

A POLICY EVALUATION OF THE BOLOGNA DECLARATION AND ITS IMPACTS ON
THE UNITED STATES' LEADERSHIP STATUS IN THE GLOBALIZED HIGHER
EDUCATION MARKET

BY

ELIZABETH SPARK

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education Policy, Organization and Leadership
with a concentration in Global Studies in Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Cameron McCarthy, Chair and Director of Research
Professor Jennifer Greene
Associate Professor Anjale Welton
Assistant Professor Nicole Lamers

Abstract

Higher education is no longer a national concept, but rather a global concept. Globalization has enacted competition as a new driving force in higher education. This includes competition for students, faculty, research, and innovation and technology. To be a leader in this competitive and global higher education market, institutions must internationalize their campuses. The United States has long been the number one destination for international students. However, Europe has implemented several higher education reforms, including the Bologna Declaration, to increase their attractiveness, visibility, and competitiveness. In response to Europe's initiatives, international student advocates like me are asking if international students will begin choosing Europe over the United States for higher education. More specifically, I am asking if and how the Bologna Declaration directly threatens the United States' competitive edge over the international student market.

Using a critical pragmatist theoretical framework, I have conducted a policy analysis of the implications of globalized competition in higher education, and examined responses to the Bologna Declaration and other international student competition influences from the top twenty international student-enrolling institutions in the United States. To remain competitive, American institutions need to consider curriculum reforms, diversify international student recruitment, and collaborate nationally to combat negative global perceptions of the United States, advocate for streamlined student visa processes, and increase funding opportunities for international students. Growing competition, combined with our nation's political climate, has increased the urgency for higher education institutions to lobby for these changes, and I believe these changes will have true policy implications for our higher education institutions and our national government that will make us more attractive to international students, as well as to our own citizens.

To my husband, Shawn, and my children, Sammy and Charlie.

The three of you are my heart, and I love you more than I can ever possibly say.

Acknowledgements

I would like to say thank you to all who have supported me throughout my doctoral studies.

First, my husband. Shawn, you have stood by me throughout the completion of this dissertation and I could not have made it without you! You have been my rock, my support system, and my balance while we have attempted to juggle demanding jobs, a long dissertation journey, challenging pregnancies, a cancer battle we never expected, and raising two toddlers! I love you oh so very much and cannot thank you enough.

A second thank you goes to my family. To my parents who always believed in me; to my sisters, Deanna and Theresa, who have always been my biggest champions; to my brother-in-law, Ted, who has always been someone I could rely on to understand my struggles and give me confidence; and to my mother-in-law, Carol, for countless hours of help with the boys.

A third thank you goes to my dearest friends for putting up with me, especially in the final year. To Jen for always being “my person,” to Allison for working with me every day and listening to me self-doubt and constantly pushing me back up, to Holly for being my support as we went through this journey together, and to Erin, Natalie, and Carrie for your any time, day or night, support!

A final thank you goes to my advisor, Cameron, and my committee members, Nicole, AJ, and Jennifer. I cannot thank you enough for the support and advice over the last seven years. I have learned so much from you, and your input and guidance has been critical to my research.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Importance of Evaluating International Student Competition.....	1
Chapter 2 Foundations of Globalization and Internationalization of Higher Education.....	11
Chapter 3 The European Perspective.....	30
Chapter 4 American International Higher Education.....	61
Chapter 5 Analyzing Global Competition Impacts.....	82
Chapter 6 American Higher Education Responses to Global Competition.....	101
Chapter 7 Higher Education Policy Implications.....	154
References.....	170
Appendix A: Questionnaire and Interview Protocols.....	184
Appendix B: List of Bologna Declaration Members.....	192

Chapter 1

Importance of Evaluating International Student Competition

Preface

I began my career in graduate admissions as an entry-level secretary for the Department of Mathematics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1999. I quickly realized I loved working with international applicants and students and that the university setting was where I wanted to be. After completing my undergraduate degree, I moved on to work for the central Graduate Admissions office at Illinois in 2004 and began learning about higher education structures in other countries. Early on in my career, I became fascinated with evaluating academic credentials from other countries. It was like putting a puzzle together as I determined how the number of years and types of classes a student took would make them eligible for graduate admission. In those days, European credentials were some of the toughest credentials to evaluate. A student from Europe applied with several different transcripts and diplomas, and I would spend a great deal of time analyzing each student using resources from the country itself, as well as those from national organizations, to evaluate their grades, degrees, and coursework.

Soon I was promoted to Assistant Director of the Graduate Admissions unit at Illinois in 2006, and by this time, the Bologna Declaration was becoming quite the hot topic for graduate admissions offices across the United States. Admissions offices had suddenly begun seeing students with three-year bachelor's degrees from Europe applying to graduate school, which left institutions uncertain as to the evaluation of these new degrees. Should we let them in? Should we make them do one year of undergrad before letting them into graduate school?

These questions were soon debated on our own campus, as well as with our peer institutions. Some smaller institutions quickly decided to accept these degrees to increase their

international student enrollments, while many larger international student-enrolling institutions, like the University of Illinois, took a safer approach. We took the stance that we would let the students in on limited status with the support of the admitting academic program.

During this time, my Director encouraged me to pursue a Master of Education degree in Higher Education at Illinois, which I did. During my time in the Higher Education program, I took every opportunity to research and write about the Bologna Declaration and the issues that generally faced our international students in the United States. With each new course, I began delving more deeply into this area of research.

Shortly before completing my Master's degree in 2008, I was promoted to Director of the Graduate Admissions unit at Illinois. As Director, I held numerous discussions regarding Bologna, international recruitment, and international admissions policies, at both Illinois and at peer institutions. Based on my research and experience in international student admissions, and in higher education structures, I began recommending and receiving approval to admit students from Europe with three-year bachelor's degrees unconditionally, with the support of the admitting academic programs.

In 2010, my Dean encouraged me to return to my academic career and pursue a doctoral degree with research surrounding the area of international student recruitment. My admissions background, and my interest in the higher education structures of Europe, led me to the topic of Bologna once again. Throughout my doctoral coursework, I continued my research on Bologna, and (during a research methods course) I began to focus my research on the competition aspect of Bologna. My ultimate dissertation question, "How has Bologna impacted our ability to maintain our lead in international student recruitment?" was formed as a result of the combined research regarding the competition goals inherent in Bologna and the best practices of

international student recruitment as a whole. I was able to hone in my methodology with the help of additional research and globalization topics courses, and soon realized that a policy analysis would best suit this research.

Studying various and multiple research methodologies throughout my doctoral program helped inform my decision to employ an evaluative policy analysis, using a critical pragmatist theory lens, to gauge the true impacts of the Bologna Declaration. My intentions for my research were to discover ways that the United States is vulnerable to losing its lead in the international student market, to learn how the Bologna Declaration has impacted and/or will impact our ability to maintain our lead in the international student market, and to determine recommendations for the United States (and more specifically, the University of Illinois) to combat these impacts and maintain and increase our leadership status in the international student market.

As previously stated, my former Dean encouraged me to pursue this doctoral degree, in part to learn how to put our institution in a better position to increase international student recruitment, but also to aide me in furthering my career at Illinois. As I have moved through my program and my career at Illinois, I do believe it is important for me to acknowledge that my research will benefit my career and my employer. Also, due to my extensive administrative background, I have the tendency to look at scholarly issues with an administrative lens¹. I recognize these biases and want to make these public to my readers. My position with Illinois also gives me an advantage in conducting my research. To research this topic and develop my recommendations, I conducted a series of document reviews, along with questionnaires and interviews with administrators from the top twenty international student-enrolling institutions. I have a number of contacts at these institutions; therefore, it is possible I was more likely to

¹ Administrative lens meaning that I tend to think as an administrator first and a scholar second. I look at the practical policy implications of my research first.

receive responses to the questionnaires and interviews than would someone else conducting this research. I have also employed snowball sampling by using these contacts to help me find additional contacts at each institution.

I have also conducted extensive document review with both United States and European trends reports for additional data about admission and enrollment trends, and for data to show successes and/or challenges of the Bologna Declaration. This document review also included the introduction of a chapter to discuss internationalization of higher education within the United States, and our strengths and weaknesses as a major player in the international student market. To develop my recommendations, I chose to triangulate² the results of my different research methods: document review, questionnaires, and interviews. I believe that utilizing the results of the three sources together has allowed me to formulate recommendations that are more comprehensive.

I hope this preface has provided you with some additional background regarding how I developed my dissertation topic, as well as why I have pursued this research, and what I hoped to achieve from it.

Introduction to Research

The United States has long been the number one destination for international student enrollment; however, with Europe's recent higher education reforms and the increase of red tape for international students entering the United States, international student advocates, like me, began asking questions such as: "Will international students begin choosing Europe over the United States for higher education", and "Does the Bologna Declaration, which has spurred a newly competitive European Higher Education Area, directly threaten the United States' "

² To triangulate research results means to evaluate each research method's results and cross-reference the results to ensure the validity of the findings.

competitive edge over the international student market”? In addition, “Do we care if we lose international enrollments, and if so, why”?

To answer these questions, I first explored the Bologna Declaration’s history, including why and how it was developed, what were the goals of Bologna, and finally, what progress has Europe made, and what are their future action plans. This exploration provided a foundation for understanding Bologna’s potential impacts on global competitiveness in higher education and for effectively responding and taking action in our own higher education structures to maintain, and even increase, our international student enrollments. In addition, I have researched the history and influences of international higher education in the United States. This included evaluating our history of recruiting international students, the benefits of international student enrollments, and the internal influences on our ability to compete for international students.

I would argue that Bologna is a direct threat to our global competitiveness for higher education, and that we may lose international students to other institutions in other higher education areas. This would negatively impact United States higher education in multiple ways. It will lessen our domestic students’ international experiences, since they will not have as many opportunities to learn about outside perspectives and differencing cultures from international students; also, US institutions and students will have fewer opportunities to influence international students with our perspectives and cultures. These interactions are important to producing good global citizens, who may one day grow to be leaders in countries with a need to work cooperatively.

The Bologna model continues to be adopted in other higher education areas across the globe, and the United States needs to not only be aware of these drastic higher education reform trends, but also start to put a plan in place to maintain and even increase our international student

enrollments. We must research how the Bologna Declaration may one day tip the balance of the international student market slightly away from the United States' favor. This balance may be tipped even more as the Bologna Declaration progresses, and as more non-European nations across the globe partner with European institutions, adopting the Bologna model for their own higher education structures. One example of this can be found in European institutions partnering with institutions in Asia, Australia, and Latin America for joint and dual degree programs. There are even a number of agreements with United States institutions, although these are general exchange agreements for a semester or two rather than an actual joint or dual degree program.

The United States remains the number one nation for international students to choose for higher education; however, if you compare the United States to the European Union (as a whole), their successes with recruiting international students far outweigh those of the United States. In addition, other countries around the globe are increasing their share in the international student market. With all of this, the United States may remain in the lead, but they are losing their market share faster than they realize. With the Bologna Declaration paving the path for Europe to increase their competition for international students, other nations around the globe are following suit and ramping up their recruitment of international students. Yet, the United States has not come up with a national agenda to maintain, much less increase, our share of the international student market. Instead, as a nation, we have increased our visa regulations and bureaucracy to make it more difficult for higher education institutions to recruit international students and more difficult for international students to choose the United States for higher education. We can review the Bologna Declaration, (its goals, its successes, and its challenges), and study the internal and external influences on why international students choose or don't

choose the United States for higher education; however, we must ultimately research whether and how the United States might learn a thing or two from Europe.

Research Purpose

The purpose of my research was to understand how the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and (more generally) other universities in the United States, might learn from the European Bologna Declaration, a major higher education reform, in terms of competition for international students. Understanding how we can do this will require using a critical pragmatist theory lens to look at how Europe has been successful at increasing its market share of international students, and how the United States may be struggling in international student recruitment. The ultimate goal was to develop strategies for the United States, and more specifically for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, to remain competitive (and increase its competitiveness) in the international student market for higher education.

In order to begin this research, I first conducted a literature review to provide a foundation of knowledge concerning globalization of, and internationalization in, higher education. This literature review not only defines these terms, but also describes how the terms are used in higher education institutions, the impacts and driving influences of globalization and internationalization efforts within higher education institutions, and ultimately how they impact the competitive nature of higher education. Competition for international students and the United States' leadership status in this competition are the primary facets of my research goals and questions, and I believe understanding the foundation behind globalization and internationalization of higher education to be critical to my research mission.

³ Critical Pragmatism allows researchers to critique and question research results, but also to think and plan practically for solutions and recommendations.

To build on this foundation, I have researched the history and influences of international education in both the European Union and the United States in chapters three and four. To fully understand the potential impacts of the Bologna Declaration on the international student market, as well as on the United States' leadership status in this international student market, it was crucial to evaluate the history of both the European Union and the United States in recruiting international students, promoting international student mobility, and implementing internationalization efforts through its higher education institutions as a result of the globalization of higher education.

In chapter five, I further discuss my methodology for evaluating the impacts of the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on the United States' leadership status in the globalized higher education market. Through a critical pragmatist theory lens, I have conducted a policy analysis of the Bologna Declaration, and in chapter six, I detail my findings and results of my document review, questionnaires, and interviews. Finally, in chapter seven, I have outlined recommendations for universities in the United States, and more specifically, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, to potentially implement to remain an international leader in higher education as well as in the globalized higher education market for international students.

Summary

When I first began this research, my hypothesis of what I would discover included higher education institutions being generally aware of the Bologna Declaration, but possibly not as concerned as they should be about international student enrollment changes. I had personally believed that while the European Union was realizing successes through the Bologna Declaration and other internationalization efforts, the United States wasn't in trouble just yet. Rather we

could begin and should begin to pay closer attention to Europe and learn from their successes and possibly look at reforms in our own higher education structures to remain competitive.

However, since beginning this journey, our country has gone through a drastic change in political and social climate that has increased the relevance of my research and the urgency to inform international education policies. Also, the European Union has undergone a number of political changes, including the United Kingdom deciding to leave the European Union through the Brexit movement, and many individual countries within the European Union taking a more nationalist stance on education and employment than the mobility favorable stance taken previously in the European Union.

For the United States, while we remain in the lead as a destination for international students, our government's executive branch has enacted several executive orders in just the last few months that have shifted the perception of the United States from being welcoming to, and valuing perspectives from, international students to a country that appears hostile to international students. The new global perception of the United States regarding immigration and international students is very alarming to higher education institutions, particularly those with large international student populations like the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Therefore, this research and the subsequent recommendations will have a greater impact than when I originally began this study.

In the end, this dissertation has served to research not only the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on the United States' leadership status in the globalized higher education market, but also to evaluate all factors that influence the United States' leadership status. You will see in my recommendations that while some include action plans directly influenced by the Bologna Declaration, other recommendations are more influenced by actions currently being taken within

the United States that are negatively impacting our leadership position. I believe my recommendations will assist higher education institutions in the United States to not only maintain their current international student enrollments, but to continue to grow enrollments and grow our missions of being preeminent global universities.

Chapter 2

Foundations of Globalization and Internationalization of Higher Education

Introduction

As discussed in chapter 1, my research is exploring the Bologna Declaration in Europe and the various impacts on the United States' leadership status in the globalized higher education market. With this research, it is important to provide some foundational information regarding both the globalization and internationalization of higher education. Globalization and internationalization are two terms used in higher education extensively. They are used on a near daily basis by faculty, staff, and students at nearly every institution in the United States. They are used in staff titles, in course syllabi, and even in academic major names. They are often used interchangeably, with everyone defining their own meaning of these terms. There are also other related terms thrown in with the discourse surrounding globalization and internationalization, such as "cross-cultural" or "inter-cultural" studies. And each individual's own personal background and/or views on globalization (and/or internationalization) are often used exclusively to define these terms for her or himself.

Let me attempt, here, to not only define globalization and internationalization, but to do so specifically in the realm of the higher education community. My goal is to offer definitions that can be used across academic and service units in higher education institutions, as well as offer explanations for the differences between the two terms and how the two terms depend on each other. Determining these definitions and the uses of such terms lays the foundation for an analysis of the globalized higher education market. The term or phrase "globalized higher education market" can also be called the "international student market" or the "market of international student competition." These terms/phrases mean different things to different

stakeholders in higher education and understanding these terms/phrases and their foundation is critical.

Numerous sources in the literature are available for defining “internationalization” and “globalization”, but again, each definition is offered from the viewpoint of the respective author. And my definitions will also, necessarily, be from my own viewpoint. As a doctoral student in the Global Studies in Education division of the Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership department of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I was naturally predisposed to defining myself as someone who uses the terms internationalization and globalization on a near daily basis. I could be identified as an expert in these areas simply because I have been admitted to study within a global studies division in such an internationally prestigious university—a university that has more international students than all but one other public institution in the United States. In addition, I oversee the Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services unit in the Graduate College at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In this role, I have a responsibility to be an international student advocate and to serve as an expert in higher education systems and policies from across the globe. These experiences directly impact my hypotheses on the definitions of internationalization and globalization. And ultimately, I will argue that a person’s, or a nation’s, or an institution’s experiences are what shape their definitions of these terms.

Defining internationalization

The National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (2011) defines internationalization as “the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. To be fully successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the academic community in global networks and

partnerships.” (NAFSA, 2011, p. 1) The National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA) serves as an organization to not only support advisors and other international student professionals, but as a voice for international students in discussing policies that impact international students. The internationalization of higher education is a concept that must serve our international students, but also our domestic students. It is an ideology that the entire academic community can come together and learn together about each other’s cultures, business practices, philosophies, and innovations.

Over the last few decades, internationalization has been a hot topic for institutions across the United States. With this, universities have been ramping up their international activities. These activities typically include study abroad, international curriculums with goals of cross-cultural understanding, foreign language proficiency, and programs to increase students’ abilities and skills of working in and with others in international labor, economic, political, and societal markets. (Altbach and Knight, 2007) In addition, internationalization is now regularly used in our mission statements, strategic plans, and our marketing and recruiting campaigns. Internationalization is viewed as a core mission of most top universities in the United States.

Benefits of Internationalization

Qiang (2003) discusses the arguments for internationalization and why it’s important to universities. He argues that with internationalization, universities are better able to prepare their students for skills to respond to the demands from the globalized job market. Internationalization specifically gives them skills in multi-lingual proficiencies, as well as knowledge in and appreciation of multiculturalism. These skills are critical to students’ ability to succeed after graduation. He also cites the economic benefits of enrolling international students, both to the institution and to our state and national economies. I believe we should maintain a non-profit

public higher education structure in the United States, but we do need to recognize the billions of dollars that international students generate in our local, state, and national economies. For example, in 2015, international students generated \$35.8 billion towards our economy. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) This benefit alone should convince institutions of the need to remain competitive in the globalized higher education market. And finally, Qiang (2003) discusses the increase in online degree programs, which allow for students from all over the globe to enroll in courses at institutions in the United States. The ability for students to sit side-by-side in a virtual classroom and interact and learn from each other is a critical innovation for universities. More universities are utilizing this new technology to offer programs and as a tool for internationalizing their curriculums and student body. For example, at the University of Illinois, President Timothy Killeen has set a goal for the university to increase its enrollment (from its three campuses) to 100,000 students by 2021 primarily through graduate online programs ⁴such as their new iMBA or Data Sciences Master of Computer Science programs operated through Coursera. (Wurth, 2017)

Qiang (2003) further argues that internationalizing a campus allows you to compare your teaching and research with that of other institutions in other nations, creating standards for your institution on the international level. Ideally, this would mean improving the quality of higher education provided. This opens new avenues of competition in the higher education market, which can only encourage universities to continue their internationalization efforts with an increased urgency. Qiang (2003) states that internationalizing a campus only fully works if internationalization is a part of the university's mission, and not just a random goal of one office of the university. Large research universities, such as the University of Illinois at Urbana-

⁴ The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign offers more than 50 MOOCs through Coursera and has had 550,396 active enrollments in these online courses from over 225 countries. (Illinois MOOCS, 2017)

Champaign, are often decentralized, and it is easy for internationalization efforts to exist in small offices for small groups of students. But, when the university comes together as a whole, an internationalization effort can be much more effective. Qiang (2003) argues that “internationalization must be entrenched in the culture, policy, planning, and organizational process of the institution so that it can be both successful and sustainable.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 258)

Institutions in the United States with successful internationalization activities and efforts often have better reputations and rankings, and an enhanced ability to recruit and retain diverse student bodies. Success in internationalization can be measured in our ability to recruit international students, offer study abroad and other international experiences for our own domestic students, offer international programming and curricula, and in how well we train our students to enter the internationalized job market of today. NAFSA (2011) argues that “internationalization will ultimately leverage the collective assets of the higher education sector to create a new generation of global citizens who will, in turn, contribute to the advancement of social and economic development for all.” (NAFSA, 2011, p. 1) This argument states that internationalization is not only good for institutions, but also for nations to take on as a mission. Institutions in the United States were first founded with goals of producing good public citizens. And in today’s age, this is transitioning to producing good global citizens. And internationalization of higher education is critical in this mission. I would argue that higher education institutions need to define for their students what constitutes a good global citizen. Through an internationally enriched curriculum, I believe it will be the responsibility of the institutions to teach students these definitions and empower them to embrace the characteristics of a good global citizen.

Approaches to Internationalization

Edwards (2007) states that United States institutions pursue internationalization activities in two approaches: an opportunistic approach and a planned approach. The opportunistic approach is used when different units on a campus are pursuing individual internationalization activities. Whereas the planned approach is when the campus, as a whole, is planning internationalization activities in an umbrella fashion. (Edwards, 2007)

Qiang (2003) also discusses various approaches to internationalization for higher education. The first, the activity approach, is designed to “promotes activities such as curriculum, student/faculty exchange, technical assistance, and international students.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 250) This is the approach used by most universities – the standard approach – offer study abroad, admit international students, have international student activities on campus, etc. The second approach, the competency approach, “emphasizes the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values in students, faculty and staff.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 250) This approach is trying to not only provide activities for students, but also to create a campus climate of intercultural awareness and promotion for its students, faculty, and staff. This is another common approach – it’s where we internationalize the curriculum and have international studies culture classes and even full out majors, and have international training for staff. The third approach, the ethos approach, “emphasizes creating a culture or climate that values and supports international/intercultural perspectives and initiatives.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 251) This approach is again working towards an over-arching campus climate with internationalization as a focus, but more at the broader level. This approach is what calls for internationalization to be in mission statements and strategic plans. Henard et al (2012) would categorize both Qiang’s second and third approach as an “internationalisation at home” approach. They argue this is the less visible

approach of internationalization where you are working to develop skills for working in an international and intercultural setting, without ever leaving the student's home country. The fourth approach, the process approach, "stresses integration and infusion of an international/intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service through a combination of a wide range of activities, policies and procedures." (Qiang, 2003, p. 251) Zolfaghari et al (2009) also support this approach arguing that "integration and infusion are also the keys in this definition to ensure that the international dimension is a central part of programs, policies, and procedures..." (Zolfaghari et al, 2009, p. 2) This approach is a bit harder to do as it involves faculty. Spreading an internationalization-focused climate through administrative offices is *easy* to do with mission statements and strategic plans compared to getting the faculty on board to implement this focus in their teaching and research; this is not such an easy agenda to tackle. In discussing the influences on internationalization implementation efforts, de Witt (2012) argues that faculty resistance and inflexible curriculums can make it difficult for administrators to follow through with internationalization efforts. De Witt (2012) argues that "leadership can make a difference, but the impetus for change has to move down to the programme level – to deans, department heads, faculty and students – for change to be realised."

Similarly, when Knight (2004) looks at the history of internationalization and how it has evolved, she argues that in the 1980s, internationalization was generally just used as a term to describe any internationally focused activities on a campus, such as study abroad or foreign language courses. But by the mid-1990s, institutions began to take a broader campus position on instituting internationalization at the campus-level. This meant introducing it as a goal in strategic plans and collaborating with multiple units on campus to truly internationalize the campus. (Knight, 2004)

Knight's (2004) arguments are similar to those of Qiang (2003) and Zolfaghari et al in that she offers that institutions cannot simply implement internationalization, but rather, they must integrate internationalization into their campus. She argues that the "concept of integration is specifically used to denote the process of infusing or embedding the international and intercultural dimension into policies and programs to ensure that the international dimension remains central, not marginal, and is sustainable." (Knight, 2004, p. 12) Ultimately, if a campus doesn't take internationalization seriously and fully integrate it into all of their goals and their central university mission, then individual unit activities will not fully succeed. The support of the campus must exist for a university to fully internationalize its academic community. The National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (2011) argues that internationalization requires "broad institutional support and involvement of faculty, senior administrators, international education professionals, and student services professionals on campuses to realize the potential that internationalization has to strengthen the role of United States higher education in our increasingly global environment." (NAFSA, 2011, p. 1)

Defining Globalization

The globalization of higher education has resulted from other globalization forces in economics, politics, and society. This is in large part due to innovation in technology that has allowed for information and knowledge to be transferred and shared across national borders. With the ease of the knowledge transfer, courses, research, and other means of delivering and producing higher education can now also be implemented and shared globally. The new globalized world of higher education is also arisen in part due to the ever-growing competition for the best students from around the globe. Students have been studying in foreign countries for

decades, but the competition for international students has now risen to the fore-front of every major research institution in every major higher education area of the globe.

Altbach and Knight (2007) define globalization as “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement.”

(Altbach and Knight, 2007, p. 290) They argue that global capital is now being invested as human capital through networks of higher education, stating that “this investment reflects the emergence of the “knowledge society,” the rise of the service sector, and the dependence of many societies on knowledge products and highly educated personnel for economic growth.”

(Altbach and Knight, 2007, p. 290) The ability to produce human capital – highly educated and globally versed graduates – is now a global commodity for which all nations are vying.

Stromquist and Monkman (2000) argue that globalization “increases interaction and this creates opportunities for new learning.” (Stromquist and Monkman, 2000, p. 11) They argue that these new learning opportunities are becoming more and more available for education in terms of online and distance learning programs. These opportunities allow for knowledge to be more easily shared across nations, and subsequently increase the knowledge capabilities of people around the world. As a result, globalization is becoming an everyday used word. Similarly, Altbach and Knight (2007) argue that the globalization of higher education has resulted in research across borders, English as the global language of higher education and business, and new ways of using information technology for knowledge transfer around the world.

Carnoy (2000) argues the relationship between globalization and information is the relationship that brings globalization to the forefront of higher education. He argues that "Two of the main bases of globalization are information and innovation, and they, in turn, are highly knowledge intensive; and because knowledge is highly portable, it lends itself easily to

globalization; and if knowledge is fundamental to globalization, globalization should also have a profound impact on the transmission of knowledge." (Carnoy, 2000, p. 43) Online learning is an enormous innovation for universities and allows institutions to offer programs to students all over the globe from different cultures and backgrounds. It allows for virtual classrooms to have students from the United States, Europe, Asia, etc. talking with and learning from each other.

Stromquist and Monkman (2000) argue that globalization "and its sophisticated use of technology implies a salient role for post-secondary education." (Stromquist and Monkman, 2000, p.14) They argue that with this new technology in its arsenal, knowledge is becoming more powerful. And for countries to achieve economic growth and remain competitive, they must possess strong knowledge capital. (Stromquist and Monkman, 2000)

Stromquist and Monkman (2000) cite that universities are working more and more with outside organizations on research. This is leading to more client-driven or corporation-driven research approaches, and less philosophy-based approaches to research. This leads universities to possibly becoming too focused on knowledge and research production and less concerned on public welfare issues like social justice. This is driven by the competition aspect of globalization. As higher education becomes more and more globalized, the competition between universities has also moved to be on the global scale. Students want to go to the institution that will best prepare them for the workforce, and the competition for these students has led to universities becoming more privatized and more client-based research focused. (Stromquist and Monkman, 2000)

Carnoy (2000) looks at another aspect of globalization and competition. He argues that globalization leads to "increased competition among nations in a more closely intertwined international economy." (Carnoy, 2000, p. 46) As competition between countries rises in the

higher education market, there has been an increased focus on teaching science, technology, and mathematics, all with an increased look at how we measure our educational achievements in these areas. Carnoy (2000) argues that these comparative measurements are critical to attracting organizations and industries to partner with and gain funding from to facilitate innovative research. Institutions now must compete for funding and for students on a global level and so having these measurements can increase their ability to develop these relationships.

Carnoy (2000) cites that universities have the support of organizations such as the International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the World Bank, when it comes to using global measurements. These organizations all measure education on a global scale and specifically look at their measurements of efficiency. These organizations “share an explicit understanding that “better” education can be measured and that better education translates directly into higher economic and social productivity.” (Carnoy, 2000, p. 56) In a globalized higher education market where competition is at the fore-front of institutional agendas, being able to measure educational productivity on a global scale is now a necessity for our institutions.

Globalization vs. Internationalization

Qiang (2003) argues that “higher education has now become a real part of the globalization process: the cross-border matching of supply and demand.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 249) This means that the institutional discourse of higher education agendas, strategies, missions, etc. can no longer exclude discussing the global implications. Zolfaghari et al (2009) also states “the idea of internationalization of higher education especially in developing countries has been deduced from globalization of education process.” (Zolfaghari et al, 2009, p.1) Qiang (2003) argues that this “calls for a broader definition of internationalization, which embraces the entire

functioning of higher education and not merely a dimension or aspect of it, or the actions of some individuals which are part of it.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 249) We must define internationalization in higher education in a way that will work across academic communities and across borders.

Qiang (2003) defines internationalization of higher education as “one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization, yet at the same time respects the individuality of the nation.” (Qiang, 2003, P. 249) This means that each country, and really, each institution, will respond to globalization based on its own experiences and characteristics. The structure of an institution, along with its culture and mission, will shape the way the institution conducts its internationalization activities. Zolfaghari et al (2009) support this argument stating, “The definition of internationalization of higher education varies and depends on the stakeholder groups, government, private sector, institution, faculty member, academic discipline, and student. These different perspectives result in several reasons for many program approaches to internationalization of higher education.” (Zolfaghari et al, 2009, p. 2)

Going along with this argument that each institution will implement internationalization based on its situation, the institution may also implement internationalization in multiple ways. The university may take an internationalization stance in its recruiting activities and even student service activities, but may not take the same stance or approach in its teaching and research activities. Qiang (2003) argues that some see internationalization as a way of achieving a goal – like competitiveness in the global market – while some see it as just a philosophy of how to approach education stating that “it thus can be said that internationalization is not merely an aim itself, but an important resource in the development of higher education towards, first of all, a system in line with international standards; secondly, one open and responsive to its global environment.” (Qiang, 2003, p. 250)

Knight (2004) offers a provoking stance on internationalization and globalization of higher education stating, “Internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization.” (Knight, 2004, p. 5) I believe that higher education is responding to the globalization of economies, technology, and innovation by internationalizing their curriculums and offering internationalization opportunities for students to create global citizens who can succeed in a globalized workforce. Knight (2004) argues that the two concepts are different, but they are definitely related and they definitely build off each other. Similar to arguments from Qiang (2003) and Zolfaghari et al (2009); she argues that each country, and even each institution, is going to react to globalization and implement internationalization strategies and activities differently based on their own experiences, cultures, history, etc. (Knight, 2004) Likewise, each individual student, staff member, and faculty member of these institutions is going to develop their own definitions of internationalization and reactions to globalization based on their own personal experiences.

Knight (2004) argues that internationalization is the higher education sector’s response to the globalization happening in our societies in terms of culture, economics, politics, and business. She cites Soderqvist’s (2002) definition of internationalization of higher education as “a change process from a national higher education institution to an international higher education institution leading to the inclusion of an international dimension in all aspects of its holistic management in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and to achieve the desired competencies.” (Soderqvist, 2002, p. 29) Institutions across the globe will often self-market themselves as international institutions. They do this when they consider themselves successful at enrolling international students and offering internationalized curriculum. They also

do this based on their own world rankings in terms of international student enrollments, academic rankings, and even globally recognized research rankings.

Knight (2004) discusses the challenges in developing a definition of internationalization for higher education and the difference in defining internationalization and globalization. She cites that a definition must be broad enough to fit all countries and all institutional structures. Ultimately, she argues that the definition must be relative to all facets of higher education and how institutions impact their stakeholders. She offers a definition of “Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education.” (Knight, 2004, p. 11) As stated previously, integration is critical to successfully implementing internationalization on a campus.

Knight (2004) would argue that internationalization is an ever-evolving process, and I would have to agree. It must continue to change, and institutions must continue to question and change how they view internationalization as a concept and as a mission. As globalization continues to change our economies, societies, politics, and information technology, its impacts on internationalization will also change. And this will create a trickle-down effect on how institutions implement internationalization as a response to globalization efforts around the world.

Altbach and Knight (2007) also offer an interesting perspective on the difference between globalization and internationalization: “Globalization may be unalterable, but internationalization involves many choices. Globalization tends to concentrate wealth, knowledge, and power in those already possessing these elements. International academic mobility similarly favors well-developed education systems and institutions, thereby

compounding existing inequalities.” (Altbach and Knight, 2007, p. 291) As internationalization is a reaction to globalization in higher education, it is more flexible in terms of how to implement and integrate it within your campus agendas. And while globalization is more of a driving force, and therefore “unalterable,” it is interpretable. So, while you may not be able to change it, you can interpret it in various ways that may differ from others’ views.

Teichler (2009) believes the following themes underlie the discourse of internationalization in higher education: physical mobility, acceptance and recognition of academic achievements across borders, knowledge transfer across borders through virtual communications, media, and publications, infusing global understanding into curriculums to create an increase in cultural awareness on a global level, the fact that comparable higher education systems across borders play a role in the success of student mobility, and that it usually grows out of a need for higher education reform to maintain global competitiveness, and a world class education must include globalization curriculum. All of these themes generally have an underlying positive connotation to bring internationalization to higher education. The themes all have a goal of improving cultural understanding, academic achievement, and to better prepare students for a globalized world. (Teichler, 2009)

In the age of globalization, student mobility across borders is now a common occurrence; whether that is for a short study abroad trip of one semester or for an entire degree program. Similar to Teichler’s (2009) themes of internationalization discourse, Altbach and Knight (2007) state that key topics in globalization and internationalization discourse include “the cross-border movement of students and of higher education programs and institutions—big business for universities and other providers—the growing international market for academic and scientific personnel, curricular internationalization, and the commercialization of international higher

education, especially the growing influence of the for-profit higher education sector.” (Altbach and Knight, 2007, p. 291)

Teichler (2009) argues that the terms internationalization and globalization are different: internationalization tends to refer more to increasing cross-border activities, while globalization blurs those lines with a hope to seek out having no borders. Teichler (2009) goes so far to state that another word for the phrase “world competition society” is global or globalization. Also, internationalization is usually focused on knowledge transfer, while globalization is focused on competition. (Teichler, 2009) This is why the Bologna Declaration, for example, focuses its language and goals on globalization as a means of competition for the international student market. This competition is a key component of its goals and whether or not it succeeds in creating a European Higher Education Area.

Edwards (2007) argues that the United States plays such a large role in the international student market, that any country’s discourse regarding internationalization and globalization will inevitably include their relationship with our institutions. Edwards (2007) argues “the way in which we think, as a global community, about globalization and what it means and how to respond to it within our educational systems results in linguistic convergence as well as model convergence—toward English, of course—and that also has implications.” (Edwards, 2007, p. 374) As the United States remains the leader in enrolling international students, we do often serve as a central location for this discourse. However, with the rise of globalization efforts in higher education, such as the Bologna Declaration in Europe, we are seeing the European Union as a second, and maybe even an equal, central location for this discourse.

Conclusion

Higher education is no longer a national concept. Higher education is a global concept. Globalization of economies, societies, culture, politics, and now education is happening around the world. How we react to globalization and how we implement these reactions is going to depend on our personal experiences, culture, history, and traditions. Higher education institutions are going to react in a similar manner. I would offer a definition of the globalization of higher education as the impacts of cross-border knowledge transfer through innovative technologies and cross-national educational policies and agreements such as the Bologna Declaration, institutional student and faculty exchange agreements between foreign countries, and global efforts for student advocacy.

I would offer a definition of internationalization of higher education as being the local implications of the globalization of higher education. These *local* implications include the ways in which a nation, or even an individual institution, implement international activities and programming such as online degree programs, international curricula, study abroad programs, and international student recruitment initiatives, in response to the globalization of higher education. These responses to globalization, these internationalization efforts, are based on an individual's, institution's, or even nation's history, culture, politics, economy, and educational structure. These personal characteristics will shape an institution's views on internationalization and globalization and shape the manner in which activities and agendas are carried out and planned.

A successful internationalization institutional plan will respond to globalization with research, competition, technology innovation, and student advocacy at the forefront of their agendas and mission statements. Institutions must research their global competitors, compare

their educational productivity to their global competitors, and seek out ways of internationalizing their curriculum, research, and services to recruit and retain the most talented students and faculty from across the globe. Institutions must realize that knowledge is power, and human capital is an investment they must make. This means leveraging their technological innovations and research to recruit the best students and faculty.

Globalization has created a new driving force in higher education: competition; competition for students, competition for faculty, competition for research, and competition for technology. This all leads to competition for funding, rankings, and reputation. And in order to maintain a leadership role in this new competitive and global higher education market, institutions must internationalize their campuses.

Globalization of higher education is not something that any institution can choose to ignore. Rather, institutions can choose how to respond to globalization with various internationalization efforts. These efforts, of course, must serve our international students, but also our domestic students. To be successful, the institutions must implement internationalization activities at the campus-level. Having the support of top administrators, and integrating internationalization in all aspects of the campus mission and strategies will allow institutions to be in the best position to remain competitive and respond to globalization.

In the following chapter, I will explore the example of the Bologna Declaration and how it serves as a response from the European Union to the globalization of higher education. The primary goal of the Bologna Declaration is to create a European Higher Education Area and make it the most attractive, most competitive higher education area in the world. The Bologna Declaration is not only impacting the European Union, but also becoming a global movement that is impacting higher education around the globe. It is a classic example of a global higher

education policy that is impacting the internationalization practices of local institutions in multiple countries. Institutions in the United States, as well as in Latin America, South America, Asia, and Australia have all, at least, had discussions on how to respond to Bologna. And many of these institutions have implemented policies and practices on how to respond to Bologna with internationalization activities such as increased international student recruitment and international partnerships with universities.

Chapter 3

The European Perspective

An Introduction to European International Higher Education

As discussed in the previous chapter, globalization has spurred institutions across the world to internationalize their higher education structures. How institutions implement internationalization in their curriculums, student opportunities, or even competition strategies will vary based on the institution itself, the state, or even the nation of the institution. Europe has employed several strategies to compete in the newly globalized higher education market, and this chapter will explore the history of European international higher education, including the successes and challenges faced by the European Union and its institutions.

The Bologna Declaration is far from Europe's first attempt at internationalizing or globalizing its higher education structures or its first attempt at trying to be more competitive in the international student market. Teichler (2009) argues that after WWII, the idea of study abroad, the Fulbright Program, and European involvement in study abroad were all acts in promoting cultural understanding through education. He argues that these acts were to help the countries fall back together in an area of trust. After the war, European countries did not trust each other, and there was a lot of hatred and political fear of interacting with each other. (Teichler, 2009) Using education and student mobility, European nations hoped to ease the pain and mistrust from the war. This is how student mobility became important in Europe. It continued through the 1970s and 1980s with various programs, but it wasn't until the Erasmus program of 1987 was established that Europe became "successful" in the area of student mobility. (Teichler, 2009)

Erasmus Program

Erasmus stands for the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students and is referred to as the “European Union’s flagship ‘mobility’ programme in education and training and one of the best-known EU-level actions.” (Europa, 2011). Today’s Erasmus program is the European version of the American Study Abroad program, and since its implementation in 1987, over two million European students have participated. (Europa, 2011) It was designed to give students the opportunity to study abroad for one year, as well as give funding to institutions and organizations willing to set up study abroad programs and support the students, as well as foster collaborative arrangements between the institutions. (Teichler, 2009) In 1989, the European Union established the ECTS European Credit Transfer System for Erasmus students to be able to easily transfer credit from institution to institution across borders. Erasmus grew from 3000 in 1987 to 86,000 in 1997 based on students’ belief that its addition to their resumes helped land their first jobs and helped them seek global employment opportunities. (Teichler, 2009)

In order to continue the increase in student mobility and the quality of globalized higher education, the European Union started a trend of establishing comparable degree programs throughout Europe. They were comparable in quality and structure in such a way as to ease the transition of transfer credit and mobility. Teichler (2009) argues that these movements were determined crucial to Europe’s success in playing their part in globalizing higher education.

Lisbon Convention

Building on the successes of the Erasmus program, the Lisbon Recognition Convention, formally known as the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region, was signed and created by the Council of Europe and the

United Nations Organization for Education, Science, and Culture (UNESCO) in 1997. This convention provided Europe with a way to create a cross-national agreement for recognizing higher education qualifications across its nations. (COE, 2014)

The Council of Europe and UNESCO worked together to create the Lisbon Recognition Convention with a goal of promoting student mobility within Europe by creating a system of recognition of degrees from each nation state. As the higher education structures in each nation state varied so widely during this time, a system for recognizing higher education qualifications across these states was critical. The Council of Europe and UNESCO were “conscious of the fact that the right to education is a human right, and that higher education, which is instrumental in the pursuit and advancement of knowledge, constitutes an exceptionally rich cultural and scientific asset for both individuals and society.” (Lisbon Recognition Convention, 1997) This belief, along with their understanding for the need for a practical recognition of degrees allowed for the Council of Europe and UNESCO to work together to create this convention to allow Europe to move forward in developing as a competitive higher education area.

In the Lisbon Recognition Convention, all parties agreed that when a student is applying to a university outside of their home country, the university must provide a fair assessment to the student of their previous qualifications earned in their home country. In the convention, the Council of Europe and UNESCO articulated, “holders of qualifications issued in one country shall have adequate access to an assessment of these qualifications in another country.” (Lisbon Recognition Convention, 1997) This includes an assessment for entry into higher education, as well as an assessment of previous periods of study in higher education and previous higher education qualifications earned. The parties also agreed that in this assessment, the previous institutions must provide information to the student and to the new university regarding their

studies and qualifications earned. (Lisbon Recognition Convention, 1997) This, perhaps, was a precursor to the diploma supplement implemented with the Bologna Declaration.

Going a step further, the convention allowed the parties to agree to providing information about its higher education qualifications to the public (and so to each other) for all qualifications given for all institutions. This includes information regarding quality, assessment, and structure of the qualifications. This allows each party to assess the other's qualifications. (Lisbon Recognition Convention, 1997) This agreement, therefore, provided a natural system of assessment so that when students travel between nations for higher education, a system is already in place for assessment of their previous credentials.

In the United States, most higher education institutions have a similar system in place for evaluating international credentials. Specifically, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Graduate Admissions office has created a manual for evaluating credentials from nearly every nation in the world. The manual includes a list of qualifications we accept from each country, and often from specific institutions. This has been a common practice in the United States since at least the 1970s.

Sorbonne Declaration

Taking the goals and successes of Erasmus and Lisbon to a more formal level, the Sorbonne Declaration was signed in 1998 by Ministers of higher education from France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom (many would argue the power players of the European Union) with a goal of creating cooperative degree programs and structures across borders. The Sorbonne Declaration was perhaps the pre-cursor to the Bologna Declaration as it agreed to the “harmonization of the architecture of the European Higher Education System.” (Sorbonne, 1998)

The Sorbonne declaration reminded Europe that while it was moving ahead with cross-border banking and economics, it must also create a cross-border area for knowledge and education. The four countries who signed the Sorbonne Declaration, France, Germany, Italy, and the UK, wanted to come together as the four countries who hold some of the oldest universities in the world to remind those of the European Union that Europe created universities and that their nations and universities had a responsibility to their students to give them a space for quality higher education that included mobility, cross-border understanding and experiences, and prepared them for their futures. They stated that they owed their students “a higher education system in which they are given the best opportunities to seek and find their own area of excellence.” (Sorbonne, 1998, p. 1). In order to give this to their students, they must work together to create the European Higher Education Area. In aiming for mobility, the Sorbonne Declaration urged students to study abroad at least one semester in both their undergraduate and graduate cycles and called for more exchange agreements between universities and joint and dual degree programs. (Sorbonne, 1998)

The four countries who wrote the Sorbonne Declaration stated that they wanted “to create a European area of higher education, where national identities and common interests can interact and strengthen each other for the benefit of Europe, of its students, and more generally of its citizens. We call on other Member States of the Union and other European countries to join us in this objective and on all European Universities to consolidate Europe's standing in the world through continuously improved and updated education for its citizens.” (Sorbonne, 1998, p. 3)

Many of the action plans within Bologna truly were first formed in the Sorbonne Declaration. The Sorbonne Declaration called for the European Higher Education Area to be built, and it called for transparency of higher education systems, mobility, and competitiveness.

The Sorbonne Declaration cited the need for two clear degree cycles, the use of the ECTS, and argued that this would lead to transparency which would lead to international attractiveness and recognition. (Sorbonne, 1998)

Hackl (2001) argues that the Sorbonne Declaration and the Bologna Declaration are eventual results of the changes in higher education that began in Europe in the 1960s. In the 1960s and 1970s, Hackl (2001) argues that both an economic and social push created a huge increase in access to higher education. The drive for more highly skilled workers became important as the European economy and job market was increasing, and with this, the social aspect of higher education became important as Europe began to see higher education as a public good. (Hackl, 2001) Throughout this time, national governments in Europe began calling for university reform, including accessibility for all citizens, not just the elite. Higher education became a part of the cross-border economic discourse in Europe and was no longer thought of as a nation-based commodity. (Hackl, 2001)

In the 1980s and 1990s, the improved accessibility to higher education had been so successful, that higher education started to be viewed as a “private benefit and responsibility” and less as a public good and “public responsibility.” (Hackl, 2001, p. 4) Also, as participation increased, governments began to encourage universities to not only depend on national funds, but also to begin looking for other means of funding for their programs and students, such as charging tuition and seeking ways to become more autonomous and privatized. (Hackl, 2001)

Little was done to change the structure of the curriculum or the length of degrees during these four decades. The lengthy time to degree and lack of structure was sometimes discussed in reforms, but it wasn’t given much support or movement until near the start of the 21st century. (Hackl, 2001)

While the Erasmus program increased student mobility and there were various agendas and reports in various countries regarding student mobility, many universities in Europe had concerns about students studying abroad. These concerns included the fact that the distribution of Erasmus students was disproportionate, that the funds for these students were constantly decreasing, and many believed that the terms spent studying abroad delayed a student's time to graduation. (Hackl, 2001) The Sorbonne Declaration provided a way for multiple nations to come together and find a way to harmonize their education systems that would still encourage student mobility, but also quality higher education and cross-border institutional cooperation. (Hackl, 2001)

Another driving force for the Sorbonne Declaration was the increase in competitiveness for international students across the globe. Europe was starting to notice the increase in international students attending institutions in the United States and Australia and less students were coming to Europe. By harmonizing their higher education systems, the four countries who signed the Sorbonne Declaration believed they could increase their piece of the international student market pie. (Hackl, 2001) In looking at restructuring higher education systems, the Sorbonne Declaration made it clear that the undergraduate degree cycle should allow for curriculum diversity and lead to an appropriate level of qualification preparing a student for the workforce; whereas, the graduate degree cycle should allow for more research and academic freedoms. (Hackl, 2001)

Hackl (2001) argues that the Sorbonne Declaration received support and buy-in from across Europe for three reasons: the consistent use of the term *harmonization*, the fact that it was signed by the four biggest power player countries in Europe with major reforms immediately

taking place in Germany and France, and that the other European Union states were invited to join the declaration which called for a meeting of all the ministers the following year in Bologna.

While the Sorbonne Declaration and the Bologna Declaration are very similar and have the same overarching agenda – to promote harmonization of knowledge and the creation of the European Higher Education Area – there are differences. These differences are found primarily in the expansion of the Sorbonne Declaration by the Bologna Declaration. The Sorbonne Declaration was written and signed by the Ministers of Education of only four countries, whereas the Bologna Declaration had input from these same 4 countries, but also from representatives from many other nations, the European Commission, and the academic community. (Hackl, 2001) Further, the Bologna Declaration took the objectives of the Sorbonne Declaration to a new level – expanding upon the requirements of the two degree levels with the addition of the diploma supplement and the ECTS requirements of each degree level. The Bologna Declaration also further defined the need for quality assurance and international competitiveness as two key components to developing a successful European Higher Education Area. (Hackl, 2001) And what may be the most important key difference between the Sorbonne Declaration and the Bologna Declaration: the recognition it gives the academic community as a critical partner in the ability for Europe to succeed with the objectives of the declaration. The Bologna Declaration invoked the Bologna Magna Charta Universitatum “calling upon the universities to respond and to contribute to the consolidation of the European area of higher education.” (Hackl, 2001, p. 26)

The Bologna Declaration is more of an agreement made by 29 countries to truly work together to create the European Higher Education Area through educational system reforms and cooperation, while the Sorbonne Declaration is more of a political statement made by the four power players of higher education in Europe (some would argue the major power players of the

world). (Hackl, 2001) The Sorbonne Declaration is more vague and more a document of ideals and goals sponsored by four countries. It is truly the pre-cursor and inspiration for the Bologna Declaration. The four countries may have laid the ground work, but the Bologna Declaration took the ideals and goals and put them into action plans with the cooperation of the rest of the academic world players in Europe.

In looking back at when he, along with Ministers of Education and Science from the UK, France, and Italy originally signed the Sorbonne Declaration, Jurgen Ruttgers (2013) regards the Sorbonne Declaration as “the most significant reform of institutions of higher education in modern times.” (Ruttgers, 2013, p. 1) Ruttgers (2013) recalls that “It was our goal to create a diverse European landscape of higher education. Good science is international. Our institutions of higher education should not only be national and European. They should also be schools of the world. The Sorbonne Declaration pushed open the doors to the world.” (Ruttgers, 2013, p. 1-2)

Ruttgers (2013) argues that while the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations are reforms of higher education that push for a new and improved higher education area, both declarations were created with their countries’ rich history in higher education in mind. The Sorbonne Declaration was signed during a celebration of the University of Sorbonne’s 800th anniversary, making it only one of Europe’s oldest universities. As many of Europe’s universities date back to the 13th and 14th centuries, there is great heritage and culture engrossed in their higher education structures and governance. Naturally, all Ministers involved were very conscious of this history while planning for the future. (Ruttgers, 2013) When looking at the historical higher education of Europe and looking to the future, Ruttgers (2013) argues that there are three components to a unified higher education area. The first is that there must be “unity in diversity,” the second is

that “higher education had to be connected to values,” and the third is “universities must be part of the knowledge-based society of the 21st century.” (Ruttgers, 2013, p. 2-3)

Interestingly, Ruttgers (2013) really argues the second component, that we must tie higher education and values together. He argues that while the importance of competitiveness and economics are critical to the success of higher education in Europe, “Universities are not businesses. They do not have to make a profit. They are committed to the truth and nothing else: truth in explaining and understanding nature, truth in self-knowledge. Here lies the western heritage which we need to cultivate.” (Ruttgers, 2013, p. 3) It is interesting to read this sentiment from one of the original writers of these declarations as many of us have interpreted the importance of the competition goal in these declarations.

Ruttgers (2013) argues that the Sorbonne Declaration also gave institutions autonomy and self-governance that they never had before. This allowed for faculty and students to take charge of their own education. He argued that this was so very important because “We need people who feel responsible for the society they live in; people who contribute to the common good and who are not only concerned with their own benefits; educated people in the true sense. Everyone has the right to education, the right to escape poverty and ignorance.” (Ruttgers, 2013, p. 5)

Bologna Declaration

As introduced above, to further define the goals of the Sorbonne Declaration and to outline action plans to carry out the intention of creating the European Higher Education Area, twenty-nine European Ministers of Education met in Bologna, Italy to sign the Bologna Declaration a year later, in 1999. The Bologna Declaration (1999) aimed to “create a coherent and cohesive European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010.” The EHEA was to establish

Europe as a place for international students to come and study (making Europe competitive in the international student market) and establish cooperative exchange, joint and dual degree program agreements with quality higher education institutions across the globe.

The Bologna Declaration was an agreement designed to bring about change in Europe's higher education systems that would lead to a more effective and competitive EHEA. Bologna consisted of six objectives and action plans to align Europe's higher educational systems and ultimately achieve the EHEA goals of both the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations.

The first objective was to adopt a "system of easily readable and comparable degrees" and implement the use of a diploma supplement. This document would accompany a student's transcripts and diplomas and would summarize the degree requirements and the overall higher education system of the institution's country, as well as be delivered in both English and the native language.

The second objective was to design a consistent three-degree cycle system, with primary focus on the first two cycles. The first degree, the bachelor, was to be at least three years leading to the second degree, the master. The master would then add knowledge in the student's major and prepare the student for the third degree, the doctorate. The bachelor's and master's degrees must provide the student with a total of at least five years of education. In addition to the specifications on time to degree, the Ministers also agreed that all degree programs would be taught in English. (Bologna, 1999)

The third objective was to begin using the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) for weighting course credits. This system was to be implemented to weight coursework consistently across countries and to ease the transferability of coursework. The bachelor's degree was to consist of a minimum 180 ECTS to prepare students for either entry-

level professional positions or for the second cycle, the Master's degree, which when combined with the Bachelor, would consist of a minimum 300 ECTS to prepare students for higher-level professional positions or for the third cycle, the Doctoral degree. The Doctoral degree was not, and has still not been, fully defined by a minimum number of years or ECTS. The Doctoral degree is a new concept in Europe, at least in the Bologna model. European institutions have been granting Doctoral degrees for years, but students simply did research with few or no coursework and little interaction with professors, fellow students, or even their dissertation advisor. With the Bologna model, the intent for the Doctoral cycle was to include courses preparing students for their research and to foster a community for students to work with each other and with their professors and advisor—similar to that of the United States model.

(Bologna, 1999)

The fourth objective was to promote mobility of students, professors, and researchers within the European Union. (Bologna, 1999) European Ministers of Education believed the creation of the EHEA would ease students' ability to be more mobile within the European Union for higher education, rather than traveling abroad to the United States or other countries. They believed the EHEA would also increase their competitiveness with other countries and increase their share in the international student market. The Ministers stated in the Bologna Declaration “we must in particular look at the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions.” (Bologna, 1999) In recognizing the need to provide additional and more quality services to their students, but with fewer resources, the

Ministers believed the new aligned degree system would create efficiency in their educational systems and that this more focused and efficient degree system would allow the EHEA to obtain its competitive goals in the global market. (Foley and Stableski, 2007)

The fifth objective was to design and enforce a quality assurance system across Bologna-compliant countries. (Bologna, 1999) This system would be used at the institutional, national, and European levels. (Foley and Stableski, 2007)

The final objective was to implement and promote the Europeanization of higher education. This goal was to emphasize European curriculum within higher education structures, including in the curriculum and mobility opportunities of degree programs. (Bologna, 1999) The Ministers agreed that all institutions in their countries would accomplish these goals by the year 2010. They also agreed to meet every two years to discuss the progress of these action plans. (Bologna, 1999) The objectives described above were laid out to increase competitiveness, mobility, and employability for European institutions and students.

Creating this new model for higher education was not an easy task. Almost all countries who initially (and have now) signed the Bologna Declaration had completely different higher educational structures with varied languages for instruction, years to degree, credit requirements, etc. Aligning such different structures from a top-down model is difficult, to say the least. From my experiences with working with foreign institutions and discussing the Bologna implementation, many frustrations existed within European institutions as the Ministers of higher education signed the Bologna Declaration, often without the input or knowledge of their higher education institutions. It is interesting to note that this is a situation that would be much more difficult to implement in the United States. The Ministers of higher education, or often the Ministers of education, in many of these countries, have a much more powerful role over their

entire country's educational systems than the United States' Secretary of Education, for example. In the United States, each state has some control over its educational structures, and making such a change for the entire country would not be possible by just signing a declaration at one conference.

These Ministers of higher education who signed with the Bologna Declaration had bigger goals than just creating this new degree structure for their institutions. Their overarching prospectus for the Bologna Declaration was to develop a European Higher Education Area (EHEA). Since 1999, additional countries have signed the Bologna Declaration, bringing the membership count to 47 countries (see Appendix B for a complete list of countries). These countries are working together to make the EHEA a highly recognizable, attractive, and competitive choice for international students when choosing their higher education institution. However, it is important to note that each country's progress towards the Bologna goals is controlled by its individual Ministries of Education; there is not a Higher Education Board of Bologna or any other overseeing agency. Each country who signs the Bologna Declaration does so freely without influence or pressure from the European Union. (Foley and Stableski, 2007)

Lisbon Strategy

In the year 2000, just one year after the Bologna Declaration was signed, the European Council met in Lisbon to create what came to be called the "Lisbon Strategy" for growth and jobs. The overarching objective of the Lisbon strategy was to "deliver stronger, lasting growth and create more and better jobs in order to unlock the resources needed to meet Europe's wider economic, social and environmental ambitions, thus making Europe a more attractive place to invest and work and improving knowledge and innovation for growth in Europe." (CORDIS, 2014) While the Lisbon strategy was primarily focused on creating more of an economic reform,

it also involved pieces of reform that could only help Europe reach the goals of the Bologna Declaration. In order to create growth in the job market in Europe, Europe realized it must invest in education, and therefore the advancement in education through the tools of Bologna could only lead to the advancement of growth and jobs.

The “Community Lisbon Programme” was a critical part of the Lisbon Strategy and tied strongly to the goals of Bologna. The programme called for three action areas including “knowledge for innovation and growth; making Europe a more attractive place to invest and work; creating more and better jobs.” (CORDIS, 2014) The first action area, knowledge for innovation and growth, tied securely with the educational reform goals of Bologna. This area called for investments in education and research and improved education and vocational training. In order to see economic growth and modernization, and become a top place for investment and employment, Europe must invest in higher education. The Community Lisbon Programme agreed to “complement national efforts to increase research investment to 3% of GDP by stimulating, organising and exploiting all forms of EU-level cooperation in research, innovation and education with means from the Community budget.” (CORDIS, 2014)

Another aspect of the revised Lisbon Strategy was to promote mobility within Europe by using a qualifications framework for employment purposes. (CORDIS, 2014) As the qualifications framework was a key action plan of Bologna, this is yet another example of how the Lisbon Strategy has been built and revised based on the successes of the Bologna Declaration. The Lisbon Strategy called for transparency in said frameworks, and transparency was one of the main objectives of the higher education reform of Bologna.

The European Council argued that the primary objective of the Lisbon Strategy of 2000 was to “become the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world by

2010 capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion and respect for the environment.” (European Commission, 2010) As competitiveness is a key component and goal of Bologna, this revised strategy was a natural progression after Bologna.

The Lisbon Strategy truly came about as a European-wide commitment to be more competitive in the areas of growth and productivity and to compete with other world leaders such as the United States and Japan. (Rodriguez, R., Warmeradam, J., Triomphe, C.E., 2010) “Europe’s deficit in terms of technological capacity and innovation became the symbol of the ground needing to be made up to assure EU competitiveness; this was at the heart of the emphasis laid on advancing towards a “knowledge society”, which became the strategy’s best-known slogan.” (Rodriguez, R., Warmeradam, J., Triomphe, C.E., 2010)

Keeling (2006) argues that higher education is a primary concern for Europe, and these concerns are heavily influenced by both the Bologna Declaration and the Lisbon Strategy. She argues that neither policy really provides the European Union with an all-inclusive plan for higher education reform, but when you combine the two, “these European-level actions are supporting and stabilizing an emergent policy framework for the EU in higher education.” (Keeling, 2006, p. 203)

Both the Bologna Declaration and the Lisbon Strategy have brought the European Union Commission to a much more involved platform for reforming higher education in Europe. The Commission has led the debates and discussions surrounding higher education with these two policies as its driving arguments. (Keeling, 2006)

Similar to the Bologna Declaration’s goal of creating a competitive and an attractive European Higher Education Area by 2010, the Lisbon Strategy also called for creating a

competitive and attractive knowledge-based economy by 2010. While Bologna had its own action plans for how to create the European Higher Education Area through the new three-tier higher education system, ECTS, the diploma supplement, and others, Lisbon's action plans primarily included investing in research and development. The European Commission "stressed the need for coherence in research policies, for increasing public support and resources for research and for improving the framework conditions for research and development in Europe in order to contribute to the Lisbon goals." (Keeling, 2006, p. 205) While in 2005 the Lisbon Strategy was revised and turned its focus to growth and jobs, the agenda driving this focus still included a strong movement to increase research and "the critical role of the higher education sector in achieving the desired outcome was highlighted." (Keeling, 2006, p. 205)

The European Commission began using both the Bologna Declaration and the Lisbon Strategy to show that higher education is not only an economic benefit, but are also critical to increasing employability. (Keeling, 2006) The Commission also continues to use these policies to showcase the quality of higher education through their qualification frameworks, and further uses the policies to argue that higher education is only successful if it is globalized and promotes mobility. This has allowed the commission to stress the importance of cross-national cooperation which ultimately leads to more success in both of these policies. (Keeling, 2006)

Ministry Meetings 2001 – 2003

In 2001, the Bologna membership grew to 32 and the Ministers met in Prague to discuss their progress with the original objectives of the declaration, as well as propose three additional action plans. These action plans included creating a new lifelong learning system, obtaining buy-in from institutions and students in their countries to increase potentiality for success, and further promoting the recruiting abilities of the EHEA. In conjunction with these initiatives, the

Ministers were committed to further enhancing quality assurance and national qualification frameworks. (Prague, 2001)

The Ministers met next in Berlin in 2003, expanded membership to 40 countries, and agreed to set an intermediate deadline for proof of progress in 2005. The Ministers recognized the importance of continuous support for quality assurance, but agreed that frameworks should be set for institutions to use and institutions must take responsibility for this objective of the Bologna Declaration. (Berlin, 2003) And finally, the Ministers outlined two new action plans. The first was to create a European Research Area (ERA) as an integral partner with the EHEA with the belief that having research as a key component in the EHEA would further increase the European competitiveness in the global higher education market, specifically in doctoral studies. (Berlin, 2003) The second was an outlined expectation that countries would show proof of progress specifically towards “quality assurance, the adoption of a system of degree structures based on two main cycles, and recognition of degrees.” (EUA, 2011)

Erasmus Mundus

According to Europa (2009), the Erasmus Mundus program was developed in response to challenges developed from the Bologna Declaration and the Lisbon Strategy. Both reforms called for an increase in attractiveness and quality of European higher education and the Erasmus Mundus program does just that.

In 2003, the European Parliament approved the Erasmus Mundus program “for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries”. (Europa, 2009) Erasmus Mundus is ultimately a program designed to promote student mobility between multi-national countries within Europe in an effort to increase the quality of higher education for European students. The program was

approved based on its goals of increasing the competitiveness of higher education in Europe – competitiveness for keeping European students in Europe for higher education and for attracting international students. In addition, Erasmus Mundus promoted goals of increasing the quality of Europe’s higher education curriculum and the cross-national improvement in multi-cultural awareness, understanding, and dialogue. Finally, the program prepared Europe to increase cooperation and ease of student mobility between European institutions and third-country institutions with exchange agreements. (Europa, 2009)

The Erasmus Mundus program was initially designed to run from 2004 to 2008 with five key action points to make it successful. The first action point was the Erasmus Mundus masters courses. The curriculum was to consist of advanced level coursework, along with collaboration and support from at least three institutions in three European Union states. This collaboration and support included scheduled terms of study in at least two institutions, use of at least two languages, an agreement for the award of degree(s) (joint, double, or multiple), fair and consistent admission and degree requirements and procedures, and finally, space and facilities for non-European students. (Europa, 2009)

The second action point was scholarships. Scholarships must be offered to support the non-European students (if met specified requirements) for their studies in the Erasmus Mundus masters curriculum.

The third action point, partnerships with institutions outside Europe, was essential to promoting outside mobility. This action point was included as a way to promote exchange of students between European institutions and abroad in order to make the European higher education area more visible and attractive. (Europa, 2009)

The fourth action point was a defined set of beneficiaries. Beneficiaries of the Erasmus Mundus program included “higher education institutions; students holding a first degree from a higher education institution; scholars or researchers; staff directly involved in higher education; other public or private bodies active in the field of higher education.” (Europa, 2009)

Finally, the fifth action point, participating countries, was limited to nations approved as states in the European Union, European Free Trade Association countries of the European Economic Area, and those countries who have applied for membership of the European Union. (Europa, 2009)

Ministry Meetings 2005 - 2009

In 2005, the Ministers met in Bergen, expanded membership to 45 countries, and conducted the mid-term progress / stock taking report as planned in the 2003 Berlin meeting on the new degree system and its recognition, as well as quality assurance frameworks. (Bergen, 2005) With the new degree system, there was great success in implementation, but noted employability issues for students between cycles, which called for qualification frameworks to be implemented. Similarly, for quality assurance, great progress had been made with most countries having frameworks in place. However, more student and international organization involvement was necessary to achieve the EHEA goals for competitive and attractive higher education. (Bergen, 2005) The Ministers called for the 2007 meeting to include the European University Association (EUA) and for Ministers to work with the EUA to further develop the third cycle, the doctorate, and its qualifications and research components. Recognizing the importance of the social component in increasing the EHEA’s competitiveness, the Ministers called for more support in making higher education and mobility more equitably accessible. (Bergen, 2005) A sub-committee was created to increase the progress towards the social reform

goals of the declaration and to remove any obstacles to the mobility goals of the declaration. Before 2007, the committee was also charged with showing proof of progress towards quality assurance standards and guidelines, qualification frameworks at the national levels, an increase of joint degrees being offered, and increased flexible or more mobile educational tracks for their students. (EUA, 2011) Finally, the Ministers called for an increase in student and staff exchange agreements with institutions from other higher education areas to increase the recognition of the EHEA. (Bergen, 2005)

In 2007, the Ministers met in London, expanded membership to 46 countries, and evaluated not only their overall progress since 2005, but their ultimate progress towards developing the EHEA noting “good overall progress” (London, 2007) and the need to continue creating a higher education with more of a student-driven than an instructor-driven environment. The Ministers set goals to tackle student mobility and equitable access obstacles and data collection at a national level, to increase communication with employers and stakeholders to identify employability frameworks for reach of the three degree cycles and for lifelong learning students, and to develop a Bologna Secretariat website and work with EUA further on their Bologna Handbook to increase recognition of the EHEA. (London, 2007) As 2010 was approaching fast, the Ministers argued that they were “determined to seize 2010, which will mark the passage from the Bologna Process to the EHEA, as an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to higher education as a key element in making our societies sustainable, at national as well as at European level.” (London, 2007)

The 2009 Ministerial meeting of the Bologna Declaration progress was held in Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve to review the progress and achievements over the last decade of the Bologna Declaration implementation and set goals and priorities for the EHEA for the following

decade: to set the EHEA and the Bologna Process goals for 2020. (Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve, 2009) The Ministers argued that the next decade will allow Europe to showcase its creativity and innovation, lifelong and student-focused learning, employability, and mobility and accessibility opportunities of the EHEA. As the global financial and economic crisis unfolds, higher education is going to be critical to allowing Europe to maintain its competitiveness in an ever-globalizing world, and the Ministers pledged to maintain and support a national commitment towards excellence in research, innovation, and higher education. (Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve, 2009)

The 2009 meeting was the first time the ministers were joined by representatives from 15 countries from outside Europe (African, Asian, North American, South American, and Australian countries were represented). These additional members were included to create a “Bologna Policy Forum.” (EUA, 2016) Having these additional participants at the meeting allowed for discussion regarding potential partnerships between the EHEA and other higher education areas. (EUA 2016) The European Ministers, along with their new foreign members, outlined a plan for continuing Ministerial meetings and Bologna Policy Forums in 2012, 2015, 2018, and 2020 and to continue to assess progress and further define goals of creating a competitive and attractive EHEA, as well as further develop partnerships across the globe. (Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve, 2009)

Bologna, Lisbon, and Erasmus Mundus: Working Together

In looking at 2009 and forward, the Erasmus Mundus program’s philosophies, goals, and support seem to be roughly the same as in its initial program design for 2004 to 2008. It is still a program that promotes multi-institution collaboration, student mobility, and European higher education competitiveness. All of these goals are in direct alignment with those of Bologna. However, in looking at the program’s current goals and values, the goal of increasing multi-

cultural understanding and awareness seems to take on greater prominence. In addition, the objective of increasing Europe's higher education competitiveness and attractiveness seems to have grown with the new objective of "the promotion of the European Union as a centre of excellence in learning around the world." (EACEA, 2011) I think this more defined objective was to be expected, but it seems now to be more visible. The program appears to have been successful with over 200 participating institutions and over 7000 participating students from over 90 countries since 2004. (EMA, 2011) The Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association (EMA) is organized and made up of current students and alumni of the Erasmus Mundus program, and they have nothing but positive things to say about the program. They state that the Erasmus Mundus program not only provides students with joint and double degrees made up of "innovate study programmes that respond to job market challenges" (EMA, 2011), but also with language, cultural, and educational experiences in two foreign countries.

Ultimately, the Erasmus Mundus program has taken the goals of the Bologna Declaration and the Lisbon Agenda and built off of their success by utilizing tools such as mobility, exchange programs, and scholarships. Both Bologna and Lisbon had the ultimate goals of creating a more attractive and competitive Europe in terms of higher education and the job industry, and Erasmus Mundus has helped them achieve those goals.

Bologna Beyond 2010: A Review of Action Plans

In looking back at the first decade of the Bologna Declaration implementation, the Ministers found it important to really take stock and reflect on their progress and challenges. They developed a report entitled Bologna Beyond 2010 with the goal of setting the agenda for the next decade of implementation. The Ministers argued in this report that the new three-degree cycle structure and national quality frameworks were clearly the most identifiable areas of

success in implementation. Both were critical action plans designed to increase mobility and transparency, and both did just that. (Bologna Beyond, 2009) Quality assurance was an action plan that went hand in hand with quality frameworks, and while implemented overall successfully, the Ministers argued that the constant development and advancement in quality assurance must continue to be reviewed. This would include the introduction of accreditation agencies which have begun growing throughout the EHEA. (Bologna Beyond, 2009). One example as to why the Ministers argued for continued evaluation of quality assurance frameworks could be derived from Fairclough's (2006) discussion of quality assurance in regard to Romanian education. He argues that regulation within the university is managed inconsistently and is usually the product of social relationships that most often benefit only the elite faculty and elite students. This could provide a misleading quality assurance measurement. (Fairclough, 2006)

While the social dimension of higher education played an important part in the Bologna implementation, it has been difficult to recognize great successes in equity. The enrollment numbers of the non-elite were still low, and the Ministers recognized in this report the need to push for more equitable education in the next decade of Bologna implementation. (Bologna Beyond, 2009). With the ever-changing economy and labor markets, employability was becoming one of the most critical action plans of the Bologna Declaration. The Ministers stated that employability "has been defined as the empowerment of the individual student to seize opportunities on the labour market, i.e. to gain initial meaningful employment, or to become self-employed, to maintain employment, and to be able to move around within the labour market." (Bologna Beyond, 2009, p. 10) The Ministers called for more cooperation between institutions and employers to better determine the future qualifications for the labor markets to better align

the skills learned with employability. (Bologna Beyond, 2009) In addition, lifelong learning continued to be stressed with this report in order to support the social dimension and employability action plans. (Bologna Beyond, 2009)

The Ministers outlined their expectations for, and the importance of, the attractiveness of the EHEA. They argued that the EHEA must be “an attractive place for study and research; an attractive labour market for academics and professionals through the quality of the experience and clearly defined career paths; an attractive area preserving its rich and diverse cultural heritage in terms of languages, institutional cultures, curricula, and teaching and learning styles; an attractive higher education area because of the connection between teaching and research.” (Bologna Beyond, 2009, p. 13) Mobility, being the other most important goal of the EHEA, was also addressed as a foundation for the justification of the implementation of the EHEA. They argued that immigration issues have arisen throughout the Bologna Declaration implementation and that they must be addressed and not impede on the success of student mobility. (Bologna Beyond, 2009) Finally, the Ministers argued that the center of the EHEA’s mission is to align the higher education curriculum around a student-centered learning outcomes approach. This approach needs to be better defined and developed in a way to be feasibly met by all institutions, no matter the nation. (Bologna Beyond, 2009)

Bologna Beyond 2010: Looking Forward

In this report, the Ministers also looked forward to Bologna 2020 and the challenges that they will face. Global competitiveness is a key challenge for the EHEA. After all, all higher education major players are in the global competitiveness fight. They must increase higher education institutional autonomy, cooperate better with employers to determine employability qualifications, identify better funding for students and programs, and develop better university

leadership structures to support all of these changes. (Bologna Beyond, 2009) Interestingly, these are the same challenges their number one competitor, the United States, is facing. Along with competitiveness, comes cooperation. Institutions must work together to collaborate and research innovative and successful ways to address global problems, whether they be scientific, political, or economic. (Bologna Beyond, 2009)

Getting the public to take responsibility for supporting and shaping higher education in the EHEA will definitely be a challenge. Public responsibility for higher education is a component of the EHEA that is not always well received. The Council of Europe recommended that the public has responsibility for determining the framework of higher education and research, making higher education equitably accessible, making sure research in higher education is still supporting the public good, and financing higher education and research. (Bologna Beyond, 2009)

With all of these new challenges of research, lifelong learning, and more equitable education, funding became the new issue in this report. The Ministers argued that institutions must work together to learn from each other and find ways to better retain funding from varied sources to support all goals of the EHEA. (Bologna Beyond, 2009)

Bologna 2020: The Future Plans!

As planned in the original Bologna Declaration of 1999, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) was fully deployed in 2010. This deployment came with the 2010 Budapest-Vienna Declaration. The Ministers again met in Budapest and Vienna in March 2010 with a goal of officially deploying the EHEA. (Budapest-Vienna, 2010) And at that time, they added one more member – Kazakhstan, taking their membership to 47 countries. The Budapest-Vienna Declaration allowed the Ministers to reaffirm the goals of EHEA – making higher education for

Europe at the forefront of the global higher education agenda. The Ministers argued that while not all institutions in all nations who have signed the Bologna Declaration have implemented the Bologna model correctly or completely or just in the same ways, there have still been successes. (Budapest-Vienna, 2010) And they will work with the entire academic community to continue to strive to meet all goals of the EHEA and the Bologna Declaration. They argued that higher education is still a “public responsibility” and that they must develop ways to evaluate and ensure that all facets of the Bologna declaration are being implemented in all institutions and in all nations under the Bologna Declaration. (Budapest-Vienna, 2010)

In 2012, the Ministers met in Bucharest with the purpose of evaluating the progress of the Bologna Declaration in regard to the 2020 goals set for the EHEA. (Bucharest, 2012) During this meeting, the Ministers agreed that due to the economic difficulties experienced in Europe, making a commitment to funding higher education was critical in order to continue to promote the EHEA and make it more accessible for European and international students. (Bucharest, 2012) And to further promote the EHEA, they agreed that “widening access to higher education is a precondition for societal progress and economic development” and that they needed to increase their “efforts towards underrepresented groups to develop the social dimension of higher education, reduce inequalities and provide adequate student support services, counseling and guidance, flexible learning paths and alternative access routes, including recognition of prior learning.” (Bucharest, 2012, p.1-2) This communication puts a significant focus on the human dimension, or as they are calling the “social dimension.” Widening access for underrepresented groups is a big priority for United States’ institutions, but one you rarely hear about from other nations. The Ministers argued for more student-centered learning, stronger quality assurance frameworks, enhanced employability, using innovating teaching methods, and a larger emphasis

on research within graduate programs. (Bucharest, 2012) Again, interestingly, all of these goals are similar to those you hear at United States' institutional meetings on a regular basis.

In 2015, the Ministers met in Yerevan and recognized a great number of achievements made in the Bologna implementation, but also admitted that while the implementation has been overall successful, there are a number of areas that need a great deal of reform. They argued that while some reforms have been implemented, they haven't been implemented either fully or with the original intention. They argued that as they look towards their next meeting in 2018, they must work together to pursue the following goals: "enhancing the quality and relevance of learning and teaching," "fostering the employability of graduates throughout their working lives," "making our systems more inclusive," and "implementing agreed structural reforms." (Yerevan, 2015, p. 2-3) They recognized that in order to achieve these goals, they must work directly with the administrators of their higher education institutions and learn to trust each other nation's institutions. (Yerevan, 2015)

Bologna: Has it reached its goals?

I would argue that, yes, Europe has reached its original goals of implementing the Bologna Declaration and the EHEA by 2010. However, as Europe has progressed with Bologna, the goals have become ongoing. The EUA produced a higher education trends report in 2010 entitled Trends 2010: A decade of change in European Higher Education. (EUA, 2011) I would argue that this report does an excellent job at detailing the successes and challenges faced by the Bologna Declaration implementation during its first decade. While there are still areas that need improvement and further evaluation, overall, I would still argue that Europe has succeeded in its Bologna Declaration implementation.

Trends 2010 used quantitative and qualitative methods to gather the data on higher education trends in Europe through surveys, site visits, focus groups, and interviews. Over 800 institutions participated in this research. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010) Furthermore, this isn't the first trends report conducted regarding the EHEA. The first trends report was actually completed prior to the signing of the Bologna Declaration to support that first meeting of the Ministers in 1999 in Bologna. The goal of the report was to give the Ministers an understanding of the current trends of higher education in Europe. Further trends reports have continued to go hand in hand with the Bologna Declaration through the first decade of implementation. A second report was created for the 2001 meeting in Prague, a third for the 2003 meeting in Berlin, a fourth for the 2005 meeting in Bergen, and a fifth for the 2007 meeting in London. The 2010 report, the sixth report, was designed to look back at the progress of Bologna's implementation in its first decade and as a review and comparison to the first five trends reports. (EUA, 2011)

In looking at the data, there are many successes recognized by the EHEA. According to the 2010 trends report, 95% of institutions surveyed stated that their institution had adopted the two or three-degree cycle component of the Bologna Declaration. In addition, 77% of these institutions have revamped curriculum to better fit the Bologna agenda, 90% of these institutions have implemented ECTS, and 66% are using the diploma supplement. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010) The degree cycle, curriculum, ECTS, and diploma supplement were key action plans of the Bologna Declaration and these numbers clearly identify Europe's success in implementation.

However, there have also been a few challenges. One of Europe's key initiatives with the Bologna Declaration was learning outcomes. Interestingly, only 53% of the institutions surveyed stated that learning outcomes had been implemented for all of their courses (32% had implemented for some courses). (Sursock and Smidt, 2010) I find this number fairly low with

learning outcomes being such a critical component to the heart of Bologna. I expect increasing this percent will be a challenge in the next decade. Another challenge will be ensuring the use of qualification frameworks and quality assurance policies. Only 38% are using a national qualification framework for their degree systems. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010)

And then there were some results that could be misleading if you don't review the full report. For example, only 39% of these institutions state that they have a lifelong learning strategy; yet, 87% state that they have professional development courses, 83% state that they have continuing education for adults, and 62% state that they offer distance learning courses. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010) I would consider all of these education avenues as tools for lifelong learning. So while institutions may not feel as though they have a fully outlined lifelong learning strategy, I see the successes in providing the tools for lifelong learning as still an overall success in this critical component to the Bologna Declaration implementation.

Another grey area can be found in education equity issues. Eighty-three percent of the institutions surveyed stated that they employ policies to support those with disabilities. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010) In addition, 75% of these institutions state that they offer policies and services for those who are considered low socio-economic status students. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010) These two statistics would lead you to believe that Europe is succeeding in its fight for equitable education. However, this same survey showed that only 30% of the institutions surveyed have policies and services in place for ethnic minority students; and only 26% of these institutions have policies and services in place for immigrant students. (Sursock and Smidt, 2010)

Conclusion

Ultimately, I think the Ministers of the 47 countries involved in the Bologna Declaration would agree that they have successfully developed a European Higher Education Area by its

original goal of 2010. However, I think they would also argue that there is still great room for improvement. Quality frameworks, lifelong learning, student outcomes, and equitable education appear to be at the forefront of things to work on, as well as obtaining funding and continuing their advancement in the ever-growing international student market.

The creation of the European Higher Education Area marks a very large-scale internationalization effort by the European Union, and I would argue that it is in direct response to the globalized international student market. While the efforts of the European Union are important to examine, it is also important to look at the history of international higher education in the United States. Looking not only for parallel internationalization efforts as the European Union, but also for contrasting efforts. This next chapter will also explore the various internal and external influences on the United States' ability to compete for international students and remain a leader in the globalized higher education market.

Chapter 4

American International Higher Education

Introduction

With the foundational literature regarding the globalized higher education market, I have discussed how institutions implement internationalization strategies as local implications of globalization. In chapter 3, I offered an analysis of the strategies the European Union has explored to launch their institutions as leaders in this globalized higher education market. In this chapter, I will discuss the strategies undertaken by the United States to remain a leader in this global market. In addition, I will look at the supporting structures within the United States for implementing internationalization efforts, as well as the internal and external influences that may make it difficult to remain in a leadership role.

A Historical Perspective

International students have historically influenced higher education institutions in the United States. We have welcomed international students in our institutions to provide our students with international perspectives and cultural insights, as well as in an attempt to foster our country's global relationships. The United States has been the world leader in international student recruitment and enrollment for some time, but this has not always been the case, and it may not always be in our future.

The International Institute of Education (IIE) produces data reports titled "Open Doors" annually. These data reports include data of international student enrollments and other international student data for the United States, and these reports date back to 1948. Interestingly, since 1948 the United States has steadily been rising in international student enrollments starting at 25,464 in 1948 and increasing to 1,043,839,926 in 2016. (IIE, 2016) We

only saw two time periods of declines – we dipped 3.2% in 1971, and then again 2.4% in 2003 (followed by decreases of 1.3% in 2004 and .05% in 2005) due to the implementation of tighter visa regulations through a new Department of Homeland Security online tracking system, SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System) after the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks. (IIE, 2011) These numbers represent the United States’ growing position in the international student higher education market.

Lowell, Bump, and Martin (2007) argue that the decline in international student interest, application, and enrollment in United States higher education was due to a number of reasons that they refer to as “a perfect storm”, and not just due to the September 11th terrorist attacks and the SEVIS implementation. (p. 13) The number one reason in this “perfect storm” is probably the most visible reason – the implementation of rigid visa regulations. But from a less visible lens, there was also the economic recession of 2001 that was making it still harder for applicants to access higher education in general, let alone the fact that United States’ higher education costs were rapidly increasing. In addition, the 2001 recession meant less job opportunities for international students to pursue after completing degree programs in the United States. (Lowell, Bump, and Martin, 2007)

However, since 2006, we have seen nothing but increases. In 2006, we saw a 10% increase of new international student enrollments in the United States, a 10.1% increase in 2007, a 15.8% increase in 2008, a 1.3% increase in 2009, a 5.7% increase in 2010, a 6.5% increase in 2011, 9.8% increase in 2012, 7.6% increase in 2013, 8.7% increase in 2014, 10% increase in 2015, and a 7.6% increase in 2016 (IIE, 2011 and IIE, 2015). There was a substantially smaller increase in 2009 than in years past; however, it was still an increase. Admissions professionals in the United States typically believe this is due to the economic struggles American universities

have faced with not being able to offer as many assistantships and other funding options as in years past.

While there are a number of internal and external factors that would suggest the United States may be in trouble in terms of international student enrollment, the numbers detailed above suggest otherwise. But again, admissions professionals would argue that while the United States has yet to see real declines in international student enrollments, we do stand to lose a lot if we lose our competitive edge in the higher education international student market.

Study Abroad Initiatives

In addition to bringing in international students, the United States also has a long history of sending our own domestic students abroad. In fact, study abroad is probably the most common way that American universities incorporate an international component into its students' curriculum. It allows for students to go abroad and learn from other cultures, learn to be a part of a globalized society, and ultimately bring that experience back into our American classrooms and share it with their fellow students. Most American universities will agree that study abroad provides opportunities for learning foreign language skills and cross-cultural understanding. I think it is also obvious that American students recognize this importance as we have grown to having over 313,415 students study abroad annually. (IIE, 2016)

In 2005, the Lincoln Commission (which was both congressionally and federally appointed) formally put forth a goal to all American universities to increase our annual student enrollment in study abroad programs to one million by 2015. (NAFSA, 2011) We didn't quite make that target, but we have still seen a 52% increase since 2005. (IIE, 2016) Universities vary greatly in their commitment to study abroad and how they manage it. Some institutions heavily invest efforts into making study abroad a key component to its academic curriculums, while

others only offer it as an option and with little encouragement. (NAFSA, 2011) In an effort to meet the 2015 one million goal set by the Lincoln Commission, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA) decided to get more involved. As discussed in chapter 2, NAFSA is an organization that advocates for international students and international education. They try to tackle all aspects of international education and set best practices and even sometimes procedures for following regulations for international students and for internationalizing campuses. In alignment with these efforts, and again, to help meet the 2015 goal, NAFSA appointed a task force on the Institutional Management of Study Abroad to recommend best practices and values for campus administrators to use when developing and managing their study abroad efforts. They came up with 4 main categories of Institutional Commitment, Study Abroad Infrastructure, Adequate Resources, and Clarity and Accountability. (NAFSA, 2011)

For the first category, institutional commitment, NAFSA recommended having an established plan or process for incorporating study abroad into academic programs, being able to support a study abroad office, and having overall support from the institution (institutional buy-in). Further, for study abroad infrastructure, NAFSA recommended having a structured way of developing agreements with foreign institutions, course approval, and credit transfer, and ensuring a variety of programs for the diverse study body, all while maintaining a plan for managing the health and safety of students abroad. For adequate resources, NAFSA recommended having a well-trained professional staff to manage the study abroad office, having financial aid and scholarship options for students, and maintaining processes for controlling study abroad cost structures. And finally, for clarity and accountability, NAFSA recommended

communications of all essential study abroad information be sent regularly to students, faculty, and administrators, and maintaining accurate and consistent agreements. (NAFSA, 2011)

Ultimately, I think NAFSA was recommending to universities that in order to succeed in their study abroad efforts, they must have the support of faculty, administrators, and students. In addition, the university must offer support for these stakeholders through management and funding. Most college campuses recognize the importance of study abroad, but have a long way to go in making it a standard part of the academic curriculum.

National Support for Internationalization in American Universities

The National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA), as mentioned above, serves as an international student advocate and fights for the importance of international education in the United States. NAFSA believes that international education is critical to the success of our nation as it is key to creating cross-cultural and cross-border knowledge and understanding. (NAFSA, 2011) In its mission statement, NAFSA states that “international education advances learning and scholarship, fosters understanding and respect among people of diverse backgrounds and perspectives, is essential for developing globally competent individuals, and builds leadership for the global community. We believe that international education lies at the core of an interconnected world characterized by peace, security, and well-being for all.” (NAFSA, 2016)

NAFSA works with institutions in the United States and across the globe with more than 10,000 members from more than 3500 institutions in more than 150 nations. In addition to their support for international education and international students, their support for their members includes not only guidance on advocacy and internationalization programs, but also training, online resources, and networking opportunities for professionals.

NAFSA has outlined seven primary goals for the next two years that include advocacy for making the United States a more globally engaged and welcoming place for international students; working with higher education institutions on integrating global perspectives into their institutional internationalization efforts; offering support on developing global competencies for our students, scholars, and faculty; conducting trend analysis to better inform educators; providing training and development opportunities for members; increasing engagement with partners and members; and working to restructure as necessary to financially continue to support international education. (NAFSA, 2016) I believe that NAFSA's first goal is listed as the first goal in a purposeful manner. I believe that advocacy efforts for making the United States a more welcoming place for international students will be critical to the success of our internationalization efforts.

In addition to NAFSA, the American Council on Education (ACE)'s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) works with higher education institutions in the United States to create programs that will help their students, faculty, and staff increase their global awareness and interactions. CIGE believes "effective internationalization goes beyond traditional study abroad programs and international student enrollment. It requires a comprehensive institutional commitment that also includes curriculum, research, faculty development, and active strategies for institutional engagement." (CIGE, 2017) CIGE also evaluates global higher education trends and works with other organizations across the globe in this area.

CIGE has created a model for comprehensive internationalization that includes six key areas that CIGE believes to be critical to an institution's success in becoming a global institution. The first area, "articulated institutional commitment", involves including internationalization in

every aspect of a campus' strategic plan, and its mission and vision statements; creating a committee to manage the implementation of any internationalization goals; working with all levels of campus stakeholders to gain campus buy-in; and finally, creating quality assurance metrics to assess the success of the campus' implementation. (CIGE, 2017)

The second area is really an extension of the first area in terms of working with all levels of campus stakeholders. It is critical to work with top leadership who can provide an administrative reporting structure, so that all areas on campus can work together on implementation. This would include working with any international student or international programming offices on campus. (CIGE, 2017)

The third area focuses on reviewing the curriculum requirements for all students. This means reviewing general education requirements to see how international courses may be included (such as language courses, global issues, or even cultural classes), and also what types of traditional major coursework could have international components added to look at these various programs of study areas in a global light. (CIGE, 2017)

The fourth area involves faculty and how to promote their involvement in internationalization efforts. This could mean including internationalization experience in tenure decisions, using internationalization experience in hiring decisions, and also promoting faculty mobility through faculty exchanges with international institutions. (CIGE, 2017)

The fifth area, "student mobility," focuses not only on sending our own domestic students to study abroad, but also on bringing international students in to study in our classrooms. (CIGE, 2017) This area includes not only setting up the exchange agreements to facilitate this mobility, but also setting up clear credit transfer policies, funding opportunities for both domestic and international students, orientation and acclimation programs to assist students who may be

travelling to a new country for the first time and need assistance, and on-going support and programming to help these new students fully integrate with the campus community during their stay. (CIGE, 2017)

The sixth area is setting up collaborative partnerships with foreign institutions to develop student and faculty exchange agreements. (CIGE, 2017) This not only supports the fifth area of student mobility by allowing for increased opportunities to send our domestic students abroad for an international learning experience and for increased opportunities to bring in international students to study for a short time, but it also allows for the chance to increase an institution's international recognition and ability to attract international students to come and complete entire degree programs in the United States.

CIGE's International Programs division promotes academic exchange agreements with American and foreign institutions. Their focus is helping American institutions to develop exchange programs and also to form relationships with international associations. They further work to develop best practices for institutions to model or learn from on all aspects of international education policies, including how to internationalize academic curriculums. (AACU, 2011) ACE has several active and past international initiatives, and are truly an international education advocate.

While NAFSA and ACE's CIGE are excellent examples of internationalization and international student advocacy and support organizations for the United States, the Institute of International Education (IIE) is another organization committed to supporting internationalization not only in the United States, but all over the world. IIE prides itself on being "among the world's largest and most experienced international education and training organizations." (IIE, Who We Are, 2016) IIE aims to advocate and increase international

education opportunities across the globe, not just in the United States. In IIE's 2015 Annual Report, they highlighted several initiatives that did just that. For example, the Fulbright Scholar Program, sponsored by the United States Department of State and administered by IIE, initiated a project to work on refugee resettlement. IIE also initiated a program to help young girls prepare for careers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) fields and has successfully assisted 800 participants in India and the Philippines in getting mentors to work within the STEM work force. (IIE, Annual Report, 2015) Another example includes IIE's Generation Study Abroad Initiative. IIE worked with more than 600 partners to commit \$185 million in funding to increase the access to study abroad over the next five years and brought in "globally-minded organizations" to help K-12 teachers get resources to help foster "globally minded students." (IIE, Annual Report, 2015)

IIE plays a pivotal role in internationalization advocacy, and they embrace this role with their vision statement where they envision a world in which "Educational, cultural, and professional opportunities transcend borders to foster a peaceful and interconnected world where all people achieve their full potential; think and act as global citizens; and build inclusive, thriving communities." (IIE, Who We Are, 2016) In addition to this broad vision statement, they have lined up six goals for 2017 that are designed to act upon this vision. These goals include increasing mobility for both students and scholars; increasing exchange and training programs and specifically for those in diverse and underrepresented areas; increasing presence and support to be the leading resource on internationalization discussions among our governments, universities, and organizations around the globe; increasing initiatives for study abroad, crisis higher education support, support for women and girls, and institutional exchanges and partnerships; providing quality assurance metrics and communications regarding IIE initiative

impacts to increase effectiveness within IIE programs and the overarching field of internationalization; and supporting IIE staff members in their roles at IIE. (IIE, Who We Are, 2016)

These organizations are critical to the support of internationalization development, maintenance, and improvement for our nation's universities. While we have seen steady increases in international student enrollments and study abroad participants over the last ten years, and the support of these organizations have had a great deal to do with that, we may need more support from these organizations and others as we look to the future. In looking at our history of internationalization in the United States and thinking of the future, we need to evaluate the internal and external influences on our ability to remain a world leader in international education.

International Student Recruitment: Internal and External Influences

The United States remains in the lead for international student enrollments, but many internal and external factors are negatively impacting our chances for remaining in this lead. Many higher education professionals, me included, will argue that the United States needs to start thinking more seriously about how to maintain their competitive edge in the international student market. With our visa regulations and the expanding executive orders from the Trump administration providing more and more barriers for international students to come to the United States, along with our rising costs of higher education, we are not making it easy for international students to choose the United States. In years' past, we were the only real player in the game and had the most to offer these international students. However, with higher education institutions all over the globe realizing the economic, social, and educational benefits of enrolling international students, we are seeing more areas of competition. More higher education institutions in Europe

and around the globe are increasing their recruiting efforts and offering more programs – giving international students more options when choosing where to go for higher education. With all of these factors, the United States may need to look at its policies and practices of recruiting and enrolling international students and to make a concerted effort to remain in the lead of this competition.

Benefits of Enrolling International Students

Enrolling international students benefits the United States in many ways: economically, socially, politically, and culturally. NAFSA believes that “international education and exchange—connecting students, scholars, educators, and citizens across borders—is fundamental to: establishing mutual understanding among nations, preparing the next generation with vital cross-cultural and global skills, and creating the conditions for a more peaceful world.” (NAFSA, 2012) A similar message of the benefits of international education was delivered by then Secretary of State Hilary Rodham Clinton on November 14, 2011 in support of International Education Week: “International students enrich classrooms and communities with their ideas, perspectives, and culture. And when they return home, they bring new knowledge, new perspectives, and a deeper understanding of the world.” In addition, international students contribute greatly in terms of economics in the United States. In 2015, international students and their dependents contributed more than \$35.8 billion to the United States economy. (IIE Open Doors, 2016)

Countries around the world are realizing the benefits of international student enrollments in their higher education institutions. And with this, many other higher education areas are increasing their recruitment initiatives. Countries across the globe are revamping their higher education systems to be more attractive to international students and one major reason for this

“increased competition is the relatively recent recognition that international students are a potential profit center.” (Douglass and Edelstein, 2009, p. 4)

Visa Regulation Changes

After the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, the United States tightened, and has continued to tighten, its visa regulations. Students must pay a visa fee (which can vary, but is often \$100 - \$200), as well as a \$180 to \$200 I-901 fee, which pays to staff the Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP), an organization charged with tracking international students in the United States using the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS). When applying for a visa, students get to spend maybe two minutes with a visa officer and if the officer chooses to (or if the student is from one of 14 countries who are considered to be of extra risk), the student can be sent for extra FBI clearance – which can take another 90 days. The amount of red tape and near-criminal interrogation-like experiences that international students have to face to obtain a student visa are leaving our international students feeling unwelcome in the United States. Scott (2007) argues the post-September 11th, 2001 United States visa regulations have “contributed to real and perceived barriers for international students as well as fueled perceptions that international students were not welcome”. (p.11)

While the United States tightened its visa regulations after the 9/11 terrorist attacks and made the visa process much more difficult for international students sending a message “that the U.S. was not as welcoming a place for foreign academics as in the past”, other countries including Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and France actively used this as a way to counter-recruit international students. (Douglass and Edelstein, 2009, p. 5) These countries, and many others, made their visa approval processing much more smooth and fast, and they even went so far as to change their immigration policies to allow international students many more

legal ways of working after completing their higher education programs. (Douglass and Edelstein, 2009) For example, the European Union's visa regulations are much more international student friendly. Students can apply for the Schengen Visa, a visa that allows students to travel within twenty-five European nations. (Study in Europe Schengen Visa, 2012) This visa process is very straight forward, costs generally no more than 50 euros and students receive their visa approval often within a month. (Europa, 2002)

Political Climate

While the visa regulation bureaucracy has been a challenge for over a decade, the inauguration of the Trump administration has provided a new set of challenges surrounding international students. Throughout the 2016 election period, then presidential nominee Donald Trump not only made a number of speeches with negative rhetoric towards Muslims, Mexicans, African Americans, and women, he also concentrated his speeches on being pro-Americanism and not pro-globalism. This was very much noticed by our international students.

In a June 2016 Chronicle of Higher Education article, Karin Fischer sites that 60% of prospective international students (80% of Mexican students) indicate they'd be less likely to study in the United States if Trump were to win the presidency. (This was from a study of more than 40,000 students from 118 countries). Reviewers of this study predicted that this could cost the United States economy \$4.75 billion. (Fischer, 2016) Days after the election, PIE News (Professionals in International Education) reported several international students' opinions on Trump's win including, "If Trump wins, study in the US will only be a dream"; "I'm a Muslim studying in the US on an F-1 visa. I don't want Trump to win...They say that the president won't really have any effect on our daily matters, but I don't want to imagine being treated worse than I already do at airport security"; and "I can't go back to a country where I am not accepted for

who I am. Yes, I'm maybe just a guest there but I would feel so unwelcomed and terrified.”
(Smith, 2016)

The New York Times also ran an article entitled *'Is it Safe?' Foreign Students Consider College in Donald Trump's U.S.* The article cited Indian students being concerned about studying in the United States now that Trump would be the President with quotes such as, “They don't want to apply to the U.S. under Trump” and “In his campaign, he's discriminating against Muslim and other brown and black people...I'm thinking of applying to Canada.” (Najar and Saul, 2016) These are just a handful of the articles and opinions voiced by international students in regard to Donald Trump winning the presidency.

Since taking office in January 2017, President Trump has issued several executive orders. On the sixth day of Donald Trump's presidency, in an attempt to fulfill a campaign promise, he signed an executive order entitled “Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements.” (White House, 2017) This executive order called for the construction of a wall on the United States' southern border between the United States and Mexico. In response to this executive order, Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto cancelled his upcoming trip to meet with President Trump stating, “I regret and condemn the United States' decision to continue with the construction of a wall that, for years now, far from uniting us, divides us.” (Ahmed, 2017) Similarly, Josiah Heyman, the Director of the Center for Inter-American and Border Studies at the University of Texas at El Paso stated “The wall is symbolic...It's the United States turning its back on Mexico. I think that could erode the good relationships that we've built with Mexican students and with Mexican scholars.” (Redden, 2017) With the negative reactions to the *Trump Wall*, it is important to think about potential implications on our international student enrollments. Mexican students are only 1.6% of the United States' international student

population, but they are ranked tenth in terms of top places of origin of our international students. (IIE, 2016)

A day later, President Trump signed an executive order entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States.” (White House, 2017) This executive order, also familiarly known as the Immigration Ban, prevents refugees from entering the United States for 120 days and immigrants from entering the United States for 90 days from seven Muslim-majority countries. These countries include Iran, Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Libya, Yemen, and Somalia. The refugee suspension for those from Syria is indefinite at this time. (DHS, 2017) This executive order is currently being held up in the judicial system; however, the Trump administration has stated it will take the issue to the Supreme Court in an attempt to reinstate the entry ban for citizens of these countries to the United States. In response to this executive order, the Association of American Universities quickly issued a response urging the administration to understand the damage such a restriction can cause and argued for ending it as quickly as possible with a statement that the administration should “make clear to the world that the United States continues to welcome the most talented individuals from all countries to study, teach, and carry out research and scholarship at our universities.” (AAU, 2017) Fifty-seven members of the AAU issued similar public responses urging the Trump administration to end this travel restriction and also offering support and assistance for those students caught in this restriction. Many of these university statements also included encouraging international students from these seven countries to not travel outside the United States unless absolutely necessary for fear that they would be unable to return.

Other national higher education organizations have also spoken out regarding this executive order. A few examples include Alisse Waterston, president of the American

Anthropological Association, stating “The order must be rescinded, immediately, and the hateful cultural ignorance behind it must be named”; Muriel Howard, president of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, stating “America’s state colleges and universities have been strengthened by the presence of students and faculty from around the globe, including those from the seven countries specifically targeted by the president’s executive order...we respectfully urge the administration to reconsider its recent action”; and Esther Brimmer, CEO of NAFSA, stating “To the students, scholars, doctors, refugees, family members and others who wonder if the United States has lost its commitment to its core values as a nation of freedom, opportunity, and welcome, let me unequivocally state that American citizens will not tolerate policies such as these that undermine our values and endanger our safety.” (Fain, 2017)

USA Today published an article on January 31, 2017 with responses from those directly impacted by the travel ban. One family travelling from Iran to the US stated, “I did not know the president can sign such orders...Because it looks like autocratic leaders in corrupt countries, not in a democratic modern country like America.” (Sawyer, 2017) A man born in Syria, but now living in the United States reported that a family member could no longer return since she was abroad during the implementation of the executive order. His response was that “[Trump]’s hurting this country rather than helping it...The U.S. has troops in Syria and Iraq. How are you going to explain it if they turn around and say they don’t want U.S. citizens there, like Iran did today? He is a bully and Congress has to stop these ridiculous executive orders.” (Sawyer, 2017) These are two responses among many from foreign citizens directly impacted by this travel ban.

These political changes may have a direct impact on the United States’ chances of international student recruitment abilities in the future. This may be due not only to simply making it too difficult for international students to choose us, but also due to the negative

perceptions arising from our stringent visa regulations. These alarming executive orders may be the larger of the negative influences on our future enrollments.

Costs of Higher Education

Another factor influencing our recruitment of international students is that the economic state of our country has led to decreased state and federal support for our higher education institutions, which is driving our cost of higher education to an all-time high (in both tuition and living expenses). In comparison to nations around the world, the United States charges the highest amount for tuition and fees at both the undergraduate and graduate level, followed by Australia, Korea, Japan, and Canada. (OECD, 2016) In comparing our rates to those just following us, we are charging 47% more for tuition than Australia and 118% more for tuition than Canada.

In addition to these high costs, graduate programs in our institutions have less money to offer international graduate students in terms of assistantships, fellowships, and tuition waivers. With an increased cost of attendance and less opportunity for scholarship, international students may start to look elsewhere for higher education.

Douglass and Edelstein (2009) argue that the United States has long been a leader in international higher education, but there are shifts happening in the global higher education arena that may impact our ability to maintain this lead. They argue that higher education is becoming a global demand, and the number of students across the globe seeking higher education has grown significantly. A 150% increase is expected from 2000 to 2025 (Hudzik and Briggs, 2012) In addition, due to the global recession almost all countries are currently experiencing, students are becoming more “price-sensitive” when picking where to study higher education. (Douglass and Edelstein, 2009, p. 3)

Chow (2011) reports from a 2009-2010 study conducted by the International Institute of Education that while international students remain positive about choosing the United States as a higher education destination, the cost of higher education is a major barrier for 60% of international students, and the difficulties posed by visa regulations in actually obtaining a student visa were reported by 50% of international students as a major barrier. Similarly, Lowell, Bump and Martin (2007) conducted a focus group with international students that showed that higher education costs were by far the greatest reason why international students may not choose the United States for their higher education destination.

The United States tuition prices are continuing to increase ten-fold. College Board developed a *trends in college pricing* publication in 2016 showing that our average cost of attendance for undergraduate students ranges from \$11,580 to \$45,370 per year (College Board, 2016). However, in the European Union, tuition prices are significantly lower. In fact, the vast majority of European Union institutions do not charge tuition at all for European Union students, and the handful of European Union countries that do charge tuition are often charging maybe a few hundred euros a year to 3000 euros a year maximum. (Study in Europe Compare Tuition, 2016) All of these factors, combined with the European Union's new standard degree structures and English instruction models, make going to Europe for higher education, instead of the United States, a tantalizing thought. In fact, it gives the European Union a great step up in its international student market competition goals.

Increased International Higher Education Options

Batalova (2007) argues that higher education has become globalized and the competition for foreign students is high. Scott (2007) and Batalova (2007) both argue that the United States has always known this, but other countries are now ramping up to compete in the international

student market through increased recruiting and scholarship opportunities. Higher education areas in Asia, Australia, Canada, and Europe are actively developing recruitment strategies for international students that include offering low costs and an increased number of programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Scott (2007) documents that countries around the globe are providing more higher education opportunities for international students by offering courses in English, as well as offering online and distance education programs.

Knight (2014, p. 84) discuss the development of international education hubs that she describes as “a critical mass of education and knowledge actors aiming to exert greater influence in the new education marketplace and to strengthen relations between local and international counterparts.” The goal of these hubs is to help nations become more visible and increase their competitiveness in the higher education arena. Knight (2014) describes the successes of education hubs in Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and Botswana. Some of these hubs house international institutions, some focus on creating research-centered institutions, and all focus on international student recruitment. (Knight, 2014) These education hubs seem to be mini-education areas. They appear to be the start of a larger higher education area, or the pre-cursor to something similar to the model of the EHEA. These hubs, if nothing else, provide additional competition in the international student market.

Bagley and Portnoi (2014) argue that increasing the global competitiveness of one’s institution has become the focus of higher education institutions across all higher education areas. Owens and Lane (2014, p. 69) agree with this argument stating that “the pursuit of enhanced prestige, greater student market share, and new resources is affecting higher education across the globe, with much of the discourse focusing on competition among higher education institutions.” With continued global economic crises and decreases in federal and state funding to

higher education, American institutions are experiencing more and more challenges in recruiting both domestic and international students.

Owens and Lane (2014) demonstrate that the product of higher education institutions is knowledge, and this product is increasingly important to the economic and diplomatic successes of nations. These challenges and increased importance put global competitiveness at the top of many of our institutions' missions. Bagley and Portnoi (2014) argue that in many higher education areas, governments and higher education institutions are working together to strategize ways to increase their global competitiveness. They cite China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia as implementing strategies that include developing what they call "Global Research Universities" with globalization being at the forefront of their mission statements. (Bagley and Portnoi, 2014) They also argue that institutions use the development of international campuses, dual and joint degrees, and exchange agreements to increase their visibility and competitiveness. These strategies are consistent with goals outlined in the Bologna Declaration. As other nations move towards these goals, the United States must follow suit in order to retain its leadership status in the international student market.

While Australia and Canada have historically been competitors to the United States for international students by offering their programs in English, many other higher education institutions in Asia and Europe are now also offering programs taught completely in English. English has truly become the international language of higher education, and so offering courses taught in English no longer adds to the United States' competitive edge.

Conclusion

So far, I have provided literature reviews of the changing globalized higher education market and the implemented internationalization strategies of the European Union and the United

States. In these reviews, it is clear that the now abundant number of higher education area options for international students, combined with our stringent visa regulation policies, negatively received foreign policy political actions, and rising higher education costs, has increased the importance of my research on how our leadership status in the international student market may be impacted. Moreover, the urgency of my recommendations to preserve our leadership role and even increase our international student recruitment has been amplified. In looking at these impacts and how we may combat them, it has been important to examine the stakeholders involved in these actions, such as the universities, national organizations such as NAFSA, ACE, and the AAU, and even global organizations such as IIE. These stakeholders have great impact on our international student advocacy and policies, and will be crucial to any university, state, or national recruitment strategies. In the following chapter, I will detail how I explored the various implications of the United States' leadership status in the globalized higher education market using a critical pragmatist theoretical lens.

Chapter 5

Analyzing Global Competition Impacts

Introduction

The previous chapters have provided a foundation for discussing globalized higher education, and the leadership status of both the European Union and the United States in this market. In looking at these two higher education areas, I have discussed the influences on their leadership status as well as on their strategic efforts for internationalizing their higher education structures, institutions, and student opportunities. In this chapter, I will now discuss my policy analysis methodologies used to develop my recommendations for the United States to remain a leader in the globalized international student market.

Theoretical Framework

I have used critical pragmatist theory to analyze the implications of the globalized international student market competition in higher education. Critical theory allows scholars to use a critical lens when conducting research. It allows for not only analyzing historical perspectives of your research, how and why things have changed, and what the current state is, but also to critique the changes over time and the influences of change. Critical theorists don't take truth at face value, but rather use critical reasoning to challenge the arguments of research. Critical theory even allows you to critique and challenge your own reasoning and your own beliefs. It allows you to critique your inquiry, methods, and findings by looking at all perspectives that have provided influence.

In contrast, critical pragmatism allows you to look at the practicality of the research problem and analyze the everyday life influences that will affect the outcomes of not only your research, but also the stakeholders involved when implementing your recommendations.

Forrester (2012) states that “critical pragmatism provides a line of analysis and imagination that might contribute both to academic planning theory and to engaged planning practices as well...it must help students of planning think critically about out comes as well as processes, about institutional and process designs, about power and performance. It must resonate experientially with perceptions of change-oriented practitioners facing complex multi-party ‘problems’ characterized by distrust, anger, strategic behavior, poor information, and inequalities of power.” (Forrester, 2012, p. 5)

Using a critical pragmatist theory has allowed me to not only evaluate the historical and current status of Europe and the United States as leaders in international student enrollments and the factors that have led to their status, but also to think critically and practically about how these same factors and others will potentially impact this status in the future. Using a critical pragmatist theory lens is necessary to truly analyze the potential implications of all internal and external influences on our leadership status in the globalized higher education market.

Robert Cox (1996) argues that critical theory surrounds an action framework. The action framework changes over time and is influenced by its history. Critical theory examines these changes, examines the history, and analyzes the problems. Apple et al. (2009) takes this definition of critical theory a step further arguing that we should not only evaluate these changes, but also their implications for our educational policies. In looking at the United States’ status as the leader for international student enrollments, I have used critical theory as Cox and Apple suggest, looking at the history of this status and the factors that influenced changes experienced, challenges faced, and successes realized. I have critically analyzed these factors in order to link them to changes in educational policies. Cox (1996) argues that critical theorists take a critical look at what is driving action, and how it has changed over time. Similarly, Apple et al. (2009)

define critical theory as an on-going process. When using critical theory in an educational context, Apple et al. (2009) argue that while we critique, we must constantly keep the surrounding local, national, and global educational policies that influence change, as well as their historical perspectives, in mind. Throughout my research, I have analyzed outside influences including how other changes in other higher education areas such as Europe, Asia, Australia, and Canada are impacting the United States' status in the globalized higher education competition market.

Giroux (2001) argues that critical theory has two essential foundations. The first is that while critical theory was originally developed by a group of scholars from what is called the "Frankfurt School" (p. 7), it was never given a concrete definition, but rather a general definition surrounding the notion of evaluating the rise of capitalism and the power changes that were associated. The second is that critical theorists seek to look at a theory or definition or "school of thought" (p. 8) and understand it first, but then critique it. He argues that critical theorists challenge ideologies and critique the status quo to offer a more just state. Giroux (2001) identifies critical theory as challenging truths, working for social change and transformation, and aiming to find rationality of truths. He claims that "critical theory contains a transcendent element in which critical thought becomes the precondition for human freedom...critical theory openly takes sides in the interest of struggling for a better world." (p.19)

Forrester (2012) argues that a critical theorist is always looking to critique, whereas a critical pragmatist is looking to plan for a possible solution. As I am not only evaluating the history and critiquing the impacts of higher education reforms on the international student market, and also deriving solutions for American institutions, a critical pragmatist lens is crucial. Critical pragmatism looks at all the angles and finds a creative solution to the problem, even if it

seems impossible. Forrester (2012) argues, “Critical pragmatism must—and can—help students of planning reconstruct possibilities where others might initially perceive or presume impossibilities.” (Forrester, 2012, p. 5) This theory lends to helping the planner or administrator to not only work through processes and policies, but to think outside the box; to conduct a critical analysis, yes, but also a realistic analysis that will allow you to come up with actual plans for a solution. The critical theorist will want to know if it’s really a good idea to implement changes to increase international enrollments, while the pragmatist will want to know what impacts it will have, what are the practical consequences if we do nothing, as well as if we do something. A pragmatist will want to know if we need to be changing what we are doing to meet these needs. Forrester (2012) argues that a critical pragmatist “has to address actual possibilities—what we might really do—in situations characterized by deep distrust and suspicion, deep differences of interests and values, a good deal of fear and, often, anger, poor or poorly distributed information and more. A critical pragmatist would have not to talk about “power” rhetorically but to explore power relations practically.” (p. 10) In looking at the internal and external influences impacting the United States’ ability to compete for international students, there are a lot of political and societal issues that have to be taken into consideration and I believe a critical pragmatist theory is necessary to evaluate all aspects of these influences.

Similarly, Kadlec (2008) describes critical pragmatism as similar to critical theory in that it shares “the belief that genuine critical reflection and action must be morally calibrated and that we must appeal to principles of justice that can inform our critical capacities.” (Kadlec, 2008, p. 55) Pragmatism allows a critical theorist to use critical thought to develop meaningful plans to fix a problem. Not just looking at the problem and is it really a problem, but is fixing the problem meaningful and who will it impact and what if we do nothing. Kadlec (2008) argues that

critical pragmatism allows researchers to develop approaches to a problem or research topic that are responsive to power relations of stakeholders and make plans or solutions based on practical every day issues that will directly impact those who have to implement those solutions. She argues that “critical pragmatism requires that we undertake the hard work of designing deliberative practices that actively confront power relations on-the-ground.” (Kadlec, 2008, p. 59) Critical pragmatism helps researchers evaluate the benefits and consequences of a planned and implemented solution.

Using this critical pragmatist lens has allowed me to look at the potentiality of losing our leadership status in the international student market as a critical theorist, to evaluate ways for universities to plan for this potential change as a pragmatist, and to develop sound solutions for responding to the Bologna Declaration and the increase in global competition for international students as a critical pragmatist by looking behind the reason for the research and evaluating the political and moral foundations of why we are looking at this issue and what are the impacts if we do or don't do something.

Research Questions

My research is seeking to answer a series of questions concerning the United States' leadership status in the international student market. These questions include should the United States be concerned about losing its competitive edge in the international student market? Specifically, should we be concerned about losing part of our market share to Europe due to their implementation of the Bologna Declaration? What other influences within the United States are impacting our ability to compete for international students? And what changes do our higher education institutions need to make to remain competitive?

Methodology

I have chosen to conduct a policy analysis using a critical pragmatist theoretical lens to further evaluate the Bologna Declaration as a higher education reform policy to better inform my peers in higher education administration so that we may make decisions on how to respond to Europe's successes and the increase in global competition for international students. Dunn (1981) defines policy analysis as "an applied social science discipline which uses multiple methods of inquiry and argument to produce and transform policy-relevant information that may be utilized in political settings to resolve policy problems." (Dunn, 1981, p. 35) He argues that policy analyses do not fall into the typical realm of qualitative research of testing and observation, but rather to go beyond and seek out information that will allow policy makers to derive values and make smarter decisions regarding policies. (Dunn, 1981)

Through my policy analysis, I have chosen to use critical pragmatist theory as a lens through which to examine my ultimate research question of should the United States take a more serious look at Europe's successes in the areas of global competitiveness in the international student market. Using a critical pragmatist theory lens has allowed me to challenge my initial beliefs of whether or not the United States needs to learn from Europe, look at the history and the internal and external influences of the global competition market for international students, and ultimately provide me with a more solid foundation for my dissertation argument of the fact that we, the United States, need to look to Europe's successes and to make changes in our recruitment strategies to maintain our competitive edge.

Data Collection: Document Review

Throughout my dissertation and policy analysis, I have utilized qualitative data analysis techniques including document review, questionnaires, and interviews. I have used document

review as a primary method to find data to answer the research question of “How has the United States been impacted by the Bologna Declaration?” This document review included analyzing current policies and public statements from the top ten United States institutions for enrolling the most international students, as well as national and global statistics and policies. I have reviewed changes in international student enrollment, as well as institutions’ documented commitment to international student engagement and enrollment, their responses to the increased competition in the globalized higher education market, and their acknowledgement of the Bologna Declaration. The institutional documents used in this review include campus level documents such as mission and vision statements, strategic plans, and campus news articles published by or for the institution’s president, provost, and/or chancellor’s offices. I have also utilized information found on university web pages centered around global initiatives, as well as from web pages for university offices that offer international student services, study abroad, and admissions. To be consistent across the ten institutions sampled in this study, I have reviewed and utilized comparable documents from each institution. While each institution’s structure and initiatives may vary, they all provided comparable documents to use for this study.

From my experiences in the Graduate Admissions office of the Graduate College at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign over the past thirteen years, I know that Europe has come a long way since 1999 in developing and implementing the Bologna Declaration. In my position at Illinois, the number two public institution for international student enrollment in the United States, it is important that I stay abreast of higher education trends and changes throughout the world. We receive graduate applications from over 115 countries and have an international graduate population of nearly 50%. The vast majority of our international students are from Asia, and this is a similar trend in most United States institutions who have higher

international student enrollments, and who have strong Engineering schools. However, after Asia in application numbers are those students from Europe. Throughout my research, my goal has been to gain a better understanding of Europe's future plans for Bologna and to find out how the Bologna Declaration is already affecting other countries' competitiveness for enrolling international students in their higher education institutions.

My document review research also included looking at the trends reports provided over the last decade, along with other statistical data showing changes in enrollment numbers of international students throughout the EHEA. In comparison, I have continued to utilize the Open Doors Reports published annually by the Institute for International Education to analyze the changes in enrollment numbers of international students throughout the United States; specifically, at the top international student enrolling institutions.

Ultimately, my research goals have been to assess the progress of the Bologna Declaration post their original implementation goal of 2010 and the impacts of Europe's increase in competitiveness on the rest of the globe. Specifically, my goal has been to develop recommendations for a United States response to the Bologna Declaration and the increased global competition for international students, and to recommend changes in our higher education structure to maintain our own competitiveness and attractiveness in the international and globalized higher education community.

Data Collection: Policy Expert Questionnaires and Interviews

In addition to using document review, I have utilized policy experts from the top twenty international student enrolling institutions in the United States to answer the research questions of "How has the United States responded to the increased global competition for international students?" and "What forces (other than Bologna) are working for and against the United States'?"

ability to compete for international students?” I have sent questionnaires designed to uncover the levels of knowledge and awareness existing in United States institutions, among administration and faculty, about the Bologna Declaration to help me in analyzing why or why not institutions in the United States are succeeding in international student enrollment. This questionnaire was sent to policy experts via email. All consent and disclosures were included in the questionnaire email approved by the Institutional Review Board. As I knew I would be primarily sending this questionnaire to busy administrators, I kept the questionnaire to just 12 questions in hopes of gaining a higher response rate. I sent out 525 surveys and received a successful 20% response rate (105 responses). The questions included were designed to gain insight to the responders’ awareness of the Bologna Declaration, of any concerns they have about losing international students to Europe, and of any changes they have experienced in their international student applications and enrollments. The final two questions asked if they would be willing to have their names and institutional affiliation published in my research and whether or not they would be willing to participate in a 30-minute phone interview to further discuss the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on the global competition market for international students.

For my research, institutional policy experts included administrators and faculty in leadership roles in admissions, international education, and international student services in United States institutions consistently ranked 20th or higher for total international student enrollments over the last five years by the IIE. To enrich my study, I have reached out to administrators from all academic areas of each campus as well. Policy experts were chosen based on their leadership roles within these administrative areas for each campus. I wanted to include administrators who were working both on the front lines as entry-level managers such as specialists and coordinators, mid-level managers such as directors, and also higher level

managers such as Assistant Deans or Vice Provosts. I also included policy experts who primary worked with undergraduate students, as well as those who worked with graduate students. This research is intended to not only discuss the numbers and tuition dollars surrounding international student enrollments, but also the cultural and political benefits and impacts of our international student enrollments. I believe having a wide variety of perspectives included in my study provides me with a more complete data set to allow for better recommendations.

To protect the anonymity of my study participants, I have specifically listed responses only as responses from policy experts in an expert area, rather than identifying them as participants from any particular institution. As there are not many administrators performing these roles at each institution, identifying them by their institution could potentially lead to loss of anonymity. In discussions with these experts, this anonymity was crucial to their participation in my study.

The questionnaires also covered questions asking for expert responses on whether or not these institutions have been affected by or responded to the European Union's successes with the Bologna Declaration, as well as address their changes in international student enrollment rates and in cooperative exchange agreements with foreign partners. These answers have been used to help me analyze the progress so far of the impacts of the Bologna Declaration, as well as to help me predict the future impacts and need for change.

Through my position at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I have utilized my contacts with these high international student-enrolling institutional administrators in the areas of admissions and international student services. I have conducted not only questionnaires, but also in-depth interviews with these international student experts in the United States to gain a deeper understanding of how the United States has so far been impacted by the Bologna

Declaration and how institutions and policy experts are responding to the increase in global competition for international students. As stated, the final question of the questionnaire asked policy experts if they would be willing to participate in an interview. Twenty-eight of the 105 questionnaire respondents indicated they would be willing to participate in an interview. I reached out to all 28 via email to invite them for the interview, and in the end, 20 participants were willing to set up the interview. All consent and disclosure information were sent via email and all participants provided scanned copies of signed consent forms prior to the interviews. All but 4 interviews were conducted by phone, and the remaining 4 were conducted in person. The interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes each and allowed for respondents to speak in great detail regarding strategies their institutions have taken to respond to the increased global competition for international students, including any specific responses to the Bologna Declaration. In addition, the interviewees discussed factors that negatively or positively impact their ability to recruit international students and whether or not they believed the United States' government should be more active in encouraging the recruitment of international students. The questions included in the interviews were designed to allow administrators to speak openly about their impressions of the increasing global competition for international students. I wanted to gauge their sense of urgency regarding competition, to obtain a more thorough understanding of their awareness surrounding the Bologna Declaration, and to find out from their perspectives what were the influences impacting their ability in continuing to recruit the top international students. Ultimately, I designed the questions with hopes of deriving potential solutions or recommendations that could help institutions in maintaining a competitive edge in the international student market. All questionnaire and interview protocols have been attached in Appendix A.

Table 1. Data Collection Matrix

Research Question	Data Collection Sources	How to Access the Data?
How has the United States been impacted by the Bologna Declaration?	IIE Open Doors Reports – use to research enrollment changes of international students since the implementation of Bologna. Document Review results of top 10 enrolling institutions for policy changes and reactions to Bologna.	Reports are accessible to the public via www.iie.org Data is available to the public on each institution’s web site.
What forces (other than Bologna) are working for and against the United States’ ability to compete for international students?	Interviews and Questionnaires with policy experts from the top 20 enrolling international student institutions	Use my professional contacts at these institutions to reach out to these administrators
How has the United States responded to the increased global competition for international students?	Interviews and Questionnaires with policy experts from the top 20 enrolling international student institutions	Use my professional contacts at these institutions to reach out to these administrators
What changes should the United States make to remain competitive in the international student market?	Use interview and questionnaire results from institutional policy experts	Review results from data above

Sampling Techniques

To define the top international student enrolling institutions in the United States, I utilized the Institute for International Education (IIE) Open Doors reports from 2011 to 2015 to discover the enrollment data by nation, higher education area, and institution. The data provided by IIE has allowed me to discover which institutions to study more in depth for changes and responses to the Bologna Declaration and regarding global competitiveness.

In 2015, the top twenty consisted of the New York University, University of Southern California, Columbia University, Arizona State University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Northeastern University, Purdue University, University of California in Los Angeles, Michigan State University, University of Washington, Boston University, Penn State University, University of Michigan, Ohio State University, University of Texas in Dallas, Indiana University, University of Minnesota, University of California in Berkeley, State University of New York in Buffalo, and Texas A&M University. (IIE, 2015) These same twenty

institutions have rotated positions in the top twenty spots for the last five years, with five additional institutions rotating in and out: Harvard University, University of Florida, University of Texas at Austin, Georgia Institute of Technology, and University of Pennsylvania. (IIE, 2015) The University of Southern California is always in the top two and interestingly, Arizona State University was #20 in 2011, but moved to be #4 in 2015 (making them #1 for public institutions). The table that follows shows the changes in enrollment patterns for these institutions over the last five years.

Table 2. Institutional Rankings and International Student Enrollments

Institution	2014/2015		2013/2014		2012/2013		2011/2012		2010/2011	
	Rank	Enrollment								
NYU	1	13178	1	11164	4	9362	3	8660	3	7988
USC	2	12334	2	10932	1	9840	1	9269	1	8615
Columbia U	3	11510	4	10486	5	8797	5	8024	5	7297
Arizona St U	4	11330	8	8683	11	6645	15	5616	20	4934
UIUC	5	11223	3	10843	2	9804	2	8997	2	7991
Northeastern U	6	10559	7	90748	7	7705	7	6486	16	5187
Purdue	7	10230	5	9988	3	9509	4	8563	4	7562
UCLA	8	10209	6	9579	6	8424	6	6703	6	6249
Michigan St U	9	8146	9	7704	9	6759	9	6209	9	5748
U Washington	10	8035	10	7469	14	6491	18	5372		
Boston U	11	7860	12	7143	12	6615	13	6041	12	5464
Penn State	12	7728	13	7024	10	6693	12	6075	15	5207
U Michigan	13	7423	11	7273	8	6827	8	6382	8	5995
Ohio State U	14	7121	14	6800	15	6478	10	6142	7	6082
U TX Dallas	15	7064	19	6296						
Indiana U	16	7009	15	6661	13	6547	11	6123	11	5471
U Minnesota	17	6984	16	6621	16	6178	14	5661	18	5124
UC Berkeley	18	6874	18	6372	20	5632				
SUNY Buffalo	19	6852	17	6594	18	5804	19	5357	17	5185
Texas A&M U	20	6690								
Harvard							17	5453	10	5594
U Florida			20	6135	17	5961	16	5588	13	5393
U TX Austin							20	5324	14	5323
Georgia Tech									19	4943
U Penn					19	5751				

Data from IIE Open Doors Reports, 2015-2011: <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Fast-Facts>

With my position at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I have made contacts at these top twenty international student-enrolling institutions that has allowed me easier access to a sampling of administrators to send questionnaires and to interview. With this, I have employed snowball sampling. Atkinson and Flint (2004) defined snowball sampling as “a technique for gathering research subjects through the identification of an initial subject who is used to provide the names of other actors.” By using my current contacts at these institutions, I have been able to reach out to a wider array of contacts at each institution. This further aligns with Atkinson and Flint’s (2004) definition of snowball sampling where they state that “these actors may themselves open possibilities for an expanding web of contact and inquiry.”

Through the use of document review, questionnaires, and interviews, I have been able to take a deeper look into each of these institutions and discover their changes in international engagement and commitment, their outlook on the competitive global higher education market, and any direct responses they have had towards the Bologna Declaration. The 105 responses received from my questionnaires were provided by administrators from 22 of the 25 institutions in the study. I believe this provides a varied set of responses that help validate my study. In addition, I received a 19% response rate for interviews of those who completed questionnaires. These interviews were from 8 of the institutions. I would have preferred to have policy experts from a larger number of institutions for my interview results, but as the responses from the interviews aligned similarly with the themes of the questionnaire responses from the larger institutional sampling, I am satisfied with the validity of the findings.

Data Analysis

To answer my ultimate research question of “What changes should the United States make to remain competitive in the international student market?”, I combined the document

review results and the interview and questionnaire responses from administrators at the top twenty international student enrolling institutions. I used a constant comparison analysis to code the document review results, and a classical content analysis to code the questionnaire and interview results. Using a combination of these methods allowed me to identify and code categories within each dataset collected, based on common trends within the document review results and the questionnaire and interview responses.

Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2007) argue that a constant comparison analysis can be used when “a researcher is interested in utilizing an entire dataset to identify underlying themes presented through the data.” (Leech and Onwuegbuzie, 2007, p. 565) This method of analysis worked well for evaluating the institutional document review findings, as it allowed me to categorize and code each institution’s strategies and responses. In developing conclusions of this constant comparison analysis, Kolb (2012) argues that the researcher “continually sorts through the data collection, analyzes and codes the information, and reinforces theory generation through the process of theoretical sampling.”

After completing the document review of each institution in my study, I separated the data into the following categories: mission and vision statements incorporating globalization, strategic planning goals focusing on global competition, senior administration publicly recognizing increased global competition, documented efforts of partnering with foreign institutions, and admissions operations responding to the Bologna Declaration. Within these categories, I employed a constant comparative analysis method to apply codes to the institutional findings and identify common themes in regard to overall globalization strategies, international student and faculty competition strategies, and specific responses to the Bologna Declaration.

While a constant comparison analysis allowed me to identify the common concerns and strategies related to global competition, using a classical content analysis approach to evaluate the questionnaire and interview responses allowed me to identify the most common approaches to combat these concerns. Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2007) argue that constant comparison analysis and classical content analysis are similar, but a classical content analysis allows the researcher to count the frequency of common responses/themes within each dataset. Similarly, Krippendorff (2012) argues, “the frequency with which a symbol, idea, reference, or topic occurs in a stream of messages is taken to indicate the importance, of, attention to, or emphasis on that symbol, idea, reference or topic in the messages.” (Krippendorff, 2012, p. 62) This analysis method allowed me to identify which responses or themes were most important to the institutions of the policy experts participating in this study by looking at the frequency of responses received. I separated questionnaire and interview responses into the following categories: Bologna Declaration awareness, Bologna Declaration concerns, global competition impacts, global competition strategies, and recruitment influences.

For the questionnaires, I have offered a numeric ranking scale for answers for the vast majority of the questions with only two open-ended questions. This allowed me to look for the average and most common response rates regarding levels of awareness and concern about increased global competition for international students. Further analysis allowed me to use these averages to determine not only overall rates, but also breakdowns for rates of awareness and concern based on policy expert area (admissions, international student services, and academic programs).

For the open-ended responses from the questionnaires, and for the interview responses, I have identified key themes in responses to code the results. By comparing responses and finding

frequencies of common responses, I have been able to identify themes of concern for these institutions and to identify strategies that would work for a larger body of higher education institutions in the United States.

For the final analysis and comparison of the full data results of all three methods, document review, questionnaires, and interviews, I have again used classical content analysis to catalog and identify recurring trends in globalization efforts from the institutions in this study. This allowed me to again determine frequencies of strategies and efforts currently being made by institutions through basic statistical analysis. Comparing institutional efforts further allows me to develop strategies and recommendations for combatting the increased global competition for international students.

Data Validity

I have employed triangulation in my data analysis methods to ensure data validity. I have triangulated the results from the document review, questionnaires, and interviews to determine my findings in my overarching policy analysis. Rothbauer (2008) offers that “the basic idea underpinning the concept of triangulation is that the phenomena under study can be understood best when approached with a variety or a combination of research methods.” Triangulation has allowed me to review, validate, and cross-reference the results from each method used to ensure more valid findings. By triangulating the results, I was able to compare responses and find common and contrasting themes to provide justification for my conclusions and recommendations. The questionnaires were received from policy experts from the areas of admissions, international student services, and academic program offices from 22 of the 25 institutions. The themes and recurring responses on awareness, concerns, and strategies involved in looking at increased global competition for international students were consistent with those

identified in the interviews conducted with policy experts (from the three expert areas) from 8 of the 25 institutions. These responses were further validated by the document review of the top 10 institutions. This document review provided evidence that the responses from the policy experts matched the public viewpoints and strategies being taken by their institutions.

Triangulating these results not only provided me with evidence of the validity of the individual participants' responses, but also for the common and recurring themes identified. This cross-referencing of responses allowed me to best formulate my research conclusions and recommendations. Without the compilation of all data sources, I believe my recommendations would be incomplete.

Reflexivity

As an administrator who manages the Graduate Admissions office for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I have not only a scholarly interest in the results of my research but also an administrative interest on behalf of my employer. My ultimate goal with this research is to make recommendations to Illinois in order for our university to remain in the lead for public institutions enrolling international students. With this, my audience includes scholars and policy experts from Illinois and from around the United States. My research will ultimately benefit my administrative career in the field of admissions and international studies in higher education, and therefore it is important that I make these goals and biases known. Lisa Anderson (2008) argues that reflexivity is a part of qualitative research and states that "it is impossible to remain 'outside' our subject matter; our presence, in whatever form, will have some kind of effect." My experiences in the admissions field and my experiences at Illinois have shaped the way I interpret the results from my research and has caused me to use reflexivity in my data analysis. Throughout my administrative career at Illinois, I have worked extensively with international

recruitment and admissions, international student advising, and researching international higher education trends. When I research the increased competition for international students and try to develop recommendations, my instinct is to think about how this would impact my office and my university and my students. I tend to think first as an administrator, and second as a scholar.

While I believe these instincts will pragmatically help me in developing strategies and recommendations that will actually work for institutions, it is important that I recognize these as instincts, take a step back, and look at policy implications from not only an administrative, planning, or pragmatic viewpoint, but as a critical scholar as well. This is why the critical pragmatist viewpoint works perfectly for my research.

Conclusion

Using a critical pragmatist viewpoint, and with recognition of my personal biases and natural administrative lens, I have conducted a policy analysis of the Bologna Declaration's impacts on the United States' leadership status in the globalized higher education market. The following chapter will provide detailed results of my research findings from document review analyses, as well as policy experts' questionnaires and interviews.

Chapter 6

American Higher Education Responses to Global Competition

Introduction

In reviewing the best ways to evaluate how the Bologna Declaration has influenced the United States, I found that evaluating the top twenty international student-enrolling institutions would provide me with not only credible, but also substantial research, to develop recommendations on how the United States can strategize to remain a leader in the globalized higher education market. As explored in the foundational chapters of this dissertation, and documented through the methodologies of the previous chapter, utilizing document review of these institutions has provided me with a glimpse into how these institutions are implementing local strategies of internationalization in response to the increased and globalized competition for international students. Delving further into this analysis with questionnaires and interviews with policy experts from these institutions provided me with substantial research findings to create recommendations for the United States, and even specifically for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, to remain a global leader in international student recruitment.

Institutional Research Findings

As the higher education market is becoming more and more globalized, and students are now presented with many more choices for higher education across the globe, competition is the new name of the game for higher education institutions. However, has the U.S. done much about this competition? We are the world leader in enrolling international students and have been so for a very long time. But, do we need to start worrying that things may change? In 2006, NAFSA argued that “while other countries are working hard to access the benefits gained from educating the next generation of world leaders and from attracting the world’s scientific, technological, and

intellectual elite, the United States is curiously disengaged, content to compete with speeches, sound bites, and photo ops.” (NAFSA, 2006) This statement is a bit discouraging, but is it true? Are we so sure that we won’t lose our competitive edge if we don’t make changes to fight for our lead in the international student market?

According to the IIE 2016 Open Doors report, we are still seeing an increase in our international student enrollments. In 2015/2016, we saw an increase of 2.4% in new international student enrollments; however, the three years prior, we saw 8.7%, 7.6%, and 9.8% increases. So, while we are still seeing increases, they are not nearly as significant as in years past. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) In an effort to ascertain what our institutions are doing to maintain our country’s leadership status, I have employed document review analysis of the top ten international student enrolling institutions. I have reviewed publicly available documents for these ten institutions to determine the strategies put in place by each institution to recruit international students and to incorporate internationalization into their campus initiatives. This document review provides context for the questionnaire and interview responses, and also serves to validate policy expert responses regarding initiatives and strategies.

New York University

New York University (NYU) has long been in the running for the top international student enrollment institution in the United States and moved to the #1 location in 2013/2014. (IIE Open Doors, 2015) NYU prides itself on its global outreach and policies throughout its campus and brands itself as the “first global network university.” (NYU Global Council, 2017) As a global network university, NYU boasts that “no university has a greater global presence.” (NYU, 2017) However, this boasting is based on success with attracting and serving international students. NYU’s international student population has origins from over 130

countries, facilitates two degree-granting campuses in Abu Dhabi and Shanghai, and offers academic centers in 11 foreign countries (5 in Europe) that enroll over 55,000 students annually. (NYU, 2017)

When Andrew Hamilton was inaugurated as NYU's new president in September 2016, he argued that as they looked to the future, the NYU campus and its members need to "encourage an openness to the perspectives of others." (Hamilton, 2016) He believes that the widespread international network of NYU paves a path for such openness; however, he questioned how they can ensure they continue to be relevant and strive for excellence beyond the numbers. In addition, he argued for the urgency of maintaining such relevance and such excellence. He stated that "there has never been a time when bold action on global education is more urgently needed than now in the face of destructive public discourse on immigration, suspicion of entire religions and ethnic groups, and a range of problems – from climate change to ideological extremism – that defies borders, it is essential that we choose not to retreat but to engage."(Hamilton, 2016) While this speech was made prior to the recent United States presidential executive orders concerning international citizens, his words could serve as a direct response to the orders' negative impacts on the perception that our prospective and current international students and partners have on being welcome and safe in the United States. Hamilton (2016) went on to argue that NYU must continue efforts to build global enterprises and global research collaborations and make these global efforts accessible to all students—that no matter their previous successes, they must continue building.

These sentiments take further the concerns that the last NYU president, John Sexton, conveyed in 2010. Sexton remained cautious that competition in the international market is an

⁵ NYU's global academic centers are located in Acca, Berlin, Buenos Aires, Florence, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Sydney, Tel Aviv, and Washington DC.

issue the university must pay close attention to. Sexton argued that other higher education areas outside the United States are working hard to recruit international students and promote the attractiveness of their institutions. He stated that “given that the talent pool and flow now are global, it no longer can be taken for granted that the United States (or even "the West" as a whole) will remain the magnet for talent it traditionally has been.” (Sexton, 2010) Across the globe, institutions are working to keep their students studying at home rather than travelling to the United States for higher education by restructuring degrees and improving program quality to compete with the United States. (Sexton, 2010) And according to Sexton, these other countries are succeeding. He documents that only 23% of students studying internationally were enrolled in United States institutions in 2006, and interestingly that the European Union had a greater number of international students enrolled than the United States if you count students studying in other European countries other than their home nation. (Sexton, 2010) As we know, part of the Bologna Declaration’s intent is to increase competition, including keeping more European students studying within the European Union and attracting more international students from across the globe to study in the European Union.

The NYU “Framework 2031” initiative (similar to a strategic plan) includes a call for action in terms of global higher education competition. It calls for NYU to use its global network, location, and alumni relations to create a competitive edge. (NYU, 2008) Having academic centers across the globe and in New York with more than 40,000 international students gives NYU a competitive advantage in sheer numbers, but also with potential to cultivate alumni relations with these students. In addition, New York City is an international hub for the arts, economics, trade, education, you name it. (NYU, 2008)

In Framework 2031, NYU recognizes that the flow of international students has changed. International students have more options with Europe's new European Higher Education Area (EHEA), Australia and New Zealand's new active recruiting strategies, and China's newly developed research universities. Framework 2031 posits "even if the number of foreign faculty and students coming to U.S. colleges and universities is relatively stable, the nation's share of the very best is diminishing. The flow of intellectual brainpower worldwide is far more complex than it was a decade ago, and NYU, along with all research universities, will be forced to deal with this change." (NYU, 2008)

In specific regards to the Bologna Declaration, the graduate admissions offices across the NYU campus offer little guidance to those prospective students with Bologna-compliant degrees. Each graduate school at NYU has their own admissions office, and the vast majority of these offices either offer no clear advisement as to what degrees will be accepted for admission, or just offer the canned "a degree equivalent to a U.S. bachelor degree" that many institutions across America require. However, the NYU Stern School of Business does specify three-year degrees from France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom will be accepted for admission. (NYU Stern, 2017) This tells me that NYU is open to receiving Bologna-compliant three-year bachelor degrees and is sending a positive recruiting message to prospective European students.

University of Southern California

The University of Southern California (USC) has long been the leader in international student enrollments in the United States. Prior to falling to second place in 2013/2014, USC had remained the number one US destination for international students since 2001. USC takes their leadership in globalized education very seriously and has used a globalization lens in developing strategic plans, new curriculums, and their overall mission of the University. A key role outlined

in their mission statement is to be “a global institution in a global center, attracting more international students over the years than any other American university.” (USC, 1993)

In developing a strategic plan and a vision for their future, USC actively includes goals of creating a global presence, visibility, and brand. (USC, 2004) These goals are designed to not only allow their students to become better prepared to succeed in a globalized market place, but also to increase USC’s attractiveness and competitive edge in the international student market. In this competitive outlook, USC believes that a “global presence will attract the most talented students in the world to USC. The demand for education is increasing worldwide, and the best students will view higher education as an international market, heightening competition and creating a truly global student body. We seek to become the university of choice for future leaders in all parts of the world.” (USC, 2004, p. 3) To increase their competitive edge, USC is working hard to increase their recruitment activities and develop alumni relations as their international students are possibly the best resource to “serve as global goodwill ambassadors.” (USC, 2004, p. 5)

USC’s President, C.L. Max Nikias, addressed the university in February 2016, highlighting a number of successes and international recognition for the university’s various programs, such as a new global biotech center, a new institute for international actors, and faculty winning international honors. In addition, he argued that USC has always been a “global institution with a global character” from its first graduating class with multiple ethnicities to its current population made up of students from all regions of the world. (Nikias, 2016)

President Nikias also gave an annual address to his faculty in February of 2015 in which he addressed a number of issues that the campus should be concerned with. One item was the increase in global competition for not only the best faculty, but the best students. He cited the

competition as an “escalating arms race for talent world-wide.” (Nikias, 2015) Similarly, USC’s former President, Steven Sample, greatly stressed the importance of maintaining a competitive edge in today’s globalized higher education market in a 2006 College Board annual forum. He believed that the United States should be concerned about its foreign competitors arguing that “we in higher education must keep pace with the breathtaking rate of change occurring around the world, that we cannot do business as usual, that we cannot simply presume American higher education will continue to be the gold standard for the world.” (Sample, 2006)

To develop partnerships and relations with foreign institutions, all with the goal of increasing competitiveness for international students, USC has made over 180 agreements with foreign institutions in 38 countries (including 8 from Europe). This outreach is designed to help USC prepare “students to thrive in the global marketplace by emphasizing research, study abroad and service learning opportunities that span countries and continents.” (USC Global, 2017)

While USC has taken many steps to internationalize their campus, develop relations with international students and institutions, and ultimately increase their competitive edge in the globalized higher education market, they do not directly address the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on higher education. Their admissions requirements for graduate school do include the Diploma Supplement for Bologna-compliant degrees and do also indicate they will accept bachelor degrees with 180 or more ECTS, which means they accept the new Bologna-compliant three-year bachelor’s degrees. (USC Admissions, 2017) This acceptance is not surprising given their successes with international student enrollments.

Columbia University in the City of New York

Columbia University in the City of New York currently falls into third place for enrolling the most international students in the United States. (IIE Open Doors, 2015) However, Columbia

has been increasing their international student enrollments in the last five years moving from spot five, to four, and now to three in just the last three years. With New York University right around the corner, Columbia has a lot to compete with and they take their international education commitment to heart. Columbia's mission statement owns the responsibility of seeking "to attract a diverse and international faculty and student body, to support research and teaching on global issues, and to create academic relationships with many countries and regions." (Columbia, 2017)

Similar to the first two institutions detailed above, Columbia prides itself on being an international education leader in the United States, but also recognizes the global competition in today's higher education market. And like NYU, Columbia believes that creating academic study sites or "Global Centers" across the globe is critical to maintaining a competitive edge and brand as an "international research university." (Columbia Global Centers, 2017)

Columbia's President, Lee Bollinger, developed a Committee on Global Thought consisting of faculty from across the campus with the goal of "enhancing the university's engagement with issues of global importance." (Columbia Global Thought, 2017) With Columbia's position as an international education leader, the Committee on Global Thought has been charged with the responsibility of maintaining and increasing the campus' commitment to exploring global issues. (Columbia Global Thought, 2017)

With the institution's high population of international students and scholars from over 150 countries (including France, Germany, Italy, and the UK in the top 10), Columbia wanted to establish degree programs that respond to this international community, and the Committee on Global Thought is doing just that. This Committee has developed a series of global initiatives for the universities since it was first formed in 2006. Some of these include the development of a

Master of Arts degree in Global Thought, and undergraduate student organization to engage in the discussion of global issues and trends, the creation of 8 global academic centers in 8 countries, annual global reports to address the impacts of globalization on its university, its students, and its communities, a university forum on Global Columbia to foster university-wide discussions about what a global university really is in today's world and how to strategize and implement action plans to become a truly global institution, a global freedom of expression project to allow for and enforce such freedom among students and faculty, a global policy initiative to help influence global policy not only regarding education, but health, freedoms, and inequalities around the world, and finally a global innovation fund to fund research and development projects and collaborations at the university's global centers. (Columbia Global, 2017)

President Bollinger also implemented a World Leaders Forum for the Columbia campus in 2003. Each year, the World Leaders Form offers symposiums, discussion sessions, and other events throughout the year aiming to “advance lively, uninhibited dialogue on the large economic, political, and social questions of our time.” (Columbia World Leaders Forum, 2017) In past events, they have hosted national and global leaders from around the globe including President Bill Clinton, as well as European nation presidents, and even the Dalai Lama. Having such great leaders lead these sessions has provided many amazing global discussion opportunities for Columbia's students and faculty. One student commented “the World Leaders Forum has become a tradition at this institution that seems to have reinforced the identity of Columbia as a truly global university and, I believe, has made this school unique amongst others.” (Columbia World Leaders Forum, 2017)

While Columbia University has responded to globalization and taken international education as a primary goal and strategy for their institution, they have offered little in terms of a specific response to the Bologna Declaration. Many of their international strategies for competing in the globalized higher education market will naturally help them respond to the Bologna Declaration, but it is unclear if these strategies are in direct response to Europe's changes. However, in looking at their graduate admissions requirements, they do indicate they will accept three-year bachelor's degrees from European countries and even mention and link to the Bologna process for European applicants. (Columbia Admissions, 2017)

Arizona State University

Arizona State University is a new player to the top five international student enrolling institutions jumping from 20th place in 2011 to 4th place in 2015. This spot also puts them as the #1 public institution for enrolling international students. With a strategic goal of "establishing ASU as a leading global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery and development by 2025," it is no surprise that they have been aggressively recruiting and growing their international student population. (ASU, 2017) ASU's President, Michael M. Crow, has been moving ASU toward becoming what he calls a "New American university" with the goals of not only increasing the excellence of the university through its research and social impacts, but also through increased access and global engagement. President Crow stated, "American higher education cannot assume that its competitive position in the world is unassailable." (Crow, 2011) President Crow argued that we cannot remain arrogant and reliant on our reputations, but rather we must continue to grow and change to remain competitive in the global higher education network.

In these efforts, ASU has grown to now include more than 165 international collaboration partnerships in 40 countries and has international students from over 135 countries. (ASU Global, 2017) Their international partnerships include joint degree programs, research opportunities, faculty and student exchanges, and innovative international initiatives at both the undergraduate and graduate level. In addition, ASU has developed curriculums surrounding globalization including the Center for Advanced Studies in Global Education that help students training to become teachers to develop methods and strategies to help their future students become successful throughout global and diverse cultures. (ASU Global, 2017)

In 2015, ASU started up a program called Global Launch. This program “propels students, educators, and other professionals to thrive in the global marketplace” by providing English language training as well as academic preparation and professional skills development services. (ASU Global Launch, 2017) This programming is offered to international students to prepare to go to ASU, as 45% of program participants are eventually admitted as degree-seeking students; however, it is also offered to global partners, such as a group of students sponsored by the Brazilian government to participate in a professional development program, a group of high school teachers from Peru to participate in an English language training program, and a group of faculty and students from Mexico to participate in a program that encompasses English language training, academic preparation, and capacity building. Ultimately, ASU has the goal of training 10,000 students and participants within the US and in partner countries by the year 2020. (ASU Global Launch, 2017)

ASU has recognized that in our globalized economy, our research endeavors cannot be limited to what benefits our nation only. Instead, we must apply our research efforts to look for solutions that can benefit the world. In addition, we must train our students to become leaders in

markets across the globe. In ASU's international development office, they have managed and initiated a substantial number of international partnership projects. ASU has been working with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to fund and collaborate on global projects (30 are currently active), including the development of a Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety to facilitate research on violence in Central America and working with United States Pakistan Centers for Advanced Studies in Energy designed to help Pakistan with their energy crisis, and to help women and disadvantaged youth get involved in research programs. (ASU Int'l Development, 2017) Some other ASU international development collaborations include working with the Higher Engineering Education Alliance Program (HEEAP) to collaborate with government, higher education, and industry organizations to reform the public engineering higher education system in Vietnam, and working with the McCain institute for International Leadership in Washington D.C. on global leadership projects regarding safety, economic development, and human rights. (ASU Int'l Development, 2017)

While ASU has been working hard to increase their global engagement and footprint in the international student market and in the global economic, research, and development arenas, they have not developed any specific response to the Bologna Declaration. Their international admissions offices offer scholarships for incoming international students, provide a great recruiting video, and participate in in-country recruiting events and have aggressively been recruiting international students in the last 5 years. All of these efforts have been working, but it is unclear if any of these strategies have been in response to Bologna. In looking specifically at their graduate admissions requirements, they indicate that a comparable bachelor's degree is required, but do not mention anything specifically about whether or not they accept three-year

bachelor's degrees from European countries or even mention anything about Bologna-compliant degrees from European applicants. (ASU Admissions, 2017)

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois) currently ranks fifth overall and second for public institutions in the United States for enrolling the most international students. (IIE Open Doors, 2015) Illinois has a deep commitment to international education including promoting study abroad options for their students, recruiting international students to study on campus, partnering with international institutions, and offering a number of international education majors. Former Chancellor, Phyllis Wise, once argued that “with a strong commitment to international initiatives both at the campus level and within individual colleges, internationalization is increasingly embedded in all aspects of the academic life on campus.” (Wise, 2012) This is still very much true today and is very evident in all the international and global efforts of the Illinois campus.

Illinois International is the university's unit responsible for a number of international initiatives, services, and activities. This office manages the international student and scholar services office that provides cultural and transition programming for international students, as well as immigration and visa advising and management, the study abroad office, and the office that manages all faculty and student exchange and partnership agreements. Illinois International also manages the Global Education and Training office that provides international training programs as well as the university's Shanghai office, and other units that provide information about international safety and international media communications. This office is committed to all things international for the Illinois campus.

In a promotional video on the Illinois International web site, the Illinois International team does a great job of sharing the commitment of Illinois to international students and partners. In this video, Reitumetse Mabokela, the Vice Provost for International Affairs and Global Strategies, and the leader of Illinois International, states “we are committed to making Illinois a preeminent global university...we have very talented faculty members here and an opportunity to use the curriculum to prepare students who will go out in to the world to be able to compete and be able to contribute in both domestic and international contexts.” (Illinois International, 2017) Other leaders from Illinois International, as well as students and faculty, contribute to this video as well, stating that Illinois is “such a global campus with so many students from different parts of the world and so many professors and scholars from different parts of the world that it really informs everything that goes on in the university” and that Illinois’ faculty find ways to “invite international students to participate in the classroom and internationalize the syllabus,” and that our international faculty bring “a unique perspective and culture to the campus.” With over 10,000 international students across the campus, over 2000 students studying abroad annually, and 1899 international faculty and staff serving students, Illinois has definitely been successful in its international recruitment efforts. (Illinois International, 2017)

Internationalization is at the core of Illinois’ strategic plan calling for the University to “intensify our international presence.” (Illinois Strategic Plan, 2017) This initiative of the strategic plan calls for an increase and development of partnerships with international higher education institutions, corporations, and alumni to develop educational, research, and philanthropic collaborations, including establishing joint research institutes and increasing financial support. (Illinois Strategic Plan, 2017) In another strategic plan goal, Illinois outlines an action plan to “integrate global perspectives within our learning environment and benefit from

the international diversity of our students, faculty, and staff.” (Illinois Strategic Plan, 2017) This action plan includes initiatives to more fully integrate an international experience in the curriculum, increase “global awareness and cultural competency” among the student body, and foster more interaction between domestic and international students and faculty. (Illinois Strategic Plan, 2017)

Illinois already has over 400 active student, faculty, and research agreements with foreign institutions from more than 65 countries. The agreements have allowed us to form a global brand. Former Chancellor, Phyllis Wise, argued that the Illinois global brand “is built on our faculty’s global networks and internationally recognized research; our reputation for excellence among our international partners; the impact of the research advances that have occurred here over our 144-year history; the quality of our capacity building and training programs; and the success of our international alumni.” (Wise, 2012) Yet, while Illinois remains a leader in international enrollments, Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko, Dean of the Graduate College, recognizes that “we will need to develop new and sustainable strategies to attract and retain the very best students in the face of growing competition.” (Helenthal, 2016)

In response to the Bologna Declaration, the Graduate College at Illinois has researched the new Bologna-compliant degrees, including their structure, credit requirements, and degree quality. This research has also included discussions with faculty from across campus to decide what degrees and undergraduate coursework truly prepares a student for graduate education. In 2010, the Graduate Admissions office publicly stated they would accept three-year undergraduate degrees from Europe on a case-by-case basis; however, in 2013, Illinois moved to formally accepting all three-year bachelor’s degrees from Europe for admission to graduate programs.

In 1998, just before the 1999 signing of the Bologna Declaration, Illinois created the European Union Center (EUC) on campus as a center for research and relations with the European Union. (Illinois EUC, 2017) The EUC is dedicated to “promoting scholarly research on the EU as a national resource center; strengthening the curricula on the EU across campus, educating the next generation of experts on EU and transatlantic affairs, and reaching out to K-12 educators and students, businesses, government leaders, the media, and the general public to deepen understanding between the peoples of the US and the EU.” (Illinois EUC, 2017)

The EUC has been very successful with attracting faculty from across campus to serve as leaders in the center, alongside their current European Union studies teaching and research. The EUC has also been successful in attracting the attention of outside resources. The United States Department of Education awarded the EUC with a Title VI National Resource Center designation in 2003, and the European Union with a Jean Monnet Center of Excellence designation in 2015. (Illinois EUC, 2017) With funding from the Title VI designation grant, as well as from the European Commission’s “Getting to Know Europe” grant, the EUC has been able to host a European Union Day annually for the past 14 years to bring together students and faculty from across the campus to discuss EU-US relations. (Illinois EUC, 2017) The Jean Monnet Center of Excellence designation came with funding for a multidisciplinary project called the “Strengthening Transatlantic Trust.” (Illinois EUC, 2017) This project is made up of three different projects that address agriculture and food standards, financial and debt global interconnectivity, and political responses to migration throughout and in comparison, between the European Union and the United States. (Illinois EUC, 2017)

Northeastern University

Northeastern University is fairly new to the top 10 institutions for enrolling international students. Just five years ago, Northeastern was placed at number 16 and then in the last few years has moved up to number six. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) Northeastern prides itself on being a global university where “teaching and research are grounded in global engagement.” (Northeastern, 2017) Northeastern University has just under 3100 global partners from all seven continents and students from 140 countries. These partnerships include the traditional student and faculty cultural experience, research opportunities, and student internship agreements. Northeastern’s President, Joseph Aoun, includes “Globalization of Higher Education” (Aoun, 2017) as a priority for the institution and in an October of 2016 interview with the Chronicle of Higher Education, Aoun commented on Northeastern’s successes in international student enrollments with “we embarked on a globalization of the university...the goal was to globalize the university and allow the students to roam the world.” (Gardner, 2016) He went on to describe how Northeastern began recruiting international students and then moved to globalizing their co-op program in over 130 countries with 3000 different employers to provide students with a “global experiential opportunity.” (Gardner, 2016)

The Northeastern Global Co-Op program, as discussed by President Aoun, allows students to travel abroad to pursue “career opportunities with global companies and organizations, where students work on the front line in diverse cultures addressing the challenges of today’s complex society.” (Northeastern Global Coop, 2017) These programs are available through nearly all academic disciplines from arts and design, business, engineering, to philosophy, history, and political science. Co-op programs are available on every continent in the world and consist of internships, project management opportunities, and research collaborations.

(Northeastern Global Coop, 2017) These programs not only provide a unique international experience for Northeastern domestic and international students, but increase Northeastern's global partnerships and footprint.

Northeastern is also a hub for international and global conversations. In October of 2017, they will be hosting the 10th annual Clinton Global Initiative University event. (Northeastern News, 2017) President Aoun has stated that “Northeastern is a global community of innovators and change-makers...it is the ideal institution to welcome representatives from around the world committed to social entrepreneurship and improving the human condition.” (Aoun, 2017) This sets the tone for the Clinton Global Initiative University conference as it brings together students from more than 75 countries to address global issues and challenges that impact their education, environment, human rights, funding, and health. The goal of this conference is not only to inspire discussions, but to develop action plans to solve real issues. The Clinton foundation has committed to funding nearly \$3 million to these action plans in the last 9 years. (Northeastern News, 2017)

Throughout its admissions information, Northeastern University pushes its global university brand and its global career opportunities for its students, such as those through the global co-op program. At the graduate level, they tell applicants that they are looking to educate them to be “global citizens,” develop “students with an international perspective,” and that their “teaching and research are grounded in global engagement.” (Northeastern Admissions, 2017) However, they do not offer any specific responses to the Bologna Declaration or whether or not they accept three-year bachelor's degrees from Europe for graduate admission.

Purdue University

Purdue University has long been in the running for the top leadership position in terms of enrolling the most international students of any United States institution; but has been moving down in the ranks over the last few years from 3rd place in 2013 to 7th place in 2015. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) Purdue is also very similar to Illinois in that they are both well-respected research universities in the Big 10 known for their welcoming international environment. Purdue believes strongly in the benefit of enrolling international students and remaining globally competitive in the higher education market and has more than 5000 international students and 900 international faculty and staff from over 120 countries. (Purdue Grad, 2017) Brian Harley, Associate Dean for International Programs, suggested that some of their successes in international student recruitment and study abroad is due to the Purdue Moves program (Neubert, 2016)

Purdue Moves is the newest version of a strategic plan for Purdue University and Purdue's president, Mitch Daniels, states that through the Purdue Moves initiative "Purdue will lead the way in delivering higher education at the highest proven value and in proving that students learn and grow while they are here." (Daniels, 2016) In a November of 2016 article regarding the international recruitment successes for Purdue, Amy Patterson Neubert argues that the Purdue Moves initiative has a series of action plans that will not only increase the international opportunities for its students, but also expand Purdue's global footprint. One of the primary goals of the Purdue Moves plan is to increase the international experience opportunities for its students. Specifically, Purdue wants to drastically increase its number of students who study abroad with additional scholarship opportunities and financial incentives for academic programs to promote study abroad experiences for their students. In addition, Purdue hopes to

promote more conversations and cultural immersion opportunities for domestic and international students on the Purdue campus to experience together. (Purdue Moves, 2017)

Former Purdue President and now National Science Foundation Director, France Cordova, was an advocate of international education at Purdue, but also very aware of the changing globalized higher education market and the need for change to remain competitive. She argued that partnering with not only industry organizations, but also with foreign institutions will be critical to remaining competitive. (Cordova, 2012) Purdue has developed several strategies to address global challenges including developing partnerships with organizations and institutions across the globe to collaborate on local, national, and global research, and using its leadership role in international education and research to brand Purdue as a global leader in economic development. (Purdue, 2008) Purdue engages its students, faculty, and community to discuss global challenges that impact research and innovation through its Purdue Policy Research Institute (formerly known as the Global Policy Research Institute). (Purdue PPRI, 2017) This institute has several initiatives to meet this engagement goal including working with academic institution partners across the globe to develop research collaborations and provide solutions to global problems. (Purdue PPRI, 2017)

In order to achieve this goal of an international land-grant university and establish itself as a global brand, Purdue has established a number of units and leaders on campus. These include a Chief Corporate and Global Partnerships Officer and a Global Academic Committee of faculty to coordinate initiatives across campus, an International Programs office to manage international education for undergraduates including study abroad, a Public Policy Research Institute as discussed above, and a Global Partnerships office to develop partnerships with foreign institutions. (Purdue Global, 2017)

In response to the Bologna Declaration, Purdue University has worked with Illinois and other Big Ten institutions to benchmark their admissions requirements, and in the end, took the lead in being one of the first Big Ten institutions to accept the new Bologna-compliant degrees. Purdue publicly states that students with three-year Bologna-compliant bachelor degrees are eligible for admission to their graduate programs. (Purdue Graduate School, 2017) This was a big step for the Big 10 community and represents a clearly positive recruiting image for prospective European students.

University of California at Los Angeles

The University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) has consistently been in sixth place for enrolling international students until 2015 when newcomers Arizona State and Northeastern University pushed them down to eighth place. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) However, UCLA remains committed to international students and the globalization of their campus. UCLA Chancellor, Gene Block, argues that global engagement is critical to the mission of UCLA and that relationships with partner institutions abroad allow its students to have additional research opportunities and gain experience in discussing and resolving critical global issues. (Block, 2017)

In an article in November of 2016 regarding the importance of global higher education, Chancellor Block argued that “to be successful in this century requires a basic global sophistication, including language skills and an understanding of other cultures” and to address how to solve global challenges, he offered “you have to understand many cultures and issues from an international perspective” and “our approach to every academic discipline needs to incorporate a global point of view.” (Kligman, 2016)

UCLA has a vast global footprint with 200 partner institutions in 50 countries, over 9500 international students from 124 countries, and over 2000 study abroad participants each year. (UCLA Global, 2017) One way of supporting this international community is through the UCLA Global Forum initiative. This initiative involves all campus stakeholders in discussing issues of local, national, and global significance. These discussions also facilitate relationships with international partners, assist with recruiting international students and faculty, and make UCLA a leader in global discussions regarding not only academic issues, but also business, society, and environmental issues. (UCLA Global, 2017)

UCLA founded its International Institute in 1958, and it currently serves as the center for all things global on campus. The institute facilitates 25 global and area studies centers that offer six undergraduate majors, nine undergraduate minors, and three graduate majors enrolling just under 1000 students annually. (UCLA Int'l Institute, 2017) These area studies centers recruit international faculty with experience and specializations in international or global studies, language teaching, or specific world region studies. In addition to its academic programs, the institute and its centers work together to provide funding for students and faculty to collaborate on research projects both at UCLA and abroad. (UCLA Int'l Institute, 2017) UCLA's Office of International Studies and Global Engagement oversees the International Institute and is led by Vice Provost Cindy Fan who believes that "international education – experienced through study and internships abroad as well as a curriculum that integrates comparative global experience – imparts a global perspective to our students. As a result, they become effective leaders, influencers and agents of change at both the local and global level." (Fan, 2015) With commitment from top leaders like Vice Provost Fan and Chancellor Block, it is no surprise that UCLA has succeeded in their internationalization and globalization endeavors.

UCLA admission web pages provide a strong message of welcoming to international students, as well as clearly outlines its vast resources and opportunities for international students, no matter if they are coming as undergraduate, graduate, or exchange students. However, at the graduate level, they do not accept the Bologna-compliant three-year bachelor's degree for graduate admission. Instead, they require students to complete the three-year bachelor's degree and the two-year master's degree prior to entering a graduate program. Given their strong commitment to enrolling international students, it was surprising to see that they do not accept these degrees from Europe.

Michigan State University

Michigan State University has stayed consistently at ninth place for enrolling international institutions for the last five years. Michigan State University's President, Lou Anna K. Simon, has embraced and developed a new philosophy in regard to the Land Grant Institution that she calls the "World Grant Ideal." (Simon, 2017) President Simon states that to truly commit to being a global university, universities must move past the ideals of the land grant institution and think globally to produce global citizens. Unlike the Morrill Act that produced the land grant institutions, universities aren't given a world grant or global rights to higher education. Instead, they must work to develop a higher education for its students that transcends borders and produce knowledge that addresses global challenges. Simon (2017) writes "World Grant is a directional aspiration, an intentional journey, as the land-grant mission of the nineteenth century aligns its core values and strengths to meet the societal needs of the twenty-first century." For an institution to truly adopt the World Grant ideal, she argues that they must commit to global understanding, global competence, and global research partnerships. (Simon, 2017)

Michigan State's World Grant ideal is woven into MSU's vision and strategic plan and is driving everything they do in regard to internationalization. In the strategic plan, The World Grant is a specific goal, but the strategic plan also calls for goals to expand the institution's internationalization efforts through "academic, research and economic development initiatives, and strategic alliances." (MSU Strategic Plan, 2017) MSU was one of the first institutions to welcome an international student in 1878 and today has more than 7200 students from more than 130 countries, more than 1400 faculty who participate in international research, teaching, or service, 25 centers, institutes, and offices with a direct focus on internationalization, and more than 270 international partners from 70 countries. (MSU ISP, 2017) Associate Provost and Dean Steven Hanson brings in the World Grant ideology into the mission of the International Studies and Programs office stating that the office focuses on "our world grant values – humility and hard work; seeking knowledge and solutions in collaboration with world-class faculty; a diverse community that includes thousands of international students and visiting scholars; and establishing relationships and partnerships in the far corners of the world." (Hanson, 2017) This office also works with faculty and student services offices across the campus to combine research and student mobility efforts, provide scholarships for international experiences, provide support for language studies, and bridge partnerships with foreign institutions. (MSU ISP, 2017)

The International Studies and Programs office at MSU also includes an Office of International Research Collaboration. This office works with faculty to develop global and international research projects, connect MSU faculty with global partner institution faculty, and help faculty write proposals to gain external funding specifically devoted to higher education international research priorities. (MSU ISP, 2017)

In regard to admissions, MSU does not accept three-year international bachelor's degrees, including those from Europe. At the graduate level, admissions is decentralized by program, and so finding admissions information as an international student can be a bit difficult as there isn't a central location for international applicant information. At the undergraduate level, they offer an entire section to international applicants with "before you apply" and "after you apply" information.

University of Washington

The University of Washington falls into tenth place for enrolling international students, but just five years ago, it wasn't even in the top twenty. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) Similar to Arizona State University and Northeastern University, they have made drastic increases in their ability to recruit international students in the last five years and now have over 8000 students from over 110 countries (Washington University ISS, 2017). The University of Washington has woven their commitment to globalization into their vision statement affirming that they prepare their students to be "global citizens," with goals of recruiting the best students, faculty, and staff from around the world and maintaining an "active pursuit of global engagement and connectedness." (Washington University Values, 2017)

As the University of Washington has been increasing its international enrollments, it's no wonder that its current strategic plan includes goals of being more competitive, more collaborative, and more innovative. (Washington University Strategic Plan, 2017) These goals are set to allow the University of Washington not only be more competitive and collaborative with its domestic partner institutions and businesses, but with international partners as well. Part of their goal to increase their competitiveness is also looking for additional ways to provide multiple forms of funding opportunities for its students. As international students' tuition costs

are always a factor in a prospective international students' decision to come to the United States, this will only further help the University of Washington in its recruitment efforts. They also recognize that not only are they facing competition in the United States, but also from international institutions. They believe that investing in their students means increasing opportunities for global learning through a more globalized curriculum, through globalized research projects, and through global scholarships. (Washington University Strategic Plan, 2017)

The University of Washington's Office of Global Affairs is crucial to the university's vision for creating global citizens and creating global scholarship and learning opportunities for its students, both domestic and international. The Office of Global Affairs works with undergraduate and graduate academic programs, and other global and international student support offices to develop or even revise current policies to support academic, research, and service programs that promote or foster internationalization opportunities for students.

(Washington University Global, 2017) The Office of Global Affairs also serves as a liaison with prospective international partner institutions to develop potential relationships and exchange agreements for faculty and staff. They work directly with the partner institutions and the University of Washington academic programs to foster these relations. (Washington University Global, 2017) The Office of Global Affairs also oversees the University of Washington Study Abroad office. This office brings in 300 exchange students and sends over 2200 students abroad annually. (Washington University Global, 2017) As study abroad can often be an expensive endeavor for students, the University of Washington has created a Global Opportunities program that the Office of Global Affairs works with undergraduate academic programs to give financial assistance and access to study abroad or other international opportunities for students with financial need. (Washington University Global, 2017)

Divya McMillin, the Director of the Global Honors Program, created the Institute for Global Engagement in 2014. This institute brings in guest lecturers from all over the United States and the world to come and talk to students about building connections through their research and encourage them to participate in experiential learning. Her goal is to “produce informed and compassionate leaders...our core curriculum gives students a sophisticated understanding of the intricacies of global interactions and prepares them for the changes of a networked society.” (McMillin,2014)

In looking at international admissions information, a graduate international applicant will find a welcoming commitment statement from University of Washington president, Ana Mari Cauce, stating “The University of Washington is proud to be the home to students, staff and scholars from around the world. We stand with them and will provide them with support as needed.” (Washington University Admissions, 2017) In addition, the admissions information specifically states that the University of Washington accepts three-year Bologna-compliant bachelor’s degrees from Europe. Similar to the quote from the university president above, the graduate admissions web sites have a plethora of welcoming and supportive quotes from university leaders, such as David Eaton, the Dean and Vice Provost of the Graduate School, being quoted with “As the 15th ranked university in the world, we are attracting more and more bright and motivated international students. A diverse, global student body is essential for robust intellectual stimulation and true career readiness.” (Washington University Admissions, 2017) The web sites are very easy to navigate and do a great job highlighting their successes with international students and their commitment to international students; the university’s goals of recruiting more international students are clearly evident within these sites.

Institutional Document Review Findings Summary

These ten institutions have clearly recognized the need for an institutional commitment to maintaining a competitive edge in our globalized higher education market. Already serving as leaders in the United States based on their international enrollment numbers alone, the research has shown that these institutions have taken steps further to create a global brand identity. These institutions' commitment to creating a global brand is clearly identified in their core policies, including their mission and vision statements, and strategic plans and goals. Further, each institution's senior administration has publicly recognized the need to be concerned about foreign competitors, to make change, to create a global presence, to partner with foreign institutions and industry, and to collaborate and respond to global issues facing higher education, economies, and research development today.

Below is a summary of these institutions' responses to global competition in the higher education market:

Table 3. Institutional Responses to Global Competition

School	Mission / Vision Statements	Strategic Plan Goals	Senior Administration Publicly Recognizes Competition	Partnering with Foreign Institutions	Admissions Response to Bologna Declaration
New York University	Brands itself as a global network university that encourages openness to international perspectives.	Use global network, location, and alumni relations to create a competitive edge.	President argues for urgency of global education in the current political climate and argues for building global research collaboration efforts.	2 degree-granting campuses in Abu Dhabi and Shanghai; academic centers in 11 foreign countries	Accepting three-year bachelor degrees from Europe.
University of Southern California	Key role as an institution to be a global institution and boasts ability to attract more international students than most other institutions.	Create global presence, visibility, and brand to attract the most talented students from across the world.	President cites the competition as an escalating global race for talented international faculty and international students.	180 agreements in 38 countries.	Accepting three-year bachelor degrees from Europe.

Table 3 (cont.)

School	Mission / Vision Statements	Strategic Plan Goals	Senior Administration Publicly Recognizes Competition	Partnering with Foreign Institutions	Admissions Response to Bologna Declaration
Columbia University in the City of New York	Mission to attract international faculty and students, to implement a research and curriculum structure for global issues, and to create relationships with foreign partners.	Create a series of global initiatives including a MA in Global Thought, university forums to foster global issues discussions, and groups to influence global policies and fund global research.	President developed a Committee on Global Thought to enhance global engagement, and implemented a World Leaders Forum to generate global discussion opportunities.	8 academic centers in 8 countries	Accepting three-year bachelor degrees from Europe and even link to the Bologna process for European applicants.
Arizona State University	Create a “New American University” through global engagement.	Become the leading global center for research and development by 2025, create globalization curriculums, offers globalization training (English language and academic and professional preparation) to prospective students and organizations around the world.	President argues the United States’ current competitive position cannot be taken for granted.	165 partnerships in 40 countries. These include joint degree programs.	No specific response to the Bologna Declaration.
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Vision includes creating a global impact through our research.	Strengthen international presence, increase international partnerships and joint research institutes, and incorporate global perspectives, awareness, and competency into curriculum.	Vice Provost committed to making Illinois a leading global university. Graduate College Dean recognizes need to develop strategies to maintain and increase our recruitment of the top students in the increasingly global competition for international students.	400 agreements in 65 countries.	Accepting three-year bachelor degrees from Europe and has facilitated campus-wide discussions of the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on American higher education.
Northeastern University	Global university brand where global engagement is woven within the curriculum and research with a goal of creating global citizens.	Prioritize globalization of higher education, increased global co-op program opportunities for domestic and international students, and foster global conversations through continued partnership with the Clinton Foundation for the global initiative university.	President committed to both recruiting international students and also globalizing their co-op program in 130 countries with 3000 employers to provide a experiential learning opportunity on a global scale. President recognized importance of increasing global footprint to remain relative.	3100 global partners from all 7 continents.	No specific response to the Bologna Declaration.
Purdue University	No specific commitment to globalized higher education within mission or vision statement.	Increase international experience opportunities, increase study abroad scholarships and funding incentives, promote global conversations and cultural immersion opportunities.	Former University President and current NSF Director, argued the higher education market is becoming more globalized and a change is needed to remain competitive.	Specifies a commitment to increasing partnerships in India and Columbia.	One of the first Big 10 institutions to accept three-year bachelor degrees from Europe.
University of California at Los Angeles	Global engagement is critical. Curriculum must include a global perspective.	Global Forum initiative to facilitate all campus stakeholders discussing issues of local, national, and global significance to make UCLA a leader in global discussions.	Chancellor argues that to be successful in today’s globalized higher education market, our curriculum must include a global perspective and international experiences through international partnerships and research opportunities.	200 partners in 50 countries.	Does not accept Bologna-compliant three-year bachelor’s degrees and instead require the three-year bachelor + two-year master for graduate admission.

Table 3 (cont.)

Michigan State University	Apply land-grant mission to develop higher education that transcends borders and produces knowledge to address global challenges in order to adopt a World Grant ideal.	Expand internationalization efforts through educational, research, and economic development and partnerships.	President argues for commitment to global understanding, global competence, and global research partnerships to meet today's societal needs.	270 partners from 70 countries.	Does not accept Bologna-compliant three-year bachelor's degrees.
University of Washington	Prepare students to be global citizens, pursue global engagement and connectedness, recruit top students, faculty, and staff from around the world.	Be more competitive, more collaborative, and more innovative. Invest in students through a more globalized curriculum, globalized research projects, and global scholarships.	Dean and Vice Provost of the Graduate School recognizes the need to increase competition for international students and that a global student population is necessary for producing the best educational experience and career preparation for our domestic and international students.	Brings in 300 exchange students and sends out 2200 students to study abroad annually.	Accepting three-year bachelor degrees from Europe.

Interestingly, only five of these ten universities accept three-year bachelor's degrees from Europe and none of these universities refer to any specific aspect of the Bologna Declaration in their arguments for global competition. It is clear that at least half of these institutions are aware of the Bologna Declaration and are adjusting admissions requirements to continue to recruit European students. And all ten institutions are working to create a global brand for their university, to create partnerships with foreign institutions, and are actively trying to increase their competitive edge. Whether or not these institutions realize that they are making these changes due to, or partially due to, the Bologna Declaration doesn't mean that they aren't being impacted by Bologna. Most of these institutions state very little about the Bologna Declaration specifically in their international policy and initiative documents, but all of these efforts directly help with their ability to compete for international students. While their numbers for international enrollments are still increasing annually, they aren't increasing at the rates of the past and they are losing part of their market share of international students to other higher education areas, and

specifically to Europe. Therefore, their internationalization efforts are critical to continue to compete with Europe.

To continue as leaders in international education, change will be necessary. These institutions are realizing it and actively seeking ways to make these changes; however, they are also the top ten. Other United States institutions that do not have the resources or the vast experience with international students and internationalizing a campus may struggle. If only the top institutions are enrolling international students, the United States as a whole may lose its leadership in the international student market.

Questionnaire Results

In an effort to gauge the United States' awareness of the Bologna Declaration and how it has impacted our international student recruitment efforts, I sent a short 12 question questionnaire to policy experts from the top twenty enrolling institutions. As the list of the top twenty changes every year slightly, I included an additional five institutions who have rotated in and out of the top twenty at the bottom of the list. I sent the questionnaires to twenty-five people at each of the twenty-five institutions, sending a total of 525 surveys. These policy experts include administrators and faculty at all levels in all areas of the campus. Some experts are at the coordinator or assistant director level for their campus, while some were as high up as the Provost. I wanted to gather as much insight as I could from top officials at each university in order to gain insight as to whether the Bologna Declaration was impacting any over-arching campus strategies for international recruitment. In addition, I needed to hear from mid-level to higher-level management staff that work with international students on a daily basis and would know the ins and outs of these strategies.

As stated in my methodology chapter, I was able to employ snowball sampling to use the contacts I've made over the years at these institutions in my professional position at the Graduate College at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to reach out and learn which administrators and faculty would be best suited to include in my study. However, as one of my concerns in starting this research was that some institutions may be naively unaware of Bologna, I wanted to make sure to include experts from all areas on campus to see if only those who directly work with admissions or immigration services were aware of Bologna and international student enrollment trends, or if it was widely known across the campus. This meant sending these questionnaires to experts who worked in admissions offices across campus, international programming and immigration services offices, higher administration offices such as the provost or chancellor's office, as well as sending a questionnaire to at least one expert from the major academic colleges or schools, including the Graduate College or Graduate School, for each campus.

In reviewing my questionnaire results, I received 105 response for a 20% response rate. 64 of my responses were from experts within an academic program office from 22 of the universities involved in my study. The administrative levels of these experts ranged from Specialist to Vice Provost. Twenty-two of my responses were from experts within an admissions office from 15 of the universities involved in my study. The administrative levels of these experts ranged from Assistant Director to Vice President. Nineteen of my responses were from experts within an international programming or services office from 11 of the universities involved in my study. The administrative levels of these experts ranged from Coordinator to Vice Provost. At each institution, there are only a few policy experts within the areas of admissions and international programming and services, while each institution has a much larger

pool of policy experts within the academic programs offices. Therefore, it was expected to have a larger response rate from the experts from within an academic program office.

I received an additional 62 responses declining to complete the questionnaire. The primary reasons for not wanting to complete the questionnaire included not knowing enough about the topic, and not feeling as though they had enough information based on their portfolio at their institution to provide good feedback. There were 6 academic program policy experts who declined because they felt that they had such few international students in their particular academic program that their opinions on the subject would potentially skew my findings. There were 12 responders who simply did not want to participate in the study for various reasons, but the most common was that they just didn't have time.

Bologna Declaration Awareness

In looking at the question of how the individual policy expert would rate their personal awareness of the Bologna Declaration on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 meaning very low and 5 meaning very high, the overall average awareness rated at 2.72, or slightly less than a moderate awareness of the Bologna Declaration. Within the responses from academic program experts, this average rate fell lower at 2.28 with a most common response of 1 for very low awareness. Within the responses from admissions experts, the average rate of awareness increased to 3.54 with a most common response of 3 for moderate awareness. As 18 of these institutions are accepting three-year Bologna-compliant bachelor's degrees for admission to graduate programs, it makes sense that the admissions office experts are at least moderately aware of the Bologna Declaration. Within the responses from international programming and services experts, the average rate of awareness was a 3.28, only slightly lower than the average rate from admissions

experts. The most common response from international programming and services experts, however, was a 4 for high awareness.

Interestingly, when you look at the question asking the policy experts to rate their institution’s awareness of the Bologna Declaration, the average response was a 3.17. The distinction between personal awareness and institutional awareness is that with the personal awareness questions, they are answering how personally aware or knowledgeable of the Bologna Declaration they are, versus with institutional awareness, they are answering how aware they believe their institution is as a whole. The largest increase in difference between the personal awareness and the institutional awareness responses was in the academic programming policy experts’ responses. This average jumped from 2.28 for personal awareness to 2.98 for institutional awareness. In contrast, the admissions experts’ responses remained relatively flat showing a slight decrease from a 3.54 for personal awareness to a 3.52 for institutional awareness, and the international programming and services experts’ responses stayed exactly even as 3.27 for both personal and institutional awareness of the Bologna Declaration. These differences between expert area and level of awareness can be seen in the chart below:

Table 4. Policy Expert Questionnaire Results on Bologna Declaration Awareness

Expert Area	Personal Awareness	Institutional Awareness	Acceptance of 3-Year Bachelor Degrees for Graduate Admission
Academic Programs	2.28	2.98	43%
Admissions	3.54	3.52	36.30%
International Programs	3.27	3.27	31.50%

As someone who works in an admissions office and also works heavily with international programming and services, these comparison results regarding personal awareness of an issue versus institutional awareness is not surprising. Oftentimes, policy experts within academic program offices expect the centralized admissions and international programming and services

offices to be the experts in all things international. This would explain why the academic program responders may have had a lower personal awareness, but expected or believed that the central admissions and international programming and services offices would have a higher level of awareness. On the reverse of that thinking, administrators within central offices often believe that our awareness level is the campus awareness level since those in central administration are often responsible for making the decisions that impact the rest of campus.

Bologna Declaration Concerns

In evaluating the responses for how policy experts would rate their level of concern that international students are choosing Europe over the United States for higher education, again on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being very low and 5 being very high, the overall response show an average rate of 2.56 or right in the middle of low concern to moderate concern. The responses from academic program experts produced a slightly lower average rate of 2.46, while the responses from admissions experts produced a slightly higher average rate of 2.86. The average responses from international programming and services experts was nearly flat at a 2.55. When looking at the most common response, the overall, academic program expert, and admissions expert rate was a 3, while the international programming and services expert rate was a 2.

These low rates of concern regarding international students choosing Europe over the United States are in alignment with the responses regarding whether these institutions are seeing declines in enrollments from European students and international students in general, as well as with changes in international partnerships and agreements. A detailed view of rated concerns regarding the Bologna Declaration can be seen in the chart below:

Table 5. Policy Expert Questionnaire Results on Bologna Declaration Concerns

Expert Area	Concern of applicants choosing EU over US	Applicants declining US offer to go to EU	Decline in EU applicants	Decline in Int'l Enrollments	Decline in Int'l Exchanges
Academic Programs	2.46	51.5% No 35.9% Yes	64% No 12.5% Yes	78.1% No 14% Yes	70.3% No 4.6% Yes
Admissions	2.86	31.8% No 63.6% Yes	65.2% No 18.1% Yes	90.9% No 9% Yes	63.6% No 4.5% Yes
International Programs	2.55	63.1% No 31.5% Yes	52.6% Yes 10.5% No	78.9% No 10.5% No	84.2% No 10.5% No

66 responders stated they were not seeing any decrease in enrollments from European students and 85 responders were not seeing any decrease in enrollments from international students in general. Similarly, 75 responders indicate they were not seeing any decline in international exchange agreements. Only 12 responders reported a moderate decrease for European student enrollments and only 13 responders reported a moderate decrease for international student enrollments. Again similarly, only 6 responders reported a moderate decrease in international exchange agreements. As the pool of policy experts in this study are from the largest international student enrolling institutions, and as some have drastically increased their institution's specific international enrollments, these responses make sense. However, what these responses do not show is that while the United States' international enrollments are still increasing, we are still losing market share in the overall global international student market.

In looking at the responses for whether or not they are aware of their international applicants accepting admissions offers from Europe instead of the United States, nearly 49.9% of the responders indicated there were not aware of this happening. However, 32.3% of responders did indicate they were aware of their applicants choosing Europe over the United States, but not at a frequent rate. Only 8.5% of responders indicated they were aware of applicants often choosing Europe over the United States.

Overall Impacts of Global Competition

To gather more in-depth feedback from policy experts across the academic program, admissions, and international programming and services offices, I wanted to ask a couple of open-ended questions. These questions were designed to allow respondents to provide information concerning the over-arching impacts of having increased global competition for our international students. These questions were further designed to allow candid responses regarding the recruitment of international students in addition to just ranking awareness and concerns levels for their campus. These two questions asked how they would describe the effects of the Bologna Declaration on their institution and for what reasons are they concerned international applicants may choose to study in Europe rather than in the United States. In the below charts, I have included the condensed themes for which their responses fell:

Table 6. Policy Expert Questionnaire Results on Bologna Declaration Impacts

Impact Concerns	Academic Programs	Admissions	International Programs
Fear of potential decreased enrollments from Europe	6.3%	4.5%	-----
Impacted admissions criteria and practices	10.9%	22.7%	21.1%
Minimal impact	18.8%	4.5%	42.1%
No impact	18.8%	4.5%	15.8%

Table 7. Policy Expert Questionnaire Results on Reasons Students May Choose the EU over the US

Areas of Concern	Academic Programs	Admissions	International Programs
Concerned for diversity, leadership status, and loss of revenue impacts if lose international students	10.9%	13.6%	15.8%
Cost / Funding	15.6%	18.2%	21.1%
Mobility	9.4%	9.1%	10.5%
Political Climate and Perception	14.1%	22.7%	26.3%
Visa Regulations	9.4%	13.6%	5.3%
No Concerns	29.7%	9.1%	21.1%

Similar to the responses discussed in the Bologna Declaration Concerns section above, 34.3% of responders believed the Bologna Declaration has had minimal to no impacts on their institution. 15.2% of responders indicated that the primary impacts have been a change in admissions criteria and practices for European students, meaning their admissions offices have had to rethink how they evaluate students from Europe for admission, particular to graduate programs.

For most of the 25 institutions, this has meant moving towards acceptance of the three-year Bologna-compliant bachelor's degrees for graduate admission. However, for 7 of these institutions, this means only being aware of the three-year degrees and making a determination to maintain their admissions requirement of a four-year undergraduate degree for graduate admission. One respondent specifically stated, "It has sparked conversation around how students are assessed for admission to advanced degree programs. It poses a philosophical question as to the measure of readiness of a student to undertake graduate-level study. Is that best measured by undergraduate degree content, length of time that degree completion took, or performance within the degree program? Likely, it is some combination of the three. These questions are regularly posed, but rarely examined in terms of university practice or policy." There were only five responders who indicated a fear of potential decreased enrollments from European students. One indicated specifically "I feel that the effect has not yet been felt in full, but given the anticipated political climate over the coming four years, as well as expressed international student concern, international students will begin to look more closely at our European competitors for their degrees." Finally, two responders offered positive impacts of the Bologna Declaration in an increased awareness of international higher education reforms and increased partnerships with international institutions.

Policy experts were also given a chance to respond open-endedly with any reasons for concerns that international applicants in general may choose to study in Europe rather than in the United States. While 23% of responders indicated they did not have any concerns, 42.9% of responders indicate at least one primary concern. The top two reasons why these policy experts believe an applicant may choose to study in Europe over the United States include higher education costs and funding opportunities (18% of responders indicated this concern) and the United States' current political climate (17.14% responders indicate this concern). In terms of funding opportunity barriers, one participant stated, "The U.S. is increasingly cost-prohibitive for international students, regardless of region of origin. The availability of free or reduced tuition at European universities, ERASMUS and other funding opportunities, as well as the high caliber of European institutions further incentivize students to remain on the continent for higher education." Responders were very vocal about the United States' current president's actions and the country's political climate being a deterrent for prospective international students. Some responses included "The emergent U.S. political climate (i.e. anti-Muslim, anti-immigrant) could sway students to choose select places in Europe and Canada over the U.S." and a response in all caps of "THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION IS RACIST AND FOREIGN STUDENTS MAY FEAR LIVING IN THE USA."

The third highest reason cited by responders was visa regulations, and it is unclear if they meant visa regulations changing due to the current political climate in the United States or the general issue of visa regulations for international students. For example, some respondents referenced the visa regulation changes that came after the terrorist attacks of 9/11 in the United States. Whereas, one respondent offered, "I believe the current immigration situation with the signing of the Executive Order has the potential to impact applications to US universities. There

is a general perception that the US is not as hospitable an (academic) environment as it once was.” I would argue this respondent is indicating both visa regulations and political climate as reasons a student may elect to study in Europe instead of the United States. If you combine political climate and visa regulations, 27.6% of responders indicate these issues as a primary concern for why students may choose to go to Europe instead of the United States.

This question was written with an intention of gaining feedback as to reasons a student would accept an admission offer from Europe over the United States, but 12.3% of responders also indicated reasons they would be concerned for the United States if we lost international students to Europe. These concerns were primarily that we would lose out on the diversity opportunities our international students provide for our student body, as well as fear that institutions would lose their global leadership status and global competitiveness if we lost international students. And of course, some indicated a fear of loss of revenue if losing international students. One respondent argued that “Diversity is important to us, and our international applicants bring important perspectives into the classroom that otherwise wouldn’t be there.” So, while this respondent did not provide input on a reason a student would choose Europe instead of the United States, they did provide good feedback on the benefit of enrolling international students.

Finally, 10% of responders indicated that the mobility opportunities within Europe might sway an applicant to elect to study in Europe instead of the United States. One respondent indicated, “I think the Erasmus exchange scheme may be another potential area that impacts the exchange world, again, in that students could choose to do exchange within Europe rather than in the US.”

Summary of Questionnaire Responses

Overall, the respondents reported a low to moderate awareness of the Bologna Declaration and have had few concerns regarding the declaration's specific impacts on the United States' ability to recruit international students. However, the vast majority of respondents do still report concerns regarding our leadership status in the international student market citing concerns regarding the rising costs of higher education in the United States and the corresponding decreasing funding options for our students, the rigid visa regulations, the hostile political climate towards internationals and immigrants, and the increasingly volatile societal climate in the United States. Overall, the respondents also expressed concerns of the impacts of losing international students to Europe or elsewhere. Their concerns included losing out on the diversity of having international perspectives on campus and in our classrooms, losing their institutional leadership status in terms of global reputation, rankings, and competitiveness, and losing the economic benefits of international student enrollments from both the tuition revenue, but also the economic contributions to the local communities in which they study.

Of the pool of policy experts who responded to the questionnaire, the admissions experts were the most knowledgeable of the Bologna Declaration, with the international programming and services experts falling right behind them. This is to be expected as these administrators work on a daily basis with international students and their credentials. The academic program policy experts were the least knowledgeable of the Bologna Declaration, but indicated the same concerns regarding the United States leadership position in the international student market.

Interviews

The final question in the questionnaire sent to policy experts at the top twenty-five international student enrolling institutions was to ask if they would be willing to participate in a

short 30-minute phone interview. Of the 105 respondents, 28 indicated they would be willing to participate in a follow-up discussion. In the end, 20 respondents from 8 of the institutions participated in an in-depth interview with me regarding not only the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on the United States, but also about the increase in international student competition and the influences on the United States' ability to recruit international students. Similar to the response rate for questionnaires, I received a 19% response rate of policy experts who responded to the questionnaire and being willing to participate in the interview. The respondents were fairly evenly split among experts with seven being from academic programs, seven from admissions offices, and six from international programming and services offices. And, their levels ranged from Assistant Director to Vice Provost. This allowed for a good variety of perspectives regarding the Bologna Declaration and the influences on the United States' ability to recruit and retain international students.

Global Competition Strategies

In talking with the respondents, 70% reported Canada to be a country we are in direct competition with for international students. This was followed by 60% of respondents reporting the UK and 50% of the respondents reporting Australia or 1 or more countries in the European Union as direct competitors. The below chart shows a summary of the trends seen from respondents in response to the global competition for international students:

Table 8. Policy Expert Interview Results on Global Competition Strategies

#	Expert Area	Top Competitors	Global Competition Strategies	Bologna Declaration Responses
1	International Programs	Australia, Canada, Germany		Amended admissions policies
2	Academic Programs	Australia, Germany, UK	Building int'l partnerships	No specific response
3	Academic Programs	Australia and Canada	Global recruitment travel, int'l recruitment/academic office	No specific response
4	Admissions	Australia, Canada, EU, UK	Global recruitment travel, int'l recruitment/academic office	No specific response
5	Admissions	Canada, France, Mexico	Building int'l partnerships	No specific response
6	Admissions	Australia, Canada, UK	Global recruitment travel, communicating to applicants	No specific response

Table 8 (cont.)

7	Academic Programs	EU and India	Restructuring curriculum	No specific response
8	International Programs	Australia, Canada, UK	Diversifying int'l population	No specific response
9	Admissions	Australia, Canada, New Zealand, UK	Global recruitment travel	No specific response
10	Academic Programs	EU	Building int'l partnerships	No specific response
11	International Programs	Canada	Diversifying int'l population, int'l recruitment/academic office	No specific response
12	Academic Programs	Canada, France, Germany, UK	Communicating to applicants	Amended admissions policies
13	Academic Programs	Australia, EU, UK	Communicating to applicants	No specific response
14	International Programs	Australia and Canada		
15	International Programs	EU and UK		
16	International Programs	Canada, France, UK	Int'l recruitment/academic office	No specific response
17	Admissions	Canada, France, Germany, UK	Global recruitment travel, building int'l relationships	Developing partnerships with EU institutions and building awareness and discussions surrounding Bologna across campus
18	Academic Programs	Canada	Building int'l partnerships, diversifying int'l recruitment	
19	Admissions	EU and UK		
20	Admissions	Australia, Canada, UK	Global recruitment travel	Amended admissions policies

In discussing strategies used to respond to the increase in global competition for international students at these policy experts' institutions, 30% of them indicated that they are travelling globally to compete for the top international students, while 25% of them indicated that they have gone a step further and set up international recruitment and/or academic offices in other countries, are working to build relationships and partnerships with foreign institutions, and/or are strategizing ways to diversify their international student recruitment. For example, one respondent stated, "We have opened a recruiting office in Beijing. China is now our number one provider of grad students, although we have a strategy of managed growth with China. There are some other American universities that have increasingly relied on large numbers of Chinese students. We have a more of a managed growth of international students. So yeah, we have a recruitment office in Beijing and recruiting staff at the university level who travel all over the world."

Thirty percent of respondents indicated that a more active communication with prospective students, particularly regarding their concerns about the political climate in the United States, has been a strategy used to maintain their international student enrollments. And, one respondent indicated they were revising their curriculum to be more competitive and attractive to international students. These curriculum changes included offering more experiential learning opportunities as well as more career and professional development to assist in students finding employment after graduation. One respondent stated, “We focus on experiential learning, and the students love that. That tends to help them so much in their career training.”

In terms of specific responses to the Bologna Declaration, the policy experts had little to say. Similar to what I saw in the questionnaire responses, most have indicated their institutions have not implemented any specific strategies to respond to the Bologna Declaration. As most responders rated their personal and institutional awareness of the Bologna Declaration on the lower side, it makes sense that they would not believe their initiatives were in response to Bologna. The only impacts they are really seeing from the Bologna Declaration are changes in how they process admissions. When asked if they thought the United States or the European Union was doing a better job at international student recruitment, the responses were mixed. Fifty percent of respondents did not feel as though they had enough data to answer the question. Six respondents felt like the European Union is doing better due to successes with the Erasmus program and the Bologna Declaration making mobility and transparency a priority for their higher education structures. While only three indicated the United States was doing better, they were all hesitant to see if the current political climate will change their perspective on this question in the next few years.

Recruitment Influences

The interviews included questions about the factors that negatively and positively impact the United States in recruiting international students. The responses received were directly aligned with the primary responses given in the open-ended questions of the questionnaire asking for reasons of concern we could lose international students to Europe. A summary of the trends in responses concerning negative and positive influences on our ability to continue to recruit students is below:

Table 9. Policy Expert Interview Results on Recruitment Influences

#	Expert Area	Negative Influences	Positive Influences
1	International Programs	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, no coordinated national recruitment strategy	Value of American degree
2	Academic Programs	Political climate, visa regulations	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree
3	Academic Programs	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, funding, violence trends	Value of American degree, American curriculum model
4	Admissions	Political climate, perception, visa regulations	Value of American degree, more options in US
5	Admissions	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, funding	Reputation/rankings, more options in US
6	Admissions	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, funding, violence trends	Reputation/rankings, American curriculum model, more options in US
7	Academic Programs	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, violence trends	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree, American curriculum model
8	International Programs	Political climate, perception, funding	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree
9	Admissions	Political climate, perception, visa regulations	Reputations/rankings, more options in US
10	Academic Programs	Political climate, perception, funding	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree, American curriculum model
11	International Programs	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, no coordinated national recruitment strategy	Reputation/rankings
12	Academic Programs	Political climate, visa regulations, funding	Value of American degree, established international community
13	Academic Programs	Political climate, perception	Reputation/rankings, established international community
14	International Programs	Political climate, perception	Less taxes in US
15	International Programs	Political climate, perception, funding	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree
16	International Programs	Visa regulations	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree
17	Admissions	Political climate, perception, visa regulations, funding	Reputation/rankings, established international community
18	Academic Programs	Political climate, funding	Value of American degree, American curriculum model
19	Admissions	Political climate, perception, funding	Reputation/rankings, value of American degree
20	Admissions	Slow to evolve and make pedagogical changes	Value of American degree, American curriculum model, more options in US

Ninety percent of those interviewed indicated the political climate was the number one factor negatively impacting our ability to recruit international students. Seventy-five percent cited international students' perception of the United States as a barrier to recruitment. In terms of the political climate and the perception issue, respondents included concerns of international students not feeling welcome, safe, and secure in the United States primarily due to the negative rhetoric, specifically anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant, of the Trump administration. When asked the question of what are the factors that negatively impact their ability to recruit international students, one respondent said, "Trump as a one-word answer...that has just changed everything." And another responded, "We are hearing more from our international students being scared to come here, more than I've ever seen...scared of the press coverage, the Trump administration, scared they won't be welcomed and won't be able to leave."

Institutions are in fear of losing their current and prospective international students because international students are often only seeing what is on the news about what is happening in the United States. As most of this news has been unfavorable, they are feeling like the United States may not be a hospitable place for international students any longer. One respondent stated, "one of the concerns that I heard over and over was 'is this a hospitable place...can I study there safely?'" as she related a discussion she recently had with a group of prospective students. Some policy experts are hearing from students that they are afraid of coming here, being trapped, and not being able to visit their homes for the duration of their program in the United States.

In addition to the fears regarding the perception of not being safe due to the political climate, three respondents indicated that international students are afraid of the increase in gun violence and hate crimes in the United States. This includes the mass shootings like that of the nightclub in Orlando, as well as the individual shootings of unarmed African Americans by

police officers. One respondent stated, “Last summer there was an African American shot during a very routine police stop and recorded live on Facebook. These sorts of things have an impact. So they think no matter where you go in the U.S., they are at risk.”

Forty-five percent of respondents indicated concerns regarding immigration and visa regulations. Similar to the questionnaire responses, these concerns are a combination of general concerns regarding the visa regulations that surround our international students from before and after the actions of the new presidential administration. In addition to regulations concerning student visas, another 30% of respondents indicated concerns about the H-1B work visa restrictions in the United States. They discussed the very limited availability of the H-1B visa and how that makes it very difficult for our international students to try to stay in the United States and find employment after graduation. They are also concerned that the current administration may try to tighten H-1B visa regulations or regulations concerning Optional Practical Training, a work program that allows international students to work for a period of time after graduation with their student visa. In discussing how the H-1 visa opportunities are rare for their students, one respondent stated they are asking “how are we preparing them for life after school in a way of transferability of skills and competencies and the recognition of that in the global labor market?”

As higher education in the United States is seeing a rising price tag at the same time we are also experiencing less funding opportunities for our international and domestic students due to fewer appropriations from state operations, it is no surprise that 45% of respondents indicated costs and funding as a negative influence on our ability to recruit international students. Our escalating costs are of particular concern when looking at international students possibly choosing to go to Europe over the United States as many of the higher education institutions in

Europe offer free tuition or if they do assess tuition, it is significantly cheaper than the United States. One respondent indicated, “The cost of going to the university in some of these other places is significantly lower. The cost in Europe is nearly a free education. They are very selective, but the fact that all is paid for, it is troublesome for us from a recruiting standpoint since our tuition has been skyrocketing way past the point of inflation. That is a hard thing to combat.”

Interestingly, two respondents argued that since our country does not have a national coordinated strategy for recruiting international students, it makes it hard for us to compete against countries that do. When asked whether the United States’ government should take a more active role in encouraging the recruitment of international students, 70% of respondents were favorable to this idea in some context. Most were favorable in a way of the federal government helping higher education institutions in the United States collaborate and work together on international recruitment strategies, which goes hand in hand with the idea that not having a coordinated strategy is hurting our ability to recruit. One respondent offered, “I see in consortiums and conferences, we’ve seen the benefits of working together... It would be good to get guidance and support from federal government to say that there is a need and a benefit to our culture, to our domestic students, to our diversity to bring in international students.”

However, even those that were favorable were also very hesitant and were very clear that while having national support for international student recruitment, whether that support be in facilitating funding, incentives, or advocacy, it should only be support. The respondents were very clear that they would not want the government involved in any decision-making aspects of higher education nor to provide any regulations to dictate recruitment strategies. One respondent stated, “I think it would be difficult in this political climate. They can make it a priority, but they

can't dictate. They can recommend and encourage, but they can't dictate. Education is a state level...Our state should have more power than the federal government."

For the 25% who indicated they would not be favorable towards government involvement, this was primarily due to not being able to fathom how it would be possible. With such a large number of universities with long histories of autonomy, and vastly different hierarchy structures, it would be too complicated. Those who were favorable of having some federal government support also shared these same concerns.

When asked about what factors positively influence the United States' ability to recruit international students, 65% of respondents indicated that our reputation and global rankings, along with the perceived value of an American degree strongly supported our leadership status in the international student market. One respondent stated, "We have a fantastic reputation and a very desirable degree. The ability to still have a lot of people who successfully find jobs in the US...that is a big selling point. Just the caliber of institutions and the fact that we have more that are top caliber than Europe does. Sure they have some like Oxford and London School of Economics, but there are so many to choose from that are top tier in the US." Many respondents indicated that global rankings are extremely important to our international students and are often all they have to go by. These rankings and the reputation these universities have for being global preeminent universities are often what attracts international students to our campuses. One respondent stated, "Your average international student is a Chinese undergraduate. And a Chinese undergraduate is going to look at rankings tables, or at least their parents are, and if you are thinking...where is favorable for international education and highly ranked in STEM, we are going to come up at the top every time." In addition, as the institutions in this study have more international students than any other institutions in the United States; they have developed a

reputation across the globe as being favorable to international students. Therefore, it is not surprising that some respondents indicated the fact that we have established international communities as a welcoming influence on international student recruitment.

In discussing the value of an American degree, many respondents argued that the American degree provides students with an excellent return on investment making them more attractive to employers, providing them with cutting edge research experiences, and connecting them to industry and fortune 500 partners. One respondent argued that we are still doing well because of “the quality of the US degree...recognition especially among our top institutions and the value of those degrees in the world-wide job market.” Similarly, 30% narrowed down this value of the American degree positive influence to the benefits of the American curriculum model. Many indicated that the American curriculum values and offers free speech and encourages the free-flowing exchange of ideas, where other parts of the world may not. One respondent argued, “Think about the history of institutional advancement in our country. The freedom of speech and freedom to organize and freedom to explore, grow, and learn. And that’s not the case in many countries in the world.” In addition, they cited the fact that we also offer experiential learning in our curriculum and interdisciplinary research opportunities as a benefit that international students crave. 50% of respondents also indicated that students simply have so many more options in the United States in terms of picking an institution at which to study.

Summary of Interview Responses

Some interesting responses came out of a final open-ended question regarding any other thoughts respondents wanted to share regarding the increase of global competition for international students. This led to a few respondents discussing the Brexit implications for Europe and the rising nationalist views becoming a trend in some European Union countries. In

regard to Brexit, one respondent stated, “I think it will make it far harder for European nationals to find employment outside of their country and that will diminish their effectiveness of getting their degree from another EU nation. Worried about the temperament in Europe...already seeing border restrictions. Almost a return to pre-EU and pre-Schengen and pre-Bologna type of transnational cooperation.” Yet a few respondents also brought up discussions of revising the American curriculum to remove general education requirements and provide a more focused three-year undergraduate degree to compete with Europe, as well as to reduce costs (as funding seems to be a prevailing issue). One respondent discussed the option of reforming our curriculum to match that of European Union institutions stating “then when you get to college, you choose a major and you focus. Shouldn’t have to take another general educational course if it doesn’t support your degree.”

In these discussions, it was apparent that respondents were much more concerned about the isolationist views of the Trump administration stating that “the constant putting American citizens first, while good in theory, it alienates international students, workers, visitors, which you have to be shockingly naïve to not recognize the impact on the economy and the value of international people in the United States.” Similarly, another supporting statement from one respondent included “Globalization has hit many sectors and we are not immune. We can’t be as insular or inward focused.” In discussing concerns about the Trump administration and closing our borders to certain populations, respondents brought up again the need to diversify our international student populations and not be so reliant on China, especially as Chinese institutions are developing their curriculum and research structures and attempting to be less reliant on the United States for graduate higher education. One respondent argued, “I think higher education has to be a lot more specific in saying that we are interested in a global

exchange of ideas and therefore our idea of diversity is global.” He was arguing that when higher education institutions discuss diversity, they are often only referring to the diversity of ethnic and racial groups of domestic students on campus. But, to truly be a global university, and have a global higher education, you must include international students and even international faculty into your mindset and goals of diversity for your campus.

The overarching discussion point was that the future is unknown, and we cannot be sure what the full impacts of the Trump administration will be as it keeps changing every day. Ultimately, institutions are very concerned that the political climate, spurred by the actions of the new president and his administration, is causing our current and prospective international students to feel unwanted, unwelcome, and unsafe. In the past, institutions have relied on their global reputations as being supportive of and valuing the perspectives that international students bring to our classrooms. However, this is starting to become overshadowed by our government’s anti-immigrant rhetoric. To combat these negative influences, our institutions are beginning to strategize on how to remain relevant and attractive, how to increase their global footprint, and how to maintain and build partnerships with international higher education institutions, organizations, and even businesses.

Research Findings Summary

In reviewing the information available through public documents of the top ten international student enrolling institutions in conjunction with the 105 questionnaire responses from 22 of the top 25 institutions and 20 in-depth interviews from policy experts of 8 of these institutions, there were some overarching themes of concerns regarding our country’s ability to maintain a leadership status in the globalized international student market. While our institutions are making efforts to increase our global footprint through international recruitment travel,

recruitment and academic offices in foreign countries, development of international partnerships and exchange agreements, we are concerned that it might not be enough in the coming years to maintain our leadership status. The primary concerns noted are regarding our political climate, our immigration and visa policies, and the cost structure and funding opportunities for our international students. We have traditionally been able to rely on our reputations and high global rankings to recruit international students, along with our longstanding established international relationships and communities. However, the more international students feel unwelcome and unsafe, the less likely they are to want to come here. And given there are cheaper, friendlier, and easier options for international students within the European Union, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom, our institutions are concerned they may see declines in our international enrollments in the future.

While all of these institutions have implemented strategies to increase their global footprint and increase their competitiveness in the international student market, it is clear that these strategies were not done in specific response to the Bologna Declaration. Rather, these institutions have implemented strategies in response to the overall increase in options for international students and to combat the negative internal influences in the United States that make it difficult for United States' universities to recruit international students.

In the following, final, chapter, I will discuss the implications of my research findings for higher education institutions in the United States. Through these implications, I have developed recommendations that I believe our institutions should consider in order to remain preeminent global leaders in higher education.

Chapter 7

Higher Education Policy Implications

Policy Analysis Summary

While the United States is still growing its number of international student enrollments, they are losing some of their market share. Between 2000 and 2013, the U.S. went from having 28% of the market share of international students to 19%. (OECD, 2015 and OECD, 2002) However, at the graduate level, the United States still maintains 26% of the international student market. (OECD, 2016) It is important to point out that while the United States is still growing its international enrollments, only 4% of its overall enrollments are from international students. (OECD, 2016)

The top five enrolling nations for international students include the United States, followed by United Kingdom with 10% of the international student population, Australia and France with 6%, and Germany with 5%. (OECD, 2015) In comparing the United States to the European Union as a whole, you can see that while the United States is one country and the European Union is made up of several, if you look at the European Union's market share of international students and the United States' market share, you will see that the European Union actually has a larger percentage: 35% in 2013 compared with only 19% in the United States. (OECD, 2015) As the European Union is taking a cross-national stance at attracting international students, as a whole they appear to have been much more successful at attracting international students. However, you must keep in mind that the 35% includes students from one European nation studying in another European nation.

In addition to the competition from Europe, other countries around the globe are increasing their market share of international students. Russia, Japan, and Canada each now have

3% of the international student market, with China and Saudi Arabia each holding 2% of the market share. (OECD, 2015) While these nations are not as much of a threat to the United States, these other nations as a whole represent more choices for international students. Since 2000, there has been an over 90% increase from 2.1 million to over 4 million international students enrolled across the globe. (OECD, 2015) With such increases in students choosing to study in a foreign country, U.S. institutions must decide what action should be taken to not further lose our standing in the international student market.

The United States has always had a few factors that put them in the lead – the rankings and reputation of their research universities, the graduate level assistantships and tuition waivers, the perceived value of an American education, the attractiveness of the open-discussion, creative thinking, and interdisciplinary curriculum, and their language, English. Thinking critically about whether or not we need to make changes in our recruitment and our internationalization efforts, we need to recognize that we still have quite a bit in our favor. As one respondent in my study indicated, “I think it all comes down to, despite the best efforts of the rest of the world, the power of the brand. The strength of the education. So far, it seems that nothing competes quite as strongly as an American graduate degree. Obviously if you can get into Oxford, Cambridge, or Heidelberg, maybe some of those, but by and large, if you look at international universities, many of the leading scholars and leading administrators have one or more North American degrees.” Ultimately, international students still want to come to the United States due to our reputation and the fact that we offer a better product than do our international peers.

However, with the ever-tightening visa and immigration regulations for both students and workers, negative perceptions regarding our political and social climate, and ever-rising tuition costs (and corresponding less offered assistantships and tuition waivers), international students

are feeling less welcome and less able to come to the United States to study. These unwelcome feelings were at their highest just after the SEVIS implementation following the September 11th terrorist attacks, and while United States institutions have worked hard to combat these feelings and reinstall international students' faith in how much we value them in our classrooms, we are in a tumultuous time again where political actions and immigration changes are potentially going to impact our international student enrollments. In discussing factors that negatively impact the United States' ability to recruit international students, one respondent argued that not only cost, but also "the perception issue...not as bad as immediately after 9/11, but the potential is there to be as bad. The new administration is giving the perception that we aren't as welcoming. We know institutions can be a liberal beacon in a chaotic society, but our overseas observers don't necessarily see that."

With these negative perceptions, international students are looking to other countries where tuition is significantly cheaper, where it's easier to obtain a visa, and where it's easier to work and stay in the host country after they finish school (unlike in the United States where it's getting harder and harder to do so). And, given that English is becoming the language of international education, these other countries are truly an option that international students may begin sincerely looking at.

If other countries continue to increase recruitment strategies, and if the negative internal influences on international enrollments in the United States continue, the United States may face a loss of international student enrollments. This may in turn mean smaller graduate programs, and a change in priorities for higher education institutions. The United States will need to learn new ways of marketing its strengths, such as its research reputation.

Douglass and Edelstein (2009) argue that the United States needs to take a national stance on welcoming international students and the importance of attracting international students – as other countries have done. The United States needs to actively recruit international students, ease up on visa regulations and complexity, increase financial incentives for international students to study here, partner with other nations across the globe, and encourage study abroad for domestic students in order to maintain their lead in the international student market. (Douglass and Edelstein, 2009) Similarly, Lowell, Bump, and Martin (2007) argue that the United States needs to make visa policies more visible and straightforward, and allow greater opportunities for international students to study and work.

In taking a critical theory lens to look at all internal and external factors influencing the United States' lead position in the international student higher education market, I definitely think higher education institutions and the Department of State of the United States have a lot to consider. However, from a critical pragmatist point of view, we have to be practical in how we plan to make changes and strategize to maintain and increase our international student enrollments. We also have to think about why we make changes and how it will impact our stakeholders. While we have maintained a steady growth in international enrollments, our piece of the pie is dwindling compared to other countries across the globe. Part of this is due to these other countries pro-actively restructuring their education systems to recruit international students and allow for opportunities that are more attractive for international students. They are making international education their major agenda for their higher education institutions' and national education missions. On the United States front, we do still advocate for the importance of international education, but our current presidential administration, our homeland security

policies, and the economic status of our higher education institutions is negatively impacting our international education recruiting and advocacy efforts.

If the market shifts of international enrollments continue, the United States will need to decide just how important international education is to the success of our nation. With our current economic situation, attacking the factors outlined in this dissertation that may negatively impact our position in the international student market may not be possible or ideal. However, given the benefits of enrolling international students in our higher education institutions, I believe that policy makers in higher education institutions and the Department of State will need to work together to advocate for international education and international cooperation as the higher education arena becomes more and more globalized. The question is when and to what extent.

Recommendations

The data uncovered in this analysis supports an argument to be cautious in restructuring our higher education degree systems. While there have been market shifts, we are still gaining in enrollments each year. In addition, we are still substantially in the lead for international enrollments over other nations. We need to pay attention to the factors that could influence our position in this market, but we need to realize that we are not in trouble just yet. We may need to make some changes, but with the numbers of enrollments we are still attracting, I would not argue that we need a major reform of our curriculum at this time, although some reforms should be considered.

Overall, we may need to put global competition at the forefront of our national higher education agenda. In order to remain competitive, we need to work together at a national level to make changes that will allow our universities to continue to compete with those around the

world. These changes would include considering curriculum reforms to offer accelerated programs, implementing strategic recruiting plans to diversify our international student recruitment, and collaborating with our peer institutions on a national level to combat the negative global perceptions of the United States and our political climate, to advocate for streamlined student visa processes and post-graduation employment opportunities for international students, and to increase national funding opportunities for international students. Our nation's political climate has increased the urgency for higher education institutions to lobby for these changes, and I believe these changes will have true policy implications for our higher education institutions and our national government that will make us more attractive to international students, as well as to our own citizens.

Curriculum Reform

To remain competitive, to increase the employability of our students, and to reduce costs, we need to consider offering accelerated programs for our undergraduate students. This means looking at our curriculum and our requirements for graduating with a bachelor's degree. The top twenty institutions reviewed in this study have implemented a number of strategies and initiatives to globalize their curriculums and offer internationalization opportunities for their students from study abroad, co-op internship programs, and recruiting international students to add a more diverse perspective to their classrooms. However, we must do more to remain competitive. Our undergraduate students are increasingly taking college credit while in secondary school in order to complete their bachelor degree programs faster. I would argue, and policy experts who participated in this study would agree, that we need to look at our curriculum and consider moving the general education requirements to the secondary level. This would allow our undergraduates to pursue a degree program more focused on their academic major and

allow for more thorough preparation for employment post-graduation. The end result would also include a shorter time to degree, which would result in reduced costs of higher education.

Reduced costs of higher education may alarm some higher education institutions because it may be seen as a loss in tuition revenue. However, I believe that with such changes, you would increase enrollments of both domestic and international students, and overall it would be a reduced cost for the students, but an increase in revenue for the institutions. As one interview respondent commented, “We need to consider having a system to allow them to focus on their strengths and abilities instead of looking at more of a well-rounded education. We focus so much on well-rounded with general education requirements that we don’t give enough focus on major coursework...this may encourage our own domestics to go to a place like the EU where they can just focus on their major to be an expert in their field and prepare for their career.” While I do not think we need to reform all of our higher education programs to this accelerated path to graduation, I do think that it could benefit students in certain academic majors, particularly in the STEM fields. We should continue to require general education requirements that would truly benefit all students, such as professional writing classes and globalization classes, but many of the general education classes could be eliminated if they will not truly prepare someone for their career.

As more and more institutions, nations, and higher education areas are adopting the Bologna Model and other reforms to make it easier and more welcoming for international students, the United States could and should look to the European Union to learn a few things. One respondent argued, “The European system can get them through quicker because they aren’t focusing on all that extra general education requirements and just straight focusing on getting a student prepared for their career. By the time kids have reached college, they have decided what

they want to pursue. Most kids know what they are stronger in and they know they need to choose a profession in those areas.” We can look at the review Europe has conducted on its higher education structures, look at the changes they have made, look at their qualification frameworks that they have implemented, and look at their successes and challenges. Looking never hurts after all and maybe, just maybe, we can learn something. After all, our original higher education structures were once modeled after Europe and that seemed to turn out well. Maybe it is time to do it again.

International Student Diversification

One of the most interesting trends from the interviews conducted in this study was the growing discussion of diversifying international student populations. There are far more Chinese international students (328,547 in 2015) in the United States than from any other country. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) They are followed by 165,918 students from India, 61,287 students from Saudi Arabia, 61,007 students from South Korea, and 26,973 students from Canada. (IIE Open Doors, 2016) With the current political climate, institutions are looking at the need to diversify its international student recruitments to not just recruit the students we have the most of and have the most visible reputation with, but rather with other countries in Latin America, Africa, and other areas around the world. One respondent offered, “In an ideal world, we wouldn’t be in this political climate...we aren’t low on international students, but I do think we should look at diversifying the country of origin for our international students. For this very reason of having a nightmarish political climate that could prevent any one nation from coming here.”

China and India have historically dominated the international student market in the United States, but Middle Eastern students have been on the rise. As mentioned above, Saudi Arabian students are ranked third, and Iran students are ranked 11th with 12,269 students in the

United States (IIE Open Doors, 2016). The current president's administration has consistently produced anti-Muslim rhetoric and with the immigration or travel ban stopping citizens from seven primarily Muslim countries from coming to the United States (even though it is temporarily held up in the courts system), we are seeing our perception of being an international student friendly country move to being a hostile country for international students. This causes concerns for the rising population of Middle Eastern international students in the United States.

Looking specifically at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Iranian students are ranked sixth for international student enrollments with 133 students on our campus in the Fall 2016 semester. (Illinois DMI, 2016) There are rumors that the travel ban, if reinstated, could be extended to other Muslim-majority countries, including Indonesia, Turkey, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia, and others. In looking at these enrollments at Illinois, you'll find that Indonesia ranks 5th with 145 students, Turkey ranks 7th with 124 students, Pakistan ranks 13th with 73 students, Bangladesh ranks 24th with 39 students, and Saudi Arabia ranks 27th with 35 students. If you pull all of these students together, they make up 549 of our international population. (Illinois DMI, 2016) While this is not a larger percentage in relation to the 10,700 international students on campus, if you take out the top three (China, India, and South Korea), it makes up 21% of the remaining international student population.

In addition to the political implications for Muslim international students, there are also political implications regarding the executive order of the Trump administration to build a wall along the south border between the United States and Mexico. Looking at Mexican students at Illinois, they rank 22nd with 45 students. (Illinois DMI, 2016) Again, any one of these countries does not represent a large population in and of itself; however, when you pool all the countries

together that are impacted by the executive orders, it becomes a larger potential impact if we were to lose our enrollments from these countries.

In looking at our largest sending country, China, we need to also be concerned. While there has been some negative rhetoric from the president in regard to relations with China, our concerns regarding China are more in regard to China's economic climate and their increased investments in higher education infrastructures. As one interview respondent indicated, "Chinese institutions are getting stronger and stronger, and the government is investing very heavily in their institutions and research infrastructure, raising the level of teaching, and investing in internationalization...If Chinese students and their parents begin to feel they will get just as good of an education in China, we could see a loss." And, this loss would be significant. Other respondents also reported that while studying in the United States, Chinese students lose out on gaining internship and other work experiences in Chinese companies, and therefore may have a disadvantage when returning home to work post-graduation.

In looking at the institutions included in this study, many of them have permanent offices set up in other countries (particularly China) to not only serve as a place for students to go with questions, but also for institutions to utilize to recruitment, to offer English and academic preparation training, and to provide a general global presence for the institution. For those trying to build relationships and partnerships with foreign institutions, this not only allows for an easier flow and exchange of students and faculty, it can often result in additional recruitment of degree-seeking international students. In an effort to diversify international recruitment, higher education institutions need to pursue avenues to set up these international academic centers in other parts of the world, such as in Latin and South American, and African countries. This would

be a great way to get our foot in the door, gain some exposure, and begin to develop relationships and recruitment of students in some of these other countries.

In the current political climate where our president and his administration are focused on only putting American citizens first and reducing options for immigration pathways, we do not want to heavily rely on any one country for international student recruitment. It is critical that we consider diversifying our international student body in order to maintain having classrooms with global perspectives and continue to create globally effective technological innovations through our interdisciplinary research methods, and produce future global leaders.

Institutional Collaboration

Higher education institutions are often in competition with each other in the United States to attract and recruit the top talent for their enrollments, both domestically and internationally. And while we will always continue to compete with each other, now is a time that we must also work together to maintain our country's leadership status in the globalized international student market. As one respondent offered, "There is a way to work together instead of competing against each other to get the best talent to come here to the US...it's a proud tradition to bring in the best and the brightest to come study at American universities."

Higher education institutions in the United States have historically collaborated on various reforms and other national educational goals through organizations such as the Association of American Universities at the national level, the Council of Graduate Schools at the national graduate level, or regional organizations such as the Big Ten Academic Alliance. As a higher education administrator, I can also attest to individual administrators working with peer institutions for benchmarking and policy reform initiatives through various administrative associations such as the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors. However, in the last

few months, our universities have been talking more and coming together more to produce a united front of advocacy for our international students, faculty, staff, and visitors. And this collaboration needs to continue.

I would argue that if our higher education institutions collaborate, we can work together to combat the negative global perceptions of the United States due to our current political climate and ever-tightening visa and immigration policies. We can work together to advocate for streamlined student visa processes and post-graduation employment opportunities for our international students. Finally, we can work together to increase the national funding opportunities for our international students.

International students, and their parents, are often exposed to the United States through global news networks, and in our current political climate, this has resulted in international citizens perceiving the United States as unwelcoming and even hostile towards international students. One interview respondent stated that international students “only get a perception from what they see in the news...seeing our activities outside of education clouding with what the experience really is. I think there is a perception that we are growing more xenophobic and that we don’t want international students here...international students are afraid of not being welcome and not being safe. We have to get out there to kind of combat that perception.” I received similar feedback from nearly everyone who participated in this study through the questionnaires and the interviews. This perception includes not just the negative rhetoric coming from our president’s administration, but also the increase in gun violence in the United States. All of these negative perceptions can only hurt our ability to recruit international students, and in order to fight this perception, we have to work together to get our message, our beliefs, and our values as global higher education institutions out to prospective international students.

As I discussed earlier, many of our institutions have locations in other countries where we can work with our staff in those locations to convey this information to prospective students. This can be done not only through staff, but also through alumni.

In addition to fighting the negative global perceptions together, I believe we can work together as institutions to advocate for streamlined student visa processes and post-graduation employment opportunities for our international students. As institutions, we can work as hard as we can to sell international students on our reputation and rankings, our curriculum and research opportunities, and our world-renowned faculty and resources; but if the visa processes for international students continue to tighten, students may look elsewhere. When recruiting students, we need to advocate nationally to streamline the process for applying for a student visa. While Department of Homeland Security vetting of incoming students is very important and should not be diminished in any way, I do believe that our nation could do a better job at humanizing the process more. International students are often made to feel like a criminal when going through their application interview and background checks, often required to travel multiple times and spend a great deal of money on travel and visa application fees, and upon finally entering the United States, they are subject to regulations that can sometimes hurt their academic achievements and opportunities. I understand the need to vet the students properly, but I believe that once a student has been vetted and comes to the United States, institutions should have more autonomy in regard to a student maintaining academic and visa status regulations.

In addition to revisions to the visa application process for students, I think higher education institutions need to advocate for an increase in employment opportunities post-graduation. Optional practical training, a program to allow students to work post-graduation on their student visa, has increased in terms of length for students in STEM fields, but only for

STEM fields and this is fairly “elitist” as one respondent indicated. We should advocate that the STEM opportunities for optional practical training should be extended to all disciplines. We also need to advocate for an increase in H-1B work visas offered in the United States each year. There is currently a cap on the number of H-1B visas offered each year, and there are no categories within these visas. This means that this includes students applying for an H-1B visa and any other international citizen applying to come and work in the United States. I would advocate that institutions should argue that students in post-graduation situations should have a category in terms of the numbers of H-1B visas granted each year. Meaning there would be a total cap, but a specific share of those visas would be specifically for international students in post-graduation situations.

Finally, I believe higher education institutions can work together to increase national funding opportunities for international students. This advocacy will be most advantageous if we can collaborate with national organizations such as the Institute of International Education, Education USA, and the governmental agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the Department of State. Ideally, these organizations, in conjunction with the federal government, could implement national level funding opportunities, similar to the grants offered by the National Science Foundation, which universities and students could apply for. This could also include offering incentives to higher education institutions to bring in international students through fellowship programs specifically for international students.

On a smaller level, we could work together to share resources on helping our students apply for funding opportunities. For example, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has one of the most comprehensive fellowship databases in the United States called the Fellowship Finder. (Illinois GC, 2017) This database includes over 1100 funding opportunities

for students. While many of these are specific to domestic students, there are a great number of fellowships available for international students included as well (861 to be exact). (Illinois GC, 2017) Of these 861 opportunities for international students, 745 of them are not restricted to University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign students. (Illinois GC, 2017) This means that these are opportunities that students from other institutions could apply for and learn about. These are the sort of resources that institutions could collaborate on to provide additional funding resources to our international students.

Conclusion

While the United States has enjoyed a privileged position of power in regards to dominating the globalized international student market in the past, we are experiencing negative international influences that jeopardize our leadership status. At this time, the long-lasting impacts of the political actions of our government, the increased violence and hateful rhetoric in our communities, and the increased nationalist views of our nation are unknown. As higher education institutions, it is our goal and, I would argue, our responsibility to provide our students with a global education in order to produce global citizens. I attended the annual NAFSA conference in 2007 and was fortunate to hear Colin Powell speak on the importance of international education. His argument that day was similar to that of a 2004 speech that included “The more we know about each other, the more we learn about each other, the more we engage on differences that we have between our societies and between our social systems and between our political points of view, the better off we are. The more dialogue we have at every level, and especially at the academic level, where opinion-makers are located...the better off we are.”

(Powell, 2004: NAFSA, 2011)

Similarly to Colin Powell's argument above, I believe that it is important not only for our domestic citizens to gain global citizenship values and perspectives, but providing this to international students also lets them return home with good American experiences to foster better leadership relationships for the United States and foreign nations. These experiences directly tie into and affect our political and global knowledge economies. There are also a number of economic advantages to maintaining and even increasing our international student enrollments. International students contribute greatly to our economies, both state and federal, and losing our competitive edge and decreasing our enrollment numbers will negatively impact our economic state.

In order to remain competitive and continue to offer a global education, we must be more strategic in our globalization efforts and operations. While this has been the case for some time, the current political climate and growing negative perceptions have increased the urgency of this need for change. Policy makers at higher education institutions must engage in strategic planning or I would argue we will see declines in international student enrollments. And this will result in a decreased global leadership status for our higher education institutions. To succeed, we need to consider offering accelerated curriculum options, diversify our international student populations, and work together to advocate for the importance of globalization in higher education and recruiting international students.

References

- Ahmed, A. (2017). As Trump Orders Wall, Mexico's President Considers Canceling U.S. Trip. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/25/world/americas/trump-mexico-border-wall.html> (2017).
- Altbach, P.G. & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 290-305. DOI: 10.1177/1028315307303542.
- Anderson, L. (2008). Reflexivity. In Thorpe, R. & Holt, R. *The SAGE Dictionary of Qualitative Management Research*. Retrieved from <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/the-sage-dictionary-of-qualitative-management-research/n86.xml> (2013).
- Aoun, J.E. (2017). *Globalization of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.northeastern.edu/president/tag/globalization-of-higher-education/> (2017).
- Apple, M., Au, W., & Gandin, L.A. (2009). *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Arizona State University (ASU). (2017). *Admission Standards*. Retrieved from <https://students.asu.edu/graduate/standards> (2017).
- Arizona State University (ASU). (2017). *Global at ASU: Transforming the world*. Retrieved from <https://global.asu.edu/> (2017).
- Arizona State University (ASU). (2017). *Global Launch*. Retrieved from <https://global-launch.asu.edu/> (2017).
- Arizona State University (ASU). (2017). *International Development*. Retrieved from <https://research.asu.edu/ked-units/international-development> (2017).
- Arizona State University (ASU). (2017). *New American University: Toward 2025 and Beyond*. Retrieved from <https://president.asu.edu/about/asucharter> (2017).
- Association of American Universities (AAU). (2017). *AAU Urges Quick End to Administration Order Barring Returning Students and Faculty*. Retrieved from <http://www.aau.edu/news/article.aspx?id=18366> (2017).
- Atkinson, R. and Flint, J. (2004). Snowball Sampling. In Lewis-Beck, M., Bryman, A., & Futing Liao, T. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Retrieved from <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-social-science-research-methods/n931.xml> (2013).
- Bagley, S. S. and Portnoi, L. M. (2014). Setting the Stage: Global Competition in Higher Education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, Vol. 2014 (No. 168), 5-11.

Batalova, J. (2007). *The “Brain Gain” Race Begins with Foreign Students*. Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=571> (2012).

Bement, A. (2012). *A Message from Dr. Arden Bement*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/globalaffairs/message.html> (2012).

Bergen Communiqué. (2005). The European Higher Education Area – Achieving the Goals. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Berlin Communiqué. (2003). Realising the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Block, G. (2017). *Office of the Chancellor*. Retrieved from <http://chancellor.ucla.edu/> (2017).

Boerma, E. (2010). The Bologna Declaration and the Risks of Internationalization. In Maclean A. & Majhanovich, S. Education, Language, and Economics: Growing National and Global Dilemmas (pp. 155-166).

BOLOGNA Beyond 2010. (2009). BOLOGNA beyond 2010: Report on the development of the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Bryman, A. (2004). Member Validation and Check. In Lewis-Beck, M., Bryman, A., & Futing Liao, T. The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods. Retrieved from <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-social-science-research-methods/n548.xml> (2013).

Bucharest Communiqué. (2012). Making the Most of Our Potential: Consolidating the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2016).

Budapest-Vienna Declaration. (2010). Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Carnoy, M. (2000). Globalization and Educational Reform. In Stromquist, N.P. & Monkman, K. Globalization and Education (pp. 43-62).

Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE). (2017). *Leading Internationalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Center-for-Internationalization-and-Global-Engagement.aspx> (2017).

Charlier, J-E. (2008). Assessing Europe’s Initiatives to Boost the Competitive Position of Its Higher Education. *European Education*, Vol. 40 (No. 1), 107-9.

Chow, P. (2011). Institute of International Education. *What International Students Think About U.S. Higher Education: Attitudes and Perceptions of Prospective students in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America*. Retrieved from [www.iie.org/en/.../IIE Student Attitudinal Survey Report.ashx](http://www.iie.org/en/.../IIE_Student_Attitudinal_Survey_Report.ashx) (2012).

Clinton, H. (2011). Secretary of State Press Statement: International Education Week. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2011/11/177130.htm> (2012).

College Board. (2016). Trends in College Pricing 2016. Retrieved from <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing> (2017).

Columbia University in the City of New York (Columbia). (2017). *Columbia Global*. Retrieved from <http://beta.global.columbia.edu/university-initiatives> (2017).

Columbia University in the City of New York (Columbia). (2017). *Columbia Global Centers*. Retrieved from <http://globalcenters.columbia.edu/content/about-1> (2017).

Columbia University in the City of New York (Columbia). (2017). *Global Thought*. Retrieved from <http://cgt.columbia.edu/about/about-cgt/> (2017).

Columbia University in the City of New York (Columbia). (2017). *Columbia University World Leaders Forum*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldleaders.columbia.edu/president-lee-c-bollingers-statement-about-world-leaders-forum> (2017).

Columbia University in the City of New York (Columbia). (2017). Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Admissions. *Information for International Students*. Retrieved from <http://gsas.columbia.edu/content/information-international-students> (2017).

Columbia University in the City of New York (Columbia). (2017). *Mission Statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.columbia.edu/content/mission-statement.html> (2017).

Community Research and Development Information Service (CORDIS). (2014). *The Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs*. Retrieved from http://cordis.europa.eu/programme/rcn/843_en.html (2014).

Cordova, F. (2011). *State of the University 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/fac/speeches/sotu2011/index.html> (2012).

Cordova, F. (2012). *State of the University 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/fac/speeches/sotu2012/index.html> (2012).

Cox, R. (1996). *Approaches to World Order*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. (2014). *The Lisbon Recognition Convention and the ENIC Network*. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/Recognition/default_en.asp (2014).

Crow, M.M. (2011). *A New American University Reader: Selected Writings on University Design and Related Topics*. Retrieved from <https://president.asu.edu/node/1207> (2017).

Daniels, M. (2016). *Purdue Moves*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/purduemoves/news/purdue-moves-overview-1510.pdf> (2017).

Department of Homeland Security (DHS). (2017). *Fact Sheet: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry to the United States*. Retrieved from <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2017/01/29/protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states> (2017).

de Witt, H. (2012). Internationalisation in higher education – Rhetoric versus reality. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120718152610930> (2017).

Douglass, J. & Edelstein, R. (2009). The Global Competition for Talent: The Rapidly Changing Market for International Students and the Need for a Strategic Approach in the US. Center for Studies in Higher Education (CSHE), University of California, Berkeley. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.8.09.

Dunn, W. (1981). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Edwards, J. (2007). Challenges and Opportunities for the internationalization of Higher Education in the Coming Decade: Planned and Opportunistic Initiatives in American Institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 373-381. DOI: 10.1177/1028315307303920.

EUROPA. (2002). Common Consular Instructions on Visas for the Diplomatic Missions and Consular Posts. *Official Journal of the European Communities*, C. 313 / 1. Retrieved from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2002/c_313/c_31320021216en00010096.pdf (2012).

EUROPA. (2009). *Erasmus Mundus (2004-08)*. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/general_framework/c11072_en.htm (2011).

EUROPA. (2011). *History of the ERASMUS Programme*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/history_en.htm (2011).

European Commission. (2010). *Lisbon Strategy evaluation document*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/archives/growthandjobs_2009/pdf/lisbon_strategy_evaluation_en.pdf (2014).

European Higher Education Area (EHEA). (2011). The official Bologna Process website 2010-2012. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

European University Association (EUA). (2011). European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.eua.be/eua-work-and-policy-area/building-the-european-higher-education-area.aspx> (2011).

European University Association (EUA). (2016). European Higher Education Area and the Bologna Process. Retrieved from <http://www.eua.be/policy-representation/higher-education-policies/the-european-higher-education-area-and-the-bologna-process> (2016).

Executive Agency Education, Audiovisual & Culture (EACEA). (2011). *Erasmus Mundus*. Retrieved from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/index_en.php (2011).

Fain, P. (2017). Forceful Response. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/30/higher-education-leaders-denounce-trumps-travel-ban> (2017).

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and Globalization*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fan, C. (2015). *Message from Vice Provost Cindy Fan*. Retrieved from <http://www.global.ucla.edu/messagefromvp/> (2017).

Fischer, K. (2016). A Trump Presidency Could Keep Some International Students Away. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Trump-Presidency-Could-Keep/236662> (2017).

Foley, C.J., Stableski, R.L. (2007). International Education 2007 Bologna Supplement. The Bologna Process: An Opportunity for International Cooperation.

Gardner, L. (2016). Doubling Down on Innovation for Success. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Video-Doubling-Down-on/238022> (2017).

Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and Resistance in Education: Towards a Pedagogy for the Opposition Revised and Expanded Edition*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Hackl, E. (2001). *Towards a European Area of Higher Education: Change and Convergence in European Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/01_09.pdf (2013).

Hamilton, A. (2016). *Inauguration Speech of Andrew Hamilton*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/communications/inauguration-speech-of-andrew-hamilton.html> (2017).

Hanson, S.D. (2017). *Building Beyond Tomorrow: MSU in the World*. Retrieved from <http://www.isp.msu.edu/about/about-isp/deans-remarks/> (2017).

Helenthal, M. (2011). Trustees Review Summer School Plan, Discuss Budget. *Inside Illinois Extra*, March 19, 2011. Retrieved from http://news.illinois.edu/ii/12/0405/bot_March15-main.html (2012).

Helenthal, M. (2016). *Illinois in 2016: 'We will rise to the challenge'*. Retrieved from <https://news.illinois.edu/blog/view/6367/307054> (2017).

Henard, F., Diamond, L., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Approaches to Internationalisation and Their Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice: A Guide for Higher Education Institutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/Approaches%20to%20internationalisation%20-%20final%20-%20web.pdf> (2017).

Horta, H. (2009) Global and national prominent universities: internationalization, competitiveness and the role of the State. *High Educ*, 58, 387-405. DOI 10.1007/s10734-009-9201-5.

Hudzik, J. & Briggs, P. (2012). Trends and Institutional Implications for International Student Enrollments in U.S. Institutions. Trends & Insights For International Education Leaders. NAFSA. February 2012.

International Institute of Education (IIE). (2011). *Open Doors Report 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors> (2012).

International Institute of Education (IIE). (2015). *Annual Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/Annual-Report/Highlights#.WJeZ5k27q70> (2017).

International Institute of Education (IIE). (2015). *Open Doors Report 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors> (2016).

International Institute of Education (IIE). (2016). *Open Doors Report 2016*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors> (2017).

International Institute of Education (IIE). (2016). *Who We Are*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are#.WJeneE27q70> (2017).

Jarab, J. (2008). Reforming systems and institutions of higher learning: Towards the creation of a European and global higher education area. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, Vol. 3 (No. 85), DOI: 10.1177/1746197907086720.

Keeling, R. (2006). The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Research Agenda: the European Commission's expanding role in higher education discourse. *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 41, No. 2, 203-223.

Kligman, G. (2016). *Chancellor Gene Block on the importance of going global*. Retrieved from <http://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/chancellor-gene-block-on-the-importance-of-going-global> (2017).

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 5-31. DOI: 10.1177/1028315303260832

Knight, J. (2014). International Education Hubs: Collaboration for Competitiveness and Sustainability. *New Directions for Higher Education*, Vol. 2014 (No. 168), 83-96.

Kolb, S. (2012). Grounded Theory and the Constant Comparative Method: Valid Research Strategies for Educators. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, Vol. 3 (No. 1), 83-86.

Krippendorff, K. (2012). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Leech, N.L. & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2007). An Array of Qualitative Data Analysis Tools: A Call for Data Analysis Triangulation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 22 (No. 4), 557-584.

Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué. (2009). The Bologna Process 2020 – The European Higher Education Area in the new decade. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Lisbon Recognition Convention. (1997). *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region*. Retrieved from <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/165.htm> (2014).

London Communiqué. (2007). Towards the European Higher Education Area: responding to challenges in a globalized world. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Lowell, L., Bump, M., & Martin, S. (2007). Foreign Students Coming to America: The Impact of Policy, Procedures, and Economic Competition. Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University.

McMillin, D. (2014). *Preparing globally-engaged leaders*. Retrieved from <http://www.washington.edu/trends/preparing-globally-engaged-leaders/> (2017).

Michigan State University (MSU). (2017). *Bolder by Design*. Retrieved from <http://bolderbydesign.msu.edu/six-imperatives/> (2017).

Michigan State University (MSU). (2017). *International Studies & Programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.isp.msu.edu/about/about-isp/> (2017).

Najar, N. & Saul, S. (2016). 'Is it Safe?' Foreign Students Consider College in Donald Trump's U.S. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/17/us/is-it-safe-foreign-students-consider-college-in-donald-trumps-us.html> (2017).

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). 2006. Restoring U.S. Competitiveness: For International Students and Scholars. *Association of International Educators, June 2006*. Retrieved from http://nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Public_Policy/restoring_u.s.pdf?n=8823 (2012).

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). (2011). *NAFSA's Contribution to Internationalization of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/File/2011_izn_contributions.pdf. (2013).

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). (2011). *International Education*. Retrieved from http://nafsa.org/about.sec/organization_leadership/about_international_education/ (2011).

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). (2011). *The Economic Benefits of International Education to the United States for the 2010-2011 Academic Year: A Statistical Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org/File/eis2011/USA.pdf> (2012).

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). (2012). *About NAFSA*. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org/about/default.aspx> (2012).

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). (2016). *About NAFSA*. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/About_Us/About_NAFSA/Mission_and_Vision/Mission,_Vision,_Values/ (2017).

Neubert, A. P. (2011). GPRI Director Gives Talk at International Science and Technology Series. *Purdue University News Service, December 5, 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/general/2011/111205BementTalk.html> (2012).

Neubert, A.P. (2016). *Purdue ranks 4th for international student population at public universities, places in top 25 for first time for study abroad*. Retrieved from <https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/releases/2016/Q4/purdue-ranks-4th-for-international-student-population-at-public-universities,-places-in-top-25-for-first-time-for-study-abroad.html> (2017).

New York University (NYU). (2008). *NYU Framework 2031*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/shared/documents/NYU.Framework2031.Final.pdf> (2012).

New York University (NYU). (2017). *A Brief History of New York University*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-university/history-and-traditions-of-new-york-university/a-brief-history-of-new-york-university.html> (2017).

New York University (NYU). (2017). *NYU at a Glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/nyu-at-a-glance.html> (2017).

- New York University (NYU). (2017). *President's Global Council*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/university-developmentandalumnirelations/president-s-global-council.html> (2017).
- New York University (NYU). (2017). *Stern School of Business*. Retrieved from <http://www.stern.nyu.edu/programs-admissions/full-time-mba/admissions/application-instructions/transcripts-degrees#sec-2> (2017).
- Nikias, C.L.M. (2015). The Value of College Education. *Annual Address to Faculty*. Retrieved from <http://www.president.usc.edu/annual-address-to-faculty/> (2017).
- Nikias, C.L.M. (2016). *State of the University Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.president.usc.edu/state-of-the-university-address/> (2017).
- Northeastern University (Northeastern). (2017). *About*. Retrieved from <http://www.northeastern.edu/#> (2017).
- Northeastern University (Northeastern). (2017). *Global Co-Op*. Retrieved from <http://www.northeastern.edu/geo/globalcoop/> (2017).
- Northeastern University (Northeastern). (2017). *Graduate Programs Admissions*. Retrieved from <http://dev.em.northeastern.edu/gradwp/> (2017).
- Northeastern University (Northeastern). (2017). Northeastern University to Host Clinton Global Initiative University. *Northeastern News*. Retrieved from https://news.northeastern.edu/2017/02/northeastern-university-to-host-clinton-global-initiative-university/#_ga=1.158502463.446164893.1487462330 (2017).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2002). *Education at a Glance 2002: OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2002_eag-2002-en (2012).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2011). *Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2011_eag-2011-en (2012).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2015). *Education at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance-19991487.htm> (2016).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2016). *Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance-19991487.htm> (2017).

Owens, T. L. and Lane, J. E. (2014). Cross-Border Higher Education: Global and Local Tensions Within Competition and Economic Development. *New Directions for Higher Education*, Vol. 2014 (No. 168), 69-82.

Pechar, H. (2007). The Bologna Process: A European Response to Global Competition in Higher Education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 37 (No 3), 107-123.

Perez Canado, M. L. (2015). The Past, Present, and future of the Bologna Process. In Blessinger, P. and Anchan, J. P. Democratizing Higher Education: International Comparative Perspectives (p. 44-60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Prague Communiqué. (2001). Towards the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Purdue University (Purdue). (2017). *Office of Corporate and Global Partnerships*. Retrieved from <http://partners.purdue.edu/> (2017).

Purdue University (Purdue). (2017). *Purdue Moves*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/purduemoves/initiatives/education/internationalExperience.html> (2017).

Purdue University (Purdue). (2017). *Purdue Policy Research Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.purdue.edu/discoverypark/ppri/> (2017).

Purdue University (Purdue). (2017). *The Graduate School*. Retrieved from <https://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/international/info/index.html> (2017).

Purdue University (Purdue). (2017). *The Graduate School: Graduate Program Requirements*. Retrieved from <https://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/prospective/gradrequirements/index.html> (2017).

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of Higher Education: towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 1 (No. 2), 248-269.

Redden, E. (2017). Higher Ed and the Wall. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/25/how-will-trumps-proposed-border-wall-affect-higher-education-collaborations-and> (2017).

Robertson, S. (2009). Europe, Competitiveness and Higher Education: an evolving project. In Dale, R. & Robertson, S. Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education (pp. 45-64).

Robertson, S. and Dale, R. (2009). The World Bank, the IMF, and the Possibilities of Critical Education. In Apple, M., Au, W., & Gandin, L.A. The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education (pp. 23-35).

Rodriguez, R., Warmeradam, J., Triomphe, C.E. (2010). *The Lisbon Strategy 2000 – 2010: An Analysis and evaluation of the methods used and results achieved*. Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201107/20110718ATT24270/20110718ATT24270EN.pdf> (2014).

Rothbauer, P. M. (2008). Triangulation. In Given, L. M. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Retrieved from <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/sage-encyc-qualitative-research-methods/n468.xml?rskey=p2IXrx&row=2> (2013).

Ruttgers, J. (2013). *The Sorbonne/Bologna Project: Higher Education for the 21st century*. Retrieved from http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_34776-1522-2-30.pdf?130802120630 (2014).

Sample, S. (2006). *Redefining Undergraduate Education for the 21st Century*. University of Southern California (USC): Address to the College Board Annual Forum. Retrieved from <https://about.usc.edu/presidentemeritus/speeches/address-to-the-college-board-annual-forum/> (2012).

Sawyer, A.M. et al. (2017). Families, students, scientists: Faces of the immigration ban. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2017/01/30/families-students-scientists-5-people-affected-immigration-ban/97235250/> (2017).

Scott, G. (2007). Challenges in Attracting International Students to the United States and Implications for Global Competitiveness. United States Government Accountability Office: Higher Education: GAO-07-1047T.

Sexton, J. (2010). *Global Network University Reflection*. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/redirect/speeches-statements/global-network-university-reflection.html> (2012).

Simon, L.A.K. (2017). *Office of the President*. Retrieved from <http://president.msu.edu/the-president/index.html> (2017).

Smith, B. (2016). Student opinions on Trump win flood social media. *The PIE News*. Retrieved from <https://thepienews.com/news/student-opinions-on-trump-win-flood-social-media/> (2017).

Sorbonne Joint Declaration. (1998). Joint declaration on harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

Stromquist, N.P. & Monkman, K. (2000). Defining Globalization and Assessing Its Implications on Knowledge and Education. In Stromquist, N.P. & Monkman, K. *Globalization and Education* (pp. 3-26).

Study in Europe. (2016). *Compare Tuition Fees Schemes in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://www.studyineurope.eu/tuition-fees> (2016).

Study in Europe. (2012). *Schengen Visa*. Retrieved from <http://www.studyineurope.eu/schengen-visa/all-pages> (2012).

Sursock, A. and Smidt, H. (2010). Trends 2010: A decade of change in European Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.eua.be/eua-work-and-policy-area/building-the-european-higher-education-area.aspx> (2011).

Teichler, U. (2009). Internationalisation of higher education: European experiences. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.*, Vol. 10, 96-106.

The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999. (1999). Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2011).

The Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association (EMA). (2011). *Erasmus Mundus*. Retrieved from <http://www.em-a.eu/> (2011).

The White House. (2017). *Executive Order: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/01/25/executive-order-border-security-and-immigration-enforcement-improvements> (2017).

United States Census Bureau. (2012). Average Total Price of Attendance of Undergraduate Education. *The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/education/higher_education_finances_fees_and_staff.html (2012).

University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). (2017). *UCLA Global*. Retrieved from <http://global.ucla.edu/global/home> (2017).

University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). (2017). *UCLA International Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.international.ucla.edu/institute/about> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2012). *Global University Summit*. Retrieved from <http://engagement.illinois.edu/globalsummit2012/> (2012).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2016). *Division of Management Information: UIUC Student Enrollment*. Retrieved from <http://dmi.illinois.edu/stuenr/index.htm> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2017). *European Union Center (EUC)*. Retrieved from <http://europe.illinois.edu/> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2017). *Graduate College: Minimum Admission Requirements by Country*. Retrieved from <http://www.grad.illinois.edu/admissions/countries> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2017). *Graduate College: Office of External Fellowships*. Retrieved from <http://www.grad.illinois.edu/extfellowships> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2017). *Illinois International*. Retrieved from <http://international.illinois.edu/index.html> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2017). *MOOCs @ Illinois*. Retrieved from <http://moocs.illinois.edu/data/> (2017).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Illinois). (2017). *The Illinois Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from <https://strategicplan.illinois.edu/goals.html> (2017).

University of Southern California (USC). (1993). *The Role and Mission of the University of Southern California*. Retrieved from https://about.usc.edu/files/2011/07/USCRole_and_Mission_Statement_1993.pdf (2012).

University of Southern California (USC). (2004). *USC's Plan for Increasing Academic Excellence: Building Strategic Capabilities for the University of the 21st Century*. Retrieved from https://about.usc.edu/files/2011/07/StrategicPln_12_10_04.pdf (2012).

University of Southern California (USC). (2017). *USC Global*. Retrieved from <https://global.usc.edu/> (2017).

University of Southern California (USC). (2017). Graduate Admissions. *Country Requirements*. Retrieved from <http://gradadm.usc.edu/lightboxes/international-students-country-requirements/> (2017).

University of Washington (Washington University). (2017). *International Student Services*. Retrieved from <http://iss.washington.edu/> (2017).

University of Washington (Washington University). (2017). *Office of Global Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.washington.edu/globalaffairs/what-we-do/> (2017).

University of Washington (Washington University). (2017). *UW Graduate School: International Applicant Information*. Retrieved from <http://grad.uw.edu/admissions/understanding-the-application-process/international-applicant-faqs/> (2017).

University of Washington (Washington University). (2017). *UW Strategic Planning*. Retrieved from <http://www.washington.edu/strategicplanning/> (2017).

University of Washington (Washington University). (2017). *Vision & Values*. Retrieved from <http://www.washington.edu/about/visionvalues/> (2017).

van der Wende, M. (2009). *European Responses to Global Competitiveness in Higher Education*. Center for Studies in Higher Education: University of California, Berkeley. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.7.09.

Wise, P. (2012). Engaging the World. *Chancellor's Blog*. Retrieved from <http://illinois.edu/blog/view/1109/72859?count=1&ACTION=DIALOG> (2012).

Wurth, J. (2017). UI plan: 93,646 students by 2021. *The News-Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.news-gazette.com/news/local/2017-01-18/ui-plan-93646-students-2021.html> (2017).

Yerevan Communiqué. (2015). Yerevan Communiqué. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/> (2016).

Zolfaghari, A., Sabran, M.S., & Zolfaghari, A. (2009). Internationalization of higher education: Challenges, strategies, policies, and programs. *US-China Education Review*, Vol. 6 (No. 5), 1-9.

Appendix A: Questionnaire and Interview Protocols

Questionnaire Recruitment Email 1 with Consent and Questionnaire Questions

Dear Administrator/Faculty:

I am writing to ask you to complete a short 12-question questionnaire regarding international student recruitment trends and policies at your institution. As the Director of Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services for the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, I'm hopeful this information will be helpful to our institution as we strategize regarding international recruitment.

The primary use of this questionnaire data will be for my personal doctoral dissertation that I am currently working on in the Education Policy Organization and Leadership program at Illinois. My dissertation is researching how the Bologna Declaration in Europe is impacting the United States' leadership status in the globalized higher education market. This research is under the direction of Dr. Cameron McCarthy. For any questions regarding this questionnaire, you may contact me at 217-377-1717 or bspark@illinois.edu, or Dr. McCarthy at 217-244-4953 or cmccart1@illinois.edu.

By completing this questionnaire, you are providing consent for your responses to be published within my dissertation; however, your name and institutional affiliation responses will be kept confidential. If you wish to allow for your name and institutional affiliation to be published with your responses, the 11th question of this questionnaire allows you to provide consent to sharing this information. Participation in this questionnaire is completely voluntary and you may skip any questions you prefer not to answer.

When this research is discussed or published, no one will know that you were in the study unless you specifically consent to allow your name to be linked to your questionnaire responses. However, laws and university rules might require us to disclose information about you. For example, if required by laws or University Policy, study information which identifies you may be seen or copied by the following people or groups: a) The university committee and office that reviews and approves research studies, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Office for Protection of Research Subjects; and b) University and state auditors, and Departments of the university responsible for oversight of research. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or if you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, including questions, concerns, complaints, or to offer input, you may call the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at 217-333-2670 or e-mail OPRS at irb@illinois.edu

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Spark
Director of Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services, Graduate College
PhD Candidate, Education Policy Organization and Leadership Department
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Questionnaire Questions

1. How would you rate your awareness of the Bologna Declaration?
1 = Very Low 2 = Low 3 = Moderate 4 = High 5 = Very High
2. How would you rate your institution's awareness of the Bologna Declaration?
1 = Very Low 2 = Low 3 = Moderate 4 = High 5 = Very High
3. How would you rate your level of concern that international applicants are choosing Europe over the United States for higher education?
1 = Very Low 2 = Low 3 = Moderate 4 = High 5 = Very High
4. Do you accept three-year Bologna-compliant bachelor degrees for graduate admission?
Yes, we admit them on full status Yes, we admit them on probationary status No
5. Have you experienced a decline in applicants from Europe?
Yes, a significant decrease Yes, a moderate decrease No
6. Have you experienced a decline in international student enrollments?
Yes, a significant decrease Yes, a moderate decrease No
7. Have you experienced a decline in international exchange agreements?
Yes, a significant decrease Yes, a moderate decrease No
8. Are you aware of international applicants choosing schools in Europe over the United States?
Yes, a significant decrease Yes, a moderate decrease No
9. How would you describe the effects of the Bologna Declaration on your institution?
Open-ended question
10. For what reasons are you concerned that international applicants may choose to study in Europe rather than the United States?
Open-ended question
11. Do you consent to having your name and institutional affiliation published within my doctoral dissertation, as well as shared with the Graduate College at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign?
Yes No

Participant Name: _____
Title: _____
Institution: _____
12. Are you willing to participate in a 30 minute phone interview to further discuss the Bologna Declaration and its impacts on the global competition market for international students?
Yes No

Questionnaire Recruitment Follow Up Email

Dear Administrator/Faculty:

I wanted to follow-up with you regarding the below email sent on (date). I am hopeful that you may be able to complete this short questionnaire. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or its purpose, I would be more than happy to talk with you further and can be reached at 217-377-1717 or bspark@illinois.edu.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Spark
Director of Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services, Graduate College
PhD Candidate, Education Policy Organization and Leadership Department
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Questionnaire Received Thank You Email

Dear Administrator/Faculty:

Thank you for completing the questionnaire regarding the Bologna Declaration and international student recruitment. I greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in this project!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Spark

Director of Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services, Graduate College

PhD Candidate, Education Policy Organization and Leadership Department

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Interview Consent Form Email

Dear Administrator/Faculty:

Thank you for completing the questionnaire regarding the Bologna Declaration and international student recruitment, and for agreeing to participate in an interview to further discuss these topics. I have attached a consent form that I need you to complete and then we can schedule the phone interview. If you could please sign the consent form, scan, and email back to me, I would greatly appreciate it!

I greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in this project!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Spark

Director of Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services, Graduate College
PhD Candidate, Education Policy Organization and Leadership Department
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Interview Consent Form

Date

Dear Administrator/Faculty:

Thank you for completing the questionnaire regarding the Bologna Declaration and international student recruitment, and for agreeing to participate in an interview to further discuss these topics. The purpose of my research is to understand how the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the United States can learn from the European Bologna Declaration, a major higher education reform, in terms of competition for international students. The ultimate goal will be to develop strategies for the United States, and more specifically for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, to remain competitive and increase its competitiveness in the international student market for higher education.

In the interview, I would like to talk with you about your perspectives and experiences with international student recruitment and enrollment trends, policies, and strategies. With your permission, I would like to audiotape the interview. I will use the audiotape only to make sure that I have a complete and accurate record of our conversation. Then, I will erase it. Your responses may be published within my dissertation; however, your name and institutional affiliation will be kept confidential. If you wish to allow for your name and institutional affiliation to be published, you may indicate this permission below.

I expect the interview to take approximately 30 minutes, and I anticipate no risks to participating in this research other than what might be experienced in normal life. Your perspectives and insights will contribute in valuable ways to our work. But, clearly, your participation in this interview is wholly voluntary.

When this research is discussed or published, no one will know that you were in the study unless you unless you specifically consent below to publish/present your name with your interview responses. However, laws and university rules might require us to disclose information about you. For example, if required by laws or University Policy, study information which identifies you may be seen or copied by the following people or groups: a) The university committee and office that reviews and approves research studies, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Office for Protection of Research Subjects; and b) University and state auditors, and Departments of the university responsible for oversight of research.

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or if you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, including questions, concerns, complaints, or to offer input, you may call the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at 217-333-2670 or e-mail OPRS at irb@illinois.edu

If you have any questions, you may contact me at bspark@illinois.edu, or my dissertation advisor, Dr. Cameron McCarthy, at cmccart1@illinois.edu. For questions about rights as a participant in research involving human subjects, you may contact the University of Illinois

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office (217) 333-2670, irb@illinois.edu. You are welcome to call collect if you identify yourself as a research participant.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Spark
Director of Admissions, Registration, and Enrollment Services, Graduate College
PhD Candidate, Education Policy Organization and Leadership Department
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

I have read and understood this consent letter and voluntarily agree to participate in this interview.

Print Name: _____ Date: _____

Your Signature: _____

Permission to audio-tape granted. yes no

Permission granted to publish respondent's name and institution affiliation. yes no

Institutional Interview Questions

1. From what other nations or higher education areas have you seen an increase in competition for international students?
 - a. What strategies has your institution implemented to respond to this increased global competition for international students?
 - b. More specifically, what strategies has your institution implemented to respond to the Bologna Declaration?
2. Do you think the U.S. or Europe is doing a better job with international student recruitment?
 - a. Why?
 - b. What lessons do you think the U.S. could learn from Europe's successes with the Bologna Declaration?
3. Based on your experience working with international students at U.S. institutions, what factors do you believe negatively impact U.S. institutions' ability to recruit international students?
 - a. What factors do you believe positively impact U. S. institutions' ability to recruit international students?
4. Do you believe the U.S. government should take a more active role in encouraging the recruitment of international students?
 - a. Why or why not?
5. Do you have any other thoughts that you would like to share on the increase in global competition for international students?
 - a. Do you have any other thoughts that you would like to share on the impact of the Bologna Declaration on the U.S.' ability to recruit international students?

Appendix B: List of Bologna Declaration Members

- Albania
- Andorra
- Armenia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Belarus
- Belgium - Flemish Community
- Belgium - French Community
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- European Commission
- Finland
- France
- Georgia
- Germany
- Greece
- Holy See
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Italy
- Kazakhstan