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The Changing Landscape of International Partnerships

Susan Buck Sutton, Senior Advisor for Internationalization, Bryn Mawr College

Daniel Obst, Deputy Vice President of International Partnerships, Institute of International Education

This is a dynamic moment for international academic partnerships, a time of renewed vitality and broadened scope. For many colleges and universities, such partnerships are no longer simply one tactic of internationalization, among many, but rather a core, driving philosophy. Institutions are rethinking their reasons for pursuing international partnerships and the processes by which they form them. The result is a fascinating, constantly changing landscape of new partnership forms, policies, and procedures.

The forces impelling this embrace of international partnership can be grouped into two overarching themes: 1) growing recognition that academic internationalization is as much a process of outward engagement as internal restructuring, and 2) the increasing need for academic institutions to position themselves within emerging global systems of higher education. The first theme reflects a view of student learning as advanced by bringing multiple voices into the classroom and curriculum; cutting-edge scholarship as advanced by collaboration among the best minds no matter where these are located; and community engagement as having global dimensions. The second theme revolves around what Jane Knight (2008) accurately describes as the now tumultuous global arena of higher education, with its jumble of confusing, often conflicting trends, including global rankings, new patterns of student mobility, the increasing reach of distance education, the emergence of regional networks and education hubs, financial restructuring, international patterns of brain drain and gain, and the dawning understanding that internationalization can have negative as well as positive consequences (see also Egron-Polak and Hudson 2010).

The first of these two themes argues unequivocally for greater and more creative use of international partnerships by institutions of higher learning. The second theme has evoked a range of responses, including some that pit institutions, nations, and organizations against each other for status and market share. Other responses to the second theme, however, take a more collaborative direction and give added impetus to international partnership formation.

The more collaborative response to the second theme posits that colleges and universities in different nations have much to gain from each other, not only in terms of their long-standing goals of internationalization but also in terms of institutional positioning on a global stage. International collaboration brings international recognition to those thus engaged and sets the stage for further international work and outreach. Within the emerging global systems of higher education, international academic partnerships are thus seen to convey what Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1994), referring to international business, has labeled “collaborative advantage”; that is, the locally-knowledgeable partners, significant resources, transformative dialogues, and unexpected opportunities that accrue to institutions skilled at developing and sustaining effective international collaborations.

In short, international academic collaborations reflect a variety of motivations. They also take a variety of forms. This volume focuses on just one of these: partnerships among a pair or small set of institutions of higher learning. Networks, consortia, associations, and partnerships with other kinds of organizations, businesses, and local communities parallel and sometimes overlap such one-on-one partnerships among
colleges and universities, but are beyond the scope of this discussion (see Stockley and de Wit 2010 for an introduction to these others). We focus instead on formal cooperative agreements between two (or sometimes several) colleges and universities located in different nations (see Kinser & Green 2009 for basic definitions of partnerships).

More specifically, this volume attempts to capture the current dynamism and range of what is happening with international partnership development among colleges and universities. International academic partnerships are a work in progress, a conversation that needs many voices and points of entry. Different institutions are exploring the potential of international partnerships in different ways. They are also confronting the many challenges that make such work daunting. There is value in compiling and learning from their varied experiences, and the chapters that follow provide just such a panorama. This volume elaborates the U.S. experience, in its many forms, but entries from the U.K., France, India, and Ethiopia clearly indicate that what is happening in the U.S. is not unique. The institutional types covered in the volume range from HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) to community colleges to research universities, and the academic fields are as diverse as engineering, business, education, health, and liberal arts. The resulting image is a complex, multifaceted, and dynamic landscape of new ideas and bold moves.

What Partnerships Are Being Asked to Do

A conclusion that quickly emerges from scanning this landscape is that international academic partnerships are being asked to do more than has been the case in the past. Twenty years ago partnerships were almost exclusively about student exchange, with only the occasional example of collaborative research or cooperative capacity-building or community development (Klasek 1992). While exchange partnerships continue strong, their goals have multiplied, their geographical span has widened, and—most importantly—they have been supplemented with other forms.

The partnerships documented in this volume pursue goals as varied as:

- Student learning, as global citizens and as future members of a global workforce
- Curriculum building and course enhancement
- Providing international learning experiences even for students who do not study abroad and even in disciplines that have historically had few such opportunities
- Developing the international capacity of faculty and staff
- Advancing research by connecting institutions and scholars with those who have similar strengths and interests
- Connecting to key parts of the world
- Supporting and enhancing the international ties and interests of the surrounding community
- Tackling pressing global issues of health, education, economic development, environment, energy, conflict, inequality, human rights, and social justice
- Promoting the overall mission of the institution, giving it distinctive qualities, and enhancing its international positioning and reputation
- Generating revenue through tuition and grants
- General institutional capacity-building
- Pursuit of public diplomacy and other national priorities
- Shaping the global system of higher education in beneficial ways

These partnerships also employ a wide range of methods and strategies to achieve their goals. Some develop short-term, deeply-embedded study abroad programs that attract a wider range of students than
those who study overseas for the whole year (e.g., Asgary & Thamhain). Some use international faculty, laboratories, and internships to introduce international learning to curricula in the professions and STEM fields (e.g., Haller & Groll, Valentine et al., Louime et al., Owusu-Ofori & Mayes). Dual degrees and joint educational programs have emerged that foster blended cohorts of students from different nations (e.g., Lavakare; Lacy & Wade, Foster & Jones, Harrell & Hinckley). Information technology and social media are used to create globally interactive classrooms (e.g., Haller & Groll, Chia et al., Valentine et al., Tedeschi et al., Harrell & Hinckley). International research teams compare perspectives and pool resources in exploring questions of mutual interest (Kuchinke, Lacy & Wade, Harrell & Hinckley), while similar teams collaborate on community development and institutional capacity building, such as spreading the community college system (Spangler & Tyler) and introducing innovative modes of English language instruction (Shull). (See Appendix A for a broad list of the many kinds of activities now undertaken by international partnerships.)

Transaction and Transformation

Whatever their goals and forms, the partnerships discussed in this volume invoke the power of collaboration and an ethos of mutuality. There is something to be gained by working together that cannot be accomplished by either institution alone. The pursuit of mutual benefit, in which all partners gain from the engagement, is a near universal theme of these chapters. Some also articulate an additional benefit: they also see mutuality as the mutual construction of goals and projects, the changes in thinking that result, and the benefits that occur as these collective efforts move forward with a momentum of their own (e.g., Cunningham et al; Carbonell).

This range of meaning for mutuality resonates with what can be seen as two poles of collaboration. Borrowing terminology from the field of service learning (Enos & Morton 2003), there appears to be a continuum of international academic partnerships from what might be called “transactional” to what might be called “transformational” (Sutton 2010, Sutton, Egginton & Favela Forthcoming). Partnerships focused exclusively on student exchange are at the transactional end because students are traded in a manner that resembles transactions in a marketplace. The individuals who travel from one institution to another are changed as a result of the partnership, but the institutions themselves remain largely separate and unaffected. Transformational collaborations, in contrast, are those that change or transform entire departments, offices, and institutions, through the generation of common goals, projects, and products. Both sides emerge from the relationship somewhat altered. Transformational partnerships combine resources and view linkages as sources of institutional growth and collaborative learning. They often produce new initiatives that go far beyond what was originally planned.

Whether expressly articulated or not, it is clear that the partnerships discussed here demonstrate a movement toward the transformational side of this continuum. As already stated, more is expected of academic partnerships than in the past. There is increasing confidence that international collaboration—with carefully selected and strategic partners—can be an important element of institutional growth. What happens outside institutions can change what happens within them. Resources can be shared or created. Joint projects can take institutions to new places. The partnership itself becomes a kind of bi-national academic unit. And it is in this manner that transformative, strongly committed, strategic partnerships can be seen as important actors in the emerging global system of higher education.
Developing an Institutional Approach to Partnerships

The desire to form more strategic international partnerships has led many colleges and universities to develop overall partnership plans and policies. These documents guide the establishment of new partnerships and reposition partnerships within institutional goals and mission. They move colleges and universities from “incidental” collaborations to “intentional” ones (Barnes) and produce “real” agreements rather than “feel good” ones (Aw & Dunsmore).

Several recent discussions (especially Van de Water, Green & Cook 2008, Kinser & Green 2009), as well as the contributions to this volume make clear that developing an institutional partnership program is a multipronged, long-term project encompassing at least the following elements:

- Taking stock of existing affiliations (creating a registry, assessing levels of activity, identifying gaps)
- Establishing a partnership approval process (developing application procedures and criteria for approval, identifying lines of decision-making)
- Articulating overall partnership goals and strategies (setting targets for number, types, and location of partnerships, activities they will pursue, impact they are expected to have, and the resources, opportunities, and challenges involved)
- Spreading a culture of partnership (promoting the value of partnerships, connecting to institutional and departmental mission, developing faculty capacity and supporting faculty in becoming involved)
- Developing policies, procedures, and organizational structures for managing partnerships (establishing steering committees, hiring staff, articulating principles for participating, tackling procedural roadblocks)
- Providing baseline financial and other support (equivalent to what is provided for other key institutional functions, such as personnel, IT, and travel funds)
- Developing effective practices for initiating partnerships (requiring multiple conversations, engagement of relevant decision-makers, and patience to let relationships and understandings mature)
- Drafting well-crafted Memoranda of Understanding and Implementation Plans (the first setting general parameters of the partnership and the second identifying specific activities, the financial and other responsibilities of each institution, outcomes expected, and when and how these will be assessed; see Appendix B)
- Pursuing effective practices for sustaining partnerships over time (providing the organization, support, and leadership to insure valued partnerships endure even when their original proposers are no longer active in them)
- Establishing procedures for reviewing, revising, and/or terminating partnerships (including periodic assessment of activity levels and quality, number of students and faculty involved, effectiveness of the working relationship, cost, and impact)

Several of the chapters in this volume provide cogent discussions of how their institutions developed partnership plans, all closely connected to institutional mission and goals. Radwan’s university, for example, found it useful to identify three tiers of partnership, each meriting a different approach. The University of Nottingham decided to focus on international teaching partnerships (Foster & Jones). Step one for Ethiopian institutions may well be identifying what they have to offer partners, since they are more used to seeing themselves as less developed than their international counterparts (Francisconi). Harrell & Hinckley give a particularly illuminating account of modifying their institution’s original plan as a result of on-the-ground experiences.

**Challenges To Be Met**

No matter how good the plan may be, international partnership work is not without its challenges, and many of these chapters take up this point as well. Many of these difficulties derive from the relative newness of such collaborations, at least in the robust multi-faceted form presented in this volume. Administrators, fiscal officers, and faculty need to be convinced of the value of this new form, avenues of support must be identified, and procedural and structural roadblocks that limit what can be done overseas must be addressed (Lavakare, Kuchinke, Asgary & Thamhain, Usuwu-Ofori & Mayes). International work has to earn its place alongside other priorities with regard to institutional mission (Valentine et al.). Policies that come from older, more inward-looking administrative forms need to be rethought (Delisle).

Other challenges reflect the turbulent changes occurring in higher education in general: from funding difficulties to on-line delivery of degrees, branch campuses, the possible rise of a small set of dominant global universities, significant differences in educational resources across nations, and political unrest both within and among nations (Altbach & Knight 2010, Knight 2008, Wildavsky 2010). These can create a tension between institutional advancement and collaborative advancement in international partnerships (Haller & Groll). Issues of brain-drain and gain, of educational and economic inequalities between the Global North and Global South can also strain partnership goals of reciprocity (Francisconi).

Other chapters in this volume discuss the challenges involved in engaging U.S. students, many of whom lack fluency beyond English, find the cost of studying abroad too high, and may be majoring in disciplines not historically engaged in international work (Asgary & Thamhain, Valentine et al., Baker). International partnerships that involve student exchange are often unbalanced, with fewer U.S. students going out than their counterparts coming in (Klahr, Asgary & Thamhain).

Finally, these chapters discuss the challenges of meshing institutional policies, procedures, and accepted business practices across nations, as well as different educational cultures and accreditation systems (Baker, Shull, Harrell & Hinckley). In a similar vein, many a partnership has foundered on false assumptions that both sides understood the meaning of partnership in the same way, and overly ambitious but unrealistic proposals (Harrell & Hinckley).

**Developing and Sustaining a Partnership**

What these chapters provide are stories of partnerships that have overcome these and other challenges. In so doing, they identify factors that have proven effective both for selecting partners at the outset and sustaining collaboration in the long run. Klahr, Barnes, Louime et al., Delisle, and Aw & Dunsmore devote
particular attention to partnership selection, assessing what makes a good institutional match, what must be learned about potential partners in order to evaluate the match, the kinds of candid conversation and careful listening that must occur, and the need to make sure that institutions have the same understanding of what partnerships mean in general and what the specific one being proposed might achieve. Cunningham and her colleagues see this as a dialogical process in which positions and understandings are modified as conversation proceeds. Relevant decision-makers must be involved, and faculty champions identified and supported (Lacy & Wade, Kuchinke). Patience, flexibility, and attention to building relationships, trust, and rapport are critical (Shepherd, Baker). So is identifying early achievable projects that can move the partnership forward (Tedeschi, Lavakare).

These chapters also identify factors that distinguish long-lived and productive collaborations from those that fade more quickly. (See Duval 2009, Hartle 2008, Kellogg 2009, Chan 2004, Prichard 1996, Kinser & Green 2009, Wiley 2006, de Wit 2004, Van Ginkel 1996, Van De Water, Green & Koch 2008, Sutton, Egginton & Favela Forthcoming for general discussions of what builds strong partnerships.) In all such cases, mutual benefit must be achieved, and there must be a balance of success in partnership projects (even if some fail). Operating with integrity, trust, and genuine reciprocity is essential, as is developing a system that fosters frequent, candid, open-ended communication that attends to cultural, linguistic, and institutional differences (Baker, Shepherd). Difficulties and crises must be handled openly and with a sense that the institutions are committed to each other for the long-run (Delisle, Baker, Lacy & Wade). Adaptability, flexibility, and willingness to change course keep collaboration active and real (Owusu-Ofori & Mayes, Harrell & Hinckley). All relevant constituencies should be engaged on both sides and structures put into place to manage the partnership and make key decisions (Carbonell, Radwan, Asgary & Thamhain, Foster & Jones, Barnes).

Long-lived partnerships also develop an ethos that the partnership is as important as any particular sub-project or individual (Shull) and develop activities that build relationships across participants while also bringing in newcomers (Cunningham et al., Harrell & Hinckley, Tedeschi et al., Brustein & Miller). They become integrated with institutional mission and core curricula (Louime et al., Klahr, Valentine et al., Owusu-Ofori & Mayes) and are also advanced when they broaden their reach to connect to local communities and businesses (Louime et al., Asgary & Thamhain, Brustein & Miller, Harrell & Hinckley). And they require regular assessment and reworking (Louime et al., Baker, Carbonell, Radwan; Tedeschi et al., Harrell & Hinckley).

Finally, long-lived partnerships are given base-line support by their institutions to keep them moving forward, but simultaneously generate new resources and external funding. Seed monies for faculty engagement, staffing to manage the partnership, programs to orient newcomers and provide the needed cultural background are all very useful (Klahr, Barnes, Kuchinke, Radwan, Foster & Jones, Haller & Groll, Lacy & Wade). The Ohio State University has even moved to opening international offices in key countries to manage their partnerships on the ground (Brustein & Miller). At the same time, successful partnerships bring new resources both to their constituent institutions and to the partnership as a whole through external grants, resource-sharing, and tuition generation (Shepherd, Haller & Groll, Harrell & Hinckley).**

**The Era of International Educational Partnerships**

The challenges faced in constructing and sustaining international academic partnerships could, of course, ultimately prove stronger than the forces favoring such collaborations. At the present moment, however, such affiliations are experiencing a tremendous growth and elaboration, what might even be called a flowering. The forms are many and the goals ambitious. A sense that institutions can do more together than they can do alone is taking hold, coupled with the realization that learning, research, institution-
building, and community engagement are now global endeavors. International partnerships are playing an important role in the global systems of higher education that are now emerging, operating as bi- or multinational nodes within these systems.

It is for such reasons that several governments and organizations have recently developed programs that support the establishment of international academic partnerships. For example in the United States, the U.S. Department of Education has for many years provided funding for innovative academic linkages or small consortia through programs such as the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program, the European Union-United States Atlantis Program, the Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education, and the U.S.-Russia Program. In 2010, the U.S. Embassy in Iraq launched a multimillion-dollar University Linkages Program that will fund partnerships between five Iraqi universities and five U.S. universities, with a focus on curriculum review and reform, career center development and student and faculty exchanges. In June 2011, India’s Minister of External Affairs, Shri S.M. Krishna, and the U.S. Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton, announced the launch of the Obama-Singh 21st Century Knowledge Initiative, which aims to strengthen academic collaboration between U.S. and Indian higher education institutions by providing U.S.-India Institutional Partnership Grants. And the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs provided grant funding to the Institute of International Education to launch the U.S.-Indonesia Partnership Program for Study Abroad Capacity, an initiative that brings together six U.S. and six Indonesian institutions. Francisconi’s chapter describes a U.S. Embassy in Ethiopia-sponsored workshop and seed grant competition to promote academic partnerships between U.S. and Ethiopian institutions.

Other governments and private foundations and organizations have also recently launched initiatives to support international linkages. The chapters by Delisle and Shepherd recount such efforts in France and the UK, respectively. Appendix C describes IIE’s Center for International Partnerships in Higher Education, which assists institutions in developing or expending international partnerships through initiatives such as the International Academic Partnership Program. These initiatives may well be harbingers of more to come.

As demonstrated by the chapters in this volume, we have entered an era of international collaboration among colleges and universities. The partnerships thus formed enhance, even transform, the institutions that engage in them, produce enduring insights and relationships across national boundaries, and are creating a globally collaborative conversation on the forms and future of higher education that is likely to continue well into the future.
In their most simple state, academic partnerships are defined as “cooperative agreements between a higher education institution and another distinct organization” (Kinser and Green 2009 The Power of Partnerships). In recent years, however, colleges and universities worldwide have taken a more holistic approach. Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, Office of International Affairs defines this new generation of strategic partnerships as “bi-national (or multinational) communities of higher education in which there is a constant flow of people, ideas, and projects back and forth, as well as the development of new projects and common goals.” When contemplating an international partnership, consider how the types below might fit into your partnership strategy. What are the pluses and minuses of each partnership type and how might each be a short or long term goal.

**Collaborative Teaching:** This low-cost partnership component is often fostered by technology through virtual classrooms, videoconferences, email exchanges, and web-based platforms. Consider working with a partner institution to develop new course modules. Collaborative teaching is also an effective way to incorporate guest faculty in the classroom and is a springboard for other collaborative efforts.

*Example:* Champlain College in Vermont seeks to initiate meaningful global dialogue between its students and their counterparts at 14 colleges around the world though it’s Global Modules program. Typically, Global Modules begin with students in both countries reading a common text, and participating in online discussions facilitated by the instructors on both campuses. Students then join together in virtual groups composed of U.S. and international students and complete a collaborative assignment. For more information, visit [www.globalmodules.net](http://www.globalmodules.net).

**Consortia:** A group of two or more institutions that work together and pool resources in order to achieve a common goal. Consortia are a great way to broaden a partnership and take advantage of institutions with complementary strengths. Consider including institutions in a third country as well as domestic options.

*Example:* U.S.–Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program: The Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), in collaboration with the Brazilian Ministry of Education’s CAPES foundation, funded 51 U.S.-Brazil consortia through the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program. These consortia are comprised of at least two U.S. institutions and two Brazilian institutions and are funded for up to four years. Find details of these programs, which range from engineering to education, at: [http://fipsedatabase.ed.gov](http://fipsedatabase.ed.gov)

**Faculty Exchange:** Faculty exchanges are excellent catalysts for deeper partnerships and federally-funded programs such as the Fulbright Scholar Program facilitate these opportunities for you. Guest faculty could instruct whole courses or components of whole courses. Consider establishing a pre-departure training for faculty before they go overseas and educate them on how to further the institution’s partnership goals. Fulbright Scholar Program: [www.cies.org/us_scholars](http://www.cies.org/us_scholars).
**Faculty-led Study Abroad Programs:** Faculty-led study abroad programs are an excellent starting point for future collaborations. They do not require a large financial commitment and generate enthusiasm on both campuses. They also eliminate the difficult discussions regarding credit transfer. Faculty-led programs also come in myriad formats, enabling you to be creative and experiment.

*Example:* In the summer of 2011, Lehigh University developed the “Democratic Society and Religious Pluralism” program, co-created by the University of Michigan, and the University of Gadjah Mada (Indonesia). A faculty member from each of the three universities guided a group of eight undergraduate students from each school on a five-week study abroad trip in both Indonesia and the U.S. For more information, visit: [http://ur.umich.edu/1011/Aug15_11/2534-u-m-partnership-to](http://ur.umich.edu/1011/Aug15_11/2534-u-m-partnership-to).

**International Dual/Double Degree Programs:** Study programs collaboratively offered by two (or more) higher education institutions located in different countries. They typically feature a jointly developed and integrated curriculum and agreed-on credit recognition and students study at the two (or more) partnering higher education institutions (i.e., 1 home institution + 1 institution abroad). Upon completion students receive degree certificates issued separately by each of the institutions involved in the program. (These programs generally use the terminology 2+2 or 1+2+1.)

*Example:* As part of the dual degree master’s program between Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) and L'Institut d'études politiques (IEP) de Paris (Sciences Po), students spend the first year in Paris at Sciences Po, acquiring core skills and a solid multidisciplinary base in a French educational context; and their second year in New York at SIPA, where they gain in-depth specialization. After two years, students earn both SIPA’s MIA and Sciences Po's master’s degree. For more information, visit: [www.sipa.columbia.edu/academics/degree_programs/dual_degree/mia_programs/sipa_sciences_po.html](http://www.sipa.columbia.edu/academics/degree_programs/dual_degree/mia_programs/sipa_sciences_po.html)

**International Joint Degree Programs:** Study programs collaboratively offered by two (or more) higher education institutions located in different countries. They typically feature a jointly developed and integrated curriculum and agreed-on credit recognition. Students typically study at the two (or more) partnering higher education institutions (i.e., 1 home institution + 1 institution abroad). Upon completion, students are awarded a single degree certificate issued and signed jointly by all institutions involved in the program. Joint degree programs are one of the most difficult partnership type to achieve and result after years of cooperation.

*Example:* An alliance between Cornell University's School of Hotel Administration and the Nanyang Technological University (NTU)'s Nanyang Business School (NBS). Students commence the 12-month master’s program at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. After a half semester, they travel to Cornell University in Ithaca, NY, for the next one-and-a-half semesters. The final semester takes place back in Singapore. Upon completion, students receive one Master of Management in Hospitality from both universities. [www.cni.ntu.edu.sg](http://www.cni.ntu.edu.sg).

**International Service Learning:** International service learning combines academic or classroom study with meaningful community service overseas. These projects aim to deepen the learning experience, teach civic
responsibility, and engage students in the international community. International service learning is often incorporated in study abroad programing (short or long term) and is often paired with pre- and post-classroom work.

**Internship Programs:** Colleges and universities often have key links to the business community and can facilitate internship experiences. What companies from your country do business in the U.S. and vice versa? Where are their headquarters located and which colleges and universities are nearby? Could you facilitate internship experiences for international students in your community?

**Joint Faculty Research:** Joint faculty research programs can occur isolated from coordinated campus internationalization, but better serves the institution when pursued on a long-term, institutional level by both institutions working in partnership. IIE recommends conducting an inventory to find out what types joint research are taking place between your faculty and counterparts in the target country. Meet with these faculty and brainstorm ways to expand the programs. For example, might their research colleague put you in touch with counterparts in other academic department? Could a faculty member with a joint research project lead a study abroad program or plan a conference on your campus?

**Jointly-Sponsored Events:** Simple events such as jointly-sponsored publications, conferences, workshops, meet and greets over video conference, lectures, performances, book clubs, film series, and of course site visits, have proved to be excellent catalyst for partnerships. Jump on any opportunity for the faculty, staff and students to interact.

**Sandwich Programs:** In a sandwich program, students begin their studies at their home institution for a certain amount of time, travel to a host institution to continue their studies, and then return to the home institution to finish their degree and graduate.

*Example:* Since 2004, George Mason University has been involved in a 1+2+1 program with a number of Chinese higher education institutions. Students from the U.S and China complete one year at the home institution, two years at the host institution, and one year back at the home institution. Upon completion, the student is granted a diploma from both the home and host institutions. For more information, please visit: [http://china121.gmu.edu](http://china121.gmu.edu).

**Sharing of Resources:** Sharing laboratory equipment, library resources, art collections, curriculums, etc. are simple ways to jump-start a partnership.

**Student Exchange:** One- or two-way movements of students for the short or long term is one of the most common partnership types. It also lends itself to creativity. In addition to taking courses, students could work in laboratories, teach languages, participate in internships or engage in service learning.
Intentionality in International Engagement:
Identifying Potential Strategic International Partnerships

by Tim Barnes

As with many public research universities across the United States and around the world, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign we are reexamining our efforts at international engagement. We have worked to more clearly articulate our goals and desired outcomes, more carefully consider our modes and models of collaborating with partner institutions abroad, and more creatively imagine the ways in which our efforts at international engagement can be thoroughly integrated into our core institutional missions. Such self-examination seems inevitable, and not without value, during these times of ever diminishing dollars in public funding for higher education. We are all seeking to do more with less, and to leverage any resources we may have to maximum advantage.

In fact, to suggest that we are “reexamining” our international engagement efforts may be somewhat disingenuous, as it implies that we as an institution previously had approached interactions with the world with some measure of deliberation and coordination. I would suggest that, to date, our university’s international engagement has been largely incidental, in that our activities have grown organically, based on the particular interests and efforts of individual faculty, research groups, or academic units. I suspect that we are not alone among our peer institutions in relying almost exclusively on this decentralized approach; nor are we alone in taking initial steps toward a more strategic, or intentional, approach to internationalization.

The incidental model of international engagement is obviously of great value—individual faculty, research groups, and academic departments are in the best position to identify international partnerships that can answer their immediate needs and enhance their particular research and educational activities. The result is a large number of highly specialized and often short-lived collaborations, of the sort aptly characterized by Susan Buck Sutton as “transactional” relationships, with institutions abroad. Yet, by its very nature, this incidental model all but precludes any sort of long-range, strategic planning for international engagement at the institutional level. Strategic international engagement, whatever the particular model employed, must rely on deliberation, coordinated implementation, and quantifiable assessment for its success. In short, it must be intentional, rather than incidental.

The emerging Strategic International Partnerships initiative at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is a first step toward such intentionality. We seek to identify peer institutions around the world that, for various reasons including geographic location, historic collaborations, and current synergies or complementarities in our research and educational priorities, offer particularly strong opportunities for institutional collaborations that are both broadly and deeply impactful. In conjunction with this identification process, we are working to develop administrative structures, budget forecasts, and funding models that can provide the necessary “start-up” support for developing new strategic partnerships, and gain support for these new partnerships from our central campus leadership.

Defining the “strategic” in strategic international partnerships

Having an ambitious, clearly articulated goal for this new model of strategic international partnership is a critical first step, akin to the vision statement that informs a good strategic plan. We concluded that strategic international partnerships should be distinguished from our traditional, focused partnerships based on five key criteria:

- **Breadth of impact.** Strategic international partnerships should be broadly impactful on two fronts. First, they should cross discipline, college, and department boundaries to involve faculty and
students at all levels, and from throughout the institution. Ideally, they should foster true interdisciplinarity in research and in learning. Second, they should involve activities directly related to all of the institution’s core missions (for example, research, education, engagement, economic development).

- **Depth of impact.** Strategic international partnerships should provide opportunities to move from simple to complex interactions between institutions. With regard to research, this might range from specific collaborative research projects, short-term exchanges of research personnel, and shared physical plant resources, to ongoing “laboratories without borders” and jointly-managed, offsite physical research facilities. Likewise, educational activities should run the gamut from simple reciprocal study abroad arrangements and short-term study abroad programming to 3+2 and sandwich programs, jointly taught courses, co-development of new curricula, and joint or dual degree programs.

- **Strong faculty support.** While some central coordination of activities in a strategic international partnership is necessary and desirable, there must be significant and ongoing interest among faculty across the campus if any meaningful collaboration is to develop. Identify key individual faculty at both partner institutions to spearhead the initial efforts and champion the partnership among their colleagues. Alumni of one institution who are working at the other can be strong advocates, particularly if they are alumni of Ph.D. programs, as the research relationships forged during their doctoral studies will often continue in their professional careers. However identified, these faculty coordinators and advocates should be recognized by the central campus administration for their efforts to promote the emerging strategic partnership.

- **Demonstrable mutual benefit.** Strategic international partnerships must offer ongoing mutual benefits to both institutions. They should add value to both institutions involved by increasing their capacity to do cutting edge research, providing unique educational opportunities for their students, opening new funding streams, leveraging existing and creating new corporate relations, and enhancing their brand names and recognition around the world. Such benefits need not be financial, or even tangible, but they should be measurable and demonstrable. As with any strategic planning exercise, metrics for success should be developed, along with baseline and future goal levels for these metrics. Some of these may include numbers of students and faculty directly participating in the partnership, increased student diversity and inclusion of demographic groups traditionally underserved in international education, numbers of joint grant proposals and funded joint research awards, co-authored publications in peer-reviewed journals or presentations at national and international scholarly conferences, and joint patent applications.

- **Sustainability.** Successful strategic international partnerships will evolve over time. The various collaborative activities undertaken should eventually be self-sustaining. Collaborative research should continue through external funding, ideally from sources that are available because of the partnership. Cooperative educational activities should be sustained by fees assessed to the participants, paired where possible with potential subsidies by government direct financial aid programs, student mobility grants, or foundation and donor scholarships. Initial investments by the central administrative leadership at the partner institutions should come in the form of seed funding to facilitate initial interactions between faculty and international education administrators at the partner institutions. This central financial support should scale down over the first five years or so, as the institutional relationship matures; it can then be shifted to support other emerging strategic partnerships.

**Identifying potential strategic partners**
Having established goals and expectations for this new model of strategic international partnership, we can look toward identifying partners. We can do this by taking two distinct but related inventories.

First, we should consider the various modes and models of international collaboration that have been employed across our campus. These various collaborative activities can be catalogued based on the core missions of the institution. Thus we consider the various types of collaborative research activities and faculty mobility programs; study abroad, student exchange, and cooperative education programs; outreach initiatives through institutional development, capacity building, and professional training programs, as well as community outreach activities of area studies centers; and corporate partnerships and relationships with strong international components. We identify activities and programs that have been sustained over time, and those that were short-lived, with an eye toward discerning the key factors in their long-term success or failure.

Next, we should review our current and recent past portfolio of international partnerships. Here we consider the various types of institutions with which we have partnered, the typical length and outcomes of these partnerships, the geographic distribution of the partner institutions, and the number of disciplines/departments, faculty, and students participating in collaborative activities within the partnerships. The goal of these reviews is a set of criteria to be used in identifying potential strategic partners. These criteria will vary from one institution to another, based on particular institutional strategic plans, core missions and values, and current priorities and foci. Characteristics of strong potential partners for strategic collaboration should align with the criteria proposed above, for defining a strategic partnership more generally. They may include:

- **Similar scope of activities.** Potential partners should be relative peer institutions, similarly focused or comprehensive in their research and educational programs, with at least some shared strengths, as well as some complementary strengths in particular disciplines.

- **Historical and existing connections.** A survey of past interactions between potential strategic partners will often reveal surprisingly long, if sometimes sporadic, relationships.

- **Mutual interest and commitment.** The central administrations of potential partners should be equally vested in developing a strategic partnership, and willing to allocate relatively equal amounts of human and financial resources to ensure the partnership’s success.

- **Compatible administrative structures.** The international offices at the partner institutions must be similarly responsive and proactive in advocating for the emerging strategic partnership.

- **Faculty connections.** Without significant faculty interest and support, the partnership has little chance of success. Initially, these connections can be fostered by holding joint seminars to bring groups of faculty together. Funding travel to enable 15 or 20 key faculty from each side to spend two or three days together, introducing one another to their research, can be fruitful.

- **Student interest.** The study abroad administrators at potential partner institutions should gauge the level of interest among their students in studying abroad at their particular locales.

- **Potential for consortial activities.** Strong candidates for potential strategic partnerships will often share other institutional partners in common, providing a facilitated path for developing consortia of institutions with shared collaborative activities. This can be particularly valuable today, when national and transnational government organizations (such as the EU Commission) have developed funding programs specifically aimed at supporting consortia of three or more institutions.

- **Potential for thematic focus.** In addition to considering the geographic distribution of a portfolio of strategic international partnerships, it may be useful to consider focusing particular strategic partnerships on specific themes. These themes should be multi-disciplinary and inclusive enough to maintain a breadth of activities, but they can often focus the attention of both students and faculty who otherwise might not naturally seek to engage with the partner.
• **Logistics and practical considerations.** Do the academic calendars of the potential partners correspond sufficiently? Are there sufficient language competencies among both students and faculty to make collaboration practical? Is the time difference between the locations of partner institutions conducive or prohibitive for synchronous distance learning/interactions? Is the difference in cost of living between the locations prohibitive for student mobility? Are there safety and risk management concerns?

**Conclusion**

Defining our concept of strategic international partnerships, and then identifying potential candidates for such partnerships, is central in moving toward intentionality in our international engagements. The specific definitions and identifying criteria can and should vary from institution to institution. The successful strategic partnership profile for a small, private, liberal arts college will look different from that of a large, public research university. But the end goals will likely be similar. We seek to build broad, deep, lasting relationships with true peer institutions around the world. We look for partnerships that infuse all aspects of our institutional cultures and inform all of our core missions and values. We strive for flexible, organic linkages that are responsive to the changing needs, priorities, and opportunities of both the partner institutions and the constituents they serve.

It is a commonplace among international education administrators to speak of the transformative nature of international experiences in the lives of our students and faculty. Thoughtful, deliberate, and strategic international partnerships are a means of scaling this transformation up to the level of the institution as a whole. The ideal of a truly transnational university, conducting research that addresses complex global problems and preparing students to be good global citizens and stewards, is within reach. Intentionality in institutional engagement can be a valuable means of attaining that lofty goal.
Twelve Principles for Successful Site Visits to Potential Partners

1. Start with an open mind, a willingness to learn something new, and the belief that you are entering into a dialogue not a lecture.

2. Learn and use the basic forms of greeting, order of speaking, rituals of conversation, gift-giving, and other forms of standard polite interaction for the country you are visiting.

3. Explore how you and your potential partner define even the most basic terms, such as “partnership.”

4. Develop a broad understanding of the potential partner (e.g., history, mission, organization, policies, procedures, strengths, positioning within the country, student body composition, curriculum, academic calendar, decision-making structures) and offer such information about your own institution in reverse.

5. Ask about the potential partner’s partnership history and experiences, and explain yours in return.

6. Learn about the larger context of higher education in the partner’s country.

7. Do not move too quickly toward closure. Take time. Revise first impressions. Allow the conversation to mature.

8. Explore a range of partnership possibilities, working toward finding areas of mutual interest and benefit. Include long-range goals but also immediate possibilities. Understand that robust partnerships take years to develop and mature.

9. Explore what resources will be needed to carry partnership activities forward and who will be responsible for providing what. Also explore policy and requirement issues that may prove to be roadblocks – and how these might be overcome.

10. Don’t make promises you cannot keep. Keep all promises you make. Make it clear that nothing can be signed at this point, and that you must take what you have learned back for discussions at your home campus.

11. Set up channels for subsequent communication. Identify next steps.

12. Take copious notes, and don’t forget the ceremonial photographs, which you should label as soon as possible. Analyze your notes on the plane ride home and make a To-Do list to follow up when you land, which should begin with thank-you notes to your hosts.
Criteria for Selecting International Partner Institutions

When planning international partnerships, there are several considerations that institutions must address. Below are concerns that should be reviewed when determining the institution and partnership that best match your institution’s needs. It might be preferable to use this as a checklist to ensure a well thought out and extensive partnership building plan.

Compatibility & Fit

General institutional compatibility with your institution
- Similar missions
- Similar areas of excellence (building synergy)
- Complementary areas of excellence (filling gaps)

Compatibility with the international goals of your institution
- Will support achievement of your goals in international teaching, research, engagement, institutional advancement
- Fits with the role you have assigned partnerships in your internationalization

Fit with the range of your existing partnerships
- Building on areas of strength
- Filling gaps and not stretching your resources too thinly

Quality and integrity of potential partner
- In terms of accreditation
- In terms of ranking
- In terms of academic programs
- In terms of business and partnership practices

Partner Desirability & Mutual Gain

Partner is in a part of the world of interest to your institution
- Faculty and programs from your institution already have connections with the potential partner
- Building on your strengths or filling your gaps in targeted areas
- Mirroring the international connections of your surrounding community
- Partner is in a nation that is a source of international students for your institution, or a place where your students would like to go
- Partnership will be of mutual benefit to all participating institutions

Maintaining Communication

Productive discussions with the potential partner have taken place
- Trust and rapport have been built
- Mutual understandings (including what partnership means) have been reached
- Common projects and interests have been identified
- All relevant decision-makers have been engaged
☐ Level of commitment has been determined
☐ Possible roadblocks and negative impacts have been identified and addressed
☐ Resources and financial arrangements have been negotiated
☐ Regulatory issues have been addressed
☐ Language issues have been addressed

Managing Program Structure

Resources and structures exist to support the partnership over time
☐ Faculty and departmental buy-in exists
☐ Funding for travel is available
☐ Revenue neutral exchange structures are in place
☐ Course articulations are possible
☐ System of regular communication can be established
☐ Each side has a team or office to manage its part of the partnership
☐ Capacity to provide language instruction, cultural and national framing for work with
☐ Partner exists (or can be developed)

Proposed partnership has undergone appropriate reviews at your institution
☐ Following agreed-upon procedures
☐ Obtaining all necessary approvals
☐ Discussed by all relevant constituencies
☐ Reviewed by legal counsel
☐ System of on-going review and re-evaluation is in place
☐ Exit strategy is in place

See also:
25 Potential International Partnership Activities

1. One- or two-way movement of students who take courses or work in laboratories, at either IUPUI or the partner university for short term, one semester, or full year

2. One- or two-way movement of students who pursue internships or engage in service learning projects at either IUPUI or the partner university for short term, one semester, or full year

3. 2+2, 1+2+1, and similar programs in which students at the partner university take 1-3 years at their home institution and then 1-2 years at IUPUI, earning degrees at both institutions.

4. Joint or coordinated degrees, enrolling students from both universities as a unified cohort and requiring coursework at both universities

5. Tailored full-semester study abroad programs developed for IUPUI students at the partner university, involving courses and in-country orientation aimed specifically at the visiting students

6. Tailored short-term study abroad programs developed for IUPUI students at the partner university, which can be stand-alone courses or complements to courses taught at IUPUI (e.g., alternate spring break experiences)

7. Tailored full-semester or short-term study abroad programs developed at IUPUI for students from the partner university

8. Collaborative teaching in which students and faculty at both universities are joined in a single virtual classroom through videoconferences, email exchanges, and web-based platforms, for either whole courses or components of whole courses

9. Exchange of faculty between partner university and IUPUI for purposes of guest teaching, either whole courses or components of whole courses

10. Provision of on-line, CD-Rom, or DVD courses and/or teaching modules from IUPUI to partner university, or vice versa

11. One-to-one faculty collaboration (through visits or electronic communication) for purposes of research or applied projects

12. Collaborative research or applied projects that are pursued on a long-term, institutional level by both universities working in partnership with each other

13. Faculty development activities (e.g., workshops, videoconferences, short courses) in which faculty or staff at one university provide sessions for personnel at the other

14. Institution-building activities (e.g., workshops, site visits, videoconferences) in which personnel at one university assist the other in terms of institutional assessment, faculty development, service learning, pedagogy, research development, accreditation, enrollment management, fund-raising, and similar activities

15. Videoconferences involving faculty and other personnel at both universities, for the purposes of getting to know one another, developing new projects, and exchanging ideas and information
16. Videoconferences and other electronic communication involving students at both universities for the purposes of getting to know one another, developing joint student activities, and understanding each other’s countries

17. Collaborating on lectures, film series, and performances that spread knowledge of the partner country at IUPUI, and/or knowledge of the U.S. at the partner institution

18. Jointly sponsored conferences on topics of mutual interest, to be held at either institution

19. Jointly sponsored publications or publication series on topics of mutual interest

20. Sharing of library resources, especially those that are digital in nature

21. Granting faculty or affiliate status to faculty from the partner institute, or vice versa; conferring honorary degrees

22. Developing educational tours for IUPUI alumni or central Indiana residents to the country of the partner university

23. Using the partnership to collaborate with organizations such as Sister Cities, development agencies, travel companies, and/or multinational businesses that also operate both in Indianapolis and the country of the partner university

24. Collaborating with yet a third university partner to develop multinational projects in any of the above areas

25. Jointly applying for funding to support any of the above activities
In designing and implementing their internationalization strategies, higher education institutions are called upon to embrace and implement the following values and principles:

- Commitment to promote academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and social responsibility.
- Pursuit of socially responsible practices locally and internationally, such as equity in access and success, and non-discrimination.
- Adherence to accepted standards of scientific integrity and research ethics.
- Placement of academic goals such as student learning, the advancement of research, engagement with the community, and addressing global problems at the centre of their internationalization efforts.
- Pursuit of the internationalization of the curriculum as well as extra-curricula activities so that non-mobile students, still the overwhelming majority, can also benefit from internationalization and gain the global competences they will need.
- Engagement in the unprecedented opportunity to create international communities of research, learning, and practice to solve pressing global problems.
- Affirmation of reciprocal benefit, respect, and fairness as the basis for partnership.
- Treatment of international students and scholars ethically and respectfully in all aspects of their relationship with the institution.
- Pursuit of innovative forms of collaboration that address resource differences and enhance human and institutional capacity across nations.
- Safeguarding and promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity and respecting local concerns and practices when working outside one’s own nation.
- Continuous assessment of the impacts – intended and unintended, positive and negative – of internationalization activities on other institutions.
- Responding to new internationalization challenges through international dialogue that combines consideration of fundamental values with the search for practical solutions to facilitate interaction between higher education institutions across borders and cultures while respecting and promoting diversity.
Partnerships as the Driving Force of Campus Internationalization

By Susan Buck Sutton

Published in IIENetworker Magazine, Spring 2007

What might happen if international partnerships were viewed not just as one component of campus internationalization but as the driving, definitional force of such efforts? Placing partnerships at the center is, in fact, a logical extension of the direction in which campus internationalization has been heading. What was once known as international education began, of course, as the province of a few disciplines, such as my own, anthropology. The unintended consequence – at least for U.S. institutions - was that international matters were defined as the province of a few specialists, with the promise of activities such as study abroad being, as Sheila Biddle put it, largely unfulfilled. The shift from international education to internationalization in the 1980s, however, signaled efforts to spread international learning and perspectives more broadly across campus.

Jane Knight has done as much as anyone to articulate what this shift has meant. Her 1994 definition saw internationalization as “integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions” of an institution. Her 2004 updating envisioned such integration even more comprehensively as reaching into “the purpose, function or delivery of post-secondary education.”

Building on Knight’s work, what might it mean if such definitions were read in the reverse direction? What if we understood internationalization not only as a process of infusing perspectives into our institutions, but also as a process of drawing our campuses out into something larger than themselves? What if we made partnerships the central mechanism and goal of internationalization? What if we acknowledged that some very important international perspectives can only emerge through international dialogue and exchange? In this light, internationalization would rest on an institution’s ability to connect with the broader world, to engage in the global construction of knowledge, and to do so with cross-cultural skill and wisdom. It would rest as much on external networks as internal expertise.

Such a shift in emphasis would also reflect the forces that have animated the recent upsurge in interest in internationalization at our institutions. After 2001, even those faculty and administrators who previously had little interest in international matters began to wrestle with 9/11 and its aftermath, the forces of economic and cultural globalization, a flattening world of IT, massive waves of immigrants and refugees, global environmental concerns, post-colonial perspectives and literatures, the globalization of science and scholarship themselves, and the worldwide market for international students.

These forces have international relations and networking at their core. The framework for academic internationalization in the 21st century is different from that of the 20th. The emphasis is no longer on specialized knowledge, held largely within a few disciplines, but rather on international interaction, student exchange, faculty collaboration, and the resolution of global tensions and inequities, depending
on one’s point of entry. This renders an emphasis on international partnerships particularly appropriate. Internationalization is no longer an option, but a requirement for all disciplines, and it is shaped by global networks, which involve us all.

By placing partnerships at the heart of internationalization, we reframe what we are doing. We knock down academic towers (whether ivory or red-brick) to place ourselves in dynamic networks of exchange, engagement, and discovery. We develop academic communities larger than our own institutions. We no longer need to hire dozens of new faculty to teach international courses because we can exchange courses and teach collaboratively with our partner institutions (both virtually and face-to-face). We identify skill at international dialogue and interaction to be key learning objectives for our students, while we simultaneously model these in our relations with colleagues abroad. Disciplines that have not traditionally had an international perspective are assisted in developing one by networking with colleagues in other countries. International respect, reciprocity, and resource-sharing become the new “Three R’s” of higher education.

A partnership approach to internationalization does not make international specialists obsolete; instead it adds a new emphasis and urgency to what they do. It identifies a major arena for expert knowledge - beyond the world of the experts. The perspectives of language faculty, anthropologists, political scientists, geographers, historians, and related scholars remain vitally important for assessing, interpreting, framing, and enhancing the interactions inherent in international partnerships. So, too, are their critical analyses and deconstructions of the internationalization process, no matter how painful.

Placing partnerships at the core of internationalization also clarifies that a central function of international programs offices must be initiating, supporting, and framing collaborations. Such offices have long been involved in faculty and student exchanges, but the shift explored here supports an even more comprehensive and active role. International offices can become repositories for research and expertise on maximizing the effectiveness of international collaboration. They should develop workshops that draw faculty into partnerships and pilot innovative ways to use partnerships for both research and curriculum development. They should vigorously pursue cost-effective ways of funding student and faculty exchanges, and lead campus efforts to take stock of existing partnerships.

At Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) - a large, public, urban university – the Office of International Affairs has found its activities increasingly converging along such lines. Each new effort has added to our growing sense of the importance of partnerships. A key result has been a program of strategic partnerships, approved by all schools across the campus. Strategic partnerships are comprehensive alliances that provide vital linkages to universities, organizations, and communities in a few selected parts of the world. Such alliances provide platforms for deep, cumulative learning, research, and engagement, such that new projects build on previous ones, students encounter these partners in a variety of courses and co-curricular activities, and a broad spectrum of faculty collaborate across national boundaries. The result is an integrated set of activities that cuts across both campuses, enhances the capacity of each for international work, and is sustained over a long period.
Strategic partnerships illustrate one tactic for placing collaboration at the center of internationalization. For IUPUI, developing such partnerships aims at creating bi-national communities of collaboration and dialogue, pulling each institution into ever deepening relationships of mutual benefit, and giving each a long-term base of operations in the other country. These partnerships focus and prioritize campus internationalization, creating economies of scale and synergies of effort. They establish explicit concentrations of activity that attract attention and support from external sources. They lay foundations whereby new projects build on existing ones, and new faculty, students, and staff become involved, including those with little previous international experience.

This is further illustrated by our first strategic partnership with Moi University (MU) in Eldoret, Kenya (http://www.ium.epsilen.com). The Indiana University School of Medicine, located at IUPUI, has collaborated with MU for nearly two decades. Over the years, this collaboration progressed from a standard exchange of a few faculty and students to a robust and remarkable collaboration to fight HIV/AIDS in western Kenya, resulting in building a joint treatment facility that serves over 30,000 patients a year. By establishing a strategic partnership earlier this year, IUPUI and MU have now committed themselves to extending this level of reciprocity and resource-sharing into other fields. This broadened alliance brings all our mutual resources to bear on the pandemic. It is also facilitating curricular and research collaborations in education, social work, informatics, engineering, library science, business, tourism management, nursing, dentistry, allied health fields, and the arts and sciences. As each new endeavor begins, it is informed and encouraged by what has already happened.

There are, of course, differences in resources between our countries and universities, something acknowledged in our budgeting and grant-writing, but the partnership between IUPUI and MU is not a one-way street. The tangibles that move from Indiana to Kenya are repaid many times over with intangibles in the other direction. IUPUI faculty, staff, and students are developing a sense of themselves as global citizens, coming to understand issues of social and economic development facing much of the world, and learning to appreciate the assets of communities they have heretofore seen only as helpless or backward. They are also developing a deep understanding of Africa, connecting them to a continent whose history is intertwined with that of the U.S. and dispelling misconceptions that continue to reverberate in the context of American racial dynamics.

What lies ahead for this strategic partnership cannot be known at this point. Nor should it be. As with all true collaborations, this alliance will take us to unexpected places. This, of course, is the point of moving partnerships to the center of internationalization. We are internationalizing by connecting, not closing ourselves off, by participating rather than observing. We hope to be as transformed by the partnership just as we want our students to be transformed by their study abroad experiences. Above all, we recognize that we no longer need to go it alone, and this is a good thing.

Susan Buck Sutton, Ph.D. is Chancellor’s Professor of Anthropology and Associate Dean of International Programs at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.
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