MEASURING INTERNATIONALIZATION

A Move Toward Measurement

- Reflects mainstreaming of internationalization as institutional goal and mission
- Parallels growth of international offices and establishment of senior international officer as administrative appointment
- Needed as universities’ international activities multiply, especially at large research universities
- Is part of era of accountability
- What gets measured = what counts
Challenges to Measuring International Activity

- Institutional siloes, especially at large research universities
- Who owns what data
- Who convenes – and who sustains
- How much to measure, and can you measure too much
- What to measure: inputs, outputs, outcomes
Global Efforts to Measure Internationalization

- International Quality Review Process in mid 1990s in Europe: self assessment tool for institutions review goals, assess strategies, and include internationalization as part of overall quality assurance
- German Ministry of Higher Education and Research
- European Union
- International Association of Universities
- American Council on Education’s Internationalization Laboratory and Mapping survey
- Internationalization in global university rankings
What Gets Measured

- International partnerships and collaborations
- Teaching and curriculum
- Research
- Budget
- Co-curriculum, campus life
- In-bound and out-bound mobility
- Faculty participation in international activities
- Staffing and leadership structures
- Global learning outcomes
## Figure 1. Sample Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Sample Inputs</th>
<th>Sample Outputs</th>
<th>Sample Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strengthen international and global dimensions of the curriculum** | • Number of courses with an international/global focus;  
• Number and range of foreign language courses;  
• Number and proportion of faculty with international experience or expertise;  
• Number of joint or dual degree programs;  
• Number of courses offered in cooperation with an international partner through technology. | • Number and proportion of students enrolled in courses with international/global focus;  
• Number and proportion of students enrolled in language courses at various levels;  
• Number and proportion of students majoring in programs with an international/global focus. | • Demonstrated specific student learning outcomes as evidenced by portfolios, intercultural competency inventories;  
• Demonstrated language proficiency;  
• Career choices or volunteer engagement of graduates. |
| **Enhance the quality of research and increase knowledge production** | • Number of faculty/researchers with international experience, expertise;  
• Amount of funding for international cooperation in research;  
• Amount of funding from international sponsors;  
• Number of research projects with international partners. | • Number of publications per faculty co-authored with international partners;  
• Number of international conference presentations per faculty members. | • Awards, prizes, recognition, rankings of institutional international activity;  
• Growth in institution's income from commercial applications;  
• Contribution to solving local or global problems. |
| **Enhance the international competence and experience of faculty and staff** | • Number and proportion of faculty and staff with international experience and expertise;  
• Number and proportion of faculty and staff educated outside the United States;  
• Number and proportion of faculty who are multi-lingual. | • Growth in number and proportion of faculty engaged in international cooperation for teaching and/or research;  
• Growth in number and proportion of staff engaged with partner institutions.  
• Increase in number of courses with international/global focus. | • Enhanced reputation and recognition for the institution's international character and work;  
• Increased student interest in international programs and activities as evidenced by course enrollment patterns, choices of majors. |

*(Based on Hudzik and StoHl (2009) and Brandenburg and Federkeil (2007)).*
Ongoing Challenges to Measuring Internationalization

- Finding metrics that are effective and accurate – vs. mushy surveys
- Siloes and what slips through the cracks – ex., problems with IIE data on graduate students’ international activity
- Need for consistency vs. need for change
- Is there still momentum behind internationalization?
- Do more comprehensive institutional portraits give a true picture of what’s going on nationally?