EDITORIAL

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, since the Middle Ages, one concept has given stability and a sense of wholeness to the university as an institution. This has been a sense of diversity brought about by the participation of professors and students from all over the known world in the seeking and transmitting of new knowledge. Starting in a highly unstructured way with the label 'Wandering Scholar' in earlier times, the title shifted in this century to 'Educational Exchange' and, more recently, the more fashionable tag has become 'Academic Mobility'.

While this can often be described in the context of interuniversity cooperation across national boundaries, it is also true that there is a great deal of unstructured mobility as a result of student *X* wanting to study in country *Y* and seeking out the best opportunity to reach that goal. In fact, academic mobility which, for the purposes of this issue of *Higher Education Policy*, we are defining as 'international, unilateral, bilateral or multilateral exchanges or visits of postsecondary students at all levels, faculty, and administrative staff', has become an integral part of the intellectual ferment and the administrative structure of universities throughout the world.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

In the early 1960s, many American universities were developing programmes of study abroad for their students, or expanding existing ones. While most of this expansion came in Europe, as African universities developed and traditional academic ties with Latin America and Asia were strengthened, the study abroad programmes of American universities became worldwide in scope.

On the occasion of the Fourth General Conference of the International Association of Universities (IAU) in Tokyo in 1965, the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), which was created in the United States to serve professional needs of the administrators of US overseas programmes, initiated a meeting between heads of American universities with study abroad programmes and the heads of receiving universities around the world. The purpose of the meeting was 'to discuss the problems of universities that serve as sponsors or hosts in reciprocal programs of student exchange set up through interuniversity agreements.' (Allaway, 1986) The participants identified a number of issues of common concern and a Continuation Committee was formed to explore these issues further.

In December 1966 the Committee met in Italy to consider 'The University's Role in International Educational Exchange', and developed a rationale and outlined a research programme to serve as the basis for the creating of an International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange (ICSEE). The rationale concluded with the following paragraph:

Two conclusions therefore emerge. The first is that universities, to be worthy of the name, must become as universal as possible in their commitment by accepting a two-way flow of both students and professors between the home university and universities in other countries as a vital and planned aspect of their activities whenever possible. The second is that their commitment to the values of exchanges should be accompanied by the determination to encourage and facilitate such research or inquiry as may be needed to give to such exchanges the maximum efficiency and success of which they are capable. The acceptance by the universities of the world of these two interlocking responsibilities will enable them to realize more fully the important goals to which they are committed and which must serve society. (Allaway, 1986)

ICSEE was formalized at a meeting in Montreal in 1970.

As a result of consultations between the IAU and ICSEE in Rio de Janeiro in 1988, an agreement was reached on jointly sponsored research. Portions of these results are reported in this issue of *Higher Education Policy*. The relationship was further strengthened at joint meetings in Helsinki in 1990 when representatives of ICSEE were invited to serve as co-editors of the current issue of the journal.

This issue, therefore, reinforces the strong commitment of IAU to the promoting of academic mobility among its membership, as reflected in *Higher Education Policy* of March 1991 on the theme 'Student Mobility and Reciprocity'. Editor Guy Neave set the historical stage for student mobility and probed a number of the key problems identified as related to current developments in the field. Other articles provided background on such aspects as the impact of current approaches to curriculum development on mobility, the way in which cultural factors affect mobility, illustrations of the way in which developments in Spain and the former USSR have affected universities, to academic mobility. This issue of *Higher Education Policy* is striving to build on that foundation by surveying a wide range of countries and/or regions of the world to look at such factors as international interuniversity cooperation in the areas described and, where relevant, a description of research efforts in the area which have contributed to a better understanding of academic mobility.

THE GATHERING CONSENSUS ON SOUND POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN ACADEMIC MOBILITY

A review of a number of policy statements by Australian, United States, United Kingdom and other international organizations leads to the conclusion that a consensus is developing with regard to what constitutes sound policies and practices in international education. Excerpts from some of these are cited to indicate the breadth of consensus and the nature of the policies and practices agreed on.

The need for institutional policy regarding educational exchange

Both of the policy statements of the ICSEE dealt with the need for institutional policy regarding educational exchange. The first statement said,

While the purposes of specific exchanges can be incredibly diverse, the sum total of the impact of international educational exchange can have both individual and institutional consequences. It is thus vital that institutions base their international involvements on a specific, well-thought-out policy. (Allaway, 1986)

Policy statement II said,

The strength of institutional involvement in educational exchange is tied directly to the extent to which it receives the attention and approbation of the governing structures in the institution of higher education. This is reflected in two areas: (a) the determination of a broad policy with regard to institutional involvement in the receiving and sending of foreign students and senior scholars; (b) policies with regard to creating opportunities for students to have a period abroad as a part

of a degree programme at the home institution and facilitating periods of study, research, and lecturing abroad for members of the faculty. (Allaway, 1986)

The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs policy statement on international educational exchange takes a general position favouring institutional policy:

In sum, it is critical that international educational activities be well conceived, organized and conducted, that they be relevant to the needs of those involved in the process and that they should not neglect opportunities for broadening citizen understanding of the world. Essential to this task are clear institutional policies regarding international education. (NAFSA, 1980)

Amplifying on this, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) states that 'the international programme is rooted in the US institutions' stated mission and purposes and reflects any special social, religious, and ethical elements of that mission.' (COPA, 1990)

In a statement on the responsible recruitment of overseas students, the United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs (UKCOSA) indicated that:

the institution should have a clearly stated policy on the recruitment of overseas students, which is endorsed by the governing body and is openly communicated to all staff . . . the operational aspect of this policy, as it affects the overseas students themselves, should cover the nature and quality of pre-offer information and pre-departure briefing and extend to the care of students on their arrival in the UK right through to their departure from the institution. (UKCOSA, undated)

Thus there appears to be consensus that policy is needed by institutions involved in educational exchange and that the policy should be consistent with other goals and objectives of the institution.

The need for the integration and coordination of programmes and policies

COPA lays an emphasis on an institution securing all the necessary internal and external approvals necessary before entering into international programmes, including accrediting associations (COPA, 1990).

ICSEE, in its first policy statement, said:

There is a need for close integration of programmes and policies within a university, between autonomous private and public institutions within a country, or even within a state, and between countries and probably at the national governmental level. . . . if the policy on integration of international exchanges is to be implemented, it will require effective coordination not only within the university but with other institutions at home and abroad and with governmental agencies. (Allaway, 1986)

NAFSA's policy statement notes that 'it is important that the loosely related and largely independent constituency of international educational interchange collaborate in interpreting to national and local leadership the important benefits – intellectual, cultural, economic, social – that derive from the interchange of students and scholars.' (NAFSA, 1980)

UKCOSA's statement on recruitment of overseas students recommends:

In order to ensure the effective implementation of a coherent policy, a senior member of staff should be made coordinator of recruitment activities (for overseas students) and given responsibility for ensuring that the institution's policy in recruitment is followed and its results monitored . . . the institution should ensure that communication between all staff and departments affected by the recruitment of overseas students is effective and that staff and departments work cooperatively. (UKCOSA, undated)

Without exception, the policy statements were in agreement on the need for coordination among and within universities and other agencies in the exchange field in both policies and programmes.

The need for establishing mechanisms for the implementation of programmes of academic mobility

The COPA guidelines include a strong emphasis on the availability of adequate offices, classrooms, libraries and computers, as well as appropriate staffing of overseas programmes responsible to a resident administrator of the home university. In addition they call for the maintenance of students overseas (COPA, 1990).

ICSEE's first policy statement called for establishing mechanisms for implementation of exchange programmes which would include:

(a) advisory services to provide information to students and faculty desiring to spend a year abroad . . . (b) foreign student advisory services to provide both pre-arrival and post-arrival information and assistance in becoming personally integrated into the university and the community . . . and (c) similar advisory services for faculty exchanges. . . . In addition ICSEE is on record as favouring academic mobility outside of formal exchange agreements but points out the need for appropriate infrastructures so that maximum benefit may be derived from the foreign academic experience. (Allaway, 1986)

NAFSA's policy statement points out that 'if the curriculum and scholarly activities of our colleges and universities are to become more relevant to transnational problems, it is essential that the administrative and academic processes of international education be given higher status within our institutions' (NAFSA, 1980).

In 'A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programmes Abroad' developed by the Council on Student Travel (now CIEE), a wide range of questions are raised which demonstrate the many ways in which programmes of academic mobility require special services to the population being served, such as in the selection of participants, the organizing of their orientation programmes, and the counselling which may grow out of the tensions in the cross-cultural situation. By calling attention to the wide range of special needs of exchangees, the Guide verifies the need for special administrative arrangements (CIEE, 1965).

In 'Guidelines for Higher Education Institutions Offering Full-fee Courses for Overseas Students', The Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC) and the Australian Committee of Directors and Principals in Advanced Education (ACDPAE) have set forth their views on necessary provisions for welcoming overseas students. One of the key provisions is for an institutional infrastructure as follows:

Depending on its nature, size, and the extent of its involvement in full-fee courses, each institution should identify an appropriate officer or establish an appropriate 'international education unit' to be responsible for all matters relating to the implementation of the institutions' full-fee overseas student program . . . (AVCC and ACDPAE, 1988).

In spite of the extensive documentation of the need for special mechanisms for the implementation of academic mobility, many institutions – particularly outside the United States – have been very slow to recognize the need for staff trained as professionals to work in this area.

The need for academic integrity in programmes of academic mobility

In referring to international education programmes that are organized overseas by American universities, COPA stresses the responsibility of the US institutions for defining the educational needs to be met, review of the content by faculty of the US institutions, the use of highly

qualified faculty who demand a standard of student achievement equivalent to that on the home campus, and the need to adapt the curriculum to the culture of the host country (COPA, 1990).

ICSEE, in its first policy statement, said:

the mechanism should likewise lead to a recognition on the part of the faculty that the differing needs of foreign students may, at times, call for some different curricular responses or adaptations, but not any changes in standards of performance as measured by the usual evaluation process.' (Allaway, 1986)

NAFSA, in its Code of Ethics, underlines the need for teachers of English to foreign students to test proficiency fairly, to use up-to-date methods and materials appropriate to the needs of the clientele, and to assure that not only are linguistic questions addressed but also the cultural aspects of the language, which can aid students in achieving their academic goals. (NAFSA, 1989)

The 'Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programmes Abroad' sets forth sound principles for assessing academic strength of programmes: 'the curriculum of an academic programme . . . should implement the aims both of the programme and of the sponsoring institution and should aid the individual to fulfil his own educational objectives' (CIEE, 1965). Where feasible, it is recommended that the curriculum should include regular courses of a host university. There is also an emphasis on the student having clearly defined academic obligations which should be as rigorous as those on the home campus. 'The programme should encourage independent achievement beyond the minimum academic requirement and should seek to develop the student's intellectual curiosity.' (CIEE, 1965)

UKCOSA emphasizes the potential problem of language difficulties on the part of overseas students and proposes that careful assessment be made of proficiency of students. Further, it proposes that language teaching be integrated with the course structure as far as possible. It also calls for making the courses more relevant to the needs of overseas students and for the need for flexibility in the structure of courses being organized for them (UKCOSA, undated).

It would appear that the general principles which guide universities in academic mobility of students, whether in sending or receiving, quite properly emphasize the need to take advantage of the diverse academic opportunities afforded by the exchange experience while maintaining the integrity of the standards by which the work of students is assessed. Universities are viewed as carrying some responsibility for seeing that language proficiency of foreign students is not an obstacle to their academic progress.

The need for adequate funding for academic mobility

In discussing principles of good practice for US institutions establishing programmes for foreign nationals, COPA emphasizes the need for providing adequate physical facilities, including classrooms, offices, libraries, laboratories and computer facilities. It also underlines the importance of building the budget of the international programme into the regular budgeting and auditing process (COPA, 1990).

ICSEE, in its second policy statement, pointed to a number of ways in which institutions can play an active role in meeting international education objectives:

- Setting realistic but sufficiently ambitious quantitative targets for foreign students and study abroad, with a view to maintaining a broad balance consistent with institutional aims and orientations,
- Providing funds from their own resources and seeking funds from other sources with a view to ensuring that as many students as possible are enabled to study abroad (recent research in a number of industrialized countries has proven that in many instances students are debarred from studying abroad for financial reasons),
- Maintaining an institutional policy for the release, replacement and exchange of faculty members for the purpose of teaching and research abroad,
- Seeking imaginative cost-sharing arrangements with partner institutions abroad. (Allaway, 1986)

UKCOSA's statement on responsible recruiting of overseas students discusses the need for institutional policy and then goes on to point out that 'resource allocation should be sufficient to ensure that the principles and practices outlined in this document can be consistently maintained.' (UKCOSA, undated)

While it is evident that international academic programmes require financial resources if they are to have appropriate academic standards, many institutions have not weighed the implications of becoming involved in international programmes before committing themselves to a partnership. Unless programmes are developed thoughtfully and personnel are available to solve the problems of those involved in a cross-cultural academic experience, there can be a very negative impact on interinstitutional relationships.

The need for reciprocity in the development of interuniversity activities

ICSEE documents, more than other documents reviewed, have emphasized the importance of reciprocal relationships in educational exchange. That this is the wave of the future is evidenced by the evolution of ERASMUS and TEMPUS as major programmes which extend academic mobility through interinstitutional cooperation.

In 1985, ICSEE made a strong statement on the value of reciprocity in academic mobility. It pointed out that:

educational exchanges between institutions and individual students and faculty within the industrialized countries and regions with fairly comparable educational backgrounds, academic standards, resources and facilities, as for example, the US and Western Europe, have generally evolved on a basis of rough and ready parity in the sharing of travel, tuition, research, residential and other constituent costs of the exchange. Serious problems and difficulties arise when the exchanges are between countries and institutions within the North and South, between the rich industrialized countries and the less well endowed developing countries, or between countries of different political and ideological systems. In such asymmetrical relationships, exact reciprocity is well-nigh impossible. A different kind of relationship, based on overall mutuality of interests and a qualitative sharing of resources other than simple arithmetical reciprocity, as well as a clear awareness of the differences involved, must be sought if such exchanges are to be successful and acceptable to the participants at either end. (Allaway, 1986).

The strongest programmes of academic mobility have been those in which universities have cooperated to their mutual benefit to achieve academic goals which they have arrived at mutually.

The need for research on academic mobility

The need for research on academic mobility is verified by the range of documentation which has been used as the basis for this editorial. There are, however, varied motivations in the call for such research. At perhaps the simplest level, practitioners in the field are interested in the results of their endeavours, and consequently survey student and faculty participants in order to determine what does work and what does not.

This type of research may translate into the justification of public policy or the affirmation of a new trend, such as the Study Abroad Evaluation Project which was carried out by the European Institute for Education and Social Policy for the European Community (EC). The

aim of the project was to examine and analyse the organizational and other characteristics of the EC's experimental study abroad programmes involving interuniversity joint curricular planning which appear to be particularly effective for attaining such goals as furthering language acquisition, improving academic performance, strengthening intercultural understanding, and/or enhancing graduates' career aspirations and prospects. From this study has come a number of volumes and articles which not only have informed EC policy-making, but also have made a major contribution to the total research literature in the field. Out of these experimental programmes came the EC's European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) which is providing European students and faculty with an intra-European academic and crosscultural experience and internationally valid university credentials that will promote professional mobility to the ultimate benefit of a united Europe.

The emphasis within ICSEE has been to use research to inform university policy. Studies over the years have looked internationally at the flows of educational exchange, the causes of success and failure on the part of exchangees, the impact of the exchange experience on individuals and institutions and, most recently, in cooperation with the International Association of Universities, an analysis of interinstitutional agreements to see whether the characteristics of the agreements play a role in the effectiveness of the cooperation taking place.

During meetings in Helsinki, four topics needing study were given priority for the future activity of ICSEE:

1. Changes in educational exchange during the past 5 to 10 years and what has been learned from recent experience,
2. The role of educational exchange in the development process around the world,
3. Mutual benefits in programmes of interuniversity cooperation, and
4. The role of language in programmes of academic mobility.

These are topics which are recommended as potential research projects for academics wishing to engage in research on academic mobility.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and its Centre for Educational Research and Innovation have devoted considerable attention to problems of academic mobility. At an International Seminar on Higher Education and the Flow of Foreign Students in Hiroshima in 1988, the following statement was included in the seminar report:

Three major sets of research activities must precede further advancement of the practitioners' and policy makers' understanding of this topic: (1) a set of focused research efforts on the nature and extent of foreign student impacts under diverse national, institutional, and programme contexts; (2) a set of country-specific analyses of the general topic of foreign student impacts and of special topics unique to certain national contexts; (3) a set of multinational reviews and evaluations of the specifics of intra-institutional adaptation to and service for foreign students in the areas noted earlier (eg housing, language, curricular adjustment). This research agenda should have a policy orientation (both for national policy and institutional policy) and should benefit from the existing and emerging body of work on these topics. (OECD, 1989)

While this issue of *Higher Education Policy* will establish that there is considerable knowledge about international academic mobility and its impact on tertiary education, one can only conclude that there remains a large iceberg of potential research on academic mobility and that what has been done so far is only represented by the tip, which can be observed floating in a sea of good intentions. Only as university policy makers and governments and the private sector see the necessity for understanding better the phenomenon of academic mobility will it be possible to offer funding for needed research in this area. Fortunately, there are distinguished researchers who have been leading the way in the field and, we hope, who stand ready to make new contributions to interuniversity cooperation through their investigations.

William H. Allaway

REFERENCES

- Allaway, W.H. (1986) The International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange: A Search for Policy Guidance, *Higher Education in Europe*, **XI**, 1, 51-61.
- Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee and Australian Committee of Directors and Principals in Advanced Education (1988) *Guidelines for Higher Education Institutions Offering Full-Fee Courses for Overseas Students*, Canberra, AVCC and ACDPAE.
- Council on International Educational Exchange (1965) A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programmes Abroad, Appendix in CIEE (1991) *Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange 1-19*, A Chronicle of Study Abroad, CIEE Occasional Papers 1965-1975, New York, CIEE.
- Council on Postgraduate Accreditation (1990) *Principles of Good Practice in Overseas International Education Programs for Non-US Nationals*, Washington, DC, COPA.
- National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (1980) *NAFSA Policy Statement on International Education Exchange*, Washington, DC, NAFSA Board of Directors.
- National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Association of International Educators (1989) *Code of Ethics*, Washington, DC, NAFSA Board of Directors.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1989) International Seminar on Higher Education and the Flow of Foreign Students, *Report of the Seminar*, Paris, OECD.
- The United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs (undated) *Responsible Recruitment – A Model for a Code of Practice for Institutions Involved in the Education of Students from Overseas*, London, UKCOSA.