

five years typically take between 10 and 30 percent longer time to complete their studies than expected, while students in associate's degree programs overextend their studies by 50 percent. As a result, every year tens of thousands of students lose their benefits in the final leg of their studies.

Lastly, lest the expansion of first-year student enrollment across institutions with free tuition threaten fiscal stability, no institution is allowed to increase enrollment beyond 2.7 percent per year. This has had a paradoxical effect on access. For two decades, the main driver of greater access to higher education for less privileged students was the expansion of the system, often at rates between 5 to 7 percent per year. These students would typically not wrest away the most coveted places in the most prestigious universities from upper middle-class students with better school grades and test scores, so their only option was to get a spot in the technical and vocational system, or in nonselective universities. They can still do this, but at a much slower rate than in the past.

UNKNOWN OUTCOMES

All things considered, the ultimate judgment about the merits and drawbacks of free tuition will rest on the evaluation of its effects on the distribution of educational opportunity, on institutional finances and development, and on who wins and who loses. Administrative data generated every year on students' applications, admissions, progression, and graduation will soon shed light on the educational side of outcomes. An improved methodology for defining tuition caps will be implemented in 2020, through a panel of experts who will attempt to define costs of instruction per "family" of programs. This adjustment, together with a healthier pattern of growth of the Chilean economy and tax revenues, may assuage the various rectors' anxieties about finances. But for now, the seemingly popular free tuition policy stands alone, supported only by its powerful entrenchment and the difficulty of change. ■

International Higher Education would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).

“Successful” Internationalization: European Insights

LAURA E. RUMBLEY, ROSS HUDSON, AND ANNA-MALIN SANDSTRÖM

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director, Knowledge Development @ Research, Ross Hudson is senior knowledge officer, and Anna-Malin Sandström is policy officer at the European Association for International Education, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. E-mails: rumbley@eaie.org, hudson@eaie.org, and sandstrom@eaie.org.

This article is based on a report by the authors, The EAIE Barometer: Signposts of Success, published by the European Association for International Education in April 2019 and available at www.eaie.org/barometer.

Discussions around internationalization in higher education in Europe and elsewhere are increasingly focused on understanding the impact that internationalization has, as well as the processes that higher education institutions (HEIs) should follow in order to reach their internationalization (and related) goals.

The growing importance of the international dimension has led HEIs to take more strategic approaches to the development and delivery of internationalization. In order to equip the professionals charged with developing and implementing institutional internationalization strategies in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) with the most appropriate evidence to inform their decision-making, the European Association for International Education (EAIE) produced the *EAIE Barometer: Internationalisation in Europe (second edition)* report in 2018. The survey on which the report is based collected responses from 2317 professionals working directly on internationalization at 1292 individual HEIs in 45 EHEA countries.

More recently, data collected for the Barometer exercise provided the foundation for a follow-up consideration: how is internationalization designed, delivered, and sustained by those institutions where respondents reported high levels of progress with respect to their international activities, confidence in their institution's performance, and optimism about the future? Do the ways in which these institutions approach internationalization provide “signposts of success” for others? Although defining success objectively may be an elusive and highly contextual exercise, our consideration of the Barometer data found that those institutions that perceive that they are on firm footing with respect to internationalization exhibit some commonalities in

several areas, notably with respect to matters of motivation, organization, and execution.

SUCCESS AS A MATTER OF MOTIVATION

When it comes to perceptions of success among HEIs, the rationale for internationalization seems to make a difference. More specifically, our analysis of the Barometer data found that, where an institution's primary focus is understood to be on increasing the quality of research or improving the quality of education, respondents were more optimistic about the future of internationalization at their HEI than their colleagues at institutions reporting financial gains as the primary goal for internationalization. Those at institutions where the academic mission was the focal point for internationalization were also inclined, at higher rates, to think that their institution was above average in relation to others in their same country.

The lack of optimism and lower sense of superlative performance among respondents at institutions reporting a central focus on financial benefits could stem from a variety of sources. The need to prioritize monetary gain could

The growing importance of the international dimension has led HEIs to take more strategic approaches to the development and delivery of internationalization.

reflect a precarious financial outlook for a given institution, which in turn could impact detrimentally on respondents' confidence in the future of internationalization in that context. The emphasis on the financial dimensions of internationalization by some institutions may also be seen as standing at odds with the traditional emphasis of higher education on educational endeavors. This, too, could lead respondents to conclude that their institution's performance with respect to internationalization is less robust than at institutions where the academic mission is more closely connected to the internationalization agenda.

SUCCESS AS A MATTER OF ORGANIZATION

The ways in which institutions choose to organize their strategic approaches to internationalization also seem to have an impact on the perception of success. For example, 47 percent of respondents at institutions with a standalone

internationalization strategy and 43 percent of those at institutions with an internationalization strategy embedded in an overall institutional strategy considered that the level of internationalization at their institution was above average, compared to other institutions in their same country. In contrast, just 26 percent of respondents at institutions with strategies situated exclusively at the faculty level (i.e., the school or college level within a university) considered their institution to be above average in their national context.

Similarly, those whose institutions carry out their internationalization agendas using multiple offices working in coordination—as opposed to a single centralized office, multiple offices working independently, or individuals working in a noncoordinated fashion—were most likely to feel that their HEI was performing above average in internationalization. They were also more prone to report that progress was being made on their institution's priority activities for internationalization. However, the latter does not hold for all internationalization activities, which is perhaps understandable, as different activities benefit to varying degrees from different structures and resources.

The specifics of where an internationalization strategy “lives” within the institution and where responsibility for the international agenda resides both seem to have an impact on the way individuals at European HEIs perceive successful performance with respect to internationalization.

SUCCESS AS A MATTER OF EXECUTION

Beyond matters of why and how the most confident and optimistic European HEIs choose to internationalize, the question of what they do to support their internationalization efforts is also salient. Our consideration of the Barometer data points to several key areas in which a focus on specific action lines seems to influence a sense of success. Specifically, committing to a broad portfolio of priority activities; establishing targets, providing funding, and supporting training for staff in relation those priority activities; and undertaking both strategy evaluation and systematic quality assurance activities, are all salient to this discussion. To a greater or lesser extent, at institutions where respondents report commitments to these areas, there is a tendency for them to indicate that they see progress in relation to the identified priority activities. There are generally also higher levels of confidence in the future of internationalization among respondents at these institutions and a sense of outperforming peer institutions in the same country.

Overall, where European institutions think broadly and specifically about their internationalization agendas, nurture these aspirations with resources, and evaluate their

quality and progress, the sense of successful engagement in the internationalization process among their staff is more palpable.

HAVE WE FOUND THE MAGIC FORMULA? NO, BUT...

It is a commonly accepted truism that there is no “one size fits all” model for internationalization of HEIs. Our analysis does not intend to contradict that notion, but it does point to some possible commonalities when it comes to approaches taken by European HEIs that consider themselves to be in relatively strong positions with respect to internationalization. Of course, “signposts of success” may point us in a general direction, but the specifics of why an institution thrives—or not—with respect to its internationalization performance remains a complex question. Still, operating from a starting point that aligns squarely with institutional mission, positioning strategy and its supporting actors purposefully within the institution, and implementing agendas that are both expansive and meaningfully resourced seems to add up to a recipe for (self-reported) success. ■

Is Strategic Internationalization a Reality?

GIORGIO MARINONI AND HANS DE WIT

Giorgio Marinoni is manager, Higher Education and Internationalization policy and projects, International Association of Universities (IAU), Paris, France. E-mail: g.marinoni@iau-aiu.net. Hans de Wit is director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College, US, and member of the IAU Advisory Committee for the 5th IAU Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu.

The full report of the 5th IAU Global Survey will be published by DUZ Academic Publishers in the coming months.

The internationalization of higher education is a phenomenon that has implications far beyond the domain of higher education; it impacts society at large. According to the definition of Jane Knight, updated in 2015 by de Wit and others, internationalization is “an intentional process undertaken by higher education institutions in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to soci-

ety.” Assuming that internationalization is an intentional process, the question arising is: how strategic is this process? In other words, is internationalization at HEIs supported by a defined strategy, with clear objectives, actions, and point persons, framed within a realistic timeline, and supported by the necessary (human and financial) resources? Is this strategy monitored and are outcomes evaluated? And in the current political climate of antiglobalization, anti-immigration, and increasing nationalism, to what extent is this strategy still relevant and up to date? The results of the 5th Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education, an online survey conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in 2018, help us address these questions.

The survey was based upon replies from 907 HEIs across 126 countries worldwide. For that survey, HEIs were asked to state whether internationalization was mentioned in their mission/strategic plan. A clear majority replied that it was. This is a sign of how internationalization has become widespread among HEIs around the globe, but it does not reveal how strategic their approach is.

HAVING A STRATEGY DOES NOT MEAN HAVING A STRATEGIC APPROACH

The presence of a strategy does not necessarily align with a strategic approach to internationalization if there are no activities to implement it and support structures in place, if the strategy is not monitored, and if progress is not evaluated. The IAU survey indicates that the internationalization policy/strategy is institution-wide in almost all HEIs that indicated having elaborated one. The presence of an office or a team in charge of overseeing the implementation of the policy/strategy is widespread, as is the inclusion of an international dimension in other institutional policies/strategies/plans. The presence of a monitoring framework and of explicit targets and benchmarks is slightly lower, but still present at almost three-quarters of the responding institutions, and a budgetary provision is present at two-thirds of them.

These results seem to indicate that a strategic approach to internationalization is indeed common at the majority of HEIs in the world. However, previous IAU Global Surveys included the very same questions, and an analysis of the evaluation of results over time unveils additional information. A clear growth of the presence of a policy/strategy at HEIs can be identified. The same is true for the percentage of HEIs having a dedicated office or team to implement the policy/strategy. In the present survey, this percentage reaches 89 percent, an increase of 25 percentage points in 15 years.