administrative and curricular reviews. For example, Juniata College noticed that the administrative review of the Office of International Education (OIE) was scheduled for the same year as the departmental review for the International Studies major (IS). Because Juniata was also reviewing its general education requirements, which included a two-semester international requirement, it decided to incorporate the review of the OIE and the IS major into an internationalization review. This strategy enabled the college to develop a comprehensive picture of the strengths and weaknesses of specific aspects of its current internationalization strategies (OIE and IS), as well as to provide an overall assessment of the internationalization of its curriculum.

**Phases of the Review Process**

Once the first crucial step—forming a review team—is accomplished, a thorough internationalization review typically takes from one academic year to 16 months. Depending on when the review begins, ACE recommends that institutions complete a draft analysis within the academic or calendar year. Unless a team is already well formed and accustomed to meeting, it will probably spend the first few months developing its group dynamic, setting goals and a timeline for itself consistent with the charge it has received, deciding on the division of labor appropriate to the scope of the review, and developing a communication plan.

**Phase 1: Launching an Internationalization Review**

Institutions may need help in getting started with the review process. It is useful to draw on the experiences of other institutions. Team members may want to call colleagues who have participated in similar reviews or to consider bringing an experienced consultant to campus to guide the team in the important early phase of its work (see "ACE Consulting Services"). Some institutions highlight the launch of an internationalization review by using a regular faculty retreat or meeting to publicly begin the process. For example, the University of Denver focused the annual provost’s convocation on internationalization to engage faculty in substantive discussion of this institutional priority. The convocation included a combination of external speakers and internal panels on international and global issues, as well as study abroad, faculty development opportunities, and technological support for international activities.

**ACE Consulting Services**

ACE offers a range of programs to assist institutions in undertaking internationalization reviews and advancing comprehensive internationalization. See Appendix N, or visit the ACE website at www.acenet.edu/programs/international.
Phase 2: Gathering Information

The second phase of the review process, the actual gathering of information, tends to vary considerably in length, depending on the scope of the intended review and whether an institution has previously gathered information about its international activities. Other factors that affect the length of this phase include:

- The importance of this task to the senior leadership, who will have set deadlines for completion of the review and can ensure timely department and unit cooperation with the internationalization team.
- The team’s ability to organize its work effectively.
- The team leaders’ capacity to keep the process moving, taking into account the disruptive aspects of the rhythm of semesters, exam periods, and other breaks.
- The support given the team to gather information, such as dedicated staff time, access to keepers of information, and, in some cases, released time for team chairs.
- The frequency and effectiveness of the team meetings.
- The efficiency of the team members in delivering their assigned information to the group.
- The motivation and availability of the team members.

Several institutions with which ACE has engaged had serious setbacks in accomplishing the review and its analysis because of turnover or sabbaticals of key team members or senior leaders. (See Chapter 1, for comments on team evolution.)

Given the magnitude of the task of conducting an internationalization review, teams can easily get stalled or bogged down. Gathering information, while time-consuming, should be rewarding if team members see the value of the findings in furthering internationalization. One of the team’s first tasks is to decide on the questions to be answered in the review. (See “Elements of an Internationalization Review” on page 48 for suggested areas of focus, and pages 91–94 in the User’s Guide for a more detailed list of questions.) If a particular question cannot easily be answered, the team should consider what kind of evidence is needed, how it should be gathered, and whether it should be gathered on a regular basis.

Most review teams assign subcommittees to gather information to answer the particular questions they have chosen to address. Common subcommittees are often aligned with the topical foci ACE recommends for a review. Sometimes institutions structure subcommittees around areas of special interest in their institutions. For example, subcommittees can be assigned such topics as curriculum, co-curriculum and student life, international students, faculty development, marketing or messaging, community relations, and education abroad. Subcommittees may devise their own strategies for collecting information on specific parts of the review, but it also is possible to create guidelines for their work.
mittees, Northern Virginia Community College developed guidelines for what it called "Collaborative Groups" (see Appendix O). However, as the review team organizes its work, it is crucial for all subcommittees to share their plans for gathering information with the entire team. Common information-gathering strategies include surveys of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community members; focus groups; interviews; and reviews of course syllabi and enrollments.

Gathering Information from Students, Faculty, and Staff Members

In gathering information for the review, the review team should use its members' time well, ensuring that the processes or tools used are the most efficient way to collect important information. Before proceeding with any approach, subcommittees should explain to the entire review team why they want to obtain information, how they plan to obtain it, and how they plan to use it. By soliciting feedback from their colleagues on the soundness of their approach, subcommittees have also avoided unnecessary overlaps. One institution discovered, for example that a number of faculty surveys were planned for the same year. To ensure sufficient results for the internationalization review, the team made some adjustments in the timing of its survey. Another institution added questions to previously planned surveys of students. Other successful institutions used coordinated surveys of faculty and staff members to gather information on the many aspects of internationalization needed for a full review.

A survey—a commonly used tool—can be constructed to address several different dimensions of a review, thus creating greater return on the effort. For example, an electronic survey of faculty members at the six campuses of Northern Virginia Community College solicited information about the content of their courses, their international background and experiences, and desirable kinds of faculty development to advance internationalization. (For sample surveys, see Appendix P or the ACE publication Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: Final Report 2003.)

While surveys can effectively serve multiple purposes, teams should not rely solely on them because there are limits to what a survey can reveal (especially if the response rate is low), and a survey can be very time-consuming to design, administer, collate, and analyze. Inevitably, surveys will yield some ambiguous responses. One institution assumed that its faculty survey could easily be analyzed by responses from full-time and adjunct faculty, but the survey did not ask respondents to identify the category to which they belonged. Because the results could not be sorted, the institution will add a new field to its next faculty survey. Alternative activities such as retreats or focus groups can generate additional interest in and conversations about internationalization. These activities also can clarify or deepen the team's understanding of survey results. It is important to think carefully about the effort required to implement a certain collection method, the possible ripple effects it might have, and how to be most efficient in the process.

Another issue to consider in collecting information from faculty, staff, and students is whether the review team has the capacity to do a particular task well. What are the resources necessary to design and implement the chosen approach? Does the review team have time and access to the appropriate groups, and if not, whose help is necessary to get that access? Does the review team have the expertise to conduct surveys, focus group discussions, and interviews? Several institutions called upon a faculty member to design and conduct surveys and student focus groups. Surveys require experts to help design the instrument and analyze the information as well as people to administer, code, and compile the results. Likewise, focus groups require facilitators well versed in this methodology to get the most useful results (see Appendix Q).

The information-gathering process can often generate unexpected information. The College of Notre Dame, for example, conducted a survey of students enrolled in its weekend and accelerated programs (see Appendix P, sample 3). Both programs include a high proportion of adult students. The survey results compelled the review team to take another look at this segment of the college’s student body and underscored the importance of understanding which kinds of internationally focused academic and co-curricular programs were best suited to these students. At one institution, analyzing the results of a faculty survey made the team think more deeply about faculty incentives for engaging in international work. At another, the faculty surveys offered insights into the campus culture as well as concrete information about the extent of internationalization of the curriculum.

Gathering Information About the Curriculum
Taking an inventory of the curriculum is always a complex undertaking. A curriculum review should help an institution determine the extent to which it is already internationalized and generate ideas about how to broaden and deepen internationalization. Each institution will have to define what it means by an internationalized curriculum. This conversation is most useful when conducted in the context of defining outcomes for global learning (see Chapter 2), so that the defining questions are how the curriculum helps all students acquire the skills, attitudes, and knowledge that the team has articulated as its outcomes. Different students will achieve these learning outcomes through different modes of study (for example, on-campus coursework or education abroad), pedagogies (interactive student-teacher discussions, collaborative group work, or experiential and service learning), and parts of the curriculum (general education, the major, interdisciplinary minors, or capstone courses) and the co-curriculum. An internationalized curriculum is an interconnected system, including general education and the major, offering international learning opportunities broadly across the curriculum.

Review team leaders will need to manage many conversations with the team to develop working definitions of what constitutes an internationalized course and
what level of internationalization it meets. If an institution already requires a course with an international or global focus as part of its general education curriculum, definitions may already exist, even if they are applied inconsistently by the curriculum committee. If the definitions are not clear, questions of legitimacy and accuracy may be raised by faculty members when the team shares the results of the internationalization review. The review team will find it especially important to engage the relevant committee(s) overseeing the curriculum, as well as deans and department heads.

One way to inventory the curriculum for international learning opportunities is to map it using global learning outcomes, if these have been developed by the team or if they already exist at the institution. This approach brings together the two strands of the internationalization review process: crafting global learning outcomes and conducting an internationalization review. Once a draft set of learning outcomes has been developed, the next important question to address is where in the curriculum students might acquire this learning. To what extent will all students accomplish these learning goals, or will only a subset of students do so by selecting certain courses or majors? (See Chapter 2 for further discussion of mapping the curriculum using learning outcomes.)

Several institutions were successful using a learning outcomes approach to map the curriculum. They went beyond scanning their catalogues for international course titles and embraced the challenge of mapping where the learning goals could be achieved across their curriculum. Cleveland State University, for example, created an inventory of internationalized courses by sending a survey to all department chairs asking them to identify courses with international or multicultural content that addressed global learning categories. These categories included students demonstrating awareness and understanding of world geography, other cultures, multiple perspectives on specific global issues, and ethnic and multicultural issues in the United States. The team then compared that list with the institution’s current general education courses to identify any overlap. Finally, the team gathered enrollment data. Through its analysis, the team was able to understand the extent to which students were taking advantage of these offerings. The next step would be to further refine the learning outcomes and develop an assessment that shows the extent to which students are achieving them.

The review team at Kennesaw State University used a mixed methodology to gather information about the extent to which the curriculum was internationalized. Initially the team charged its members to review course syllabi in selected departments to determine the extent to which they had international content. Because they were able to collect information from only a few departments, the team then followed up with surveys directly to the faculty. But the greatest progress came when the members of the review team...
Keeping the Information-Gathering Process Moving
To keep the information-gathering process moving, the review team should schedule regular meetings, typically once every two weeks, at the same time. Regular meetings serve both to prod team members to have something to report to their colleagues (competition and potential embarrassment are powerful motivators) and to provide feedback on efforts under way. In addition, reporting on those meetings to faculty members and staff can create campus buzz about internationalization. Boise State posted agendas and minutes of all the meetings of the review team and its subcommittees on the institution’s internationalization web site (see www2.boisestate.edu/vpaa/internationalization/). Northern Virginia Community College established an international blog (see www.nvcc.edu/international/itf/).

The review teams that were most successful in conducting the internationalization reviews had team leaders who placed a high priority on conducting the review, were invested in keeping the process moving along, and were awful in how they managed the team process. Effective team leaders paid attention to group process, ensuring that the group worked well together, and dealt with conflict, both overt and covert.

Finally, team chairs must sometimes take corrective action. If specific review team members are not carrying out their responsibilities in gathering information, the team leaders need to intervene to help that individual or sub-group, or figure out an alternative way to get that work accomplished.
Phase 3: Analyzing the Review Findings

Review teams that were successful in the analytical phase of the work typically allocated several months to analyzing the information gathered. A positive first step is to identify findings that point to a clear strength of the institution, whether this is already known or discovered through the review. Institutions are frequently pleased when they find out the strength of their faculty members' international backgrounds, experiences, language skills, and interest in international activities.

Positive responses can help an institution identify new opportunities, such as where international contacts can be leveraged and where institutional partnerships for research and exchange might easily be established.

But review teams must be rigorous in identifying weaknesses as well. One institution, which had already been committing substantial institutional resources to the recruitment of international students, was surprised and disappointed with the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement, which showed that its domestic students reported below the national average in having significant encounters with students from other cultures. This finding led the institution to realize that it needed to rethink how international students were integrated into campus life, and several program revisions were identified.

This kind of analysis is often described as a SWOT analysis, which identifies Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats suggested by the information gathered. Most institutions doing an internationalization review with ACE's assistance applied this approach to each dimension of the review. Institutions doing a SWOT analysis sometimes found that the categories did not always apply neatly; nonetheless, these analyses did identify additional issues and questions for the review teams to consider. The SWOT exercise fosters critical reflection and encourages the team to develop recommendations based on the evidence accumulated through the review. Some questions to structure such a SWOT analysis include:

- What are this institution's strongest points in internationalization?
- To what extent do our internationalization strategies and activities address our stated goals? Where are the gaps between our goals and our activities?
- Which of our activities most directly help students achieve our desired student learning outcomes?
- What areas show underdevelopment or weakness? Are these areas important to us? What would it take to strengthen them?
- What factors, internal and external, do we need to take into consideration as we chart future directions?
• What opportunities exist for fostering synergy among our internationalization efforts?

• What opportunities exist for aligning our internationalization efforts with other institution-wide initiatives, such as assessment, general education reform, multiculturalism, and institutional strategic planning?

(For more details and tools for a SWOT analysis, see Appendix R.)

If a question deemed important by the review team yields unclear or contradictory information, this result tells the planning team that the institution needs to adapt its information-gathering strategy in order to yield information that will be useful in planning for internationalization.

Analyzing the findings attached to every question addressed in the review report will give an institution a good sense of the directions it will need to take in both the short and long terms. A key set of issues that a review team must address for every question in the review is: What are the implications of this review item for the institution’s internationalization work for the next year and for the next three to five years?

Careful analysis of information gathered during the review is critical to establishing reasonable internationalization goals and setting priorities among the action items. Without analysis, teams will have no justifiable basis for deciding what new directions to pursue or which initiatives to undertake, which to revise, and which to drop. An analysis should also help a team decide which goals are the most important in the short, medium, and long terms.

The following questions can help a team identify the most important areas for additional attention:

• Where are the most significant gaps in our internationalization efforts?

• Where are the gaps between our articulated global learning outcomes and opportunities for students to acquire this learning?

• What areas, if not addressed, will be the significant barriers to achieving our institution’s vision of internationalization?

Rigorous analysis and use of data gathered in the review process can also prevent teams from being one-sided in developing initiatives. Although particular team members may be passionate advocates for particular strategies or initiatives, internationalization has many different aspects, including curriculum, institutional partnerships, student life, faculty research, and education abroad. These can be seen as competing interests, and the team should suggest ways to move the whole institution forward, rather than protecting any particular program or interests. No review process is apolitical, but an institutional review and a thorough analysis of information gathered will help increase the likelihood that the institution will move forward strategically and not just through a set of political compromises.
Phase 4: Drafting a Report on the Findings

The culmination of the review process is putting the information together into a report on the internationalization review, usually written by the chair or co-chairs of the review team, based on the reports of the subgroups. The structure for such a report can vary considerably, but one simple solution is to follow the format of the review guidelines (see “Elements of an Internationalization Review,” page 48). Because the report will be for internal use and provide a basis for future planning, it should present the findings as clearly and frankly as possible.

When an internationalization review report identifies the institution's internationalization vision and activities and communicates them effectively, it also provides an opportunity for further communication and engagement. Cleveland State University, for example, held a retreat on the findings of the review to which all administrators and faculty members were invited. A draft version of the report was available before the retreat. This approach enabled the review team to gather additional information at the retreat itself and to allow those faculty not directly involved in the review to participate. St. Louis and San Diego Community Colleges, both facing leadership transitions, also used their reports to introduce their new leaders to the international work of their institutions.

Some institutions use external consultants or peer review teams to provide additional analysis of the findings of an internationalization review and to help develop recommendations to incorporate in institutional planning. Peer review teams read the internationalization review and supporting documents; spend one to two days in intensive meetings with a wide array of faculty, students, and administrators at the institution; and then debrief the institution, making recommendations for short- and long-term strategies, based on their observations and expertise (see Appendix S). A written report with the consultant's or the visiting team's observations is a helpful conclusion. These reports can address the institution's strengths and weaknesses and provide recommendations for improving their internationalization efforts. The recommendations of the peer review team are then discussed by the institution's internationalization team and may be incorporated into its findings or recommendations (see “Sample Recommendations Emerging from a Review,” on next page). Some institutions engage their stakeholders again when the consultant and/or peer review team has completed its work. At any stage, discussion is crucial for the development of strongly supported recommendations for the institution's planning efforts.