

**Report on the State University of New York College at Geneseo  
Participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory  
By the American Council on Education Peer Review Visit Team  
April 1-3, 2015**

**I. Introduction**

This report is based on a visit to the State University of New York College at Geneseo (Geneseo) by an American Council on Education (ACE) peer review team on April 1-3, 2015. This report also draws upon several documents provided to the peer review team in advance: Global Geneseo Report, March 16, 2015 with all its appendixes and various other charts and publications.

The visit included meetings with Interim President Carol Long; Interim Provost David Gordon; the **Global Geneseo Committee** comprised of the **Coordinating Committee** (David Gordon, Interim Provost; Ronald Herzman, Faculty, Department of English; Meredith Harrigan, Faculty, Department of Communication; and Becky Lewis, Assistant Provost for International Programs); **Internationalization at Home** (Jeremy Grace, Faculty, International Relations; Irene Belyakov-Goodman, Faculty, English for Speakers of Other Languages; Mary Hope, Director, International Student and Scholar Services; Kodjo Adabra, Faculty, Department of Languages and Literatures; George Marcus, Faculty, Department of Physics; Peter Corrigan, Assistant Dean; Leonie Stone, Faculty, School of Business; Linda Steet, Faculty, School of Education; Luciano Scala, Student; and Mary Jensen, Faculty, School of Education); **Internationalization Abroad** (Rob Doggett, Faculty, Department of English; John Williams, Coordinator of Accreditation and International Programs, School of Education; Gabe Iturbides, Interim Director, Access Opportunity Programs; Anne-Marie Reynolds, Faculty, Department of Music; Jennifer Rogalsky, Faculty, Department of Geography; Tim Nolan, Faculty, School of Business; Regina Clinton, Faculty, Department of Biology; Beverly Evans, Faculty, Department of Languages and Literatures; Cynthia Klima, Faculty, Department of Languages and Literatures); **Institutional Structure and Support** (Maria Lima, Faculty, Department of English; Anjoo Sikka, Dean, School of Education; Jo Kirk, Faculty, Department of Political Science and International Relations; Ken Kallio, Interim Associate Provost; and Stacey Wiley, Director of Career Development); the Deans and other senior officers (Jon Hysell, Interim Vice President for Advancement; Anjoo Sikka, Dean of the School of Education; Celia Easton, Dean of Residential Living; Denise Rotondo, Dean of the School of Business; and Savi Iyer, Dean of Curriculum and Academic Services); the Department Chairs; the International Programs office staff; and open meetings of interested faculty and staff, which were extremely well attended.

The visit was part of the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, a project that builds upon the learning from several earlier ACE multi-campus initiatives, including Promising Practices in International Education and Global Learning for All. In addition to Geneseo, other institutions participating in the 2013-15 Laboratory are California State University, Dominguez Hills; Clemson University (SC); Emerson College (MA); Hawai'i, Leeward, and Windward Community Colleges (HI); Lewis University (IL); Orange Coast College (CA); Sacred Heart;

University (CT); University of Alabama at Birmingham; University of Massachusetts Amherst; and Western Washington University.

This is a confidential report to Geneseo, designed to assist the institution with its internationalization efforts. However, the reviewers encourage wide internal distribution of the report so that it can assist the college community in these tasks. The contents will not be published or made public unless Geneseo chooses to do so or gives ACE permission to do so.

## **II. Peer Review Team**

Elizabeth Brewer, Director, Office of International Education, Beloit College (WI)

Barbara A. Hill, Senior Associate and Director of the Internationalization Laboratory, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), American Council on Education, Washington, DC (team leader)

Suzanne Shipley, President, Shepherd University (WV)

## **III. Overall Strengths**

### **Senior Leadership**

Geneseo is at a propitious moment in time to broaden and deepen its internationalization efforts because the college has strong administrative support for internationalization and broad faculty interest. The Lab process has been extremely helpful to Geneseo as it demonstrated the grass roots interest and assets available for moving forward with comprehensive internationalization as an element of Geneseo's strategic direction, a position that was reinforced at every one of the meetings during our visit. Joining the ACE Lab showed strong administrative commitment, especially from Interim President Carol Long and Interim Provost David Gordon, who in spite of their interim roles were able to encourage widespread discussions that helped formulate the clear and achievable goals contained in the report. Their support was acknowledged and appreciated by those with whom we met. We understand that the incoming president, Denise A. Battles, has been informed of the Lab process and will be able to respond to the report when she arrives on campus in July.

### **Leadership and the Internationalization Laboratory Team**

The team leadership by Coordinating Committee was extremely effective, designing a process that elicited wide participation and encouraging consensus through repeated committee meetings with cross-campus representation and presentations to faculty groups throughout the process. We sensed an excitement generated by the collaboration and the ease with which the participants found common ground. We had the strong impression that everyone was listened to, and that the culture of Geneseo was encouraging the campus to think creatively and flexibly about what the college could do with imagination and dedication, in spite of limited resources. In addition, the Lab process allowed people the opportunity to work outside "silos" for the good of the whole institution. We were particularly impressed by the spirit of collaboration that seemed to infuse the Lab process, a combination of bottom-up and top-down working together that conveyed a sense of trust on the campus. We enjoyed learning about the World Café process,

which both evidenced and engendered a high level of faculty, student, and staff interest in internationalization.

### **The Internationalization Review and Strategic Plan**

The Global Geneseo Report provides a clear narrative of the Lab process and a convincing analysis of the findings of the review. Further, the recommendations and their rationales are buttressed with knowledge of the field of comprehensive internationalization. The recommendations are fully aligned with the college's mission and provide compelling arguments about why the college is well poised to move ahead. Geneseo's strengths in the area of internationalization came into focus in the review process, as did the challenges. In some cases the strengths seem isolated from one another, but the report suggests a set of actions that can be the underpinning to make the sum greater than the individual parts.

### **Cluster Hiring**

The concept of hiring a group of faculty in the same year to support curricular directions is a particularly promising process that can accelerate internationalization, as interdisciplinary work seems natural to curricular internationalization. This may be a new model that should be presented at national meetings by teams of Geneseo administrators and faculty.

### **Study Abroad**

That study abroad numbers are increasing is a very good sign. Certainly the students have a wealth of opportunities, some sponsored by SUNY and others from third party providers. But the growth is probably most due to prompts from Geneseo faculty at home, the presentations in classes, and the wide advertisement of the opportunities.

### **Diversification of the Student Body**

Because Geneseo has a diversity plan, the college is especially sensitive to the issues of difference. We were amused that because of the dominance of New York State residents at the college, a student from Virginia would seem exotic. In any case, the mix of domestic, recent immigrants or New Americans, and international students on campus should have a positive effect of helping to develop an intercultural pedagogy.

### **International Students**

The number of international students at Geneseo is quite impressive, especially for a college in a rural area. The practices that support this should be continued. Given that the campus wants to increase the number of international students, the current situation seems promising.

### **Residential Support**

Recent changes to housing policies to allow more than one residence hall to stay open during holiday breaks is a good action, accommodating to international students' needs. Having international mentors is a creative response, as well.

### **Curriculum**

The existence of a Common Core that includes the humanities and a language requirement in which culture is foregrounded, are positive assets for comprehensive internationalization.

### **Interns in International Programs Office**

The student interns are a valuable addition, as they can provide workshops for international students, acclimatizing them to American mores. We sensed that Geneseo has an innovative and informed study abroad office with vision and expertise.

## **IV. Observations and Recommendations**

### **Unfinished Business**

The Global Geneseo Report still needs further development to become a strategic or implementation plan. The individual actions need to be placed in a timeline, with responsible parties specified. Some institutions have used a matrix format to do this with action, actors, expected completion or start dates, and status updates.

### **Continue Global Geneseo**

We suggest that the Global Geneseo working group continue, perhaps with some reconfiguration and perhaps with a new charge. The group could advise the Office of International Programs on integrating Geneseo's international activities, developing a communications plan so that the campus is more aware of international activities, assisting in data collection, staying abreast of best practices in the field to avoid isolation, and to ensure that programs and partnerships advance the entire college's mission.

### **Study Abroad**

We observed that the college seemed fixated on the primacy of study abroad, which is a default position at many institutions and common at liberal arts institutions, such as Geneseo, where the emphasis is teaching and student learning. Geneseo's study abroad numbers are high, although in our opinion, unlikely to reach 100% participation. We heard that some students' majors do not allow time for study abroad, even though other institutions have found ways to allow for study abroad in even the most structured majors. And, of course, we heard about the problem of affordability of study abroad.

Many faculty seem to be deeply invested in faculty-led short term study abroad, but the way that these are currently financed (faculty travel, hotel, meals, and even stipends are currently paid for by the additional fees charged to the students) will not give greater access for economically disadvantaged students to these opportunities. Because financial aid travels for semester-long programs, and students do not incur the extra costs involved when faculty accompany students abroad, semester-long options seem to offer a better opportunity for financially-challenged students. Further, it was not always clear to us how a particular course benefits from being taught abroad; perhaps this question is addressed in the proposal process. Finally, the learning outcomes of study abroad need to be better articulated and understood, both to make clear to students the purpose of study abroad and how their own goals relate to this, as well as how different kinds of experiences (e.g. semester-long enrollment in universities abroad vs. short-term courses led by Geneseo faculty) contribute to potentially different outcomes in terms of student learning and development.

## **Internationalizing the Curriculum and Faculty Development**

Internationalizing the curriculum is a vital part of comprehensive internationalization. Because not all students will be able to study abroad, the college must consider ways to internationalize at home by internationalizing the curriculum. An internationalized curriculum can also make study abroad a part of students' overall educational trajectories, as opposed to being a semester away. We recommend that Geneseo make the process of internationalizing the curriculum and pedagogy a priority as soon as possible. Curriculum internationalization is a long-term process, involving a discussion of the desired student learning, creating opportunities in **all** programs for students to acquire and demonstrate this learning, and integrating student study abroad experiences, where possible, into the curriculum (both prior to departure and upon return).

The chief resource needed to accomplish this is the faculty, both those currently at the institution and those who will be hired in the future. They need to be incentivized to do this work. Internationalization cannot be accidental—it must be intentional. Advertisements of new positions can emphasize that international experience or background is preferred so that the institution can augment its internationalization. Professional development at various levels will be necessary to help faculty members, department chairs, and deans identify international and/or intercultural learning outcomes, enhance the international/intercultural content of current programs, and perhaps create study abroad opportunities that will incorporate perspectives relevant to particular majors. Professional development may involve grants and stipends, workshops, released time, administrative support, perhaps even modification of tenure and promotion guidelines or an award system. Internationalization is not additional work, but a means to give the faculty new ways to think about their current teaching and research in a more nuanced way. As the university's international agenda continues to develop and incorporate graduate education as well as faculty research, the possibilities for productive linkages between undergraduate and graduate training as well as research should be enhanced as much as possible.

Internationalizing the curriculum is not just a responsibility of the language departments or the humanities; all courses, general education requirements, and majors and minors can be internationalized. Some programs at the college are already doing this. All disciplines need to understand the major in terms of local, national, and global dimensions and think about how this perspective can be most effectively transmitted to their students. Encouraging interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary as well as cross-unit collaboration in curriculum development will be especially important in a college such as Geneseo.

Many resources are available to assist the faculty in internationalizing the curriculum, many of which might be familiar to Geneseo. ACE has posted or published successful programs from several projects: "Where Faculty Live"—disciplinary associations (American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Historical Association, and the Association of American Geographers) describing what an internationalized major would look like in their disciplines. Most recently, ACE has posted a four-part series on internationalizing the curriculum on its website in the feature "Internationalization in Action." <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Intlz-in-Action-2013-December.aspx>

In addition, other curricular resources are available at [www.campusinternationalization.org](http://www.campusinternationalization.org), a collaboration of 12 higher education associations dealing with internationalization, including internationalizing the curriculum. Some of the curricular postings include: Campus-Based Curricular Development (AAC&U)—links to 10 award-winning institutional projects; Global Citizenship (AAC&U)—internationalizing undergraduate majors at 11 institutions; Integrating Global Learning in Science Courses (AAC&U); and Internationalization of Teacher Education (NAFSA)—three case studies, Internationalization of STEM Education (NAFSA). Other useful documents are Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum: Theory and Practice Across the Disciplines (Brewer, E. & Cunningham, K., Eds.). Stylus: 2009 and a chapter (by Bette Leask and Betsy Brewer on Internationalizing the Curriculum in the SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education. It can be downloaded at no cost from: <http://www.aieaworld.org/publications>

Finally, Geneseo may want to intentionally expand its culture of faculty development grants to include internationalization of the curriculum.

### **Use of Technology**

Geneseo is already aware of the technology opportunities offered by the SUNY system through the COIL office, though we sensed a campus ethos so focused on face-to-face instruction that there were comments on not wanting to “seduce residential students into on-line learning.” Although on-line learning and other uses of technology in support of internationalization may prove to be imprudent at this time in Geneseo’s history, technology can in fact enhance classroom learning, and we would encourage exploration of its use. ACE has sponsored three technology awards about bringing the world into the classroom, which are available on the ACE website.

Technology can boost faculty involvement in international education efforts. Technology can offer faculty and their students the opportunity to engage with colleagues overseas without incurring the costs (time, money) of traveling abroad. Co-teaching courses with faculty located in other countries using video/internet technology, for example, can help fill gaps in international expertise at an institution and enhance the internationalization of the curriculum. We acknowledge that this kind of cooperation will require considerable investment. Technical capacities are needed in locations convenient for faculty and students. Supports are needed to develop the relationships that can lead to such cooperation, and the university will need to recognize that this may require face-to-face contact for cooperating faculty (and possibly administrators) at some points over an extended time. Further, to be successful, technology must serve specific objectives of an institution’s international education program and be recognized for what it is: a tool that may or may not be the right one for the particular task at hand. Technology, at its best, needs to be used to integrate classroom and educational experience across the disciplines. Finally, technology can prove to be very costly, and if it is not designed to clearly support the international program, Geneseo may find that this particular investment may not be wise

### **International Students**

We heard that international students have a lot of needs, which smacks of a deficit model. Instead, we recommend an asset model, under which international students are viewed

positively, not just as a revenue stream but as a lever to change teaching into an intentional intercultural model. That will help link the diversity and international agendas on campus. We recommend expanding the international student mentors program.

### **Partnerships**

Geneseo does have some international partnerships with universities abroad. Rather than trying to develop new ones, we suggest that the college first work on broadening existing partnerships by engaging more departments with them, and going beyond student exchange to include other opportunities for collaboration, such as faculty exchanges, joint teaching, and research.

### **Development Office**

We recommend that the alumni office and the development office keep records of who studies abroad each year, as institutions have found that such data is useful when trying to raise funds to support comprehensive internationalization.

### **International Students and Alumnae**

Like many institutions, Geneseo needs to continue efforts to intentionally connect its domestic and its international students. In addition, the university needs to better track its international alumni, who are a potentially valuable source of internship and service learning opportunities, as well as institutional partnerships.

## **V. Conclusion**

Geneseo is clearly fortunate to have support for internationalization from many in the faculty and administration. But the conversations about comprehensive internationalization need to continue to widen the base of support so that the college can effectively deliver what its mission implies about internationalization.

Geneseo is well positioned to continue developing its work in comprehensive internationalization because it has all the key ingredients: leadership, energy, and a “new normal” vision to support this work. Global Geneseo has demonstrated that it can engage faculty members and influence faculty processes, and the college should continue this important work. Geneseo also benefits from a student body that is invested in the promise and rewards of internationalization. Internationalization is a long-term project, requiring regular processes for checking progress. In fact, we recommend that the college consider having a Lab 2.0 revisit by a peer review team in three to five years. By developing and continuing an intentional process, Geneseo will make its balanced internationalization goals part of its everyday operations, continuing to reinforce its status as a distinctive institution.

Submitted June 15, 2015