

**Opportunities and Challenges in the
Internationalization and Globalization of Higher
Education in the United States: Implications for
US-India Student Mobility**

Gary Rhodes

*(Center for Global Education, Rossier School of Education, University of
Southern California, U.S.A.)*
grhodes@usc.edu.

Introduction

While over 54,000 Indian students are studying at US colleges for full graduate and undergraduate degrees, only 811 U.S. students have taken part in short-term study abroad in India (Institute of International Education). If India is the largest democracy in the world and the US is one of the more important democracies in the world, one can ask the question: Why is the movement of students so uneven?

This paper will review some of the characteristics of US higher education which result in challenges and opportunities for student mobility, in general, and in mobility between the US and India, in particular. This paper is intended to help promote discussion about the challenges and opportunities for international education and student mobility between the US and India. Following an introduction to the issues, this paper will introduce resources, which can be useful for developing policy and implementing student mobility programs.

The role of interactions between systems of higher education has increased as the interactions between individuals, institutions, and

countries around the world have accelerated. This includes the interconnectedness of economies, environments, technologies, political, and other systems. These interactions around the world require a look at education systems beyond an individual nation-state (global) and from the perspective of the nation-state of those forces beyond its borders (international). Knight and DeWit (1997) define global and international education as follows:

“Globalisation is the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas...across borders. Globalisation affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities.

Internationalisation of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalisation yet, at the same time respects the individuality of the nation.(Knight and deWit,1997)”.

Twenty-first century forces require that countries look at the impact of the global on their higher education systems (mission, administration, faculty, students, community, teaching, research, and community service) as they provide education to support individual country, regional and world educational needs for the future. Whether policy-makers decide to provide policy that will increase collaboration or decrease interactions across borders, this policy should be developed from a framework, which looks at the global and international forces in place. Altbach and Teichler (2001), elaborate on some of these forces:

- Common Academic Model Worldwide (stems from European model)
- Increasingly Global Academic Marketplace: Students & Staff
- Use of English Internationally for Research & Teaching
- Use of Distance Education and Internet for Research & Teaching
- Trend of Institutional Partnering With Other Country Institutions
 - Creation of Off-Shore Campuses
 - Franchising of Educational Programs & Degrees
- Harmonization of Degree Structures, Courses, Credits, Related Mechanisms of Evaluation, and Measurement of Academic Progress (Altbach and Teichner, 2001).

Levels of Internationalization

Institutions should also take into account the various levels at which these forces provide impact upon their constituents. Following is a list of ten levels of these forces to help provide a framework. Below each level, a sample of relevant institutions or programs that make up the organizations at each level is listed. Many more institutions could be added at each level as institutional leaders consider the impact of the individuals and institutions that will impact them in providing for educational policy:

- **Worldwide (Global/Multinational) Government Level**
 - United Nations
 - World Bank
- **Regional Government Level**
 - European Union
 - North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
- **National Government Level**
 - Fulbright: US Department of State
 - FIPSE: US Department of Education
- **State/Province Government Level**
 - Illinois International Education Association
 - K-12/Higher Education: State Department of Education
- **Local Institution Level**
 - University System Realities
 - Individual University Realities
- **Cultural Group Level**
 - Religion/Missionary
 - Heritage Student Programs
- **Personal Level**
 - Travel, Study, Work, Job Training Abroad
 - Language Learning/Cultural Learning
- **Technological Level**
 - World Wide Web/E-Mail
 - Distance Learning
- **Agency Level**
 - American Council on Education

- Institute of International Education,
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators
- Corporate Level
 - Motorola
 - Siemens

Support for Internationalization in the U.S.

From the US perspective, the year 2000 saw a growth in the types of statements from the Office of the President of the US. In the last year of the Clinton administration, there were statements about the importance of international education. The Office of Postsecondary Education of the US Department of Education took part in the 'Agenda Project', which provided feedback from across the US about higher education priorities for the future. International education was shown to be an area of significant importance. However, as these policy statements and documents came at the end of the Clinton administration, they had only limited implications in terms of policy change and implementation.

In the first years of the George W. Bush administration, there have been statements by the President, the US Secretary of State, and the US Secretary of Education on the importance of international education. Following are excerpts from each of these statements:

"Complex Global Interactions, once reserved for the diplomatic corps, are today the stuff of everyday business deals and cultural exchanges. If we expect students to navigate international waters, we need to give them an international education that meets the highest standards". (Paige Quote, 2001).

"I can think of no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of future world leaders who were educated here... International education prepares our citizens to live, work, and compete in the global economy, and promotes tolerance and the reduction of conflict". (Powell, 2001).

..."We must also reaffirm our commitment to promote educational opportunities that enable American students to study abroad, and to encourage international students to take part in our educational system". (Bush, 2001).

It is unclear whether these policy statements will result in significant increases in programs and funding for international education in the US.

It will be important to watch the process of whether these international education statements turn to international education policy which will be implemented, providing support for increased linkages and funding for various international and global activities which would affect US higher education.

At the regional level, there have been various efforts across the world, which have resulted in regional cooperation. At this time, the European Union has provided for a large amount of funding and support for cooperation in higher education across borders. DeWit (2001) summarizes the importance of the Bologna Declaration in leading towards a European higher education area and some of the critical issues for higher education from the European perspective:

“The Bologna Declaration of June 19, 1999 was the start of a process that will lead to the creation of a European higher education area. The Bologna Declaration had six objectives: comparable degrees, a two-year cycle degree structure, establishment of a course credit system, promotion of mobility and common European patterns in higher education...

...The challenge will be whether institutions of higher education in Europe will be able to cross regional and national boundaries to become players in the European and global higher education market...

...the institutions pointed to the importance of maintaining as guiding principles the autonomy of higher education; higher education as a public, rather than a commercial, good; and its diversity in terms of language, systems, types, profiles, and curricular orientation. Quality assurance, compatible qualifications, and attractiveness are seen as crucial elements for the realization of the new European higher education space”.

Although there are efforts in North American and in South Asia to provide for educational cooperation, they are not driven by a desire for common cultural area in either region (in contrast to the European Union). Resources available in South Asia and North America for higher education collaboration across borders do not match up in terms of policy or funding to that provided by the European Union for regional higher education collaboration efforts.

Looking at North America, one can see the contrast between the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and European Union efforts. When developed, NAFTA provided for collaboration in the area

of business and trade. There were no commitments towards collaboration in the area of a common culture, educational collaboration, nor resource provided for student, faculty, or staff mobility in the region. Since that time, programs like the North American Mobility Program, through the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) of the US Department of Education as the lead institution from the US side and independent organizations like CONAHEC have supported North American mobility efforts, but none of those efforts anywhere close to that in the European Union through programs like ERASMUS and SOCRATES.

One can contrast the efforts of governments in the area of support for student mobility. The governments of Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom have taken part in centralized efforts to increase the number of international students coming to study in their countries. In each case, central government funds were allocated to jump-start recruitment efforts and provide resources to support increasing the numbers of international students studying in their countries. Along with funding, government efforts included easing the visa process for international students.

In the United States, as noted previously in the paper, there have been statements about the importance of international education and a limited amount of new programs that have been funded at the federal level (for example, Fulbright and FIPSE). However, one can't point to an implementable federal government policy supporting an increase in the number of international students in the US, with increased funding to do so, nor an easing of the visa process for international students (this situation has toughened significantly since September 11th).

Although education is the purview of each of the 50 states in the United States, there are ways that the U.S., at the federal level, provides support for both public and private higher education: A portion of the total U.S. funding for higher education supports international education activities. Most of the funds, however, support activities for US students or US institutional programs movement abroad. Following are a number of US federal programs that support international education:

- US Dept. of State: Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs
 - Fulbright Offices/Programs
 - Institutional Linkage Programs
 - Educational Partnerships Program

- US Department of Education
 - Grants/Loans/Scholarships: US/Abroad
 - Grants/Loans/Scholarships: US/Abroad
 - Teaching/Research Assistantships
 - Title VI: Area Studies, Language, International Business, Research
 - FIPSE: Comprehensive Programs: Regional Initiatives
- National Security Education Program
 - Student Grants
 - Institutional Grants
- US Agency for International Development
 - Institutional Partnership Program

At the same time, the United States continues to be the country that brings in the largest number of international students to study for degree programs of any country around the world. This includes an increase from 514,723 international students in 1999/2000 to 547,867 international students in 2001/2002. In the most recent data, there were 54,664 Indian (India is the second largest sender of international students to the US) students studying in the US for undergraduate or graduate degree programs. However, in the most recent study abroad statistics, only 811 US students were studying in India (all of these were studying in India for less than one year)(Institute of International Education).

Recent surveys showed that the US public does favor international education. According to the American Council on Education (ACE) report (ACE, 2001). In the population surveyed, 59 percent of students responded with an interest in study or internship abroad for a semester. An additional 18 percent said they would like to go just for the summer, while another 9 percent indicated they preferred only a few weeks. Eleven percent said they would want to go abroad for one year. In the population surveyed, more than 75 percent of the general public believed students should have a study abroad or internship experience some time during their college or university years. When asked whether the United States should take an active part in world affairs, approximately 80% of the general public responded positively (strongly agree or somewhat agree) while only 15% did not favor this (somewhat disagree and strongly disagree).

While the public may support international education, if one looks at federal funding for academic exchanges in constant dollars, one can find

a 24 percent reduction since the levels of 1994 to 1999 (1994: 215.09 million to 1999: 122.23 million). These figures look at funds set aside specifically for exchange purposes.

The US government does provide a significant amount of funding to support the higher education of students at US colleges and universities. Many of those funds are portable for study abroad, if the credit abroad is counted towards the US college or university degree program. For institutions looking for students from the US, these funds may provide more than enough funding to cover tuition, room and board, and international travel. The range of costs at US colleges and universities starts at less than \$100 per year for tuition at some community colleges to over \$25,000 per year at many private colleges and universities. This does not include the cost of room and board, which varies widely depending on the location and cost of living in the city where the college or university is located.

US college and university students have many different sources of funding for their studies in the US. Students may receive grants or loans from family/personal, federal or state government, institutional funding of all types, private foundation grants, bank loans (subsidized or unsubsidized), as well as jobs on campus. The best students and the best athletes on a university campus can receive full funding for tuition, room and board.

Types of International/Global Education Initiatives

There are many types of initiatives, which can provide support for international and global education initiatives in US higher education. In 1995, the American Council on Education listed (ACE, 1995) ten areas that can be used as benchmarks for looking at internationalization efforts at US colleges and universities:

1. Require that all graduates demonstrate competence in at least one foreign language.
2. Encourage understanding of at least one other culture.
3. Increase understanding of global systems.
4. Revamp curricula to reflect the need for international understanding.
5. Expand study abroad and internship opportunities for all students.
6. Focus on Faculty development and rewards

7. Examine the organizational needs of international education.
8. Build consortia to enhance capabilities.
9. Cooperate with institutions in other countries.
10. Work with local schools and communities. (ACE, 1995)

The US general public's impressions of the importance for US citizens to speak a foreign language do not match up with the realities of current enrollments. Enrollment in foreign language courses at US colleges and universities does not paint a great picture for the internationalization of US higher education. As a percentage of total enrollments in US higher education, over the last 40 years, the percentage of students enrolled in foreign languages declined from sixteen to eight percent. Language enrollments are not evenly distributed among world languages. Spanish language enrollments are over 50% of all language enrollments (ACE, 2000).

When asked, the US public confirmed their impressions of the importance for U.S. citizens to speak a foreign language. Eighty three percent of those surveyed (40%: very important, 43%: somewhat important) supported the importance of speaking a language to compete successfully in a global economy. Only 9% considered it not very important and only 5% responded that it was not important at all.

The US general public's impression of the importance for US students to study abroad does not match up with current participation rates. Although the percentage of US students studying abroad has seen a significant increase, that increase is from less than one half of one percent (0.39%) in 1985 to less than one percent (0.88% in 1997). Only about 0.8 percent of total enrollments and 3 percent of undergraduate students study abroad. At the same time, the length of the study abroad period has been decreasing. Between 1985 and 1997, the number of students studying abroad for more than one semester shrunk from 18 percent to 10 percent (ACE, 2000). Almost one half (45.9%) of all students who study abroad do so for less than one term.

Downsides of Globalization

It is important to look at ways that globalization in education can have negative, as well as positive consequences. Altbach reviews trends in globalization that have the potential for negative outcomes (Altbach, 2001): "Today, trends such as the rise of the Internet and the globalization of knowledge have the potential for creating severe

problems for academic institutions and systems in smaller or poorer nations. In a world divided into centers and peripheries, the centers grow stronger and more dominant and the peripheries become increasingly marginalized. Inequalities grow more pronounced. There is little leeway for academic systems or individual universities to independently develop in the increasingly competitive and fast moving global higher education scene dominated by the world-class universities in the industrialized countries. The traditional academic center becomes ever stronger and more dominant—mainly in the English-speaking countries of the North (the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada) and in Australia, and in the larger countries of the European Union (notably Germany and France, and to some extent Italy and Spain).

The norms, values, language, scientific innovations, and knowledge products of countries in the center crowd out other ideas and practices. These countries are home not only to the dominant universities and research facilities but also to the multinational corporations so powerful in the global knowledge system. Information technology companies such as Microsoft and IBM, biotechnology and pharmaceutical firms (Merck or Biogen), multinational publishers like Elsevier or Bertelsmann, among others, dominate the new international commerce in knowledge, knowledge-based products, and information technology. Smaller and poorer countries have little autonomy or competitive potential in the globalized world. Globalization in higher education exacerbates dramatic inequalities among the world's universities". (Altbach)

The Indian context:

According to Powar (2001), it is important for Indian Universities to look more closely at internationalisation activities:

"The Indian universities have not been able to take advantage of the possibilities that internationalisation offers for improving the quality of education, promoting Indian culture in different countries, and deriving political or economic benefits. In the context of recent national and international developments, in all major areas, it is imperative that we take up the task of internationalisation of our higher education seriously. After all, globalisation has permeated into practically all areas of India's social, cultural, political, and economic activities. The opportunities consequently available to the youth, in the national and global employment market, cannot be disregarded. These require that students

be not only well versed with national issues, but also be conversant and informed about the global scene. In the coming years, international experience will be an added value, and perhaps a necessary requirement, in the student's portfolio.

At the same time, there are concerns for the quality of programs that are in place for Indian students. This concern reflects programs available from international educational institutions in India and those available for Indian students around the world. Powar (2001) provides a background on efforts taken to develop guidelines for developing appropriate international partnerships:

“In order to promote quality education, it would be worthwhile to promote genuine institutional links that are based on equal participation and have adequate controls related to quality and financial arrangements. As a step in this direction the Association of Indian Universities (AIU), in 1999, formulated guidelines to enable the grant of equivalence to degrees offered in India by foreign universities. The main conditions laid down are:

1. The Indian institution (partner) has adequate infrastructure and facilities as substantiated by a report of a Review Committee of the AIU.
2. The programme is implemented jointly by the foreign and Indian universities, or academic institutions affiliated to them, with both contributing to the academic programme in approximately equal measure.
3. The foreign university gives an undertaking, in the form of a certificate, that the degree/diploma awarded to the student in India would be considered as equivalent to the corresponding degree/diploma awarded by the University at home, and that it would be recognized in that country as being equivalent to the corresponding degree/diploma of the awarding university”.

As the primary context for education continues to be inside the nation-state, it is important that governments look closely at the impact which international education can have on its system of education. Dhar (2001) raises an important set of questions for India, when thinking about internationalization in education:

1. One would need to have set reasons/goals for internationalisation.
2. Priorities may be fixed on the aspects of the internationalisation.

3. The internationalisation should not be at the cost of country's own identity or its basic higher education or values.
4. The educational knowledge created should be quality orientated.
5. The inter-cultural aspects should not pose a challenge to our own culture.
6. Economic gains should not be the main consideration.
7. The existing systems should be strengthened to meet the challenge.
8. Proper ways and means should be worked out to implement the process.
9. The model to be adopted should be a tested one, and must fit into the country's environment.
10. The significance of internationalisation of higher education should be taken as development of the existing system, rather than something new or imported.
11. Benchmarks should be developed to test the international character of the knowledge base.
12. Finally, any system can be useful and successful only when there is what we now call 'international mindset' in the area of globalisation and/or internationalisation of higher education.

Student Mobility Outcomes

When developing study abroad and student exchange programs, it is important to look at the change in the outcomes expected and ways that these expectations have changed over time. According to Altbach and Teichler (2001), there has been a change in emphasis from an 'exchange paradigm' to a 'competency paradigm'. The 'exchange paradigm' looks at exchange as a value in itself, long term benefits (hard to measure), the virtue of reciprocity, mutual trust, transparency, improvement through cooperation, joint efforts to reduce costs, and learning through mutual understanding. They contrast this with the current 'competency paradigm' which, according to Altbach and Teichler (2001) includes the following features: lack of concern for equality of opportunity, a neglect of features of learning that don't produce results, the exploitation of foreign students (financially or through poor programs), an overemphasis on easily marketable products (English or other 'world language', MBA, ESL), selling of knowledge products to foreigners (not emphasizing internationalization and mutual understanding), the growth of for-profit

enterprises (delivering easily marketable programs, some with little regard for standards or quality).

Finding US Partners for Exchange or Study Abroad

Finding appropriate college or university partners from the US can be a challenge. With over three thousand higher education institutions, it is not easy to determine which institutions would be appropriate exchange partners. There is no single source which evaluates the quality of higher education programs in the US. One can narrow down the field a bit by ensuring that their college or university partner is an accredited institution, but that only confirms that the institution meets a minimum standard, which has been confirmed by a regional accrediting agency. The process of approval follows a self-study process, which includes an institutional self-study report, a peer site review of the report and a site visit. The self-study and report of the peer review team will generally both include institutional strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for ways to improve the quality of teaching, research, and community service, where relevant. Even this review does not provide a clear understanding for foreign institution partners of what "level of quality standards" has been met. Institutions, for the most part, are either accredited, or not. Some individual academic departments are also reviewed for accreditation in a separate process (faculties of law, medicine, education, business, engineering, etc.). Those programs which do undergo a review for accreditation have only limited, if any, review of the types of special programs which are offered for study abroad or international students.

The US News and World Report magazine annual rankings of US colleges and universities at the undergraduate and graduate levels are generally controversial, in terms of their validity or importance, from the perspective of US colleges and universities. However, they do provide some feedback about US higher education institutions, both at an institution-wide level and with reviews of specific academic departments. Their annual survey also rank institutions within categories, based on types of higher education institutions. The GATE review process has been discussed as a possible help in this area for the future. However, at this time, each international partner and each international student has a significant challenge in trying to identify an appropriate partner in the US. Some of these challenges include:

- Education as responsibility of each of 50 states
- Independence of over 3,000 us colleges and universities

- Differences in each academic unit/program
- Differences in institutional locations: urban/rural
- Differences in support services: housing, counseling, etc.
- Multiple offices supporting international collaborations
- Regular revisions of institutional goals and administration (5 year plans)
- Practice of high level administrators of signing memoranda of agreement not necessarily intended for implementation

Another challenge in developing institutional partnerships between the US and India is the expectations of students and institutions in terms of student service resources. Many US higher education institutions maintain comprehensive student service resources. This includes services that range from support staff for academic advisement in each department to coordinators for student activities, students with disabilities, counseling services, housing, a comprehensive student health center, insurance, athletics, etc. Evaluating the quality of student services on a US campus is not a simple process. As with the academic quality, international institutions will end up needing to work to review the quality and quantity of academic services available to find an appropriate match with a US college or university.

Student Mobility: Student Service Needs

The level of student services provided by US colleges and universities may also raise the expectations by US students on what they would expect in a study abroad program or international higher education institution. Following is a sample of some of the service support offices that may be encountered at a US college or university. For those US institutions providing study abroad programs, or international institutions hosting US students, there may be a need to provide many of these services (although many times with a much more limited staff or resources than would be found on the US campus. Student mobility can be complex when dealing with US colleges and universities. Institutional representatives may play a broad administrative role. In the US, the complex legal environment is mirrored on a US campus (Rhodes, 1998).

Training is also inconsistent in the student mobility field. In US higher education, many student services roles are filled by staff with Master's and Doctoral (Ph.D. and Ed.D.) degrees in student affairs

administration and student service roles. There is inconsistent training for those involved in student mobility roles. When looking for a US partner, it is important to look at their support service resources, which includes financial and staff resources (including staff education and training). Service support roles may include (Rhodes and Millington, 1994):

- Academic freedom advocate
- Academic program developer/adviser
- Admissions and enrollment officer
- Academic records officer
- Budgetary officer
- Bursar
- Computer center manager
- Contract developer
- Course development and evaluation administrator
- Crisis and emergency manager
- Cross-cultural issues consultant
- Drug and alcohol counselor
- Equipment manager
- Evaluation officer
- Facilities manager
- Financial aid officer
- Grades department administrator
- Housing rental agent
- Currency exchange expert
- Insurance counselor
- International communications expert
- International law expert
- Internship program sponsor
- Librarian
- Loan officer
- Orientation program administrator
- Paralegal
- Parental liaison

- Personal and professional counselor
- Personnel administrator
- Program developer and evaluator
- Public relations officer
- Recruiter
- Risk manager
- Student affairs administrator
- Student conduct judicial officer
- Students with disabilities manager
- Student health professional
- Testing administrator
- Textbook manager
- Translator
- Transportation supervisor
- Travel agent and tour operator
- Visa and immigration specialist
- Women's issues advocate
- Writer and editor

Higher Education Associations

When developing exchange agreements with higher education institutions, it is important to collaborate with both domestic and international higher education institutions. Samples of national, regional, and international higher education institutions that may be relevant in terms of setting up appropriate partnerships include:

- Association of Indian Universities (AIU)
- Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA)
- Australia Regional Higher Education Associations
- British Universities Transatlantic Exchange Organizations (BUTEX)
- California Colleges for International Education (CCIE)
- California Community College Chancellor's Office Mega Conference
- Council on International Educational Exchange (COUNCIL)
- European Association of International Education (EAIE)

- German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)
- Intl. Association of College Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA)
- International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA)
- Interorganizational Task Force on Safety and Responsibility in Study Abroad
- National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA)
- NAFSA: Association of International Education Administrators
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrations (NASPA)
- Risk and Insurance Management Society (RIMS)
- University Risk Management and Insurance Association (URMIA)

Resources for Student Mobility: USC Center for Global Education

World Wide Colleges and Universities: This resource provides connectivity with colleges and universities around the world through the World Wide Web. Through this site, one can find linkage (where identified) with a home language homepage, an English language homepage, and an international relations office. Through information from organizations like the International Association of Universities, this site provides a background on the systems of higher education in each country around the world. Indian universities may want to make sure that they have easy connectivity through the World Wide Web to assist international institutions to more easily connect with the information about their institutions and with their faculty and staff. (<http://www.usc.edu/globaled/wwcu>).

SAFETI Clearinghouse: The Safety Abroad First – Educational Travel Information (SAFETI) Clearinghouse of the Center for Global Education in the Rossier School of Education in the Rossier School of Education was funded in 1998 by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) of the US Department of Education to serve as a resource for the study abroad field. There are a number of resources available through the USC Center for Global Education, which may assist Indian institutions in considering institutional partnerships with US higher education institutions. Resources include a SAFETI Audit Checklist, a SAFETI On-Line Newsletter, links to government and higher education associations, and information about student mobility orientation courses and programs (www.usc.edu/globaled/safeti).

Safety Abroad Handbook: How to Get There... And Back: The Safety Abroad Handbook assists students and parents to ask the right questions and make appropriate preparations in support of finding a quality program and supporting their personal health and safety while participating in study abroad. For US students considering study abroad, safety is a critical issue. Indian institutions may want to review some of the issues, questions, and checklist items as they develop programs to attract more US students for study abroad (www.usc.edu/studentsabroad):

Research on Study Abroad: The USC Center for Global Education has compiled three bibliographies and abstracts of the study abroad field and made them searchable through the World Wide Web (www.usc.edu/globaled/ro).

Resources for Study Abroad: This site includes practical links for finding a study abroad program and preparing for international study and travel (www.usc.edu/globaled/rfsa).

Summary

Student mobility is a critical component in connecting people from countries around the world. As the US and India are two of the world's most important democracies, one can see the importance of greater understanding by the citizens of each country about one-another. Increases in quality and quantity of student mobility between the US and India will be dependent on cooperation and the sharing of quality practices of higher education in both countries. The Association of Indian Universities and leaders, faculty, and staff at Indian and US higher education institutions can play a critical role in this area. It is important to share quality practices at all levels in developing and implementing relevant, new programs and evaluating and improving existing programs.

References

- Altbach, P., (2001), Higher Education and the WTO: Globalization Run Amok, *International Higher Education*, 23: 2-4.
http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News23/text001.htm.
- Altbach, P. and Teichner, U., (2001), Internationalization and Exchanges in a Globalized University, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 5, Issue 1.
- American Council on Education, (1995), *Educating Americans for a World in Flux: Ten Ground Rules for Internationalising Higher Education*, ACE, Washington D.C.

- American Council on Education, (2000), *Preliminary Status Report 2000: Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education*, ACE, Washington D.C.
<<http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/index.cfm?pubID=204>>.
- American Council on Education, (2001), *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys About International Education*, ACE, Washington D.C.
<<http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/index.cfm?pubID=237>>.
- Bush, G.W., (2001), International Education Week 2001 Statement, The White House, Washington D.C.
< <http://exchanges.state.gov/iew2001/message.htm>>.
- Dhar, B.B., (2001), Internationalisation in India: To What Extent?, in K.B. Powar (Editor), *Internationalisation of Indian Higher Education*, AIU, New Delhi.
- DeWit, H., (2001), The Long and Winding Road to a European Higher Education Area, *International Higher Education*, 25: 4-5.
<http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News25/text002.htm>.
- Institute of International Education, (2001), *Open Doors 2001: Report on International Educational Exchange*, IIE, New York.
<<http://www.opendoorsweb.org>>.
- Knight, J. and DeWit, H., (1997), *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*, European Association of International Education, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Paige, R., (2001), Quote on International Education Week, US Department of Education, Washington D.C.
<<http://exchanges.state.gov/iew2001/quote.htm>>.
- Paige, R., (2001), Statement on International Education Week, US Department of Education, Washington D.C.
<<http://exchanges.state.gov/iew2001/paigestatement.htm>>.
- Powar, K.B., (2001), Preface, *Internationalisation of Indian Higher Education*, Association of Indian Universities, Delhi, India.
- Powar, (2001), International Providers of Higher Education in India, in K.B. Powar (Editor), *Internationalisation of Indian Higher Education*, pp 69-75, AIU, New Delhi.
- Powell, C.L., (2001), Statement on International Education Week 2001, US Department of State, Washington D.C.
<<http://www.state.gov/secretart/rm/2001/4462.htm>>.
- Rhodes, G., (1998), International Study Programs: Developing Reasonable and Prudent Policies and Procedures Consistent With Institutional Goals and Higher Education Law, *Law and Higher Education: Issues in 1998, Vol. 1.*, Stetson University College of Law, Florida.
- Rhodes, G. and Millington, W., (1994), Avoiding Liability in Study Abroad: Home Campus and International Campus Concerns, *NAFSA Newsletter*, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Washington D.C.