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Introduction
The International Partnerships Workgroup is a sub-committee of the Council for Internationalization and Global Engagement. It received the charge to assess what UWEC has been doing to implement the global learning goal included in the current strategic plan, and to draft and suggest policy language for the whole CIGE consideration and further recommendation to the chancellor as to how to develop an internationalization plan for the institution while enhancing academic global engagement opportunities for all students, faculty and staff.

Background
The workgroup met five times during fall semester of 2014. The minutes were uploaded to the CIGE website and its deliberations were guided by the following three questions:
1. What constitutes an effective institutional relationship with an international partner?
2. How can we discern whether an existing relationship is educationally meaningful?
3. What criteria should be considered to evaluate an already existing relationship so it warrants mutual benefit?

For the purpose of clarity in the language to be used in the report, the workgroup listed four activities that could be identified as international experiences:
1. Student Exchange Program (definition needed)
2. Student Dual Enrollment (definition needed)
3. International Fellows Program (definition needed)
4. Faculty Led International Experiences (definition needed)

The workgroup understands that while these activities have an international component, they do not capture the relational essence of an international partnership, per se, which is what we need to define. Furthermore, the workgroup verified that, currently, a template for a Memorandum of Understanding that reflects such essence or one that is informed by those three questions does not exist. Consequently, the workgroup arrived to a shared understanding that an international partnership must refer to a University to University strategic, organic, mutual effort to engage in global learning as opposed to, for example, in isolated student exchange programs. Simultaneously, an international partnership must respond to an expressly declared mutual interest in investing institutional prestige and
resources in promoting common understandings and ethical practices in the global commons as opposed to, for example, a simple quantification of participants in international ventures.

**Criteria for international partnerships**

The workgroup identified a set of eight criteria to be taken into consideration for the design, enhancement and evaluation of an effective and meaningful international network for global learning engagement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Mutuality and shared responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Clear mutual declaration of purpose aligned with respective institutional missions and global learning goals. Larger audiences are aware of mutual benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Integrity</strong></td>
<td>Institutions identify and address concerns about security and safety of all participants as well as expectations about their academic and ethical integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. **Financial sustainability** | Expenses generated by the international partners are express responsibility of respective incurring university.  
  - Proposal has a plan for sustainability after an initial period of financial support.  
  - Partners may agree to collaborate in requesting financial support to pertinent institutions when appropriate. |
| 4. **Inclusive leadership, accountability and viability** | Representatives from both institutions engage in purposeful dialogue, strategic planning and collaboration to design, implement, and assess global learning and its impact in both institutions.  
  - Periodic accountability reports to each other are included in the reflective process.  
  - Systematic assessment and critique of students and institutional learning outcomes generates organic discussion about structural transformation needs and informs institutional decision making processes. |
| 5. **Authenticity** | Projects build genuine, lasting capacity and include opportunities to work together with, teach to and learn from local individuals as articulated by UWEC LE Core Responsibility Outcome 2: Evaluate the impact of systems, institutions and issues in local and global context and across cultures. |
| 6. **Criteria-based mutual feedback** | Institutions mutually agree on both the frequency and criteria with which their relationship will be assessed as effective and significant, and in a good faith-based procedure to solve conflicts. |
7. **Compatibility**

Both institutions understand each other's programs, facilitate a fluid, mutual process of accreditation and develop complementarity.

8. **Expanded networking potential**

Shared vision and practice expands through multiple institutional connections and networks.

**What is meaningful for UWEC faculty?**

This workgroup considered important to survey all faculty who has ever provided leadership in an international experience about what they now consider meaningful about it. The survey was sent to 51 individuals currently on campus of which 33 (65%) responded. They were asked to identify three of those aspects and to give them an order of priority. The narratives offered similar language and nuances in the description of what made those experiences meaningful. *What follows is a chart that needs to be discussed by CIGE.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Competence</td>
<td>Provides opportunities to develop global awareness and global competency skills through connection, interaction, negotiation, association, and network with global partners for academic purposes based on mutual respect, an appreciation for difference and diversity, and shared interest in enhancing a professional knowledge and practice that welcomes dissonance generated through global contexts, and invites self-critique, multidisciplinary perspectives, and universal frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Global Learning</td>
<td>Provides authentic experiential learning opportunities to apply and generate globally contextualized knowledge that support students' intellectual, professional, personal and interpersonal growth, allowing them to generate their own narratives about themselves and others, and continued opportunities for collaboration and global intervention after the experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Global Network</td>
<td>Provides opportunities to develop global friendships and long-lasting professional and institutional relations that enrich UWEC's curriculum and add value to the college experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UWEC international practices**

This workgroup commissioned a research project to help document a comprehensive, descriptive inventory of UWEC international practices. A History major student, under the supervision of Dr. Louisa Rice, gathered and analyzed data to respond to the following questions:
4. What is the latest international activity?
5. What is the purpose of this activity?
6. Who is responsible for making it operational? Faculty? Staff?
7. How do students benefit from it?
8. What are the financial elements/implications?
9. What is the modality? Student exchange? Faculty exchange?
10. Where does money come from?
11. What amounts are dedicated/given?
12. How did the university benefit from it?
13. Is it currently active? If not, should it be?

A descriptive inventory will be attached to the final version of this report as an addendum. Two additional outcomes associated with this report are an interactive map with hyperlinks to UWEC’s global engagement sites, documentation and narratives to be made available online and an institutional narrative telling the story of UWEC’s global engagement. The preliminary website may be located through this link: https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=zlGVhvM7VfOw.kiE7q55YfqMM

The workgroup would like to present two final questions to CIGE:

1. How can this amount of effort and money be monitored and whose responsibility should it be?
2. How can this report be used to tell UWEC’s global engagement story and ascertain the way in which we, as a learning institution, learn (or should be learning) from within but at a global scale.