

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CES found that WSU's Globalization Task Force did a superlative job of inventorying and evaluating current international education and global engagement activities at the University, and of envisioning what an enhanced state of affairs might look like regarding impact on WSU's mission, and changes in curriculum and co-curriculum, faculty research, international student and scholar services, and organizational infrastructure. The Task Force's report created the foundation necessary for developing more particular recommendations once an institution-wide global affairs planning process later unfolds. One indication of the Task Force's diligence and thoroughness is that it divided itself into no less than seventeen different subgroups, each charged with evaluating a particular area of concern in greater depth. The Task Force thus succeeded admirably taking the first step in expanding WSU's commitments to globalization, i.e., defining the current state of affairs and beginning the process of imagining more concerted globalization efforts for the future. Another indication of the quality of the Task Force's work is that a number of the findings and recommendations presented by CES in this report echo or build upon those of the Task Force itself.

Having studied the Task Force's report and met with its members and many other individuals and groups on campus, CES has concluded, first of all, that while different individuals, programs, and colleges at WSU engage in a broad variety of impressive international efforts, the University nevertheless lacks an overall global vision related to its distinctive mission, which would serve to connect and leverage its international commitments, link it more closely with its stakeholders, and uplift academic quality and achievement campus-wide. Also, in the absence of such a vision, the University has not yet developed a unified approach or overall plan for international education and global engagement. There are various adverse consequences to the absence of such a plan. One is that there is relatively little synergy and mutual support among diverse international and global efforts. Another is that there are important program areas where insufficient attention is being paid to international issues. Also, those pursuing global activities in one area of the campus are sometimes unaware of initiatives undertaken elsewhere, even in instances where collaboration might be particularly beneficial. Further, the total impact of often independent or uncoordinated initiatives is only infrequently greater than the sum of the individual undertakings. In addition, external stakeholders are sometimes critical of the University's not doing more to pursue a global agenda, given that it is difficult to discern an overall strategy in the University's current portfolio of international activities. And finally, some potentially very attractive opportunities for WSU to make a distinctive impact in global education have yet to be capitalized upon.

Second, CES also believes that there are several important impediments that will likely have to be addressed, or guiding principles that will have to be embraced, to enable the University to define a broader vision and to develop and prioritize new, beneficial strategies:

A. The institution needs to find the most academically legitimate and useful ways of reconciling historic "local" commitments with "global" outlooks: the institution needs to synthesize its honored mission as an "urban serving" university, focusing on the students and the needs of Wichita and south central Kansas, with global aspirations and demands from its stakeholders that it produce graduates with greater global competence and capabilities. CES believes there should be no inherent conflict between these two purposes, in that the student constituencies historically served by WSU need to prepare for globalized professions, careers, and workplaces just as much as students from any other

locale. Many of these students will make their careers in Wichita-based and Kansas-based companies that are already global in character, and that will only expand their international pursuits in the future. We also believe that each college and school at WSU should participate in University-wide globalization efforts, not merely those professionally-oriented schools whose graduates are most likely to enter the corporate workplace. In addition, the educational experiences that are or should be commonly shared by WSU students, regardless of their major or degree—i.e., general education, honors curricula, study abroad, cooperative education and other experiential learning opportunities, and various co-curricular and student life experiences—should also all reflect a deeper commitment to imparting global competence.

B. WSU must therefore develop strategies for meeting the needs of its principal stakeholders (notably the aerospace industry and large, private corporations, such as Koch Industries), and for using the international dimension to be a key driver of Wichita's economy, while simultaneously making an equal place in its global plans for those colleges and programs that may less directly serve such stakeholders. As the University develops new globalization initiatives and increases its overall expenditures for such purposes, it should continue to support global initiatives among all its colleges, rather than divide itself into "haves" and "have nots" on the international front, with Business, Engineering, and Health Sciences leading the way and receiving most of the new funds available, and Liberal Arts, Education, Fine Arts, the Museum, and other programs becoming less involved or less supported. As just one example, CES notes that the greater Wichita area is home to numerous ethnic groups that have immigrated to Kansas from many different nations, and that the Wichita public school system reflects this international diversity. If WSU is to serve this surrounding, diverse population as well as possible, it needs to provide appropriate international education opportunities for students in the College of Education, rather than mostly for students interested in corporate careers. The same principle should apply to students in all of the University's various colleges.

C. The University needs to develop the academic, administrative, and related infrastructures that an enhanced global agenda would require. First, the chief globalization officer position (CGO) likely needs to be reconceived on broader terms, with the expectation that this individual will provide both intellectual and managerial leadership, and bring a new entrepreneurial spirit to campus-wide globalization efforts. Such leadership can and should be exercised in a manner fully compatible with the traditional responsibilities of deans, chairs, and other academic leaders. Second, institution-wide faculty and administrative steering or oversight committees should probably be created to help provide better communication, coordination, and support regarding globalization efforts, and to draft new policies and procedures that would facilitate advancing a global agenda. On some campuses, a combined faculty-administrative committee, sometimes with student and stakeholder membership as well, functions as a unified "international council."

Third, the University should make larger commitments to key matters such as the following: (a) undertaking a University-wide review of the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum regarding international education, with the understanding that the analyses performed will be intended to result in clear recommendations for improvements; (b) developing living-learning communities, including both domestic and international students, that focus on global concerns; (c) achieving much wider participation in study abroad; (d) enhancing international faculty recruitment; (e) improving international student and scholar services; (f) incorporating global experiences into faculty and staff professional development programs, and into recognition and reward structures; and (g) promoting international research collaborations.

Fourth, international concerns should become more central to institutional marketing and fund raising strategies, and a more concerted effort should be made to capitalize fully on WSU's larger numbers of international alumni, some portion of whom are not yet identified, let alone stewarded for different institutional purposes.

D. Further, in developing a vision for globalization and the strategies and plans most appropriate to WSU's distinctive mission and the particular needs of its stakeholders, the University would likely benefit, and also accelerate its progress, by systematically familiarizing itself with the successes and failures, and the best practices, of leading competitor and peer institutions. On the whole, WSU is not particularly well informed about innovations and best practices at comparable universities, nor does it seem to participate actively, so far as CES could learn, in the leading professional associations whose purpose is to promote international education and global engagement (one exception being the institution's membership in NAFSA: The Association of International Educators). CES is not suggesting that WSU merely replicate programs or initiatives that have proven educationally or financially successful elsewhere; rather, we believe that a careful examination of global activities at selected peer institutions would help WSU determine priority areas for its own improvement—at the institutional, college, and departmental level--and also assist in identifying opportunities distinctive to its mission that would enable WSU to excel compared with other schools. We believe that Wichita State should embrace the principle that if it is to remain one of American's most "forward looking" universities, and truly aspires to "national stature," then international education and global engagement must rise to forefront of the institution's teaching, research, and service missions throughout its various colleges and programs.

Lastly, while there would surely be alternative ways for WSU to bring a unifying focus to its globalization efforts, and to link its educational initiatives with real world stakeholder needs, CES outlines at some length later in this report one possibility which we think would be particularly promising, i.e., the creation of a University-wide "CENTER FOR URBAN WORK FORCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE GLOBAL CENTURY." We believe that such a Center could help integrate WSU's local and global agendas in ways uniquely beneficial to students, faculty, and stakeholders; it could have the potential to influence curriculum in almost all of WSU's colleges and academic programs; it would capitalize on some of the University's most distinctive strengths, such as its strong relationships with the private sector, its excellent cooperative education programs, its unusually close relationships with and dependence on community colleges, and its large numbers of international alumni; it would facilitate additional initiatives in study abroad and in developing research and other collaborations with universities in other countries (perhaps particularly other "urban serving" institutions); it would help make WSU an even more important driver of the greater Wichita and Kansas state-wide economies; and it might well attract external funding from corporations, foundations, and local, state, and federal government. We believe this concept, as one alternative, merits WSU's serious consideration.