

**Transatlantic Leadership Dialogue:**  
*The Role of Advocacy: Making the Case for Internationalization*  
--Summary Report--

Co-Chairs:

Gil Latz, Ph.D.

Association of International Education Administrators

Duleep Deosthale, Ph.D.

European Association of International Education

Co-sponsored by:

Association of International Education Administrators

and

the European Association of International Education

23 February 2017<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

The Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) and the European Association of International Education (EAIE) resumed its jointly sponsored discussion of the Transatlantic Leadership Dialogue on 23 February 2017, immediately following the AIEA 2017 annual conference in Washington, DC.<sup>2</sup>

The 2017 Dialogue explored the role of advocacy-- making the case for internationalization— as viewed from North America and European perspectives. Discussion focused on the how and why, and the challenges associated with, making the case for internationalization with: public and private sector leaders, the general public, and higher education colleagues. The topic is one that takes on particular urgency in light of present-day public reaction to globalization. Winds of political change sweep across North America and Europe; as a result, the significance of our work as educators takes on new meaning and challenge.

After issuing a call for participation, a distinguished group of 40 experts were invited to join the 2017 Dialogue, representing: Austria, Canada, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Ireland, the Netherlands, the UK, Sweden, Turkey, and the US. See *Appendix 1* for a list of registrants.

Participants were encouraged to read two documents in advance:

- ‘Now we face the (temporary?) end of American internationalism’, Philip G Altbach and Hans de Wit, *University World News* 11 November 2016 Issue No: 436.  
[http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20161110203906750&query=N  
ow+we+face+the+%28temporary%3F%29+end+of](http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20161110203906750&query=Now+we+face+the+%28temporary%3F%29+end+of;); and
- ‘No Certificate of Global Citizenship’: Amid turn toward nationalism, global educators consider their work, Elizabeth Redden, *Inside Higher Education*, 10 January 2017.  
[https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/10/amid-turn-toward-nationalism-global-  
educators-consider-their-work#.WHUVjWmK4fw.mailto](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/10/amid-turn-toward-nationalism-global-educators-consider-their-work#.WHUVjWmK4fw.mailto).

---

<sup>1</sup> The event took place from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM, Old Tabard Inn, 1739 N Street NW, Washington, DC.

<sup>2</sup> A listing of previous Dialogue reports can be found at: <http://www.aieaworld.org/dialogue-reports>.

## Overview

The Dialogue was organized around a keynote presentation by Dr. Patti McGill Peterson, Presidential Advisor for Global Initiatives, American Council on Education. Dr. Peterson's remarks addressed the advocacy topic in a presentation entitled "Shaping Messages/Bridging Divides," noting that,

....a scan of the global horizon shows ultranationalism on the rise in both the United States and Europe. Along with it come other supporting isms such as populism, isolationism and identitarianism that combine to threaten the foundations of internationalization. How shall we read the signs on the horizon and what are their implications for international education? What counter narratives should international educators be developing in their efforts to promote the benefits of globalism and the value of internationalism as a response to resurgent nationalism? Addressing these and related questions will be critical to effective advocacy strategies.

Following Dr. Peterson's remarks, two discussants commented, respectively, from European and North American and perspectives: Dr. David Richardson, Vice-Chancellor of the University of East Anglia; and Dr. Susan Buck Sutton, emerita associate vice president of international affairs and emerita chancellor's professor of anthropology for IUPUI, and Bryn Mawr College.

Eight facilitated breakout discussion groups, four in the morning, and four in the afternoon, interspersed with full group dialogue, explored the implications of the Dialogue theme, keynote and discussant comments. Morning and afternoon breakout groups and associated full group discussion explored, respectively: the keynote and discussant comments; and action steps.

### **Morning Breakout Sessions:**

- **Anti-globalism/ Populism/ Elitism**, Co-facilitated by Dr. Jón Atli Benediktsson, University of Iceland / Dr. Susan Buck Sutton, IUPUI; Bryn Mawr College
  - Discuss examples of anti-globalism/populism/elitism in your university/region?
  - How has your university/organization responded?
- **University Leadership**, Co-Facilitated by Dr. Hilary Kahn, President, AIEA/ Dr. David Richardson, University of East Anglia
  - What is the role of university leadership in addressing advocacy for internationalization?
  - How is the leadership role changing in the present political environment?
- **Messaging (logical, understandable, achievable)**, Co-Facilitated by Dr. Sonja Knutson, Memorial University of Newfoundland/ Dr. Kees Kouwenaar, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
  - Exercise: identify whom table wishes to reach with advocacy efforts; messages about internationalization they are currently delivering to external audiences; and critique whether message/language is readily understood beyond the academy.
    - Discuss effective ways for the academy to make the case for internationalization?
    - Are there counter-productive actions that should be avoided?
- **Partners/ Alliances, other Stakeholders**, Co-Facilitated by Dr. Markus Laitinen, President, EAIE/ Dr. Penelope Pynes, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

- What examples of partnership are emerging in the present political environment?
- What new thinking is required in the academy to forge effective alliances?

### **Afternoon Breakout Sessions:**

- **Publications and Responsible Parties**, Co-facilitated by Knutson/ Kouwenaar
  - Identify opportunities/publications for making the case for internationalization?
  - Identify the individuals or organizations to assume leadership role?
- **Individual or Joint AIEA/EAIE Actions**, Co-facilitated by Kahn/ Richardson
  - What are the opportunities for AIEA/EAIE to pursue advocacy for internationalization?
  - What limitations must each organization keep in mind and how should such limitations be addressed?
- **Proposals for Upcoming EAIE and AIEA Conferences (types of sessions)**, Co-facilitated by Laitinen/ Pynes
  - Identify sessions and individuals to discuss advocacy in upcoming conferences.
  - Are there other organizations that should be invited to participate?
- **Role of Member Institutions in Pursuing Advocacy (what does it look like; how achieved)?** Co-facilitated by Benediktsson/ Sutton
  - Exercise: identify whom table wishes to reach with advocacy efforts; messages about internationalization they are currently delivering to external audiences; and critique whether message/language is readily understood beyond the academy.
    - How do we measure success in pursuit of advocacy over time?
    - As efforts are made, and goals accomplished, what are the most effective ways to share progress with institutional members?

A third distinguished speaker, Dr. Jón Atli Benediktsson, Rector, University of Iceland, offered concluding remarks on the keynote, discussant comments, and the day's discussion.

The co-organizers thank those who made the Dialogue possible: the leadership of AIEA, EAIE, and all who participated in the discussions in Washington, DC on 23 February 2017. The Dialogue discussion notes were ably compiled by the AIEA Secretariat staff, Dr. Dafina Blacksher Diabate and Ms. Katy Rosenbaum.

The primary themes explored during of the 2017 Dialogue, as identified through presentations, group discussion, and breakout sessions will guide the individual and collaborative work of AIEA and EAIE, as specified by the leadership of each organization.

## **Dialogue Report**

### **Welcome: Gil Latz and Duleep Deosthale**

- AIEA/EAIE Dialogues began with AIEA “Ghost Ranches” in the 1990s in rustic settings. At the 2000 Ghost Ranch, several EAIE members participated, and in the 2000s, this event evolved into a Transatlantic Leadership Dialogue.

- This year’s theme of advocacy is timely given current political contexts, and participants come from the U.S., Canada, and many European countries.

### **Overview of the Dialogue; Objectives for the Day: Gil Latz and Duleep Deosthale**

- This Dialogue addresses the critical question of how international educators develop effective narratives for making the case for internationalization. One lesson Gil Latz has learned as a Senior International Officer (SIO), and common to other leaders in the field, is the value of dialogue with many different types of audiences, achieved through story telling: through conversation, writings, newsletters, etc.
- From the outset, there is a need to acknowledge that the term “internationalization” does not always communicate well, both because of the “internationalization vs. globalization” debate as well as other reasons. We—as international education leaders—should develop a new language and new narrative around our work, especially in response to broad questions now raised in response to the process of globalization.
- The conveners of this dialogue are interested in outcomes from the Dialogue, including an agenda that both AIEA and EAIE can use for advocacy.
- Ground rules were established: confidentiality; agreement that participants speak for themselves and not on behalf of an institution or organization; all involved agree to listen carefully to other voices and to make space for others to speak.

### **Icebreaker: Gil Latz and Duleep Deosthale**

- Dialogue Participants broke into groups of three and participated in story circles, with each participant responding to the prompt of describing a time they successfully advocated in their life or career.

### **Keynote Speaker: Dr. Patti McGill Peterson-- *Shaping Messages/Bridging Divides***

- The theme of “advocacy” for this event is not new, but it is very timely. On both sides of the Atlantic, political and societal events are of serious concern, and we are attempting to understand both the long and short-term consequences.
- The keynote, then, is framed at the macro level, with the aims of considering implications for internationalization, understanding external advocacy (though internal advocacy is also important), and how to shape messages to help address challenges of advocacy in new international contexts and what that means for institutions.
- *“Know Thy Space”*  
When Dr. McGill Peterson was a college president, the institution would regularly conduct an annual environmental scan, asking “What has changed? Who has changed?” The results would be compiled in a grid to connect macro issues to the relevant institutional stakeholders. Leadership would then assess the viability of strategic goals and how to achieve them. While the core goals of the institution did not change, the implementation strategies and advocacy were tailored for stakeholders.
- *“Think about our assumptions about our worldview”*  
In order to address macro-level issues, we must be aware of our assumptions about our worldview. Globalization is a part of the process, but we must recognize that

globalization is not always good, and that there is not always occur on level playing field. International educators' worldview often posits that globalization has opened the way to greater research, a faster flow of ideas and people, but not all stakeholders agree.

- *Current Environment*

We are in a different environment than even a few years ago. Globalism is being replaced with populism, nationalism (U.S./E.U.), protectionism, and isolationism (U.S). The current U.S. President invokes a dangerous sense of nationalism; blames most problems on globalism; and turns inward while demanding respect from the “freeloading” world. The “America First” and national chauvinism of this administration has “huge” implications for international education. An environmental scan shows in both the U.S. and Europe a shift from a league of nations orientation to a league of nationalists. This current tone, influenced by the Alt-Right, the *bloc identitaire* movement, and others with a hate agenda, provides a different context for internationalization.

- *Importance of Facts*

Facts are essential for our advocacy efforts—national political discussions based on “alternative facts” have consequences, as evidenced by the gap between perception and reality on issues such as the number of immigrants in the U.S.

- *National to Local: “All politics is local” (-Tip O’Neil)*

We must look at what is happening nationally that filters down to external stakeholders locally. For example, many governors have stood up against the administration; mayors are declaring sanctuary cities, often working with universities. Not all officials have anti-immigration views, and they may need our assistance to help articulate internationalism. An example is that because Fulbright funds are a line item in the federal budget, they are constantly in advocacy mode and have found champions to work with. We must ensure local officials, citizens, and local organizations understand the vision—they can become partners. Through those local alliances, we can create a well-tuned web of advocacy. A possible tool is to **create advisory councils** with internal and external stakeholders to provide a forum for better understanding what we do: ask what they understand about our work and how we can use their advice to shape our messages.

- *There is no “one-size-fits-all” approach*

We must take a nuanced approach to advocacy, and look at which stakeholders are sympathetic to new “isms.” How have we been keeping them informed? Have we gone beyond the boilerplate communications of websites and a President’s report towards segmented messaging to respond to different stakeholders’ concerns? We **should fine-tune strategies and messages for each stakeholder** with clear, easily understood messages.

- *The Ivory Tower*

One view of higher education is that we are the clubhouse of the elite, in a “bubble” and out-of-touch. In the current context, bashing the “liberal elite” has become a bloodsport of the American right, and the ivory tower is an easy image in the U.S., Canada and Europe. **We must think about how we convey the concept of internationalization and be consciously self-critical of our messaging.** One example is on the American Council on Education’s website, which includes the following statement: “*In order for the*

*United States to have a truly world-class higher education system, colleges and universities must be globally engaged and prepare students to be citizens of a multicultural community both at home and in a globalized world. Institutions accomplish this by having a multi-dimensional, comprehensive strategy that includes internationalization at home and engagement with global issues and partners.*” In our world, these statements are reasonable. Do they resonate beyond “true believer” community, or are such statements just in-house truisms? Does this translate well as-stated to those beyond our circles, or just codes we use? The more we try to explain internationalization or international education, the harder it is—an “elevator speech” is necessary, and statements must win hearts and minds.

- *Conclusion*

Making the case for internationalization requires attention. Scanning the environment is an important first step: “know thy space.” Testing long-held assumptions about how we explain internationalization is important. We must be propagators of facts amidst misinformation. International education leaders must construct counter-narratives that reach outside our circles. **Our counter-narrative must cast new definitions of what it means to be “patriotic.”** National pride and identity have moved towards xenophobia—we must present patriotism differently; patriots can also adhere to global citizenship, seeing cooperation as essential. We may need to create coalitions: those working with fact-based climate science, advocating for a free press, and others combatting inequities.

**Respondent/Discussant: Dr. David Richardson (University of East Anglia)**

- Lessons learned include the importance of partnering with charities or organizations, and that we should help local governments to see the importance of international students and how they benefit local communities.
- We must engage with our communities, including taking advantage of soft power and using alumni to help advocate for internationalization.
- This context also helps illustrate the importance of cooperation through partnerships. **We cannot let the focus on national boundaries get in the way of university partnerships.**
- We are currently living in a post-truth era when people do not believe that global challenges are actually challenges. We must respond through **academic diplomacy**: we have networks, so we should use them as diplomatic networks, and academics should begin to consider themselves international diplomats.
- When we look to advocate for why international education is important, it becomes clear that we need partners in business, with local authorities, and with politicians.

**Respondent/Discussant: Dr. Susan Buck Sutton (IUPUI; Bryn Mawr College)**

- **We are in a watershed moment**—a moment of re-thinking what it is that we do. We are in a crisis of internationalization both internally and externally. The work that we do has been implicitly indicted and politicized by politicians preaching a divisive populism that goes against the national interest. We will have to respond and explain ourselves in new ways while staying true to ourselves and why we believe what we do has value.

- **We are now in and contending with a realm of public opinion and it will be important to think carefully about our changing role.** In addition to advisory teams, politicians, and other more traditional stakeholders, we must explore how to have genuine two-way conversations with **those who feel left behind due to globalism.** Why do miners think answers are to go back to mines? We should hear it from themselves, not politicians. We must listen to their lives: what are they losing, how are they losing it, and how is our work contributed to that? We must show empathy for those who have genuinely been left behind. Globalization has elements of good and bad-- how do we increase the good and decrease the bad?
- **The starting point shouldn't be why international students in universities benefit communities, but a philosophical framework of what unites us and them.** We should articulate a philosophy of global mutuality in a way that operates on many levels and is for everyone (miners, philosophers, urban dwellers, etc.). True self-interest includes group interest, as individuals don't prosper if the group doesn't; and a group doesn't do well if individuals do not do well. We need a better term than internationalization, because the work we do is about **connectivity.** Our task is to translate the connectivity to other groups outside international education and academia. We should focus on **collaborative advantage** and the better returns that follow.
- **International (institution-institution) partnerships.** Unilateral internationalization is an oxymoron, and we cannot internationalize in isolation. Whether or not we succeed with our advocacy, we should maintain these international partnerships.

### **Small Group Discussions (morning)**

Dialogue participants self-selected small breakout groups for discussing the following themes: anti-globalism/populism/elitism, university leadership, messaging (logical, understandable, achievable), partners/alliances/other stakeholders. Breakout groups then reported out to all Dialogue participants:

#### **Small Group: Anti-globalism/populism/elitism**

- Higher education in and of itself contains a liberalizing factor. But an interesting question arises: "what do we do about it?" This is a bit less resolved.
- The current issues we face are far more complex than the "deplorables" – this is not a left/right issue, but something much more complex.
- Unenviable speakers on campus (that represent extremist groups) are not a diplomatic way for institutions to proceed.
- Harley Davidson and Miller Beer are working class American brands that reap rewards, so higher education can learn from their approach.
- Sports cross boundaries. Universities are good at sports, so this is a possible tool to use.

#### **Small Group: University leadership**

- International education leaders should partner with others around issues of inequity.
- We as a field need a balanced approach between soft power and a hard approach.
- There is an imperative for leaders and (international) messages to be placed into the local context.

- A possible strategy is to craft a message that does not include the term “internationalization,” but focuses on issues such as student success, workforce development, etc.
- We must recognize that we won’t be able to persuade some (i.e., the coal miner); instead move towards internationalization advocacy that addresses the gross inequality that now characterizes the US and other countries. University leadership also has to prioritize narrowing inequality.
- All participants report that international offices have gained prominence in last few weeks as leadership in such countries as the UK and US alter pre-existing national policies-- how do we leverage this and push an agenda that do not have counterproductive labels?
- We are going through an evolution-- in the end, there will be a new foundation established for global engagement. As this occurs, how do we address student needs? There is an imperative to listen to the students.
- Collective voice vs. singular voice: we must bring folks to the center and amplify leaders’ stories of success.

#### **Small Group: Messaging (logical, understandable, achievable)**

- There is a need for institutions to consciously and intentionally share a welcoming message, as society more broadly may be sending less welcoming messages.
- The term “internationalization” is a “bad word;” we must address how to get above or below the word itself and focus on what it brings to the university community. We all know that internationalization is not the end goal—we need to communicate why internationalization is important and what the end goal of this process is for our universities and our communities. The key is communicating what value internationalization brings to students and their families.
- These messages need to be strengthened, and based on facts (for example, using data or insights from business to demonstrate that international skills are valuable for graduates).
- Soft skills are 21<sup>st</sup> century skills that are transferrable and desirable traits employers seek to identify in the hiring process. We should strengthen the evidence base between both soft skills and employability, as well as the connection between internationalization and soft skills.
- In regards to internal vs. external messaging, if we are able to effectively communicate the added value of internationalization to students and their families, we are constructively engaging with (internal and external) audiences from whom we seek support.

#### **Small Group: Partners/Alliances**

- In the U.S., international education leaders should look for more opportunities to engage with foundations. We should also be encouraging our scholars to talk to legislators.
- Canadian participants expressed interest in supporting U.S. institutions in the current political climate.

- European participants encouraged government coalition support and partnerships in areas such as how European nations and institutions can address refugee issues.
- Despite the political climate, Turkish universities are working better together now both internationally, as well as with other Turkish institutions.
- Questions still remain: What will be the result of the backlash against higher education and against internationalization? How can we capitalize on major statements from business and industry? How can international education organizations work more closely together?

### **Large Group Discussion (morning)**

- We need to unpack different regions and the dynamic between populism/anti-globalism/elitism. This is complex and based on local realities that are difficult to generalize. Even within one U.S. state, there are dichotomies between rural/urban—or even rural/urban/migrant-- that complicates how we approach advocacy, and that we must unpack.
- The current U.S. administration grossly simplifies internationalization/ global engagement. But it is hard to fight when that narrative controls the media. This approach is not a researched or measured approach.
- How do we get our message into public discussions as quickly as possible? Such advocacy is not what we in higher education usually do—our culture is to go back and think about things. In this new world order, we must act quickly and cohesively, which can be uncomfortable.
- In our efforts to unpack the dynamics of different groups, we must take into consideration all of the forgotten people who are adversely affected by global economic and other forces. Rather than the image of taking an immigrant and making him or her the scapegoat for all, the forgotten groups must meet each other in order to recognize that they are not causing each other's problems, and to explore together how to find and address the real problem(s).
- Advocacy is new for some international education leaders and for some organizations. Three questions from a European perspective on addressing advocacy for the first time include: Should we be reinforcing our base, or do we need to try to change opinions? Should we be reactive or proactive (for example, do we condemn actions such as a travel ban when they arise, or do we need to look more long-term and proactively)? Is there such a thing as “moderate advocacy” (do we take strong stances for or against something, or just present facts that inherently imply a stance)?
- As a part of advocacy strategy, we must recognize that Republicans have not always supported anti-immigration, anti-trade rhetoric. There are Republican legislators who are not anti-globalism. We have an opportunity to look at historical proponents and opponents and think about ways to bridge the gap with strategies like external advisory boards or “Harley Davidson” initiatives. If we articulate our values in a better advocacy plan, we will be better able to identify non-typical partners who share some of those values (industry, Republicans) to align with and take advantage of new alliances.

- While international education initiatives and higher education are life-changing products, not all have access. We should have a long-term plan to address the question of access in our local communities, because this matters. We do not always know how to communicate with the “forgotten” populations who lack access because we do not understand their worldviews or what they believe. Part of advocacy involves creating tactics towards actualizing equity.
- We need champions and personalities who are eloquent, relatable, and charismatic. This may sound unappealing, but we need to find and support these voices. When those who oppose us have these leaders and we do not, we will continue to struggle with our messages.
- A missing piece of this issue is not knowing or understanding if there is an overarching set of principles. We need a positive message that include the principles that define higher education. Once we have these principles, we can move to a proper dialogue or discussion of where to go next. How can we collaborate to promote “global engagement” (as a possible replacement for “internationalization) in a way that is based in values and character-building? Our justifications should not be based in numbers alone—but in moving AIEA, EAIE, IAU, and other organizations to consider and agree on a set of positive principles and values.
- An important issue to address is how we can find alignment amongst ourselves about issues such as who we serve, and who benefits from internationalization and then communicate that without “big words.” To do this, we must have multiple messengers. Some of the best ambassadors for our institutions are students and their unscripted stories. We do not always have to deliver the message—maybe Harley Davidson does. Different messages need different messengers.
- The question remains: what does this discussion mean for the role of an organization like EAIE or AIEA? There is value in the organization of this Dialogue as a platform for exchange. But is advocacy part of the charge or mission for these organizations? Are there other institutions who have that role? Should international education organizations help leaders become better advocates, take on an advocacy role, or lead the charge to help find and support the right advocates?
- We must go back to the idea of patriotism in the model of Martin Luther King, who had both principles and charisma. His American identity was legitimized by his going back to the declaration of independence and the constitution. The message we should exemplify is that America’s story is the great immigration story, and that the great story of higher education is immigration.
- International education leaders must be self-reflective and problematize the concept of elitism. We are not perceived as viable advocates to those who are disillusioned because we are perceived as elite. However, the loudest voices of populism are billionaires posing as the face of ordinary people. We can and need to expose this—but the question is how? How do we redefine “elite?”

### **Small Group Discussions on Action Steps (afternoon)**

Dialogue participants self-selected small groups for discussing the following themes: Conference Session Proposals, Individual or joint AIEA/EAIE Actions, Role of member institutions in pursuing advocacy, and Publications. Groups then reported out to all Dialogue participants:

#### **Small Group: Proposals for upcoming EAIE and AIEA Conferences**

- The timeline of different conferences' Call for Proposals creates some structural issues where sessions proposals are needed months before the conference and may not be able to respond to immediate needs or news.
- Sessions are generally 30-75 minutes, which is a relatively short amount of time to dig into advocacy.
- Presenters may need to find ways to make sessions focus on building support from other allies (for example, address how international education leaders can help the campus take ownership and help with advocating for internationalization).
- Possible sessions might include:
  - How to build advocacy into our work without taking it over
  - Media training and how to write op-eds
  - How to collaborate with communications or marketing departments
  - Incorporating student voices and panels—testimonials that benefit from international experience
  - How to communicate the benefits of international research
  - Working with business/industry for advocacy
- Conference chairs may want to consider having an advocacy-themed conference, or subthemes that involve how to engage various stakeholders in advocacy.
- Organizations may consider issuing statement on a topic as a result of the conference.

#### **Small Group: Individual or Joint AIEA/EAIE Actions**

- Organizations should step back to consider the value of a joint values statement. What is the intent behind it, and whom would we give it to?
- If the two organizations decide to create a joint statement, it should not be used to talk about international education as much focusing on other areas the field supports (such as equity, workforce development, student success, employability, etc.). The term “internationalization” should not be used.
- Organizations should create a bank of resources (toolkit) so we can act faster when things come up. This toolkit should include facts as well as good best-practices about messaging and network-building, and might be best conceptualized as a clearinghouse of resources.
- Organizations should consider joint publications to make issues more visible.
- Organizations need to be “short and sexy” in terms of how we speak and use tools from journalism and the media.
- Organizations might be able to help constituents develop elevator pitches for different stakeholders.
- There should continue to be meetings such as this Transatlantic Leadership Dialogue and ensure that this important conversation is sustained.

- International education organizations can provide support by working to simplifying our messages.

### **Small Group: Publications**

- Before jumping to specific publications, we should consider what we are trying to achieve and if publications are best way to achieve those goals.
- Questions to consider include: What is the message, what audience, through which channels, and how do we gain the support of and through each channel? Only after examining these answers will it be clear if publications are the best format.
- The group proposed a four dimensional grid to consider for any advocacy-related publication—each should be identified and tailored towards the goal or objective of the publication:
  - Message
  - Channel
  - Target
  - Messenger
- The group also proposed that publications might be used to reach out to populations who do not have access to our institutions. This can be a tool for us to use once we understand them better to get them to understand us better. We need to help those populations with awareness, aspiration, and attainment.
- Any public affairs strategy should focus on the value that international education brings to society.
- Organizations may consider creating a handbook on how to have an effective public affairs strategy for desired internationalization outcomes.
- Conferences might include a workshop or session on public affairs expertise.

### **Small Group: Role of Member Institutions in Pursuing Advocacy**

- While we must be careful, these are urgent times. Since internationalization is under assault we should be able to advocate in a stronger way.
- We should consider the goal of these organizations. Is it promoting mobility between nations, or something deeper?
- Member organizations should consider intended audience, strategy, and message with any advocacy work.
- Suggestions for the near future: the development of a policy statement; to continue to produce stories or narratives with good examples in order to advocate for internationalization, etc.

### **Large Group Discussion (afternoon): What are the take-aways?**

- A potential outcome from this Dialogue is to creating an advocacy toolkit for our members.
- Higher education is about research and service to society, and in order to do that better we need to do so internationally. However, we may be failing when we are not servicing a portion of society.
- We should expend energy on finding advocates who can affirm the value of universities.

- We need definitions of what our goals are. Most associations have goals, but they are not always visible to all. International education leaders have learned to present different sides of internationalizations to different constituencies. This may be the moment to come up with broader goals that are beyond maintaining positions (helping SIOs do their jobs). Some possible goals include increasing soft power and developing citizens who are aware of their own position in the world. One goal might be internationalization, but our broader goal is to go one step further into what internationalization is about, and which values we shared with society.
- There may be other goals to advocacy that we should clarify—are we looking to have organizational presence at Capitol Hill? Are we striving to change minds in our communities about the value of international education? Are we aiming to break down the image of elites?
- Our goals should be dynamic and not static.
- Another clear objective for associations is to celebrate successes, networks, innovations, research, etc., which can be leveraged for advocacy.
- We are talking about two aspects of advocacy at this Dialogue: one is establishing relevant goals for our institutions/orgs; the second is the specific goal of advocacy. Example-- IIE is on Capitol Hill once a week as part of advocacy. Is this approach relevant to our organizations? Is the goal changing minds in our communities about the value of international education? Breaking down image of elites?
- International education leaders should capitalize on creating opportunity out of crisis. It is rare to have so many organizations from sectors of society making statements in the U.S. about the recent executive order. Our statements are very short-term oriented; we might want to consider more long-term strategy. We now have the opportunity to create a web of influence—we can reach out to others and find common ground regarding a statement and then use it as a catalyst for partnership for more sustainable and long-term advocacy.
- Possible EAIE take-aways from this Dialogue include:
  - EAIE will be advocates for US organizations such as NAFSA and AIEA because of shared goals.
  - EAIE will include a hot topics session focused on advocacy at the Annual Conference.
  - EAIE will continue to discuss advocacy as a topic be it undertaken as an organization, or the case of EAIE supporting others in their advocacy efforts.

**Impressions: Dr. Jón Atli Benediktsson (University of Iceland)**

- International collaboration has its pros and cons.
- Iceland has immigration laws that people think are fairly tough; some consider it a disgrace.
- International collaboration is extremely important.
- We need students to travel beyond our borders.
- The message around the importance of internationalization is not getting across, and messaging is crucial.

## **Closing Remarks: Gil Latz**

- "Know thy Space"
- Globalization affects every aspect of our lives. These issues are not simple binary notions of global/local-- we must engage with a 'spherical web' of communication in new ways.<sup>3</sup>
- We need to rethink our language, in particular, the term "internationalization." We must be cognizant of who we are communicating with, and use narrative and storytelling (with a human element). Our stories should include facts, and use student voices.
- We should continue to explore how our partners can assist us in the roles of advocacy.
- We must be careful about the notion of elitism. There is unique value to the pursuit of knowledge. Yet we cannot only speak to ourselves -- this is counterproductive.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### ***2017 Transatlantic Leadership Dialogue: List of Registrants***

<b>First</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
David	Ayers	Purdue University
Susan	Bender	University of Idaho
Jón Atli	Benediktsson	Bergen University/University of Iceland
Tom	Bogenschild	University of Oregon
Gonzalo R.	Bruce	Boise State University
Margeet	de Lange	Utrecht University
Darla	Deardorff	AIEA
Duleep	Deosthale	(EAIE)/Admission Table
Eny V.	Di Iorio	Lorenzo de' Medici Institute
Dafina	Diabate	AIEA
Ahmad	Ezzeddine	Wayne State University
David	Fleshler	Case Western Reserve University

<sup>3</sup> Universities are obligated to address issues of concern on campus and in the communities they reside; the binary notion, local/global needs to be reconsidered not only in terms of geographic proximity but also in terms of intersecting "spheres of engagement," from the local to the global. See: Gil Latz, Susan Sutton, and Barbara Hill, "An Internationalized Stewardship of Urban Places". *Metropolitan Universities Journal*. March 2015. Vol. 25 Number 3: 83-98.

Cheryl	Francisconi	Institute of International Education
Melanie	Gottlieb	AACRAO
Richard	Harvey	UAE
Kahn	Hilary	Indiana University, Bloomington
Elisabet	Idermark	Stockholm University
Ni	Jadon	McMaster University
James	Jenkins	University of Hertfordshire
Sonja	Knutson	Memorial University of Newfoundland
Kees	Kouwenaar	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Jane	Kucko	University of Tulsa
Markus	Laitinen	EAIE
Gil	Latz	AIEA/IUPUI
Ross	Lewin	University of Maryland
John S.	Lucas	ISEP
Patti	McGill Peterson	ACE
Elaine	Meyer-Lee	NAFSA
Terence	Miller	Marquette University
Sabine	Pendl	Incoming President EAIE
Douglas	Proctor	University College Dublin
Penelope	Pynes	University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Joanna	Regulska	UC Davis
David	Richardson	University of East Anglia
Katy	Rosenbaum	AIEA
Ian	Rowlands	University of Waterloo
Hanan	Saab	Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
Burca	Sarsilmaz	Koc University
Susan	Sutton	Bryn Mawr College
John J.	Wood	The State University of New York, University at Buffalo