The Institutional Context and Prerequisites for Success in Dual, Double and Joint Degree Programs

**STINT
Double-Degree Programmes
Stockholm, March 2018**

Prof. John K. Hudzik, Michigan State University

NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalization and President of MUCIA;
Former MSU Vice President and Dean of International Programs;
Past President of NAFSA and of AIEA,

Key Framing Questions

1. What are the intellectual drivers and core values to be advanced by the collaboration?

    ❖ Desired outcomes?

    ❖ Definition of success?

    ❖ Balancing intellectual, pecuniary, and core-value goals.

2. Do we have sufficient and sustainable institutional commitments?

3. Do we have the right partners for a collaboration?

4. Will there be mutual benefits?

5. Will key sectors/authorities/individuals support?

Much is at Stake

- Protecting admission and degree requirements.

- Intellectual freedom in the classroom.

- Intellectual property protections.

- Quality assurance and accreditation requirements.

- "Business" model sustainability.

- Policy/regulatory compatibility.

- Protecting institutional reputation and core values.

What are the Intellectual Drivers and Expected Outcomes?

- In learning

- For research/scholarship.

- Institutional priorities in curricula and research.

- Community engagement.

- Building sustainable institutional capacity.

The Basis of <u>Strategic Partnerships</u> and Collaborations

For all institutions involved:

- Supports core missions.

- Addresses priority institutional education or research thrusts.

- Builds on strength and/or advances capacity in priority areas for strengthening.

- Addresses key institutional measures of success and core values.

Cross-Border Credentialing Collaborations

- For: degrees, majors, diplomas, certificates, other.

- Terminology: Dual, joint, combined, double, conjoined.

- Options for delivering subject matter (e.g, courses):
  - Recognition/acceptance of the other's "courses."
  - Division of labor in who teaches what.
  - Joint design and joint teaching of courses.
  - Cross-Border Team instruction (with or without technology).
  - Etc.

One Classification Option
Adapted from Kris Olds, Global Higher Education, 2011

- *Collaborative Course or Program Resource Sharing*: Agreements with other universities in which curricular and educational resources are shared (pre-vetted) to leverage strengths of partner institutions and create synergy. Wide variety of models which can be stand alone courses, or used in any form of degree or certificate credentialing.

- *Sequential Degrees*: Formalized arrangement in which students earn a specified degree at a partner institution and then completes a second, related program at University of X. Courses from the first program may waive requirements in the University of X program. Students required to meet all University of X program and degree requirements. (e.g., twining arrangements).

- *Dual Degrees*: Students complete the requirements for two degrees from two institutions, with efficiencies in course taking by way of cross counting courses/requirements. Each institution is primarily responsible for its own degree award.

- *Joint Degrees*: A single degree authorized and conferred by two or more partner institutions; faculty, governance groups, governance boards share authority.

Issues When Cross-Border Collaborations Include Research/Scholarship Activities

- Intellectual property, copyright, royalties.
- Proprietary rights and public access.
- Human subjects' rights, animal rights.
- Protections of core institutional values.
- Balancing pecuniary and intellectual motivations and outcomes.

Basic Collaborative Options

◈ Collaborations that are:

▣ **Strategic:** Long-term sustainability as well as depth and breadth in the nature of interactions, and a high degree of shared responsibility and tight connection to institutional missions.

▣ **Project/Tactical:** Focused collaborations that tend to be project-specific and which may also have expectations of an end date.

◈ It may be easier and less risky to "test the water" with latter than with the former.

Matrix of Internationalization Scale and Scope Options

(Adapted from the University of Nottingham)

	SCOPE: Single mission	Scope: Multiple Missions
SCALE: Small	**(1) E.**g. A dual or joint degree in a single or particular subject matter or academic unit.	**(3)** E.g., An academic unit partners with a similar unit abroad via joint degree, joint research, joint community problem solving, joint faculty/student teams.
SCALE: Large	**(2) E.g.,** internationalizing the entire undergraduate curriculum (all majors/subjects).	**(4) E.g.,** Collaborations integrating teaching, research, service partnerships abroad in selected high priority institutional strategic areas.

POLICY ISSUES: Should the Institution...

1. Start in quadrant 1, if not doing anything now or yet?

2. Have a longer range plan that moves efforts toward quadrants 2 and 3 and perhaps ultimately quadrant 4 collaborations?

3. Allow/encourage "individual" led efforts (likely in 1 and 3)?

How will Success be Defined? Examples

- Numbers of students?

- Student evaluations?

- Faculty assessments?

- Financial viability?

- Outcome measures?
  - Completion rates
  - Time to completion
  - Student academic performance
  - Employer assessments of graduates

Do We Have the Right Partner(s)?

- Are institutional cultures and values
  - <u>Compatible</u> enough to forge a partnership,
  - <u>Flexible</u> enough on both sides to adapt where needed (administratively and cross culturally),
  - <u>Open</u> to learning from the outside?
- Will priorities remain stable at collaborating institutions?

Do we Have the "Right Attitudes" for a Workable Relationship?

Challenges of "academic parochialism:"

- We do it this way, they do it that way, our way is the only acceptable way.

- Unwillingness to consider how differing requirements might be rationalized.

- Can we making reasonable exceptions/revisions to institutional policies (e.g., credit transfer limits, course equivalencies, residency requirements, guidance committee composition)?

13

The Basis for Mutuality

- **Shared vision** of desired outcomes

- **Mutual contribution**
  - Each bringing value added and unique contribution
  - From assistance to **co-production**

- **Mutual benefit**

  - **Symmetric** (similar benefits e.g., straight exchanges, project grant and research collaborations leading to shared funding/revenue).

  - **Asymmetric** (the benefits are defined and operationalized differently for members).

14

Examples of Asymmetric Benefits

Balancing the value of different benefits.

- Dual Degree (besides student head count):
  - Fill unique gaps in instructional or scholarly expertise at collaborating institutions.
  - Providing access to private sector opportunities or active learning opportunities at collaborating institutions.

- Other forms of cross-border collaboration:
  - Undergraduate students in one direction, banking "credits" for graduate degrees in the other.
  - Research and publication opportunities for faculty from institution "X" community capacity building institution "Y."

15

Will Key Sectors/Authorities Support?

- Academic governance;

- Core academic units;

- Institutional service/support units;

- Accreditation bodies;

- External approvals (e.g., government);

- Is there a market?

What criteria and processes are necessary to protect consumers and who will assure their protection?

Appendix

Additional Design, Administrative, and Accountability Issues

Academic Program Support

- Which institution(s) and unit(s) have primary responsibility for
  - Admissions (process and criteria including language skill).
  - Student support services:
    - Academic advising and support counseling.
    - Monitoring and evaluating student progress.
    - Student access to faculty, courses and service.
  - Academic actions (e.g., admission, probation, dismissal, certification of completion of requirements).
  - Meeting ancillary student costs (e.g., travel, housing, living abroad, and other needs).
  - Certifying completions and awarding credentials, awarding degrees or other credentials, transcripts, and documents.
- Provisions for availability and administration of student financial support.

Who Should be Involved at Various Stages of Planning and Action?

- During initial talking stages (which administrators, staff, and faculty)?

- In the design phase (administrators, faculty, students, and support units)?

- In the approval phase?

- In the implementation and monitoring phases?

Decide "Business and Operational Plan" Parameters

Operating Control

- Who exercises <u>day-to-day</u> control and supervision?
- Who decides <u>strategic directions</u>?
- Who is responsible for assessing <u>standards/quality?</u>
- Who enforces standards/quality?
- To whom does the program or operation report?

Governance

- Who/what is the <u>governing authority</u> or body?
- What are <u>governance roles/powers of the parties</u>?
- Who has advisory roles?

Who/What is Driving the Collaboration and What is the Institutional Staying Power?

- Main options
  - Top-down based on macro institutional stature and need.
  - Bottom up based on programmatic stature and need.
- Multi-levelled synergies are best.
- Is the collaboration personality or institutionally driven and supported?
  - If driven by administrative leaders, is there evidence of commitment from key faculty(ies)?
- Institutional sustainability: what is the likely staying power on the part of the institutions involved?

Elements of a General or Enabling MOU (Memorandum of Understanding)

1. Brief statement on the:

    • Origins and scope of agreement.

    • Shared purpose, goals, and benefits expected.

2. Lead administrative unit and principal contact person on both sides (and for updating these).

3. Other key units that will provide necessary services or supports.

4. Scope: Categories or types of activities and programs encompassed in the agreement.

Elements of the MOU (continued)

5. Legal parameters:

    ⬧ Programmatic scope;

    ⬧ Limitations and obligations of parties;

    ⬧ Financial commitments, obligations and limitations. Duration of the initial agreement (e.g., 5 years).

6. Provisions for review, renewal, termination.

7. Sunset provisions.

8. Provisions for completing students in the pipeline if the agreement is terminated.

Elements of the MOU (continued)

9. General commitment for assessment: dates, outline of a process/criteria and by whom.

10. Provision for amending the agreement.

11. Naming of key institutional policies that will be applicable (e.g., non-discrimination, student rights and responsibilities, and academic policies).

12. Signed on both sides by persons with authority to commit the institution.

Challenges and Potential Pitfalls

- Finding and sustaining institutional support resources.

  - Most degree collaborations are labor intensive.
  - Few if any can be self-financing.
  - External contracts and grants are difficult to sustain.
  - Most outside grant or other support mechanisms will require institutional soft and/or hard match.

- Are there or will there evolve expectations that tuition (and other costs) will be discounted.

25

Challenges and Potential Pitfalls (cont'd)

- Achieving symmetry in exchanges.

- Staying power in moving through the labyrinths of setting up the dual/joint degree.

- Sustaining long-run administrative and faculty support.

- Sustaining access to key courses and services needed from units outside the department.

- Insufficient student language skills sufficient for classroom survival (particularly oral and listening).

26

Challenges and Potential Pitfalls (cont'd)

⊕ Surviving inevitable changes of institutional leadership.

⊕ Knowing when and how to modify, phase out, or terminate t the collaborations

⊕ Designing and building an integrated joint or dual degree experience, rather than one merely glued together at the edges (at the points of handovers).

Implications of Privatization and Private-Like Forces on Building Collaborations

- Does it make money?

- Does it build institutional reputation and "pedigree" in the aggregate
  - Shaping inter-institutional partnerships and collaborations
  - Building institutional capacity.

- The balance between protecting core values and payoffs.

- The balance between knowledge for the sake of knowledge and payoffs.
  - Educational programming
  - Research and it applications

28

Numbers of "Members"

🔸 **Bi-lateral** (Probably easier to manage and focus)

🔸 **Tri- or multi-lateral** (Expands the talent base and access to resources and connections)

🔸 **Networks** (More complex interactions and greater need for network management structures; but far greater access to a diversity of talent and capacity)

  ◼ **Fixed** (in membership and roles)

  ◼ **Flexible and shifting** (membership may shift but members may also access different parts of the network as needed on project specific bases.

29