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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report advances the view that identifying and implementing an appropriate global strategy is crucial to George Mason University’s future success and its ability to thrive in a rapidly changing world. **Global must be a core facet of Mason’s identity** and should be central to how we think about our mission: the advancement and distribution of knowledge in pursuit of a better world. The report identifies the key issues and questions that bear on Mason’s ability to thrive in global contexts and recommends a number of strategic commitments that will set us on a path to becoming a **university for the world**:

- Apply clear and consistent criteria in assessing the strategic value of global opportunities
- Develop organizational structures and support services that reflect best practices for enabling global success
- Foster global citizenship in all our teaching and throughout the Mason community
- Develop a strategic focus on emerging nations and global mega-cities
- Invest in global problem-solving where our likelihood of impact is highest: conflict; human development; environmental sustainability
- Position Mason as a pre-eminent global convener

The report outlines global trends shaping our current and future operating environments; identifies several global problems where Mason can have an impact; discusses how to leverage our comparative advantages in terms of location and institutional culture for global success; proposes criteria to govern our assessment of prospective global opportunities; proposes, defines, and identifies pathways of fostering global citizenship as a core educational goal at all levels of teaching; and discusses the appropriate organizational structures for achieving global success.

**Key insights:**
- Mason’s current approach to global activity is highly decentralized. This promotes enormous pluralism and local ownership but also entails challenges relating to communication, coordination, and strategic coherence.
- Our strategy must provide global education and promote global opportunity across all disciplines and units, not just programs with an explicitly global focus.

Mason’s comparative advantages:
- A highly diverse, globally engaged student body.
- Locations in a region with extensive connections to the world; proximity to the nation’s capital.
- A flexible and entrepreneurial culture that allows us to consider global opportunities other institutions might pass up.
- A strong foundation of campus internationalization and global programming on which to build.

*Global Strategy Working Group*
II. Global Strategy Working Group Report

A. Introduction

This report will advance the view that identifying and implementing an appropriate global strategy is crucial to George Mason University’s future success and its ability to thrive in a rapidly changing world. **Global must be a core facet of Mason’s identity** and should be central to how we think about our mission as an institution: the advancement and distribution of knowledge in pursuit of a better world.

While global activity has been a focus at Mason for some time now, it has not always been approached in a strategic manner. Mason has now reached a point in its institutional evolution where it can no longer afford to pursue global teaching, research, and partnerships without a clear strategic vision. We must also recognize that while our potential in this area is enormous, success will not be easy. Fully realizing our global aspirations will involve multiple trade-offs and costs, and will likely require us to consider painful structural changes and institutional reorganization. The primary purpose of this report is thus to identify the key issues and questions that bear on Mason’s ability to thrive in global contexts and to recommend a number of strategic commitments that will set us on a path to becoming a university for the world.

The report proceeds as follows. After defining the distinctive characteristics of the global paradigm and providing a brief overview of current global activities at Mason, we identify various trends at work in the world today that have particular implications (whether positive or negative) for higher education in the United States and Mason in particular. This discussion permits us to identify where in the world we should focus our work, and the specific global problems Mason is best suited to address. This leads us to consider more closely our comparative advantages as an institution of higher education and how we might best leverage our location and unique assets for global success. We then engage the question of how best to cultivate a global mindset in our students and the broader Mason community. We approach this as an effort to foster global citizenship and discuss various dimensions of—and specific pathways towards achieving—this goal. Finally we turn to the question of the appropriate models and methods for global success at Mason on a wider range of fronts, leading to a discussion of various structural issues and the question of how best to organize the university to realize its global potential.

Over the course of the report we recommend **six specific commitments** pertaining to various dimensions of Mason’s evolving global strategy. These commitments address: (1) which parts of the world represent a strategic focus for our work; (2) what kinds of global problems Mason is best suited to address; (3) the comparative advantages that suggest a specific global role for Mason; (4) concrete and measurable pathways to global citizenship as a distinct educational goal; (5) the appropriate organizational structures and infrastructures for global success; and (6)
criteria for assessing global partnership opportunities and determining which global initiatives are in the university’s strategic interest.

What is “global”?
Today it has become almost routine to claim that we live in a global world. We usually invoke this idea to get at the sense of ever increasing interconnectedness among peoples and cultures around the world: the fact that things happening in our local communities and lives are often shaped by forces and factors both distant and disparate. We marvel at the ease with which the Internet permits instantaneous communication with the other side of the world, or the dizzying flows of global finance whose vicissitudes have very tangible impacts on our livelihoods and futures.

The idea of globalization—a term that seeks to capture in aggregate the broad array of economic, cultural, and technological forces that comprise today’s intense worldwide interconnectedness—thus seems to be a defining theme of the contemporary age. And yet defining what it means to be “global” remains a challenge. Some use the term as a synonym for more conventional ideas such as “international”—that is, as a way of referring to things happening in and between other countries. Others—particularly those in the academy—view globalization as a new and distinct set of processes, but disagree vehemently about its defining features, origins, and significance.

As both an intellectual and operational paradigm, global encompasses but also transcends more traditional concepts such as international. Where the latter term assumes that we should understand the world by looking primarily at relationships between individual countries (“international”), the global approach focuses our attention on a much broader range of actors, forces, and levels of analysis/practice. Globalization has drawn our attention to the rise of new actors on the world stage such as multinational corporations—some of which have a net worth larger than many small nations—with complex, worldwide supply chains and multiple, highly diverse markets. Globalization is also associated with the ability of subnational—sometimes even very local—actors, such as civil society organizations and community groups, to mobilize and exert influence across national borders. A global orientation further demands that we recognize the complex implications of interaction between human and natural ecosystems on a planetary scale. Concomitant with this view is the idea that the world comprises spaces that connect territories—oceanic, atmospheric, and beyond—as much as it does nations and physical territories themselves. In short, the global paradigm speaks to the fact that it is now possible—indeed, perhaps imperative—to think about the world as a single space.

Why does global matter?
The distinctive features of today’s global world represent both opportunities and risks for institutions of higher education in the United States. The breadth and flexibility of higher education organizations means that it is possible today for universities to take on new roles and
have significant impacts across a wide range of sectors beyond the traditional core mission of undergraduate education. With worldwide demand for tertiary and professional education at an all-time high, and the U.S. still viewed—at least for the time being—as the gold standard in higher education, there are enormous new student markets to be tapped. But along with new demand has also come new supply. More specifically, a number of “emerging economies” (discussed below in more detail) such as Brazil, China, India, and South Korea have begun to position themselves as world leaders in science, engineering, and technology. The well-known phenomenon of outsourcing is testament to the fact that the availability of knowledge intensive and highly skilled labor for sectors such as biotechnology and software development is no longer the sole preserve of the United States and other advanced industrial economies in the global north.

U.S. universities—including large, public institutions—can today best serve their students and local communities by embracing the global approach and leveraging their particular areas of competitive advantage. For Mason, this means that we must prepare our students to be global citizens and make them competitive in increasingly globalized labor markets. By virtue of its close association with federal government agencies and the national defense industry, the Commonwealth already enjoys a high level of worldwide exposure and interconnectedness. But Virginia is also a major player in the information technology and engineering sectors and, for many global companies, a highly attractive place to do business. Indeed, governors of Virginia past and present have recognized the power of globalization and worked to make the Commonwealth a global player. For example, the Virginia Economic Development Partnership, a state authority, has an international trade team—with offices in Japan, China, India, and Europe—dedicated to identifying export opportunities for Virginia businesses while attracting new foreign investment in the Commonwealth. By the same token, universities like Mason can best serve Virginians by forging strategic global partnerships that offer our best expertise and services to the world while simultaneously working to bring the best of the world to the Commonwealth.

If Mason aspires to become a “university for the world” then the cultivation of global collaborations and new partnerships that traverse national boundaries need to be seen as a form of ethical commitment on the part of the university. Cosmopolitanism—understood primarily as a set of values and principles—needs to become a hallmark feature of our understanding of higher education and its ultimate goals.

Global at Mason: Multiple Dimensions
Mason already hosts a great many globally focused programs and initiatives, with particularly noteworthy growth over the past decade. While a comprehensive inventory of the university’s
global work is not yet available, we can begin by identifying at a broad level the main categories and types of current global effort:

Teaching

- Alongside **degree programs with an explicit global focus** (such as Global Affairs, Government and International Politics, International Commerce & Policy, Global and Environmental Change in the College of Sciences) or an interdisciplinary emphasis on world regions or themes (such as Latin American Studies, Middle East Studies, Central Asian Studies, Asia-Pacific Studies, Immigration Studies) we must also include fields and disciplines which, by their nature, also include a great deal of global coverage such as Anthropology, Cultural Studies, History, and Economics.

- Many of Mason’s **professional schools also offer programs with strong global content**, including the School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution, the School of Public Policy, the College of Health and Human Services (particularly its Department of Global and Community Health), the School of Management, and the emphasis on culturally and linguistically diverse learning found in the College of Education and Human Development.

- The Department of Modern and Classical Languages (MCL) also plays a key role in **equipping students with the communication skills required to operate in global environments**. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that MCL offers instruction in the key languages associated with global emerging markets (Chinese, Portuguese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, and Arabic).

- Mason’s primary effort to date at **integrating global awareness across the curriculum** has been the ‘Global Understanding’ requirement within the University’s General Education program. Some units have added supplemented global teaching in their own general education offerings, such as the ‘Non-Western’ requirement in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Research

- **Numerous research centers with a primary emphasis on global issues** can be found across the University. These include the Center for Global Studies, the Center for International Education, the Center for Climate Change Communication, the Center for Global Policy, the Center for Global Business, the Center for Emerging Market Policies, the Center for Global Business, the Center for Emerging Market Policies,

---

1 Although we note plans to launch in spring 2013 a new database (the “Global Register”) that captures the university’s activities in various countries around the world.
the Terrorism, Transnational Crime, and Corruption Center, the International Center for Applied Studies in Information Technology, the Center for the Study of International Medical Policies and Practices, the Center for Global Ethics, and the Ali Vural Ak Center for Global Islamic Studies—among others.

- Other units host programs and projects focused on leveraging the findings and import of their research to address global problems, such as the Engineers for International Development program at the Volgenau School Engineering and the Center for Social Complexity at the Krasnow Institute for Advanced Study. For example, the Department of Civil, Environmental, and Infrastructure Engineering created the Engineers for International Development extra-curricular program in which students conceive, design and build simple infrastructure projects in villages in developing countries. EfID also integrates non-engineering students in projects, as well as universities within project countries.

- Another facet of global research at Mason relates to the many units and programs whose faculty undertake collaborative work on a wide range of subjects with researchers based in other countries. The College of Sciences, for example, currently has research partnerships focused on cancer genomes in Italy and remote sensing in China. These transnational scientific collaborations often entail unique challenges such as dealing with national differences in intellectual property laws and human subjects research standards.

**Extra-Curricular Services & Curriculum Support Programs**

- Mason students interested in studying outside the United States are served by the Center for Global Education and the Center for Field Studies, both of which provide a wide variety of study abroad experiences with and without associated academic credit. A number of degree programs in specific units also offer their own international study abroad and internship programs.

- The university provides a wide range of support services to international students who come to study at Mason through the Office of International Programs and Services, the English Language Institute, and the Center for International Student Access.

**University partnerships**

- In addition to globally focused programs within individual colleges and units, the University also participates in a number of centralized global initiatives that involve multiple Mason stakeholders and teaching/research areas. These include the China 1-2-1 programs, the Provost’s Global Problem Solving Consortium, and the soon-to-open
Mason campus in Songdo, South Korea.

- Many of these initiatives—along with other facets of the University’s global portfolio—are overseen by an **Office of Global and International Strategies** with a dedicated Vice President.

The various offices, programs, and units cited above do not by any means represent the full range of global activity currently to be found at Mason. Rather, the intention here is to provide a representative sample of the kinds of activities that need to be taken into consideration when developing a global strategy for the university.

**Global at Mason: Key Findings**

Looking across the range of activity surveyed above and the university’s current organizational structure with respect to global efforts, several defining characteristics seem to emerge. These represent broad, cross-cutting facets of global at Mason that need to be taken into consideration as the university goes about devising a new strategic plan:

1. **Mason’s global activities are highly decentralized**, disaggregated, and often highly compartmentalized within specific units. This approach has ensured relatively high degrees of local ownership on the part of relevant faculty, staff, and students and has permitted the cultivation of an extremely diverse portfolio of global work at the university. On the downside, however, this “let a thousand flowers bloom” approach often means that individual global stakeholders are unaware of what each other is doing, making it difficult to develop productive synergies, producing duplication, generating confusion among prospective and current students in navigating the many options, and leading to an overall lack of strategic coherence.

2. **Global at Mason needs to be about more than just those units and programs with an explicitly global focus.** When one thinks of the university’s global programs and activities, things like the global affairs or international studies programs spring readily to mind. Likewise study abroad or instruction in foreign languages. A key facet of the global paradigm, however, is the idea that global trends and developments affect every aspect of the university’s operation and, by the same token, the idea that there is potentially global opportunity in everything we do – not just those programs and activities specifically titled or marked “global.” Take, for example, programs focused specifically on local government, civil planning, or small business development in Northern Virginia. While these are not explicitly global programs in name, it is likely that the knowledge, experience, and best practices they have identified through their work could be transferable and add value to suburban and local settings elsewhere in the world. Furthermore, many units without “global” designations are pursuing their work with a
global perspective in mind (including the sciences and professional schools) and need to be an intrinsic part of the university’s global strategy.

**Mason’s student body is our most important global resource.** The 32,000+ students who attend Mason represent one of the most diverse campus populations anywhere in the United States. The economic dynamism of Northern Virginia and its strong ties to the wider world by virtue of its proximity to the Nation’s Capital have ensured that this region has become an enormous magnet for global immigration in recent decades. Mason’s student body hence reflects the enormously rich range of cultural, national, and linguistic backgrounds to be found in the communities surrounding our Northern Virginia campuses. Fairfax County Public Schools, for example, counts more than a hundred languages and dialects spoken by its students. In addition to an abundance of local diversity, Mason currently has students from more than 135 countries studying on its campuses. Taken as a whole, Mason’s students represent people who are globally aware, globally engaged, and who harbor global aspirations. Our approach must therefore include an analysis and strategy for taking advantage of the myriad global connections and relationships to be found in our classrooms, and a means to create cross-fertilization between the many forms of informal global education that regularly occur in student life and our work in the classroom.

**B. The World and Mason**

An essential step in thinking about how Mason should approach global strategy involves identifying the major forces shaping the world in which the university will operate now and in the coming years. Below we outline and explain a series of global trends that represent a mixture of opportunity and risk for the university, before going on to discuss how Mason can contribute most effectively to solving today’s—and tomorrow’s—global problems.

**Global trends and implications**

**Ongoing global economic uncertainty**

With continuing pressure on governments to reduce public expenditures—including higher education—universities are forced to explore alternative sources of revenue. Global partnerships involving **collaboration between universities and multinationals in the private sector** represent an increasingly attractive source of support for higher education activities. Such opportunities are worth exploring if and when they are consonant with the strategic criteria identified below and when properly deconflicted with our ethical commitments and Mason’s obligation as a public institution to provide a broad-based education in the liberal tradition.
Global demography
While global population growth is projected to stagnate and level off by the middle of the present century, many countries—particularly in the global south—will continue to experience a “youth bulge.” Large numbers of unemployed young people unable to enter the labor force represent a source of social and political tension in many countries—witness the 2011 “Arab Spring”—and a potential source of instability and conflict. In other settings—such as the emerging markets discussed below—the **youth bulge has been associated with increased demand for higher education, a middle class ready to invest in their children’s college and graduate education abroad, and an opportunity for institutions such as Mason to cultivate new student constituencies.** That said, all countries are subject to the exigencies of global economic turbulence and even today’s prospering emerging markets run the risk of creating a population of well-educated youth with unrequited demands. As a university we have a responsibility to study and address these challenges even as we respond to the opportunities they create.

The globalization of higher education
While the United States continues to enjoy a preeminent place in the pecking order of global higher education, it is **no longer the sole desirable destination for international students.** Universities in Europe, Australia, East Asia, Brazil, and even India are vying today for an increasingly globalized market for advanced studies. Nations around the world are investing in the establishment of education, research, and development hubs and seeking to draw upon foreign talent. Likewise, the **U.S. can no longer count on always being able to attract the top faculty and researchers** when others are offering lucrative incentives to attract top international researchers and their intellectual property.

The global proliferation of information and communication technologies
Widespread access to technology is no longer a phenomenon confined to prosperous post-industrial economies in the global north. Mobile telephones are pervasive in the developing world and Internet usage has been increasing steadily around the world—particularly among the younger generation. The ability to reach out and engage potentially unlimited audiences means that institutions of higher education are no longer dependent on users of their services being present in physical classrooms. Various distance education technologies and online learning platforms—such as iTunes University, TelePresence, and the rapid proliferation in massive online open courses (MOOCs)—make it possible for a campus to extend its reach well beyond the boundaries of its campus. But there are limitations here, not only in terms of what the technology can do but also how far they can reach when relatively low proportions of the world’s population has access to the bandwidth and hardware needed to access the aforementioned services. A global distance education strategy would thus have to take into consideration the so-called “digital divide” and consider multiple approaches such a mobile telephony, low bandwidth services, and applications designed for less capable devices and settings where IT support is limited or nonexistent.
Urbanization and the rise of global megacities
Fundamental shifts in the dominant modes of economic production over the past half century have generated mass influx to cities in many regions and today more than half of the world’s population lives in urban areas. A number of global cities such as New York, London, and Tokyo serve as major hubs in the world of finance and as magnets for the “creative classes.” These urban centers are tied together by capital flows, communication networks, and trajectories of human mobility that together constitute the defining infrastructure of globalization. Indeed, in some respects these cities are more tightly integrated with each other than with the rest of the countries in which they are located. More recently we have seen the emergence of conurbations in which multiple urban areas have grown together to form a single “megacity.” Many of these areas, each of which has a population in excess of 20 million, are to be found in Asia (e.g. Tokyo, Mumbai, Seoul). With global cities becoming distinctive polities unto themselves and increasingly important forms of world community, focusing the university’s outreach and global engagement efforts on particular urban areas is an especially compelling direction.

The rise of emerging nations
The past two decades have witnessed the phenomenal rise to global prominence of countries such as Brazil, China, and India. While clearly driven by the economic dynamism exhibited by these “emerging powers,” this phenomenon is by no means confined to the realm of global trade and commerce. Emerging nations have been asserting themselves in the diplomatic arena through new great power conglomerations such as the G20 and have also been pursuing various “soft power” approaches centered on, for example, creative communication strategies and new development aid practices. While scholars and commentators debate which countries should be considered emerging powers—frequently coining clever acronyms along the way— it is clear that the world today is witnessing a fundamental reconfiguration in global power. While the traditional great powers of the Atlantic age remain vitally important in world affairs, they are no longer capable of dictating the global agenda. While it is commonplace today many U.S. universities to establish partnerships in China given the size of that country and its appetite for premier higher education services, there are enormous opportunities in other emerging markets such as Brazil, India, Indonesia, and Turkey. Universities in these countries are keen to establish partnerships and Mason’s institutional profile—relatively new, flexible, and focused on innovation—makes it an attractive partner. As Mason approaches the question of where in the world it should concentrate its global efforts, it may be worthwhile thinking about emerging nations as an area of strategic focus. Many of the emerging megacities cited above, it should be noted, are to be found in countries classified as emerging nations.

---

2 The most commonly cited acronym is BRICS (encompassing Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) but The Economist has offered an alternative roster in the form of CIVETS (Colombia, India, Vietnam, Egypt, Turkey, and South Africa) while Mason’s own Jack Goldstone has suggested a focus on TIMBI (Turkey, India, Mexico, Brazil, and Indonesia).
COMMITMENT 1: Mason will develop a strategic focus on emerging nations and global mega-cities

An emphasis on emerging nations would provide a greater sense of focus to Mason’s global strategy while also offering the prospect of long-term partnerships that could evolve over time. Such an approach would also leverage and bring a greater sense of strategic coherence to a number of initiatives and programs already underway at Mason such as the South Korea campus, our China and Russia programs, the Global Problem Solving Consortium (whose members all hail from emerging nations), SPP’s Center for Emerging Market Policy and the Center for Global Studies’ Working Groups on Emerging Powers and South-South Cooperation, and Cities and Globalization. The fact that Mason already teaches the most important languages for doing business in emerging nations adds a further rationale for such an emphasis.

Such a focus would also entail a number of trade-offs and risks. In some of the relevant countries, the infrastructure for supporting institutional partnerships is less developed and start-up costs potentially higher. Instances of corruption and bureaucratic malfeasance are not uncommon. There is also the fact that such countries are considered “emerging” precisely because they are on their way up rather than having firmly arrived. While many have experienced phenomenal economic growth (in some cases 8-10% year on year) for the last decade, such dynamism is not sustainable in the long run. Mason should therefore not focus on initiatives designed to take short-term advantage of “quick return” opportunities but rather on programs focused on mutual interests and on jointly devising constructive solutions for stable and sustainable levels of growth and development over the long haul – with Mason as a consistent and committed partner. Finally, there is also the risk that an overly narrow focus on countries categorized as emerging nations could lead us to neglect lucrative opportunities in other parts of the world. So long as our operational doctrine recognizes that having a strategic focus on a particular part of the world does not preclude us from exploring partnerships elsewhere when they fit our criteria, these concerns are not significant. By the same token, we will need to recognize that not every emerging nation opportunity that comes our way will be appropriate to pursue.

A focus on global mega-cities would represent a heavier lift for the university because, with the exception of few individual faculty, we do not possess a well-developed comparative urban studies program or an existing portfolio of projects with a primarily urban focus. Because many of the relevant global cities are to be found in emerging nations, such a focus could perhaps constitute a facet of a broader emphasis on new pivotal states.
Mason’s contribution to solving global problems

If Mason is to commit itself to pursuing and fostering a better world then it will have to make judicious choices about where it focuses its efforts in order to have maximum impact. This is a difficult undertaking for an institution with a broad portfolio that encompasses nearly every field, discipline, and area of human endeavor. Indeed, looking over the list of global problems identified by the Copenhagen Consensus—an international brain trust of experts charged with determining which world issues should receive the greatest priority—Mason possesses expertise and some modicum of activity covering nearly every challenge they cite. It thus becomes necessary to assess Mason’s unique strengths and comparative advantages in order to identify a more limited set of global problems where we are likely to see greater return on invested effort measured in terms of likely impact.

COMMITMENT 2: Mason will invest in solving global problems where our likelihood of impact is highest: resolving conflicts; fostering human development; and pursuing environmental sustainability.

Our sense is that the best candidates for focusing Mason’s global problem solving efforts are threefold:

Conflict Resolution
Mason is home to a pioneering and world renowned School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution with a deep track record of practical work around the world. The university is also the home of several other critical masses of expertise and applied experience in various aspects of peacebuilding (e.g. SPP’s Peace Operations Policy Program), democratic transitions (Department of Public and International Affairs and SPP’s Center for Global Policy), post-conflict social resilience (CEHD’s Diversity Research and Action Center), and transitional justice (CGS’s Human Rights and Transitional Justice Working Group). Furthermore, Mason’s proximity to the nation’s capital, a major international airport, on-campus conference facilities coupled, and a dedicated site focused on conflict resolution (S-CAR’s Point of View) all make us a very attractive site for convening global meetings. Such an emphasis would also dovetail well with another recommended commitment, that of positioning Mason as a preeminent global convener.

Human Development
Most experts agree today that “development” is a multifaceted phenomenon that encompasses far more than just monetary prosperity. Indeed, all current major indices of developmental attainment (such as the UN’s Human Development Index), strategic action platforms for global development (such as the Millennium Development Goals), and criteria for measuring investments in correlates of development (such as the eligibility criteria employed by the U.S.
Millennium Challenge Corporation) employ methodologies that focus on quality of life factors such as education, health, and governance alongside more traditional measures of poverty, inequality, income and economic growth. Mason possesses a wealth of expertise and experience that could be brought to bear on human development as a strategic focus, particularly if programs currently housed in different administrative units across the university could be provided platforms for cross sector collaboration. Relevant units here include the Mason Center for Social Entrepreneurship, the Center for International Education, the Department of Global and Community Health, Engineers for International Development, the Center for Global Studies’ Gender and Justice Working Group, the Center for Global Policy, and the Public Administration program and comparative politics clusters within the Department of Public & International Affairs—among others.

**Sustainability and the Global Environment**

Mason’s strengths in issues relating to the natural environment suggest that global sustainability could represent a promising focus area for global problem solving. We possess internationally recognized and prize-winning faculty in programs in climate dynamics as well as a vibrant Department of Environmental Science and Policy, research strengths in remote sensing, a flagship center focused on Global Climate Change Communication, a National Academies Grainger prize winner for removal of arsenic from drinking water in Bangladesh, an engineering school with well-established strengths in civil infrastructure and bioengineering, and a School of Public Policy program in transportation policy, a critical issue in the developing world.

Among the risks and trade-offs associated with committing to these particular global problems are the difficulties associated with measuring tangible impact and therefore identifying clear criteria for success. New developments in monitoring, development, and assessment methodologies—particularly with respect to human development initiatives—may assist here. There is also some risk that privileging our work with respect to this particular set of issues could result in other valuable contributions made by Mason to mitigating world problems not receiving the attention they deserve. Finally, delivering on our potential in these areas would likely involve devising new programmatic structures and cross-unit collaborations that may require administrative adjustment. As things currently stand, there are strong disincentives for programs to work across Colleges and Schools. However, we will only be able to generate the focused synergies necessary to making tangible progress on the global problems identified above by developing platforms and programmatic structures that resist institutional stovepiping and foster collaboration across disciplines, fields, and professional schools. For example, achieving success on the human development commitment will only be possible if social science-based programs are encouraged and enabled to work closely with colleagues in science and engineering fields.
C. Mason in the World

Leveraging our locations
How does a university distinguish itself in order to develop a competitive global presence and prominence? What attracts students and faculty to one university versus another? The increasing globalization of the market for higher education puts pressure on institutions of higher education to create a distinct identity. Mason is building a strong reputation, but could raise its name recognition and solidify its status as a noted research university by taking full advantage of the unique resources provided in its surroundings. Mason should leverage its locations by firmly tying its locations to its identity, positioning itself as a convener on global issues.

Mason’s locations, particularly its proximity to the nation’s capital, provide distinct opportunities to elevate it to one of global prominence and distinguish it from other universities. The university should build upon its existing strengths and take advantage of its locations to create new opportunities. With a ready source for the highest caliber talent for faculty, as well as access to federal agencies, policy makers, embassies, NGO’s, arts organizations, and a multiethnic population, there are abundant resources upon which the university could draw to influence a variety of issues on a global stage.

Other than its proximity to Washington, D.C., Mason’s distributed campuses and sites provide opportunities to serve in this role. The Mason-Smithsonian School of Conservation in Front Royal provides an opportunity to become world renowned as the convening space for environmental and conservation issues. Arlington’s proximity to Washington, DC with its numerous agencies and institutions, and S-CAR’s Point of View dedicated to conflict resolution, demonstrate this capability. Likewise, the Mason Korea campus could be a site for gathering experts from around the North Pacific region to explore this increasingly significant area of the world.

Trade-offs on creating such an identity include becoming known for particular issues to the detriment of others. In order to be truly successful in becoming well known for its locations, it is critical that Mason have the full backing of a strong public relations program to support this commitment. Access to university housing and/or affordable guest housing is also critical if Mason is to serve as a global convening space. And while Mason’s proximity to the nation’s capital is frequently and rightfully cited as an asset, it is also the case that successful outreach to key policy audiences and Capitol Hill requires a presence in the District of Columbia itself. Despite the fact that its Fairfax campus is twenty miles from the seat of Congress, Mason may in the future need to consider establishing a direct presence in Washington DC in order to achieve its maximum potential in global, and especially policy-oriented, programs.
COMMITMENT 3: Mason will seek to position itself as a preeminent global convener across multiple fields and perspectives.

Taking advantage of its locations and its international faculty, Mason should be the locus of expertise and attention for critical global issues, giving it a competitive edge. As such, Mason will bring value to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Mason has the advantage of both unparalleled access to the considerable talent that surrounds it as well as its own distinguished areas of expertise. Serving as a leader in global engagement will raise its visibility and reinforce the brand of “a university for the world.”

Building on its competitive advantage in solving global problems, Mason could focus attention by gathering experts on key issues such as conflict, poverty, governance, and the environment. With its own key strengths in policy (public, education, science, and the arts), Mason could build on this expertise by serving as the platform from which these issues are discussed and researched, engaging the campus, community and the world.

Approaching global opportunities strategically
Universities are regularly approached by institutions of higher education from abroad with new opportunities and requests for partnerships. These opportunities range from student and faculty exchanges to dual and/or joint degrees, and joint research. There are numerous factors to consider when determining whether or not to pursue a particular global partnership or prospect. The mere fact that an opportunity is global does not make it worthy of attention. A university must know where it is currently engaged globally in order to make sound decisions regarding new opportunities. This poses a challenge for large research universities. They must have access to current data to track global partners, research endeavors, and areas of expertise to map out a global strategy. Mason’s decentralization creates challenges in tracking its global engagement, with each college involved in a plethora of global activities. In order to approach global opportunities strategically, it must have a handle on its global reach.

A strategic approach for global engagement should build upon Mason’s competitive advantage in solving the global problems identified earlier. Such a strategy should include developing deep partnerships with select institutions rather than numerous scattered partnerships that are neither long lived nor strategically beneficial. Mason is often approached by international universities that are in the formative stages or in developing countries seeking to reinvent their system of higher education. Due to its own youth and rapid development, Mason is sought after to provide its expertise for these partners as they pursue new directions in education. Its multidisciplinary programs, creative approach to program development, and entrepreneurial spirit provide a distinct advantage in this arena and could benefit from providing this expertise.
Yet Mason cannot take on every partnership opportunity. There must be a cost-benefit analysis. Should we invest our limited resources of time, talent, and money into a particular opportunity? If so, other opportunities must be declined. Does a new program build on current strengths and bolster our weaknesses? In order to determine the answers to some of these questions, the development of an international database, known as the Global Register will be critical to our efforts to develop a global strategy. The university will need to invest in this tool, and to keep it up to date, in order to fully inventory its global initiatives. Taking stock of its global reach will serve not only the university, but could serve as a vital tool for the Commonwealth when seeking specific global expertise for economic development. In addition, the importance of global initiatives must be made clear to faculty not only through opportunities and new hires, but also through a coordinated incentive structure that motivates faculty to invest in initiatives that develop a cohesive Mason strategic global plan.

**COMMITMENT 4:** Mason will apply clear and consistent criteria to assess the strategic value of potential global initiatives and determine which partnerships and initiatives to pursue.

When considering opportunities for global collaboration, administrators and faculty should carefully consider whether the partnership or initiative meets the following unranked criteria:

- Improves learning outcomes for Mason students
- Expands opportunities for Mason faculty
- Operational plans have been vetted by relevant faculty
- Ethical implications of the program have been investigated, with input of appropriate parties
- Capitalizes on existing institutional strengths or provides new opportunities in critical areas where relatively minimal investment can yield substantial gains
- Prospective partner’s goals are known and are complementary to Mason’s goals
- Evidence that resources will be available to sustain the program
- Yields financial benefits that can be used to invest in the work on home campuses or in other global initiatives
- Brings significant value to promoting the university
- Clearly benefits the Commonwealth of Virginia.
D. Fostering Global Citizenship

If Mason is to become a “university for the world” then it is incumbent upon us to make a strong commitment to fostering global citizenship among our students, faculty, staff, and alumni. The benefits of pursuing such a strategy extend from the individual to the Commonwealth to the world itself as Mason’s global influence spreads outward. It is important that such a commitment not be merely atmospheric—something we like to say or think about ourselves—but that it be a concrete commitment that drives decisions about resource allocation and commitments of effort. Otherwise, Mason will become one more of far too many American universities claiming to be committed to global citizenship, but doing little more than making the claim. It is also important to recognize that the broad diversity of Mason’s student body described earlier creates numerous opportunities for building global citizenship among our students, alumni, and other key stakeholders. Quite literally, our students can be ambassadors for global citizenship to one another and to those connected to Mason in various ways.

Defining global citizenship

The Working Group defined “global citizenship” in three interrelated ways:

1. Global citizenship as an approach to critical thinking and analysis. If Mason students are to become engaged and effective global citizens they need to move beyond a basic awareness of global issues and challenges. Being an engaged global citizen requires that our students develop the ability to think critically about global problems and opportunities while situating their analysis in a global framework. At present, except in isolated ways, Mason does not do a very good job of inculcating more than a very basic level of global awareness among our students. The most obvious example of the problem is the global understanding requirement in the general education curriculum. Currently, 80 different courses spread across 25 different academic departments meet the global understanding requirement. Given this broad diversity of courses and disciplines, it is impossible to imagine that our students are developing anything like a strong set of critical thinking and analysis tools that will help them become global citizens. The Working Group therefore recommends a serious reevaluation of the global understanding requirement in the general education curriculum, including the possibility of models similar to the award winning Writing Across the Curriculum program (e.g. “Global Across the Curriculum”) and the writing in the disciplines model (ENGL 302) that have so successfully improved the overall writing abilities of our students.

2. Global citizenship as a set of practical skills. For Mason’s students to be able to function successfully in the global economy, they need a set of practical skills that allow them to build upon the analytical tools they learn in their courses. The Working Group recommends that Mason faculty, administrators, and students work together to first develop a list of such practical skills, and work to create pathways for our students to develop such skills. It is also worth noting
that many Mason faculty and staff would likewise benefit from such practical global skills and so consideration should likewise be given to helping our employees develop these skills as well.

3. **Global citizenship as an ethic.** What does it mean to think globally? What does it mean to be a global citizen? How can one act on the global stage in ways that lead to the achievement of goals and the improvement of the global condition? The Working Group believes that for Mason’s global initiatives to be successful in creating the kind of global presence we want and the kinds of global successes our students aspire to, Mason needs to lead a dialogue on these questions (and others) and then develop specific programs designed to foster the notion that to be an effective global citizen, one must also have a firmly grounded ethic of global citizenship that encompasses principles such as valuing and respecting difference, an ability to understand and think about justice in global contexts, or sensitivity to the environment and sustainability, to name a few.

**COMMITMENT 5:** Mason will develop programs, incentives, and resources that will infuse global awareness and the values of global citizenship across all fields of undergraduate and graduate study and the Mason community at large.

**Pathways to global citizenship**

The Working Group makes several recommendations designed to help foster global citizenship among Mason students (both undergraduate and graduate), faculty, and staff:

1. **Expand opportunities for study abroad.** As successful as we have been in promoting study abroad opportunities for our students, far too few Mason students actually avail themselves of the opportunity to study in another culture. The most important single reason why many students do not study abroad is cost, both the cost of the study abroad program, and the income the students lose because they are not working while they are studying abroad. Given how many Mason students contribute a substantial share of the cost of their education, unless we address the cost issue, we cannot expect much growth in our study abroad participation rates. The Working Group therefore recommends the dedication of additional funds for study abroad scholarships, as well as making raising such funds a priority in future university campaigns. It is important to note that students who do study abroad are important ambassadors for global citizenship back on Mason’s campus. They help their peers to develop notions of global citizenship unavailable in classroom settings. For graduate students, Mason needs to develop research funding to permit them to pursue their research programs abroad, especially in those fields where graduate students to not have ready access to such funds from external sources.

2. **Better integrate study abroad and academic degree programs.** The current model of study abroad at Mason is largely, though not exclusively, driven by opportunities identified and
capitalized on by the Center for Global Education (CGE). A minority of study abroad opportunities are created by academic units independent of the CGE. This situation is obviously not an optimal use of resources and has the potential for creating significant confusion among students. This is a problem in particular for students in degree programs with highly-defined accreditation requirements (e.g. engineering). Smooth articulation between a Mason curriculum and a study abroad curriculum is difficult, with the result that studying abroad is likely to result in these students having to enroll for an extra semester to complete their Mason degrees. For these reasons, the Working Group recommends a careful examination of the ways in which study abroad opportunities for Mason students can be more closely integrated with academic degree programs.

3. Create “global” opportunities in the local area. Mason is situated in a global community here in Northern Virginia and the university should invest in the creation of “global” opportunities for our students in the local area. Such opportunities can include building relationships with globally focused NGOs that will offer our students internships, capitalizing to an even greater degree on global cultural opportunities here in the local area (speakers, films, museums, etc.), and helping Mason students investigate global employment opportunities through local corporations.

4. Provide incentives for departments to create “globally intensive” tracks in their degrees. In the same way that many academic departments are creating “research intensive” tracks in their degrees to respond to the QEP, Mason should provide incentives for departments to create similar “globally intensive” tracks.

5. Promote global cultural awareness tied to academic programs. Mason already offers our students a wide variety of global cultural opportunities, but those efforts are only rarely tied to academic programs. This state of affairs is the result of a general diffusion of effort on campus (see section E below) whereby most cultural opportunities come out of non-academic units and take place without coordination with the academic units. The academic units are equally guilty in this regard, rarely, if ever, tying their own global cultural opportunities to student life or other administrative units. Some of this diffusion can be solved by administrative consolidation (again, see section E), but others can be solved through incentive programs.

6. Support aggressive extra-curricular programs that engage students not as observers, but as global drivers of change. The Engineers for International Development program, a transformative experience for its students in which students apply engineering to solve problems in developing countries, is one example, and it can be enlarged to develop a similar “for Global Development” template for other applications, for example, nursing and the health sciences.

Criteria for assessing global citizenship
For this effort to work, Mason must also develop firm criteria for assessing global citizenship among our students—criteria that can be tracked over time. The Working Group recommends bringing together a team from the office of institutional research, the faculty, and student life to develop these criteria, making reference to similar efforts on other university campuses. Once the criteria are developed, data should be collected and analyzed over time to measure the efficacy of our efforts in this area.

E. Methods and Models for Global Success in Higher Education

The Global Strategy Working Group carefully scrutinized the ways that peer (actual and aspirational) institutions have organized themselves to promote their global presence, research, and teaching. As might be expected, these models were almost as diverse as the number of institutions examined, however, three general categories of organization emerged from our scan of the environment: the “School of...” model in which the institution promotes global presence, research, and teaching through something like a school of global or international studies/affairs; the “Global Resource Center” model in which the institution pursues these three areas of endeavor through a consolidation of global resources and effort in a center or administrative locus; and the “Website Aggregator” model in which the institution’s global initiatives are highly decentralized, but are presented to the world through a website that gives the appearance of greater coherence of effort.

At present, Mason’s global presence, research, and teaching are most closely aligned with this latter model. The Working Group strongly endorsed the “Resource Center” model as the most promising way forward for Mason and rejected the “School of...” model for reasons that will be detailed below. The Resource Center model does not require a curricular consolidation, but naturally leads to questions about how best Mason’s global curriculum can be consolidated, coordinated, and enhanced through such a model.

Each of the three models described above is situated on a continuum ranging from highly centralized to highly decentralized, with the Resource Center approach being more on the centralized side of the continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“School of...”</th>
<th>Resource Center</th>
<th>Web Aggregator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most prominent local examples of the centralized approach are George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs and Georgetown’s School of Foreign Service. The centralized model has many advantages, including being a natural locus for research and
teaching, as well as for promoting the global presence of these universities. The centralized model also has many disadvantages, including a much higher cost structure, especially from additional administration, and the need for dedicated space, something Mason lacks. Further, for Mason to create such a school of global or international affairs now, we would be entering a very crowded field here in the Washington area and so it would be a decade or more before we could imagine Mason even beginning to emerge from the shadows of the much better known and much better resourced competitors. The Working Group rejected this model both for these reasons and because creating such a school on our campus would result in significant dislocation of research and teaching as various global and international programs were removed from their current academic units to create the new school.

The Working Group also rejected the current state of affairs (the Website Aggregator model) as being insufficient for Mason to achieve its aspiration to become a university for the world. There is currently too much diffusion of effort in the university around our global and international mission, leading to duplication of effort, confusion in the marketplace, and a dilution of Mason’s global brand. The Working Group further concluded that continuing with the current model at Mason placed us at a significant disadvantage when it came to responding to global opportunities due to the fact that when such opportunities appear, it is difficult to marshal our resources to respond because those resources are distributed across too many academic and administrative units.

**COMMITMENT 6:** *Mason will develop organizational structures, support services, and administrative policies that reflect recognized best practices for achieving global success in higher education.*

The Working Group therefore agreed to strongly recommend moving toward the Resource Center model of organization going forward from 2012. While the most successful of the nationally known global resource centers are funded by U.S. Department of Education National Resource Center grants ($450,000 or more annually), the Working Group believes that Mason can nevertheless build a much stronger global and international brand, better promote global research and teaching, and best use its existing resources by moving to such a model. The challenges of such a move are not to be minimized, because it would mean a significant administrative reorganization to bring all of our global and international initiatives under one line of authority.

To offer one example, when it comes to students coming to Mason from abroad or Mason students going abroad, Mason currently has an Office of Global and International Strategies charged with, among other things, realizing the Korea campus initiative and operating the China
1-2-1 program. But we also have the Office of International Programs and Services and the Center for International Student Access reporting to Vice President for University Life, and the Center for Global Education reporting directly to the Provost. So long as this and similar examples of diffusion of effort exist, Mason’s response to global and international opportunities will continue to be characterized at best by administrative overlap and at worst by internal competition.

A Resource Center would also help to promote Mason’s global research initiatives by providing faculty with assistance in the identification and writing of grants, the drafting of and tracking of MOUs with global partners, and the facilitation of other less intensive global partnerships. It would similarly provide students with much clearer pathways for pursuing their global plans (research, study abroad, etc.). Finally, such a resource center would be able to promote Mason’s global mission to our local constituencies in a more coordinated manner.

Such an approach will not be without pain and dislocation—administrative reorganization is never easy—nor would it be entirely without cost, especially in the first few years. But, based on our consideration of Mason’s potential global opportunities, the Working Group believes that these costs and dislocations will be well worth it given the likely dividends that might accrue in the coming years.

Mason’s global success—with or without the reorganization envisaged here—will also depend crucially on the university possessing a set of administrative policies and support services that reflect our global ambitions and enable us, quite literally, to do business with the world. Inordinate risk aversion can lead to overly conservative interpretation of regulations and statutes governing visas, the payment and taxation of non-citizens, and international travel reimbursement, all of which represent seemingly mundane but crucially important components of our international efforts. Mason can develop the most visionary and profound global strategy imaginable, but without a high quality, globally savvy, and enabling administrative support infrastructure, it will be worthless. We recommend that Mason engage in a fully comprehensive review— overseen by the highest levels of the university—of its policies and support services with a view to implementing best practices that enable and support engagement with the world.

F. Conclusion: A University for the World

Global at Mason is just beginning to thrive. One easily loses track of how many new programs and initiatives with a global focus have been created in recent years. And this burgeoning excellence has been noticed. The university has been recognized nationally for its diversity, campus internationalization, and study abroad effort—alongside the many global accolades
accorded to its faculty and students. But there is a long way to go and much to be done in the way of bringing greater strategic coherence to our many and unique global strengths.

Going forward, global must be a core facet of Mason’s identity as an institution. It is not an exaggeration to say that getting the global piece right is essential to our future success and ability to thrive in a rapidly changing world. Identifying and implementing an appropriate global strategy is therefore a crucial element in the next phase of Mason’s development.

This report has sought to identify the key questions and issues that bear on our future global success and to delineate actionable context for the future development of a global strategic action plan. Our Working Group has also advanced some concrete ideas about commitments Mason might consider making as part of any such strategy. Above all, we come out of this process excited, enthusiastic, and optimistic about Mason’s enormous global potential. We feel that global should be more than just one aspect of a new vision for this institution; rather we believe that Mason should define itself in the pursuit of global excellence and strive to become first and foremost a university for the world.