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Abstract

This study surveyed academic libraries across the U.S. to establish baseline data on their contributions to campus internationalization. Supplementing data from the American Council on Education (ACE) on internationalization of higher education, this research measured the level of international activities taking place in academic libraries and their role in campus internationalization efforts. The results of this study indicated that responding libraries contribute broadly to campus internationalizing efforts yet trail campuses in strategic planning and organizational support. Based on analysis of the results in comparison with ACE data, the authors provide suggestions for further library initiatives and research that focuses on international and global learning activities.

Introduction

Internationalization and global education have become important strategies within higher education to prepare students for productive citizenship in an increasingly globalized world. This focus on internationalization has been precipitated by a number of factors including the acceleration of a global economy, rapid advances in information and communication technologies that facilitate the production and transmission of knowledge, and the drive to address global challenges such as poverty, health, security, and the environment. Additionally, continued success in research and development output necessitates international collaboration. There is widespread recognition among higher education leaders that students must be prepared for productive international engagement and leadership to navigate the complexities of the contemporary world. Much has been written about what this means specifically within the context of U.S. higher education, and how to strategically work towards achieving global competence and engagement in our students and institutions.
To gain a better understanding of how colleges and universities have been addressing this need, in 2001 the American Council on Education (ACE), a leader in higher education, instituted the Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses project, surveying U.S. colleges and universities, to “assess the current state of internationalization at institutions, examine progress and trends over time, and identify priorities going forward.”ii ACE re-executed the survey in 2006 and in 2011. The ACE survey “is the only comprehensive source of data on internationalization in U.S. higher education institutions from all sectors and ... assess[es] many aspects of campus internationalization, including: articulated institutional commitment; administrative structure and staffing; curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; collaboration and partnerships.”iii Although many definitions of “internationalization” have been offered, this study uses the ACE survey definition, “broadly referring to institutional efforts to integrate an international, global and/or intercultural dimension into the teaching, research or services function.”iv

Though the ACE survey attempts to provide a comprehensive view of campus internationalization, academic libraries are excluded. Academic libraries, however, have a long history of engaging in international projects and programs, ranging from support of the profession’s growth abroad to campus support for research, curricula, and student services, including: foreign language collections, international partnerships and library exchange programs, support for research and study abroad, and services for international students. This study models the ACE survey to: 1) supplement the established data collected by ACE on internationalization policies and practices of U.S. colleges and universities by focusing on academic library contributions, 2) compare the results of the two surveys to understand the relationship between library and campus internationalization activity, 3) contribute to a deeper
understanding of the extent to which academic libraries are engaged in internationalization activities and, 4) consider opportunities for future research in this area.

**Literature Review**

Although academic libraries have a substantive role to play in supporting increasing internationalization efforts on campuses, the higher education literature on internationalization generally does not include the library. However, the academic library literature demonstrates the long-term involvement of libraries in campus internationalization activities, though not typically framed as such until recently.

**Higher education and comprehensive internationalization**

The ACE report indicated that the process of strategic and coordinated comprehensive internationalization “requires a clear commitment by top-level institutional leaders, meaningfully impacts the curriculum and a broad range of people, policies, and programs, and results in deep and ongoing incorporation of international perspectives and activities throughout the institution.” Comprehensive internationalization is viewed as transformative, requiring broad support across campuses. Achieving comprehensive internationalization, according to the ACE report, “requires careful planning, resources, and a sustained commitment that starts with top leadership and permeates the institution.” Similarly, Green and Olsen, in their heavily cited 2003 publication, *Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide*, describe four elements essential to comprehensive internationalization: “leadership, resources, organizational structures, and partnerships.” Though the library is largely omitted from the higher education literature on comprehensive internationalization, Green and Olson make clear that libraries have a foundational role to play in these efforts.
NAFSA Association for International Educators is the primary national organization that focuses on both international students coming to the U.S. and U.S. students studying abroad. However, NAFSA’s guide to education abroad for advisors and administrators neglects to mention the role of either the home or host institution library for students engaged in research abroad. In their recent publication on comprehensive internationalization, the library is only briefly noted as an example of a support unit that should work with international students.

More recently, internationalization literature includes a focus on assessment and measurement of these efforts on college campuses. For example, Terry Rodenberg developed an assessment instrument that focused on the broad areas of institutional resources, administration, institutional philosophy, faculty support and opportunities, curriculum, marketing and communication, and student support. Notably absent, however, is inclusion of the role of foundational services such as libraries and writing centers.

Themes of internationalization in the academic library literature

In the academic library literature, a rich engagement with internationalization-related themes is evident and growing. Some of the themes explored in the literature include working with international students, information literacy, supporting study abroad students/programs, international branch campuses, LIS education, library staff exchanges, and collection development.

The overarching theme of internationalization efforts and the academic library has also been examined. Becker describes the Australian context of higher education and notes that with strategic planning, library leadership, and budgetary support, academic library participation in internationalization trends are evident. In, “Internationalization and the North American University Library,” Bordonaro frames her study of international student and scholar use of
academic libraries within the context of internationalization. Her findings indicate that librarians, international students, and international scholars overwhelmingly see a role for the library in internationalization efforts. However, she also notes a general absence of the library in university strategic internationalization plans, and “the literature of higher education in general … has not specifically considered or mentioned the role of the university library in internationalization.” There is a clear opportunity for library support of campus internationalization to be incorporated more fully into the general higher education dialog. According to Dewey, within the global knowledge context, the success of academic/research libraries in the future will require emphasis on collaboration and partnering both within and beyond the university.

Beyond the general theme of libraries and campus internationalization, the library literature related to internationalization focuses on the resources and services libraries provide. Most notably, a substantive body of literature addresses library support for international students. Davis provides a chronological annotated bibliography of this literature. Peters’ bibliographic essay notes that the literature in this area began to proliferate in the 1980s. Jackson and Sullivan provide a collection of case studies focusing on innovative ways in which academic libraries support international students. Recent articles on international students and academic libraries include themes of: research process and plagiarism workshops, university international partnerships and the role of libraries, information literacy, LibGuides as tools for international students, and understanding the unique needs of international and ESL students from a broadly cultural perspective.

A body of literature on library support for study abroad students has also recently developed. For example, in 2008, ARL published a SPEC kit examining how ARL libraries
support these students. Additionally, Denda and Kutner, studying university students, both found that students had a general lack of awareness about using their home institution libraries while studying abroad. Relatedly, Cohen and Burkhardt consider alternative modes of communication to provide reference services for students studying abroad.

Library support of international branch campuses is also increasingly documented. Green examines library service provision at international branch campuses, providing insight into the challenges these libraries face. She indicates that collaboration with the home institution is important, which is echoed by Brown and Barr-Walker. Collaboration to build collections at international branch campus libraries is discussed by Smith and support for information literacy at international branch campuses of a U.K. institution is discussed by Coombs.

Abdullah, Kajberg, and Virkus discuss the importance of developing LIS curricula consistent with the principles of internationalization including integrating more international/global content into courses, increasing international students, and creating opportunities for LIS students to have international education experiences. Griner and Herron provide an example of a library school international service-learning, community-based program.

Kidd and Roughton note in their 1994 study that international library staff exchanges are often documented in the literature as personal stories or case studies of “how we did it.” As many current articles on staff exchanges demonstrate, this is still the case today. Although some of these articles may also take a comparative perspective and document the differences discovered between libraries during exchanges, studies that assess the impact of exchanges are more rare.
Other internationalization-related themes present in the literature include collection
development of international materials to support curricula and digitization and access to global
information. As Dewey and others note, global research trends require knowledge of and
access to materials from other countries, and it is the role of the research library to support
university global initiatives and international research collaborations.

As the literature review suggests, librarians support increasingly global study and
research and are well positioned to support trends in campus internationalization. The overall
scope of this support across academic libraries, however, is less established.

Methods

To measure the level at which academic libraries in the U.S. support campus
internationalization objectives, the authors conducted a survey of libraries and compiled
aggregate results based primarily upon degree granting status. With the approval of ACE, the
authors adopted the methodology employed in the 2012 Mapping Internationalization on U.S.
Campuses survey. The goal was to both compare libraries to the overall results of the ACE
survey and develop a better understanding of the extent to which academic libraries engage in
international activities. Although the ACE survey included all colleges and universities, the
academic library survey focused on four-year institutions and above. The research team invited
1,580 U.S. academic libraries, from bachelor’s to doctoral level institutions, for which there was
at least one valid email address for the library or library director, to participate. The survey was
addressed to library directors or their equivalents to complete via an online instrument.

The 38 item survey consisted of both closed and open-ended questions divided into the
following sub-sections: Institutional Information, Library Commitment, Organizational Structure
and Staffing, Internationalizing Collections and Services, Financial Support, Faculty Policies and
Opportunities, and Internationalization as a Focus. These sub-sections and the survey items were adopted from equivalent or similar sections in the ACE survey to reflect the specific services and structures found in academic libraries. In preparing the survey, the researchers consulted with the University of Illinois’ Survey Research Laboratory, which helped to construct the survey items in a manner that provided clear language while ensuring that pertinent data would be gathered.

Survey responses were individually anonymous yet prompted responding libraries to provide their institution’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) number. IPEDS are maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which maintains a system of interrelated surveys conducted annually. Being able to link survey responses to IPEDS data allowed the research team to analyze results based upon degree granting status. In addition, respondents had the option to include contact information for a planned follow-up study that will focus upon qualitative interviews.

Using IPEDS data, the research team developed a contact list based upon publically available email addresses. As in the ACE study, institutions were not sampled randomly but were surveyed in total to provide a census of library internationalization activities across the U.S. In March 2013, e-mail invitations were sent to library directors. Follow-up invitations and reminders were sent to non-respondents and the survey concluded in early May 2013. Some organizations, such as the Association of Research Libraries and the American Library Association also re-posted the survey announcement via email listservs.

Results and Discussion

A total of 1,580 valid contacts received surveys. Invalid contacts included 224 university libraries for which there was no publicly available contact information or the listed email addresses elicited error messages. Overall, 202 institutions completed the survey for a response
rate of 13 percent among valid contacts. When broken down by type of institution response rates differed, with the largest variation between doctoral (25%) and both bachelor’s (6%) and master’s (11%) degree granting institutions. The resulting sample provides a dataset in which responses from bachelor’s and master’s institutions are underrepresented (Table 1). The results are therefore presented descriptively without an attempt to generalize across institution types and beyond the responding institutions.

[Insert Table 1 Here]

Underrepresentation within the sample suggests that there is a potential for bias among the responding institutions. Using IPEDS data, other criteria were used to determine whether or not certain types of institutions within the university community responded to the survey at differing rates. For example, 98 percent of the 217 for-profit institution libraries were non-respondents. On the other end of the spectrum, libraries from universities described through IPEDS data as having high to very high research activity completed surveys at a rate of 32 percent. When universities were viewed based upon the percent of international student enrollment, other patterns emerged. The overall population of universities reported an average of 3 percent international student enrollment. Among respondents, however, the average international student enrollment was 5 percent of the total student body (Table 2). This suggests that there may be bias within the responding population toward institutions with international student enrollments in the top quartile and greater campus research output. In addition, it suggests that higher response rates among other institution types would potentially yield differing overall results.

[Insert Table 2 Here]
The people who completed the surveys overwhelmingly represent leadership positions within their libraries; University Librarians or Library Directors accounted for 75 percent, Associate University Librarians equaled 14 percent, and librarians or the library’s international officer represented the remaining 12 percent.

**Library Commitment and Focus on Internationalization**

Libraries’ articulated commitment to internationalization was measured by identifying the extent to which international education and global learning are included in mission statements, strategic plans, and committee work within the library and on-campus. Five questions asked whether internationalization was included in the library’s mission statement, the extent to which internationalization is a priority in strategic planning, whether the library has a discrete plan for library internationalization, whether the library has a committee charged wholly or in part with internationalization activities, and whether the library is included in campus-wide internationalization committees.

Overall, a preponderance of libraries in each category indicated that their mission statements do not refer to internationalization, with only 13 percent of bachelor’s, 12 percent of master’s, and 17 percent of doctoral supporting libraries responding affirmatively. However, a higher percentage (44%) reported including internationalization in their strategic plans, with libraries from doctoral institutions reporting the highest percentage of inclusion (56%) (Figure 1). In regard to committees, only 2 percent of libraries reported that they have specific committees or taskforces that focus on internationalization. A higher proportion of all responding libraries have committees with internationalization as part of their charge (14%), with libraries from doctoral institutions reporting an even higher percentage (20%). Libraries reported higher levels
of participation in campus committees (41%), with a higher percentage of doctoral institutions (48%) including libraries in these committees (Figure 2).

[Insert Figures 1 and 2 Here]

To measure the focus or intensity of work in internationalizing activities, respondents were asked a series of questions about the level and motives for actual internationalization work undertaken – as opposed to planned work – by the library in the past three years (academic years 2009-10 to 2011-12). Three quarters of respondents indicated that their library is not a leader in the area of internationalization; almost half (48%) of these respondents reported that their library’s level of internationalization is not high at all. However, slightly over two-thirds of respondents reported that internationalization activities have increased in recent years (Figures 3 and 4). Libraries supporting doctoral work more often stated that activities had increased in recent years, with 77 percent reporting a rise in internationalization activities.

[Insert Figures 3 and 4 here]

To gauge motives, libraries were asked to select the principal catalysts spurring internationalization initiatives in the library. Across institution types, no clear individual or role emerged as the primary catalyst for international activities within libraries. Overall, library directors were selected 37 percent of the time by respondents (who were primarily library directors) as the principal catalysts for internationalization (Figure 5). Analysis by institution type revealed that only PhD institutions were more likely to report that the following leadership positions acted as principal catalysts for internationalization within libraries: University Presidents/CEO (29%), Chief Academic Officers (30%), Senior International Officers (19%), Library Directors (45%), and Heads of Collections (18%). Respondents also indicated other
catalysts, such as the community, librarians in non-administrative positions, boards of directors, state leaders, alumni, funders, and foreign visitors.

The researchers also asked an open-ended question regarding motivations for increasing internationalization-related initiatives in libraries in recent years. It elucidated a variety of responses with identifiable recurring themes. A total of 103 colleges and universities responded to this question, including 20 bachelor’s level, 40 master’s level, and 43 doctoral level institutions. Across all libraries, the most frequent motivation was to support wider campus internationalization initiatives and institutional priorities. Indicative of this was the statement by one respondent: “We follow the lead of the campus and offer services that meet the programmatic needs of the campus. As the campus starts to develop international programs, we work to support those endeavors.”

The next most frequent response theme related to supporting increasing numbers of international students and study abroad programs. Also noted as motivators were support for changing curricula, including global learning initiatives and new programs, and an increased emphasis on foreign languages. A less common, though repeated theme, focused on proactive initiatives due to interests and expertise of individual librarians and library deans and directors. Additionally, three doctoral supporting libraries mentioned support for international campuses as a motivating force.

Another question asked respondents to identify the four most compelling reasons why their libraries were focusing on internationalization. In addition to the themes addressed above, numerous responses across institution types focused on today’s inherently global world and the need to, as one respondent describes, “prepare our graduates to lead and thrive in a global
society.” Relatedly many libraries reported the importance of access to global information and the role of libraries in facilitating this, as well as the role of libraries in supporting cultural diversity and diversity of perspectives through knowledge and information. While the respondent libraries are overwhelmingly engaged with supporting their campus internationalization efforts in myriad ways, a few respondents indicated no specific focus in this area.

Organizational Structure and Staffing

As noted in the ACE report, “appropriate administrative structures and staffing form the framework for successful implementation” of organizational efforts. In order to determine the extent to which libraries provide coordinated oversight to implement and support internationalization efforts, four questions focused on determining the extent of staff activities, administrative structure, and reporting lines for duties related to internationalization efforts within the university library.

Respondents were asked to select each of the listed internationalization-related activities that applied to their institutions. Figure 6 reports the results; the most frequently mentioned activities include liaising to foreign language and area/international studies departments, providing orientations specific to international students, and collecting international and foreign language materials. Among activities not noted above, over half of the doctoral supporting libraries reported having staff focused on international interlibrary loan and outreach to campus and community on international topics. Other activities such as administering international partnerships were less represented in the survey. Respondents also reported a number of activities not prompted by the survey. These include developing international curricula, leading study abroad programs, advising international students, and working internationally with donors to raise funds.
Administratively, university libraries report a fairly unstructured leadership in regard to internationalization activities with a majority of respondents reporting that leadership in this area emanated from either “multiple” or “no particular individual or units” (Figure 7). In terms of reporting lines, individuals whose duties include internationalization activities report mainly to library deans and directors. Again, there is a difference reported by libraries from PhD institutions, with staff engaged in internationalization more likely to report to unit heads than in the other two types of institutions (Figure 8).

Internationalizing Collections and Services

The library survey’s section on internationalizing collections and services focused on measuring library contributions to curricular and learning outcomes that support research and teaching, including support for courses on global trends, foreign languages, and co-curricular resources and activities that enhance student learning. Questions in this survey section focused on collections supporting international and area studies, services for English as a Second Language (ESL) students and international students, and library instruction in support of international initiatives. Categories for these questions were derived from activities reported in the library literature.

All respondents were asked to select their library’s offerings from among a list of programs, services, and instructional activities related to international students and international learning objectives (Figure 9). The responses demonstrate that libraries emphasize services such
as individualized research support, guides for traditional curricular offerings such as language and area studies, and services for international students. Fewer services and resources are focused on activities such as study abroad, ESL programming, or teaching internationally related content. The trend to support curricular activities is also reflected in Figure 6 where staff resources are more aligned toward work that supports curricular rather than co-curricular elements of campus internationalization.

With regard to collections, libraries from doctoral institutions are more likely to have a collection plan that includes specific regions and languages than libraries from institutions whose highest degrees are at the master’s or bachelor’s levels. As Figure 10 displays, regional emphasis on collections is spread fairly evenly across responding institutions with Latin America, North and East Asia, the Middle East, and Western Europe noted most often within collection plans. Languages collected follow these regional patterns.

Taken as a whole, the mean number of regions, languages, services, and activities were compared across institution types. Table 3 indicates that libraries from doctoral institutions have a higher number of countries/regions and languages in their collection plan and also offer more programs and activities. Given the breadth of research and instructional offerings, it is clear that libraries at doctoral institutions are required to provide broad support for research collections and programs. In regard to support for services and instruction, however, libraries from bachelor’s and master’s institutions reported totals much closer to the overall mean. This indicates a wider presence of services related to campus internationalization across institutions despite clear differences in collecting practices.

[Insert Figure 10 and Table 3]

**Financial Support**
Another indicator of commitment to internationalization is the source of funding and level of professional support provided for activities. Overall, 16 percent of respondents received internal funding from the campus to support international activities. Of all institution types, libraries from doctoral institutions are more likely to have received internal funding in the past three years (25%). Although libraries from doctoral institutions also reported receiving external funding from more sources, (Table 4) most institutions reported no external funding (Figure 11). Following a similar trend, libraries at doctoral institutions also report more frequent staff support for aspects of internationalization and professional development activities than the other two types (Figures 12 and 13). In particular, libraries from doctoral institutions are more likely to sponsor workshops on international trends in librarianship and support international travel to meetings and professional activities.

Perspectives of Library Administrators

The ACE survey concludes that strong administrative support is necessary to sustain international initiatives. To explore the role of library administrators, the survey included two open-ended questions. The first asked respondents to describe the ways in which upper level library administration are involved in internationalization initiatives at the university committee/governance level. A total of 117 institutions provided responses to this question, including libraries at 28 bachelor’s, 45 master’s, and 44 doctoral institutions. Responses were analyzed for general trends. Strikingly, it was noted that across all levels of institutions there was a high level of variability in the ways upper-level library administration interfaced with
university administration dependent upon institutional initiatives regarding internationalization, institutional administrative structure, and institutional culture regarding the library.

Of the 28 bachelor’s institutions that responded to this question, nine indicated no involvement with campus internationalization activities at the university administrative level. Other respondents who indicated a high level of involvement reported a range of institutional-level administrative planning activities, including: direct responsibility for creating the college’s strategic plan and college policy decisions, active conversations with deans regarding need for library support for international programs, membership in internationalization-related committees, membership on college dean’s committee where internationalization is discussed, and work with various programs that support study abroad and international students.

Of the 45 master’s institutions that responded, ten indicated no involvement in internationalization-related initiatives at the institutional level, and a few expressed frustration at this. The respondents that indicated involvement described activities such as serving on university leadership teams; developing and maintaining relationships with potential partner international institutions; facilitating international exchange programs with partner institutions including sister library programs; and engaging with university international student and study abroad offices, including two library directors who identified themselves as having led short term study abroad programs at their institutions.

Of the 44 doctoral institutions that responded, six indicated no involvement in internationalization-related initiatives at the institutional level. As reflected in the results described in Figure 2 above, more direct involvement on university committees focusing on global engagement was expressed by libraries at doctoral institutions. Again, there were numerous expressions of strong involvement in internationalization-related strategic discussions,
as participants in university leadership teams, including library support of new global and international curricula, new internationally-focused general education requirements, and international partnerships.

The second open-ended question asked respondents to describe the potential they see for further, future engagement by the library in internationalization and global education efforts on their campuses. A total of 113 institutions responded to this question, including 28 bachelor’s, 42 master’s, and 43 doctoral institutions.

Of the 28 libraries from bachelor’s institutions that responded to this question, five indicated no or limited potential for further engagement by the library in internationalization-related support, citing reasons such as limited staffing and resources. Other respondents indicated potential for future library engagement in areas such as: support for international students (including information literacy instruction, bilingual instruction, library guides, individual research support, collection development of materials for ESL learners); further support and involvement with study abroad programs; building collections of foreign language materials and materials to support global curricula.

Of the 42 libraries from master’s institutions that responded, 8 indicated an uncertainty about further engagement in this area, citing need for increased funding and staffing, enrollment dependence, and strategic initiatives set by upper level university administration. In addition to areas of future engagement mentioned above, this group cited a wider range of future possibilities than the bachelor’s level respondents, including potential for increased international library staff exchanges, greater emphasis in the library strategic plan, additional support for international university partnerships, and proactive outreach to international students.
Of the 43 libraries from doctoral institutions that responded, only one indicated uncertainty about further future engagement in this area, and this was because of the already high level of involvement by their library. Three libraries from doctoral institutions specifically reported a need for increased funding to support growth of initiatives in this area. Generally, the comments of respondents in this group mirrored the comments by respondents from bachelor’s and master’s institutions regarding potential future engagement in support of internationalization. However, libraries at these larger scale institutions also indicated more engagement with international institutions. This included things such as expanding international university partnerships and collaboration with international libraries as well as expanding research initiatives, developing international research centers, and growing international digitization projects. The complexities of libraries at large scale institutions supporting internationalization efforts were elucidated by one respondent from this group:

The library is uniquely positioned to contribute to and, in fact, to lead internationalization efforts on campus. Our work is, by its very definition, international. By that I mean: both scholarship and publication are global. Discovery, access, and fulfillment necessarily cross geopolitical boundaries. So we daily experience and enable international peer-reviewed data, information and knowledge exchanges. The challenge is moving from facilitators of authoritative knowledge exchanges into the knowledge creation processes. This can take the form of serving on international grant-funded teams, given our expertise in, for instance, data creation. Or our new roles could place us in classrooms as co-teachers of discipline based inquiry, which draws ideas and inspirations from the international scholarly ecosystem. We must also ensure that we maintain a diversity of perspectives in our collections, reflective of the increasing diversity of our campus constituencies. Relatedly, we must purposefully extend our collective cultural competencies so as to assure all campus stakeholders feel welcomed and enabled in our virtual spaces and physical places.

Comparing the ACE Survey and Library Survey

Comparing the results of the ACE Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2012 survey and the results of this survey is useful in considering the role libraries play in
campus internationalization. There is much convergence in library and campus activities and structures related to internationalization, but there are also striking differences. Like the library survey (Table 1), the ACE survey enjoyed a much higher participation rate among doctoral institutions (60%) with similarly decreasing rates of completion by master’s (40%) and bachelor’s (27%) level institutions. Both surveys found a higher level of internationalization activity at doctoral institutions than at other types of academic institutions and academic libraries. Most likely, the high level of internationalization activity at doctoral institutions has driven the corresponding high level of activity at libraries serving doctoral level institutions as they work to support their parent institutions.

In addition, both the ACE survey and the library survey report an increase in internationalization activity and funding, and display optimism that this trend will continue. Further, both surveys report that commitment to internationalization from top-level organizational leaders is a key driver. Libraries tend to identify library directors as principal catalysts while institutions reported the President or CEO in this role. Clearly library directors and campus leaders are important to setting the necessary institutional tone to ensure initiatives are well supported and promoted strategically.

One of the most striking differences in the surveys is the reported level of internationalization in libraries and on campuses. In the ACE survey, 56 percent of the overall respondents and 95 percent of the doctoral institutions indicated that internationalization had been “high” or “moderate” in recent years. Only 30 percent of academic libraries and 39 percent of the libraries serving doctoral institutions, however, reported high to moderately high levels of internationalization (Figure 3). Although internationalization activity has increased in responding libraries, explicit articulation of it in planning documents often has not occurred. Further, less
than 20 percent of libraries that responded include internationalization among the top five priorities in their strategic plans (Figure 1), while 52 percent of campuses in the ACE survey include it as a top priority. These results suggest that the organizational priorities and levels of international activities within libraries differ considerably from trends in internationalization expressed in the ACE survey.

Further review of the results, however, suggests that despite disparities in articulation and emphasis, libraries are active contributors to campus-wide internationalization efforts. For example, libraries are represented well at the institutional level on internationalization committees. ACE reported that only 44 percent of institutions have campus wide internationalization committees, and nearly 40 percent of libraries report being included on these campus level committees (Figure 2). These percentages and the evidence presented through the responses to the library survey’s open ended questions suggest that libraries are often included in campus-wide internationalization planning when it does take place.

The ACE survey reports that many campuses have offices for coordinating international activities and that 40 percent of all institutions have a full-time professional overseeing these activities. However, most libraries report that there is no particular person or unit in charge of overseeing international related activities in the library though most units working in this area report to the library director (Figures 7 and 8). Obviously, the level of coordination required to manage international activities across a campus is much greater than it is in one unit such as a library. However, the fact that most libraries do not to coordinate these activities demonstrates a lack of focus on internationalization in libraries.

In supporting international professional development, the ACE survey reports a slight downturn from 2006 to 2011 in the percentage of institutions offering funding for this type of
activity. Even with this decline, 48 percent of all academic institutions report that they did support international conference travel (the most common international professional development activity) for faculty in 2011. The library survey reported that 31 percent of all libraries financially support librarian attendance at international conferences, though this is heavily skewed towards doctoral institutions (60%) as compared to bachelor’s institutions (4%). It is also interesting to note that 46 percent of all libraries reported no funding for any aspect of international professional development (Figures 12 and 13). The downward trend in support for this type of professional development at the institutional level, if it continues, will most likely have a corresponding effect in libraries.

In terms of trends in services and programs related to internationalization, the ACE survey demonstrated that a growing number of institutions devote resources to study abroad, international student recruitment, and joint and branch international campuses. As Figures 6 and 9 reveal, libraries are involved, to varying degrees, in providing resources and services to support these initiatives. The ACE study, however, reported that though activities such as international student recruitment have increased, an increase in corresponding support services to these students has not. Libraries could potentially focus on developing their existing service base in order to address the campus-level need to support international students. Libraries across all levels of institutions, however, indicated a need for financial and human resources in order to increase support for campus internationalization.

According to ACE, the number of institutions with globally focused general education requirements has increased. However, although the majority of academic institutions have a foreign language graduation requirement, the number of institutions with this requirement has steadily decreased since 2001. The ACE report raises the question of whether this trend towards
globally focused general education requirements and away from foreign language coursework is displacing depth for breadth. The library survey on the other hand demonstrates that library commitment to foreign language collections and support of area studies programs -- two areas that have been a traditional focus of international activity in libraries -- continue to be strong (Figures 6 and 10). In fact, in the library survey’s open-ended questions, librarians state that one motivator for increasing internationalization activity is increased emphasis on foreign languages at the institutional level. So while the ACE survey reported a downward trend in foreign language requirements, perhaps this library response reflects the additional ACE finding that there has been an increase in language training related to languages considered important for national strategic interests such as Arabic and Chinese. Whether libraries will respond to the institutional shift in focus away from general foreign language training at some point in the future or remain the bastion of foreign language and area studies collections and support activities on campus remains to be seen.

Conclusion

This project was undertaken to provide a foundation for understanding in a systematized manner the extent to which academic libraries are involved in internationalization efforts. It was conducted in response to the lack of articulation in the general higher education dialog regarding the academic library’s myriad roles in supporting campus internationalization. It bears mention that a similar absence with regard to the lack of inclusion of libraries’ roles in campus strategic initiatives has been noted earlier, as evidenced in studies done by the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience. Developing a further understanding of the complexities of reasons for lack of recognized fundamental integration of libraries into campus strategic initiatives requires a separate call for focused and detailed research.
As a starting point for documenting or “mapping” library contributions to campus internationalization, this project has succeeded. It has provided a baseline from which the academic library community can more fully understand both the breadth and depth of library contributions to campus internationalization efforts. By adapting the ACE “Mapping Internationalization” survey, there is a common language from which to articulate to the higher education community the extent of library contributions to campus internationalization and new roles that libraries can play.

The ACE survey has been administered three times to colleges and universities across the United States (2001, 2006, 2011). As a first attempt at a national library survey on campus internationalization, the response rates have been lower than ACE surveys. Although the data from bachelor’s and master’s institutions are not generalizable, they do provide insights into commonalities and differences in the ways in which different types of institutions engage with campus internationalization, which can be further analyzed and articulated with future research. Response rates from doctoral level institutions allow for a stronger baseline of generalizable information to inform future, more focused research. Though reasons for low response rates may be varied, it is possible that the dialog around libraries and campus internationalization is only evolving, as evidenced in the survey results. Therefore, as with ACE, the intent is to repeat this survey every five years, to collect longitudinal data and systematically track the ways in which academic libraries articulate, support, and intersect with campus internationalization over time.

Both the ACE and library-focused survey indicate that internationalization initiatives continue to increase on college campuses across the U.S. The ACE report concludes with recommendations for more research to be conducted on best practices for internationalization and for ensuring that student learning is at the core of internationalization efforts. In tandem,
the authors recommend development of best practices and assessment measures for library support of campus internationalization, broadening the internationalization context that ACE has established.

Overall, the libraries and campus internationalization survey results corresponded well with evidence found in the review of the literature. Libraries see increasing international activities and respond to needs to support student services and curricular changes that have resulted from campus global education initiatives. Although the survey is not predictive, it is easy to hypothesize that moving forward there will be an increasing emphasis on the library’s role in meeting international goals and student demands. xxxviii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% in Frame*</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>44% (791)</td>
<td>6% (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>40% (719)</td>
<td>11% (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>16% (294)</td>
<td>25% (73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frame size is based on IPEDS data for bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral institutions in the U.S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% International students within full-frame of 1,822</th>
<th>% International students among completed surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>25 0.45%</td>
<td>25 1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 1.73%</td>
<td>50 3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 4.51%</td>
<td>75 6.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1: Internationalization within Library Strategic Plan
FIGURE 2:
Library Representation on Campus-wide Committee for Internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bachelor's (n=24)</th>
<th>Master's (n=71)</th>
<th>Doctoral (n=98)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No such committees exist</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 3:
Library's Level of Internationalization

Bachelor's (n=24)
Master's (n=74)
Doctoral (n=97)
FIGURE 4:
Change in Library's Internationalization Activities Over Three Years
(academic years 2009-10 to 2011-12)
FIGURE 5:
Principle Catalysts of Internationalization in Library
FIGURE 6:
Aspects of Internationalization Supported by Library Faculty/Staff

- Bachelor’s (n=24)
- Master’s (n=74)
- Doctoral (n=98)
FIGURE 7:
Administrative Structure of Internationalization Activities
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FIGURE 8:
Reporting Line of Individuals Whose Duties Include Internationalizing Activities

![Bar chart showing the reporting line of individuals whose duties include internationalizing activities.](image-url)
FIGURE 9:
Total Responses by Specific Service Program, Resource, and Instructional Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Program</th>
<th>Bachelor’s (n=24)</th>
<th>Master’s (n=74)</th>
<th>Doctoral (n=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foreign language tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialized orientation for intl students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individualized research services for intl students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides for intl students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides for ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides for study abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides for foreign language courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guides for intl/area studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction for international students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction for ESL courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction for study abroad courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach on global information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach in global themed courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figure shows the total responses by specific service program, resource, and instructional activity. The bars indicate the distribution of responses among Bachelor’s, Master’s, and Doctoral programs.
FIGURE 10:

Frequency with which Regions Reported in Collection Development Plans
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree awarded on campus</th>
<th>Number of countries/regions collection development plan targets(^1)</th>
<th>Number of languages represented in collection development plan(^2)</th>
<th>Number of programs/support services for intl students(^3)</th>
<th>Number of info literacy and instruction activities(^4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Mean</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Mean</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Mean</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)F(2, 196) = 8.33, p = .044; 2F(2, 196) = 18.173, p = .017; 3F(2, 196) = 5.107, p = .001; 4F(2, 193) = 6.792, p = .000
FIGURE 11:
Sources of External Funding (n=196)

- Federal govt: 12%
- State govt: 2%
- Alumni: 7%
- Private donors: 9%
- Foundations: 12%
- Corporations: 3%
- Other: 2%
- No external funding received: 53%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree awarded on campus</th>
<th># of sources of external funding in past 3 years(^1)</th>
<th># of aspects of intl services funded in previous year(^2)</th>
<th># professional opportunities for staff in last 3 years(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>Mean .21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Mean .15</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Mean .94</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean .55</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)F(2, 196) = 1.134, \(p = .000\); \(^2\)F(2, 196) = 6.062, \(p = .000\); \(^3\)F(2, 196) = .636, \(p = .002\)
FIGURE 12:
Library Funding for Professional Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Bachelor's (n=24)</th>
<th>Master's (n=74)</th>
<th>Doctoral (n=98)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other Intl activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no funding for intl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foster intl agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop seminars abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in intl projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study/conduct research abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel to meetings abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead students on study abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach/serve in institutions abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host visiting intl librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collections funding for intl travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel for intl book buying trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel to intl book fairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 13:

Professional Development Opportunities with International Focus

- Other opportunities
- No international professional development
- Opportunities to improve language skills
- Workshops: cross-cultural communication
- Workshops: technology to enhance international collaboration
- Workshops: international trends in librarianship

Bachelor's (n=24)
Master's (n=74)
Doctoral (n=98)
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