Background of the Study
About the Research Partners

AASCU is a Washington D.C.-based higher education association of nearly 420 public colleges, universities and systems whose members share a learning- and teaching-centered culture, a historic commitment to underserved student populations and a dedication to research and creativity that advances their regions’ economic progress and cultural development.

Founded in 1974, World Education Services (WES) is a non-profit organization dedicated to helping individuals achieve their higher education and professional goals by evaluating and advocating for the recognition of international education qualifications.

With a staff representing 37 nations and speaking over 40 languages, WES has delivered evaluations to more than 1.5 million people worldwide that are recognized by more than 2,500 educational, business, and governmental institutions throughout the U.S. & Canada.

WES has set the standard of excellence in the field of international mobility with our world-class credential evaluations, research, training, and ongoing support for international students and skilled immigrants in the U.S. and Canada.
Project Overview

Objectives:

- To understand the strategic priorities and best practices that can help AASCU institutions diversify and grow their international student enrollment population in a sustainable manner.
- To investigate new trends and strategic priorities related to international student enrollment at member institutions and measure changes since 2015.

Method:

- Online survey of AASCU members
  - Invitation sent by AASCU
- Estimated total invitations: 385*
  - Completed responses: 91
  - Valid responses for analysis: 85
    (remove 5 duplicated responses -> One response per institution)
  - Estimate response rate: 22%**

Notes:
**Response rate was generated based on the estimated number of total invitations (n=385).
Limitations

- Interpretation of results are based on the responding sample and may or may not reflect the AASCU population.
- The profile of responding institutions by region and Carnegie classification are significantly different compared to the 2015 sample. (See slide 17)
- Changes to some questions in the 2017 survey may impact the comparability of some of the findings.
  - Changes to the survey include adding additional choices (see footnotes for reference) or changing the type of question from an open-ended question to a multiple choice question. This could cause incomparability if looking at percentage only; instead, looking at the preference of choices is more appropriate.
- Although the survey sample consisted of only AASCU institutions, the survey is not longitudinal as some institutions participated in 2015 but not in 2017. As such the results, especially the comparison analysis, should be viewed as general trends for AASCU members.
# Glossary

## Geographic Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>AK CA HI NV OR WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains</td>
<td>CO ID MT UT WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>IL IN MI OH WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>IA KS MN MO NE ND SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid East</td>
<td>DE DC MD NJ NY PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>CT ME MA NH RI VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>AL AR FL GA KY LA MS NC SC TN VA WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>AZ NM OK TX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Size and Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>four-year, primarily nonresidential four-year, primarily residential four-year, highly residential More than 10,000 FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>four-year, primarily nonresidential four-year, primarily residential four-year, highly residential At least 3,000 but fewer than 10,000 FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>four-year, primarily nonresidential four-year, primarily residential four-year, highly residential At least 1,000 but fewer than 3,000 FTEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*According to IPEDS, this classification describes institutions' size and residential character. Because residential character applies to the undergraduate student body, exclusively graduate/professional institutions are not included.

Size of the institutions is based on their full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment and not on the basis of total enrollment. FTEs are calculated by adding the number of full-time students to one-third the number of part-time students.

Source: Based on institutions profile data collected from IPEDS
Executive Summary

Key Takeaways, What’s changed, Recommendations
Key Takeaways

- As the size of the institution increases, it is more likely that they prioritize Strategic International Enrollment Management (SIEM) and develop a plan. See slide 32
- Institutions with international enrollment of 5.1% or more reported a decline in international student enrollment from the 2013/14 to 2015/16 academic year. See slide 48
- Primary reasons for developing an institution-wide SIEM plan: See slide 33
  1. To increase international enrollment
  2. To internationalize the institution
  3. To increase diversity on campus
- Increasing the number of international students is still the top priority for AASCU members in 2017, followed by developing strategic partnerships. See slide 35
- Large institutions are the most interested in developing strategic partnerships with institutions abroad. See slide 36
- Low brand awareness and lack of funding are still the top two challenges for AASCU Institutions in 2017, followed by the new political environment. See slide 39
What’s Changed Compared to 2015?

**Enrollment**

- The percentage of institutions reporting an increase in international enrollment dropped by half and nearly half of the reporting institutions saw no significant change in enrollment. [See slide 24]

- The number of responding institutions reporting an increase in international enrollment dropped from all regions in 2017 except for Mid East & New England. [See slide 25]

- The percentage of institutions reporting a drop in international enrollment increased significantly from the Southeast, Midwest and West regions. [See slide 25]

- The responding institutions in 2017 placed more emphasis on recruitment at the undergraduate level. [See slide 26]
What’s Changed Compared to 2015? (cont.)

Profile

▪ Institutions from the Midwest region were the most represented region in 2017, vs. Mid East & New England in 2015. See slide 21

▪ Fewer Medium-sized institutions participated in the survey in 2017. See slide 20

▪ The percentage of Master’s institutions dipped by 20%, whereas Research/Doctoral institutions increased by 17%. See slide 20

▪ The proportion of respondents in each job title are comparable to 2015, however, 9% more respondents from senior level admissions took the survey corresponding with 6% fewer in senior level of IE programs. See slide 17
What’s Changed Compared to 2015? (cont.)

Overview of Internationalization

- In 2017, AASCU member institutions were more likely to have an SIEM Plan compared to 2015. See slide 27
- Institutions selected, “enhance the diversity of international students on campus” as a lower priority in 2017. See slide 35
- Nearly 30% more institutions in the West reported, “increasing the number of international students” as a high SIEM priority, compared to 2015, which reflects the fact that Western institutions witnessed no significant increase in international student enrollment in 2017. See slide 37
- Institutions with larger international enrollment size (5.1% or more) indicated that SIEM is not as high of a priority over the next three years compared to 2015. See slide 30
- International enrollment management at the institutional level has not been as well supported as it was in 2015. See slide 52
Recommendation: Political Environment

- Send clear messages to your international applicants and enrolled students that they are welcome and highly appreciated (e.g. using the #YouAreWelcomeHere hashtag on social media).
- Listen to your international students’ experiences and provide timely support service in regards to emotional and academic challenges, career expectations, questions about status, etc.

“The current political environment in the United States has been viewed negatively by those abroad. Policies, executive orders, etc. have negatively changed how the U.S. is perceived abroad thus making the job of attracting internationals to campuses in the U.S. more difficult.”

“Raise awareness of elected officials about the critical importance of international students to the growth of US institutions, the overall economy of the country and its overall success. Current political discourse is harming the national interest of the country.”

“We are closely watching the impact that the change in the Presidential Administration and recent Executive Orders on immigration has on applications, enrollment, and retention.”
Recommendation: Budget Constraints

“Recommended:

- Strategically allocate scholarships to increase applications, yield, and retention.
- Partner with other universities domestically and internationally in international student recruitment.
- Evaluate options with third-party providers in recruiting best-fit international student candidates.
- Promote online and short-term programs (e.g. summer programs for executives or high school students; certificate and exchange programs).

“We recently hired a former Provost from Costa Rica to lead the establishment of partnerships at several Latin American universities. The purpose is for academic collaboration, study abroad, and student recruitment.”

“We have adopted a Latin America strategy for academic partnerships, study abroad, and student recruitment...”
Recommendation: Brand Management

- Invite and train alumni, faculty and students to be “informed” brand ambassadors when abroad.
- Adjust your branding message to students based on country of origin, academic level and programs.
- Adopt technology to create responsive website design and strategic social media.

“As a public institution with a regional focus within our state, an international perspective is not a part of institutional culture.”
Recommendation: Embrace Comprehensive Internationalization

“Our region attracts a large number of international employees. We attract these employees and spouses that are interested in our institution. The Office of Global Affairs and Admissions needs to work together in coordinating a SIEM plan.”

“Global Awareness Through Education is our Quality Enhancement Plan and weaves international in curricula…”

- Promote global research and innovation programs in your institution that are accessible to all students.
- Develop faculty and students’ global competencies.
- Support a pervasive campus culture that embraces internationalization to the benefit of all constituencies.
- Promote hiring and orienting new staff/faculty with an international mindset.

“Incorporating a global perspective into the campus strategic plan…”
Respondent and Institutional Profiles
Respondent Profile: 2015 & 2017

**Job Title**

- Provost and/or Vice President for Academic Affairs: 29% (2015) vs. 37% (2017)
- Associate Provost for Academic Affairs: 8% (2015) vs. 5% (2017)
- Vice President for Enrollment Management: 4% (2015) vs. 2% (2017)
- Other (please specify): 59% (2015) vs. 56% (2017)

**Job Titles for Respondents mentioning “other”**

- Dean: 4% (2015) vs. 2% (2017)
- Senior level-Academic Affairs: 7% (2015) vs. 6% (2017)
- Senior level-Admissions: 13% (2015) vs. 22% (2017)
- Senior level-International education/programs/global engagement: 76% (2015) vs. 70% (2017)
*Nearly half of respondents in 2017 have been in their current job position for at least 6 months to less than 3 years.*
Respondent Profile: 2015 & 2017 (Cont.)

CAO's & their Relationship with International Student Enrollment

- 37% of respondents in 2015 indicated they are the Chief Academic Officer at their institution.
- 36% of respondents in 2017 indicated they are the Chief Academic Officer at their institution.
- 76% of respondents in 2015 indicated international student enrollment is managed under their office.
- **56%** of respondents in 2017 indicated international student enrollment is managed under their office.

*In 2017 fewer respondents indicated that international students enrollment is managed under their office.*
Institutional Profile: 2015 vs. 2017

Changes in institutional profile:

- Institutions from the **Midwest region** were the most represented region in 2017, vs. Mid East & New England in 2015.

- Fewer **medium-size** institutions participated in the survey in 2017.

- Compared to 2015, the percentage of Master’s institutions dipped by nearly 20%, whereas **Research/Doctoral institutions increased by 17%**.
Profile of Survey Respondents is Representative of Overall AASCU Member Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Region</th>
<th>Overall AASCU Institutions</th>
<th>Responding Institutions - 2015</th>
<th>Responding Institutions - 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West (Far West &amp; Rocky Mountains)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-West (Great Lakes &amp; Plains)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-East &amp; New England</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size &amp; Setting</th>
<th>Overall AASCU Institutions</th>
<th>Responding Institutions - 2015</th>
<th>Responding Institutions - 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Overall AASCU Institutions</th>
<th>Responding Institutions - 2015</th>
<th>Responding Institutions - 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate/Associates</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Doctoral</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS available for 385 AASCU institutions
Note: “Not applicable” are not included in the table so it may not add up to 100%
Survey Findings
International Enrollment Percentages Has Shifted

Percentage of International Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1% to 2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1% to 5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1% to 10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1% to 15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AASCU member institutions have an international enrollment of more than 5% compared to 27% in 2015.
Two Thirds of Respondents No Longer Seeing Increased Enrollment

Change in International Student Enrollment

- Increased: 60% in 2015, 33% in 2017
- Decreased: 9% in 2015, 20% in 2017
- Not changed significantly: 31% in 2015, 48% in 2017

Although more institutions indicated they have an SIEM plan in place, enrollment of international students has not changed for almost half of responding institutions.
Slower Enrollment Growth Reported Across Most Regions

**Fall to Fall International Enrollment Status 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Not changed significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid East &amp; New England</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall to Fall International Enrollment Status 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Not changed significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid East &amp; New England</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In general, the percentage of institutions reporting an increase in international enrollment has declined from all regions except for Mid East & New England, and in contrast to 2015, more institutions reported no significant change in enrollment across all regions.
- Percentage of institutions reporting a drop in international enrollment increased significantly from Southeast, Midwest and West regions compared to 2015.
- **Mid East & New England** is the only region where the majority of institutions (60%) saw an increase in international enrollment in 2017.
More Emphasis on Recruiting at Undergraduate Level Only in 2017

Institution’s primary focus of recruitment

- Undergraduate level: 33% (2015) - 43% (2017)
- Graduate level: 5% (2015) - 3% (2017)

n=92 (2015) - n=86 (2017)
Institutions’ SIEM Priority & Planning Stage

The priority level of SIEM has remained the same for AASCU institutions.

In 2017, more institutions reported they already have an SIEM plan, in contrast to a significant number of institutions reporting they were currently developing a plan in the 2015 survey.
Change of Status of Institution’s Strategic International Enrollment Management (SIEM) Plan Over 2 Years

Note: Results were based on the overlap of participating institutions (n=32) in 2015 and 2017 survey.
Decreasing Prioritization of SIEM Over 2 Years

Prioritization for SIEM Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low priority</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate priority</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High priority</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results were based on the overlap of participating institutions (n=32) in 2015 and 2017 survey.

2017 SIEM Priority of Institutions that had Low or Moderate SIEM Priority in 2015 (n=18)

- Low priority: 28%
- Moderate priority: 33%
- High priority: 39%

Note: Results were based on the overlap of participating institutions (n=32) in 2015 and 2017 survey.
Institution’s SIEM Priority over the Next Three Years by Percentage of Total International Students

**SIEM Priority over the Next 3 Years - 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total International Students</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Moderate priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5% or less</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1% or more</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIEM Priority over the Next 3 Years - 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total International Students</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Moderate priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5% or less</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1% or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to 2015, fewer institutions with large enrollment size (5.1% or more) indicated that SIEM is a high priority in 2017 (*64% vs. 46%*).
SIEM Planning Stage by Population

SIEM Planning Stage by Percentage of International Students

2017

- Not sure: 13%
- We have a plan: 42%
- We are currently developing a plan: 31%
- We do not have a plan: 15%

5% or less: n=60
5.1% or more: n=26

2015

- Not sure: 1%
- We have a plan: 18%
- We are currently developing a plan: 51%
- We do not have a plan: 36%

5% or less: n=67
5.1% or more: n=25

- Institutions with a total international student enrollment of more than 5% are more likely not to have an SIEM plan compared to 2015.
- 40% of institutions with 5% or less international students already have a plan, which represents more than a 50% increase compared to 2015.
### Priority of SIEM over Next 3 Years by Institutional Size 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Moderate priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Small: n=15
- Medium: n=44
- Large: n=27

### Current Status of SIEM Plan by Institution Size - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>We have a plan</th>
<th>We are currently developing a plan</th>
<th>We do not have a plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Small: n=15
- Medium: n=44
- Large: n=27
Primary Reasons for Developing SIEM Plan

**Reasons for Developing an SIEM Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To increase international enrollment</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To internationalize the institution</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase diversity on campus</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase revenue</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To grow the student body overall</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To align international student enrollment with institution's vision and mission</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Open ended question in 2015*

**Reasons for developing an SIEM plan in 2015 (n=60)**

1. **Diversifying the international student population** or diversifying the *overall* student population was reported as a primary reason for developing an SIEM plan.
2. **Student population growth**
3. **Revenue**
Primary Reasons for Not Developing SIEM Plan

**Reasons for Not Developing an SIEM Plan**

**2017 (n=16)**

- Not a high priority of the university: 35%
- Lack of personnel with the skill and expertise: 23%
- Lack of additional funding: 19%
- Lack of residential halls for students: 15%
- Lack of institutional capacity: 4%
- Other (Please specify): 4%

**Reasons for not developing an SIEM plan in 2015 (n=19)**

Factors such as lack of institutional capacity and residential halls are not major obstacles for institutions to develop an SIEM plan, rather their willingness to prioritize and invest in personnel was cited by respondents.
Increasing Number of International Students Remains Top Priority, Followed by Developing Strategic Partnerships

Overall the percentage of selecting high priority at each option dropped from 2015, especially for improving student experience (-24%), indicating the sense of urgency at the international enrollment sector has declined.

*Note: “Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes” was a frequent mentioned factor of another open-ended question in the 2015 survey thus was added as a choice in the 2017 survey.*
Large Institutions Show the Most Interest in Developing Strategic Partnerships with Institutions Abroad

Top Strategic Priorities in IEM by Institutional Size - 2017

- Increase the number of international students
- Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Small (n=15)</th>
<th>Medium (n=44)</th>
<th>Large (n=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of international students</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the diversity of international students</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Institutions show less interest in diversifying international students in 2017 compared to 2015.*
Enrollment Challenges Affecting Top SIEM Priorities in West and Southeast

High Strategic Priorities for SIEM over the Next 3 Years (n=86) 2017

- Increase the number of international students
- Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Southwest n=9
- 33% Increase the number of international students
- 11% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 11% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 11% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 36% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Midwest n=28
- 46% Increase the number of international students
- 36% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 36% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 21% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 29% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Mid East & New England n=14
- 50% Increase the number of international students
- 21% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 29% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 29% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 30% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Southeast n=20
- 60% Increase the number of international students
- 35% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 45% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 45% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 50% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

West n=14
- 71% Increase the number of international students
- 14% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 21% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 11% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 36% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

2015

Southwest n=13
- 77% Increase the number of international students
- 31% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 31% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 23% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 36% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Midwest n=18
- 67% Increase the number of international students
- 50% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 17% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 29% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 35% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Mid East & New England n=24
- 83% Increase the number of international students
- 56% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 56% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 29% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 35% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

Southeast n=17
- 53% Increase the number of international students
- 41% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 53% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 53% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 35% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes

West n=19
- 42% Increase the number of international students
- 42% Enhance the diversity of international students on campus
- 37% Improve the quality (academic preparedness) of international students
- 58% Improve the experiences (satisfaction) of international students
- 37% Develop strategic partnerships with institutions abroad for recruiting purposes
### Other Strategic Internationalization Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing <strong>partnerships</strong>: collaboration with higher education counterparts, pathway programs and <strong>community colleges</strong>, especially in recruitment.</td>
<td>Developing <strong>partnerships</strong> and relationships with institutions and others abroad to aid recruitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging more American students to <strong>study abroad</strong>.</td>
<td>Recruit through domestic channels, including <strong>U.S. high schools</strong> and <strong>community colleges</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand <strong>study abroad</strong>, including for international students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Low Brand Awareness and Lack of Funding Remain Top Two Challenges, Followed by Political Environment

Top 3 Challenges Confronting Your Institution in Terms of Meeting its International Student Enrollment Goals - 2017 (n=86)

- Low brand awareness abroad: 55%
- Lack of adequate financial support to students: 50%
- Political environment: 37%
- The institution’s location: 34%
- Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.): 33%

2015 (n=92)

- Low brand awareness abroad: 68%
- Lack of funding: 61%
- Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.): 40%
- Lack of dedicated & trained staff: 40%
- The institution’s location: 39%
Small Institutions Struggle with Location, Lack of Expertise, Compared to Larger AASCU Peers

**Top Issues & Challenges in IEM for Small Institutions in 2017**

- The institution's location: 53%
- Lack of adequate financial support to students: 47%
- Lack of expertise with international student enrollment: 40%
- Lack of dedicated and trained staff: 33%
- Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.): 33%
- Low brand awareness abroad: 27%
- Lack of adequate support services for international students once on campus: 27%
- Lack of programs appealing to international students: 13%
- Political environment: 13%
- Lack of support from senior administrators: 7%
- Lack of support from local and/or state government(s): 7%
- Lack of supportive campus culture: 0%
- Lack of support from faculty: 0%

Note: Due to changes on type of the question and newly added options in 2017, no direct comparison between 2015 and 2017 can be made therefore results should be interpreted within the context.
Brand Awareness Still Top Challenge for Medium-Sized Institutions

Top Issues & Challenges in IEM for Medium Institutions in 2017

- Low brand awareness abroad: 55%
- Lack of adequate financial support to students: 36%
- Political environment: 36%
- The institution's location: 32%
- Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.): 30%
- Lack of expertise with international student enrollment: 25%
- Lack of support from senior administrators: 18%
- Lack of dedicated and trained staff: 18%
- Lack of adequate support services for international students once on campus: 18%
- Lack of programs appealing to international students: 16%
- Lack of supportive campus culture: 9%
- Lack of support from local and/or state government(s): 5%
- Lack of support from faculty: 2%

Note: Due to changes on type of the question and newly added options in 2017, no direct comparison between 2015 and 2017 can be made therefore results should be interpreted within the context.

2015
1. Low brand awareness abroad
2. Lack of funding
3. Institution location
Political Environment Most Significant for Large Institutions

Top Issues & Challenges in IEM for Large Institutions in 2017

- Lack of adequate financial support to students: 67%
- Low brand awareness abroad: 59%
- Political environment: 44%
- Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.): 30%
- Lack of expertise with international student enrollment: 19%
- Lack of dedicated and trained staff: 19%
- Lack of adequate support services for international students once on campus: 19%
- The institution’s location: 15%
- Lack of support from senior administrators: 15%
- Lack of support from local and/or state government(s): 7%
- Lack of programs appealing to international students: 4%
- Lack of supportive campus culture: 4%
- Lack of support from faculty: 0%

Note: Due to changes on type of the question and newly added options in 2017, no direct comparison between 2015 and 2017 can be made therefore results should be interpreted within the context.
### Top 3 IEM Issues & Challenges by Geographic Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Region</th>
<th>2017 Top 3 Issues &amp; Challenges in IEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>Lack of adequate support services for international students once on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midwest</strong></td>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution’s location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mideast &amp; New England</strong></td>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of programs appealing to international students / Lack of adequate financial support to students*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td>Lack of adequate financial support to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td>Lack of adequate financial support to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of expertise with international student enrollment / The institution’s location / Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Options with slash (/) reflects tied choices
### Top 3 Issues & Challenges by Status of IEM Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIEM Plan</th>
<th>2017 Top 3 Issues &amp; Challenges in IEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We do not have a plan</td>
<td>Lack of adequate financial support to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of expertise with international student enrollment / Lack of support from senior administrators*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are currently developing a plan</td>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of adequate financial support to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of expertise with international student enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a plan</td>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of adequate financial support to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Options with slash (/) reflects tied choices
Conclusion

Develop/enhance institution-wide SIEM plan to:

- Increase international enrollment
- Internationalize the institution
- Increase diversity on campus

Next Steps:

- Engage campus leaders in advocacy efforts
- Strategically minimize budgetary constraints
- Address branding challenges collaboratively
- Embrace comprehensive internationalization
Appendix
Institutions with Enrollment of 5.1% or More Saw a Decline in International Student Enrollment from Fall 2013/14 to Fall 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of International Students 2017</th>
<th>Percentage of International Students 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In general, the percentage of institutions reporting an increase in enrollment has declined whereas more institutions saw no significant change in enrollment in 2017 compared to 2015.
- Nearly 6 in 10 institutions with international student enrollment of 5.1% or more reported a decrease in enrollment from Fall 2015 to Fall 2016, whereas no institutions with that percentage of international students saw decreases in enrollment from Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 in 2015.
- 6% fewer institutions with international student enrollment size of 5.1% or more reported an increase in enrollment in 2017, compared to 2015.
### Top 3 Challenges Confronting Institutions in Terms of Meeting International Student Enrollment Goals

#### Please Select the Top 3 Challenges Confronting Your Institution in Terms of Meeting its International Student Enrollment Goals - 2017 (n=86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>2017 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low brand awareness abroad</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate financial support to students</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political environment</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transitional programs (e.g. pathway programs, intensive English programs etc.)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of expertise with international student enrollment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of dedicated and trained staff</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate support services for international students once on campus</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of expertise with international student enrollment</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from senior administrators</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of programs appealing to international students</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supportive campus culture</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from local and/or state government(s)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from faculty</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AASCU Institutions Overall Profile

**Geographic Region**

- **2015**
  - West (Far West & Rocky Mountains): 14%
  - Mid West (Great Lakes & Plains): 22%
  - South East: 29%
  - Mid East & New England: 23%
  - South West: 11%
  - Outlying Areas: 1%

- **2017**
  - West (Far West & Rocky Mountains): 14%
  - Mid West (Great Lakes & Plains): 23%
  - South East: 29%
  - Mid East & New England: 23%
  - South West: 10%
  - Outlying Areas: 1%

**Size & Setting**

- **2015**
  - Very Small: 2%
  - Small: 18%
  - Medium: 52%
  - Large: 26%

- **2017**
  - Very Small: 3%
  - Small: 21%
  - Medium: 49%
  - Large: 27%
AASCU Institutions Overall Profile (Cont.)

**Carnegie Classification**

- **2015**
  - Associate's: 1%
  - Baccalaureate: 15%
  - Baccalaureate/Associate's: 3%
  - Master's: 62%
  - Research/Doctoral: 17%

- **2017**
  - Associate's: 1%
  - Baccalaureate: 16%
  - Baccalaureate/Associate's: 3%
  - Master's: 64%
  - Research/Doctoral: 17%

Institutional Characteristics for IEM

- International enrollment initiative at the state level has weakened compared to 2015.
- International enrollment management at the institution level has been less supported than it did in 2015.

Note: % refers to respondents who answered “Yes”  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2015 (n=92)</th>
<th>2017 (n=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your state have any initiatives to promote international student enrollment?</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a dedicated team or position to facilitate international enrollment management efforts at your institution?</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING

Need more information?
Visit: www.wes.org/partners