



Dialogue
Creating the Next 60 Years

Project Report

June 25th, 2013

ICU-UC 50th Anniversary Celebration, an open symposium
"Study Abroad and Academic Integration"



60th Anniversary Project
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY



Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

On the second day of the ICU-UC 50th Anniversary Celebration, an open symposium was held in the International Conference Room at Kiyoshi Togasaki Memorial Dialogue House. The theme of the symposium was Study Abroad and Academic Integration, and the audience was treated to presentations and commentary by a number of distinguished speakers.

A warm welcome was offered by both Junko Hibiya, president of ICU, and by Jean-Xavier Guinard, Associate Vice-Provost and Executive Director of the University of California Education Abroad Program (UCEAP). The session was moderated by Junko Ito, Director of the UCEAP Tokyo Study Center.



KEYNOTE ADDRESS

The keynote address was given by Juan E. Campo, co-chair of the Academic Integration (AI) Initiative in the University of California Education Abroad Program (UCEAP), and Associate Professor of Religious Studies at University of California (UC) Santa Barbara. Campo has been involved in a number of UCEAP programs, and he discussed the University of California's plans for Academic Integration of the study abroad programs during the 21st century.

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

When the University of California originally came up with the Education Abroad Program, they envisioned three pillars. The first idea was to offer programs of high academic quality for qualified students to make progress toward their degree at a reasonable cost. The second was to encourage the development of foreign language skills. The third was to enrich students' lives culturally. However, at the beginning their efforts were focused on establishing programs around the world.



The very first program was conducted with the University of Bordeaux in 1962, and 80 students spent an entire year in France. Programs with Japanese universities began in 1962, with the official opening of the ICU Study Center in 1964. From the 1960s to the 1980s, the program grew and diversified from 80 students in the first France exchange to more than 1,200 students in 33 countries. This growth was also reflected in the UC programs in Japan, with numbers increasing from about 20 students a year in the 1960s to an average of more than 180 students a year between 2003 and 2013. UC Tokyo Study Center was opened officially in 1964.

The University of California system is incredibly complex as it has more than 10 autonomous campuses, 234,000 students, hundreds of departments and programs, and 19,000 faculty members. Because of this institutional complexity, UC's EAP program required a great amount of time, money and hard work to develop a system to applicable to all campus during the 1990s and 2000s.

The number of students enrolled in UCEAP has grown from 1,200 in 1980 to 4,481 in the 2012-2013 school year. UC fees and programs costs continue to rise, and UCEAP now handles over 250 programs in 39 countries. Organizers must learn to respond to a number of issues: UCEAP's recent reorganization, the shifting relationships with individual UC campuses, and faculty-led programming.

UCEAP's Active Research Program now undertakes regular surveys and holds focus groups to better analyze the system itself, and the academic outcomes of academic integration. Results showed that a majority of participants showed an interest in taking courses related to their major area of study, and a majority of them actually took those courses at their destination institution. They weren't looking to take only non-required courses. Another most promising result was the number of students who would recommend UCEAP's program to other UC students. (See list below.)

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

Given your experience, would you recommend UCEAPs program to other UC students?

1. In your major: 88%
2. In your minor: 54%
3. In other academic disciplines: 90%
4. Interested in doing academic research: 52%
5. Interested in doing an internship: 51%
6. Interested in pursuing general elective or breadth requirements: 80%
7. Interested in pursuing language requirements: 84%

(Source: Campo presentation documents, June 25, 2013)

In other words, a large majority of students seem to believe in the effectiveness of the UCEAP, particularly for students in the same major.

Finally, UCEAP has set a number of strategic goals for its 50th anniversary; first, to strive for academic excellence; second to establish Best Business Practices; and third, to provide study abroad programs for all.

Campo described a few strategic components the working group is presently looking into. One component was that, in order to expand, they wanted to internationalize engineering programs to encourage more men to join. UCEAP could look into what engineering students want to take outside of their regular engineering courses, and also offer foundation courses for summer options, offer research internships, etc. It is critical to obtain this type of information from host universities and send it back to the home campuses where it can be effectively used to identify which programs would be good for UC students. UCEAP has already begun following through on this strategy with a program in “Engineering for Sustainability” set to begin next summer in Munich.

Another strategic component was to update which courses have been taken in the various programs, and to determine how many units were transferable. A system is available now, but it is neither regularly updated nor is it accessible across the different programs.

The third component was to collect data on course approval to clarify what methods the different campuses use to approve courses for credit.

Campo finished by reading a passage written by a UC student who had studied in Japan.

Being able to study about Japan while in Japan, gave me the chance to witness what I was learning firsthand... I appreciated being able to go to those places I was learning about...and then construct assignments around those locations. I also enjoyed being able to take advantage of hearing different points of view than I would have been able to access in an academic setting back in the US.

In Campo's eyes, this shows that students believe that academic integration works. As he said,

"You have the academic component, the personal aspect, and the cultural immersion component. That what we want to see more of as we move forward with the academic integration initiative."

PRESENTER TALKS

After Campo's keynote speech, talks were offered by a number of presenters from universities in Japan and from overseas. All had the general theme of cultural exchange and language learning, and while some presenters discussed their own institutions programs, some looked at the bigger picture of inter-cultural exchange and learning in general.

The first to present was Osaka University (OU) professor Sachihiko Kondo, who is presently responsible for managing a number of student exchange and short stay programs for the Centre for International Education and Exchange. Kondo talked a little bit about the academic makeup and history of OU, before going into detail about the present state of the university's exchange program.



Osaka University presently has 99 inter-university and 402 inter-faculty agreements in place with institutions overseas (as of May 2013). Students come from a variety of places around the globe, with the vast majority coming from Asia (with 1,588 students), with Europe a distant second (at 207), for a total of 1985 visiting students (as of May 1, 2013). This trend of seeing large proportions of visitors coming from Asia was also seen in the number of international researchers, with more than 30% of the total of 777 researchers coming from China (178) and South Korea (77) alone (FY 2012).

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

Kondo described how students on the outgoing exchange must fill out a learning agreement sheet which they use to describe the lectures they will take at their destination university. They also list equivalent courses that are held at Osaka University which they wish to earn the credits for, and professors must sign their approval on the learning agreement sheet. This is a part of their effort to improve academic integration at Osaka University, and while Kondo believes it is a simple system, it seems to work. He did mention, however, that organizers should look into what proportion of courses is accepted for transfer.

Kondo believes that they are some hurdles to overcome, but the university is tackling those issues in a number of ways. They offer a great amount of support for visiting students to help them adapt to and live in Japanese society and offer vibrant classrooms, enabling students to take the initiative in their own education.

The second panelist to speak was ICU professor Natsumi Ikoma, who teaches British and Japanese literature, feminist theory, and gender theory. Ikoma's presentation was about the previous 50 years of ICU and UC educational exchange.



Thus far ICU has sent 2,328 students to its exchange partners – with 718 travelling to study at UC – and 1,164 visiting students have been welcomed into the ICU classrooms over the years. Entry into the ICU program is quite strictly regulated; only students who have planned out their major and have sufficiently prepared for their future education at ICU are accepted into the program.

One by-product of this requirement is that the students who do end up on exchange tend to perform well academically. Also, a high percentage of the classes they take are accepted as transfer credits. Students are allowed to take classes outside of their major, and about 2/3 of students who go on the ICU exchange programs still graduate on time.

One idea that Ikoma touched upon was related to greater program variety. New programs could be offered that philosophically lie somewhere between the present exchange program and ICU's Service Learning program. English language programs could also be popular, and programs of shorter duration could better

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

cater to the needs of some students.

Ikoma also discussed some of the obstacles that remain in the exchange program offered by ICU. Students are required to choose their major in their second year, which means that they have not yet decided their majors, and therefore cannot choose a destination institution suitable to that major. Ikoma suggested that major-oriented programs could play a role here.

Another issue is that programs run from the summer of third year to the summer of fourth year. Japanese companies tend to focus on hiring university graduates directly out of school through job fairs that take place during that period in third and fourth year, so some students must worry that participating in the program will cause them to miss out on job opportunities.

One slightly odd thing that Ikoma pointed out was the sudden increase in enrollees in 2011. They still do not know why numbers increased that year, but Ikoma suggest that it could be a result of more people looking at exchange as a positive experience, i.e. “not (as) an obstacle to job hunting, but rather an advantage.”

Ikoma asked the audience to consider some questions that are fundamental to the goal of academic integration and study abroad programs. What is the ideal exchange program for a liberal arts college, and how should it be built? What can organizers do to have more students benefit from the experience? In striving to answer these questions, exchange programs will be able to enrich the lives of even more students.

Mitsuhiro Yoshimoto is a professor of Media and Cinema Studies at Waseda University, and he was the third presenter to take the podium.

In lieu of a detailed look at Waseda’s international programs, Yoshimoto prepared a short critical paper on issues related to international education in Japan and study abroad programs at Japanese universities.

Yoshimoto began his talk by pointing out that the number of Japanese students studying at US



universities has been on the decline for the last decade. In 1997, 47,073 students were studying at American universities, but that number had dropped to 19,966 by 2011.

Yoshimoto explained that one common conclusion made is that the drop in numbers somehow reflects an increased lack of interest in the rest of the world on the part of Japanese students. The Japanese government, in response to the drop in numbers, has begun to call for action to be taken to reverse this trend, and they have the support of Japanese industry and educational leaders. These groups maintain that Japan's future depends on the education of what they call, "*gurobaru-jinzai*" (グローバル人材.)

Yoshimoto says that the term is now used so often that it "is difficult to discuss the state of Japanese higher education without making reference to the idea." The term made frequent appearances in the report on bilingual exchange between the US and Japan, prepared by the Educational taskforce CULCON, the U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange. The report emphasized that their goal was to double the number of visiting students on exchange in the other country by 2020.

However, while Yoshimoto explicitly stated that he didn't want to criticize the viability of their goal, he asserted that the information the report is based on and the concepts behind terms such as "*gurobaru-jinzai*" cause issues that must be addressed. Throughout his talk Yoshimoto used this term in its Japanese form to better highlight its ambiguity.

Though "*jinzai*" could be expected to be translated as "human resources," Yoshimoto described how the English version of the report tended to translate the term to match the context, ending up with various translations such as "global talent," "global human resources," and "global citizens."

This is part of the problem, according to Yoshimoto.

"Global citizenship is definitely not the same as global resources," he said.

He discussed a number of other issues, such as how the adoption of the TOEFL test as an entrance requirement in Japanese schools could have dire consequences, but he also brought up some more data that seems to go against the idea that Japanese students are becoming more inward-looking.

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

The number of students studying at US universities through inter-faculty and other programs has actually increasing over the last decade. In addition, the overall number of students studying at overseas universities (i.e. not only in the USA) also dramatically increased from 18,570 in 2004 to 28,804 in 2010. Yoshimoto believes that while he can make few conclusions without further study, one thing that can be said that Japanese students are definitely not losing interest in studying at foreign universities.

The data shows that the US is simply one of many countries Japanese students wish to study in, just as Japan is only one of the many countries US students wish to go on exchange to. Yoshimoto believes that too much emphasis is placed on the bilateral relationship between the US and Japan, rather than on what Japanese universities are looking for in international education in Japan.

The concept of Liberal Arts is often pointed to as the solution to the internationalization of Japanese higher education, but Yoshimoto pointed out that in Japanese, the term serves as an “empty signifier.” It is a phrase used as a place holder; it can mean anything, “but precisely because of that means nothing in the end.”

Yoshimoto concluded by describing some of the problems Japanese Universities face: low English language proficiency, the Japanese university calendar, the negative effect of Japanese company hiring practices on study abroad programs, etc. The problem is, in his opinion, that these issues are often “enthusiastically debated while avoiding squarely confronting the fundamental problems of the Japanese university as an institution.”

Program organizers and universities must work to expand exchange programs and make it easier for students to take advantage of them. But, in Yoshimoto’s opinion, unless the fundamental problems of Japanese universities are seriously addressed, and unless substantial and coherent changes are introduced quickly, the idea of expanding international exchange “may be a temporary fad.”

Ellis S. Krauss is Visiting Professor at Meiji Gakuin University, and he gave his presentation on the history and future of Meiji Gakuin and the university’s exchange program.

Meiji Gakuin is a Christian University founded in Japan in the late 19th century by James Curtis Hepburn. Hepburn himself is famous for his Hepburn

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

Romanization System, a method of romanizing the Japanese language still in use today, but the university has also had a number of other famous feet walk its floors.

They have a tradition of social activism with the likes of Toyohiko Kagawa (1888-1960), who helped establish credit unions, schools, hospitals, and churches, and worked for universal male suffrage. He was imprisoned for publicly vocalizing his opposition to the war with China, and he also opposed the war with the US. Before his death he was nominated for two Nobel prizes, one in peace and one in literature. The university has also had relationship with ambassadors, government ministers, and other figures who have played major roles on the world stage.



Students who take part in the Meiji Gakuin exchange program are treated to a number of experiences, among them a field trip to Hiroshima. On past trips, students have visited the Peace Memorial Museum, visited islands that used to hold military establishments, and have even listened to a talk by a survivor of the atomic bomb who talked about her experiences.

Students also take the “UC Director’s Seminar” which includes both public and “Director’s” lectures given by guest speakers. Guests this year included ambassadors, professors and researchers, and a former aide to Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi.

In terms of how well his programs have succeeded in promoting academic integration, this semester the average student is taking 5.44 courses, with 4 of those related in some way to their major.

Krauss concluded by offering his own answer in regards to how to promote academic integration: “No worries.” He found that rather than having to push for more academic integration, the students at Meiji Gakuin were integrating their majors into their study abroad programs on their own.

The final part of the symposium involved a round table panel discussion, with comments and questions coming from both guests and from the audience.

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

Chia-ning Chang is a professor of Japanese at UC Davis and currently the Director of the UCEAP Study Center at Fudan University, China.

He commented that there are a number of obstacles to overcome before academic integration can be completely successful. As an example, he offered an anecdote about a professor at UC Davis who was “worried about the level of instruction” at a university in Japan, and how this was a symbol of lingering provincialism on the part of professors at UC. He also addressed something Sachihiko Kondo mentioned in his

presentation: more Osaka University students visit the US than any other country, but most of the students coming to Osaka University come from Asia. Chang thought that it would be beneficial to look at how to address this discrepancy, as “if we really want to be global citizens, we really need to look at other places...the world is not the US.”



Finally, Chang asserted his belief that Yoshimoto’s paper was extremely relevant to the symposium. How is “Liberal Education” defined in the context of education abroad? Chang praised Yoshimoto for his astute observations regarding the vagueness and shortcomings of plans and reports, and for discovering that the “empty signifiers” do not increase our understanding of what education is in Japan.

Chang also reminded the audience why exchange programs are so necessary.

“Exchanges help people learn about the inner logic of things that may seem confusing at first. It is the very nature of our superficial differences and understanding – and sympathizing with those differences – that makes the UCEAP experience so important.”

Shaun K. Malarney, ICU’s Dean of International Affairs and Professor of Anthropology, commented that while the term “Liberal Arts” may be ill-defined in Japanese, he believes that Liberal Arts truly IS the solution to the internationalization of Japanese education.

On the use of the term *gurobaru-jinzai*, Malarney mentioned that when he was at university he went on two exchanges. When he looked back on his experiences, he realized that his interests were what helped him achieve some level of academic

Dialogue

Creating the Next 60 Years

integration, and that integration was a great benefit to him. He worries that, particularly in Japan, education is about creating “workers” – about building a workforce with a particular “skillset” to make Japan strong again – and that this will have a negative effect on student education.

Malarney appreciated Yoshimoto’s interpretation of *gurobaru-jinzai* as “an empty signifier” as opposed to a clearly articulated set of ideas about what you plan to do.



That empty signifier has to be filled, Malarney said, and it must be done in a humane, international way. He said that in order to succeed “international education is not just about getting a skillset.” He quoted Jesuit educational philosophy by asserting, “It’s about...getting a total person education.” They must engage people more deeply, and challenge them to “think about their position as a global citizen.”

The session was wrapped up after comments and questions from the floor about such issues as how to employ skilled people to work with the students, how to encourage and engage students, and how to overcome issues experienced by exchange students such as those of loneliness and isolation.

After being treated to some closing comments by Junko Hibiya, Junko Ito wrapped up the session by reading from a congratulatory letter from an ex-student who took part in the exchange at ICU, and Shaun Malarney thanked the audience for their participation. The panel and the audience then adjourned to continue their discussions over tea in the dining hall.

