America First Policies and International College Students: A Case Study on Greater Boston-Area Universities

Author: George A. Agras

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:108670

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2018

BOSTON COLLEGE
Lynch School of Education

Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education

Center for International Higher Education

AMERICA FIRST POLICIES AND INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE STUDENTS: A CASE
STUDY ON GREATER BOSTON-AREA UNIVERSITIES

Master's Thesis
By

GEORGE A. AGRAS

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in International Higher Education

July, 2018

Abstract

This study examines the experiences of four higher education institutions as they respond to the current U.S. political climate and to the Trump administration's policies on travel and immigration. It aims to understand and analyze the potential impact on the institutions' internationalization priorities and engagement with their international students and to describe how those universities have reacted to national policies on foreigners and U.S. immigration. The study gathers information from six semi-structured interviews with university administrators and international student leaders at Babson College, the University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston College, and Bentley University. Data drawn from document-based research, including university webpages containing mission and vision statements, strategic plans, and press releases, among other data, help bring to symmetry the full scope of the institutions' interpretations and actions in response to the political climate. The case study institutions report various levels of impact on their international activities as a result of the Trump administration's immigration policies and the national politicization of anti-foreigner rhetoric. For example, heightened sensitivity to international recruitment and enrollment priorities demonstrates a prime area of concern among institutions. Senior administrators are motivated to express a campus-wide commitment to global engagement on their campuses. Institutions' international offices respond *ad hoc* during critical times to accommodate increases in international student support and to solve pressing issues. Opportunities for sustaining the drive of institutions to engage deeply and meaningfully in activities that foster and enhance support for their international student populations and internationalization strategies, and future areas of research are also discussed.

Keywords: internationalization, Trump, international students, immigration policies

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

Purpose and Significance of the Study

This study describes and analyzes the experiences of four universities in the Greater Boston-area as they rationalize, interpret, and respond to the effects of the current U.S. political climate and recent foreign policies on travel and immigration with respect to the potential impact on their internationalization priorities, specifically those activities supporting the engagement and experiences of international students. This research advances our understanding of Greater Boston-area colleges and universities' (G.B.A.C.U.) experiences with the Trump administration—installed just 18 months ago, in January of 2017—and the image it may be creating of the United States as an unwelcoming and insensitive place for foreigners. One important objective of this study is to generate awareness and further discussion regarding the ways in which higher education administrators can improve institutional resources and support to further promote and enhance the on-campus inclusion and purposeful involvement of international students.

Higher education engagement with internationalization in its many manifestations is an increasingly valued, yet complex issue in U.S. higher education. Despite the expansive modern history of internationalization in the United States, it remains an elusive concept, oftentimes for reasons relating to its common misusage by American higher education institutions (HEIs) and higher education professionals. A common way universities interpret the meaning of internationalization is to make their campuses more globally oriented by attracting others to it. Thus, universities in the United States with a strong international agenda often tend to focus their resources and attention on the recruitment and enrollment of international students. Currently,

the U.S. hosts a little over 1 million international students, and the 2016/17 academic year marks the eleventh year of consecutive growth in international student enrollment (Institute of International Education or IIE, 2017). While the record is impressive, U.S. higher education will have to fight hard to keep those numbers high, especially if institutional efforts to attract more students are thwarted by the current administration.

This study places institutions and international students at the center of the analysis because it is this group that is most immediately affected by the federal government's shifting immigration goals and policies. The study contributes equally to a much needed discussion from an institutional and qualitative perspective on how macro-level changes in national policies, once supportive of educational exchange and global awareness, have the potential to negatively impact our centers of knowledge and learning, students, teachers, families, and our communities. This study is significant for several reasons. First, it is important to understand what attracts so many foreigners to America from a U.S. perspective. Traditionally, the U.S. has welcomingly received top talent from around the world as these individuals work to fulfill their dreams of earning an American education, which has made the U.S. a leader in the global higher education community for a long time. Its differentiated system is an exemplary feature that distinguishes it from other higher education systems in the world and allows youth to seek multiple alternative pathways of study, which can greatly expand their future professional and vocational opportunities. The U.S. system of higher education has long been perceived as a country of immigrants—founded by immigrants and made great by them—and continues to attract people from all over the world seeking the "American Dream" and a better quality of life. Second, it is important for Americans to feel connected to a world that extends beyond the United States. There were 325,399 Americans that studied abroad in 2015/16, which is only around one third of

the total number of international students hosted by the United States for the same year (IIE, 2017). Since the U.S. is perceived as more of a destination country than a sending country, acts restricting the inward mobility of international students potentially risk limiting domestic students' cultivation of intercultural competence—an essential element to fostering the development of global citizens (Green, 2013), especially among students that might forgo an international experience abroad. In addition to the significant contributions made by international students to teaching and research in higher education, the U.S. stands to lose its credibility and long-standing reputation as a friendly and neighborly destination for foreigners—a shift in global consciousness with potentially long-term implications for U.S. higher education.

Research Questions

The primary research question this study aims to answer is as follows: To what extent have the policies on travel and related mandates on immigration issued by the United States federal administration between President Trump's January 2017 inauguration and May 2018—including, but not limited to its executive branch—impacted Greater Boston-area colleges and universities' internationalization priorities, specifically those relating to the provision of programmatic and organizational strategies supporting international student engagement?

The study has two objectives to address the primary research question. The first is to describe the institutions' internationalization priorities, specifically those focusing on the strategies and programs to support the inclusion and involvement of international students in campus life at the respective institutions under focus. The second is to understand and evaluate the "lived experiences" of international students and the experiences of the institutions hosting them, as both interact with and respond to federal-level policies on travel and immigration and

the anti-foreigner rhetoric that has saturated U.S. politics, the news, and social media during the Trump administration. Four secondary research questions support the primary question:

1. What steps have G.B.A.C.U.s taken to address the greatest potential risks or negative effects on international students caused by these policies?

2. With respect to the political environment in the United States and federal policies on immigration and travel, what have been the effects on enrollment and recruitment at the G.B.A.C.U.s?

3. What are the distinct support-areas that university administrators are focusing on with respect to making their campus environments welcoming and safe for international students?

4. What are the key challenges and opportunities for the G.B.A.C.U.s to continue to attract the best and brightest international talent to their campuses?

This paper argues that the Trump administration—including but not limited to the U.S. political climate, the policies on travel and immigration, and the waves of anti-immigration and anti-foreigner rhetoric and statements that have followed in its wake—is perilous to the internationalization goals of the G.B.A.C.U.s participating in this study, especially in relation to the international students they enroll and aspire to attract to their institutions.

Research Design and Methodology

Case Study Method

This study aims to gain a greater understanding of how the current U.S. political environment has affected in specific ways higher education institutions in the Greater Boston-area. In part, what is gained is an 'inside look' from key administrators and international student-leaders into the circumstances unfolding at each university. The foundation from which

this study is built emerges from the assumption that the lines between a phenomenon and its context are not readily known or recognized (Yin, 2009). A case placed directly in its context allows descriptions and rich qualitative details to flow from it naturally, adding essential meaning and value to its contours while shaping its context. The cases under investigation in this study possess an intricate combination of 'lived experiences' of 'what it is like' (Geertz, 1973) to be an institution, at this very point in American history, in the Greater Boston-area, and subjected to the laws and policies of the federal administration. Indeed, Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) argue simply that case studies are: (a) set in locational, institutional, and temporary contexts that permit limits to be made around the case; (b) understood by the meanings and characteristics attributed to them by their supplier; and (c) outlined by individuals defined with specific roles and functions (p. 319). These qualifying indicators of case studies suggest this research is well-suited to this particular methodology because case studies allow for the genuine understanding, experiential knowledge, and nuanced detail to be supplied by people working, studying, and 'living' in these environments and therefore most familiar with their multiple contexts. In addition, the collection of various types of data contributes equally to painting a 'real-life' picture of present-day circumstances (Robson, 2002; Dyer, 1995) as they frequently change according to the climate and to circumstance. Nisbet and Watt (1984) assert the effectiveness of case studies for their many strengths: comprehension by a wide-audience; provision of intelligible results; the capturing of special descriptive features that might otherwise be lost in survey research; the presentation of an accurate portrayal of reality in real-time; and the provision of insights applicable to different contexts and situations. They also underscore certain weaknesses, including the possibility of lower generalizability, except in instances where the researcher can see applications to other cases and situations, and lower feasibility for case studies

to be cross-checked and referenced, suggesting possible researcher/research bias, among others. Other critics have also noted the imperfections of case study design, citing the lack of certain measures of control and the unsystematic control of treatments (Shaughnessy et al, 2003); pre-selection of criteria by the author with or without the respondents' knowledge of what was included or excluded (Dyer, 1995); and that case studies represent a weak method of knowing logically that which historical research is better designed to figure out (Smith, 1991). Ultimately, however, the case study method is preferred to other methodological approaches because it distinctly contributes to discerning the "how" and "why" of complex and contemporary social phenomena (Yin, 2009)—international students, U.S. higher education, and the Trump administration—through the experiences of universities and through the lenses of their members.

Case Selection

The identities of the institutions are featured in this study because the environment in which the cases are examined is critical to understanding the nature of the institutions in their real-life contexts (Yin, 2009). The subjects of this research include the following four higher education institutions:

1. Babson College (Babson);
2. The University of Massachusetts—Boston (UMB);
3. Boston College (BC); and
4. Bentley University (Bentley)

Table 1 provides information on the case study institutions, including the name of the institution, the type, total enrollment, and international student enrollment in absolute numbers and as a percentage of total enrollment.

Table 1

Total Enrollment v. International Student Enrollment, 2016-17: All Case Study Institutions

Name	Type	Total Enrollment (Fall 2016)	International Enrollment	International Enrollment (as % of Total)
Babson	Private	3,165	1,141	36.0
UMB	Public	16,847	2,427	14.4
BC	Private	14,466	1,933	13.3
Bentley	Private	5,506	1,391	25.2
		Total: 39,984	Total: 6,892	Average (%): 17.2

Sources: IIE (2017a) and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2018)

The selection of cases is a crucial element of case study research (Yin, 2009). There were a number of variables considered during the case selection process, such as—e.g. time, expense, sample size, and accessibility, among others, yet several of these factors also had a constraining effect on how cases were chosen. Two rationales helped inform the selection of an appropriate sampling strategy. First, case institutions possessing the presence of particular characteristics (e.g. matriculated international students, etc.) were sought to address the sample's unique needs. Thus, criterion–based purposive sampling was selected as the study's principal strategy. Criterion-based sampling is a type of approach used to locate cases that meet some pre-determined criteria, while its purposive technique is designed to detect "information rich-cases…from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research" (Patton, 1990, p. 169). To make the research manageable, the criterion that

institutions enroll international students was narrowed and refined to include institutions hosting 1,000 or more international students. Second, the geographical accessibility of the case study institutions was an important part of the selection process. The logic of accessibility lends itself to the notion that close physical proximity to the sample would enable the researcher access to the institutions' campuses and to the key respondents for in-depth in-person interviews. The idea of access to the physical grounds of the institution and the idea of availability of knowledgeable people compliments the logic of selecting institutions in the Greater Boston-area.

Consequently, the lack of geographical variance among all four institutions weakens the degree to which generalizations of the findings can be made. However, the institutions selected—while not representative of all U.S. higher education institutions—do provide a diverse range of "representational types" of institutions in the Greater Boston-area based on the specific parameters established in the case selection process. The four case study institutions consist of a private not-for-profit business school focused on entrepreneurial education; a large urban research institution (the UMB)—the only public university in the Greater Boston-area; a private religiously affiliated research institution (BC); and a private business institution (Bentley).

The participating case study institutions were sourced from the International Institute of Education's (IIE) 2017 *Open Doors* Report. The report is published annually and tracks information on international student and scholar mobility in the United States and U.S. students studying abroad for academic credit. Searching in the *Open Doors* Report against the key criteria for participation in this study generated a list of 250 institutions (IIE, 2017). An enhanced search for the top G.B.A.C.U.s hosting international students generated a list of 11 institutions. Table 2 provides information on the top institutions in the Greater Boston-area hosting international students. Of the total number of institutions solicited for participation in

this study, four G.B.A.C.U.s responded and indicated their availability and willingness to participate. Therefore, these four institutions became the sample. While the case study design is known to limit generalizability, the multiple case studies that have been identified and are included in this report contribute to greater generalizability to some degree (Yin, 2009).

Table 2

Top G.B.A.C.U.s Hosting 1,000 or More International Students, 2016-17

Name	Type	International Student Enrollment
Northeastern University	Private	13,201
Boston University	Private	8,992
Harvard University	Private	5,978
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Private	4,685
University of Massachusetts Boston	Public	2,427
Boston College	Private	1,933
Brandeis University	Private	1,703
Suffolk University	Private	1,623
Bentley University	Private	1,391
Tufts University	Private	1,232
Babson College	Private	1,141
		Total: 44,279

Source: IIE *Open Doors* (2017a)

Data Sampling

A purposive sampling strategy was also employed in order to access certain key individuals with in-depth and expert knowledge about the core issues of this research (Ball, 1990). The central aim of data sampling was to gather information from two distinct groups— administrators and international students. However, the selection criteria for the research participants varied depending on the group. The recruitment of university administrators entailed focusing on individuals in positions of authority in terms of facilitating or leading internationalization on campus or coordinating international student services within their institution. Student interviewees were sought based on their leadership experience serving in student organizations, specifically those focused on the needs and interests of international students at their respective institutions. Individuals who did not fit these criteria were not invited to participate. The individuals that did fit these criteria were invited by e-mail to participate in the study.

To protect the highly sensitive nature of the responses and 'lived experiences' of the interviewees, I determined from the beginning of the study that it was not in the best interest of the research participants to be identified by name. The core issues under investigation, while not extremely sensitive to all respondents, had the potential to be very sensitive to some. Therefore, pseudonyms are used in lieu of the real names of participants. In addition, all first name designations have been made unisex and "Mx" (pronounced 'mixed') has been used as the gender-neutral designation, to preserve equality among participants (Mx., n.d.). Gender neutrality is retained throughout this paper by using double pronouns, such as 'he/she' and 'him/her' or single pronouns, such as 'they/their' in instances where participants are not

referenced directly by their pseudonyms (The University of North Carolina, 2018). Table 3

includes details on the study's participants.

Table 3

Study Participants

Pseudonym	Pseudo-title (Admin only)	Institution	Interview Date
Dr. Blaire Crane	High-Senior International Adviser	Babson	May 14, 2018
Dr. Taylor Uriel-Mitchell Barns	High-Senior International Adviser	UMB	May 14, 2018
Mx. Blake Campanotta	Mid-Senior International Adviser	BC	May 15, 2018
Mx. Bailey Collins	Graduate Student	BC	May 18, 2018
Mx. Brook Upman	Mid-Senior International Adviser	Bentley	May 17, 2018
Mx. Bo Untari	Undergraduate Student	Bentley	May 25, 2018

While total anonymity cannot be guaranteed, I promised confidentiality to the study

participants and employed measures to address the issue of anonymity as Frankfort-Nachmias

and Nachmias (1992) have suggested: (a) using pseudonyms in place of real names; (b) coding

the participants' identities to keep information gathered from them separated from their personal

identifiable information; and (c) using password-protected files. It was my intent from the

beginning of this project to uphold the confidentiality of participants' identities and this intention

was underscored in my earliest communications with them. All participants signed an informed

consent form (See Appendix A).

Keeping in mind the promise to protect participant confidentiality, I wish to emphasize that the information in Table 3 and elsewhere on 'level of involvement with internationalization' offers a general indication of the level of engagement of the non-student interviewees with the internationalization agenda and activities at the interviewees' respective institutions. The university administrators, for the purposes of this report, are separated into two groups: they are either given the title of a *high-senior international adviser*—someone undertaking a significant amount of work in global engagement—or a *mid-senior international adviser*—someone undertaking a less significant amount of global engagement work or specializing in a particular aspect or niche area of international affairs. These 'pseudo-titles' (see Table 3) help maintain participants' identities, while simultaneously providing just enough for the reader to understand the interviewees' role at their institution.

Data Collection

A major benefit of undertaking a case study is the experiential accounting of unfolding and dynamic situations in subjects' lives (Nisbet and Watt, 1984, p. 78). Therefore, the critical step to take after determining the sample was to identify the key foci for collecting data about the participating institutions. Yin (2009) identifies six evidentiary sources used for case study research, including documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts. However, the primary instruments used to collect data for this study were interviews and documents. (Some quantitative data on the institutions' international student population was also used but accounts for a small fraction of the total data collected.) Once the case study institutions were identified and their participation confirmed, the process began with desk research of the case study G.B.A.C.U.s' websites, which provided a trove of valuable documentary data. The key documents analyzed included institutions'

mission and vision statements and values, strategic plans, as well as information on individual offices and support services. A further website review of documents of the university generated a mixture of records, including press releases and statements by the institutions' leadership, and reports of international offices, among other data.

Interviews are one of the most essential tools for a researcher conducting case study research (Yin, 2009). For this study, semi-structured interviews were scheduled and held with each of the participants separately (See Appendix B for interview protocols). The study participants were accessed either by having an existing professional relationship with the interviewee before beginning the study or by e-mail after searching for possible candidates via the case study institutions' websites.

The number 12-16 was set as the maximum number of interviewees; this figure was established in order to recruit a wide range of administrators to draw upon the multiple experiences and perspectives of a diverse range of professionals with different levels of responsibility in facilitating internationalization across the campus. While the target goal for key administrators and students was not met, the target for the number and types of institutions was achieved, which created a nice panorama of representation, as far as institutional type is concerned. Through the examination of multiple sources of data and by employing the technique of 'catch and release' of electronically derived data, the most crucial sources of evidence could be uncovered and utilized to answer the key research questions asked in this study.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the data in this research study was, indeed, a most challenging endeavor. Yin (2009) argues that "the analysis of case study research is one of the least developed and most

difficult aspects of doing case studies" and further states how novice researchers can be at a significant disadvantage when conducting this type of research, stating "rigorous empirical thinking" is more suited to experienced social scientists (p. 127). From the perspective of a novice researcher such as myself, this is quite an accurate assessment.

Overall, the research questions posed in this study seek answers relating to the participating G.B.A.C.U.s' overall internationalization strategies and those acutely affecting the institutions' engagement with its international students. Challenges and opportunities for both groups are examined in this analysis. To answer the research questions, I first established the units of analysis. This process led to making a record of the subjects under investigation, e.g.— university administrators, student-leaders, and texts (gathered through desk and website research). For each of the research questions, the relevant issues were examined as key categories of information which took two forms: (1) an examination of the data gathered from the study participants (e.g. student and non-student interviewees); and (2) an analysis of the text-based data that had been collected from desk research of the institutions' websites. I then subjected those data to a content analysis (Krippendorp, 2004).

Several scholars suggest *coding* as a reliable technique to employ in case study research (Yin, 2009; Krippendorp, 2004; and Gibbs, 2007). The central constructs of interest were derived from the research questions themselves and formed the basis of the coding procedure. Transcribing and coding the interviews formed the bulk of labor for this analysis and required constant revisiting of the interview texts to improve coding consistency across the entire dataset (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For instance, if a code for a text was modified or a new code was developed for a single text, the updated code would need to be reapplied across all the cases. The data were coded by hand rather than by statistical software. This process was incredibly

time-consuming but helpful for the novice researcher, in that I gained an appreciation for the fine details and attention required to conduct coding well; additionally, it gave me the opportunity to become very familiar with groups of data from each of the cases, as well as the whole data set. Beginning the analysis by ascribing codes to single words was a good start, but more importantly, as Le Compte and Preissle (1993) argue, establishing relationships and linkages on a single data set and then across all data sets allows the analysis to move from pure description to drawing connections by identifying confirming cases and uncovering "underlying associations" (p. 246).

Later in the analysis, I used tables to organize and compare the data within individual cases, which became a useful and appealing way to analyze the data systematically (Miles & Huberman, 1994). After analyzing the data on a case-by-case basis, I performed a cross-case synthesis—an analytic technique that Yin (2009) argues "is likely to be easier and the findings likely to be more robust than having only a single case [and] having more than two cases could strengthen the findings even further" (p.156). Meanwhile, I compiled the data and created data-tables consisting of individual case-data on all four cases to facilitate efficient comparison-making across multiple cases, aiding in cross-case synthesis. However, in using this type of analysis, Yin (2009) cautions "to know how to develop strong, plausible, and fair arguments that are supported by the data" (p. 160) in order to present the results of the analysis intelligibly in the findings. I have attempted to follow this advice to the best of my ability, but I leave the door open for others to raise questions or concerns should the results not measure up to Yin's (2009) forewarning.

Definitions and Concepts.

A foundation for which this research is dependent is the reader's' understanding of key language used and dispersed throughout this report. Therefore, several key definitions and concepts are presented to facilitate comprehensibility of the chapters to come. The main terms are as follows:

- *Greater Boston-area*. The area of Greater Boston, for the purposes of this research, can be defined as the area within a 20-mile radius of the Massachusetts State House located at 24 Beacon Street, Boston Massachusetts 02133.

- *Internationalization.* For the purposes of this discussion, internationalization is defined as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2003, p. 2). While the definition of this phenomenon is not universally accepted nor intends to be universally applied, as de Wit states (2002), its purpose here is to serve as a foundation from which the main objects under investigation can be further explored.

- *International Student.* The definitions of and meanings attributed to international students are numerous and should be explored in whichever context holds the most relevance, whether that is institutional, national, or regional. The OECD (2004) operationalizes the definition of "foreign student" in multiple nation-specific contexts. The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) offer this definition of an internationally (mobile) student: one that has left his or her country, or territory of origin, and moved to another country or territory with the singular objective of studying (WES, 2009). The IIE defines international students in the United States as, "those who travel to the country on a temporary, non-immigrant visa that allows for academic

study" (IIE, 2017a, pg. 32). The IIE's definition captures the type of study (e.g. "academic")
and legal status of this population, so its use is favored for the purposes of this paper.

- *Programmatic and Organizational Strategies for Internationalization.* According to
  Knight's (2004) typology, programmatic strategies account for: academic programs (e.g.
  student mobility and degree programs), research and scholarly collaboration, domestic and
  cross-border relations, and extra-curricular activities (e.g. student organizations and
  intercultural campus events, etc.), while organizational strategies primarily focus on structure
  and resources around which the programs (listed above) are implemented, including
  governance, operations, services (e.g. student support services and academic support units,
  etc.), and human resources. These combined areas make up the complete strategic dimension
  for carrying out internationalization at the institution level.

- *Student Engagement.* For the purposes of this report, student engagement, in the context of
  U.S. higher education, is the implicit obligation of an institution to facilitate the purposeful
  and meaningful involvement of students throughout the curricular, co-curricular, and extra-
  curricular environment. 'Student engagement' is used synonymously in this study with the
  term 'student experience'.

- *Trump Administration.* This study touches on the executive policies of the United States
  mandated by the current U.S. presidential administration of Donald J. Trump (who was
  inaugurated in January 2017, approximately 18 months before the execution of this research)
  that are related to immigration, foreign policy, or national security and defense, specifically
  policies that might affect, in any way, international students studying in the United States. A
  reference to the political environment or atmosphere, or the Trump administration, in most
  cases, refers to the combination of executive policies on immigration, including but not

limited to anti-immigrant and anti-foreigner rhetoric, and public statements and positions by the federal government, unless otherwise specifically addressed in context.

Limitations.

There are a few important challenges worth mentioning in relation to this research. First, the overarching limitations were time/timing and scope. The primary target goal for the recruitment of study participants was set at 12-16. The goal of recruiting 2-4 individuals per institution was appealing because it offered variety in terms of perspectives from a number of different university position types as well as variety in perspectives among all participants. In the end, only 6 individuals were successfully recruited. The low number is probably attributable to the fact that the effort to recruit participants was initiated towards the end of the academic year, which could have made it significantly harder for individuals to reply due to competing end-of-year activities and other factors.

Moreover, the university positions of the recruited administrators presented a set of other challenges. Due to the study's inability to include both high-senior international advisers or mid-senior international advisers and students for each institution, the amount and type of data that could be gathered from the interviews was quite inconsistent across the institutions. This became particularly problematic during the coding phase of data analysis. Overall, the weakness was counterbalanced to some extent in that the data that could not be supplied by the participants was perhaps revealed in other data sources (e.g. university documents). The study was also limited in how it could discuss the study participants, given the sensitive nature of the research topic. In addition, piloting the study before conducting the interviews would have been useful in order to find gaps in how the interview questions were organized and presented.

Reliability and Researcher Bias.

Reliability was enhanced by recruiting administrators and students separately and by drawing upon the data the researcher collected from participants that know what happens in the day-to-day affairs on-campus and in the institutional environment more broadly (Yin, 2009). Instrument reliability could have been greatly improved by including a survey in addition to the semi-structured interviews. Implementing a strategy to survey the participants would have been beneficial and valuable quantitatively, but it was not attempted due to time constraints. However, an important technique to enhance reliability that is employed by many social scientists conducting case study research is triangulation, which Yin (2009) defines as the "rationale for using multiple sources of evidence" in order to improve "the development of converging lines of inquiry" to support case study research (p. 114-115). While interviews served as the primary instrument and document analysis (through review of institutional websites) as the secondary instrument, interviews were conducted with two very different types of individuals—administrators and students—which allowed for greater coverage of the main questions under investigation. Therefore, at least in one sense, triangulation was utilized to improve reliability in the data collection process.

Researcher bias is also a serious concern in qualitative research (Merriam, 2009). Yin (2009) also warns to avoid attempting case study research with the intention to validate a previously held opinion or idea on a subject matter. It would be impossible for me to be completely objective in researching this topic; there will necessarily be some bias. However, it is important that I share my understanding of and connection to the case study institutions being investigated in this study to best frame the reasons for my involvement in a way that is both honest and informative commensurately. First, as a graduate student at Boston College, pursuing a degree intrinsically tied to the essence of both my professional history and academic studies, I

am without question a product of this environment as much as I am an actor in it. Second, I have been employed at two of the four institutions participating in this study, namely Boston College and the University of Massachusetts Boston, and have formed relationships with certain individuals I met while working there. Third, I have several friends that are international students, have been international students, or are considering becoming international students at a higher education institution in the U.S. My connection to them is profound, as is my professional promise to be a productive and ethical educator who is sensitive to the identities of his students and stands behind what he believes is right. While prone to idealistic thinking, and as I understand there are certain limitations in life as there are in my career, I am keenly aware of the importance of maintaining a professional and ethical approach to my work and strive towards doing so in every working environment in which I find myself. Lastly, and without question, it is most difficult to conduct a study, as Yin (2009) suggests, in which one enters with preconceptions as to how they believe or feel the results should be, as this would be harmful to the logic of a research study, by confounding the experiment with externalized notions of how it should be carried out and what ought to be discovered (or forced to be discovered). However, should the results be questioned in any way, shape, or form, as the researcher, I am completely open to contrary observations and findings.

Organization of the Thesis

The paper is composed of eight chapters. Chapter One begins with an introduction to the purpose and significance of the study. It presents the primary and secondary research questions, and is followed by the mechanics of the investigation, namely the research design, methodology, case and participant selection, data collection and analysis, key definitions, limitations, and reliability. Chapter Two undertakes a review of the literature on the major units of the analysis,

including a close examination of internationalization in U.S. higher education specifically with respect to global student mobility, international student engagement, specifically, and the phenomenon of the Trump administration and his immigration policies. Chapters Three, Four, Five, and Six provide a thorough overview of the case study G.B.A.C.U.s and begin to examine their internationalization priorities, specifically on the aspects concerning engagement of their international student populations. Chapter Seven presents the experiences of the case study institutions—paying special attention to the 'lived experiences' of the international students confronting the immigration policies and anti-foreigner rhetoric of the Trump administration— through the eyes of the study's institutional members. In Chapter Eight, the key findings of the individual institutions are considered in the aggregate. Finally, Chapter Nine concludes the study by presenting a summary of the key findings, providing a list of possible recommendations for the case study institutions, and closing with the limitations to the study, suggestions for further research, and closing remarks.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

The mobility of international students and scholars is a hallmark of universities in the past and the present (Altbach, 2004). Indeed, the movement of these learners and teachers is a defining feature of the global dimension of higher education that largely impacts institutions and society. Globally, mobile students are an essential element framing the international activities of universities and they are increasingly subjects of interest for governments and businesses due to the rapid growth of international student enrollment worldwide in recent years. To understand the full scope and depth of this conversation, we shall begin with a review of important literature on internationalization within a U.S. higher education context in a Trump-era dominated largely by "America-first" politics.

This chapter is framed in three sections. First, the literature will observe the historical development of U.S. engagement with international education and the central role the U.S. continues to play to this day as a magnet for attracting globally mobile students. Second, internationalization in U.S. higher education will be discussed, focusing on two salient dimensions: (1) institutional strategies for internationalization; and (2) international student engagement as a central philosophy guiding the behaviors and actions of universities in relationships with their international students. The final section of the literature review will concentrate on the Trump administration's immigration policies, the travel ban, and the anti-foreigner and anti-immigrant rhetoric as they increasingly impact the international students of U.S. higher education.

The United States and Global Student Mobility

Historical Development

Higher education in the United States—largely as a manifestation of its global interactions through war, trade and communication—is a central player on the global higher education stage (Lucas, 2006; Cohen, 2010; Kramer, 2009). The U.S. framework of higher education may be seen as a successful adaptive merger of two distinct European university archetypes—England's collegiate model and Germany's research university—and elevated quickly as the premier higher education system during the late 20th to 21st centuries (Altbach, 2016b). American institutions play a critical role advancing "...the fundamental work of higher education—the discovery, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge via research, teaching and service…" in which it "...inherently transcends boundaries, engages scholars, teachers, and students across nationalities, and operates across sovereign borders" (ACE, 2011, p. 9). Indeed, it would be quite impossible to preclude the presence of the United States in the world of higher education.

The structure of the modern American university—a complex self-governing and multi-purpose institution—has nearly been unchanged since its inception. Yet its nature has fundamentally altered due to the influence of sophisticated external phenomena—massification, globalization, the privatization of higher education, and global academic rankings, for example—as well as the evolution of student populations and the academy (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). Higher education in the United States is encumbered with numerous challenges, many of which stem from its historical development as "a land of opportunity" and its self-made identity in a global society. The United States emerged from the two world wars of the 20th century transformed as a nation and elevated as a leader of diplomacy. For instance, the establishment of

the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1919 helped facilitate a new role for the U.S. as an international destination for cooperative exchange in higher education. The international activities of American HEIs have expanded in volume and scope since that time.

In the early 20th century, some of the first international activities involved U.S. coordination of exchange programs and cooperative agreements with foreign governments that aided Americans in studying abroad and U.S. participation in foreign delegations to promote peace and mutual understanding (Altbach, 2016a). For example, one of the earliest programs for the training of Chinese scholars in America was funded through an indemnity fund created to redress acts by Americans during the Boxer Rebellion (de Wit, 2002). The Fulbright Program, signed into existence by President Harry Truman in 1946, was a groundbreaking initiative dedicated to promoting bilateral educational exchange and international cooperation, and it continues to serve as a marker for America's participation and leadership in a global society (Bevis & Lucas, 2007). The Fulbright Program has helped fund the education of hundreds of thousands of students and scholars in the fields of education and science from the United States and other countries including Myanmar, China, the Philippines, New Zealand, Turkey, Germany, Australia, South Korea, and Japan. In addition, U.S. Fulbright scholars play a pivotal role harnessing the relationship-building capacities of universities and colleges by helping to connect their home institutions to their research host institutions abroad (O'Hara, 2009). While the success of the Fulbright program since its founding cannot be refuted, some state that many of the international development projects of the 20th century that took place at the national level and involved the cooperation of foreign governments were mainly driven by political motivations, leaving HEIs with a less active role in developing those relationships (Altbach, 2016c).

The creation of these early initiatives led the U.S. to engage further with the notion of mobility as a catalyst for national and economic development. At a time when the United States was emerging from the Cold War, Bok (1986) argued that U.S. higher education suffered from an increasing loss of intellectual activity in academic areas needing international attention and faculty expertise—economic development, foreign security and trade, and international law—emphasizing the urgency for American HEIs to engage in global affairs by addressing the lack of international activities on their campuses and in their classrooms. U.S. engagement in the world of academe is manifest based on its historical development with the phenomenon of student mobility and academic exchanges, but the U.S. continues to face some pressing issues and challenges despite its trail as a global leader of higher education in the contemporary world (Altbach, 2016c; de Wit, 2002).

Present-day U.S. Landscape

Global student mobility is a growing phenomenon today that is constantly changing the landscape of higher education (Llieva & Peak, 2017; Altbach & Engberg, 2014; Bhandari & Blumenthal, 2011). According to NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the incoming mobility of international students and scholars is quite important for the many foreign policy, economic, and educational benefits they provide America as a whole and U.S. higher education specifically (NAFSA, 2003). The financial rationale is significant. The full tuition paid by international students generates additional revenue for universities and can offset the financial costs to American students. Second, the economic rationale—strengthening economic development through international students' purchase of goods and services while enrolled, as well as supporting thousands of U.S. jobs in the process—should not be understated. International students contributed a total of $32.8 billion to the U.S. economy in

2016, in addition to international students benefiting the industry of higher education by creating and supporting 57 percent of all direct jobs within the sector (NAFSA, 2016a). Moreover, California, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas host over half of all international student enrollment in the U.S. (474,474 students in the 2016/17 academic year) and these states were the recipients of 60 percent of all financial contributions by international students ($17.4 billion) in 2016/17 according to the NAFSA's Economic Calculator. Lastly, international students serve to greatly improve U.S. geopolitical relations abroad by advancing the nation's soft power agendas; increasing important means of steering international strategic alliances and networks, nation-building and human infrastructure development; and increasing the nation's technological competitiveness and political influence (Marginson, 2018; Kramer, 2009).

Many observers agree that international students have always been at the center of higher education institutions; consequently, their mobility has naturally shaped the geopolitics of states and the global academic environment for centuries (Altbach, 2016a; Kramer, 2009). U.S. higher education, while a key global example given its traditional position as the top destination country in the world, should not presume its perpetual preeminence as "the unquestioned destination of choice for the world's mobile students" (de Wit & Rumbley, 2008, p. 213). Shifts in the political landscapes of countries, increases in the global refugee populations, and the mass development and delivery of cross-border educational opportunities all have had some impact on global student mobility (OECD, 2004). In turn, universities in the United States engage in a competitive global academic marketplace of students, degree programs, courses, and other education-related products and services, with considerable resources being dedicated to attracting students from developing countries where the demand for U.S. higher education is greatest (Altbach & Knight, 2016, p. 109).

The demand for international education is growing, and research forecasts on student mobility predict a rapid rise from 1.8 million international students in 2000 to 7.2 million international students in 2025 (Böhm, Davis, Meares, & Pearce, 2002). In 2016/17, international students studying at American HEIs increased 3.4 percent over the previous year to nearly 1.8 million, which marks the 11th consecutive year of growth in total numbers of international students (IIE, 2017a). However, comparing international student numbers to total higher education enrollments, the U.S. (along with Japan and China) falls behind other countries in terms of international students as a proportion of total domestic enrollment: 5.3 percent, 4.7 percent, and 1.1 percent, respectively—compared to Australia (23.8 percent), the U.K. (21.1 percent), New Zealand (15.0 percent), and Canada (15.2 percent) (IIE, 2017b).

The latest iteration of the Institute of International Education's *Open Doors* report provides critical insight on international enrollment figures at American colleges and universities for the last academic year (IIE, 2017a). Indeed, higher education institutions and U.S. states are seeing an increase in the number of international students coming to the U.S. to pursue formal academic study. In 2016/17, the top 5 metropolitan areas—New York, NY; Los Angeles, CA; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; and Dallas, TX—hosted approximately one third of all international students in the United States. In the metropolitan area of Boston, MA, for instance, the enrollment of international students has nearly doubled in the last ten years (IIE, 2008; IIE, 20017). While there has been an overall growth of international students enrolled at U.S. HEIs, there have been significant drops, as well, particularly at colleges offering master's and associate degrees, according to the last iteration of the *Open Doors* report. The enrollment drops have been as high as 20 percent at some institutions, which have significantly affected their revenue streams (Redden, 2017a).

While the last ten years have been marked with steady growth in international student numbers, recently in 2015/16, new international enrollment experienced a drop of 3.3 percent across all U.S. institutions and then increased 3.4 percent the following year (IIE, 2017). The changes in enrollment could be attributed to a number of factors. In a recent survey (Hobsons, 2017) of 62,366 prospective students from 196 different countries, three broad conclusions were drawn. First, international students value the sense of feeling welcomed by a country or by an institution. Second, teaching quality was rated higher than rankings as a push factor for studying in another country. In fact, 79 percent of the student survey participants chose the former over the latter as more important for selecting an institution. Third, 85 percent of prospective students use social media as a tool to research universities of interest, which suggests that institutions with diversified social media communications strategies have a statistically higher chance at attracting students than universities that do not employ such strategies (Hobsons, 2017).

While universities have seen positive enrollment growth in recent years, efforts to attract more international students to pursue educational opportunities in the United states could be thwarted by more than an "isolationist political environment in the United States" (Schulmann & Le, 2018, p. 7). Choudaha (2017) argues that the key challenges and issues impacting shifts in global student mobility are complex and multiple and discusses "three waves" of influence that have shaped student recruitment and enrollment over the last 20 years. The first wave may be seen as a conflagration arising from the terrorist attacks of 9/11 on U.S. soil. The second wave involves the Great Recession and the housing market crash that ensued in its wake. The third wave, however, is an interplay of global events, namely, a flattening out of economic surge in the Chinese economy; the Brexit decision by the UK in 2016; and the inauguration of Donald Trump as president of the United States in 2017. The combination of these events, while not impeding

students' decisions to go abroad, have produced an environment where "institutions must innovate not only to grow international student enrollment but also balance it with corresponding support services that advance student success" (Choudaha, 2017, p. 831).

Internationalization 'in' U.S. Higher Education

Altbach (2006) asserts that internationalization "has been part of the work of many universities and academic systems for centuries" (p.123). However, the contemporary realities of modern universities have shifted dramatically since the establishment of Europe's first institutions. And yet, agreement on a definition for the internationalization of higher education remains controversial. De Wit (2002), in an attempt to compare and contrast the terms *international education* and *international higher education*, states the former is a term used commonly by American authors and organizations that tend to overlap and synonymize the definitions, basing them mostly on institutional programs (e.g. curricular and teaching and scholarship and research) and activities (e.g. study abroad, student and scholar mobility, teaching, staff development, etc.), while "internationalization of higher education" is used more commonly by non-American authors encompassing efforts beyond institution-oriented activities. This group views internationalization as a non-static process that needs to be continuously cultivated and nourished (p. 104-116). De Wit (2002) goes on to argue,

> As the international dimension of higher education gains more attention and recognition, people tend to use it in the way that best suits their purpose. While one can easily understand this happening, it is not helpful for internationalization to become a catchall phrase for everything and anything international. A more focused definition is necessary if it is to be understood and treated with the importance that it deserves. Even if there is

no agreement on a precise definition, internationalization needs to be grounded by

parameters if it is to be used to advance higher education (p. 114-115).

Indeed, the concept varies quite significantly depending on the context in which it used as well

on the type of entities who are using it (Altbach, 2016c). Among universities in the U.S., it

could mean an overall strategy for the planning and coordination of international activities on

campus or stand for increasing student participation in study abroad programs and forming new

international partnerships and linkages. Some observers view the international dimension with

the singular means of promoting global citizenship and intercultural learning on their campus by

infusing an international dimension into the curriculum as a measure of quality assurance (Green,

2013). To understand the various dimensions and forms of internationalization, it is important to

place the term in context to see how institutions are making it work for them.

Institutional Strategies for Internationalization

Several scholars have noted the key rationales and strategies steering internationalization

(Knight, 2003; de Wit, 2002; Knight & de Wit, 1995); specifically, the social/cultural, political,

economic, and academic areas may be viewed as overarching categories. Knight (2004)

underscores the importance of recognizing the distinct features of internationalization as either

national or *institutional*, which updates de Wit's (2002) analysis, as the split in contexts very

much addresses present-day realities. Knight (2004) provides a typology of specific *strategies*

for institutions to consider implementing if they wish to go "beyond the idea of international

activities" and consider a more "planned, integrated, and strategic approach" to

internationalization (p.13).

The internationalization of higher education is a direct response to the forces of

globalization (Altbach, 2004a). The United States, indeed, plays a critical role as facilitator,

actor, and key contributor in the transformative landscape of global higher education.

Internationalization takes many shapes, forms, and sizes. Many organizations and institutions

have attempted to build capacity for the international dimension within the field of higher

education by framing its various dimensions as cyclic or reflexive—paradigms that undergo

continuous change while maintaining some structure and integrity and holding true to its original

forms—to produce a systematic way of looking at the field of international education and

developing it. The American Council on Education' (ACE) Center for Internationalization and

Global Engagement (CIGE) created a model for comprehensive internationalization that attempts

to address the phenomenon of internationalization through a systematic configuration of the

various areas constituting key processes. The CIGE model for comprehensive

internationalization is designed to interconnect programs, policies and institutional target areas

(ACE, 2018a). The model focuses on seven main areas:

- articulating an institutional commitment to internationalization through strategic planning, gaining buy-in from stakeholders and formulating an assessment of the target goals;
- having leadership and an administrative structure in place to carry out the main goals;
- developing student learning through engagement with the curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes;
- driving those learning goals by way of faculty who are the best means of transmittance and dissemination of knowledge and fundamental to the entire enterprise;
- enhancing inbound and outbound student mobility and facilitating on-campus engagement through reentry programs for study abroad students and improving credit and program mobility for international students; and

- establishing and sustaining long-term partnerships with institutions, organizations, governments, businesses that can help carry out the mission of the institution and facilitate meaningful learning opportunities and academic excellence.

To substantiate the model, NAFSA's Paul Simon Award is offered each year to the top U.S. institutions demonstrating a comprehensive internationalization plan on their campuses. The award is given with the aim to promote and incentivize institutions to continue carrying out the work of international education in ways that are both intentional and beneficial to students, faculty, and the whole campus community.

Higher education institutions and policymakers are increasingly interested in understanding the growing sector of transnational education, or cross-border education (CBE) and how it can be used to support their missions and policy objectives. Institutions are seeking alternatives like CBE to attract and recruit top talent and to reach an audience that would be otherwise unreachable. The high-growth period of transnational education activity engages multiple stakeholders, including university leaders, governments, faculty, students, and others in the global education marketplace (e.g. multinational academic vendors and proprietors of "twinning" programs, "franchised" institutions, etc.) and explores the challenges, trends, patterns, and policy frameworks that affect the entire landscape of international higher education, globally (Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, 2004). The OECD (2004) argues that implications for universities considering engaging in transnational activities can be far-reaching and urges the need for institutions to understand the main mechanisms driving program and institution mobility in the sense that they might somehow affect existing quality assurance frameworks; for example, looking at whether or not cross-border student mobility can restrict domestic access to higher education in developing countries (p. 246).

There has also been a focus in recent years on curriculum and learning outcomes. This component of internationalization affects the entire learning dimension of higher education, for all students, particularly domestic students. A large effort has been made by U.S. universities to bring international ideas, concepts, modes of teaching, and global perspectives to American classrooms. While efforts to strengthen global learning might be planned and purposeful, the results are oftentimes mixed and can depend heavily on the institutional context. Key variables include how well administrators promote and endorse the effort, and how willing faculty are to adopt a "global perspective" in their teaching approaches or in their approaches to developing their course learning outcomes and syllabi (Brewer & Leask, 2012).

The efforts to raise the awareness of the importance of international education would be short-lived if not for access to reports that document and track how U.S. institutions engage with various international activities and initiatives on their campuses. The CIGE's *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* is a significant study conducted every five years that monitors and records data on hundreds of U.S. colleges and universities to share information on the state of internationalization in U.S. higher education. The 2017 iteration reports several of the following key findings:

- Internationalization is increasingly an administrative-intensive endeavor, coordinated by a single office and/or a senior international officer. More institutions are implementing policies, procedures and planning processes to guide internationalization efforts.

- While student mobility has consistently been a focus of internationalization efforts, the 2016 data indicate an increasingly sharp emphasis on this area relative to other aspects of internationalization. The level of support international students receive once they arrive on campus, however, remains a concern.

- Though the curriculum and co-curriculum take a backseat to student mobility in terms of stated priorities for internationalization, an increasing percentage of institutions are implementing academic and co-curricular policies and programming that facilitate on-campus global learning on a broader scale and among a broader base of students.

- More institutions are offering internationally focused faculty professional development opportunities. However, the faculty-related data raise questions about the recognition of faculty as key drivers of internationalization (Helms, Brojkavic, & Struthers, 2017, p. vii).

In many ways, internationalization can be greatly enhanced by focusing institutional resources and efforts on improving an institutions' infrastructure, such as by raising awareness of and promoting the role of student support and other university services (Kelo, Rogers, & Rumbley, 2010). Indeed, many countries seek to host international students to strengthen the demographic profile of their institutions, raise the prestige and global relevance of their institutions, and supplement their existing incomes with additional funds from student tuition and fees (Altbach & Knight, 2016). However, some argue that more can be done to balance the inputs (e.g. prestige and income-generation, etc.) with the outputs (e.g. student programs and services), such as by "capitalizing on the strengths of [institutions'] existing campus support services as they create strategic and collaborative student engagement programs that can, in turn, generate positive local stories and attitudes" among students and the campus community (Briggs and Ammigan, 2017, p. 1080).

International Student Engagement

It is not uncommon for the mobility experiences of international students, especially at the outset of an academic journey, to cause some homesickness and re-adaptation difficulties to the host culture (Götz, Stieger, Reips, 2018). Institutions attracting international students are

responsible for helping students feel welcomed and well-supported, and national policies and institutional support systems have a major role to play here (Hanassab & Tidwell, 2002; Cho & Yu, 2014; Wongtriat, Ammigan, & Perez-Encinas, 2015). While student support types can vary across institutional contexts, all services, programs, and activities that contribute to the involvement of international students in curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular learning and campus life can, in turn, facilitate these students' social, personal, and academic development (van der Beek & van Aart, 2014). While international students make a significant contribution to campus diversity (Peterson et al, 1999), others have noted the difficulties international students can have forming relationships with domestic student populations (Thomson & Esses, 2016). Green (2013) states "…too many institutions have ramped up their [enrollment] goals without planning for the accompanying investment in student services, language support, or programs to facilitate integration into the local and campus community" (p. 53). Several observers note that student affairs professionals can have an enormous influence on the ways institutions engage their international students in campus life (Ping, 1999). Perez-Encinas & Rodriguez-Pomeda (2017) argue that a higher level of student support services offered to international students may result in greater satisfaction with their educational experience, while others argue that internationalization more broadly can be strengthened by garnering support for increased and enhanced university student services (Kelo et al, 2010). While Perez-Encinas and Rodriguez-Pomeda (2017) report findings on the program-specific and organizational-related services of universities in understanding student needs, they also highlight the importance of improving internationalization strategies by actionable plans to enhance the student experience and to strengthen the international environment on campus. Burdett and Crossman (2012) provide a thematic analysis that underscores engaging with quality assurance

frameworks in Australia's higher education system, a country known globally for its robust national international education strategy. Their analysis of the findings from the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) Cycle 2 report reveal practical applications of support through policy-oriented recommendations that suggest a number of ways Australian institutions approach campus internationalization, such as through international student socio-academic engagement and through improved English language support development. Briggs and Ammigan (2017) suggest a model for developing an effective practice of international student outreach and programming at U.S. higher education institutions that recruit and enroll (with an aim to retain) international students. The model establishes a typology of programs that enable institutions to (1) support international student success; (2) understand government regulations; (3) promote international understanding; and 4) connect with the local community. While no single model fits all institutional types and contexts, Briggs' and Ammigan's (2017) model is quite adaptable, as it considers the international office, a characteristic administrative feature of many institutions hosting international students, as the key locus of support, channeling all activities and services through its doors. In addition, the model is intentional and distinctly collaborative in its approach, as it inter-links multiple university stakeholders and units and encourages and promotes community engagement—an essential spatial element that impacts students' awareness of their own needs and reflects the type of social environment they seek to create and maintain (Bartram, 2007)—as the survey conducted by Hobsons (2017) suggests.

With a potential impact on overall international education exchanges and student mobility, institutions are having to reiterate their commitment, dedication and support towards international engagement and mutual understanding on their respective campuses (Choudaha, 2016a). Offering programming and outreach support to international students during times of

high stress can help them manage the many issues they face, including language and cultural barriers associated with academic and social adjustment, as well as the emotional challenge often connected with the processes of acculturation. Through the implementation of culturally sensitive programming and interventions, effective outreach initiatives have proven to be successful in meeting the various needs of underserved and underrepresented university students (Nolan, Levy, & Constantine, 1996). Such programs can also help strengthen the message that these students are welcomed on their respective campuses.

International student engagement is a critical aspect of internationalization at home, inside and outside of the classroom. However, research on this important area of international student mobility is lacking in the U.S. context. Australia and the U.K. are more involved with these aspects of the experiences and success stories of international students. Ziguras and Harwood (2011) demonstrate through their study on the level of support for international students in Australian institutions that many universities fail to meet the minimum standard of support as stipulated by law. They highlight nine key areas of support and establish good practice principles to aid Australian institutions in improving the type and quality of services they offer their international students.

There are several observers in the U.S. context who argue that support should be seen as an important priority on par with the recruitment and enrollment of international students (Choudaha & Schulmann, 2014; Perez-Encinas & Ammigan, 2016). Indeed, Briggs & Ammigan, (2017) note that

> Inevitably, universities that have a strong focus on recruiting international students for
> revenue generation draw attention to whether they are doing enough to create a

welcoming campus environment for these students and provide a platform for

international programming and cross-cultural engagement (p. 1082).

Briggs and Ammigan (2017) further argue that

The recent introduction of immigration regulations, policies, and compliance standards

by the U.S. government has undoubtedly created a high level of uncertainty and concern

amongst international students studying in the United States (p.1083).

They reiterate the importance of students being proactive and reaching out for assistance when

needed, noting that "these students are probably less exposed to available campus resources and

may not know how to find support that can help them cope and adjust to their new home in the

United States" (p. 1083).

Trump and "America-first" Policies

Trump's inauguration as the 45th President of the United States has gained widespread

attention both nationally and internationally. The *Chronicle of Higher Education*,

InsideHigherEd, and the *New York Times*, among others, have been at the forefront of keeping

the public informed of the latest developments on Trump's immigration and foreign policies, as

they have continued to affect international students and U.S. higher education institutions.

Unsurprisingly, the focus of the majority of these stories relating to international students

concerns their mobility—entry to and exit from the United States— and not as much on how the

current federal policies and anti-immigration rhetoric have affected their learning, social

adjustment, or lives in general.

There are strong indications that international students have been having second thoughts

about coming to or staying in the U.S. since Trump took office, especially after the president's

consecutive public pronouncements during his campaign threatening to "build a wall" on the

U.S./Mexico border (Choudaha, 2016b). However, given how new the current administration is, much of this evidence is based on tracking enrollment figures. We have not had much opportunity to explore the 'lived experiences' of institutions and the international students facing the challenges as a result of the effects of these policies.

After the September 11 (9/11) terrorist attacks on U.S. soil in 2001, visa and immigration regulations were tightened and more severely enforced, which created an environment that was perceived as not as welcoming to foreigners as what had been experienced prior to the attacks. Altbach (2004b) refers to the U.S. as an "obstacle course" for international students wishing to study in the American higher education system (p. 21). After the tragedy of 9/11, NAFSA (2003) released a report calling upon the government to reaffirm its commitment to international student access to U.S. higher education and to continue its service as a global leader, emphasizing

> We cannot know what the future holds, but we do know one thing: There will be other crises. When the next generation's crises occur, and the United States needs friends and allies to confront them, we will look to the world leaders of that time who are being educated in our country today. If we act out of fear and insecurity, rather than confidence and strength, we risk making the future worse, not better, for our country and our world" (p. 3).

The federal government's focus on international students as a potential threat to U.S. security unveiled itself in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. However, as NAFSA (2003) and others have argued, international students represent only a small fraction of the total number of non-immigrants that come to the United States every day. A common question they raise is: 'Should not the focus by the Department of State and Homeland Security be taken off

international students and scholars— whose primary goals in studying at American HEIs is to pursue educational degrees and advance research—and placed on other non-immigrant visa-holders seeking entry to the United States'? Indeed, the processes involved in securing students' visas, consular visits, and immigration approvals is already taxing on students at so many levels of their academic experience; additional red-tape could make it all the more difficult to begin an education in the United States.

This year, the Pew Research Center released a study (Ruiz & Budiman, 2018) that shows evidence of significant growth in the stay rate of international students enrolled in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields who remain in the U.S. post-graduation to participate in the U.S. federal work authorization program—Optional Practical Training (OPT). According to the study, the U.S. experienced a 400 percent increase in STEM field graduates from 2008 to 2016 (Ruiz & Budiman, 2018). In addition, of the 1.5 million graduates following up their degrees with OPT, nearly 75 percent of students came from Asia, including India (441,400), China (313,500), South Korea (90,800), Taiwan (52,700), Japan (39,400), and Nepal (23,500). The study shows a 104 percent increase in international students enrolled on F-1 visas in U.S. colleges and universities between 2008 and 2016—the majority of which occurred after the global economic crisis in 2008—compared to only a 3.4 percent increase of total growth in U.S. college and university enrollment for the same period. The data show that there is a clear demand for employment opportunities, indicated by the steady growth of H-1B visa approvals— a distinct visa category that the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services applies to individuals who work in a specialty occupation (USCIS, 2018)—and of OPT, which highlight one important dimension of the current debate on international student enrollment. Indeed, the data show increases in the number of skilled immigrant workers to fill the growing

gaps in the U.S. labor force, especially in industries requiring technical expertise (Choudaha & de Wit, 2014). Most recently, however, the Trump administration has threatened to restrict visas to Chinese students seeking to study in U.S. colleges and universities (Redden, 2018). The threats have not been operationalized, but if they do become policy, the impact on the U.S. could be extensive—considering the large population of Chinese students studying in the U.S.— extending from its colleges and universities to even the labor market and technology sector. Moreover, the Trump administration has suggested revisions to the OPT program, which could have far-reaching implications for all international students looking at the U.S. for academic study and work opportunities.

Trump in many ways foreshadowed an intention to put America's interests before all other countries', especially with respect to immigration and other related policy areas, from the start of the transition between his administration and that of his predecessor, Barack Obama. In the president's inaugural address (Trump, 2017a) to the nation and to the world, Trump stated

> We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this moment on, it's going to be America First. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength (para. 36-40).

Trump's "America-first" agenda —as represented in his inaugural address—prioritizes immigration, foreign policy, and trade as key policy areas of interest to his administration. His speech emphasizes American interests as preponderant and preeminent. Trump's

pronouncements on immigration and foreign policy became manifest during his first two weeks in office when he issued a travel ban restricting entry into the United States for foreign nationals from seven Muslim-majority countries. This was followed by a revised proclamation (travel ban 2.0), introduced two months later, after several U.S. courts issued preliminary injunctions blocking the first ban's enforcement (Redden, 2017b). The current version of the ban—in its third iteration—went into effect on September 24, 2017 and restricts U.S. entry to varying degrees for people from Iran, Libya, North Korea, Somalia, Syria, Venezuela, and Yemen (ACE, 2018b). According to Executive Order 13780, Trump (2017b) asserts

> It is the policy of the United States to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks and other public-safety threats. Screening and vetting protocols and procedures associated with visa adjudications and other immigration processes play a critical role in implementing that policy. They enhance our ability to detect foreign nationals who may commit, aid, or support acts of terrorism, otherwise pose a safety threat, and they aid our efforts to prevent such individuals from entering the United States (para.5).

On the one hand, many proponents of the Trump administration supportive of the travel ban agree extreme vetting and immigration screening of foreign nationals is necessary to protect U.S. borders (Lewin, n.d). However, on the other hand, many U.S. HEIs and higher education groups have criticized the third ban claiming that the debarment threatens the many currently enrolled international students and negatively affects HEIs' ability to attract international students to the U.S. (*Trump v. Hawaii*, 2018). Indeed, the travel ban has impacted the mobility of students, scholars, and researchers from several of the targeted countries, particularly students from Iran, which is one of the top 25 countries of origin for international students in the United States, accounting for over 12,500 students (IIE, 2017a). However, Rose-Redwood and Rose-

Redwood (2017) argue, "measuring the impact of the travel ban in terms of enrollment figures alone is insufficient. The emotional stress, fear, and uncertainty that many international students are currently experiencing is simply beyond measure" (p. 3). Despite the small share of international students in U.S. higher education (5 percent in 2016/17) (IIE, 2017b), the Trump administration's immigration policies and politicized rhetoric on foreign policy—emanating from an 'America-first' perspective and position—could have a significant impact on the educational and economic benefits international students bring when they choose America as their destination for study (NAFSA, 2016a). U.S. higher education institutions and their leaders—cognizant of the rapid changes in the global academic environment—are beginning to address these critical challenges on their own terms and in their own contexts.

There have also been major developments over the past few years that have led to a rise of nationalism around the world—not just in the U.S.—turning the logic of many countries against the rationale for improving the inward flows of people into their countries. This might have first been felt with Brexit in the United Kingdom in 2016, and more recently in the United States under the Trump administration (Altbach & de Wit, 2017). Specifically, Trump's travel ban in its many iterations is just one issue under scrutiny. The perceptions alone caused by the anti-immigrant and anti-foreigner rhetoric might have created far-reaching consequences for international students studying in the U.S. in both the short and long-term.

In this political environment is it still reasonable to continue to encourage universities to internationalize their campuses? What barriers and discomforts exist for currently enrolled international students as they endure the stresses of the U.S. political environment and how are institutions responding to address their international students' concerns and their needs? Indeed, the answers are complex and vary greatly from institution to institution. The next chapter looks

at how four institutions in the Greater Boston-area have made sense of these important issues on their campuses and examines the approaches they have taken to address their students' worries and concerns about the state of the current U.S. political climate as well as asking themselves how it has impacted their own global engagement efforts.

Chapter Three

Babson College

Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to begin to address the study's primary research question according to the institutional context of Babson College, i.e., to what extent have the policies on travel and related mandates on immigration issued by the United States federal administration between the president's inauguration and May 2018—including, but not limited to its executive branch—impacted Babson Colleges' internationalization priorities, specifically those relating to the provision of programmatic and organizational strategies supporting international student engagement? To address the research question, the first part of the analysis presented in this chapter aims to provide an institutional overview of Babson College in relation to its internationalization goals and priorities. Given the centrality of understanding the experiences and challenges of Babson College and its international students since the beginning of the Trump administration in January 2017, this chapter draws upon a number of Babson's web pages and university documents to illustrate important details about the nature and scope of its international activities and student support services.

Institutional Overview

Babson College is one of the premier institutions providing entrepreneurship education in the United States. The Babson Institute was established in 1919 in Wellesley, Massachusetts, by its founder Roger Babson, a successful economist and businessman, and officially became a college in 1969. Wellesley is a small town of about 27,982 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census) in Norfolk County, Massachusetts, located in the residential suburbs to the west of Boston.

Babson College is a small, private, not-for-profit institution, accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (Babson College, 2018a). The institution enrolled approximately 3,100 students in 2015/16, 880 of which were graduate students (NCES, 2018). Babson's undergraduate school offers a robust business education curriculum fusing liberal arts and applied business programs with ample co-curricular opportunities. Signature features of Babson's academic credentials include its F.W. Olin Graduate School of Business, conferring MS and MBA degrees, and an Executive Education program focused on seasoned professionals seeking to grow their business acumen and enhance their skill-sets. Nearly 90 percent of Babson's faculty hold doctoral degrees, and many are well-accomplished business leaders, scholars, researchers, and artists (Babson, 2018a).

While the college specializes in entrepreneurship education, it also houses several other academic areas. The curriculum is divided into 10 faculties, including accounting and law; arts and humanities; economics; entrepreneurship; finance; history and society; management; marketing; math and science; and lastly, technology, operations, and information management. The college incorporates into its combined curriculum the "SEERS" principles of Entrepreneurial Thought and Action and Social, Environmental, Economic Responsibility and Sustainability in order to realize its mission through academic advancement—to "educate entrepreneurial leaders who create economic and social value everywhere" (Babson, 2018a). Drawing from multiple community and alumni resources, Babson makes supporting its students convenient and accessible. The college is home to four centers and three institutes. For example, the Center for Women's Entrepreneurial Leadership was launched in 2000 and is dedicated to the advancement of women entrepreneurial leaders worldwide by striving to provide

opportunities and programs to connect alumnae, women faculty, and business women with global-minded organizations and communities. The Institute for Family Entrepreneurship supports students and their families, including small businesses, foundations, and start-ups, connecting them to Babson resources and intelligence. Babson's entrepreneurial reach is extensive and offers many opportunities for students to gain real-world experiences through its centers, research and innovation labs, and faculty.

Babson's Internationalization Strengths and Priorities

There are several unique 'internationalized' features that make Babson an especially interesting case study for this project. A large part of its mission is dedicated to not only developing entrepreneurial leaders of the U.S., but those of the world as well. The high-senior international adviser of the college, Dr. Blaire Crane, states Babson's goal clearly—"to be the preeminent institution in entrepreneurship education, globally," citing the importance of honoring its mission—"we're not going to educate entrepreneurial leaders who create social and economic value everywhere, which is our mission, if we're not able to have a multinational campus, which currently brings in students from 80 plus countries." Babson's president, Dr. Kerry Healey, reinforces Babson's grand vision of being at the forefront of global change by stating "today, everyone, everywhere, is talking about entrepreneurship. Increasingly, the world is recognized and valuing Entrepreneurship of All Kinds® as a powerful force for solving the economic, social, and environmental issues confronting our world" (Babson College, 2018a). Moreover, Dr. Crane sees "internationalization as a way to bolster what the institution's mission is," which fundamentally requires several imperatives of internationalization to be operationalized, many of which are already key strengths of Babson.

Babson is the first private college to pursue a Global Entrepreneur in Residence Program (GEIR). Through the GEIR program, Babson College will help qualified international graduates from Babson and other area colleges/programs remain in Massachusetts, continue to build their high potential startup businesses, and bring new, high-skill jobs to the region. "Babson is pleased to establish a Global Entrepreneur in Residence Program in order to attract, support, and retain talented entrepreneurs who can provide valuable contributions to the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Massachusetts," says Babson College's president Kerry Healey. "Babson values the perspectives and experiences of international entrepreneurs, and our new GEIR program is yet another effort by the College to advance economic, social, and personal development through global entrepreneurship education" (as cited in Chmura, 2016, para. 5). The initiative started in 2016 with the aim to host up to 10 GEIRs who want to accelerate their companies and qualify for a cap-exempt H-1B visa. Entrepreneurs with viable startups who are currently starting or about to start the Optional Practical Training (OPT) period of their F-1 visa and want to apply for the H-1B visa also are encouraged to apply to GEIR. The GIER program is one example of a conscious effort by the institution to create a symbiotic relationship among its students to promote a global learning environment locally.

Babson has many international programs and co-curricular opportunities. For example, another one of its global programs—the Babson Global Fellows—is a cohort-based program for undergraduate students who are passionate about global issues, language study, and international learning experiences. The Global Scholars Program awards need-based scholarships to highly qualified international applicants. To be considered for the programs, international students must demonstrate financial need by completing the College Scholarship Service (CSS) Profile administered by the College Board. The international students selected receive a grant covering

the total cost of their tuition expenses for the entire degree program. Additional funding for cost

of living expenses (e.g. housing, food, books, supplies, etc.) is available to students who

demonstrate a high-level of need. Students participating in the program receive extra support,

including (1) a pre-orientation program; (2) a first-year scholars leadership retreat; (3) a

mentoring program; and (4) social and cultural events. In general, the provision of financial aid

for undergraduate international students is highly limited in U.S. higher education (NAFSA,

2017b); however, Babson has made an effort to provide some scholarship opportunities (e.g.

need and merit-based) to its international students (Babson College, 2018b).

One distinguishing feature of Babson's global footprint is its international student

enrollment. While Babson's overall student enrollment was just over 3,000 in 2016 (NCES,

2018), its international student population at the undergraduate level for the same period was

nearly one third, or 28 percent, of its total. This is surprising and significant considering that

total enrollment in most U.S. HEIs is comprised of less than 10 percent international students

(IIE, 2017). At the graduate level, as much as 85 percent of students are international, and over

50 percent are enrolled in full-time MBA programs. According to an annual Babson College

report, Babson experienced a nearly 100 percent increase in its undergraduate international

student population and nearly 60 percent growth in total international student enrollment over the

last 10 years (Babson College, 2017). These are strong growth figures over a short period of

time for any institution, but the numbers are particularly prominent in the Babson case. Babson

only recently began hosting more than 1000 international students, achieving these numbers for

the first time four years ago in 2013/14 (IIE, 2013). *Forbes* magazine has ranked Babson for two

consecutive years (i.e., 2016/17 and 2017/18) as the number one destination for international

students. The ranking is based on five key indicators, including school quality (50 percent); the

total percentage of international students (25 percent); the growth of the international student population (five percent); and academic programs of interest to international students. While Babson's international enrollment might be one of the most visible and impressive aspects of the institution's global footprint, there are other notable dimensions of its internationalization plan.

The curriculum and co-curriculum are two other critical components of Babson's international agenda. Babson College offers a dynamic curriculum for students seeking a career in global entrepreneurship, known as Babson Global. If one follows the trail where 'Global' has been deployed throughout the Babson College website, one will begin to see evidence of how global activities and initiatives are supported in earnest by the institution. It would appear that a central goal of the college is to make sure the students are best equipped to handle the challenges and realities of the rapidly changing business and entrepreneurial environment globally. Thus, making sure students have internships, experiential learning activities, and other types of opportunities available to engage with—both at Babson and abroad—in addition to an entrepreneur-focused curriculum is an institutional priority. Dr. Crane states "two-thirds of our students will have had an international experience through Babson College at the undergraduate level [by the time they graduate]." Furthermore, if one looks at the class of 2017, for example, "over 50 percent participated in a credit-bearing education abroad program and if you add the non-credit bearing...another 15 percent or so," which demonstrates one way the institution's leadership intends to prepare students for the global knowledge society. At the graduate level, infusing an international dimension is harder for international students since attending Babson is their 'international experience.' However, the college has taken steps to internationalize its academic programs to some degree by requiring students to take international courses and to participate in other international opportunities at the graduate school.

In terms of research, the Babson College faculty are engaged in several ways. One particularly noteworthy example is through the establishment of its Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)—a successful research program initiated as a joint venture between Babson College and the London Business School and housed in the Arthur M. Blank Center for Entrepreneurship. The center was established in 1999 and serves as a focal point of entrepreneurial activity for the campus. There are nodes in nearly 100 different countries tracking the behavior and patterns of how entrepreneurship is taking shape globally.

Babson College's commitment to global engagement is demonstrated by the relative ease of locating information on international students and global programs via the main page of its website. Through the admission link "international students" are featured prominently as a main category and complemented with links on the student visa process, living in Boston, and U.S. immigration regulations. Alternatively, accessing "Global" via the link on Babson's main home page—"About Babson"—one finds the Glavin Office of Multicultural and International Education, which serves as the locus of all global activities in which Babson engages, including education abroad, international student and scholar services, and multicultural programs (Babson, 2018a). The Glavin Office houses the International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) unit, a key division comprised of four staff members with roles varying from overseeing direction of the office to managing individual student cases and advising on immigration-related matters, such as OPT and U.S. regulatory and compliance measures. The office's main functions include providing adequate immigration to international students on F-1 and J-1 visas, helping students in the U.S. acculturation process by introducing them to resources at Babson and the Boston area, and serving the educational mission of the institution as an intercultural auxiliary

unit. Much of the work the ISSS assumes as priority is relaying accurate information on employment and how to best maintain status as an international student.

This chapter focused on providing a broad picture of the international activities and strategies of Babson College. The next chapter will proceed in a similar fashion by looking more closely at the institutional environment and internationalization goals and priorities at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

Chapter Four

The University of Massachusetts Boston

Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to begin to address the study's primary research question according to the institutional context of the UMB— To what extent have the policies on travel and related mandates on immigration issued by the United States federal administration between the president's inauguration and May 2018—including, but not limited to its executive branch—impacted Greater Boston-area colleges and universities' internationalization priorities, specifically those relating to the provision of programmatic and organizational strategies supporting international student engagement? To address the research question, the first part of the analysis presented in this chapter aims to provide an institutional overview of the UMB in the context of its internationalization goals and priorities. In order to understand the challenges faced at the UMB since Trump took office in January 2017 and to better understand the type of impact federal-level policies and positions, such as the travel ban and anti-immigration rhetoric, have had on its international student population, a number of the UMB's web pages and university documents are examined. The key objective of this chapter is to illustrate the important details about the nature and scope of the institution's international activities and university services supporting engagement with its international students.

 Institutional Overview

The University of Massachusetts Boston is a four-year, public research institution conferring bachelor's, master's, and doctoral (research/scholarship and professional practice) degrees and is the Boston metropolitan area's only public research university. The UMB was the third campus established in the UMass system—a model five-campus public research university

system known across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the quality of its academic

programs, excellence in research, and mission to serve the public and the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts. The system traces its roots back to 1863 when it was first established at Amherst

under the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges Act as the Massachusetts Agricultural College. The

university system was officially designated the University of Massachusetts in 1947, opening the

Boston campus in 1964, which was preceded by the Medical School in 1962 (University of

Massachusetts, 2018a).

 The UMB is also the third largest of the five campuses, enrolling approximately 16,400

students in 2016 (University of Massachusetts, 2018b). In addition, the UMB is one of the

system's largest employers, ranking just below UMass Amherst and the Medical School in total

employees. The UMass Boston campus ran into some fiscal trouble a few years ago, amassing a

nearly $30 million deficit. An audit release in November 2017 showed years of capital

mismanagement and unscrupulous budgeting processes that have led to mass layoffs and

financial restructuring (Krantz, 2017). The UMB experienced a slight enrollment decline of 2.5

percent in the fall of 2017 (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2018c), which could have been

attributed, at least in part, to the campus's financial predicament.

 Despite its financial difficulties, the university recognizes the tremendous value of

teaching, research, and service—acknowledged fully in its vision statement for 2025—and

pledges allegiance to the principles upon which it was founded by continuing to serve as a

teaching and research institution and as "an economic and cultural engine for the

Commonwealth...to prepare students to succeed in a transnational world" (University of

Massachusetts Boston, 2018d). The UMB's mission is an extension of that vision—to uphold

a dynamic culture of teaching and learning, and a special commitment to urban and global engagement. Our vibrant, multi-cultural educational environment encourages our broadly diverse campus community to thrive and succeed. Our distinguished scholarship, dedicated teaching, and engaged public service are mutually reinforcing, creating new knowledge while serving the public good of our city, our commonwealth, our nation, and our world.

The institution's values of inquiry, creativity, discovery; transformation; diversity and inclusion; engagement; environmental stewardship and sustainability; economic and cultural development; and an urban commitment are core tenets of its mission and purpose. The UMB's mission is especially nuanced, while recognizing and acknowledging a responsibility to serve local, state, national, and global interests. There is a special emphasis in the vision and mission of the institution on the global dimension, which manifests itself in various ways at the university.

The UMB is home to 11 colleges and schools, spanning a wide range of disciplines, including the liberal arts, business management, language studies, nursing and health sciences, public administration, education and human development, policy studies, and environmental studies. In 2017, the UMB ranked in the *U.S. News and World Report's Top 100* list for graduate studies in rehabilitation counseling (No. 24), master's in nursing (No. 59), Doctor of Nursing Practice (No. 62), education (No. 74), public affairs (No. 77), and clinical psychology (No. 87) (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2018e). The Venture Development Center (VDC) is an incubation hub for business innovation that has launched 35 start-up companies and earned $57.1 million in research funding for the fiscal year 2017. The campus supports more than 50 interdisciplinary research institutes and centers.

The economic challenges endured by the institution stem, in part, from its 25-year master plan, which envisages a redeveloped and expanded campus that paves a "pathway to excellence" in academics and research for future generations (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2018d). The plan has already realized several noteworthy accomplishments, including the construction and opening (in 2015) of the Integrated Sciences Complex—a signature state-of the-art academic building with labs supporting undergraduate research and faculty scholarship in the hard sciences, including biology, environment, earth and ocean sciences, physics and chemistry and cancer research. University Hall, the UMB's newest academic building, serves as an expanded academic space for classrooms, chemistry laboratories, the performing arts department, staff offices, and a cafe to be utilized by the university community.

Given the overall prominence of the UMB in the Greater Boston-area as the only public research institution, it takes on a relatively large burden of institutional responsibilities to serve the needs of the Boston community, the UMass system, and any external stakeholders that demonstrate a desire to be part of the UMass legacy. To understand the institution's goal of attaining recognition as a global research institution of the 21st century, it is especially important to understand the size and scope of its internationalization goals and priorities.

UMB Internationalization Strengths and Priorities

The UMB as a research institution is particularly well-suited to the Boston area. Its recognized research in the sciences has attracted international talent from all over the world. The locus of international activity for the campus is situated in the Office of Global Programs (OGP). The mission of the OGP is "to facilitate UMass Boston's processes of strategically integrating the dimensions of international (global), transnational (borderless), transcultural, and intercultural, and national trends and policies into the curriculum, teaching, research, community

engagement, and service functions of the university" (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2018f). A team of 6 international education professionals leads the office in providing support for students and faculty in multiple capacities. The OGP houses the International Scholar and Student Support Office (ISSO)—a unit responsible for serving the needs of the UMB's international student population—and a Study Abroad office which facilitates the outgoing mobility of UMass students, faculty, and staff. The OGP shares the space with Navitas—a UMB partner and pathway program provider that offers international students an opportunity to study in the U.S. when they might not be admitted through direct application channels. In addition, Navitas supports the university by using its extensive network and financial resources to recruit international students. Students enroll in a Navitas-based program for their first year to aid in building skills in English and academic-writing, and once they graduate enter into the second year of the bachelor's degree program. Navitas creates programs and activities for their own students and provides specialized academic advising and student support. While Navitas students participate in a special cohort, they are students of UMB like all international students and have access to all accompanying resources and services.

The university exhibits strengths in many aspects of internationalization. The UMB enrolled 2,427 international students in 2016/17 (IIE, 2017a) but experienced an increase of nearly 3 percent in total numbers of international students from 2013 to 2017. The UMB's international student population in 2016 represented 13 percent of its total student population (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2018g). In 2015/16, 165 degree-seeking students participated in credit-bearing education abroad programs in both Europe and Asia. Of particular importance to the UMB case is its student demographic profile, whose majority is comprised of underrepresented minority students, including African American (18 percent), Asian (14

percent), Hispanic (16 percent), students representing 2 or more races (3 percent), Cape Verdean (less than 1 percent), and Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, or Alaskan Native (less than 1 percent); international students as well as students not reporting race and ethnicity are excluded from this count (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2018g). These data indicate UMB's commitment to student diversity, which naturally creates a unique on-campus environment with the potential to shape inclusivity and multicultural learning. Despite whether or not there is administrative and academic coordination to promote a global learning environment, the natural character of the UMB's student diversity makes such an effort much more feasible.

A high-senior international advisor, Dr. Taylor Uriel-Mitchell Barns, believes a major part of the UMB's global agenda and strength is underscored in its academic programming and present among its faculty. He/she states the following:

> We have programs at the graduate level focused on global public policy, we have a school for global inclusion and social development, and we have undergraduate programs in global affairs...the school for the environment focuses on global environmental issues pertaining and relating to climate change...they were able to receive a $3.1 million grant from the NSF focused on the impact of coastal climate on the population of the Horn of Africa and compared that to what's going on in Boston.

The rich plethora of programs offered at the undergraduate and graduate levels is evidence of the university's commitment to build and sustain the university's public-serving mission. The UMB's goals of internationalization are also exhibited by its 'portfolio' of institutional collaborations and its goals for partnership development, which currently include over 80 partner universities and programs in countries all over the world, including Australia, Brazil, Canada,

China, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Taiwan, West Indies, Vietnam, and several others.

To contribute to the development of academic empowerment and achievement, the OGP also promotes faculty, student, and staff engagement through a special seed fund to encourage global teaching and learning through internationalized programming, research collaboration, study abroad opportunities, and participation in international conferences. To be considered for funding, prospective participants must submit an application that outlines their course/program proposal, including the purpose and list of specific activities the funding will support, a clear strategy for recruiting students, and the desired impact or learning outcomes. Funding awards are competitive, ranging from $1,500 for a course to $3,500 for an entire program. The seed fund was developed to directly promote faculty exposure to and engagement with internationalization, specifically with respect to curricular development.

Within the schools and colleges, Dr. Barns is aware of and supports the drive to internationalize by enhancing global learning and by "developing graduate research activities and graduate education and training opportunities for students as well as staff and others." The UMB's intentional efforts and innovative approaches to developing the international dimensions of its research, teaching, and learning were recognized by NAFSA in 2016 when the university was one of four U.S. institutions selected to receive the Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization (NAFSA, 2016b).

While Chapter Four observes the institutional context of the UMB and its international activities and strategies, the next chapter will focus on the institutional characteristics of Boston College and its internationalization agenda.

Chapter Five

Boston College

Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to begin to address the study's primary research question according to the institutional context of BC— To what extent have the policies on travel and related mandates on immigration issued by the United States federal administration between the president's inauguration and May 2018—including, but not limited to its executive branch— impacted Greater Boston-area colleges and universities' internationalization priorities, specifically those relating to the provision of programmatic and organizational strategies supporting international student engagement? Therefore, this chapter begins to address the research question by providing an overview of BC institutional context and its internationalization goals and priorities. A number of BC's web pages and university documents are referenced in the following sections in order to illustrate the nature and scope of the BC's international activities and services supporting its international students and fostering a global learning environment.

Institutional Overview

The history of Boston College can be traced back to its founding by the Society of Jesus in 1863. The Jesuit tradition is at the core of Boston College, embedded as much into the curriculum as it is in student life on-campus. The four-year research institution into which BC has evolved began as a small college with a strong liberal arts education at its foundation, focused on the classics—Greek and Latin—and philosophy. At the beginning of the 20th century, the college moved from its then South End location in Boston to its current location in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences was inaugurated in

1925 followed by additional graduate programs and professional schools, including Law School, the College of Advancing Studies, the Graduate School of Social Work, and the Wallace E. Carroll School of Management. With this growth over time, BC came to take on a more "university" character. Father William P. Leahy succeeded Father J. Donald Monan as president in 1996 after Monan served a nearly quarter-century term. The university has undergone tremendous expansion in terms of its physical size— acquiring 43 acres in Brighton in a deal struck in 2004 with the Archdiocese of Boston and purchasing another 18 acres of land in Brighton three years later. In 2007, a $1.6 billion project revealed a 10-year plan to add 100 new faculty members, a recreation complex, new residence halls and athletic facilities. Successful fundraising campaigns and savvy investments have contributed to tripling the university's endowment since 1996, from $590 million to $1.8 billion (today $2.4 billion). In 2012, Boston College celebrated its 150th anniversary and its legacy as a preeminent center of academic excellence (Boston College, 2018a).

The university recognizes the importance its religious tradition plays in guiding its future as an educational institution in the 21st century. The university's mission (Boston College, 2018b) states this simply—

> Boston College builds upon its traditions. It seeks to be the national leader in the liberal arts; to fulfill its Jesuit, Catholic mission of faith and service; to continue to develop model programs to support students in their formation; and to seek solutions—as researchers, educators, leaders, and caregivers—that directly address the world's most urgent problems.

The institution's commitment to its educational activities and its future role as a leader in the U.S. higher education community, especially within its own community of Jesuit-affiliated

institutions, is acknowledged and reinforced by institutional leaders like Father Leahy. In one address to BC, Leahy states, "The history of Boston College is a narrative of response to society's call. In 1863, that call came from an immigrant community that sought a Jesuit education to foster social mobility" (Leahy, n.d.). He goes on to say that

> Boston College endeavors to educate a new generation of leaders—men and women who will be capable of shaping the future with vision, justice, and charity—with a sense of calling, with concern for all the human family. We pursue this challenge because it is a worthy goal for any university, but particularly for Boston College, a university uniquely suited to be a beacon of hope and light for all…(Leahy, n.d.).

Reflecting its nature, character, and mission, BC released its latest strategic plan in the fall of 2017 to address its future opportunities and challenges over the next decade. The 10-year plan focuses on four key directions: (1) re-conceptualize its liberal arts education, raise the quality and engagement of bolstering faculty involvement, and capitalize on its academic merits and programs; (2) enhance student, faculty, and staff formation while strengthening its institutional culture; (3) contribute to finding solutions to society's most pressing problems by expanding support for scholarship and research; and (4) increase the institution's presence in Boston, the United States, and around the globe. The part of the strategic plan that concerns the primary focus of this paper—internationalization and engagement with international students—is found within the fourth strategic direction and will be discussed in further detail in the section below.

BC's Internationalization Strengths and Priorities

In terms of BC's history as an educational institution and its institutional mission and vision as articulated by its president, BC's position as a private and religious institution makes it a particularly special case to include in this study. An emphasis on serving 'the world' by

addressing its problems is clearly evident in the BC mission. While a comprehensively-oriented intentional agenda might have been weaker previously, there has been a conscious effort to improve the institution's 'global-mindset' by developing a clearer internationalization strategy with articulated goals and rationales for engagement. The Global Engagement (GE) Committee was formed to raise the global profile of BC, from which its members were appointed by the university's president in 2017 to assess the landscape of BC's international activities as they stand currently and to identify the key assets and infrastructural needs requisite to building upon and enhancing the institution's mission. A number of faculty and administrators make up its key members, while Dr. Alberto Godenzi, special advisor to the president for global engagement, and Dr. Jennifer Erickson, a professor of the political science department and international studies program, serve as co-chairs on the GE Committee. Dr. Alberto Godenzi states

> Success in global engagement is a matter of investing resources, but more than that, of being intentional and far-sighted in how you craft that engagement. It means, for example, integrating global education into curriculum, research, and outreach programs for undergraduate, graduate, professional courses and programs. It also means making sure all stakeholders—staff, as well as administrators, faculty, students, alumni and friends of BC—understand the impact global engagement will have on the institution (as cited in Smith, n.d.).

The intentionality behind BC's re-envisioned global strategy stands out, as this is the first consolidated and institution-wide effort initiated and supported by the senior leadership to effect some change to the international dimensions of the campus beyond student mobility.

Mid-senior international advisor, Mx. Blake Campanotta, who also serves on the GE Committee, states

We need to improve in some areas, and again, we need to make this an obvious

priority...the Jesuit connection is a strength but in terms of actual internationalization

priorities, we need to be working more closely with our international alumnae, which we

don't do…and selfishly, to get some financial aid for undergraduate international

students. You don't think when you come on to the BC campus this is an international or

global [place] right away...so...

The imperative for the GE Committee, in terms of developing the initiatives the university has

put forth and outlined in the fourth strategic direction of its 10-year strategy statement, is to

improve the organization, coordination, and advertisement of all of its international and global

activities across the campus.

The fourth strategic direction (Boston College, 2018d) specifically states the following:

Boston College commits itself in the coming years to increasing its presence and impact

through creative partnerships on the local and national levels, increased outreach to

international students, recruitment of faculty with international backgrounds, and the

development of programs that promote global cooperation.

The institution's internationalization goals refer specifically to:

- Enhancing the undergraduate curriculum to incorporate greater attention to global issues and

  concerns and to include international perspectives in courses and programs;

- Making available the expertise of its nationally recognized schools of law, education, social

  work, nursing, theology and ministry, and management to specific challenges in the

  Greater Boston area, particularly those with possible application nationally and

  internationally;

- Maintaining and expanding its commitment to educating leaders for the Church in the United

    States and in various parts of the world; and

- Developing a more effective structure to promote and coordinate international initiatives

    (Boston College, 2018d).

The institution's strategic plan lays out four corresponding initiatives to achieve each of the goals

stated above. Boston College and the GE Committee sponsored and hosted two town meeting-

style events in the spring of 2018 to facilitate discussion on global activities within the BC

community. Moreover, the university created a website dedicated exclusively to global

engagement to promote its plans and engage its students, faculty, and staff, among other

university stakeholders.

   The most prominent offices on campus that provide international services and global

opportunities, recognized most immediately by both domestic and international students, are the

Office of International Programs (OIP) and the Office of International Students and Scholars

(OISS). The OIP is dedicated to assisting students seeking educational and experiential

opportunities abroad. As part of the Division of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, the OIP (1)

collaborates with faculty and staff across the university to advise over 1,200 students

participating in academic year and faculty-led summer programs; (2) provides ongoing support

for students participating in international programs, from pre-departure to re-entry; (3) processes

academic credit for approved semester and OIP summer programs abroad; (4) administers the

McGillycuddy-Logue Fellows Program in coordination with the McGillycuddy-Logue Center for

Undergraduate Global Studies; (5) provides academic and administrative support for over 200

international exchange students annually from partner institutions; and (6) organizes activities

that promote the internationalization of the university.

Conversely, the OISS is a much smaller unit, comprised of four people, including a director at the helm accompanied by a support staff. This team provides advice, programs, and services to almost 2,600 international students—undergraduate, graduate, and exchange students—faculty, and research scholars from over 96 countries (the enrollment of international students at BC is 1,751 as of fall 2017). Specific services include international student orientation; immigration administration support and advising; international student and family support programs; on- and off-campus employment advising; intercultural competency advising and counseling; and publications and additional resources.

The university has seen steady growth in its international student population since the 1980s. From 2007/08 to 2017/18, total international enrollment (excluding students in practical training, research scholars, and dependents), grew nearly 127 percent. In the last five years, BC has experienced a 37 percent growth in the enrollment of international students (Boston College, 2018c). A growing international student population is one feature of the BC's engagement efforts with internationalization. In terms of academic staff, across all of BC's schools, colleges, centers, and institutes, 278 faculty and research scholars hail from 44 countries spanning from South America and the Caribbean to Asia, Africa, and Europe. These faculty are largely situated in the departments of chemistry, philosophy, law, theology, economics, computer science, and accounting; the vast majority of international faculty, nearly 60 percent, are housed in the Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences (Boston College, 2018c).

This chapter presented the institutional features that define the BC case. Chapter Six will look more closely at Bentley and the international activities that inform its institutional context.

Chapter Six

Bentley University

Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to begin to address the study's primary research question according to the institutional context of Bentley— To what extent have the policies on travel and related mandates on immigration issued by the United States federal administration between the president's inauguration and May 2018—including, but not limited to its executive branch—impacted Greater Boston-area colleges and universities' internationalization priorities, specifically those relating to the provision of programmatic and organizational strategies supporting international student engagement? To address the research question, this chapter draws upon a number of Bentley's web pages and university documents to begin an analysis of the institutional context of Bentley and its international goals and priorities, illustrating the nature and scope of the institution's engagement with internationalization with respect to engagement with its international students and campus-wide community.

Institutional Overview

Bentley University is a four-year private institution in Waltham, Massachusetts. The institution was founded in 1917 by Harry C. Bentley as the Bentley School of Accounting and Finance. In 1961, the school began offering a bachelor's degree in accounting and changed its name to Bentley College of Accounting and Finance (Bentley University, 2018a). Five years later the college became accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) and five years after becoming accredited the college officially changed its name to "Bentley College" which permitted the institution to grant the Bachelor of Science degree in all business disciplines. The university received accreditation from the Association to Advance

Collegiate Schools of Business in 1989. Finally, in 2008 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts granted Bentley 'university' status, thus officially making the institution "Bentley University."

The mission of Bentley University is "to educate creative, ethical, and socially responsible organizational leaders by creating and disseminating impactful knowledge within and across business and the arts and sciences" (Bentley University, 2018b). The university is guided by six core values known as the Bentley Beliefs: diversity, integrity, responsibility, excellence, courage, and teamwork. Dr. Alison Davis-Blake was recently announced as the institution's eighth president. In a message to the Bentley community (2018c), she states

> Bentley's mission of preparing students for successful careers and lives that make a positive difference in the world is at the heart of why I became an educator. My father was a college professor and I grew up in the world of education. Over the course of my own academic career, I've seen that in helping students learn, grow and reach their full potential, we change the course of history for them, their family and their community. I believe strongly in the transformative power of higher education to improve people's lives and change the world.

There is a strong tone in her message that conveys a vision for Bentley to help young people make their academic and career aspirations a reality and the role of Bentley to serve the community and the world.

The university enrolled 5,506 students in 2016, nearly a quarter of which (1,284 students) form its graduate student base (NCES, 2018). Approximately 78 percent of its students live on campus. Over 80 percent of faculty hold doctoral degrees, many of which pursue research and scholarship in their respective fields. The graduate school offers PhD programs in business and accounting, awards seven Master of Science degrees as well as an executive education

program. The median annual starting salary of a Bentley graduate is $57,000 and 97 percent of

its graduating class in 2017 found jobs with six months of graduating or were admitted to

graduate school (Bentley University, 2018a). Students who live on campus can pursue

opportunities to engage with over 100 student clubs and organizations and nearly one in five

students belongs to a fraternity or sorority. The institution offers more than 70 study abroad

program opportunities in 25 countries, and nearly 50 percent of the student body studies abroad

during their time at Bentley (Bentley University, 2018a).

Bentley's Internationalization Strengths and Priorities

The history of Bentley University's international activities can be traced back to 1987

with the founding of the International Programs unit. The university's current mission and

vision reflect global ambitions. Bentley's high profile as a premier business institution of higher

education is prominently displayed on several of the institution's webpages. The inclusion of

Bentley in this case study adds value to the discussion because its business programs attract

many international and domestic students coming from all backgrounds and nationalities.

Bentley University's prominence in the U.S. as a business school allows it to appear most

visibly in the rankings at the undergraduate level among the regional universities of the

Northeast, ranked for its high retention rate, best value, and best business programs for internship

opportunities. Bentley is also featured in several, highly regarded publications such as *U.S.

News and World Report*, *Bloomberg Business Week*, and *The Princeton Review*. Its graduate

programs compare similarly in national and international recognition to its undergraduate

programs. In 2017, *Forbes Magazine* ranked Bentley number 12 out of the 50 best U.S. colleges

for international students. The president of the university, Gloria Larson, is reported to have

said,

As a college president working with scores of young adults, one of my favorite aspects of

Bentley is the power of our diverse community that reflects the gender and cultural

diversity of the 21st Century world we live in...I am equally proud of the fact that this

diversity of backgrounds means a diversity of opinions and ideas (as cited in Mason,

2017).

While the mission of the institution does not explicitly contain global elements, its vision,

celebrating its centennial in 2017, possesses some evidence of an agenda to internationalize its

campus. Specifically, Bentley partially affirms its commitment to international education,

stating

Bentley University is known nationally and internationally as a business-focused center

of learning that operates in an ethical and socially engaged environment; and thanks to its

achievements, Bentley is highly sustainable in resources and scale, and is an attractive

partner for global centers of teaching and research excellence (Bentley, 2018b).

The first point emphasizes recognition and branding as a "business-focused" institution, while

the second point projects its accomplishments onto the global landscape, by first presenting its

prowess as a business-center of excellence in "teaching and research," and second, by promoting

its programs and resources to prospective partners.

Moreover, there are several areas of the institution's website that highlight its

international foci, which clearly displays supportive opportunities for global engagement by the

entire Bentley community. Indeed, many web pages are filled with international resources for

students, faculty, and staff, including but not limited to a single webpage devoted exclusively to

demonstrating its pledge to international students and the community (Bentley University,

2018d):

The international presence on the Bentley campus continues to grow each year with students from nearly 100 countries learning, participating in campus events and conducting research with faculty members. International students play an important role in our Bentley Beliefs by enriching classroom learning through the different perspectives and experiences they bring to our campus.

International student enrollment at Bentley is the third largest among the institutions in this study, with 1,391 in 2016/17 (IIE, 2017a). International students make up approximately 16.7 percent of the undergraduate student population and 44 percent of all graduate students (Bentley University, 2018a). In the last 10 years, Bentley's international student population has grown over 147 percent.

The Center for International Students and Scholars (CISS) is a particularly important unit as it serves the many needs of Bentley's international student population. The CISS is similar in size to its BC counterpart, including a cohort of five staff members, and plays a central role in the institution's international student affairs as it "serves as the gateway for all services," according to mid-senior international advisor, Mx. Brook Upman. The CISS receives many students who frequent the office with concerns about their grades or other issues the CISS is not suited to address that must be redirected to counseling, for example, or to the financial aid office to clear a hold. "We collect these issues and we 'farm' them out...kind of like 'a funnel'...to different places [on-campus]," states Mx. Upman. International students also rely heavily on the ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) Center, counseling center, and their faculty and academic advisors. The ESOL Center's free tutorial services are provided by faculty in the English and Media Studies departments in an effort to support student success inside the classroom and in students' co-curricular activities, as well. The ESOL Center is also a key

resource for all students whose first language is not English, helping them to develop their academic and professional writing skills.

Indeed, the university has made programs for international students quite visible. Many of the programs contribute directly to student success and to building an inclusive community on-campus. The Academic Edge Program is one such program designed to help international graduate students improve their academic skills by providing advanced English courses in writing, speaking, listening, pronunciation, as well as building a strong business vocabulary. Through Bentley's graduate school, international graduate students have access to a number of resources specific to their academic and vocational needs, such as tutorials and seminars on a wide range of topics including academic writing, presentation and speaking skills, resume and cover letter writing, and mock job interview practice sessions. The WorldView Program helps disseminate global perspectives by giving international students an opportunity to share their cultural backgrounds and national perspectives to the wider Bentley community. The purpose of the program is to foster social interactions with domestic students and promote global citizenship and intercultural engagement. Some international students selected for the program have the opportunity to collaborate with faculty by offering global perspectives adjoining class lectures. The international residencies program is for cohorts of international graduate or executive students from non-U.S. business schools tailored to a program-area of their choosing.

On the faculty front, there are several opportunities promoted internally via the website to actively engage with Bentley's internationalization agenda. By accessing the web pages of the Cronin Office of International Education, faculty will find a number of resources and documents dedicated to facilitating the internationalization of Bentley's curriculum (Bentley University, 2018e). There are resources to support global learning and teaching, including a fund to support

the development of new international courses designed and led by Bentley faculty. Faculty are also encouraged to attend a global workshop or conference to diversify and internationalize their approaches to teaching; some might receive sponsorship to attend WISE, an intercultural skills development conference specifically for faculty leaders, program coordinators, and administrators, offered and hosted by Wake Forest University. Finally, Bentley supports its faculty to seek opportunities with its partner institutions to teach and conduct research. The Center for Languages and International Collaboration is an extension of the effort to internationalize the curriculum, in that it aims to support curricular development through modern languages, such as Chinese, Japanese, Italian, Spanish, and French, and through international studies by supporting global learning and teaching by using multimedia instructional technology.

Chapters Three, Four, Five, and Six described the unique institutional aspects that make up the Babson, the UMB, BC, and Bentley cases, highlighting several areas of their internationalization efforts and on-campus goals for global engagement. Chapter Seven extends the analysis to more closely examine the contexts of all the case study G.B.A.C.U.s in a Trump-era reality by providing illustrative examples of institution-specific circumstances and perceptions of challenges experienced at the case study institutions through the lenses of its administrators and international students.

Chapter Seven

Institution-Specific Experiences

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis of the experiences in and reactions to the current U.S. political climate from the specific perspectives of each case study institution. The main objective is to address some of the study's secondary research questions, specifically with respect to the academic, social, personal, and legal challenges of the institutions' international students and the impact on international enrollment more broadly, recruitment strategies, and the provision of support services and university resources. The data for this analysis are principally sourced from semi-structured interviews with seasoned international education professionals—'high-senior international advisors' and 'mid-senior international advisors'. The BC and Bentley case study analyses are illuminated with data from their international students. For Babson and the UMB, however, this perspective is absent due to the unavailability of student participants. The statements and positions of administrators and students showcased in this chapter do not presume complete representativeness, but are rather offered as illustrative insights to enhance the document analysis presented in the preceding chapters.

The Case of Babson College

Key Student Challenges

At Babson, the obstacles international students face are similar to those of any student who uproots themselves from their home environment and 'transplants' themself into a totally new context. There is the expectation to adapt to and engage with the unfamiliar space, a climate that for Babson is characterized not only by a academic rigor, but also by the college's tradition as a

historically white institution in the Northeastern United States. Many international students at Babson, especially at the undergraduate level, are living abroad for the very first time. Dr. Crane asserts:

> Many of them are non-native English speakers...they are quite fluent in English and they have passed the TOEFL with flying colors, but that doesn't mean they understand all of the vernacular that's used in our culture and in our context...being able to perform at the academic level is that much more difficult.

Language is central to adaptation in any culture, but some of the other challenges students encounter at Babson are navigating the U.S. academic system, including, for example, Babson's expectations with respect to academic integrity and plagiarism. Those are some of the challenges international students face after they have arrived to Babson. In the pre-arrival phase of their journeys, the challenges will be to understand U.S. admissions processes, and specifically those of Babson, and overcoming hurdles in visa processes placed on them by the Department of State.

International students at Babson are like domestic students in many ways. Both cohorts of students depend heavily on support through university services, such as faculty, academic advising, health services, counseling, and residential life, but there are services specific to international students, including those relating to "the student visa, immigration, travel and reentry, work authorization, and cultural adjustment. Those are going to be the kinds of work that our ISSS team does really well and is exclusive to international students," states Dr. Crane.

Despite Babson's prestige and reputation nationally and internationally as a global entrepreneurial education institution, its students can still face some bigotry off-campus, according to Dr. Crane, citing "an occasional surface of bigotry that happens to students standing

in the supermarket talking to her friend in Spanish, and someone under their breath saying 'you

got to speak English now.'" Although Dr. Crane reports that the level of prejudice that Babson's

international students and minority students might encounter has generally not increased since

Trump took office. Overall, it can be quite difficult to determine whether there have been

increases in cases of bigotry and prejudice if it goes unreported or takes place off-campus.

Interestingly, in a survey conducted by the Southern Poverty Law Center's Teaching Tolerance

project (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016) of over 10,000 K-12 teachers, counselors, and

administrators across the United States, it was reported that the results of the 2016 presidential

election have had a chilling effect on schools and students, citing "ninety percent of educators

report that school climate has been negatively affected, and most of them believe it will have a

long-lasting impact" (p. 4). Indeed, the findings demonstrate clearly the adverse effects of the

Trump administration at many schools in the United States. Ultimately, however, the survey

focuses specifically on K-12 education, so there are no indications that the 'Trump-effect' has

had or will have similar implications for U.S. higher education without a similar study examining

the impact of the presidential election and the Trump administration on U.S. colleges and

universities.

Trump Administration Policies' Impact on Babson

The political climate has provoked some serious challenges for Babson College. In fact,

the Trump administration's travel bans and its anti-immigration and anti-foreigner statements

have affected more than just international students. They have affected how this institution and

its support offices carry out their work on an everyday basis. When asked what major offices

and service areas at Babson had been most heavily affected, Dr. Crane asserts

Admissions and recruitment are the pipeline to everything, so I would say absolutely admissions and recruitment. We've had to think about the messaging that we share with our prospective students concerning the kind of place Babson is and that we will continue to welcome international students with open arms...continue to support them, and we use a variety of ways to do that...at the graduate level we have seen significant changes in the patterns of both student interests and...engagement with our admissions and recruitment efforts. So, that's been most challenging for us. And, if we broaden that term [international students] to more than just student visa holders, there are some that are really struggling with what they're facing out there...so, they're using a combination of counseling, the international office, their deans and academic advisors for support. And so, that's taxing. That's extra effort.

The drain on institutional resources and the capacity to serve students can be seen through the student lifecycle, from the pre-admission/enrollment stage to currently matriculated students. Enrollment figures for the 2018/19 academic year are not known presently, so information is limited on how the Trump administration's travel bans and immigration policies and anti-foreigner sentiments might have affected enrollment at Babson—if at all. However, it is important to note that less than 2 percent of Babson's international cohort comes from Muslim-majority countries, including Bahrain, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, and Saudi Arabia (Babson College, 2018). These specific countries have so far not been included the list of countries affected by the travel ban, but they are Muslim-majority countries nevertheless. The vast majority of Babson's international student population comes from East Asia (25 percent), South and Central Asia (25 percent), Europe (13 percent), and Latin America and the Caribbean (20 percent), with much smaller numbers coming from Africa and North America (i.e. Canada).

Part of the challenge for higher education institutions like Babson is helping the federal government understand that HEIs have a limited role to play in securing borders and ameliorating threats to national security. Dr. Crane believes that U.S. HEIs are complying with immigration regulations through SEVIS, and in the process, they are supplying the government with vital facts and figures on their international student populations. However, he/she thinks the government might be challenged in terms of managing its immigration operations. Higher education institutions, according to Dr. Crane are

> …already providing significant amounts of data, information, and updates to the Department of State and Department of Homeland Security. They're being held accountable in fairly stringent ways, so as to who is on your campus, how long are they studying, how long are they not. As soon as their record is terminated, that notification goes to the Department of Homeland Security. I do think that there's a lot more onus on the part of the government to actually make sure that the apparatus—the work that higher education institutions are doing—is paying dividends for them and holding themselves accountable.

Indeed, a frequent argument is that international students represent a small fraction of the total number of non-immigrants entering the country every day via visitor visas and by other means. Why is there less scrutiny and attention placed on that end of the spectrum? Why is the focus placed on the higher education community? Dr. Crane argues,

> …because we're already collecting data and we're already taking on the burden of what needs to happen. And, I doubt that we're going to be able to tell ourselves that we're limiting threats to national security through this lens alone. It has to be much more holistic...higher education is only one tiny piece of it.

Many argue that the focus on HEIs is misplaced and there is little that can be done to improve relations with the government beyond compliance with student visa regulations and the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS)—the management system used by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and operated under the Department of State to track and monitor international students and exchange visitors in the United States (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2018). Drawing from the interview data, a large part of the issue stems from how the government chooses to understand the circumstances around the 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001 with respect to international students. Dr. Crane states that he/she recalls traveling to conferences out-of-state and speaking with colleagues that have shared stories of their own students' experiences with government officials at the airport. Dr. Crane, anecdotally speaking, reports his/her colleagues' students having issues with the official at the security checkpoint because the agent cannot check the student's SEVIS record because they do not have access to the database. Dr. Crane says, "We have done our due diligence and have reported that. They are not connecting the dots…" He/she states that HEIs have fulfilled in part their responsibility to the government, but the federal administration might need to address certain inadequacies in its internal structuring to help streamline the immigration processes for international students.

The impact of the federal administration's' efforts to limit the flow of human resources into the country has had quite serious effects on Babson's institutional capacity to present an image to prospective students that is free of stress and worry. In terms of real impact, Babson has felt the travel ban's immediate effects, as Dr. Crane reflects,

> We've seen students postpone travel because of concerns. We've seen people, even
>
> faculty, who have postponed or not participated in international conferences because their

status was in question or in limbo and they didn't have any assurances...And, we have, since September 2001, been losing our share of the market of international students who are mobile. And this will just precipitate and accelerate that loss.

What can be seen and felt more immediately is the impact on current students and Babson's student support offices that have been redoubling efforts to respond to increased questions and concerns from students. What cannot be felt or realized immediately is what Dr. Crane refers to as something other than "a change in the reality on the ground...not just material regulations or changes in the law, but also perceptions." Dr. Crane goes on to argue

When the Trump administration announces that they're considering restricting student visas from China...even if they don't implement that policy and it never comes to pass, that's a newspaper article title in China that is absolute poison for our ability to attract the best and brightest as we have for decades.

The perception of America is changing across the world. America's once inclusive and welcoming image is changing to one that increasingly reflects a new focus—satisfying American interests first, regardless of the negative impact on students, scholars, and even other nations. Higher education institutions will suffer from "America-first" policies, as Dr. Crane notes:

And just like business, when stability goes away, investment goes away...so, it makes me wonder how much families will be reconsidering their potential investment in this, which we feel is a superb education...in their daughter, son, in their child...when there is uncertainty even when it doesn't come to pass. So, it hurts us in that way.

Indeed, the manifestation of perceptions occurs at home and abroad, oftentimes developing in unexpected ways. While the impact on enrollment for the 2018/19 academic year is unknown at this time, there has been some impact on the recruitment of international students,

which at least, in part, limits Babson's capacity to continue to build upon what it has been striving towards for five decades—"to create social and economic value everywhere"—thus obstructing its mission. The travel bans and anti-foreigner and anti-immigration rhetoric have distorted Babson's outreach and messaging efforts by sending mixed signals to prospective students on the atmosphere in America and in Wellesley, M.A.

The Trump administration's executive orders and public statements also have the potential to affect outbound mobility (for faculty and students) as much as inbound, according to Dr. Crane:

> And, if we think about it globally, some of the Trump sentiments and some of the rhetoric could create anti-Americanism abroad, which could be problematic for our students who are abroad and faculty engaging abroad...it could also drive away some other potential players in our executive education space.

The rhetoric and inherent prejudices of the Trump administration and many of his constituents have the potential to create and perpetuate false impressions at home, in Wellesley, and in a more domestic context. Dr. Crane argues, "Some portion of the population start to think in more colloquial ways instead of more global ways, so we have to be mindful of that as well. So, it really goes against the grain of internationalization in many ways."

The Case of the UMB

Key Student Challenges

The challenges international students face at the UMB are similar in many ways to the challenges other international students deal with at other colleges and universities in the Greater Boston area and in the U.S. in general. However, student obstacles can also be contextually dependent. As Dr. Barns commented, "I think our international students face some serious

challenges when they...are newly enrolled, coming from their home countries, adapting to a new environment, new climate...and being away from their home base and families…" especially when "learning about the American higher education system and how to navigate through the institution." Indeed, there are many university services on which international students at the UMB heavily depend, Dr. Barns underscores. The most relied-on services are the international students and scholar services, primarily for support on immigration and travel-related issues; the student services of the UMB, which offer support in academic advising, financial-aid, personal counseling, academic tutoring and mentoring; and health services. The least relied-on service seems to be career services. Moreover, the level of support offered by individual departments, apart from academic advising, is undeterminable.

Many institutions have enough capacity and resources to offer several types of support to their international students. Unfortunately, this is not the case with UMass Boston. "I don't think we had a dedicated staff to attend to international students, except for immigration issues...which are handled by the international student and scholar services office—they only addressed immigration issues," says Dr. Barns, continuing:

> ...and it just so happens that UMass Boston had a shortage of staff to begin with to address all students, but in particular there was a shortage of staff to address international students and helping them...meet their needs...especially this last year when they had these [budget] cuts—that made things even worse.

The Trump administration notwithstanding, the challenges for the UMB, therefore, have been two-fold. First, there is a lack in the range of services available to international students that come through the OGP, especially in terms of support not focused on immigration. Second, there is a deficiency in the number of human resources to help all students, but specifically

international students who might need additional support outside of immigration and travel, such as academic tutoring, acculturation services, advice on housing, and other types of assistance. The budget cuts and overall fiscal crisis at the UMB have caused serious strains on university resources, especially for this essential arm—international student support.

The Trump administration's travel bans and all associated rhetoric on tightening up immigration regulations have impacted the climate at the UMB in some way. In terms of affecting the institution's broader internationalization goals and agenda, "I think this has impacted our recruitment of international students very clearly," says Dr. Barns, emphasizing the drop of 5.4 percent in international student enrollment from 2016 to 2017. The drop in undergraduate students was 3.7 percent and the drop in graduate students was 9.8 percent. The "Trump-effect" has impacted study abroad as well. Dr. Barns states

> When it came to study abroad programs, this has impacted our students, particularly those that are international students to begin with...but because these international students became concerned about the anti-immigrant sentiment and the changes and the immigration concerns of getting visas to get back into the country, we had a lot more international students that shied away from participating in study abroad programs...they were concerned that if they left the country, they would be unable to get back...and we had incidences where students were getting stuck overseas...when these things started circulating to the forefront.

The primary concern for international students seeking education abroad opportunities dealt with reentry. At the time the travel ban was issued, especially directly after the first iteration of the ban, Jill Welch, Deputy Director for Public Policy, stated "it is important to remember the unwelcoming message these bans send to groups of people around the world who wonder if their

nation may be next on the list" (NAFSA, 2017a, n.p.). International mobility was a significant international area impacted by the ban at the UMB. Dr. Barns notes:

> I would say also that [the ban] impacted our international research activities...graduate students were also concerned, that were engaged in international research, about leaving the country. And we advised them. We advised most of the international students, particularly those from the targeted countries—if they didn't have to leave they shouldn't…

That is not to say that all aspects of cross-border activities were affected. After being questioned about the effects on the UMB's global institutional linkages, Dr. Barns answers this way:

> I'd say that it wasn't a healthy environment for developing new partnerships...in those countries that have been flagged by the Trump administration that were subject to visa restrictions...because there was no point in it, but not all across the board...we continued to increase our international partnerships in countries outside the ones that had been targeted by the Trump administration.

Of particular importance in the case of UMB is the impact on the lived experiences of its international students. "There was a lot of anxiety and apprehension...and there were a lot of questions...I heard from my colleagues in student affairs, the vice-chancellor of student enrollment, that students are using mental health services because of this anxiety" states Dr. Barns. The immediate impact of the ban caused a spike in stress and anxiety among UMB students that had not necessarily been visible before the ban was announced publicly. "I think there was also the sentiment during the election about hatred towards different populations, ethnicities, and religions...against Mexicans, Muslims…" which Dr. Barns views as a precursor

to much of what has expanded into real prejudices, acts of discrimination, and violence taking place around the country.

The current political climate is toxic and disturbing for HEIs engaging internationally, according to Dr. Barns, stating,

> The tone of the Trump administration—their anti-immigration and anti-foreigner statements as well as these travel bans—have had a significant impact on international student enrollment in the U.S...there has been an increase of international students going to Canada and Australia, the U.K. and other countries, and some of them obviously stay home rather than enroll in U.S. institutions...obviously this impacts revenue that's generated.

The benefit that international students bring with them when they choose to study in the U.S. is stripped away, and the income institutions have come to depend on so heavily, as seen in the literature, has been threatened. The impact at UMB has been felt across the campus, from its academic programs such as English as a Second Language to its support offices. Dr. Barnes also suggests the financial atmosphere at the UMB, with respect to its recovery from capital mismanagement and excessive building and infrastructure costs, has had a confounding effect on the institution's capacity to do its work.

Trump Administration Policies' Impact on the UMB

The UMB has endured many challenges that have affected its entire campus community, some of which can be seen as being connected to the Trump administration. With respect to how UMB has responded specifically to the Trump-era realities like the travel ban and general negative sentiment towards immigrants and foreigners, it would be particularly valuable to look at what has been done on the "ground-level" and why that is important to the UMB's mission

and to the students, particularly the international students, faculty, staff, and the entire UMB community.

The UMB has taken several pragmatic steps, with the limited resources available, to help support international students as they navigate this especially turbulent political atmosphere during their studies in the U.S. The institution's most immediate response after the first travel ban had been issued was to host forums to address students' questions and concerns about the travel ban and related immigration policies. Based on the data from the interview with Dr. Barns, the forums were one type of intervention that could be organized and administered relatively easily. Forums were conducted on both small and large scales: first, strictly with students from countries specifically targeted on the travel ban, and then will all international students. The main purposes of the forum were to try to alleviate international students' anxiety and stress; to inform students of the realities of the ban; and to provide them with the best possible information that UMB had from a legal perspective. To accomplish this, Dr. Barns states

> We had someone from legal services in the President's office; we had an external
> Chinese immigration attorney that works for UMass also attend; we had the
> administration...the provost and vice-provosts, staff, and faculty participate in this forum.

The result of the effort was a turnout of over 200 people, mostly students. "We also set up a website to inform our international students on all of the new restrictions and the developments with immigration," Dr. Barns says, which offered the most comprehensive way to address sensitive matters relating to students' legal statuses and immigration that could be reached by all students, all in one place.

There were waves of support from around the campus that were not always organized or systematic in their approach. Dr. Barns specifically recalls:

A number of administrators and departments had some of the faculty really engage to provide support, especially moral support, to these students to make them feel more at ease...where the honors college has a glass area...there were Post-It notes, saying 'if you're Muslim, we love you', 'if you're from Syria, we love you'...there were a lot of these positive messages, comforting messages that were posted.

A declaration of support came from the city of Boston as well, in the form of a letter from the Mayor, Marty Walsh. The letter was addressed to UMass and, "he probably sent it to other universities in the area," says Dr. Barns. The purpose of the letter was intended to portray Boston as a city that welcomes foreigners and international students. Dr. Barns states, "It's not a 'welcome' because they're already here. It's a message to reassure and reinforce the fact that the city of Boston is there to support them.'" Mayor Walsh has played a particularly visible role in making it publicly known that Boston supports immigrants and first generation college students, especially with respect to students under Temporary Protected Status (TPS) or those specially designated as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) (Walsh, 2018). While DACA students are not included in international student enrollment figures (and are not necessarily the focus of this study), it is worth noting the significant challenges this group of students faces on college campuses across the U.S. and, by extension, the challenges of other types of marginalized and underrepresented student populations in the American educational system with respect to hate, bias, and discrimination traced to the Trump administration and to the rhetoric surrounding the 2016 U.S. presidential election (SPLC, 2016). The official message from this key Boston public official—Marty Walsh—is that the community of Boston is a community of

immigrants and here to resist the federal government's attempt to bar them from establishing an American life. While the city of Boston openly and officially declared itself as a sanctuary city, the UMB has opted to not declare itself a 'sanctuary campus'. Dr. Barns' personal view is this:

> I think there were some obstacles perhaps. I think there was more to lose if we declared ourselves a sanctuary campus than we would gain because the city itself was declared a sanctuary city...so what was the point of declaring us a sanctuary campus? That was the rationale...

To extrapolate from this, it would not be hard to surmise that there exists a natural tension between the national government and state authorities. The "more to lose" could mean greater confrontation with, or at the very least, greater risk by direct exposure to the federal government and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement division of the Department of Homeland Security. The UMB did not see any value in 'placing themselves in the spotlight' since the mayor of Boston had already emphasized its commitment to protecting its immigrant-citizens.

Relations between the federal government and HEIs must exist, and there is evidence to suggest that it is the interests of both entities to collaborate more effectively with respect to international students. While there is a distinctly perceptible and delineated role between the two, further collaboration could prove to mitigate the potentiality of miscommunication or misunderstanding that so often occurs between them. "I know that we have a very good relationship with the Homeland Security folks. Each region has a Homeland Security officer that we have to engage with," states Dr. Barns. He/she explains,

> And, I remember the officer assigned to UMass Boston...we meet him periodically, so if they're issues or concerns for particular students, that's where we have an opportunity to engage...not only communicate via a database, but in person, so we have an opportunity

to have a face-to-face conversation regarding issues that we have with international

students...regular meetings are a good thing.

If communication and interactions between HEIs and the government could be more deliberate,

there stands a greater chance of developing a closer relationship. This one example suggests that

close contact on a regular basis could help strengthen a relationship that on the surface appears to

be shaky and unbalanced. Once developed and nurtured, a meaningful partnership that is

supportive and encouraging could, in turn, produce patience and understanding between parties

rather than greater resistance, such as in the case of the UMB.

The Case of Boston College

Key Student Challenges

The challenges of international students at BC are different from the student challenges at

other institutions. The challenges presented in this section reflect BC administrative and

international student perspectives and covers multiple interrelated issues.

Among the key challenges facing BC students, the interview data show that finding jobs

is a significant difficulty—including interviewing for them and securing them. Mx. Campanotta

adds "it's a challenge because there are immigration regulations," stating

they also face challenges in the classroom; culturally it can be very different. They are

not used to participating in class or writing papers in the direct style that we are, and also

meeting Americans is a big challenge for them as well, especially for some our larger

groups, like our students from China. It's really hard for them to meet Americans because

there are so many of them.

Mx. Campanotta reports many international students can tend to stay close to their own

cultural group, especially if a large cohort of them is present on-campus. In the case of BC,

China represents by far the largest international student population, approximately 800 students, 390 of which are undergraduates and around 400 of which are graduate students (Boston College, 2018c). Some argue there can be a tendency to address personal and psychological needs within a familiar cultural context, as indicated by the literature (Hanassab & Tidwell, 2002; Götz et al, 2018), as it can foster an "at-home" attitude and perspective that can be counter to the purpose of an international student's study abroad experience. Although, 'assimilation' can be especially difficult, given the current political climate, especially for BC international students seeking job opportunities off-campus, Mx. Campanotta says that

> international students need to find jobs, so I think that is really pressing for them...it's a challenge because there is prejudice and discrimination and anti-immigrant sentiment that is going on right now [in the U.S.]. So, that's definitely a big challenge for them.

Some of the most utilized services for international students at BC are the OISS, which they rely on heavily for immigration-related issues. While less utilized by international undergraduate students, the university career center receives most of its international 'student traffic' from international graduate students. The Connors Family Learning Center's tutoring services are also frequented by students at all levels. There are many other services available to international students, but the OISS is limited in the ways in which the office can promote them, according to Mx. Campanotta. She/he states:

> The reason I'm challenged with this is that they don't take advantage of a lot of the services available to them like counseling, because they don't use counseling as much, or the academic advising centers as much...we do a lot of programs, and we have groups that come to ours, but a lot of them don't.

Meanwhile, Mx. Bailey Collins, as a student-leader of an on-campus student organization that supports international students' needs, and as an international graduate student, Mx. Bailey Collins understands the most challenging issues affecting international students at Boston College. To begin with, Mx. Collins points out with clear distinction how common it is for many international students, especially first-year international students, to experience culture shock due oftentimes to the 'collectivistic' nature of many cultures, which conflicts directly with American values of individualism. "Usually students don't spend too much time on campus, so it's hard to find connections...find friends," which resonates with Mx. Campanotta's assessment of being challenged to integrate into and feel, at the same time, a part of a community. Indeed, the social pressures and inherent differences in cultural values and expectations can make 'fitting-in' quite challenging.

Challenges from the students' perspectives can many times confirm what administrators and student affairs staff already know, and sometimes it can contradict these understandings. For example, there is some agreement between Mx. Campanotta and Mx. Collins with respect to students' awareness level of on-campus resources and the limited number of students that actually take advantage of those types of support. Mx. Collins states that there is "a conversation partners program offered by OISS as well as assistance in academic writing...many international students are not aware of those resources. So, there's a lack of connection and delivery between the institution and students." Mx. Collins argues that staff might think international students are not actively seeking resources and support, "so they are the one to blame," but Mx. Collins asserts there is a 'lack of connection' or unawareness on the part of higher education staff members of how to improve the delivery of services and outreach to international students. This is especially true for new international students, explains Mx. Collins: "And, when you just came

to school and you receive a bunch of emails, there's a high probability that you will miss those opportunities, especially when you're not aware of the situation...what challenges you may face here…" There also could be a disconnect in the levels of support for undergraduate and graduate international students, according to Mx. Collins, stating "they [the OISS] have a weekly discussion period that they discuss some cultural issue or challenges that international students face, but from my experience and other friends' experiences, they feel this discussion series is quite [like a] 'shadow', like they catch the superficial face of the problem, but they won't have really deep conversation about it...so those discussion questions are not actually fulfilling for those students [graduate students] to attend those meetings.

What stood out as particularly salient in my interview with Mx. Collins had less to do with students' social inclusion but more so with engagement barriers inside the classroom. "Sometimes it's not only because they're not fluent in English," Mx. Collins says, "but it's more because domestic students do not have the awareness to leave space for those that haven't spoken yet. And, also when international students bring up their 'global' opinions, some domestic students may think it's irrelevant to the class." The classroom presents its own set of challenges that could or could not be mitigated by professors, depending on the teacher's experience and comfort level addressing those challenges. However, Mx. Collins asserts that often "professors are not aware of international students' own challenges...it's more like a 'color-blind' thing that they should treat international students the same as domestic students, but they ignore the specific challenges they are facing." The assessment of faculty engagement with issues in the classroom might be accurate, in general, but it is difficult to generalize without a broader, more systematic approach to understanding classroom challenges specific to BC international students. Moreover, Mx. Collins argues

...especially at BC, many faculty think students should assimilate to the host culture. So, they want you to study American culture and 'be American students' and that's the only way you can thrive in your academic work. But, actually, it's a two-way interaction. You can't really actually expect international students to assimilate to the culture and you know nothing about them...about their background.

The statement reflects what has already been articulated by Mx. Collins in that it suggests a "one-way" interaction, analogous to what the literature and international educators report, which Mx. Collins views as unfair:

So, all of the resources that schools are providing are for international students to fit into [American] culture, but what we really need is orientation for domestic students to promote an inclusive environment for all students. So, there's this difference in understanding.

Indeed, the onus is often placed on international students to do a better job of using on-campus resources, but the student leader's perspective on inclusivity and appreciation for diversity suggests the onus rests more so on the faculty to create and shape a learning environment that promotes expanded ways of thinking and global perspectives. The everyday social interactions of domestic and international students are also important but do not necessarily happen as 'naturally' as many intend. The harder issue of addressing inclusion and social acceptance by internationalizing the curriculum, which would require increased faculty engagement and improvements in classroom management practices, is more difficult, but necessary, if the institution wishes to extend campus internationalization well beyond the provision of university support services and increased participation of student affairs professionals. The internationalization of higher education in many contexts, thus, is considered

a process for good reason, in that it requires constant attention and engagement by the leadership in order for ideas and new perspectives to effectively cross institutional boundaries, particularly academic spheres where influence and resistance can be greatest.

Throughout most of the student interview, questions relating to the Trump administration, including questions on the travel bans and anti-immigration rhetoric, were not always answered explicitly, which created some difficulty in extracting evidence of changes to the level of support offered by the administration or understanding how student organizations on campus were reacting to the U.S. policies on travel and rhetoric on defending the country against threats to its national security. However, in one particular instance in the interview, Mx. Collins hinted at evidence of the 'Trump-effect' when a classmate in her school made a callous statement that directly hurt her feelings as an international student:

> I don't feel international students are welcomed or supported. Especially in the classroom, I do think their opinions are not valued like domestic students'. There's one course that I took last year...and the professor brought up a question to say 'if you think our international students should be appreciated in our community, and there's one domestic student that explicitly stated that 'if they have any challenges, it's the school's responsibility to support and provide resources for students, but I don't think it's the school's responsibility to appreciate our school's international students.' So, I remember that very clearly word by word. So, that's one thing. So, I do think if they [domestic students] are talking about support, it's in a very condescending way—that international students are disadvantaged, and 'as American students, we don't like to provide resources, if that's not intervening of our own interests.

It appears that at least some international students at BC may indeed face social challenges that make it difficult for them to find friends, not because they are not attempting to make connections with domestic students, but domestic students often do not reach out because they lack interest.

Trump Administration Policies' Impact on BC

The travel ban and accompanying anti-immigration and anti-foreigner rhetoric have, so far, not affected the BC Global Initiative. Mx. Campanotta says

It's kind of interesting that we're deciding to move forward with these internationalization goals in this age of nationalism, but I don't think it's really curtailing them. And, from my perspective, I think we need this more than ever, and so it's not like people are saying 'forget about the BC Global Initiative because of what's going on with the government.' But, in terms of people's passion and support on the committee, it hasn't curtailed it. If anything, they feel more strongly about it than ever, that we should be doing this.

It is not entirely clear, based on the interview data and from the review of the university's webpages, exactly when BC's leadership decided to initiate and create plans to implement a global strategy—before or after Trump took office. However, the item of greater importance and relevance to this study is that the institution's global initiative has not been severely affected by the products and by-products of the federal administration's position on immigration.

Despite the limited effect on the institution's Global Engagement Initiative, Trump-era positions have impacted other offices and university services, some more than others. The BC admissions office is certainly enduring some of the impact. Mx. Campanotta says, "I think it's definitely had an impact on them that they have to more intentionally think about...they just can't

say/rely on [the assumption that] international students are going to want to come here."

Although the recruiting and admission office has been impacted, "...our numbers were up last

year. They weren't down. I don't know what they're going to be this year. They were up like 9

percent," Mx. Campanotta reports, adding that admission relied on inter-office support to ensure

their messaging reflects an "open and welcoming" BC campus for all students. However, it is

important to note that less than 1 percent of BC's international students were affected by the first

iteration of the travel ban (Boston College Statistics: International Students, Faculty, and

Research Scholars, 2018), targeting principally Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Sudan, and Yemen.

There are students from other Muslim-majority countries represented at BC, i.e.— Jordan,

Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain, but those numbers are small, compared to numbers of

students from other countries. Concerned about the far-reaching effects, Mx. Campanotta says:

> I would argue more than the travel ban, the larger anti-immigration sentiment and
>
> rhetoric and a lot of these new threats and regulations could be devastating. If for some
>
> reason, Trump goes forward with limiting the number of Chinese students coming here,
>
> in specific fields, like science, because there's a concern about that, that would be
>
> devastating, not just to BC but to every institution. I mean they are our largest population,
>
> but that's how it is nationally. That would have a much wider impact.

 Mx. Campanotta underscored the wider implications for higher education institutions in the

United States:

> More than just the ban, it's other things that may be coming...if they get rid of STEM,
>
> OPT, if students can't work after...they're not going to come to the US anymore. They're
>
> already going to Canada, Australia, and the U.K., and other places that have more open
>
> immigration policies. So, we're not going to draw the finest international talent if we

have laws that prevent...and the general sentiment that it's 'America-first' and its

nationalism and all of that...so, I think, nationally, it's going to have a big impact.

The negligible impact on the Muslim international students might partially be attributed to the

fact that BC is a Jesuit Catholic institution, Mx. Campanotta reported. In addition, the incidence

of BC maintaining their international enrollment aligns with the IIE's findings—the more

prestigious institutions in New England have not taken as hard an impact as some other

institutions and U.S. regions (IIE, 2017a).

The initial fear that came with the first travel ban has slowly trickled down among BC's

international students, especially since not very many students were directly impacted. While

many offices and departments share similar experiences in supporting students as a result of

Trump's travel and immigration policies, the OISS has been particularly affected.

So, we first have to keep them up to date, so we had to create a webpage on our website

about recent updates…sending emails out to our whole [international] student population

going, 'this is what it [the policy] means, this is what it doesn't mean, to try and relieve

some of their stress and anxiety...We definitely had to engage them more and support

them more. But again, I think that was when it first came out. We'll see what happens

over the summer.

As the political landscape keeps changing, BC must adapt to whatever is most pressing at any

given time, which could be a more severe strain on human resources than was reported.

However, the preferred method of communication, in nearly all cases of engagement with

international students, tended to be by electronic communication, apart from individual and one-

on-one meetings with faculty advisors and counselors in private settings. Mx. Campanotta, in

discussing how the community external to BC has engaged with topics on immigration and international students, had this to say:

> We're in a very blue state where the mayor and the governor have made it very clear that they're not agreeing with this anti-immigrant sentiment...so I'm hoping that they're [international students] not feeling a lot of discrimination as a result of it...and of course, we're lumping all international students together, whereas the white Australian with a cute accent is not going to get the same reaction as one of our Muslim students from Africa...but that's always been the case. That's not really new.

The treatment of international students on U.S. college campuses is not a new or emerging issue. The more important set of questions dictates understanding how to curb the negative effects caused by the Trump administration, especially apparent in the BC case, which perhaps has tended to exacerbate existing tensions between domestic and international students.

The Case of Bentley University

Key Student Challenges

President Gloria Larson addressed the Bentley University community when the first travel ban was announced:

> Even in this moment of uncertainty, I know that the students, faculty and staff of this university are members of a tight-knit, loving community—one that cares for each other, no matter our ethnicity, gender, race or religion. The turmoil of the world beyond our campus may at times lie beyond our control, but our community has consistently shown the power to engage with each other, learn about each other, and stand together in the face of uncertainty. I know that today, this week, and in the months ahead, we will stand stronger than ever before (as cited in Larson, 2018).

The resilience and determination of a strong leader notwithstanding, Bentley understands the role it should play to engage its community and international students to strengthen mutual understanding and cooperation across the institution.

The key priority for the CISS is to positively impact the student experience for Bentley's international student population by providing enough support and programming to facilitate a smooth transition into community life at Bentley. However, as we have seen at the other institutions in this study, a college experience without any associative challenges is rarely the case for any student, especially if they are international. As Mx. Upman comments,

I think that our international students face a lot of challenges [and] some of them are similar to our domestic students...it's an added challenge when you come from another country, so I would say that adjusting to academic life and culture at Bentley, you know…the amount of homework assignments—that can differ greatly...I would say that there are mental health concerns that we've seen. Again, no different from the domestic population, but may be exacerbated by people who come from countries where mental health is not recognized as an issue. And then, they get here and they need to sort of grapple with that and treat themselves...as well as you know…political climate…but that's another…that's pressing on everybody's mind.

Student challenges are often seen through various lenses, both from an administrative point of view and from a student's. Moreover, not all international students will face the same challenges because they will all have different needs (Choudaha, Orosz, & Chang, 2012). The experiences of one international student could differ entirely from the experience of another. Reflecting on the most pressing issues of international students at Bentley, Mx. Bo Untari, an undergraduate student serving in a leadership role in an international student organization, says this:

The number one issue, especially affecting people personally, is the internship...like being able to work off campus is a huge deal for most…and it's very difficult to administer to international students in terms of where you can work and how long you can work...that's the biggest issue.

Mx. Untari also thinks cultural adjustment can be hard for some, stating "I would say adapting to the culture is a bit difficult [although] I would say that's a part of the first year issue...it gets much better as you go." In replying to a question about the current political climate, he/she says, "I wouldn't say it has necessarily affected my learning experience and study experience because I don't really see much of [that] kind of discussion [taking place on-campus]," adding that the institution is limited in terms of addressing student concerns that exist outside of the institution. At Bentley, "I do think, especially with the resources on campus, there is an effort [by the administration] to understand these challenges", says Mx. Untari.

On the other hand, the institution is aware that its campus community is diverse and mixed in terms of its political and philosophical views and realities. As Mx. Upman states,

I think that Bentley is an interesting place...because a lot of higher education institutions tend towards being very liberal and being very anti-Trump. But, Bentley being a business school, it's not always like that. So, there are some groups here that are divided, and I think that sometimes our international students experience—and this isn't necessarily a bad thing—but they're experiencing bits of both sides...and I think that it's just more of a learning experience...But, I have had people come up and say, 'oh, I saw a Trump flag in that room down the hallway' and they're hesitant about it, but there's nothing directly affecting any of them that I know of.

The principal method of contact with Bentley international students is email, as was seen with several of the other case study institutions; and the number of emails student receive is usually contingent upon swings in the political climate. The institution is continuously reaching out to international students, according to Mx. Untari, who stated that "...there are frequent reminders...it's not like a one-time thing. There's encouragement from different areas in the school," Untari explains, noting that professors are aware of the issues and accommodate students by helping them locate resources on-campus.

Given the tense political climate in general, Bentley international students might also be extra aware of how the institution demonstrates its stance with respect to alienation and intentional acts of misconduct towards students of color and international students. Mx. Untari asserts,

> I would say the campus climate has changed in terms of...what can be acceptable and what is not obviously...I wouldn't have had an understanding of what things were like before Trump was President...But now, I think there's a heaving emphasis by my institution to make sure that people feel welcomed and supported...there's a pretty low tolerance for aggression towards international students with respect to Trump...I would say people are generally very respectful of that...but if there is situations where there is aggression/hostility [towards] international students, it's always [e]mail that is sent out that that's quickly addressed that say 'the university has zero tolerance for...so don't do it'.

Mx. Untari's statement is corroborated by Mx. Upman's assessment of the state of discrimination on-campus towards international students. Upman states that "...I haven't seen anything negative [on-campus]...and I think I would know, too, because we have a bias incidence

reporting system and I haven't heard anything specific about international students." In discussing how the rhetoric is being perceived by Bentley's organized student groups, Mx. Untari states, "On-campus, most student organizations that are not politically affiliated...the general opinion is that it's ridiculous. It's something that's not necessarily to be frowned upon, but it's not approved of [either]...it's generally met with negative connotations," further adding that "...it's creating unnecessary tension." The policies on travel are not discussed as much in student circles.

In spring 2018, Bentley also implemented academic progress tracking, where if two or more academic reports are submitted by professors, the CISS calls in the international student for advising. The main purpose of the tracking is to "establish ourselves as a resource and also just kind of give them that extra support they might need," states Mx. Upman, adding "...because we know that it's scary to come here, especially these days." According to the interview data and to the number of visible web pages with links to student resources, Bentley could be seen as proactive in many ways in response to addressing the potentially negative impact of Trump administration policies and anti-immigration rhetoric on its international students. However, there have been several areas of the institution affected already, which have responded quickly to the ongoing swings in present-day 'America first' politics.

Trump Administration Policies' Impact on Bentley

"Our admission team for sure has been impacted...particularly at the undergraduate level," reports Mx. Upman, further stating:

We've had a drop in enrollment from the Middle East. We have counterbalanced that

with [an] increase in enrollment from China and Asia. I think that's pretty common with

a lot of the institutions around here. But, that is where the physical numbers are

manifesting themselves for sure.

Green (2013) cautions that recruiting large numbers of international students from one country

can be particularly problematic for on-campus integration (p. 53), but during such turbulent

times and under pressure to make up for lost revenue, institutions must make sacrifices.

Moreover, the matriculation of large Chinese student populations is becoming more of a trend on

college campuses across the U.S. However, the shift in recruitment strategies can also have a

'shocking effect' on institutions that have a lower capacity to manage the influx of one student

group. Mx. Upman states

> So, because of our drop in Middle East enrollment and our resulting increase in Chinese
>
> enrollment, that has actually put a strain on our institutional resources in that the Chinese
>
> students tend to need more language support services than other students. Not only
>
> language services, but academic support services as well as mental health services…and
>
> again that goes back to the fact that mental health isn't really seen as a thing in China. So,
>
> our services here have tended to be more taxed because of our greater Chinese
>
> population, which is a result of the travel ban impacting our lower Middle Eastern
>
> population...

As a result of the shift in international student enrollment at Bentley, the CISS has also

experienced a slightly higher demand for support services. "In our whole approach to serving

our students, we've shifted our focus and we've shifted our messaging as a result of the Trump

administration," asserts Mx. Upman. Equally important and particularly relevant to international

students is the impact on job placements in the Greater Boston-area. Mx. Upman, states that

...career services is seeing more companies here [becoming] more hesitant to hire

international students after they graduate...and it's not a bias thing, but it's more of a fear

for the change of visa regulations that might be coming, and they don't want to invest in

someone who is not ultimately going to be able to get sponsored or have a visa.

Indeed, the biggest change in the way in which some members external to the institution,

specifically Boston-area companies, view and engage with Bentley's international students is

particularly significant. Clearly, for international students attracted to U.S. HEIs for the

prospect of gaining some work experience in addition to pursuing their academic goals, a serious

problem is created by new federal level immigration restrictions and the fear-based sentiments

on changing visa regulations induced by those policies. The impact, at least in the case of

Bentley, should not be overlooked or underestimated.

Indeed, a grave area of concern for many prospective international students is that new

policies could pose an even greater barrier to acquiring a visa to study in the U.S. Mx. As Upman

argues,

There are already a lot of hoops that people need to jump through…I mean, if you can get

a student visa, you've already gone through the admissions process by U.S. institutions

and you've already shown your financial documentation, you've already proven you have

non-immigrant intent. So, to add more restrictions on that I definitely do not think is the

answer...we just had a student denied yesterday, and we don't know why. He was a

student from Pakistan.

The consequences for HEIs in the U.S. as a result of perceived threats are vast, and the pervasive

monitoring of international students could have far-reaching implications. At Bentley, Mx.

Upman says,

We've had students who were here from those countries [on the travel ban list] that...did

not go home because they could not go back to finish their degree…and you got

separation right there…their family members certainly couldn't come here and visit them

for graduation.

Moreover, declaring oneself a 'sanctuary campus' "in some ways...draws more attention to your

campus than needs to be there," says Mx. Upman, adding

I think it's kind of, unfortunately, a meaningless term...I mean yes, it gives a message to

international students that we care about you and you're safe, but...I know that it doesn't

do anything...you can't prevent the government from revoking someone's immigration

status even if you call yourself a sanctuary campus…

There are certain truths to the legal barriers of universities declaring themselves as sanctuary

campuses. However, it has not prevented some U.S. cities (i.e. New York City, Seattle, etc.)

from declaring themselves 'sanctuary cities'; they claim that resisting federal intervention is their

"lawful exercise of local government authority" (NBC, 2017).

The university is taking several steps to curb the potentially negative impact caused by

Trump administration immigration policies and general anti-foreigner rhetoric and statements

circulating through mainstream media. Bentley has decided to work more intently with their

messaging and outgoing communications with students to convey on a more personal level,

according to Mx. Upman. She/he states

we care about them and we're here for them...that we're going to do everything we can

by advocating...attending conferences and keeping up with the regulations and make sure

we can make their experience as good as possible given the climate.

However, a bulk of the messaging U.S. university recruiting and admissions offices have relied on in the past might not be as convincing as it in the past. The troubling current political environment might call on institutions to think more critically about ways to diversify their recruiting practices beyond relying on graduates' positive experiences—albeit these experiences will vary greatly from student to student and from institution to institution. IHEs will necessarily have to consider the future of U.S. higher education more pragmatically.

From Mx. Untari's point of view,

> I don't think I would like fully encourage anybody to come to the US to study. I believe the aggression or the welcoming of international students [in the U.S.] is decreasing in my opinion...that it may not be by institutions themselves, but I do believe that the government...Trump...I believe it's becoming less and less welcoming and that it's becoming more of worry to international students. 'What is my future going to look like? Will I be able to study comfortably? What are my options after graduating?' It's already such a big question—what are my options after study that I think now that it's becoming even more of a question...and more of a worry...and something you have to think about. But I would say if they are prepared to have those kinds of discussions and have that additional cost...I mean have those concerns and have that additional worry on top of you studying. Then I would say go ahead. But, I wouldn't be the first person to say to come here to study.

Sharing with me a conversation with campus recruiter about plans after graduation, Mx. Untari expressed concern about the current political climate:

> The whole uncertainty...with international students are already so difficult...but with the [federal] administration...I think it does make it a bigger question to answer...In general,

I've always had the sense that I would like to continue my studies and have a bit of work

experience abroad and then return home. But now I have to accept that that might not be

the case. We really don't know what's going to happen.

Mx. Untari thinks it would be in her best interest to continue studying in the U.S. and hopes to

pursue opportunities after graduation, but the environment raises many questions for her. As she

states,

I think universities are very welcoming and open to international students. So, I do

believe, given...recent events...and given how the universities responds to certain issues

they will actually attempt to attract even more international students. I think it's going to

be difficult given that universities are...and I'm just speculating... trying to welcome an

even bigger population of international students. However, the government might not be

very welcoming to certain groups of people or certain nationalities. So, I think it could go

one of two ways because universities, given their nature as educational institutions, will

try to make students as welcomed as possible, but still comply with the law...However, I

do believe that institutions will move towards welcoming more international

students...kind of like a retaliation.

There is an awareness that the university is trying its best to support her and her peers

accomplish their goals for study and work experience, but the competing factors of the work

environment and of companies expressing a concern for hiring international students make this a

difficult time for Mx. Untari and others seeking post-graduation employment opportunities. The

Trump administration policies and postures have something to do with it. However, as he/she

indicates, it is not the only factor involved in creating the environment where he/she can feel

welcomed and supported to carry out his/her dreams.

Chapter Eight

Findings

The evidence collected from the case study institutions demonstrates that the reality of the Trump administration has negatively impacted the internationalization strategies of these universities and has created an unwelcoming environment for international students on their campuses. Given the number and type of data collected, it may be difficult to assume that institutions beyond the Greater Boston-area colleges and universities participating in this study have been necessarily affected by the travel ban and immigration policies.

This chapter will now aggregate the 'lived experiences' of the case study institutions by drawing principally on the individual accounts of the research participants, in addition to university web pages, documents, and other sources, to gain insight into the unique circumstances and changing on-campus environments of four institutions in the Greater Boston-area. The result will help shape a greater understanding of the primary goal of this study, which is to assess the level of impact on international students at the participating G.B.A.C.U.s and on the institutions hosting them. The analysis moves from description, through the examination and comparison of texts within each case study, to categorization, the conceptualization of emerging patterns and synthesis of data across all cases (Yin, 2004). The construction and designation of codes guided much of this analysis and was framed in the early stages around the key categorical constructs that constitute the bedrock of this study.

The overall aim is to make some meaningful connections among the different dimensions of challenges facing the case study institutions' internationalization goals and priorities, with special focus on the effects being exerted on the international student experience. To frame the discussion, the key issues and trends of the case study institutions are organized and compared to

encompass a wide range of experiences to the different challenges—arising in many unexpected ways—posed by the Trump administration. By synthesizing the data, the most salient issues and state of the overall higher education climate affecting international students at the participating G.B.A.C.U. campuses can be more clearly and broadly understood.

Impact on International Priorities and Organizing Strategies

There is an expressed interest in internationalization across all the case study institutions; however, the specific areas of internationalization on which the institutions focus their energy, time, and activities vary. The commitment to cultivating an internationalized campus culture and global outlook is most readily evidenced by the institutions' mission statements, the visions of its senior leaders, and strategic initiatives. While the institutions' presidents and upper leadership can serve a vital role—as sources of encouragement and inspiration for students, faculty, staff, and others in the community—to carry out a global agenda, articulated rationales for internationalization (and clear objectives to carry them out) suggest an intentional effort by the administration to integrate the international dimension into many if not all functions of the university. This effort is more visible at the UMB and Babson, based on the combination of their core principles and values, missions, and vision statements, than it is at BC and Bentley. Looking at the same criteria, there appears to an intention by the latter two institutions to strengthen their positions in relation to internationalization. The explicit recognition of the importance of internationalization is certainly expressed in some form at each of the case study institutions.

The drive by the case study institutions to foster a global learning environment that is sensitive to and in tune with the interests of its campus community is very important as we look at how, across the four cases, the Trump administration has impacted the institutions'

internationalization goals and priorities, international students being featured prominently at the forefront of those agendas. Table 4 shows which of the case institutions' internationalization activities and other areas have been affected by the Trump administration's influence and ranks them (high to low) according to how important the institution perceives the area impacted.

Table 4

Area of Internationalization Impacted by Trump Administration and Estimated Level of Importance: All Case Study Institutions

Name	Area of Impact	Level of Importance
Babson	Recruitment	High
	Study abroad	High
	International Student Engagement	High
	Revenue Generation (from enrollment of international students)	High
	Academic Programs	Medium
	Faculty Engagement Abroad	Medium
	Partnership Development and Research Collaboration	Low
	Local community engagement	Low
UMB	Recruitment	High
	Enrollment	High
	Revenue Generation (from enrollment of international students)	High

	International Student Engagement	High
	Study abroad	Medium
	Graduate student research	Medium
	Partnership Development	Low
	Research Collaboration	Low
BC	International Student Engagement	High
	Global Engagement Initiative	Low
	Enrollment	Low
	Future international student recruitment efforts	Low
	Partnership Development	Low
Bentley	Recruitment	High
	Enrollment	High
	International Student Engagement	High
	Demographic shifts	High
	Engagement w/ international students by Companies in Boston	High
	Study Abroad	Low
	Partnership Development	Low

Recruitment and Enrollment

Given the most recent *Open Doors* report (IIE, 2017a), the data illustrate a trend affecting

most higher education institutions in the United States; despite a slight increase in total

enrollment, the matriculation of new international students, for the first time in nearly a decade,

is decreasing. A review of the literature further shows evidence of the U.S. as a less favorable

option for study compared to other English-speaking countries. These emerging trends are

reflective, in some ways, of the experiences of the institutions in this study. Despite prevailing

assumptions, not all have been affected by the changes in enrollment. The study participants at

the UMB, Bentley, and Babson cited recruitment and enrollment—to various degrees—as major

areas of concern, and two of those three institutions cited revenue generation as consequently

problematic. On the other hand, BC does not think the political climate has necessarily affected

its enrollment or its capacity to recruit new students. The institution's claim supports some

existing evidence that suggests some of the more competitive nationally ranked private

institutions have not experienced a decrease, and in fact, retain and have grown their

international student enrollments. Although BC's GE initiative is focused on other aspects of its

internationalization agenda, if future plans to recruit more international students are carried

out—which the interview data suggests might be the case—BC could experience a potentially

negative impact on its enrollment and recruitment strategies. While there is significant variation

in marketing and admissions tactics, in general, it appears that the most pragmatic action taken

by the case study institutions to address their recruitment and enrollment priorities has been to

focus keenly on outgoing communications and promotional messaging. In this way, the

participating institutions aim to combat the sometimes harsh rhetoric emanating from the federal

administration and to thoughtfully reassure students and the community that students are

supported. In addition, two of the case study universities aim to increase engagement with their

alumni engagement in order to attract prospective international students. Indeed, enrollment and recruitment tended to be the most frequently referenced priority areas of concern for the case study institutions, both as a major facet of internationalization, in general, and as a key area of interest during the Trump administration.

Academic Programs and Study Abroad

Contemplating the goals inherent in their missions, all the case study institutions express a desire to advance their global efforts across several dimensions. There were limited data to draw conclusions on how the Trump administration has specifically impacted the institutions' academic programs. However, the evidence that was gathered suggests classroom learning and teaching have not been negatively affected. Data on international students' academic challenges at the case study institutions indicate no increased or decreased incidences of bigotry or hate towards international students. At the other end of the mobility spectrum is the effort by all the participating institutions to provide opportunities for education abroad to both domestic and international student populations. While all institutions demonstrate some level of commitment to education abroad, participation rates are stronger at some institutions than others. Bentley, Babson, and BC, all show 50 percent or higher participation rates among their entire student population. The UMB and Babson cases especially stand out as their administrations have expressed some concern about their students studying abroad, citing the political climate in the U.S. as a cause and as a driver. While the reasons for and extent of their concerns vary, the administrations at the case study institutions are aware the issue is real, either because they have had students experience it or they worry their students will.

International Partnerships and Research Collaboration

The case study institutions had very different views on whether or not Trump's immigration policies have had an impact on partnership development and research collaboration. However, the respondents from the UMB and Babson both indicated the current political climate creates a less 'healthy' environment for establishing new institutional partners, either indirectly by figuratively cross-comparing the U.S. higher education landscape and national policies against other countries with more open and welcoming immigrant policies, or by explicitly stating the Trump administration and its severe vetting processes as a reason not to engage in new partnership discussions. At BC and Bentley, the data are less clear, due primarily to the respondents' level of involvement and/or knowledge of institutional partnerships and institutional research, much less the actual impact of the political climate on those areas. In addition, at least in the case of Babson, the Trump administration has not impacted research collaboration among faculty, as the interviewee there stated that joint-research is active and on-going. Overall, the data suggest that international partnerships and research collaborations are not an area of major concern.

Student Support Services and University Operations

In general, the organizational dimension at all four case study institutions is an important focal area in their internationalization strategy, as it is principally concerned with the institutional mechanisms of delivering university-wide support to international students. Again, understanding there is considerable variation in the specific ways these institutions approach and engage their students on campus, there is some similarity in terms of impact on certain areas, offices, and support units across all four of the G.B.A.C.U.s participating in this study. Table 5 shows the level of impact on the institutions' international offices and the key approaches taken

by them to support their international students in response to developments initiated by the

Trump administration.

Table 5

Level of Impact on International Office and Type of Action Taken to Provide Student Support in Response to Travel Ban and Immigration Policies of the Trump Administration: All Case Study Institutions

Office Name	Level of Impact	Type of Action Taken
Babson's International Students and Scholars Services (ISSS)	High	Created forums
		Invited immigration attorneys
		Increased outreach to student groups on campus
		Proactively engagement by career services
		Increased faculty support and engagement
UMB's International Student and Scholar Office (ISSO)	High	Created forums with target countries and all students
		Invited immigration attorneys
		Created webpage to share updates on immigration and travel policies
		Increased administrative involvement
		Increased faculty involvement
BC's Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS)	Medium	Created webpage to share updates on immigration and travel policies

		Increased outreach to students
Bentley's Center for International Students and Scholars (CISS)	High	Implemented international student progress report tracking
		Changed student approach; service more customer friendly
		Enhanced outreach efforts
		Took trip to DC to advocates for students

There are several other university offices that have been impacted by changes to and statements made about travel and immigration. For example, career services at three of the four case study institutions have been impacted in some way. However, the Babson interviewee was the only participant to have explicitly stated "proactive engagement" as an approach taken by its career services office to support its international students, while the other interviewees mentioned that their career offices might have been impacted but did not provide reasons why or details about how this might have occurred. To what extent the institutions' career service offices were engaged is unknown based on the data collected.

What is clear is that the most affected units—the international offices of all four institutions—were reported to have received the brunt of the attention and traffic from international students. Most of the major actions taken in response to a call for support by students have been initiated and carried out by those offices on the ground closest to the students (e.g. academic departments, advisors, health services, counseling, etc.), with the international office taking the lead, likely due to its proximity to and familiarity among students, or simply due to the product of its context—an office created specifically, more or less, to support

international students. Broadly speaking, nearly all of the most visible administrative

adjustments seem to have been made around the same time and probably in direct response to

either the announcement of the travel ban or an immigration-oriented policy development. Apart

from offering general support to students, there have been few actions common among all four

case study institutions. Indeed, Bentley is most distinct in this regard because its enactments are

unique compared to the others. Bentley implemented an academic progress report tracking

system to monitor student success and other issues; took a trip to Washington D.C. to advocate

for its students; and made intentional changes to how it approaches its international students.

However, steps absent from Bentley's list of key actions are present in the other three.

Interestingly, the UMB is uniquely positioned between BC and Babson in terms of shared key

actions. In both the case of the UMB and BC, the creation of a webpage displaying important

updates and news on executive orders and policy developments stands outs as a particularly

pronounced decision. This action might be partially attributed to the size of these two

institutions and the large number of international students they enroll (number one and number

two in terms of total student enrollment out of all four institutions profiled in this study). The

UMB also shares with Babson the decision to create a forum for international students and to

invite immigration attorneys and legal experts to address immigration concerns more broadly and

to calm any fears or rumors that might be spreading throughout the international student

community. It is particularly interesting that Babson chose this course of action considering the

relatively small (though not smallest in this study) size of its international student body

compared with BC and Bentley, which have larger international populations. In addition, the

invitation to immigration lawyers and the hosting of the student forums were likely organized ad

hoc to address students' and administrators' most pressing concerns (and have since been

discontinued). They were likely coordinated within a short window of time, but specifically in response to the travel ban.

Impact on Lived Experiences of International Students

In all cases, the data collected from the key administrators at the four participating G.B.A.C.U.s suggest the Trump administration is responsible for confounding the environment and multiplying the challenges faced by some international students—already complex in nature and diffused throughout their college experience—which has led each of the institutions down a road they would not have otherwise traveled. A general trend and overarching theme that emerged across all four participating universities is the creation of a state of uncertainty caused by some of the immigration policies and the anti-immigration rhetoric and, in general, the overall political environment surrounding the Trump administration. The centerpiece beyond the specific international activities and organizational strategies of the case study institutions and which many connect to the idea of a truly internationalized and multicultural campus is its international student population. However, the issues and challenges international students deal with will vary significantly from student to student, and they will also be perceived differently depending on who is asked. Therefore, the discussion now moves to discovering the dynamic dimensions of international students' lived experiences at the case study institutions through two lenses—administrators' and international students.' [1]

Administrations' Heightened Awareness of Challenges

The experiences of this population of students can vary and can encompass many known and unknown variables simultaneously. The data suggest that the case study institutions, while continuously engaged in the work of student affairs, with respect to improving

---

[1] The analysis of the lived experiences of international students from the student perspective is made based principally on the interviews with international student-leaders at Boston College and Bentley University. There were no international student participants from Babson College or the University of Massachusetts Boston.

internationalization on-campus, have developed a keen awareness of and sensitized reflexivity to the needs of their international students, especially since the time the first travel ban was announced. The desire and willingness to bolster student support services is a characteristic shared across all four institutions and is demonstrated by the recognition of several important areas of impact to the social, academic, and personal development of their international students. Table 6 provides some examples of the types of challenges international students might face from the administration's point of view, the attribute of the challenge, and a sample response from the administrators. Administrators at the case study institutions tended to be aware of the challenges their students are facing, in most instances.

Table 6

Type of Challenges to International Students and Associated Causes from Administration's Perspective: All Case Study Institutions

Name	Type of Challenge	Challenge Attributed to	Sample Administrator Response
Babson	Social	Rhetoric	Students are "concerned about, maybe even experience intimidation, discrimination"
	Psychological/Emotional	Travel Ban	The experience for "international students was jarring—it shook them up"
	Community	Rhetoric	International students still face "occasional bigotry and other things"

	Informational	Travel Ban	"We had no real way to reassure ourselves, much less our students"
UMB	Social	Rhetoric	Intensifies pressure to "adapt to the climate"
	Psychological/Emotional	Travel Ban Immigration policies Rhetoric	"There was a lot of anxiety and apprehension" and students "using mental health services"
UMB	Academic	Travel Ban	"Student research activities overseas 'has been somewhat affected"
	Co-curricular	Travel Ban Immigration policies	International students considering study abroad "shied away from participating because of reentry difficulties"
	Informational	Travel Ban	"There were a lot of questions, concerns, apprehension"
BC	Social	Cultural adjustment Rhetoric	It can be "hard for them to meet Americans"
	Psychological/Emotional	Travel Ban	The first one "caused fear and anxiety"
	Work Experience	Immigration policies Rhetoric	Finding jobs is a challenge "because there is prejudice,

			discrimination, and anti-immigrant sentiment going on"
Bentley	Social	Student Political affiliations	"Some [student] groups here are divided"
	Psychological/Emotional	Travel Ban Immigration policies Rhetoric	"It's scary to come here, especially these days"
	Student Life On-Campus	Rhetoric Immigration policies Rhetoric	"If concerns arise, we are reaching out early"
	Work Experience	Rhetoric Immigration policies	"Companies are hesitating to hire international students"
	Mental Health	Cultural Adjustment Political climate	"We have seen mental health concerns"

Moderately congruent across all the participating universities is the increased attention to vulnerable student populations, including but not limited to only international students. Specifically, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) was cited as one such group—due largely to either new immigration policies or the threat of new policies—who are labeled in the legal system as having only temporarily lawful presence in the U.S. due to their lack of permanent residency status or U.S. citizenship. Under legal terms and with respect to SEVIS, students with DACA status are not counted as international students. Unlike international students, DACA students have fewer legal rights under the law, which makes them a particularly vulnerable population. Since DACA students are not required to identify themselves, they often

fly under the radar, which has created another set of challenges for institutions. Some administrators of the case study institutions indicate that the issues and challenges experienced by both types of students with respect to immigration are similar. I reference DACA here not only because a pattern could be seen in the data, but also because of the interrelation and overlap of vulnerable student populations' experiences.

Across all institutions, administrators reported feelings of 'anxiety' and 'stress' as some of the most common symptoms experienced by their international students, especially at the time the first travel ban was announced by the Trump administration. In addition, all administrators reported feeling empathetic to their international students' unique situations last year when another version of the ban quickly manifested right after the first, and all of the respondents reported some level of discouragement for being unable to reassure their students not to worry and that the situation would likely pass or be improved.

International Students' Perception and Realization of Challenges

The international students from Boston College and Bentley University reported some different issues from the administrators at those institutions, and their perspectives as students were also not aligned with one another. Table 7 provides a sample of responses from each of the students on the types of challenges they are facing and the sources they perceive those challenges to be attributed.

Table 7

Type of Student Challenges and Attributable Causes from International Students'
Perspective: Boston College and Bentley University

Name	Type of Challenge	Challenge Attributed To	Sample Student Response

Mx. Bailey Collins (BC)	Social	Institution/Campus culture	"Environment to make friends isn't welcoming and supportive"
	Psychological/Emotional	Institution/Campus culture	"I don't feel a sense of belonging"
	Academic	Domestic students Professors Academic departments	"Students find it hard to engage in class discussions" and [some departments] "Don't feel welcoming and supportive"
	Work Experience	Existing difficulties Rhetoric	"It's been hard for [graduate students] to find jobs"
	Informational	Institution/Campus culture	"I do feel there's a lack of connection between the institution and international students"
Mx. Bo Untari (Bentley)	Life On-campus	Domestic students	"I do feel [domestic] students are less interested in engaging in critical discussions about [global] issues"
	Adaptation	Cultural Adjustment Political Climate	Adjustment beyond "normal culture shock"
	Social	Rhetoric	"I would say the campus climate has changed in terms of what can be acceptable and what is not obviously"
	Psychological/Emotional	Travel Ban Rhetoric Immigration Policies	"America is becoming less and less welcoming"

Academic	TB	"In general, it hasn't affected my learning"
Work Experience	Immigration Policies	Pursuing work opportunities "is becoming more of a worry"
Informational	Institution/Campus culture	The availability of resources means "university is making an effort to understand student challenges'
Life On-campus	Political Climate	Institution is aware and "makes sure people feel welcomed and supported"

The students' stories tended to be more nuanced and contextualized and, in general, were less corroborative in terms of their own experiences as students. The reasons could be partly attributed to the students' nationality, cultural values, personal circumstances, sensitivity to certain issues over others, or a host of other differences. The following are some of the topics on which the student participants could agree: recommending the U.S. as a destination of study to their friends back home (at least partially); the feeling of being welcomed in the current political and cultural climate in the United States; and the general attitude of universities with respect to hosting international students. While the student from BC would recommend his/her friends back home to study in the U.S. citing the quality of U.S. higher education as a major reason, the Bentley student reported that he/she would only recommend the U.S. as a study destination to his/her friends back home if they were prepared to endure some significant challenges, specifically referencing the anti-foreigner and unwelcoming atmosphere in the United States.

Each one of them senses a growing hostility towards foreigners, and both fear that ensuing challenges will likely become barriers for international students seeking to study in U.S. higher education.

The students expressed a feeling of unwelcomeness associated directly and indirectly with the current political climate, relaying a general feeling of discomfort, stress, and uncertainty. Reflecting on their current situation, one student does not feel their learning experience has been negatively impacted by U.S. politics but sees anti-immigrant and anti-foreigner rhetoric as an increasing area of concern for international students considering educational opportunities in the United States. Both students tend to agree that U.S. colleges and universities by nature exist to serve students and support them in their educational pursuits. However, with respect to improving support, one student is acutely aware of the critical need for institutions to foster a learning environment where bilateral exchange and global perspectives—intentional processes and outcomes of internationalization at home and of the curriculum—are valued and appreciated not only by single offices and departments, but by the entire university community. The students, in many ways, suggest that all institutions should consider ways in which they can make the future of U.S. higher education more accommodating and responsive to the growing needs of international students.

Chapter Nine

Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this concluding chapter is three-fold. The opportunity to summarize the key findings is paramount among them. The results, specifically attuned to the case study institutions, demonstrate why the central issues under investigation are important and how they could be meaningful and worthy of interest to institutions beyond the institutional contexts presented in this study. In addition, this report provides some recommendations on ways to enhance support for the international student dimension of internationalization at the case study institutions or on other G.B.A.C.U. campuses that might find these suggestions helpful to their needs. And lastly, this chapter discusses the limitations to the study, addressing any apparent shortcomings and possibly serving as a point from which other researchers might enhance the study's design or identify the 'incomplete' parts of the research. Possible areas for further research will also be presented.

The purpose of this study was to understand the extent to which four G.B.A.C.U.s—Babson College, the University of Massachusetts Boston (UMB), Boston College (BC), and Bentley University—have experienced and responded to the central realities of Trump administration as those realities have challenged their international students specifically and their internationalization priorities more broadly. Data on each of the participating institutions was gathered primarily by interviews with four key administrators engaged in the international work of the university and with two international students serving in leadership roles within an international student on-campus organization and by reviewing a mixture of official university documents, press releases, and webpages. An analysis of the data was then undertaken to draw

out multiple shades of meaning in the ways the four G.B.A.C.U.s responded to their

environments and to certain key events at the national level (e.g. announcement of the travel

ban). Finally, the analyzed case-specific data were used to make comparisons across all four

institutions and to determine if any patterns or themes emerged.

In essence, the institutions of this study have responded similarly to the U.S. political

climate. The general feeling of discouragement was demonstrated to be a motivating factor as

the institutions, their administrations, and central offices and services leaned toward being more

receptive to international students in the midst of a seemingly fluctuating immigration policy

crisis. Although willing to administratively adapt in certain situations in response to U.S.

politics and ensuing waves of anti-immigration rhetoric and sentiment, the institutions

understand a robust support structure is critical if they are to improve services and retain

students. Most important presently for the case study institutions is staying abreast of new

developments affecting their currently enrolled international students.

Summary of Key Findings and Implications

The broader dimensions of internationalization at the G.B.A.C.U. case study institutions

represent an overarching category framing this study, with the student dimension embedded

critically at its core. The key finding observed therein is that all four case study institutions have

taken tangible actions that have materialized beyond emblematic institutional statements

addressing their campus communities. Specifically, the data show that all four institutions have

reacted to the U.S. political climate—particularly focusing on Trump-era immigration policies

and the travel ban—out of a natural impulse to want to help, but they also have reacted carefully

and purposefully because that is what they feel needs to be done in order to mitigate further

negative impact to their current international students and potentially negative impact to new

students. The institutional efforts to curb the greatest possible risk are more evident at some institutions than others, but the motivation and drive to respond to the unfolding situation seems to stem from a utilitarian perspective, having less to do with interviewees 'jobs' and more to do with their sense of purpose and self as educators engaged in public good actions for all of their students and entire campus community.

This study finds that the G.B.A.C.U.s participating in this research have indeed responded to federal immigration policies and nationalistic political rhetoric—emanating from and perpetuated by the Trump administration—on their campuses in specific ways relevant and significant to their distinct institutional contexts. Some of the most pronounced findings indicate the institutions are:

- *Reacting especially attentively to the recruitment and enrollment of international students.* Indeed, admissions offices serve the important function of attracting international students to the institution. The institutions' survival depends on the enrollment of international and domestic students and is a high priority area that appears to warrant much of the attention of the case study institutions.

- *Developing an increasing awareness of the sensitive nature of special student populations.* Recognition that all international students are not the same is an axiom for many international educators. However, there tended to be a desire by all the participating institutions to raise awareness of underrepresented and vulnerable student populations by encouraging campus community-wide support.

- *Affirming a clear commitment by institutional leaders to engage their campuses globally.* While the message to cultivate engagement with internationalization on their home campuses is certainly expressed by the case study G.B.A.C.U.s in several places on their websites and

in their university documents, there is a demonstrable effort by the senior leadership to reach out during especially sensitive times to reinforce their commitment.

- *Emphasizing the international office as a central channel for student services and support.* Serving as the de facto administrative center for services to international students, the international office plays a critical role at all four case study institutions in terms of its 'support' responsibilities. For many students, the functional aspect of the office takes on an identity akin to a 'home base' or a place of familiar comfort for international students.

- *Taking ad hoc actions and changing approaches to support students during critical times.* Beyond the standard scope of pre-existing student programs and support services, efforts to respond efficiently and effectively to new developments—particularly around the times in which the first two travel ban versions were announced—most noticeably took the form of *ad hoc* approaches and sensitized services specificity with respect to engaging the case study institutions' international students.

The past two years have represented a significant period of reflection and growth for American higher education institutions. The hard-stance 'America-first' strategies and the precipitous immigration policies issued in the wake of the current federal administration could have been envisioned and operationalized during any number of presidencies, which suggests it is never too late to develop some fresh goals and contingency plans should a new internationalization 'emergency' arise without warning. More importantly, the case study institutions, and the wider higher education community in the United States, should recognize that the rapid immigration reform propelled by the Trump administration can cause serious impediments to their existing internationalization strategies, especially those concerning international students and engaging that vulnerable population successfully on their campuses.

American colleges and universities must continue to monitor the shifts in the flow of students to the U.S. And understand also that those shifts represent a small reflection of the expansive demographic shifts in migration occurring globally. These changes are likely to have far-reaching implications for both incoming and outgoing student mobility currently affecting U.S. higher education.

Recommendations and Future Opportunities

The experiences presented in this study by the case study institutions and international students suggest there are a number of opportunities to improve the international dimensions of their learning, working, and living environments. However, sustaining the energy and drive to engage meaningfully in those activities and discussions will require the combined efforts of the entire campus community. More than moderately congruent across all participating case study G.B.A.C.U.s is a desire to improve engagement with the idea of internationalization, but more specifically, a focus on deeper engagement with their international student populations. The central issues of the G.B.A.C.U.s participating in this study are not entirely different from those of the international students they serve, in the sense that both are seeking resources, albeit in different forms, in order to problem-solve in areas requiring attention and to find solutions to the encumbering weight of those problems. There are no 'complete answers', especially in a highly differentiated and rapidly changing U.S. higher education environment. However, what is hoped is that some of the following recommendations might be useful to the G.B.A.C.U.s participating in this study, as well as to other institutions facing similar challenges in the Greater Boston-area and in the U.S, more broadly:

- *Form polyvalent relationships by interconnecting key institutional centers of support.[2]* There
  are several service units and staff on campus to support international students; however, there
  does not appear to be much cohesion and collaboration between them. A network of inter-
  linking support between the senior-leadership, academic departments and deans, student
  affairs, English language training programs, career services, and counseling centers, for
  example, could enhance coordinating efforts on-campus, in turn, encouraging offices to share
  their experiences working with international students and to develop some effective
  mechanisms to responsibly provide outreach services to them.

- *Create a database to support international student success and inclusion.* Implementing a
  strategy to systematically track the progress of international students that could be shared via
  several departments could be useful for retention purposes. Offices receiving high volumes
  of student visitors, such as e.g.—counseling centers, English language training programs,
  academic tutoring offices—might be good candidates with whom to start an initiative such as
  this. Processes for 'how' and 'to whom' data is reported will be need to be clearly defined.

- *Centralize institutional commitment to diversity tolerance and global awareness.* The senior
  institutional leadership can play an active role in promoting a welcoming and inclusive
  higher learning community on their campuses by encouraging and sustaining the
  involvement of all schools, departments, offices, faculty, community organizations, and other
  stakeholders.

- *Design and implement bi-annual international student evaluation surveys.* The surveys
  could assess the satisfaction levels of students with respect to the services and programs

---

[2] Valence can be defined as the capacity of one person or thing to react with or affect another in
some special way, as by attraction or the facilitation of a function or activity. (Valence, n.d.).

offered to them throughout the school year. The performance indicators, for which the survey would account, could draw from data gathered by student services, counseling, English as a Second Language, student involvement, and academic departments (see 'inter-office and inter-department collaboration efforts above). Performing regular assessments and evaluations of support services would offer essential feedback directly from the source—international students. Such information could be promoted and distributed by the international student office, which students are bound to use.

- *Improve relations between international student groups and the institution.* Institutional leadership can work more directly with leaders of international student organizations to include them in "town-hall" meetings, ensuring that their voices are heard alongside other on-campus student groups and associations. There is also room to cooperate further and more deeply with international student offices to improve the provision of existing support programs and services.

- *Strengthen institution-government relations and collaboration.* Although most case study respondents agree that HEIs play a limited role in securing borders and limiting threats to national security, there remains room to strengthen the relationship with government. Beyond compliance with SEVIS, there could be opportunities to work more closely with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and other immigration officials. One way to improve this relationship, according to one respondent, is to have more regular face-to-face encounters. Another way might be to host professional development seminars and workshops for university staff and to invite immigration officials as special guest speakers.

Limitations

Why limit this study to only HEIs in the Greater Boston-area? Convenience was a motivating factor. The ability to meet with study participants in person was also an attractive feature of this strategy. More importantly, the selection of the Greater Boston-area allowed for a closer look at how a highly saturated higher education community located in a given state's main metropolitan area is responding to wide and sweeping policy changes at the federal level. A case, therefore, could be made that the results of this study have greater 'generalizable' capacity, at least across this specific geographic domain. A major limitation in this study was the number of available students and administrators able to participate. Fewer than half of the hoped-for number of interview participants sought were reached. Particularly noteworthy is the lack of student participation from Babson and the UMB. The most probable reason to account for this gap in participants could be he time in which recruitment began—at the end of the spring semester in 2018. This timing might have counter-interacted with commencement, the closing of the fiscal cycle, summer traveling (among students and administrators), or other priorities.

Another visible limitation on the part of the researcher was clearly distinguishing between student issues and challenges arising from the Trump administration and the issues and challenges that predated Trump. Such was the case in how some of the interview questions were framed (i.e. non-student interview, question #2).

Suggestions for Further Research

There were several important findings from the analysis on the case study institutions' internationalization priorities. However, the evidence also helped uncover several other areas of interest concerning global student mobility and international student engagement that further research might help address. Two of the most salient areas include:

1. All the case study institutions experienced some level of bewilderment, especially around the time the travel ban was first announced by the Trump administration. The politicized rhetoric on immigration during the Trump campaign raises a number of red flags for higher education institutions enrolling not only international students from predominantly Muslim countries (including but not limited to the one identified on the travel bans) but also to the untold numbers of DACA students. When rhetoric turns to demonstrable action through policy decisions and implementation, there is not much that can be done by institutions other than to provide as much support and accommodations to their students as possible (within the scope of the law) and advocate on their behalf to the government. However, many U.S. college and university campuses might not have the necessary plans in place to be able to offer support or they might not know where to begin. Therefore, some important questions might include: Has pressure from the U.S. political climate improved how institutions manage crises involving their international student populations on their campuses? How active are student affairs and academic affairs in addressing crises involving international students? Do institutions' have contingency or backup plans to implement when their organizational strategies on internationalization and university-wide operations are disrupted by circumstance beyond their control (e.g. issuance of another travel ban)? How confident are universities in their existing student support infrastructure to respond to students in dire need of assistance? Should an institution's leadership be involved in these discussions, and if so, to what degree?

2. Another important area for further research might look at the provision of health services and mental health counseling at U.S. colleges and universities. Health services are a key service area and they serve an important function in institutions' infrastructure as the service is

widely used by the entire academic community. While the purpose of this report was not focused on addressing the specific dimensions of this particular university service, the discoveries made in the analysis of the case study institutions show that health services are increasingly being used by students to address mental health issues. However, not all students might feel comfortable using these services because they might not address the unique cultural backgrounds and sensitivities of all their students. Some questions for further research of this dimension might include: How do institutions with articulated internationalization plans critically address the health concerns of their international students? What types of international students are more likely to use these services, for example mental health counseling, and what might be the reasons why other groups do not use them? How much time is devoted in international student orientation to discussing mental health and how accessible are existing resources? Language translation to aid in comprehensibility of student health service functions is another important dimension that should be addressed.

Closing Remarks

Many of the challenges and issues that have impacted U.S. higher education institutions in the past continue to affect institutions today. The need for enhanced support for international students is clearer than ever before. While national security and immigration are critical issues facing our country today, the federal government should understand that international students are here principally to study and improve their livelihoods while at the same time making a significant contribution to the nation's economy and to the financial operations of universities. The barriers to study in the United States as an international student were extensive before the Trump administration, but new policies on immigration threaten to turn away even

further this crucial intellectual capital—which will have an extraordinary impact on U.S. higher education—giving the opportunity to other competitive countries to benefit from U.S.'s loss. Despite the apparent challenges, colleges and universities in the United States—specifically those with internationalization priorities that involve international students—have an important role to play in attending to their campus communities and the raised concerns of international students' as they potentially face further impediments to their education, careers, and lives.

References

Altbach, P.G. (2004a). Globalisation and the university: myths and realities in an unequal world. Tertiary Education and Management 10(1), 3-25. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:TEAM.0000012239.55136.4b.

Altbach, P.G. (2004b). Can the United States remain the top destination for foreign students? *Change*, *36*(2), 18-24.

Altbach, P.G. (2016a). Patterns of higher education development. In M.N. Bastedo, P.G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the 21st century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Altbach, P.G. & de Wit, H. (2016c). Internationalization and global tension: Lessons from history. *Global perspectives on Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Altbach, P.G. & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*(1), 5-25.

Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L.E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. *UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from https://www.unesco.org/tools/fileretrieve/28449773.pdf.

Altbach, P.G. & De Wit (2017). Trump and the coming revolution in higher education internationalization. *International Higher Education*, (89), 3-5. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/viewFile/9831/8613 DOI: http://dx.doi/org/10.6017/ihe.2017.89.9758.

Altbach, P.G. & Engberg (2014). Global Student Mobility: The Changing Landscape. *International Higher Education*, 77, pp. 11-13.

Altbach, P.G. & Knight, J. (2016). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Global perspectives on higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

American Council on Education (ACE) (2018a). CIGE model for comprehensive internationalization. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx.

American Council on Education (ACE) (2018b). ACE, higher education groups say the Trump administration's third travel ban threatens colleges' ability to attract international students, scholars. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/ACE-Higher-Education-Groups-Say-Third-Travel-Ban-Threatens-Colleges-Ability-to-Attract-International-Students-Scholars.aspx.

American Council on Education (ACE) (November 2011). Strength through Global Leadership and Engagement: U.S. Higher Education in the 21st Century. Blue Ribbon Report on Global Engagement. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/2011-CIGE-BRPReport.pdf.

Babson College (2018a). About Babson. Retrieved from http://www.babson.edu/about-babson/Pages/home.aspx.

Babson College (2018b). All undergraduate award details. Retrieved from http://www.babson.edu/admission/tuition-aid/undergraduate/Pages/all-scholarship-details.aspx.

Babson College (2017). Glavin Office of Multicultural and International Education. Retrieved

   from http://www.babson.edu/about-babson/global/mie/isss/Documents/babson-

   international-student-statistics.pdf.

Ball, S.J. (1990). *Politics and Policy Making in Education*. London: Routledge.

Bartram, B. (2007). The sociocultural needs of international students in higher education: A

   comparison of staff and student views. *Journal of Studies in International Education*,

   11(2), pp. 205-214.

Bentley University (2018a). About Bentley University. Retrieved from

   https://www.bentley.edu/about/bentley.

Bentley University (2018b). Mission, Vision, and Values. Retrieved from

   https://www.bentley.edu/about/mission-vision-and-values.

Bentley University (2018c). Message from the president. Retrieved from

   http://president.bentley.edu/news-and-updates/.

Bentley University (2018d). Our international community. Retrieved from

   https://www.bentley.edu/undergraduate/international-students.

Bentley University (2018e). The Cronin Office of International Education: 2017 Annual Report.

   Retrieved from https://www.bentley.edu/files/2016-

   2017%20International%20Education%20Annual%20Report.pdf.

Bevis, T.B. & Lucas, C.J. (2007*). International students in American colleges and universities: A

   history*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Doi: 10.1057/9780230609754.

Boehm, A., Davis, D., & Pearce, D. (2002). The Global Student Mobility 2025 Report: forecasts

   of the global demand for international education. Canberra: IDP.

Bok, D. (1986). The American System of Higher Education. In D. Bok (Ed.) *Higher Learning*,

    pp. 8-34. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boston College (2018a). A brief history of Boston College. The Office of the University

    Historian (updated August 23, 2011). Retrieved from

    http://www.bc.edu/offices/historian/resources/history.html.

Boston College (2018b). University Mission. Retrieved from

    http://www.bc.edu/offices/bylaws/mission.html.

Boston College (2018c). Boston College Statistics: International students, faculty, and research

    scholars, 2018. Retrieved from

    https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/offices/oiss/pdf/2014%20pdf/Documents%202017/

    OISS%20Stats%20Book%202017-2018%20-%20Official%20.pdf.

Boston College (2018d). Boston College Strategic Direction IV. Retrieved from

    https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/sites/strategic-plan/strategic-directions/direction-4-local-

    national-global-presence.html.

Brief of Amicus Curiae American Council on Education and 32 Other Higher Education

    Associations in Support of Respondents, Donald. J. Trump, President of the United

    States, et al. v State of Hawaii, et al. (2018) (no. 17-965). Retrieved from

    http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Amicus-Brief-Trump-v-Hawaii-as-filed-

    3-29-18.pdf

Briggs, P. & Ammigan, R. (2017). A collaborative programming and outreach model for

    international student support offices. *Journal of International Students*, *7*(4), 1080-1095.

    https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1035969.

Brewer, E. & Leask, B. (2012). Internationalization of the curriculum. In D.K. Deardorff, H. de

    Wit, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of international higher education*

    (pp. 245-265). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Burdett, J. & Crossman, J. (2012). Engaging international students: An analysis of the Australian

    universities quality agency (AUQA) reports. Quality Assurance in Education 20 (3): 207-

    22.

Cho, J. & Yu, H. (2014). Roles of University Support for International Students in the United

    States: Analysis of a Systematic Model of University Identification, University Support,

    and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *19*(1) 11–

    27.

Choudaha, R. (2016a). Campus readiness for supporting international student success. *Journal of*

    International Students, *6*(4), I-V.

Choudaha, R. (2016b). International educators build bridges, not walls. *University World News*.

    Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com.

Choudaha, R. (2017). Three waves of international student mobility (1999-2020). *Studies in*

    Higher Education. Retrieved from

    http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2017.1293872.

Choudaha, R. & de Wit, H. (2014). Challenges and Opportunities for global mobility in the

    future: A comparative and critical analysis. Symposium Books.

Choudaha, R. & Schulmann, P. (2014). Bridging the gap: Recruitment and retention to improve

    international student experiences. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Choudaha, R., Orosz, K., & Chang, L. (2012). Not all international students are the same. *World Education Services*. Retrieved from https://wenr.wes.org/2012/08/wenr-feature-2012-not-all-international-students-are-the-same.

Chmura, M. (2016). Babson establishes global entrepreneurship in residence program. Retrieved from http://www.babson.edu/news-events/babson-news/Pages/2016-babson-establishes-global-entrepreneur-in-residence-program.aspx.

Cohen, A.M. & Kisker, C.B. (2010). The shaping of American higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

De Wit, H. & Rumbley, L.E. (2008). The Role of American Higher Education in International Student Circulation, pp.199-232. In H. de Wit, A. Pawan, M.E. Said, M.T. Sehoole, & M. Sirozi (Eds.), *The dynamics of international student circulation in a global context* (pp. 199-231). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Dyer, C. (1995). *Beginning Research in Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. (1992). *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: Edward Arnold.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Sage.

Götz, F.M., Stieger, S., & Reips, U.D. (2018). The emergence and vitality of homesickness in exchange students abroad: A smartphone-based longitudinal study. *Environment and Behavior*, pp. 1-28.

Hanassab, S. & Tidwell, R. (2002). International Students in higher education: Identification of needs and implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *6*(4), 305-322. DOI: 10.1177/102831502237638.

Helms, R. M., Brajkovic, L., & Struthers, B. (2017). Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2017 edition. *American Council on Education*. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Mapping-Internationalization-2017.pdf.

Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the Teacher*. London: Routledge.

Hobsons (2017). Welcoming the World: The changing dynamics of international student recruitment. *Global international student survey 2017*. Retrieved from https://www.hobsons.com/res/Whitepapers/Hobsons_ISS2017_Global_Welcoming_the_World.pdf.

Institute of International Education (IIE) (2017a). *Open Doors 2016-2017*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Institute of International Education (IIE) (2017b). *Project Atlas*. Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Project-Atlas/Explore-Data.

Institute of International Education (IIE) (2014). *Open Doors 2013-2014*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Institute of International Education (IIE) (2008). *Open Doors 2007-2008*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Kelo, M., Rogers, T., & Rumbley, L.E. (2010). International student support in European higher education: Needs, solutions, and challenges. *Academic Cooperation Association*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education, 33*, 2-3.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(1), 5-31.

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America* (pp. 5-32). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: European Association of International Education.

Kramer, P.A. (2009). Is the World Our Campus? International Students and U.S. Global Power in the Long Twentieth Century. *The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations 33*(5), 775-806. The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR). Malden, MA: Wiley Periodicals.

Krantz, L. (2017, November 15). Caught in a financial crisis, UMass Boston begins to cut jobs. *Boston Globe*, Retrieved from https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2017/11/15/three-dozen-layoffs-umass-boston/OwW4xaTfnuy6SgkGJWoCzN/story.html.

Larson, G. (2018). President Larson's Message on the Executive Order on Immigration. Retrieved from https://www.bentley.edu/prepared/president-larsons-message-on-executive-order-on-immigration.

Leahy, W.P. (n.d.). Boston College: Answering Society's Call. Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/bc-web/about/message.html.

LeCompte, M. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (second edition). London: Academic Press.

Lewin, L. (n.d.) In support of a travel ban. *CNN*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2017/03/politics/travel-ban-supporters-cnnphotos/

Llieva, J. & Peak, M. (2017). The shape of global higher education: International mobility of

    students, research, and education provision (Volume 2). *The British Council*. Retrieved

    from https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/global-

    landscape/shape-global-higher-education-vol-2.

Lucas, C.J. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York: St. Martins Press.

Marginson, S. (2018). The new geo-politics of higher education: Global cooperation, national

    competition and social inequality in the World-Class University (WCU) sector. London:

    Centre for Global Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education. Retrieved from

    http://www.researchcghe.org/publications/the-new-geo-politics-of-higher-education/.

Mason, M. (2017). Bentley named one of the best colleges for international students. Retrieved

    from https://www.bentley.edu/prepared/bentley-named-one-best-colleges-international-

    students.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (second edition). Beverly Hills,

    CA: Sage.

Mx. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster online*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-

    webster.com/words-at-play/mx-gender-neutral-title

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2017a). NAFSA opposes latest ban on

    immigrants. Retrieved from

    https://www.nafsa.org/About_Us/About_NAFSA/Press/NAFSA_Opposes_Latest_Ban_o

    n_Immigrants/.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2017b). Financial aid for undergraduate

international students. Retrieved from

https://www.nafsa.org/About_Us/About_International_Education/For_Students/Financial

_Aid_for_Undergraduate_International_Students/.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2016a). *New NAFSA data: International*

students contribute $32.8 billion to the U.S. economy. Retrieved from

http://www.nafsa.org/About_Us/About_NAFSA/Press/New_NAFSA_Data__Internationa

l_Students_Contribute_$32_8_Billion_to_the_U_S__Economy/.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2016b). *2016 Paul Simon Award Winners*.

Retrieved from

https://www.nafsa.org/About_Us/About_NAFSA/Press/NAFSA_Presents_2016_Simon_

Award_Winners/.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2003). In America's interest: Welcoming

international students. A report of the strategic task force on international student access.

Retrieved from

https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Public_P

olicy/in_america_s_interest.pdf.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2018). *College navigator*. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/.

Nisbet, J. & Watt, J. (1984). Case study. In J. Bell, T. Bush, A. Fox, J. Goodey, & S. Goulding

(Eds.) *Conducting Small-Scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London:

Harper and Row.

Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. (2004). Mapping borderless higher education:

      Policy, markets and competition. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Ohara, S. (2009). Internationalizing the academy: The impact of scholar mobility. In R. Bhandar

      & S. Laughlin (Eds.) *Higher education on the move: New developments in global*

      mobility. New York: IIE.

OECD, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2004). *Internationalization*

      and trade in higher education: Opportunities and challenges. Paris: OECD.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (pp. 169-186). Beverly Hills,

      CA: Sage.

Perez-Encinas, A. & Ammigan, R. (2016). Support services at Spanish and US institutions: A

      driver for international student satisfaction. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(4), pp.

      984-98. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1125790.pdf.Perez-Encinas, A.

      & Rodriguez-Pomeda, J. (2017). International Students' Perceptions of Their Needs

      When Going Abroad: Services on Demand. *Journal of Studies in International*

      Education, *22*(1) 20–36.

Peterson, D. M., Briggs, P., Dreasher, L., Horner, D. D., & Nelson, T. (1999). Contributions of

      International Students and Programs to Campus Diversity. *New Directions for Student*

      Services, (86), 67-77. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.8609.

Redden, E. (2018, June 7). Chinese students: Security type threat or stereotype threat? *Inside*

      Higher Ed. Retrieved from

      https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/06/07/lawmakers-discuss-national-security-

      concerns-and-chinese-students.

Redden, E. (2017a, November 13). An end to years of growth in international student

 enrollments. *InsideHigher Ed*. Retrieved from

 https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/article/2017/11/13/after-years-growth-us-

 colleges-see-decline-number-new-international.

Redden, E. (2017b, September 26). Travel ban 3.0. *InsideHigher Ed*. Retrieved from

 https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/09/26/new-travel-restrictions-raise-

 questions-concerns-higher-ed.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research* (second edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Rose-Redwood, C. & Rose-Redwood, R. (2017). Rethinking the politics of the international

 student experience in the age of Trump. *Journal of International Students*. DOI:

 http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.5281/zenodo.569939.

Ruiz, N.G. & Budiman, A. (2018). Number of Foreign College Students Staying and Working in

 U.S. After Graduation Surges. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from

 http://www.pewglobal.org/2018/05/10/number-of-foreign-college-students-staying-and-

 working-in-u-s-after-graduation-surges/.

Shaughnessy, J.J., Zechmeister, E.B. & Zechmesiter, J.S. (2003). *Research Methods in*

 Psychology (sixth edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, H.W. (1991). *Strategies of Social Research* (third edition). Orlando: FL: Holt, Rinehart

 and Winston.

Smith, S. (n.d.). World of possibilities. *University Communications*. Retrieved from

 https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/bcnews/nation-world-society/international/global-

 engagement-initiative.html

Shulmann, P. & Le, C. (2018). Navigating a new paradigm for international student recruitment. *World Education News and Reviews* (WES). Retrieved from https://www.wes.org/research/pre-registration-navigating-a-new-paradigm-for-international-student-recruitment/.

Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) (2016). After election day, the Trump Effect: The impact of the 2016 presidential election on our nation's schools. Retrieved from https://www.splcenter.org/20161128/trump-effect-impact-2016-presidential-election-our-nations-schools

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2018). *Gender inclusive language*. Retrieved from https://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/gender-inclusive-language/.

Thomson, C. & Esses, V.M. (2016). Helping the transition: Mentorship to support international students in Canada. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(4), pp. 873-886.

Trump, D.J. (2017a). *President Trump's inaugural address* [transcript]. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/the-inaugural-address/

Trump, D.J. (2017b). *Presidential proclamation enhancing vetting capabilities and processes for detecting attempted entry into the United States by terrorists or other public-safety threats*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/presidential-proclamation-enhancing-vetting-capabilities-processes-detecting-attempted-entry-united-states-terrorists-public-safety-threats/

University of Massachusetts (2018a). *History of UMass Boston*. Retrieved from https://www.umb.edu/the_university/history.

University of Massachusetts (2018b). *Quick fact*s. Office of Institutional Research. Retrieved from https://www.massachusetts.edu/about-umass/quick-facts.

University of Massachusetts (2018c). *Facts 2016-2017*. Office of Institutional Research.

Retrieved from

https://www.umassp.edu/sites/umassp.edu/files/content/publications/institutional-

research/facts-2016-2017.pdf.

University of Massachusetts (2018d). *Strategic planning 2010-2025*. Retrieved from

https://www.umb.edu/the_university/strategicplan.

University of Massachusetts (2018e). *Facts and figures*. Retrieved from

https://www.umb.edu/the_university/facts.

University of Massachusetts (2018f). *Office of Global Programs*. Retrieved from

https://www.umb.edu/academics/global.

University of Massachusetts (2018g). *Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and*

Planning. Retrieved from https://www.umb.edu/oirap.

United States Customs and Immigration Services (USCIS) (2018a). *H-1B Specialty Occupations,*

DOD Cooperative Research and Development Project Workers, and Fashion Models.

Retrieved from https://www.uscis.gov/working-united-states/temporary-workers/h-1b-

specialty-occupations-dod-cooperative-research-and-development-project-workers-and-

fashion-models.

United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) (2018). *Student and Exchange*

Visitor Program. Retrieved from https://www.ice.gov/sevis.

Valence (n.d.). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved from

http://www.dictionary.com/browse/valence?s=t.

Van der Beek, C. & van Aart, J. (2014). *Key influencers of international student satisfaction in*

Europe. Eindhoven, The Netherlands: StudyPortals.

Walsh, M. (2018). Setting the record straight on TPS and DACA. Retrieved from

    https://mayormartywalsh.com/setting-the-record-straight-on-tps-and-daca-93862f11d315.

World Education News and Reviews (WES) (Published September 1, 2009). What defines an

    international student: A look behind numbers. Retrieved from

    https://wenr.wes.org/2009/09/wenr-september-2009-feature.

Wongtrirat, R., Ammigan, R., & Perez-Encinas, A. (2015). Building an inclusive community for

    international students. *International Higher Education* (83): 17-18.

Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (fourth edition). Thousand Oaks,

    CA: Sage.

Ziguras, C.J. & Harwood, A. (2011). Principles of good practice for enhancing international

    student experience outside the classroom. ISANA. Retrieved from

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230578148_Principles_of_Good_Practice_for_

    Enhancing_International_Student_Experience_Outside_the_Classroom.

Appendix A. Informed Consent Form

Invitation to be Part of a Research Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. You were selected to be in the study because your institution was one of several in the Greater Boston area to meet the key eligibility criteria, i.e. institutions that enroll the largest international student populations in the Greater Boston area. In addition, you were selected to participate because of the importance of your role and the responsibility you carry for overseeing international student support and/or advocacy activities in your respective organization. Taking part in this research project is voluntary.

Important Information about the Research Study
Things you should know:
- The purpose of the study is to investigate the effects of new Trump era realities on Greater Boston area colleges and universities. Specifically, the study aims to determine how federal-level policies on immigration and travel have affected your institution's internationalization priorities, particularly the provision of programs and strategies for supporting international student engagement. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to take part in an 8 or 12-set question interview format (depending on your role). The scheduling of the interview will be coordinated according to your availability, desired location, and other arrangement details. The interview itself will take approximately 25-30 minutes.
- Risks or discomforts from this research will be minimal. Physical and psychological risks are not particularly applicable because of the purpose of the research. There is a possibility that some interview questions will be sensitive or difficult to answer due to the nature of the research, but steps have been taken to mitigate risks and discomforts as much as possible.
- The study will not benefit you directly but will strive to gather generalizable knowledge that could be largely beneficial to your institution and staff, faculty, students, local communities, educators, and advocates of international higher education. It is assumed that once the information is analyzed and the findings are disseminated, it could be used by higher education institutions and their professional staff to improve the services offered to their students.
- Taking part in this research project is voluntary. You don't have to participate and you can stop at any time.

Please take time to read this entire form and ask questions before deciding whether to take part in this research project. Should you have any concerns expressed herein, please direct questions to the principal investigator (PI). Or, if you'd like to discuss the study with someone other than the PI, please contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Boston College. The IRB contact information is provided at the end of this form.

What is the study about and why are we doing it?
The purpose of the study is to examine the effects of the current U.S. political climate and recent US policies on universities and colleges in the Greater Boston area, specifically with respect to the potential impact on their international student enrollment, recruitment strategies, and provision of programs and services supporting international students. The total number of

people in this study is expected to be 12-16 individuals. Participants will include both university administrators and international students.

What will happen if you take part in this study?
If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to **individually** take part in an interview of approximately 25-30 minutes. The principal investigator (PI) will coordinate a date, time, and location to meet with you in person, or over the phone or via an online media platform such as Skype or Zoom, when meeting in person is less feasible. The PI will make every effort to accommodate your schedule. Three to five days prior to the interview, the PI will send you an email, which will include the interview procedure and actual interview questions. This is intentionally done so that you may feel comfortable and have time to deliberate on your answers, crafting a response that is satisfactory and to your liking. If the interview is to be over the phone or on an online platform, precautions will be taken to maintain a distraction free environment and to account for technological issues.

How could you benefit from this study?
The participants that will take part in this study will be university administrators and students. The participants deciding to participate will not benefit directly from this research project but will understand that the benefit is largely to gather generalizable knowledge that could enhance the practice and experiences at their respective institutions, of university staff and higher education professionals, other students, and local communities. The likelihood of benefits is strong for administrators because they tend to serve in decision-making positions that directly impact student affairs. The information gathered and analyzed from this study may, in fact, serve them immediately and directly as professionals and practitioners of higher education and international education, by offering them opportunities to reflect critically on the current state of policy impact on their practice. Students will benefit less directly in the short-term. Yet, it is the hope of this study that the issues addressed in the project will benefit international students in the long-term.

What risks might result from being in this study?
Risk from participation in this study will be minimal. Risk that is physical or psychological is inherently minimized because the purpose of this study does not require knowledge of the participant's personal health. Informational risk will be mitigated as much as possible yet is marginally likely because the study involves gathering information (via phone or in-person) from and speaking directly to participants. There may also be unknown risks associated with participation.

How will we protect your information?
The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report the PI may publish, he will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. All research records will be kept in electronic format and will be coded and secured using a password-protected file.

At the end of this document, you will be asked for your permission for the interview to be audio-recorded for data-collection purposes. If you agree to allow the interview to be audio-recorded, the procedure will be as follows: The interview will be recorded only for the purposes of completing the research project. The PI will be the only individual to have access to the

recording. The audio recorder to be used will be an iPod. Once the conversation has been recorded, the PI will upload the audio file to a designated folder location on a secure Boston College online drive that is secure and password-protected.   Once stored, the file on the iPod will be permanently deleted. The audio recording will then be transcribed so the data may be properly analyzed. Once the interview has been transcribed, the audio file stored on the computer will be permanently deleted.

Lastly, the transcription of the data will be permanently deleted once the master's thesis (for which the study is being conducted) has been submitted to the PI's faculty advisor. The data gathered from the interview itself will not be linked to any information beyond the scope of the research project.

While the PI will know the identities of the people who participate, the PI will not link any personally identifiable information (PII) to the research data under any circumstances. At the time of data collection, participants' personal information (e.g. name, institution, contact information, etc.) will not be used to identify you as the interview subject. A unique code identifier will be used in place of actual identifiers. This is done to protect the anonymity of participants while maintaining the secure management of data. The record linking each participant's coded identifier to his or her actual name will be kept separate from the research data.

The PI and his faculty advisor will be the only people to have access to research information; however, please note that a few other key people may also have access. These might include the Institutional Review Board at Boston College and internal Boston College auditors. Otherwise, the researchers will not release to others any information that identifies you unless you give your permission.

What will happen to the information we collect about you after the study is over?
After the research study has been completed, your name and other information that can directly identify you will be permanently deleted. The PI may share the anonymized research data with other investigators or a repository for future use by other researchers without asking for your consent again, but it will not contain information that could directly identify you.

How will we compensate you for being part of the study?
There will be no compensation for participating in this study.

What are the costs to you to be part of the study?
There is no cost to you to be in this research study.

Your Participation in this Study is Voluntary
It is solely up to you to decide to be in this research study. While participation in this study is voluntary, even if you agree you may change your mind and stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. If you decide to withdraw before this study is completed, the data gathered from you up until the point of withdraw will not be used in this research and withdrawal will not result in denial of entitled benefits.

If you choose not to be in this study, it will not affect your current or future relations with the University, the Lynch School of Education, or Boston College.

Getting Dismissed from the Study
The researcher may dismiss you from the study at any time for the following reasons: (1) it is in your best interests (e.g. side effects or distress have resulted); or (2) the PI decides to end the study.

Contact Information for the Study Team and Questions about the Research
If you have questions about this research, you may contact the PI, George Agras, at **agras@bc.edu** or (205) 999-8484. In case you wish to contact the PI's faculty advisor, the information is as follows: Name: Dr. Laura Rumbley; email: **laura.rumbley@bc.edu**; phone: (617) 552-1269.

Contact Information for Questions about Your Rights as a Research Participant
If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions, or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher, please contact the following:

Boston College
Office for Research Protections
Phone: (617) 552-4778
Email: irb@bc.edu

Your Consent
Before agreeing to be part of the research, please be sure that you understand what the study is about. If you have any questions about the study at any time, you can contact the study team using the information provided above.

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be in this study. Make sure you understand what the study is about before you sign. I will give you a copy of this document for your records. I will keep a copy with the study records.

I have read (or have had read to me) the contents of this consent form. I have been encouraged to ask questions. I have received answers to my questions. I give my consent to be in this study. I have received (or will receive) a copy of this form.

_____
Printed Subject Name

_____
Signature   Date

Specific Activity Permission

By signing this section, you are agreeing to be audio recorded for data-collection purposes. You sign in the acknowledgement that information relevant to data-collection procedures have already been described to you in detail in this form, and you agree with its terms.

Consent to be Audio Recorded
I agree to be audio recorded.

YES_____   NO____

Interview Protocol for Administrator Participants

1. What are your institution's internationalization priorities and strengths?

2. From your perspective, what are some of the most pressing issues and challenges faced by international students at your institution?

3. On which services do you find international students rely most heavily?

4. From your perspective, how have the Trump administration's travel bans, and its anti-immigration and anti-foreigner statements and positions, affected:

    a. your institution's broader internationalization goals?

    b. your institution's international partnership development and inter-institutional collaboration on research?

    c. the "lived experience" of the international students at your institution?

    d. the way your institution engages with and supports its international students?

    e. the way the community external to the institution (e.g. local businesses, not-profit organizations, state agencies, religious and public service groups, etc.) views and engages with your institution's international students?

5. If, from your perspective, the Trump administration's travel bans and its anti-immigration and anti-foreigner statements and positions have had some effect on your institution and/or your international students:

    a. Which offices/services/areas at your institution have been most heavily affected (e.g. admission/recruiting offices, academic programs, research centers, student support offices, etc.) by these challenges?

    b. Has there been any strain placed on institutional resources in terms of working to meet international student needs in response to concerns about the travel bans and anti-immigration and anti-foreigner rhetoric, and if so, how?

6. With respect to immigration matters, higher education institutions and the federal government already act as partners, to some extent, through compliance with SEVIS and student visa regulations. Beyond these areas, what other collaborative roles do you think higher education institutions and the federal government can play in terms of securing borders and limiting threats to national security?

7. The American Council on Education released a statement on March 29, 2018 claiming "the ban promises to have detrimental effects on critical academic exchange by inhibiting the free cross-border exchange of ideas; dividing students and scholars from their

families; and impairing the ability of American educational institutions to draw the finest international talent." How accurate is this assessment in relation to your institution and the international students it serves?

8. Across the United States, institutions have declared themselves "sanctuary campuses" and safe-zones for international students, scholars, and researchers. What is your view on sanctuary campuses?

Interview Protocol for International Student Participants

1. What are the most challenging issues affecting international students at your institution?

2. In what ways has the current political environment affected your learning and study experience here in the U.S.?

3. Do you think your institution understands the challenges you and your peers face as international students in the United States?

4. With respect to the challenges facing international students at your institution, do you feel that resources at your institution are immediately available and known to international students? If no/yes, why?

5. Do you feel the level or kinds of support with which your institution has provided you and your peers has changed at all over the last year? If so, how? If no, why not?

6. Since the Trump administration took office, what has been your experience with making friends with domestic students? Has the general campus climate changed at all in terms of international students feeling welcomed and supported? If yes, how? If no, why not?

7. How are student organizations and other on-campus student groups reacting to the U.S. policies on travel and the rhetoric on defending the country against threats to its national security?

8. How do you think the local community (external to the institution) feels about the travel ban and current anti-immigration rhetoric? Could you please explain your answer?

9. Have you, any of your family, your friends, or anyone you know been negatively impacted by the travel ban?

10. Considering the current political climate in the U.S., would you encourage or recommend any of your friends back home to come to the U.S. to study?

11. In what ways, if at all, are the immigration policies of the Trump administration affecting your thoughts about future plans in the United States (e.g., further study or pursuit of job

opportunities)? Could you please explain?

12. What do you think the future of higher education looks like for international students studying in the U.S.? Please explain.