

The Advancement of International Education and its Sustainability from the Perspective of Professionalism and Administrative Staff Development

George R. Harada*

1. INTRODUCTION
2. THE EARLY STAGES OF INTERNATIONALIZATION—RECOGNIZING AND BUILDING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE NEXT STAGE
3. ESTABLISHING “HEADQUARTERS” FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
4. PERSPECTIVES ON PROFESSIONALISM AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND ITS SUSTAINABILITY
5. CONCLUSION: THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last four decades, many universities in Japan have been involved in promoting international education to adapt to the effects of globalization. The mobility of international students globally has accelerated the need for internationalization of universities. In 2019, the numbers of international students in Japan surpassed 300,000. With the temporary border closures caused by the coronavirus pandemic, the numbers fell by 10 percent in 2020.¹⁾ The numbers are expected to fall even further until the end of the pandemic. Although new visa applicants are at a standstill, there are many international students still residing in Japan studying for their degrees. The

pandemic has forced institutions to change. New platforms to promote international education are being developed. Therefore, maintenance as well as reform of international education and related programs are vital especially in these difficult times. In this regard, both the promotion and review of internationalization of universities are more important than ever—and, will be dependent on the sustainability of the faculty and administrative staff involved in promoting the various international education programs.

This paper will focus mainly on the significance, maintenance and sustainability of the administrative staff involved in the promotion of international education from a Japanese perspective. The discussion will be related to the need to advance professionalism and expertise in the internationally-related offices and centers at universities promoting international education.

2. THE EARLY STAGES OF INTERNATIONALIZATION—RECOGNIZING AND BUILDING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE NEXT STAGE

According to Professor Yutaka Okihara of Hiroshima University, in the early stages of internationalization, there were only a small percentage of international students attending Japanese universities. This was related to the nation’s modernization process that began since

* Professor, Hiroshima University of Economics

the Meiji Era which emphasized a “one-way” learning attitude or assimilation process with Western cultures.²⁾ Japanese universities were more active in sending students abroad than in accepting international students. This learning attitude or assimilation process was deficient in efforts to share, introduce and promote understanding of Japanese systems and culture to the rest of the world.³⁾

In advancing internationalization among national universities in Japan, Professor Okihara suggested several areas that needed improvement concerning the acceptance of international students. First, he mentioned a need for a system that would assign an appropriate faculty advisor that matched the field of study/research of the international student to prevent possible problems that may end up in the termination of research or switching of advisors after the research had begun.⁴⁾

Second, he mentioned that seventy percent of the international students at the time (1976) were attending universities in Tokyo and Osaka metropolitan areas. He recommended to the Ministry to disseminate more information about the faculties and majors, as well as the attractiveness and special characteristics of universities located in other smaller cities and suburbs of Japan to make prospective international students more interested in attending universities outside of Tokyo and Osaka.⁵⁾

Third, Professor Okihara mentioned his concern with the housing environment in Japan. He suggested special care would need to be given to international students in providing dormitory rooms and/or accommodation facilities. And, preferably facilities that would allow a mixed living environment with Japanese students to

enhance intercultural learning opportunities. As of 1976, there were only five national universities (Hokkaido University, Chiba University, Tokyo University of Technology, Nagoya University, and Kyushu University) that provided *Ryugakusei Kaikan* (International Student Accommodation Facilities).⁶⁾ As a result of shortage of rooms, many international students were forced to find private apartment rooms on their own.

Fourth, citing a 1974 Report by the Central Council for Education pertaining to the “Internationalization of Education, Learning and Culture,” an extremely important issue was the promotion of Japanese language education abroad to international students and foreigners. He suggested that Japanese language education would be the foundation in promoting mutual understanding that would enhance international exchange with foreign partners.⁷⁾

And finally, Professor Okihara mentioned that as more and more international students begin to attend the international programs of universities throughout Japan, universities will be required to hire or assign personnel to be responsible for duties and activities involved with international students.⁸⁾ As of 1976, there were only four national universities (Tokyo University, Kyoto University, Tokyo University of Foreign Languages, and Osaka University of Foreign Languages) that had established a *Ryugakusei Gakari* (International Students Office). Another twelve national universities (Tohoku University, Chiba University, Tokyo University of Technology, Tokyo University of Marine Sciences, Hitotsubashi University, Yokohama National University, Nagoya University, Osaka University, Kobe University, Hiroshima University, Kyushu University, and Kagoshima University) did not

have an International Students Office, but had a full-time administrative position in charge of international students.⁹⁾ In order to establish an appropriate system that would be comprehensive and university-wide to take care of the in-bound international students in the areas of academic guidance, counselling, and alumni services, Professor Okihara recommended to the Ministry to create an International Student Advisor position. To this, he added that this position should be assigned to a faculty member since it would not be appropriate for an administrative staff member because of the administrative internal transfer system that would prevent long-term professional development. He also mentioned that an appropriate person with sufficient foreign language capability, English typing skills and previous study abroad experiences would be difficult to find if the position were limited to an administrative staff position.¹⁰⁾ According to Professors Masahiro Yokota and Satomi Shiratsuchi, for national universities, it would take another eight years (1984) before an official position of International Student Advisor would be established. This position was developed in line with a Ministry order to establish International Student Centers for national universities that had accepted more than 200 international students.¹¹⁾

From a private university's perspective, Masaki Yamashiro, former Vice Chancellor of Waseda University, who previously worked in the Department of Instructions, International Liaison Office, explained that as the acceptance of international students increased, a new office was created to assist faculty and other members of the university to advance international education.¹²⁾ This office was established in 1962 and would be in charge of liaison duties related to

overseas partner universities, institutions, and international student affairs. He worked in this office from its establishment until 1983.¹³⁾ He recalls that they were flooded with inquiries from international students concerning daily issues arising in school life and academic matters (such as, immigration status issues, transferring credits from home country, Japanese language study problems, change of majors, student housing problems, tuition payment issues) as well as other personal matters (such as part-time work and career placement, marriage and family matters in their home country, etc.,...), all of which they listened to and assisted as best as they could.¹⁴⁾ The urgency of each problem brought into the Liaison Office did not allow Masaki Yamashiro and his colleagues working there to ignore them and to pass them on to a faculty member or needless to say to another department on campus. He and the International Liaison Office at Waseda University were appropriately acting as the "International Student Advisor" for these students.

He also mentioned that a staff development opportunity provided by Waseda University to visit the US to observe and study "international exchange" during the period of April to September in 1966, and another administrative overseas study/visit opportunity through a grant provided by the Private University Welfare Study Grant to compare systems of the USA, Europe and Southeast Asia, were experiences that made him realize how important the development and future of international education and exchange would be.¹⁵⁾ During this period, he and other administrators from nearby universities got together to form a group called the *Gaikokujin Ryugakusei Mondai Kenkyukai* (Research Group

on Problems Concerning Foreign Students) that would be able to exchange information on the promotion of international education as well as to share experiences of “good practices” of complex issues concerning international students. This group eventually became to be known as JAFSA (Japan Association of Foreign Student Advisors) in 1968.¹⁶⁾

There are very few accounts on the actual difficulties and challenges that faculty and administrative staff in charge of in-bound international students experienced, however, one account by Professor Ryusuke Kamio, Founding Director of the International Students Education Center of Kyushu University, who was assigned to teach international students (Ministry of Education Scholarship Students) Japanese language during the first sixth months after their arrival into Japan, covered many of the issues that were previously mentioned by Professor Okihara.¹⁷⁾

According to Professor Kamio, one particularly difficult task was in finding housing for international students when they first arrived to the university. Since there was no official service or person in charge of this task, he arranged a system that would involve a student volunteer organization called the *Kyushu Daigaku Kokusai Shinzenkai*, referred to as the *Kyushinkai* (Kyushu University International Friendship Association,) to assist in this task. The *Kyushinkai* would assist in the pickup services of in-bound newly arriving international students and also in the search for available accommodation in the local area.¹⁸⁾ Professor Kamio described several occasions when he himself inquired with local real estate agents and landlords when students had difficulty in finding available rooms. He mentioned his concerns related to the discriminating attitudes

of local landlords at the time and the difficulties in finding rooms for Asian international students.¹⁹⁾ Professor Kamio also mentioned other troublesome issues involving economic difficulties experienced by students, especially incidents involving illness and/or injury during the students' study period in Japan. At the time, official international student-oriented insurance programs were only offered to students selected on the Japanese Ministry of Education Scholarship Program. Therefore, self-financed international students took extra care in their health condition since medical expenses were known to be quite high in Japan. To add to this problem, many international students from the Asian region did not purchase insurance before coming to Japan. According to Professor Kamio's account of one student who experienced multiple occasions of medical treatment, a self-financed Taiwanese international student fell ill because of a kidney disease and was hospitalized at a local hospital. The cost of the medical treatment and hospitalization was much more than he could afford. After Professor Kamio's involvement in informing the hospital about the student's financial difficulties, the hospital arranged to nullify the costs by designating the patient to be “poverty stricken.” The same international student was hospitalized again the following year, but at the Kyushu University Hospital. He was given free treatment after negotiation with the two doctors who treated this student.²⁰⁾

Although Professor Kamio was not a counselor, as a result of his helpful advice to students and the many occasions of going beyond his duties to help them out, many of his students would stay in contact and ask for assistance even after their graduation and degree programs. One

case involved a former Vietnamese international student who attended medical school and eventually became a doctor in Japan. Several years after starting his medical career, he fell in love with a Japanese woman who worked as a nurse at the same hospital where he worked. The former student contacted Professor Kamio from Tokyo and asked if he could assist in a personal matter that involved his marriage because he had no one else to turn to. Although Professor Kamio did not realize it, he was like a father figure to this student because during his study period at Kyushu University, Professor Kamio was close by and assisted him when he had lost his parents and family during the Vietnam War. According to the former student's explanation to Professor Kamio, the future father-in-law would approve this marriage only if it were done under traditional ceremonial procedures beginning with an assignment of an official *nakodo* (go-between) and traditional *yuino* (gifts) ceremony. Although he had just recovered from surgery, Professor Kamio agreed to help out and represent his former student as part of his family.²¹⁾

In another account some years later at the same university, Associate Professor Satomi Shiratsuchi, who in September 1984 was appointed as both the official International Student Counselor (Advisor) located in the International Students Center (later merging with the International Students Education Center) and the Director of the International Students Residence Hall, suggested that he did not realize how much work there was in "caring" for the international students (including their families)—much of his work went far beyond the position's official duties (his official duties included: daily counselling duties; scheduling of remedial Japanese language

classes; necessary general administration of the International Students Meetings; administration of the Residence Halls; and the promotion of international activities). He remembered what his predecessor, Professor Hideo Moriyama, had told him: "You just can't look the other way and ignore the difficulties that international students are experiencing..."²²⁾

As the numbers of international students made its way toward the target mark of 100,000,²³⁾ Professor Masahiro Yokota suggested that a passive approach that had been used thus far in attending to problems after they occurred would not be enough to effectively resolve problems related to international students in the future. More complex problems will arise and they will require a professional "cross-cultural exchange advisor" to actively get involved with the international students, faculty, local Japanese citizens and/or organizations to encourage and mediate a resolution together.²⁴⁾ And, for the cross-cultural exchange advisor to work effectively: 1) it will require both faculty and administrative staff on campus to work as a team; 2) to be able to function effectively throughout the campus, the position will need to be located within an International Center; and 3) since the present situation required flexible perspectives and responses, it would be advisable to set up a network that included relevant resources of information and professionals in the field that could attend to matters whenever necessary.²⁵⁾

3. ESTABLISHING “HEADQUARTERS” FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

3.1 The Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities

In examining the development process of internationalization at Japanese universities, what becomes evident is that the “personnel” involved in creating and promoting policies, implementing and maintaining international education programs would take on a significant role in making a smooth advancement of internationalization. Another important issue would be the sustainability of these key personnel or positions that are involved with promoting internationalization of universities. However, as the previous section suggested, the early stages of internationalization made clear some of the deficiencies in the implementation and maintenance of internationalization as well as the various difficulties that needed to be dealt with (i.e., cultural, organizational, structural and even legal issues) as internationalization advanced. Although many universities in Japan realized the need to “internationalize” in some way, many were not aware of what to do, who was to lead, and how to sustain international education and exchange—there was an obvious lack of expertise in the field. Even if they did have answers to these questions, universities, particularly national universities were bound by nationally set policy and rules (laws) that prevented them to move forward with speed.²⁶⁾

One particular government grant program that assisted in answering some of these questions and providing various models of how to promote international education was the Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters

in Universities (hereinafter, SiH).²⁷⁾ The SiH was a five-year program from 2005 to 2009 that provided for an annual grant of 10 to 40 million yen to each of the twenty pilot institutions that was selected by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereinafter, Ministry of Education) to establish “strategic international headquarters” to promote university-wide international development and linkages.²⁸⁾ The twenty pilot institutions that were selected provided for four different types of “international strategic headquarters”:

- 1) Project-based Headquarters;
- 2) International Initiatives-based Headquarters;
- 3) Central Control-based Headquarters;
- 4) Departmental Support-based Headquarters.²⁹⁾

According to the analysis of the *Final Report* of SiH (2010), the different types of headquarters presented ten critical “common” points in advancing internationalization: 1) the importance of governance and the University President’s leadership (Osaka University; National Institute of Natural Sciences); 2) the importance of setting effective objectives and action plans (Nagoya University; Hiroshima University); 3) the importance attaining external funds for international education and research (Kyushu University; Nagasaki University); 4) the importance of establishing international cooperation among universities (Tokyo Institute of Technology; Tokyo University of Foreign Studies); 5) the importance of expanding international activities based on specific international research projects (Hokkaido University; Niigata University); 6) the importance of training and securing administrative personnel highly specialized in promoting international education and programs (Hitotsubashi University;

Kyoto University; Kobe University); 7) the importance of improving services and support for overseas researchers (Waseda University; Aizu University); 8) the importance of promoting study and research opportunities for young Japanese researchers (Tokyo University; Tohoku University); 9) the importance of establishing and operating overseas hubs (Keio University; Tokai University); and, 10) the importance of the impact created by “good practice” cases for university internationalization (JSPS’s initiative in widely disseminating information to other universities to advance the internationalization of universities).³⁰⁾

It is important to note that over half of the above mentioned “critical” points required the involvement of faculty and/or administrative staff having professional skills or expertise in international education-related fields. In this respect, the SiH made clear the importance of having “qualified” personnel involved in creating and promoting policies, implementing and maintaining international education programs. The sixth critical point (Section Six of the *Final Report*) specifically suggested the importance of training and securing administrative personnel highly specialized in promoting international education and programs. There were three universities that exemplified this point. First, Hitotsubashi University provided a model that adopted a “professional development program” that utilized an internship with their partner university in Australia where their administrative staff would take a five-week intensive English language course (to brush up on language proficiency) at the Monash University English Language Center with another five weeks interning at Monash College experiencing and learning about in-bound

international student policies and activities.³¹⁾ Hitotsubashi University adopted another short-term staff development program with their partner university, Glasgow University, that was a four-week session oriented to improve business skills in coordinating international programs which included conference management skills, negotiation skills, and training in interviewing people and making presentations.³²⁾ The evaluations showed that the long-term professional development program developed significant professional skills in “planning” and “problem solving.” The *Final Report* suggested that if this professional development program had a component that allowed participants to design their careers in international education after their completion of this program, more high achieving administrative staff would probably be willing to participate.³³⁾

The second model was developed by Kyoto University. Kyoto University called this model, the University Administrators Workshop (UAW). It was to be used to develop “multi-lateral” international exchange and “to strengthen the university’s international exchange foundations.”³⁴⁾ Kyoto University utilized the international consortia and networks that they were members of to implement an “international staff development” program. The two-day workshops began in 2006 in Kyoto inviting vice-presidents and administrative staff in charge of international programs from twelve universities participating from The Association of East-Asian Research Universities (AEARU) and three universities from Japan. The title of the first workshop was: Enhancing the Quality of International Activities of Asian Universities.³⁵⁾ According to Kyoto University, workshops of this kind were frequently held by

NAFSA (USA) and EAIE (Europe), but very rare (at the time) in the Asian region.³⁶⁾ The *Final Report* gave high evaluations for the UAW in three areas. First, it not only assisted in staff development, but at the same time its effects strengthened existing network connections. Second, the many themes presented at the “international” workshops assisted in discovering the different approaches to the same policies and programs in the Asian region. And, finally, the UAW provided for the opportunity in learning how important international programs and exchanges were to everyone in the region. And, it was especially surprising for the Japanese side to witness so much activity from their counterparts in the Asian region. Through this experience, participants of these workshops were “strategically” placed in internationally-related departments.³⁷⁾

The third model was developed by Kobe University. Kobe University’s model was based on the idea of hiring qualified personnel from outside of the university instead of solely using the administrative internal transfer system. The process began by hiring a person to fill the position of *Koryu Kodineta* (Exchange Coordinator) to work in the International Strategic Headquarters.³⁸⁾ The Exchange Coordinator would be in charge of the planning and management and the overall international arrangements for the headquarters. This position would also be in charge of the on-the-job (OTJ) training of personnel transferring into the internationally-related positions and sections within the university. In order to develop skills necessary for international administration, training sessions were developed in coordination with the Personnel Department and the International Strategic Headquarters. The influence of holding training

sessions from 2005 to 2008 persuaded the management that more personnel with special expertise in international administration and language skills were needed. As a result, language requirements were included into a university hiring examination created specifically for internationally-related work positions. Personnel who were hired after passing this examination became candidates for a new position referred to as the *Kokusai Renkei Shien'in* (International Administrative Coordinator) to be placed in each academic department to take over international administrative tasks that were originally managed by faculty—management of international agreements, support in the administration of accepting foreign researchers, and other internationally-related tasks.³⁹⁾ According to the *Final Report*, the hiring of the Exchange Coordinator from outside the university not only accelerated the speed in implementing the policies and programs planned by the International Strategic Headquarters, but also motivated the internal administrative staff working to promote international programs—it assisted in training many administrative staff members in international administration; it created a new “unique” hiring examination for international administrative staff; it created a new international administrative position to be placed in each of the academic departments; and, it helped advance consciousness of relevant placements for positions requiring specialized expertise and/or experience.⁴⁰⁾

3.2 Recommendations

The final analysis of Section Six of the *Final Report* recommended several important points.⁴¹⁾ First, in pursuing the internationalization of universities and the promotion of international edu-

cation and exchange, this grant program made clear that specialists or personnel with expertise in international affairs and its administration were vital for the international strategic headquarters if it were to advance internationalization professionally. And, hiring personnel from outside (as opposed to internal transfers) would be another valuable option in attaining the appropriate person for the job.⁴²⁾ Second, assuming that there may be eligible and qualified personnel within the university to fit into the internationally-related offices and positions after appropriate training, internal transfer opportunities for designing one's career to become a part of the administrative staff in charge of international affairs would be another option to consider.⁴³⁾ Third, developing professionalism among administrative staff is important, however, it is also equally important to stress that as they attain expertise and professionalism, administrative staff should be considered as working partners of faculty and not just assistants in academic administration.⁴⁴⁾ Finally, the *Final Report* found that many universities were engaged in sending their administrative staff to external training sessions domestically and abroad. It added that those who had English language proficiency should also be sent to NAFSA and EAIE to attend and make presentations at sessions held at these conferences.⁴⁵⁾

SiH was significant in that it advanced internationalization of universities by making clear the importance of unified "organizational" understanding of internationalization and the promotion of international education—the administrative foundations of which lie with the personnel that are involved.⁴⁶⁾

4. PERSPECTIVES ON PROFESSIONALISM AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND ITS SUSTAINABILITY

SiH provided for models in unifying internationally-related administrative functions into "headquarters" to establish a more "professionally" coordinated system of international education. As this initiative advanced, it became evident that universities would need to reform some of their previous methods and procedures related to its governance if it were to successfully promote internationalization that would be sustainable.⁴⁷⁾ One account surveying international offices of national universities (around the same period as the SiH was being implemented) identified multiple issues.⁴⁸⁾ One of these issues will be mentioned here. It concerned the issue of administrative internal transfers continuing even after realignment of the organization coordinating internationally-related administrative matters were completed. The typical case showed universities establishing a "strategic headquarters" with an International Center below it to promote international education. The International Center with faculty and administrative staff working in the same office would be neatly divided into two divisions. One division would be in charge of the international students' academic/education-related matters and the other division would be in charge of international exchange-related matters. The framework showed a flat organization with faculty and administrative staff assigned to one International Center, but in actuality, the organization had a two-tiered framework with faculty being dispersed from a designated Faculty or Department and administrative staff being

dispersed from what would be the International Administrative Office or International Students Office that would still exist. “Traditional” administrative internal transfers would still continue, more personnel became involved with the management of students and international partners which, ironically, made the system more complex and more difficult to maintain.⁴⁹⁾ Another issue within the same framework was that at national universities, the personnel typically in charge of contact relations and communication with the international partners continued to be a member of the faculty (most likely the faculty member that initiated the signing of partnership in relation to his/her research). One problem with this was that when this faculty member moved to another institution it left the contact position open with no replacement ending up in a gradual deterioration of this partnership.⁵⁰⁾ One significant reason for realignment of the organization was to involve qualified administrative staff to work with the faculty and take over the management of contact relations with the international partner.

In order to alleviate some of the difficulties arising from continued use of administrative internal transfers, universities utilized internal and external staff development (SD) and training programs to enhance professionalism.

This in part was strongly influenced by a Report presented by the Central Council for Education in 2008 (hereinafter, *2008 Report*) reflecting the need to reform undergraduate education.⁵¹⁾ It stressed the “importance of SD” for both public and private universities in the midst of complexity developing from the changing educational environment. It suggested that this changing educational environment necessitated professional development of skills and

knowledge of administrative staff to be able to adapt to these changes. Generally, it mentioned skills related to communication, knowledge related to strategic management and fields related to finance, personnel, planning, research and other fields related to the understanding of academic issues. It also specifically mentioned the need for specialized expertise in areas related to international education if the university was focused in this field.⁵²⁾

The *2008 Report* added that the introduction of research on good practice examples of SD from overseas, effective use of private organizations, academic societies and networks involved in promoting SD should be used to promote professionalism. It emphasized that SD was especially needed to adopt the concept of *kyoshoku kyodo*—a work relationship of equal responsibilities between faculty and administrative staff. Stronger collaborative working relationships were necessary to promote active reform.⁵³⁾

SD eventually became so important⁵⁴⁾ that the *Daigaku Set'chi Kijun* (Standards for the Establishment of Universities) was amended in 2016 (effective April 2017) to require universities to include SD into their university management routine.⁵⁵⁾

The present issue is how to use SD effectively to advance professionalism in a way to sustain the administration of international education. Large or small, if the university is not able to prepare internal SD programs oriented to developing knowledge and skills needed for the administration of international education, one idea would be to use the recommendation given in the *2008 Report* to utilize external SD programs offered by academic societies and networks oriented to advancing internationalization, such as, The Japan Network for International

Education (JAFSA) that provides introductory workshops and sessions for administrative staff newly entering the field. Also, JAFSA's counterparts in the USA (NAFSA), Europe (EAIE), and Asia (APAIE) provide a number of workshops and sessions on different topics and on different levels of expertise. There are also other academic societies specifically oriented to advancing professionalism in the field of administrative management like the Japan Association of University Administrative Management (JUAM).⁵⁶⁾ Bungen Miyazawa, Head of the Management Planning Section of Gakushuin University, and one of the Directors of the Board for JUAM, explained that the organization was seriously involved with SD programs oriented to developing global perspectives for administrative staff. Sessions are held on "internationalization" topics by linking up and collaborating with other international associations organized by "university administrators."⁵⁷⁾ Depending on where the university is located, local consortium-based SD training programs can also be effectively utilized. One example was introduced by Masami Shiokawa, a committee member for Staff Development Training, Consortium of Universities in Osaka (CUO).⁵⁸⁾ The SD program related to internationalization was implemented in collaboration with CUO and the Foundation for International Cooperation in Higher Education of Taiwan (FICHET). Previously, the two consortia had exchanged meetings each year since 2008 with University Presidents discussing issues of higher education and exchanging information on internationalization. A three-day SD session for administrative staff was planned and successfully implemented. Twelve participants from various departments (student affairs, instructions, corporate office,

and international) of universities of CUO participated. They visited four different universities and exchanged information at a symposium. The presentations and exchange were done in English.⁵⁹⁾ Masami Shiokawa elaborated on several significant outcomes of this SD program. First, although English was not the mother language of either side, both sides realized the importance of "international communication" and having English as a common language medium to communicate.⁶⁰⁾ Second, the participants were able to witness a different style and method of teaching for language classes that suggested new ideas in the area of instruction and teaching.⁶¹⁾ Third, the participants were introduced to a Japanese student that was studying full-time at a university in Taiwan—he was fluent in both Chinese and English. The impression was that he was the kind of global human resource that Japanese universities were aiming to foster. His presence in Taiwan made the participants think about what Japanese universities were deficient in and what they needed to do in fostering global human resources in the future.⁶²⁾ And, finally, the experiences of this short SD visit to Taiwan made the participants realize that internationalization of universities was not just about the recruitment of international students, but would also include the need for a review of each's daily routine to make sure it aligned with globalization and the international changes that followed.⁶³⁾

In the case of Hiroshima University of Economics, internally arranged "internationally-oriented" SD sessions have been strategically inserted into the annual schedule of SD programs since 2016. The SDs have been used to enhance awareness of global issues in general and to persuade administrative staff (and faculty who

participate) that internationally-oriented experiences and perspectives can complement and become an added-value to them regardless of wherever they work. This type of SD is based on the idea that if internal transfers are to continue, why not train or at least get as many administrative staff as possible interested in global issues and familiarized in international student related matters (such as international student recruitment, international student activity with the community, issues related to study abroad, training related to developing intercultural adaptation skills, methods in resolving possible international student conflicts, and other crisis management issues), before being transferred into the Center for International Education Exchange.⁶⁴⁾ If successful, “internationally-oriented” SDs would significantly assist to shorten the training process as well as to maximize the potential of the personnel after being transferred into the Center. In this short period of implementation since 2016, the effects after experiencing the “internationally-oriented” SDs have shown that administrative staff in other sections and offices have become more “internationally-friendly,” and work better with the Center of International Education Exchange when some sort of engagement or collaboration is necessitated. The idea to insert this type of SD session into the annual schedule of SD programs was developed from Professor Miki Horie’s discussion suggesting that the common objective of Japanese universities developing “generalists” through internal transfers was not all that bad. Her perspective suggested that those who were trained and experienced work in the international office brought added-value to the other sections and offices by bringing in work experience and skills that were deficient and

needed.⁶⁵⁾

5. CONCLUSION: THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

The early stages of internationalization of national universities relied mostly on the faculty to manage international education. Since national universities were regulated by regulations and laws established by the government, faculty and administrative staff were restricted in their academic and administrative activities. At times, the promotion of international education necessitated action beyond the regulated duties of the assigned position. In many cases, international education was promoted by the faculty in relation to his/her research—arranging partnership agreements, accepting international students to do research in the graduate school, arranging scholarships and accommodation facilities for international students, and recommending his/her Japanese graduate students to study abroad at the partner institution by contacting his/her counterpart who most likely was a faculty member specializing in the same field. The administrative staff located in the department of this faculty member would assist whenever necessary, but in many cases the assistance was limited to menial administrative duties. If and when these faculty transferred to another institution, in many cases, administration of international education experienced a suspension of activity until a replacement could be found. On the other hand, private universities like Waseda University, were quick to establish liaison offices or professionally-oriented international centers with administrative staff managing and being responsible for various matters related to the promotion of international

education. In either case, as the need for internationalization advanced, both national and private universities realized that more personnel with special expertise and professionalism were needed to accommodate the rapid changes and complex environment.

The SiH provided for models in developing international strategic headquarters which would unify organizational understanding of internationalization and also provided recommendations on correcting some of the deficiencies in the system to enhance the promotion of international education. In this process, the importance of developing and maintaining professionalism of university staff became evident. Various types of SD programs as “good practice” examples in fostering professionalism were introduced—short-term and long-term “professional staff development” internships arranged with international partner universities; university staff workshop sessions created by effectively using international consortia; and, simple SD programs internally arranged using experienced staff members. Hiring specialists and experts in the field from outside of the university was also recommended as a way to develop professionalism.

As the goals and visions become clear and “personnel” are selected, the final issue is whether or not the personnel can work together well. In promoting the internationalization of universities, the Ministry of Education emphasized that universities promoting internationalization should adopt the concept of *kyoshoku kyodo* referring to a work relationship of equal responsibilities between faculty and administrative staff. According to Associate Professor Yukako Yonezawa, “the concept is simple in the abstract,” but difficult in practice “because it requires not

only structural reform but also cultural changes in organizational behaviors.”⁶⁶⁾ Traditionally, the Japanese university governance for national universities established a bureaucratic two-tier organizational structure that comprised of an educational organization with faculty in control and an administrative organization with the director of administration at the head. As national universities became national university corporations, the director of administration position was replaced by an executive that would be directly in charge of administrative staff. In either case, the faculty would be in a stronger position than administrative staff.⁶⁷⁾

If as Associate Professor Yonezawa explains, “a *kyoshoku kyodo* approach necessitates a shift in organizational relationships from vertical to horizontal under shared university-wide visions and values,” then this will not be an easy task—the solution will require a strengthening of “organizational capacity on both the academic and administrative sides” and facilitation of “inter-organizational communication to support equal responsibilities.”⁶⁸⁾ Governmental grants promoting internationalization like the SiH and the other grants that followed provide strong influence in implementing these structural and cultural changes. Some (private) universities in Japan, such as Waseda University with pioneers in promoting international education like former Vice Chancellor Masaki Yamashiro, have the concept of *kyoshoku kyodo* imbedded into their organizational structure from the very early stages of internationalization.

Sharing ideas and having equal responsibility between faculty and administrative staff will be vital in establishing professionalism in offices and centers promoting international education.

This will be one of the key factors to the sustainability of the administration of international education. Many universities in Japan are interested in promoting international education, but underestimate the importance of professionalism and the need of expertise in the field. When pandemics like the one we are experiencing now bring the system to a standstill, professionals will still be moving and finding answers to the problems by talking to other professionals, developing and sharing innovative programs, switching paradigms to fit into the crisis situation, and even using the crisis to build a better system to prepare for the next stage...

NOTES

- 1) See, Study in Japan website for international student statistics: <http://www.StudyinJapan.go.jp/en/statistics/zaiseki/data/2020.html> (last visited, September 21, 2021).
- 2) Yutaka Okihara, "Daigaku no Kokusaika to Ryugakusei no Uke'ire (Acceptance of International Students and Internationalization of Universities)," in Monbusho Daigaku Kyoku Gakuseika, ed., *Kosei Hodo* (Welfare Guidance) (Dai'ichi Hoki Publishing, 1976), p. 20.
- 3) *Id.*, pp. 20–21. The 1983 Ministry policy proposal to promote internationalization of universities also mentioned this "one-way" attitude as one of the reasons for the small numbers of in-bound international students, see, Monbusho, ed., "Nijuis'seiki he no Ryugakusei Seisaku ni kansuru Teigen ni tsuite (On the Proposal Concerning the International Student Policy for the Twenty-first Century)," 1277 *The Monthly Journal of Monbusho* 76, 78 (Gyosei, 1983). (Hereinafter, *1983 Ministry Policy Proposal*).
- 4) *Id.*, p. 22.
- 5) *Id.*
- 6) *Id.*, pp. 24–25.
- 7) *Id.*, p. 25
- 8) *Id.*, p. 23.
- 9) *Id.*, pp. 23–24.
- 10) *Id.*, p. 24. Since administrative positions within national universities were "civil service" positions, these positions in general did not require applicants to have special language skills or previous study abroad experience.
- 11) See, Masahiro Yokota & Satomi Shiratsuchi, eds., *Ryugakusei Adobaijingu* (International Student Advising) (Nakanishi Publishing, 2004), p. 57. According to the 2008 Ministry Policy Proposal, these International Student Centers would be a partial solution to assist in managing the various needs related to Japanese language support as well as learning support in general for international students. See, *supra* note 3, *1983 Ministry Policy Proposal*, pp. 86–87.
- 12) See Masaki Yamashiro, "Ryugakusei to Watashi (International Students and I)," in *Daigaku Kokusai Koryu Jissai—Pai'onია tachi Kara Jisedai he no Mes'seiji Dai Isshu* (The Beginnings of University International Exchange—Message From the Pioneers to the Next Generation Volume 1) (Committee on the Publication of Essays Commemorating Masaki Yamashiro's Retirement, 1997), pp. 186–191.
- 13) Masaki Yamashiro worked in the International Liaison Office for 21 years. Under normal administrative standards, then and even now, 21 years in one office or section is extremely long and "quite rare." It can be assumed that Waseda University believed that his professional skills and expertise that came from his long-term experiences were essential for the successful promotion of international education.
- 14) *Id.*, pp. 188–190.
- 15) Masaki Yamashiro, "Owarini (Kansha wo Komete) (Conclusion (With Gratitude)) in Haruo Nishihara, Takayasu Okushima, Yoshinori Murakami, eds., *Daigaku Kokusai Koryu Jissai—Pai'onია tachi Kara Jisedai he no Mes'seiji Dai Nishu* (The Beginnings of University International Exchange—Message From the Pioneers to the Next Generation Volume 2) (JAFSA (Japan Network for International Education), 2005), pp. 227–230. (Hereinafter, *The Beginnings of University International Exchange, Vol. 2*)
- 16) *Id.*, pp. 228–229. In the year 2000, JAFSA changed its name to JAFSA: Japan Network for International Education. Also, see Manabu Horie, "Yamashiro'san tono De'ai, soshite JAFSA (How I met Mr. Yamashiro and JAFSA)" in *The Beginnings of University International Exchange, Vol. 2*, pp. 140–143. In this short essay, Manabu Horie, former Executive Director of JAFSA, explains various episodes with Mr. Yamashiro and his relations with JAFSA.
- 17) See, Ryusuke Kamio, *Ryugakusei Tachi No Nihon* (The Japan of International Students) (Kyushu University Publishing, 1984). Professor Kamio's academic background was in the field of Chinese literature. His background in being familiar with Chinese language and culture made him a strong candidate to become the Founding Director not only because of the large numbers of Chinese international students, but because of his mild mannered interculturally oriented personality that fit well in

- the complex situation at that time.
- 18) *Id.*, see Chapter 1, “Ryugakusei no Uke’ire to Kyushinkai (Accepting International Students and the Kyushinkai),” pp. 5–15. The International Students Education Center was in charge of teaching Japanese language to newly arriving Ministry of Education Scholarship Students for the first six months before being sent to the assigned national university in the Kyushu region. It acted as a language learning center hub for the other national university in the Kyushu region. One of the problems that Professor Kamio recalls involved these six months language students and the issue of housing when they first arrived. Since these students would not be entering Kyushu University after the termination of their language studies, regulations disallowed them to live in the Kyushu University International Students Residence Halls. Priority was given to first year matriculating international students. Someone would have to find private accommodations (home stays, apartment rooms, etc.,...) for these students before they arrived. According to Associate Professor Shiratsuchi, these students were finally allowed to move into the Kyushu University International Students Residence Halls during their six months study period starting in October 1988. See, Satomi Shiratsuchi, *Ikoku towa, Manabu towa, Koyru towa—Ryugakusei tachi no Shuhen* (The Meaning of a Foreign Country, The Meaning of Studying, The Meaning of Exchange—Issues Related to International Students) (Fukuokaken Fujin Shimbunsha, 1990), p. 191.
 - 19) *Id.*, pp. 93–111.
 - 20) *Id.*, pp. 35–36.
 - 21) *Id.*, pp. 149–166.
 - 22) See, Satomi Shiratsuchi, *supra* note 18, pp. 33–54.
 - 23) See, 1983 Ministry Policy Proposal, *supra* note 3, pp. 76–88. For an outline (in Japanese) of the 100,000 International Students Acceptance Plan, see, https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/007/gijiroku/030101/2-1.html (last visited, September 21, 2021).
 - 24) See, Masahiro Yokota, “Gekizo suru Ryugakusei to Kokusai Koryu Adobaiza no Hitsuyosei (The Rapid Increase of International Students and the Need for a Cross-cultural Exchange Advisor)” 11 *Gakusei Sodan Kenkyu* 19 (1990).
 - 25) *Id.*, p. 19.
 - 26) One particular governmental policy decision that will not be mentioned in detail in the text, but significantly influenced universities, particularly national universities, to implement various changes of organization and programs involved with university reform was the change of the legal status of *kokuritsu daigaku* (national university) to become *kokuritsu daigaku hojin* (national university corporation). Data, and documents (in Japanese) related to this change can be found on the Ministry of Education Culture, Sports, Science and Technology website: https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/houjin/houjin.htm (last visited, December 20, 2021). Also, The National University Autonomous Legal Entity Law (*Kokuritsu Daigaku Hojin Ho*), Law No. 112 (2003) can be found (in Japanese) at: <https://www.elaws.e-gov.go.jp/document?lawid=415AC000000112> (last visited, December 20, 2021).
 - 27) See, Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities, *University Internationalization within a Global Society—Recommendations for Internationalizing Japanese Universities—Final Report* (Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences, 2010) (hereinafter, *Final Report*). An English Summary of the *Final Report* can be found at: https://www.jsps.go.jp/j-bilat/u-kokusen/program_org/finalreport.html (last visited, December 20, 2021).
 - 28) *Id.*, *Final Report*, Chapter One, Outline of Grants Program, pp. 1–4. The twenty pilot institutions (nineteen universities and one inter-university research institute) were: Hokkaido University (National); Tohoku University (National); The University of Tokyo (National); Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (National); Tokyo Institute of Technology (National); Hitotsubashi University (National); Niigata University (National); Nagoya University (National); Kyoto University (National); Osaka University (National); Kobe University (National); Tottori University (National); Hiroshima University (National); Kyushu University (National); Nagasaki University (National); The University of Aizu (Prefectural); Keio University (Private); Tokai University Group which included Tokai University, Hokkaido Tokai University and Kyushu Tokai University (Private); Waseda University (Private); National Institute of Natural Sciences (Inter-university Research Institute).
 - 29) *Id.*, *Final Report.*, pp. 89–93.
 - 30) *Id.*, *Final Report*, Chapter 5—Honjigyo no Seika to Daigaku Kokusaika no tameno Teigen (Outcomes and Recommendations for Internationalization of Universities), pp. 293–303.
 - 31) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 188–191. The professional development program at Monash College included the following contents: Marketing and Operations, Program Management and Administration, Writing and Replying Business Letters, Internet Research, E-business and E-Recruitment, Student Orientation/ Graduation Session, Coordination of Activities in Student Support, Administration of Home-stay Program, Recruitment and Orientation of Host Families, General Administration Support, Assistance with Study Abroad Fairs.
 - 32) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 189–192. The Department

- of Staff Development Service, the English as a Foreign Language Unit at the University of Glasgow provided for a program that included: How to Run a Meeting, Memos and Letters, Communicating with People Face to Face, Making Interviews, Making Presentations, and Independent Study. In the later stages of this training program, administrative staff of Tokyo University of Technology also participated diversifying the program.
- 33) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 191–192.
- 34) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 192–195.
- 35) According to Kyoto University’s website, this workshop has been held each year with different themes and has been held fourteen times so far. For the themes of the past workshops, see, <https://www.oc.kyoto-u.ac.jp/network/uaw/uaw-past/> (last visited, December 20, 2021). The unanimous agreement by the vice presidents of the AEARU members to the significance of holding this kind of workshop in the Asian region is thought to be the impetus to its sustainability.
- 36) See, *Final Report*, *supra* note 27, p. 193.
- 37) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 194–195.
- 38) *Id.*, *Final Report*, p. 196.
- 39) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 196–197.
- 40) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 197–198.
- 41) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 200–204.
- 42) *Id.*, *Final Report*, p. 200.
- 43) *Id.*, *Final Report*, p. 201.
- 44) *Id.*, *Final Report*, pp. 202–203.
- 45) *Id.*, *Final Report*, p. 204.
- 46) All competitive government grants that followed related to the internationalization of universities such as the Global 30 (2009), the Inter-University Exchange Project (2011), and Top Global University Project (2018) required proposals to have some kind of component or condition that emphasized the inclusion of “professionalism” in the administration of international education.
- 47) Issues concerning university governance, leadership and the role of senior international officers are important here, however, limitation of space does not allow us to cover these topics. A detailed discussion on these issues will have to wait for another occasion.
- 48) See, Akira Kuwamura, “Kokuritsu Daiga Hojin ni okeru Kokusai Ofisu no Genjo Bunseki to Tenbo (Future Prospects and an Analysis of Present International Offices of National Universities)” 14(3) *Bulletin of Yamagata University Education Science* 325 (2008). See also, Akira Kuwamura, “Nihon no Daigaku Kokusaika—Kadai to Tenbo (Internationalization of Universities in Japan—Issues and Overview)” 45 *Aichi Kenritsu Daigaku Gaikokugo Gakubu Kiyo* (Journal of the Faculty of Foreign Studies, Aichi Prefectural University) 191 (2013). For a short discussion of this topic in English written by the same author, see Akira Kuwamura, “The Challenges of Increasing Capacity and Diversity in Japanese Higher Education Through Proactive Recruitment Strategies,” 13 *Journal of Studies in International Education* 189 (2009).
- 49) *Id.*, Kuwamura (2008), p. 327. Associate Professor Akira Kuwamura mentioned that although some universities had adapted their administrative staff (and faculty) to accommodate in-bound international students more professionally by putting experienced and interculturally-oriented personnel in the international offices and centers for longer intervals or by hiring permanent international student advisors, many institutions still continued to use the internal administrative transfer system that nurtured so-called “generalists” in administration. (*Id.*, pp. 326–327)
- 50) *Id.*, p. 327.
- 51) See, Chuo Kyoiku Shingikai (Central Council for Education), *Gakushi Katei no Kochiku ni Mukete—Toshin* (Towards the Restructuring of Undergraduate Education—Report), December 24, 2008. (Hereinafter, *2008 Report*) The Report (in Japanese) can be found at: https://www.mext.go.jp/component/b_menu/shingi/toushin/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2008/12/26/1217067_001.pdf (last visited, December 23, 2021).
- 52) *Id.*, *2008 Report*, p. 41. From a similar perspective emphasizing administrative staff development, a survey analyzing the relationship between the role of administrative staff and knowledge development (in specialized fields of administration which included the international offices) suggested that a successful outcome of this relationship would depend on whether or not universities could create a circular knowledge development environment that promoted advanced learning among administrative staff by providing positions and decision-making activities where this acquired expert knowledge and skills could be implemented. See, Ruriko (Miyamura) Fukudome, “The Role and Development of University Staff,” 2004 (7) *Japanese Journal of Higher Education Research* 157, 171 (2004). In another article introducing a Tokyo University Graduate Program in University Management and Policy Studies, as another option in advancing expert knowledge through “graduate school education,” a survey of the graduates of this program and their objectives in attending the program suggested that very few had the objective of advancing his or her own career in university administration after completion of the program. One reason behind this result was that although a significant number of graduates were at the time of their attendance university administrative staff members, most were familiar with the position held with their workplace, in that, many universities did not appreciate the experience

- and the advanced degrees attained at the graduate level considering it as overeducation. See, Akiko Ryojumi, “Daigaku Shokuin Kyoiku Kosu no Yakuwari (The Role of the University Administrative Staff Education Course),” 2017 (6) *IDE* 47, 48–49 (2017). Many of the administrative staff members that do decide to attend graduate school to further their knowledge and expertise in the field of their specialty frequently terminate their position and reapply for a “faculty of professional position” after completion of their advanced degrees.
- 53) *Id.*, 2008 Report, p. 42.
- 54) SD became an important factor in governance reform of universities, see Chuo Kyoiku Shingikai Daigaku Bunkakai (University Sub-committee, Central Council of Education), *Daigaku no Gabanansu Kaikaku no Suishin ni tsuite*—Shingi Matome (On the Issue of University Governance Reform—Summary of Deliberations), February 12, 2014.
- 55) See, *Daigaku Set'chi Kijun* (Standards for the Establishment of Universities), Law No. 28. A copy of this law (in Japanese) can be found at: <https://elaws.e-gov.go.jp/document?lawid=331M5000080028> (last visited, December 23, 2021). Article 42–3 states: A university, in order to appropriately and effectively manage the university's education and research activities, can allow *shokuin* (staff) to learn necessary knowledge and technical skills or arrange research sessions (not related to research sessions stipulated in article 25–3) and/or other arrangements to engage staff to advance their skills and quality as necessary. (translated by author) According to Associate Professor Jun Oba, in a notice from the Ministry of Education sent to the universities, “staff development” meant not only development of administrative staff, but also included faculty as well as the executives and technical workers. See, Jun Oba, “Sutafu Deberop'pumento no Gimuka ni tsuite kangaeru (Thinking About the Obligation of Staff Development)” 65 *Daigaku Jiho* 62 (2016–2017). Professor Oba mentions the reason for the delay in implementing this law concerned the difficulties in attaining consensus in allowing administrative staff to take “professional” positions that were “traditionally” assigned to faculty (*Id.*, p. 65).
- 56) The Japan Association of University Administrative Management (JUAM) was established in 1997 to promote research in theory and practice of administrative management for the aim of establishing administrative management personnel as professionals. See, JUAM website at: <https://juam.jp/wp/im/juam/en-juam/> (last visited December 23, 2021).
- 57) See, Bungen Miyazawa, “Staff Development Programs Responding to the Demands to Turn out ‘Human Resources with Global Perspectives’ at the Japan Association of University Administrative Management: A Case Study on the Staff Development Training Programs Provided by the Kanto Regional Research Group (in Japanese),” 89 *Ryugaku Koryu* 43 (2018). He mentions specifically, The Association of University Administrators (UK), Korean Association of University Administrators (KAUA), and the Korean Association of International Educators (KAIE).
- 58) See, Masami Shiokawa, “Staff Development Program to Respond to the Demands of Bringing Up ‘Globalized Human Resources’ at Universities: A Case Study from the Overseas Staff Development Training Program Provided by the Consortium of Universities in Osaka (in Japanese),” 82 *Ryugaku Koryu* 40 (2018).
- 59) *Id.*, pp. 43–44.
- 60) *Id.*, p. 44.
- 61) *Id.*
- 62) *Id.*, p. 45.
- 63) *Id.*
- 64) This idea is in line with the *Global Strategies Report-April 2021* outlined by Dr. Vicky Lewis where she suggested that “the fostering of a global mindset and cultural intelligence in staff was viewed as an essential underpinning for truly inclusive internationalisation.” See, Vicky Lewis Consulting, “Executive Summary” in *UK Universities’ Global Engagement Strategies: Time for a rethink?*, p. 8 (April 2021). *The Global Strategies Report - April 2021* can be accessed at: <https://www.vickylewisconsulting.co.uk/global-strategies-report.php> (last visited: December 23, 2021). See also, EAIE, *Forum—Internationalisation for All* (Winter 2021 Edition) which discusses “distributed leadership in international education,” including an article by Dr. Vicky Lewis on “Fresh Perspectives & Inclusive Models,” pp. 6–8.
- 65) See, Miki Horie, “Kokusai Koryu Tanto-sha no Ido—Jinji Ikusei kara mita Riten to Genkai (The Transfer of International Exchange Coordinators—The Merits and Limits to Personnel Training),” 8 *Ryugaku Koryu* 18 (2004).
- 66) Yukako Yonezawa, “Management of Internationalization in Japanese Universities: Towards the Development of Collaborative Relationship Between Academic and Administrative Staff,” 15 *Higher Education Forum* 39, 40 (2018).
- 67) See, Motohisa Kaneko, “Daigaku Shoku'in no Tenbo (An Overview of the University Administrative Staff),” 4 *IDE* 4, 6–8 (2008).
- 68) See, Yukako Yonezawa, *supra* note 66, p. 40.