

Ann Imlah Schneider, Ph.D.  
International Education Consultant  
Washington, DC  
Aimlahs@aol.com

## **Educating Prospective K-12 Educators – and Others – Internationally**

My plan today is to give you a preliminary report on findings and recommendations from my current research on the problems and prospects for internationalizing the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers here in the U.S. I'm not sure how this presentation landed in a panel on "Modalities for Development," but can only imagine its relevance to be

- that by improving (i.e., increasing the international exposure) the outlook of our K-12 teachers we will ultimately be preparing Americans generally for more educated roles as world citizens, with better understanding of world-wide development questions,
- that education is important for political and economic development in the United States, or
- that the issues discussed may be relevant to development of education systems in other countries – or
- all of the above.

Whatever the rationale, the topic is relevant for ISA members – and to all university faculty members engaged in educating a globally aware citizenry, in whatever country.

What got me involved in this project? After many years as a program officer at the U.S. Department of Education, urging Title VI-funded grantees (who are mostly in the Arts and Sciences) to forge effective curricular linkages with professional schools, and particularly Education, I became part of a research team evaluating the long-term impact of one of those programs.<sup>1</sup> Although that research project included one or two questions about teacher training, the responses seemed focused on faculty development or on outreach to the current teacher rather than preparation of future teachers, so with the press giving increasing attention to the deficiencies of K-12 education, research seemed needed to learn about the obstacles to an internationalized curriculum for teachers – and ways to overcome them. My first grant, completed in 2003,<sup>2</sup> focused on the undergraduate, pre-service training of the secondary school teacher. The current grant builds on the first, with emphasis now on undergraduate preparation for elementary level teaching. All three grants have been funded (competitively) under the Department of Education's Title VI International Research and Studies Program.

### **Methodology**

The methodology has been similar for both teacher education projects. Data has been collected in nearly 400 structured but open-ended interviews (conducted by myself) with deans, faculty, and advisors in both Arts and Sciences and Education, with Education students, and with senior administrators. Although many of the questions were similar for all groups, somewhat different protocols were used for

---

<sup>1</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, and Barbara B. Burn, *Federal Funding for International Studies: Does it Help? Does it Matter? Long-Term Impacts of Federal Funding on International Studies and Foreign Language Programs: A Research Report*, University of Massachusetts (Amherst), 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, *Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?*, April 2003 (available from the author) and summarized in *International Studies Perspectives*, April 2004, vol. 5, #3.

Arts and Sciences, Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs), and senior administrators. The interview protocols were revised somewhat for the second phase, but most questions were the same in both; however, drawing on the data from the first phase, a number of second phase questions included menus of possible responses – which probably elicited more systematic data on several topics. In addition, views were collected by interview (by volunteers) or by questionnaire, using still another set of questions, from over 100 current teachers, the majority of whom are working at the elementary level.

The university interviews were conducted on 41 campuses (actually 42, with one dropped in the second phase) at both research (18) and comprehensive (19) universities and at liberal arts colleges (4), located in 19 states plus DC, on the west and east coasts, in the midwest, and in the southeast and southwest. For the 23 institutions included in both phases, additional second-phase interviews were conducted either by telephone or in second site visits. The average number of interviews per campus was more than six. However, because the numbers of respondents in several sub-categories (such as Education advisors) are relatively small, the study must be considered an exploratory one, pointing to topics that need to be studied further, and more systematically. The result is a daunting amount of data which I hope to summarize enough to provoke discussion in several contexts, including the ISA.

A small group of advisors drawn from the ranks of Education faculty, the K-12 teaching community, area studies center directors and outreach coordinators, and senior university administrators has helped enormously in refining the interview protocols and procedures and in reviewing findings, recommendations, and dissemination strategies.

### **Defining Internationalization**

Findings from a few earlier studies seemed to indicate that internationalization efforts in teacher training programs concentrated on only two types of activity – sending a few students abroad for a semester, or less, and sending faculty abroad, although with no special assignment or mandate. Because other research has shown that fewer than 5% of all undergraduates are able to study abroad,<sup>3</sup> and because no research has demonstrated that faculty travel automatically affects course content,<sup>4</sup> our internationalization definition was broadened to include a wide range of on-campus activity as well as various opportunities abroad. To set the stage accordingly in the campus interviews, the first question asked about a series of activities that might be taking place at the institution. Most were direct questions, but respondents were invited to report other activities as well.

One of the handouts/attachments, “Defining Internationalization,” shows the list of internationalizing activities, and the totals of people reporting each at their institution, with notes showing which responses were volunteered. The first part of the list shows various types of overseas activity, and, yes, study abroad for students and overseas travel by faculty do top the list – for the Education respondents and for Arts and Sciences. However, the next group of activities devolves around the home campus curriculum, and it includes not only majors and minors that can have non-US content but also the presence of international modules in general education courses and whether there is a general education requirement of at least one non-US or comparative course. Some respondents may have been a little surprised by questions about foreign language requirements, although many consider foreign language training to be the bedrock of an internationalized curriculum. The third grouping of activities is more extracurricular, but still campus based, and includes clubs, film festivals and other activities. The final item is outreach (beyond the institution) with an international emphasis. Interestingly, few people

---

<sup>3</sup> Madeleine F. Green, “Joining the World” in *Change*, May/June 2002

<sup>4</sup> Findings in this study indicate that faculty members seldom travel for course development reasons.

volunteered that their institutions are doing it, but the numbers might be different had the question been asked directly.

How might all of this concern participants at an ISA conference? Senior administrators were asked whether all of the activities we had discussed were available to undergraduates throughout the university; the answer was uniformly “yes,” indicating that all could have an impact on students in Education programs. Just as important, any student in a teacher certification or licensure program must take the majority of her or his courses in Arts and Sciences fields, some to meet general education requirements and some to meet the highly prescribed curricular requirements for an Education major and for certification. As members of an Arts and Sciences faculty – which I assume that most ISA members are – you surely are involved with curriculum discussions and you are likely to have prospective teachers in your introductory level classes. As international studies specialists, in whatever department, you might want to have a greater impact on the training of the teachers of your future students. And if American education practices are serving as examples to educators in other countries, then surely we want to demonstrate international awareness.

### **Findings**

At this point, let me anticipate questions. Is increased “internationalization” for prospective teachers needed? What activities are deemed desirable *and* can be sufficiently cost-effective in the current funding climate? What kinds of activity can I urge you to undertake that could make a difference?

To answer the first question, the current teachers’ responses are helpful. Generally, only about half of the teachers participating in the survey felt that they had had enough pre-service training in the subjects they are now teaching – and most reported getting their “content” training in Arts and Sciences. Two thirds of the responding teachers reported that the recently modified standards which they are required to meet (and also the standards for the tests that their students must pass) do not reflect increasing globalization. Nonetheless, many of the Education deans, faculty, and advisors participating in the project clearly recognize the basic need for this country to do more to develop a globally competent workforce, and were searching for ways to increase their students’ international (and “multicultural”) exposure, but felt seriously constrained by the many curricular requirements for their students, combined with state-level demands for reductions in time-to-degree to alleviate teacher shortages. Several commented that the interview had given them some ideas, and they in turn passed on many ideas to the interviewer, which I want to share with you. The second page of the handout/attachment indicates some of the strategies discussed, giving some answers to the second and third questions.

### ***Advising***

At the top of the list of suggested strategies for “internationalizing” is strengthening of academic and career advising systems. Indeed, it was a topic that just about all interviewees wanted to talk about. At nearly all the institutions where interviews were conducted, the students preparing for teaching careers enter their postsecondary training through Arts and Sciences, taking required general education courses and other prerequisites for the Education programs in their first two years. Have students made the best use of their pre-major options for international exposure? The students who were interviewed indicated that they probably had not, even at institutions with a wide range of international activities. Internationally-aware advising, even before matriculation, could make a difference, particularly for students wanting some kind of study abroad experience. Most (but not all) of the institutions visited do offer a number of international courses and study abroad programs, and some of these overseas courses might be taken to meet general education and other prerequisite requirements, and others as electives.

How prospective teachers might be steered to them is a challenge that could be met through better advising.

Who does undergraduate academic advising? As often as not, I learned, it is not done the same way throughout the institution. The patterns vary not only from institution to institution but also from college to college, and even department to department, within institutions. Most academic advising is done by faculty, although increasingly, even for departmental majors, it is done by professional advising staff, with faculty serving a “mentoring” role. The advisors – faculty or professional staff – are most likely based in Arts and Sciences (at the college level for “undeclareds” and in departments for majors). Students often reported their advisors (faculty or professional staff) to be overburdened with advisees and not always available. Some current teachers reported that their best advice came from peers, and not through the formal system at all. The practices are generally similar to those reported by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA).<sup>5</sup> However, for Education students, many of whom transfer from other institutions (70% was the proportion cited in one interview), usually community colleges, and may be first generation college students, the advising pattern becomes increasingly confusing and is all the more important.

Particularly for the secondary level, students prepare for teaching with Arts and Science majors – indeed, some institutions (and particularly the liberal arts colleges) do not offer a teacher education major. In California, where K-12 teachers are required to have done a major in the liberal arts, universities in the CSU system are likely to offer special content liberal arts majors for students preparing for teaching careers. These students, who have set career goals early in their undergraduate years, are normally enrolled in the teacher education program along with the Arts and Sciences major. Advising by Education staff and faculty is usually available only after these students have been accepted for a teacher education program or, in some instances, when they are considering applying for it, and it focuses pretty exclusively on what students need to know and do to meet certification requirements.

How do students receive information about international options and activities? The question was asked in both the Education and Arts and Sciences interviews. Respondents most frequently thought that posters were the medium (although one remarked that fliers about international activities are rarely posted in the College of Education building!). Also mentioned as information sources were classes, faculty, and other advisors, then the student paper, clubs, and various meetings. Why were faculty and other advisors not mentioned most frequently? Yes, most said, they are in a position to advise students about the full range of curricular and extracurricular activities that increase international exposure. However, at some institutions I learned that students do not need to even have advisors sign off on their course choices and even if they do, their time with an advisor can be very limited.

Another set of advising questions dealt with career counselling. What about the liberal arts major who is undecided about a career? In the Arts and Sciences interviews, questions were asked about how students learn about teaching careers; many respondents were unclear about the sources of such advice for students, and a substantial number of faculty members, and a few deans, said that they didn’t know how advisors are prepared to help students learn about teaching as a career. Of the current teachers who had been Arts and Sciences majors, two thirds reported that the advising system did not include exploration of the teaching career option – and 90% felt that it should have. Perhaps this is another aspect of advising

---

<sup>5</sup> Wesley R. Habley, and Ricardo H. Morales, *Current Practices in Academic Advising: Final Report on ACT’s Fifth National Survey of Academic Advising* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1998), 13. NACADA, 1998)

for students already interested in international and foreign language study that could ultimately contribute to a more internationally aware teaching profession.

So it was not surprising that nearly 350 respondents, including current teachers, would like improvements in the academic and career advising systems. Even on campuses where faculty reported that advising was working well, students thought that improvements were needed. But what might be done? Many, including deans, responded quite simply that more (advising) staff members are needed, although that would not necessarily solve the international exposure issue.

Education participants in this project were asked whether advisors are sufficiently trained with respect to the international options for students, and more than 70% of the respondents, at all types of institutions and including advisors, replied that they are not. In the Education and Arts and Sciences interviews a question was also asked about how advisors receive the information needed for advising. A few shrugged their shoulders and reported that they consulted the catalogue or handbook. Most mentioned e-mail, memoranda, and/or meetings, but relatively few reported attending workshops, until we got to questions about how the advising system might be strengthened. Training sessions for advisors about the benefits, and realities, of international exposure for students could certainly help get better information to the prospective teacher – and the training should include not only faculty and professional advising staff, but also admissions officers.

Other ways to increase all advisors' (and students') international awareness were also suggested, including

- sending advisors on overseas missions, such as evaluation of study abroad programs;
- special briefings (for advisors) by International Programs staff;
- special attention to international needs and possibilities in the advising for first year students;
- inclusion of international options on the standard advising checklist menu;
- increasing the international content of freshman orientation;
- more peer advising (by returnees) about study abroad options;
- training about international activities for residence hall personnel;
- improved website information;
- more open houses for international programs, including foreign language “days”;
- advisor participation in curriculum discussions; and
- longer days!

One respondent to the improving-advising-question suggested that internationalization should have much more attention in curriculum committee discussions, so let us now look at findings about the curriculum.

### ***Curriculum Development***

As noted above, the course requirements for prospective teachers are very prescriptive, with the courses needed for certification or licensure added to at least twice as many “content” and general education courses, leaving little room for electives. From more than half of the institutions visited I obtained advising check sheets, for analytical purposes, but found that making comparisons between them is not simple for several reasons, such as their reliance on institution-specific codes (not explained on the

sheet itself), likely overlapping course titles (from one institution to another), and imprecision about the general education requirements that could fill some of the apparent gaps. Less than a third of the checklists show the possibility of any electives (which could be internationally-oriented courses), and for that third the average number of such courses is less than three.

The good news is that at least 75% of the check sheets show a requirement of one or more “world” courses, and one institution seems to require many as four. Furthermore, even if 25% of this sample did not seem to have a requirement for world history, geography, or politics, it may be that the students could get some such exposure through their general education courses. Indeed, as each interview began, in both phases, more than 300 respondents said that one or more general education courses have international or comparative components. In the second phase of interviews, more than 50% of the participants reported a general education requirement of at least one international or comparative course. Should the general education requirements be changed, to add more international exposure? More than half would like to see that happen, but most acknowledged that it would require a great deal of negotiation to do so, that adding to the general education requirements would be impossible, and that making substitutions could raise many hackles. However, it was nonetheless noted by several that this might be the best approach for internationalizing the teacher training experience. Put a little differently, the institutional context and the liberal arts curriculum need to provide most of the international exposure that teachers in training may receive.

At a few of the institutions with no “international” general education requirement it was pointed out that an institutional goal is to have all courses permeated with international content. But the reality is far from such an ideal on most campuses. Indeed, a large number of the current teachers suggested that having more international courses would be an effective approach, if funds were available. Many university respondents would add that space in the curriculum for additional courses in teacher education programs is very limited, or non-existent, because state legislatures are pressing for prompt completion, capping the number of required courses for the teacher-in-training. What about lengthening the undergraduate teacher education program to be longer than eight semesters? Fewer than a third of the current teachers liked that idea. A more acceptable approach would be the addition of international or comparative components to existing courses in both Arts and Sciences and Education. Indeed, high on the list of preferred strategies for internationalizing teacher education is facilitation of course revisions, or the addition of more international courses (suggested particularly by current teachers).

Another curricular approach is based on the assumption that the student training for an elementary education career does a major in that field, but can minor in another. Actually, a majority of the current elementary school teachers reported doing just that, although their minor fields were not likely to have had much international content. When SCDE interviewees were asked whether Education students might be allowed to minor in internationally-oriented subjects, nearly 75% said yes, and only about 5% were negative. A surprising number of current teachers also liked this approach. How many of you have students whose minor is your field, while majoring in Education? One Arts and Sciences faculty member mused that he’d just noticed that a very large portion of his students were actually based in Education, wondering if, because of that, adjustments in his presentations might be helpful.

A second question about minors probed options for the Arts and Science major: Might an education minor for Arts and Sciences majors be an effective approach for recruiting prospective teachers? Few SCDEs offer a teacher education minor, or any education minor, and many of the Education interviewees initially responded negatively to the notion, commenting that a minor would not be enough for certification, and that it would be too much of a burden on their already strained resources.

But might it serve as an introduction to the profession for the Arts and Sciences major, and ultimately serve to shorten a post-baccalaureate certification program for the student who eventually decides on a teaching career? Well, come to think of it, that might be a good idea... Few Arts and Sciences faculty knew how their students might learn about teaching as a career option, and they were close to unanimously in favor of an Education minor option for their students. Have you ever made such a suggestion to your students?

Following the questions about strategies for change, interviewees were asked whether departments have enough flexibility to make changes that could improve the international exposure of teachers in training. Some 95% of the senior administrators considered departments to have enough flexibility, while close to 50% of the Education interviewees felt that they do not, probably because of the constraints related to certification requirements and increasing emphasis on standards and testing. Yet some did comment that perhaps their basic courses on Educational Foundations might be revised to include more comparative information. Of the Arts and Sciences respondents, 92% opined that departments do have the flexibility to make changes, and Arts and Sciences deans and faculty certainly responded favorably to questions about strategies that would lead to curricular changes. Perhaps this is another indication that efforts to increase international exposure for prospective teachers can, and must, be made primarily by faculty in the Arts and Sciences. So let us now move to more information about faculty.

### *Faculty Development*

One of the early questions in most of the interviews explored the sources of initiative for internationalization efforts. Faculty efforts were the most cited by the respondents in all categories. Nonetheless, for the final question asked of all the university interviewees, about how they would want to use a hypothetical outside grant of funds for internationalizing teacher education, a substantial number would target more faculty development and course revision. (Information about those responses is also in one of the handouts/attachments.) And because the course revision would need to be primarily in the Arts and Sciences, responsibility for doing so would seem to lie with faculty most knowledgeable in international studies – again, like people attending these ISA meetings.

What kinds of activities were discussed to encourage faculty in the internationalization effort? I asked some direct questions about specific activities, but might also infer suggestions from answers to a few others. First, from the direct questions:

- As noted, facilitation of **course revision** was favored by many – over 90% in phase two. In the interviews with senior administrators, it seemed clear that all of the institutions visited have funds that could help with this, subject to faculty interest and university priorities.
- Helping faculty to **work abroad on course development** was favored by many (78% in phase two), in Education as well as in Arts and Sciences – although few (barely 7%) reported foreign travel for this purpose hitherto. Asked whether faculty experience abroad affects teaching, a large majority replied that it does, and they particularly cited course revisions, at the very least with inclusion of more varied examples. At one or two institutions I heard about faculty grants for overseas travel for a variety of primary purposes, but always with a condition that an impact on a course syllabus also be demonstrable. It was also noted, by many, that faculty who travel overseas are much more likely to encourage students to do the same. So it seems that facilitating overseas experience for faculty is very likely to advance campus internationalization in several ways.

- **Joint Arts and Sciences and Education faculty workshops** to solve specific curriculum issues (related to internationalization) were an idea liked by a surprising 75% (in phase two), notwithstanding the qualifications voiced by some respondents in Arts and Sciences that the Education folks would probably not like it – and vice versa. In fact, I heard increasingly about successful efforts of this sort already under way, often facilitated by an institutional Center for Teaching and Learning. This might be an exercise that the Arts and Sciences faculty member mentioned earlier might have found helpful, with Education methodology experts helping him with choices of content and presentation that could be most useful to the prospective secondary, or even elementary, school teacher.
- **Team teaching**, with Education and Arts and Sciences faculty, was also looked on favorably, by nearly 75% – many more than in the first phase of the project. Administrative problems abound for such efforts (who gets credit for the enrollments? and who pays for the teaching time?), but when deans have found special funding, the concept has seemed to work. Might you, as international relations specialists, for example, consider a team-teaching assignment with experts on social studies methods courses, which are required for most elementary school teacher training programs?

The interviews indicated possibly a few other ways that faculty might be encouraged to do more internationally:

- Although a majority reported that international activity is not a criterion for promotion and tenure, most said that it can play a positive role in the process, if appropriately presented. Perhaps administrators could put more emphasis on this in their orientation of new faculty.
- Every interviewee (who was asked) reported that their institution had some funds for faculty development, be they department travel stipends or grant funds from deans and other offices. Might international activity be given priority in the allocation of these funds?

### *Students' International Experience*

As noted earlier, for many, international education has been defined as study abroad. I hope that I have persuaded you by now that domestic university-based experiences can contribute substantially to improved international knowledge and understanding. But that is not to discount the impact of study abroad on participants, from whatever field. Although improvements in advising came out a little ahead, if one ranks the reactions to the various strategies on the list (in the handout/attachment), study abroad is close behind, and in the recent phase of interviews it is actually ahead, favored as a strategy by more than 90% of the respondents. A separate question was asked about internships abroad, and that too was highly recommended. However, notwithstanding the respondents' enthusiasm for it in principle, an appreciable number knew of no Education students actually participating in a study abroad program; the average number of participants for those who did know about participants was about eight per year, ranging from zero to 75. Of the current teachers (who, I should note, were nearly all participants in special in-service programs on international topics), only 40% reported having ever lived or studied outside the United States, yet about 60% felt that their undergraduate programs would have been improved by a study abroad experience.

Most of the campuses visited have some experience with internships abroad, but such programs are even more complicated than study abroad to administer effectively. And both are particularly difficult for the Education student. Questions that need to be addressed to make any kind of overseas experience



more effective for students are its relationship to requirements in the general education part of the curriculum, how the experience may be integrated with the major (or minor), whether internships abroad are feasible (or can be made so) for teachers-in-training, what pre-program preparation is most effective (and needed), and what follow-up practices can increase its effectiveness for returnees, and their fellow students. A number of interviewees, and current teachers, felt that follow-up courses or seminars, and encouragement of presentations and papers drawing on the overseas experience, could serve to amplify the impact of the students' overseas experiences. Here too is a realm in which ISA members on university faculties could make a difference.

Under this heading might also be mentioned the on-campus roles of international faculty and students, as well as community resources. Many interviewees – over 80% – reported (see the “Defining...” data) having international students serving as resources in courses. However, to the questions about strategies, more than 70% in the second phase agreed that it would be a good idea to involve more international students in curricular or extracurricular activities, many noting that they are doing some but could do a lot more. About international faculty, in the second phase all of the senior administrators reported having them, but their potential impact may not be institution-wide, since only 80% of the Education interviewees responded positively on this question. At one institution it was noted that nearly all the international faculty are in scientific fields. So do international faculty actually contribute to internationalization? Yes, they do, almost unanimously – through their different perspectives and methodologies, special presentations, and help in developing exchange and study abroad programs. But how many are teaching the courses taken by teachers-in-training?

Another question about international influence on the home campus was whether the resources of heritage communities are drawn on in course syllabi. Here the response was less unanimous, with at least 20% noting that they were not located in areas where representatives of one or more heritage communities might be available – but nonetheless, nearly 70% did report use of this kind of teaching resource. Are students able to observe and/or do their practice teaching in bilingual or magnet schools? About 70% of the Education respondents said they can, and do; those who responded negatively did so only because the option is not available in their communities.

### ***Foreign Language Requirements***

Many of the participants in this project felt that attaining some proficiency in a foreign language is an important piece of the undergraduate experience and should be a part of the teacher training program as well. However, although about two thirds of the respondents reported a language requirement at their institutions, most of those requirements apply only to Arts and Sciences majors. The Education major is very likely to be exempted from a university requirement, if there is one. Nor are teacher certification requirements likely to require foreign language competence. But the current teachers, by a ratio of 12 to 1, do think that foreign language study should have been a part of their training. Of the Education respondents to the university interviews about 70% would like to add or increase a foreign language requirement; the percentage was much higher among the senior administrators and in Arts and Sciences. Interestingly, however, the only categories of respondents who would give priority to foreign language instruction if funds were available were Education advisors and students and current teachers. The obstacles to doing so are many, the principal one being the limitations on time in the undergraduate teacher education curriculum.

This is a topic discussed at a recent conference on language teaching<sup>6</sup> and one that will have more attention in my final report, but now let me just mention one of the language questions that may be of interest to ISA members. In “defining” internationalization, does your campus have a program for “Languages across the Curriculum?” Often I had to explain – even in the Arts and Sciences interviews – what “Languages across the Curriculum” can involve; briefly, it is an opportunity for students to do non-language department coursework in a foreign language. An example might be a course on Latin American Politics taught in Spanish, including readings and class discussion, or the same course might have a section meeting an extra hour a week (for extra credit) for discussion in Spanish (or Portuguese). This kind of program gives students an opportunity to use the language at a more advanced level and develop specialized vocabulary in their fields of interest. Less than a quarter of the recent interviewees reported positively on this question, and a fair number did not know about this type of program at all. Languages-across-the-Curriculum may be an unrealistic goal in the teacher education curriculum, but I mention it in part because several interviewees cited, as an obstacle to having a language requirement for prospective teachers, that the language training offered at their institution is unrelated to students’ interests in fields other than literature. Perhaps the existence of such options (and faculty capabilities) would provide a somewhat different perspective in courses the teacher-in-training might take. And it should certainly be an approach of interest to ISA members.

### ***Governance***

On most campuses, a key player in the internationalization process is the Office of International Programs. However, on at least three of the campuses visited, such an office does not exist, and it is probably not a coincidence that the internationalization process seems less developed for those institutions. The functions of such offices may be limited to serving (and possibly recruiting) international students and faculty, and study abroad (some have separate offices for these two functions), but they are likely to provide other services as well: administering exchange programs, organizing events such as lectures and film festivals and other outreach activities, running ESL programs, administering area and/or international studies majors, handling applications for faculty international travel grants, providing assistance for outside grant applications, and coordinating curriculum development efforts. Additional functions mentioned by a few include leadership for an institution-wide international council, backstopping a special club for study abroad returnees, running an international student house, special seminars for faculty, passport application acceptance, university representation outside the United States, oversight of international alumni relations, and Eurail pass issuer.

Directors of such offices were almost always among the interviewees for this project on each campus; the discrepancies between their reports of what they do and the other information garnered on the same campus was the subject of another paper,<sup>7</sup> and will be updated in my final research report. Suffice it to say that the information flow about this potentially important source of help for many aspects of the internationalization process could be improved. Several Directors of International Programs indicated willingness to facilitate faculty and curriculum development efforts, but faculty on their campuses seemed unaware of this service. You may want to think about this on your own campuses.

Another aspect of the information flow has to do with knowledge about how internationalization efforts may be initiated – and funded. Faculty like yourselves were cited most frequently as the initiators

---

<sup>6</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, “Language Instruction and Prospective Teachers: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations.” Presented at the Interagency Language Roundtable Showcase, July 29, 2005

<sup>7</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, “Connecting ‘International’ and Prospective Teachers: Added Challenges?” presented October 30, 2004, at Beloit College (<http://www.beloit.edu/%7Eoie/conference/>)

of international activity. The next most frequently cited were senior university administrators – presidents and provosts – although in a number of conversations they were described as “very supportive” of faculty efforts, rather than initiators. College administrators (i.e., Arts and Sciences and Education deans) came in a close third. Students were sometimes ascribed a role, and other occasional sources were alumni and the local business community. Some ventured that their institutions had some encouragement, but no help from the state for internationalization efforts. A few, however, noted encouragement from consortia such as the UNCF. And were Education respondents encouraged to internationalize by the priorities of their professional associations? Half of the faculty said they were (by at least one association), but some 30% did not feel that to be the case. On the other hand, about 80% of the Arts and Sciences respondents – and 73% of the Education faculty – did report impetus for internationalization coming from foreign visitors.

Outside grant funding also plays a part in the initiation of internationalizing efforts, but the responses to questions about what the sources of incentive funding might be were quite mixed. Nearly 40% of the non-student Education interviewees just did not know or even venture a guess about what funding sources might exist. Some U. S. Government agencies were mentioned by many, particularly by respondents at the comprehensive universities – most likely FIPSE, Department of State, USAID, and the Department of Education (Titles II, III, and/or VI), but also NIH, and NSF. UNESCO was even mentioned. “Foundations” were also cited, possibly more frequently at research universities and a little more by people in Arts and Sciences and by senior administrators than by Education interviewees, although it was not always clear whether the reference was to the university’s own fund-raising organization or an outside entity such as the Lilly or Japan Foundations. Interestingly, in the responses by senior administrators to the question about how their internationalization efforts really are funded, the large majority (85%) said that much was done with internal funds. In this relatively small sample, comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges seem much less likely to receive U.S. Government funds (Title VI or other), or even to be aware of federal government funding sources, and seem more likely to use internal funds, and to cultivate private donors, and the state, compared to the research universities. Here I might mention my surprise that relatively few mentioned the Department of Education’s Title VI which provides funding for programs intended to develop exactly the kinds of activities we have been discussing.

## Conclusions

So, given key players’ pessimism about funding sources, it is perhaps relevant that many of the strategies suggested, and liked, by a considerable number of respondents, are not very expensive. Many institutions currently do offer many international and foreign area courses; improved advising might simply make better use of those already-existing resources, for example. I learned on many campuses about programs to help faculty improve and update their teaching, so adding an international strand to that activity might similarly be quite cost-effective. If any of you are interested in improving access and adaptability of education institutions in other countries, perhaps some of the foregoing suggestions could apply there too.

I hope it is clear why I wanted to share these research results with fellow ISA members. The importance of strengthening the preparation of K-12 teachers everywhere is well recognized, and as international studies specialists you can surely – you must – recognize the importance of having teachers well grounded in the basics of our global context. The prospective teacher is trained primarily in the Arts and Sciences – the professional home of most ISA members – and Arts and Sciences faculty need to give

serious attention to their impact on that training by working with Education faculty, through discussions of course requirements, through faculty and curriculum development to increase international content of as many courses as possible, and through an advising system that is sensitive to the real options – and needs – for as much international exposure as possible.

We have developed a fairly extensive set of recommendations – for state and local governments, for accrediting agencies, for professional associations, for outside funders, for Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, and for institutions of higher education generally. All will be included in the final report, which I hope to have ready by next summer. For purposes of this presentation, I include the recommendations for institutions of higher education generally, as they are probably most applicable to participants in this ISA conference.

Obviously, I am still at work on the analysis and drafting of the research report, but even now I would urge you to do more, if you possibly can, on your campuses to extend internationalism to the students now or prospectively in your Schools of Education. And I welcome your questions, comments, and suggestions.

Thank you for your attention to this important topic.

## Recommendations

### ***For institutions of higher education generally:***

- implement a wide range of strategies for increasing international exposure for pre-service teachers, among them –
  - add formal international components to student advisory services, beginning in the pre-application phase, to assure the feasibility of maximum international exposure within normal time-to-degree constraints;
  - provide training, and website support, on international options for students, faculty, and professional advisors;
  - foster development of internationally oriented curriculum, through, for example,
    - individual faculty grants (particularly for general education courses),
    - joint workshops for both Arts and Sciences and Education faculty, and
    - hiring faculty with international training and experience;
  - strengthen requirements for foreign language training for all undergraduates, with a goal of attaining at least conversational proficiency in a second language; and
  - review policy and practice for the integration of study and internships abroad in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements;
- strengthen the role of campus-wide offices for international services and programs, and effectively provide information about them;
- expose all students with international interests to the challenges and satisfactions of teaching careers; and
- track characteristics described in this report for evaluation, research, and planning purposes, for all undergraduate programs, including those in professional schools and advising services.

## DEFINING INTERNATIONALIZATION

Interview Responses for Title VI-funded Studies of Internationalizing Teacher Education

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Institution Type</u>						
	<u>SCDE</u> <i>n=162</i>	<u>A&amp;S</u> <i>n=139</i>	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>n=85</i>	<u>Total</u> <i>n=386</i>	<u>Research U.</u> <i>n=195</i>	<u>Comprehensive U.</u> <i>n=157</i>	<u>Liberal Arts Col.</u> <i>n=34</i>
Study abroad	140	129	84	353	168	151	34
Faculty going abroad	139	124	81	344	161	151	32
Internships/practice teaching abroad	120	100	73	293	144	118	31
** Exchange programs	33	26	35	94	40	45	9
** Overseas centers	0	4	2	6	6	0	0
** Summer research abroad for students	1	3	6	10	4	4	2
<b>Language requirement</b>							
<b>- institution-wide</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>- for some departments/colleges</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>International module(s) in general education courses</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>General education requirement of at least one non-US or comparative course</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Possibility of a minor in discipline such as history, including non-US content</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Possibility of a major in discipline such as history, including non-US content</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>32</b>
* <b>Language-across-the-Curriculum</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>International students as cultural resources in courses</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>32</b>
* <b>Heritage communities as cultural resources in courses</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>13</b>
** <b>Internet, international video hook-ups</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
** <b>Curriculum permeated with non-US content</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
** <b>Student theses</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Mentoring of students by in-service teachers with international outlook	83			83	39	39	5
* Promotion and tenure policies	27	21	14	62	34	28	0
* Foreign visitors	99	93	75	267	124	116	27
International house, dorm floor	59	50	38	147	76	55	16
International clubs	108	98	73	279	128	123	28
* Model UN	28	41	33	102	53	33	16
* International film, food festivals	95	76	58	229	107	95	27
** <i>Outreach with international emphasis</i>	3	4	20	27	20	7	0

\* Volunteered by interviewees in Phase 1, direct question in Phase 2

\*\* Volunteered by interviewees in both phases

## STRATEGIES FOR INTERNATIONALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION

by respondent (*for entire project*) and home institutional types (*second phase*)

Activity	<i>entire project, per</i>			<i>ph. 1    ph. 2</i>		<b>Project Total</b>	<i>or (in Phase 2 only), per</i>			
	<u>A&amp;S</u> <i>n=138</i>	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>n=85</i>	<u>SCDE</u> <i>n=163</i>	<u>In-Service Teachers</u> <i>n=28</i>	<i>n=45</i>		<u>Research U.s</u> <i>n=101</i>	<u>Comp. U.s</u> <i>n=85</i>	<u>4-Year Colleges</u> <i>n=25</i>	<u>Phase 2 Total</u> <i>n=257</i>
Strengthening advising and career counseling systems	115	81	110	9	32	<b>347</b>	91	75	19	217
More study abroad	87	76	127	9	29	<b>328</b>	96	84	24	233
Joint A&S and SCDE faculty workshops for curricular development	108	66	116	1		<b>291</b>	92	81	21	194
Sending faculty abroad for course development	89	68	119			<b>276</b>	97	82	23	202
Changing/increasing general education requirements	69	53	85	1	35	<b>243</b>	65	71	16	187
Facilitating course revision/more international courses	89	70	113	10	17	<b>299</b>	95	83	25	220
Adding a foreign language requirement	39	31	63		36	<b>169</b>	48	37	7	128
Changing (increasing) the foreign language requirement	49	38	25	2	4	<b>118</b>	33	32	10	79
Recruiting students with international interests	46	48	85	2		<b>181</b>	77	62	22	161
A&S/SCDE team-taught courses	69	53	94			<b>216</b>	89	81	21	191
More internships abroad	61	55	104	1	17	<b>238</b>	93	80	22	212
Involving more international students in extracurricular or curricular activities	59	54	88		4	<b>205</b>	88	73	21	186
Creating an education minor for A&S majors	37	32	50			<b>119</b>	64	35	14	113
Encouraging SCDE minor in international or area studies	50	42	72		23	<b>187</b>	73	66	17	179
Departments have flexibility to make changes	53	47	49			<b>149</b>	32	33	9	74
or not	4	2	38			<b>44</b>	20	12	1	33
<b>Priority Targets:</b>										
Faculty development	37	33	50	1		<b>121</b>	34	40	8	82
Course revision/new courses	30	20	26	16	13	<b>105</b>	24	14	6	57
Advisor workshops	15	4	3			<b>22</b>	5	2	1	8
More study abroad	32	23	27	20	7	<b>109</b>	24	24	5	60
More study abroad programs	7	7	12			<b>26</b>	14	13	4	31
Financial aid for study abroad	14	21	51	7	5	<b>98</b>	11	13	5	34
Internships abroad	10	5	21	3	4	<b>43</b>	14	10	4	32
Foreign language requirements			5	3	4	<b>12</b>		1		5
Student travel				11	11	<b>22</b>				11
Outreach (for in-service teachers)				8		<b>8</b>				