

# **To Leave No Teacher Behind**

**Building International Competence into the Undergraduate Training  
of K-12 Teachers**

**A Research Report**

**Ann Imlah Schneider  
Washington, DC**

**May 2007**

## **Acknowledgements**

The project has received substantial encouragement and help from many people, among them David Imig, Sharon Robinson, Christopher Brown, and Mary Harrill-McClellan at the American Association of Colleges or Teacher Education; Barbara Turlington, Laura Siaya, and Madeleine Green at the American Council on Education; George Mehaffy, Arlene Jackson, and Patricia Fesci at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; Roberta Flaherty at the National Academic Advising Association; Fred Czarra at the Council of Chief State School Officers; Merry Merrifield at Ohio State University; and J. David Edwards at the Joint National Committee for Languages; Diane Taylor Olson; and Miriam Kazanjian. Their comments and suggestions have been much appreciated as the project has evolved, in both phases.

The project's board of advisors (see Appendix A) has provided invaluable insights and counsel. Several NRC outreach directors proffered their help with the collection of data, particularly from current teachers. And without the many interviewees who shared their time, experience, and ideas – in some instances, more than once – the project just would not have been possible. I cannot thank them enough.

Support for the project, financially and substantively, from the U. S. Department of Education and the IEPS staff has of course been crucial. However, the report and its recommendations are entirely my responsibility.

Ann Imlah Schneider  
Washington, DC  
May 2007

## Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Summary	4
Introduction	6
Methodology for the Research	
Preparation	7
Advisory Groups	7
Data Collection	8
Findings	
Defining Internationalization	10
The Advising Process	12
Getting Information to Students	12
Recruiting Future Teachers	16
What Might Be Done?	17
Curriculum	
General Education Requirements, Majors, and Minors	20
Foreign Language Requirements	24
Experience Abroad	26
Certification and Accreditation Issues	30
Faculty	32
Governance and Policy Issues	
OIP Activity	35
Incentives	37
Strategies	39
Conclusions	41
Recommendations	42

## Tables

		<i>Page</i>
Table 1	Institutions Visited, Interviews Conducted	9
Table 2	Interview Responses: Defining Internationalization	11
Table 3	Advising Sources	13
Table 4	Advisors' Information Sources	15
Table 5	International Curriculum Options	21
Table 6	Foreign Language Requirements	24
Table 7	Institutional Responses about Study and Internships Abroad	27
Table 8	Current Teachers' Responses about Study and Internships Abroad	27
Table 9	Certification and Standards Information from Current Teachers	31
Table 10	Impact of Faculty Experience Abroad	33
Table 11	Functions of University Offices of International Programs	36
Table 12	Strategies for Internationalizing Teacher Education	40

## Appendices

A. Advisory Group	44
B. Site Visit List	46
C. Interview Protocols for	
(1) Arts and Sciences Faculty, Deans and Advisors	48
(2) Education Faculty, Deans, Advisors, and Students	50
(3) Senior Administrators	54
(4) Current Teachers	56

# **To Leave No Teacher Behind: Building International Competence into the Undergraduate Training of K-12 Teachers**

## **SUMMARY**

### **The Project**

The research data for this exploratory study, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, have been collected in interviews with some 400 administrators, faculty, and students at 41 institutions over a five-year period, focusing first on the undergraduate training of secondary school teachers and more recently on the elementary level. More than 100 current teachers also contributed data through interviews and questionnaires.

### **Findings and Recommendations**

The findings point to a number of recommendations that emphasize cost-effective approaches, clustering around four general topics. Here are some highlights:

#### **Advising**

Strengthening undergraduate advising in both two- and four-year institutions to include international options – particularly for underclassmen – emerges as a major need. Nearly 75% of the interviewees in Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs) felt that advisors (faculty and staff) are *not* sufficiently trained about the full range of possibilities for international exposure for students – and over 90% of the responding current teachers think that teacher training should include advising about international options.

#### **Curriculum**

Although many – teachers, faculty, administrators, students – would like more study abroad participation, even more (94% of SCDE respondents, for example) would like to add *or revise* courses to include international dimensions. Few reported foreign language requirements for prospective teachers, but many, in all categories (among current teachers in a ratio of 9 to 1), felt that teachers should acquire foreign language competence. Training of foreign language teachers for elementary as well as secondary school instruction is another need.

#### **Faculty**

To facilitate needed development of curriculum with more international dimensions, most respondents, including 96% of the senior administrators, like the concept of faculty travel abroad for curriculum development, but few are doing so currently. Nearly as many, in both Arts and Sciences and Education, would like joint (A&S/SCDE) faculty workshops focused on curriculum development.

#### **Policy and Governance**

More than 80% of the recently interviewed teachers, and two-thirds of the SCDE respondents, reported that changes in certification requirements do not reflect increasing globalization, nor do subject standards, or most SCDEs' graduation requirements. Yet a few internationalizing initiatives are being undertaken in SCDEs by faculty and deans, with encouragement from senior administrators *and* colleagues in Arts and Sciences.



## INTRODUCTION

Are the teachers in our schools, at all levels, sufficiently prepared to teach their students about the world we all live in? If not, what might be the obstacles to curriculum “internationalization” for the prospective teacher? And, realistically, what can be done to expose an undergraduate teacher-in-training to the diversity of the wider world, in this era of “globalization”? These were my questions some seven years ago when I began a quest for answers. This report describes the findings from the quest so far, and offers recommendations for strengthening this increasingly important aspect of the training of K-12 teachers the United States.

In case the reader still wonders why internationalization is needed, a first answer is simply a reminder of the many current events involving other countries and our economic and political relations to them, indicating the extent to which today’s students must be trained to appreciate diversity – and to compete effectively – on a global scale. In 2006 several key voices joined the calls for more international content in our educational system. First, in February the Committee for Economic Development (CED) issued a policy statement recommending international content “taught across the curriculum and at all levels of learning...” and expansion of the “training pipeline at every level of education to address the paucity of Americans fluent in foreign languages...”<sup>1</sup> Then the National Governors Association put international education on its 2006 agenda. Next, the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) issued a report in September calling for teacher training with a focus on global perspectives and urging, among several “action steps,” that foreign language instruction “be included as part of the global perspective.”<sup>2</sup> And in November the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) issued a policy statement on global education with even stronger recommendations: to ensure “that every student graduating from an American high school will be multi-lingual,” the CCSSO recommends that state standards be reviewed “to incorporate world orientation in the curriculum” and that teacher certification require “all pre-service teachers to be fluent in a world language and have training in the teaching of world languages.”<sup>3</sup> Even more recently, *Educational Leadership* has carried a lead article stating that “[t]he United States must create its own education response to globalization, which should include... internationalizing the curriculum.” To be successful, programs must train students “to be knowledgeable about the world [and] be able to communicate in languages other than English...”<sup>4</sup> Appropriate preparation of teachers is essential to providing adequate training of students for adult roles which will inevitably have some kind of connection to the world beyond our shores.

From his 1989 study of transcripts at nearly 50 colleges and universities, Richard Lambert found that at the comprehensive institutions of higher education, where most teachers are trained, the average Education major took only 1.5 internationally focussed courses (compared with 2.4 such courses for all majors); furthermore, he found the “low exposure of education majors” to foreign

---

<sup>1</sup> Committee for Economic Development, *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington, DC: Committee for Economic Development, February 2006) and available at [www.ced.org](http://www.ced.org).

<sup>2</sup> National Association of State Boards of Education, *Citizens for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Revitalizing the Civic Mission of Schools*, (Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education, 2006).

<sup>3</sup> Council of Chief State School Officers, *Global Education Policy Statement* (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, 2006)

<sup>4</sup> Vivien Stewart, “Becoming Citizens of the World” in *Educational Leadership* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 2007), vol. 64, #7, 10.

language study “especially troublesome.”<sup>5</sup> My research indicates that little has changed. U. S. Department of Education programs, through Title VI of the Higher Education Act, have been available for years to provide resources for curriculum internationalization, but the available resources have seldom been used for K-12 teacher education programs. For more than 30 years the Title VI National Resource Centers, which develop instruction in foreign languages and international and area studies, have been urged to improve their ties with professional schools of education, but evidence of success in this realm is limited and the obstacles to doing so unclear. Few of the grants funded by the Title VI Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program have targeted teacher education.

My first study of internationalization in K-12 teacher education focused mainly on the undergraduate pre-service training of the secondary school teacher and was completed in 2003.<sup>6</sup> The second and more recent grant, for which this is the final report, has built on the first, with emphasis on undergraduate preparation for elementary level teaching. Are students preparing to teach in elementary schools given more or less international exposure than those preparing for the secondary level? Might more international options be available for elementary school teachers-in-training? Are they able to include foreign language training in their preparation?

## **METHODOLOGY FOR THE RESEARCH**

### **Preparation**

What persuaded me to take on this project? After many years as a program officer at the U.S. Department of Education, urging Title VI-funded grantees to forge effective curricular linkages with professional schools, and particularly with Schools of Education, I became part of a research team evaluating the long-term impact of one of those programs.<sup>7</sup> We collected our data with a survey questionnaire, followed by structured interviews in site visits to about half of the survey respondents. The survey included one or two questions about teacher education, but the responses seemed to focus on faculty development or on outreach to the current K-12 teacher rather than on the undergraduate preparation of future teachers. So when the press was giving increasing attention to the deficiencies of K-12 education in the late 1990s, research seemed needed to learn more about the obstacles to an internationalized (and thus, of course, improved) curriculum for prospective teachers – and ways to overcome them. With U. S. Department of Education funding, under the Title VI International Research and Studies Program, I took on this two-phased project. Background material for all three studies has come from many sources in addition to the written materials mentioned above.

### **Advisory Groups**

An important part of the project’s methodology has been a small group of advisors (listed in Appendix A) who contributed throughout the project. Most of them participated in both phases; collectively, they have had experience as Education faculty and department chairs, the K-12 teaching community, NRC directors and outreach coordinators, and senior university administrators. They met

---

<sup>5</sup> Richard Lambert, *International Studies and the Undergraduate* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1989) 67-69 and 122-125.

<sup>6</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, *Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?*, April 2003 (available from the author and on her website, [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org)) and summarized in *International Studies Perspectives*, April 2004, vol. 5, #3.

<sup>7</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.



twice in each phase of the project and communicated by e-mail between meetings. They helped enormously in refining the interview protocols and procedures and in reviewing the findings, recommendations, and dissemination strategies.

Other important sources of advice have been officials at the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). All have contributed significantly to the planning and carrying out of the research, as have people at the Joint National Committee on Languages (JNCL), the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR), and the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA).

### **Data Collection**

The methodology has been similar for both teacher education research projects, drawing on experience in the site visit phase of the first grant. The data reported here were 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 interviewees, the interview protocols' emphases differed for Arts and Sciences (A&S), for Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs), and for senior administrators. The protocols are included in Appendix C.

The protocols' emphases, and most of the questions, were the same in both phases, but the original interview protocols were somewhat revised for the second phase, the main change being that, drawing on the data from the first phase, a number of second phase questions included menus of possible responses – in other words, more detail was obtained for several questions. Another difference in the second phase is that in nearly all instances when the interview time was too limited, I completed the conversation later by telephone. Both of these adjustments elicited more systematic and complete data on several topics for the second phase interviews. Nonetheless, because of some interviewees' time constraints, the reader may notice variety in the base numbers (the “Ns”) in some of the tables that follow.

In addition, using still another set of questions (also somewhat revised in the second phase and included in Appendix C), views were collected by interview or by questionnaire from nearly 120 current teachers, the majority of whom are working at the elementary level. Particularly when the protocol was used as a questionnaire, which was more frequent in the second phase, respondents may not have answered all questions, so these data also have considerable variety in the base numbers on which percentages could realistically be calculated.

Considerable attention was given to development of a representative sample of colleges and universities in setting up the interview schedule. The original plan for phase one was to visit about fifteen campuses, and ultimately twenty-four were included. For the second phase, an additional dozen or so were envisioned, yet actually eighteen more were added to the list. To some extent, the sites were chosen because of my earlier contacts, but many were responses to “cold” calls; in only one instance did an institution decline to participate. The participating institutions are listed in Appendix B. Table 1 shows the distribution of the university interviews; they were conducted on 41 campuses (one first phase campus was dropped for the second phase) at both research (20) and comprehensive (17) 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. Some seven HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) and HSIs (Hispanic Speaking Institutions) were among the participating institutions. Institutional sizes varied from a little over 1,000 to more than 50,000; the teacher education program enrollments ranged from about 20 to several thousand. Less than half of the sites had had experience with Title VI grants for strengthening the internationalization process. 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 (in person or by telephone) was more than six.

**Table 1**  
**Institutions Visited, Interviews Conducted**

	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>No. of Interviews</u>
	Comprehensive Universities	14	3	161
	Arts and Sciences			61
	Education			64
	Senior Administration			36
	Liberal Arts Colleges	1	3	34
	Arts and Sciences			15
	Education			12
	Senior Administration			7
	Research Universities	18	2	191
	Arts and Sciences			63
	Education			86
	Senior Administration			42
	Total	33	8	386
	Current Teachers			119
	Grand Total			505

The current teachers come from a variety of settings. Most were attending internationally-oriented workshops in California, Connecticut, North Carolina, and Ohio; another thirteen states are also represented. In the first phase of the project most of the participating teachers were secondary school teachers, but a few were working at the elementary school level. The total number in the first phase was 65, and the total in the second, more recent phase is 54. Of the 119 in both phases, 64 are, or have recently been, elementary school teachers. Their average number of years of teaching experience is about 13, ranging from none (one or two had just graduated, and had completed practice teaching only) to 37. Nearly 90% had done graduate work. Half of the teachers in the second phase have completed their undergraduate work since 1989, while half of those in the first phase got their bachelor's degrees after 1980.

Particularly because the numbers of respondents in several subcategories (such as senior administrators at liberal arts colleges, and Education advisors) are relatively small, the study must be considered an exploratory one, pointing to topics that need to be studied further, and more rigorously. Furthermore, because of the nature of my own contacts (primary and secondary) with the institutions included, it is possible that the data collected are somewhat biased in favor of the need for more internationalization throughout our educational system. The data from current teachers may also be biased because they were drawn from the ranks of participants in internationally-oriented workshops. In any event, the amount of data collected is daunting, so this report must be but a summary.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> More detailed presentations are available at [www.internationaladvice.org](http://www.internationaladvice.org).

## FINDINGS

### DEFINING INTERNATIONALIZATION

From preliminary research, it was clear that previous work on the subject<sup>9</sup> had pinpointed two activities used by Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education to “internationalize” their programs. One is study abroad for students, and the other is sending faculty abroad. However, it quickly became clear that very few students in teacher training programs actually do study abroad, that the Education faculty who went overseas had no mandate to internationalize course offerings on their return – and that little attention was given to the students’ general, home-campus experience. So research on a more complete range of options and strategies was clearly needed.

Because other research has shown that fewer than 5% of all undergraduates are able to study abroad,<sup>10</sup> and because early stages of this research indicated that the numbers are even lower for prospective teachers,<sup>11</sup> our internationalization definition was broadened to include a wide, and diverse, range of on-campus activity as well as a variety of overseas experiences. 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. The menu of direct questions was longer in the second phase of the research, and all respondents were invited to report additional activities. The response totals are shown in Table 2.

These international activities cover a broad range of campus activity, with overseas activity at the top of the list, followed by curriculum characteristics, then extracurricular activities. Generally, of course, respondents were familiar with most of the international resources that I asked about – but, comparing responses within institutions, I have found considerable inconsistency, particularly on issues such as language requirements, overseas internships, and even whether the general education requirements include an international or comparative course. (Unfortunately, because time was limited in many of the interviews with advisors, all too often I was not able to spend time on this issue. Nor did my interviews include a substantial number of professional advisors.)

The notes in Table 2 indicate some of the ways in which Education interviewees tended to respond differently from people in other categories. In addition:

- As anticipated, the percentages reporting study and internships abroad as possibilities were a little lower for Education respondents; of those who replied that either is an option, nearly all emphasized that few Education students can actually do either.
- A curious set of responses came for the question about a general education requirement of at least one non-US or comparative course: Only about a quarter of the interviewees in liberal arts colleges reported having such a requirement, but at the same time, a very high percentage of liberal arts college respondents reported international modules in

---

<sup>9</sup> Frank Klassen and others, *The International Dimension of American Teacher Education: A Survey of International Education Programs of American Colleges and Universities* (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972); Allen D. Glenn, *International Education Activities: An AACTE Survey* (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1992); and Sarah M. Pickert, “Changing Views about International Education in American Teacher Education Programs” (Washington, DC: ERIC Document No ED460092, 2001).

<sup>10</sup> Madeleine F. Green, “Joining the World” in *Change*, May/June 2002; the numbers have increased some, but not a lot, since 2002.

<sup>11</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, “Study Abroad and the Undergraduate Preparation of K-12 Teachers” (May 2006) available at [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org).

**Table 2**  
**Interview Responses: Defining Internationalization**

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Comments</u>
	<i>N=386</i>	<i>From interviewees' reports</i>
Study abroad	353 (92%)	Less than 90% at research universities and in SCDEs
Faculty going abroad	344 (89%)	Over 95% at comprehensive universities, less than 90% in both A&S and SCDEs
Internships/practice teaching abroad	293 (76%)	Higher percentages reported by senior administrators and at liberal arts colleges
* Foreign visitors	267 (69%)	Senior administrators most likely to cite
** Exchange programs	94 (24%)	(Could overlap with other categories)
** Overseas centers	6 (2%)	Only for research universities
** Summer research abroad for students	10 (3%)	
<b>Language requirement</b>		Nature of requirement not specified
<b>- institution-wide</b>	<b>140 (36%)</b>	Reported by only 25% at research universities, 74% at liberal arts colleges
<b>- only for some departments/colleges</b>	<b>123 (32%)</b>	SCDEs rarely have requirement
<b>Possibility of a major in discipline such as history, including non-US content</b>	<b>329 (85%)</b>	80% or more in all categories
<b>International students as cultural resources in courses</b>	<b>321 (83%)</b>	Least at research universities and by SCDEs
<b>International module(s) in general education courses</b>	<b>310 (80%)</b>	Least for SCDEs, and at research universities
<b>Possibility of a minor in discipline such as history, including non-US content</b>	<b>297 (77%)</b>	Reported by less than 65% in SCDEs
<b>General education requirement of one non-US or comparative course</b>	<b>214 (55%)</b>	Less than 50% in SCDEs, and by only 26% in liberal arts colleges
* <b>Heritage communities as cultural resources in courses</b>	<b>144 (37%)</b>	More than 40% at comprehensive universities
* <b>Language-across-the-Curriculum</b>	<b>70 (18%)</b>	More than 25% only at research universities
** <b>Internet, international video hook-ups</b>	<b>10 (3%)</b>	
** <b>Curriculum permeated with non-US content</b>	<b>4 (1%)</b>	Only reported at liberal arts colleges
** <b>Student theses</b>	<b>1</b>	
International, foreign language clubs	279 (72%)	Less in SCDEs and research universities
* International film, food festivals	229 (59%)	Highest % at liberal arts colleges
International house or dormitory floor	147 (38%)	Under 50% in all categories
* Model UN	102 (26%)	Much less reported in SCDEs
Mentoring by in-service teachers with international outlook	83 (51%)	Only in SCDEs, all kinds of institutions
* Promotion and tenure policies	62 (16%)	Not reported at all in liberal arts colleges
** Outreach with international emphasis	27 (7%)	Not reported at all in liberal arts colleges

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

\*\* *Volunteered by interviewees in both phases*

general education courses, and several stated that they are well on their way to having their entire curriculum permeated with international content.

- It is interesting that for several activities (such as study abroad, faculty going abroad, and international modules in general education courses) lower positive response rates were found at research universities and in SCDEs.
- Perhaps more surprising is the extent to which interviewees at research universities, which one might expect to be leaders in efforts to internationalize, provided responses below average for many activities, including study abroad and internships, international modules in general education courses, use of international students and/or heritage communities as cultural resources, foreign visitors, international and foreign language clubs, and even international film and food festivals. It might seem that leadership in developing campus internationalization strategies is generally more likely found at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges – but again, the sample here is not large.

Another set of comparisons offered by this data indicate more international options offered to the prospective elementary school teacher than to students preparing for the secondary level. Comparing Education responses in phase one, which focussed on the secondary school teacher, with responses in phase two, focussing on teacher preparation for the elementary school, the proportions responding positively increased for many activities, including study and internships abroad, foreign language requirements, the possibilities for majors and/or minors with non-US content, the existence of an international house, and international and foreign language clubs. The only point on which there is a marked percentage decrease for the elementary-focussed phase is the general education requirement of at least one non-US or comparative course. Some of these points will be discussed later, when we look more closely at curriculum issues.

## **THE ADVISING PROCESS**

Although interviewees in the advisor category were familiar with the international resources that I asked about, it may be notable that only one university interviewee (of nearly 400) volunteered that her/his institution's internationalization efforts have included the advising system. Yet the most salient findings from this research point to advising, and particularly first-year advising, as a crucial factor for getting prospective teachers exposed to more international options. Many – more than 85% of the phase two interviewees – felt that student advising about international options should be improved. Interviewees offered many suggestions about how to do so. This finding was buttressed by responses to another question that surprised Education respondents: Are advisors trained about the international content and exposure needed by teachers? Nearly 75% replied that they are not.

### **Getting Information to Students**

#### *Who Does Advising?*

Questions about who does undergraduate academic advising were asked of nearly all respondents on each campus. The responses are summarized in Table 3, listed in descending order of frequency. Generally the patterns vary not only from institution to institution but also from college to college, and even from department to department, within institutions. Indeed, about half of the senior administrators told me that advising is not done the same way throughout their institutions, with the

possible exception of comprehensive universities where as many as two thirds of the senior administrators interviewed reported that the advising system is the same.

Overall, while the most frequent advising source was reported to be faculty, professional advising staff are clearly playing a very important role, particularly for first and second year students. Indeed, I learned that increasingly, particularly at large comprehensive and research institutions, professional staff are advising departmental majors, with faculty serving a “mentoring” role. At the liberal arts college the advising scene is quite different, with all the interviewees reporting faculty as the academic advisors, often with an official advising office (probably staffed by a part time faculty member) available, it was emphasized, only to support the faculty. A very high percentage also cited faculty as advisors at comprehensive universities, although again the proportion went down in the

**Table 3**  
**Interview Responses about Advising Sources**  
*by types of institutions, with comparisons to SCDEs and current teachers’ experience*

<u>Source</u>	<u>Comprehensv Universities</u> <i>N=161</i>	<u>Lib. Arts Colleges</u> <i>N=34</i>	<u>Research Universities</u> <i>N=191</i>	<u>Current Teachers</u> <i>N=119</i>	<u>Elementary Teachers</u> <i>N=64</i>	<u>SCDEs</u> <i>N=162</i>
Faculty	91%	100%	78%	79%	81%	77%
Professional advising staff	79%	32%	76%	51%	56%	78%
Website	71%	79%	67%	11%	16%	68%
Special offices, such as OIP	66%	91%	64%	31%	41%	65%
Peers/TAs	28%	38%	38%	31%	34%	25%

*NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.*

second phase. From my interviews and reading of NACADA publications, it seems that a mix of professional advising staff and faculty is the usual and recommended combination.<sup>12</sup>

Comparing the data from the second research phase with its emphasis on elementary education with the first phase data, it is curious that for most categories the response ratios are not very different, although fewer (proportionally) at research universities cited professional staff than in the first phase (which emphasized teacher training for the secondary school). From the current teachers, overall a large majority reported getting advice from faculty, compared with about half for professional staff. Many of the responding teachers – elementary and secondary – probably did their undergraduate work in an era when faculty did more of the advising, so current teachers would have had less access to professional advisors in their day. For the same reason, very few had used a website, as undergraduates, to find information about course offerings and requirements.

Offices of International Programs (OIPs) stand out as advising sources at the liberal arts colleges, while the lowest response rate for the advising done in such special offices was at research universities. Although NACADA data show relatively little reliance on peer advising,<sup>13</sup> I did ask about it in the interviews, emphasizing the word “formal.” If peer or teaching assistant advisors have a role, it is usually in a very supervised situation, and most often in conjunction with an OIP’s recruitment and

<sup>12</sup> Roberta Flaherty, Executive Director, NACADA, interview by author, Manhattan, KS, September 26, 2001, and 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.

<sup>13</sup> Mabley and Morales, *Current Practices*, 42.

orientation for overseas programs, to draw on the experience of students just returned from study or internships abroad.<sup>14</sup> Occasionally “RAs,” in residence halls, were also mentioned.

Because Education students need to meet extensive requirements both for a major and for certification, the advising patterns are more complicated, while being all the more crucial, with little room for error in course choices in the planning of study programs. Nonetheless most of the academic advising is done by Arts and Sciences faculty (and/or professional staff) who are expected to be familiar with the requisite curricula. Prospective secondary school teachers, and many prospective elementary school teachers, are likely to do A&S majors; the elementary education teachers-in-training who major in education have many required A&S courses. Most of the SCDE advisors are experts on the myriad requirements for certification or licensure, adding their counsel to that of the academic advisors.

At the majority of institutions visited for this project, the advising process is well established. However, there are exceptions. For the Education students who transfer from a community college – as many as 75% of students in the teacher preparation program at one of the institutions visited – the potentials for complications and missteps are even greater. A number of advisors told me that it is possible for a student to work through the many general education, major, and pre-certification requirements, and include study abroad and even foreign language study within four years, but only if the planning starts very early – which, unhappily, may not be the case for most students.

As noted above, Education interviewees 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. What can be done to improve the situation? The interviews moved on to two more questions about how information is, or could be, transmitted.

#### *How Do Advisors Get Their Information?*

Interviewees in both Arts and Sciences and Education were also a little taken aback by this question (“how are advisors kept abreast of changing rules (and opportunities) for students?”). It was open-ended, and most interviewees did offer answers. The main sources of information are listed in order of decreasing frequency in Table 4.

Because the question about the advisors’ sources of information was an open-ended one, many made comments that add texture to the issue. A few institutions have special councils on teacher education, but it was not clear how such councils’ recommendations actually reach the people who do the advising. One dean emphasized a focus on general concepts when meetings are held, but said that (otherwise) “advisors are on their own!” Several people stressed the important role of the department chair in communicating needed information to advisors, yet one chair told me that the “system” is really “catch as catch can.” Among the Education interviewees, state-level meetings and workshops were often cited, but again, without being clear how the information might be transmitted from such meeting participants to all the university colleagues needing the information. One elementary education faculty member commented that a close working relationship with faculty in Arts and Sciences (presumably about advising) is more likely for the secondary education faculty. One or two people working on internationally-oriented programs (in A&S) remarked that special and constant “lobbying” with advisors is necessary – indeed, it seems that particularly at larger institutions formal systems for spreading

---

<sup>14</sup> See Schneider, “Study Abroad and the Undergraduate ...” for more detail about study abroad findings.

information to those doing the advising, not to mention advising about international options, may be rather uneven.

**Table 4**  
**Advisors' Information Sources**  
*according to deans and faculty (and advisors) by institution type*

<u>Source</u>	<u>Comprehensive Universities</u>		<u>Liberal Arts Colleges</u>		<u>Research Universities</u>	
	<u>Deans</u> N=40	<u>Faculty &amp; Advisors</u> N=76	<u>Deans</u> N=8	<u>Faculty &amp; Advisors</u> N=13	<u>Deans</u> N=43	<u>Faculty &amp; Advisors</u> N=80
Meetings	85%	74%	75%	85%	72%	64%
E-mail	70%	76%	75%	100%	58%	62%
Newsletters, memos	38%	37%	25%	62%	51%	35%
Workshops	30%	18%	12%	-	35%	25%
“Word of mouth”	10%	14%	-	8%	7%	16%
Handbook, catalog	20%	14%	-	15%	9%	9%
Website	-	10%	-	-	5%	10%
Faculty orientation	8%	8%	-	23%	-	4%

NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.

Comparing the interview responses in the first and second phases of this research project could show a few changes over time. Across the board, in all types of institutions, is a decrease in reliance on *newsletters and memos*. Use of “*word of mouth*” was also reported less, but reliance on *handbooks and catalogues* for advising information actually went up, according to second phase respondents. But might the catalogues and handbooks now be on line? Perhaps not, because although increased use of the *website* seems to be the case for comprehensive universities, it is not for research universities, and not according to the deans. That reliance on a website may now be only slightly more usual than *faculty orientation* is interesting, but it is even more interesting that neither were much cited by interviewees. More recently, in the second phase, it seems that deans, and respondents in comprehensive universities, attribute even more importance than the first phase respondents to *meetings*, and to *e-mail*, for transmitting new information that advisors might need. It seems likely that many of these differences, where they exist, are attributable to changing times rather than to differences in the advising services for prospective secondary, compared to elementary, teachers.

A trend perhaps worth noting at both comprehensive and research universities is that workshops were reported as a source of advising information by a markedly *decreased* proportion of interviewees in the second phase. However, in the final set of questions, about strategies that might work to improve the international exposure for the prospective teacher, strengthening advising systems came out at the top of the list. And what would be the best approach to this? More training for advisors. And what should have priority if funds became available? Many respondents cited workshops for advisors! Perhaps an apparent declining use of advising workshops is a funding issue.

#### How Do Students Learn About International Options?

Since the ultimate consumer of most of the information on international options is the student – i.e., in this study, the teacher-in-training – finding out how s/he learns about these possibilities was the next question, again open-ended, and again the interviewees in Arts and Sciences and in Education seemed surprised to be asked. The top response, among both A&S and Education respondents, was posters, or fliers (79%), a proportion that holds even among the student respondents themselves. Many



cited faculty and classes (69%). In descending order, the remainder are e-mail (51%), the student paper (36%), the website (29%), "word of mouth" (26%), student clubs and meetings (23%), the office of international programs (22%), and freshman orientation (9%). Interestingly, nearly half of the student interviews yielded "word of mouth" as a source. Among the *least* cited were advisors (8%).

Because this question was asked only in the second phase of the project, comparisons between information sources for students of elementary and secondary education are not possible. However, comparison of responses at the three types of institutions does indicate some exceptions to the general drift of the responses above. Consistent with the data on advisors' sources of information at the liberal arts colleges, the students there also seem more likely (than at other institutions) to get information about international options from e-mail, and from their offices of international programs. At research institutions, the student paper seems to play a more important role, as does "word of mouth," while offices of international programs and student clubs and meetings seem to be less used than at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges. If advising activity is an indicator of institutional internationalization efforts, then it seems that the comprehensive universities included in this survey are a bit more proactive about internationalization than many of the research universities.

Sobering aspects of the responses to this question are how seldom cited were sources such as freshman and pre-freshman orientation that one might expect to be high on the list, and not once were advisors cited as sources of information about international options in my interviews with groups of SCDE students. One advisor for teacher education students, and several deans, told me that finding information about the possibilities for international exposure is a matter for student initiative. For institutions wanting to increase international exposure for any of their students, and certainly for undergraduates in very prescriptive professional programs such as teacher education, early publicity and marketing efforts really need to be strengthened through as many routes as possible.

#### ***Recommendations***

That institutions of higher education provide training on international options, and website support, for students, for faculty, and for professional advisors.

That Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs) strengthen the international components of academic advising services, in cooperation with other university and community college advising services.

#### **Recruiting Future Teachers**

Most of the questions in the interviews focused on the resources available for students either already enrolled in an Education program or planning from early in their undergraduate experience to apply to a teacher education program. But what about students who begin their undergraduate careers with strong interests in international or foreign language study and are undecided about their ultimate career plans? In the Arts and Sciences interviews I asked three more questions, about career counselling. Again, interviewees were surprised to be asked. For many, with the possible exception of foreign language faculty, steering students toward a teaching career – in elementary or secondary education – seemed to be a new idea.

#### **How Do Students Hear About Teaching?**

The responses were sparse for the first of these questions, "How do A&S students learn about career possibilities in the teaching field?" Of those who did respond, advisors were cited by a

substantial number (75%) only at comprehensive universities (many of which have traditionally emphasized teacher training); the comparable percentages were 40% at liberal arts colleges and only 16% at research universities. A majority of the deans, faculty, and advisors cited the career counselling offices, and their career fairs, but the majority was stronger at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges than at research universities. Several, again, noted the importance of student initiative. One faculty member said that it was the domain of the campus honorary societies! At least six people simply said that they didn't know. In other words, encouraging teaching as a career for students with interests in international and foreign language studies would seem to be low on the agenda of Arts and Sciences faculty and advisors.

*Who Counsels A&S Students Wanting to Teach?*

The first follow-up question on this issue was, "For those A&S students interested in teaching, who does their career counselling?" Again, six interviewees did not have answers. Nearly 40%, including nearly half of the deans, would send A&S students with an interest in teaching to the career office. About half, again including about half of the deans, and half of the faculty, would (also?) send them to the SCDE. Interestingly, a substantial number suggested that the (A&S) faculty advisor would provide career counselling – which led to the next question, about:

*Advisors' Preparation for Career Counselling*

The question was actually: "How are advisors prepared to help students in foreign languages and in international and area studies fields discover their vocations for teaching?" Several deans were quite frank, one responding that there is very little preparation, others opining that advisors do try to respond when questions are posed by students, and another commenting simply that it is not done in Arts and Sciences. A few, at research and comprehensive universities, cited availability of career books with sample plans for students to consult, with the unstated assumption that such books would supply all the needed information. One faculty member suggested that interactions of A&S faculty with their Education counterparts solved the problem, yet on all too many campuses I heard that such communication is relatively rare. Another faculty member conceded that the role of the advising center vis-à-vis the "undeclared" student might need clarification on this point. The most common responses were either that there is no preparation for faculty and advisors to help Arts and Sciences students consider teaching careers, or that the interviewee simply did not know how advisors are prepared.

***Recommendations***

That institutions of higher education expose all students with international interests to the challenges and satisfactions of teaching careers.

That SCDEs strengthen the international components of career advising services, in cooperation with other university and community college advising services.

**What might be done?**

In all the interviews, the final question about advising asked how to strengthen the system for advising about international exposure and the concluding group of interview questions asked in several ways about strategies for improving international exposure for teachers, among them advising. The responses provided many ideas for strengthening advising, as well as obstacles to be avoided or dealt with in the process. Most important, as noted earlier, is that so many interviewees – some 85 % – felt that improved advising could make a difference in the campus internationalization process.

### The Checklist

Another question asked only of the Arts and Sciences interviewees was whether advisors are in a position to encourage students to participate in “internationally-oriented” extracurricular options, such as language houses. Nearly 90% of the respondents replied that they are. The follow-up question, whether such advice is actually given, was not asked, but the answer may be implicit in the previous paragraph. It seemed clear from various responses that advice on international options is rarely a part of advisors’ agendas.

However, I did learn early in the project that most advisors have developed checklists that guide students directly and/or guide advisors’ discussions with students. I did not begin to collect and review them seriously until the second phase because, although they are important instruments for advisors and students, analysis by an outsider is difficult, usually requiring familiarity with course numbers and other abbreviations unique to each institution. Nonetheless, I have tried to find commonalities among checklists for elementary education programs of some 26 institutions, and find that about 80% of them do include one or more required courses that might be described as “international.” On the other hand, and consistent with the data in Table 2, little more than 25% of the checklists show any foreign language requirement, and of those that do, the average requirement is a minimal two semesters.<sup>15</sup> The sheets seldom show space for electives for students in teacher education programs, confirming the problem most frequently cited as an obstacle to “internationalization” of the prospective teacher’s program: very limited space in the curriculum.

Even more to the point, however, not one of these checklists appears to provide a reference to optional international experiences, with one possible, and limited, exception – the large research university with web pages for checklists that include a sidebar link to study abroad information (only). In two other instances the packages I was given with the checklist information about requirements and curricula included fliers for overseas internship options. Even though none of the Arts and Sciences interviewees reported a prohibition on encouraging students to participate in internationally-oriented extracurricular options, the standard advising document – the checklist – seems to provide no encouragement or reminder to do so. This could be a very cost effective instrument for better internationalizing the prospective teacher’s undergraduate experience, since most of the options (described in the “defining” section) are available on most campuses.

### More OIP Interaction

Almost all (95%) of the campuses visited have offices of international programs, and the roles of such offices are being strengthened on the many campuses where they do exist.<sup>16</sup> Although in many instances the OIP office staff may be stretched too thin, most are making some efforts to work with advisors, in an impressive variety of ways that were described to me. Among them are –

- inclusion of information about international options in admissions materials;
- workshops for all advisors (faculty, professional advising staff, and admissions officers);

---

<sup>15</sup> Findings and recommendations about foreign languages for prospective teachers are discussed in a paper presented to the Interagency Language Roundtable Showcase, in July 2005, and available at [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org).

<sup>16</sup> More detailed discussion of “...The Roles of OIPs...” was presented to a session of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) in February 2006; the paper is available at [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org).

- improving interactions with advisors at two-year colleges, possibly with a special series of workshops;
- networking with an advisor knowledgeable about study and internships abroad in each department;
- including advisors in the evaluation of overseas programs;
- strengthening international components of faculty orientation;
- organizing debriefings by faculty returning from overseas trips;
- forming a university-wide committee to develop international initiatives and provide liaison with departments;
- preparing materials about international options for both advisors and students;
- improving website information and links;
- strengthening contacts and influence in residence halls, especially for freshmen;
- backstopping student clubs that foster international interests;
- increasing the number of internationally oriented organizations sending recruiters to the campus; and
- inserting information about needed global competences in career planning presentations.

Indeed, although an OIP might initiate most of these – and other – activities, most could as well be initiated by interested advisors, faculty, and deans. Nearly all the students I talked with felt that more could and should be done to inform them about the possibilities for international exposure. Furthermore, nearly 90% of current teachers reported that as undergraduates they had not had special advising about international options, a whopping 95% felt that their undergraduate experience should have included such advising, and 80% felt that a stronger formal advising system could have improved their preparation for teaching.

Might there be obstacles? Most will answer “yes!” The most frequently mentioned problems are the related issues of limited time, staff, and money. One dean commented on a mindset that needs to be changed – that advising has too long been considered to be strictly a monitoring function. On a few campuses I heard about faculty unions and contracts that specify faculty as the only advisors, implying more organizational challenges to systematic change. Indeed, on one campus, the union contract limits the amount of time that faculty members can be required to have office hours. A small number of people in both Arts and Sciences and Education felt that no further improvements were needed, and a comparable number of senior administrators (4%) agreed. Although a few faculty members claimed to know very little about the advising system, most did have ideas to share.

Another set of obstacles to improved international advising is probably most frequent at comprehensive universities, where the majority of teachers are trained – and where an increasing number of students are first generation university students with little travel experience and often with little exposure to ways of life beyond their own states. Many have families and hold jobs while they are studying, making time away from home and work very difficult. And as noted earlier, an increasing proportion of these students at both research and comprehensive universities will have done their first two years at a community college. Advising about international options is particularly crucial at early stages of these students’ college careers if they are to have any hope of including experience abroad, or

foreign language study, or even meeting general education requirements with internationally-oriented courses.

***Recommendations***

That institutions of higher education 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.

That outside funders offer support for academic and career advising, among the allowable activities that can encourage international exposure for undergraduates.

## **CURRICULUM**

### **General Education Requirements, Majors, and Minors**

As already noted, 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. Of the advising check sheets I obtained, less than a third show openings for any electives (which could be internationally-oriented or foreign language 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 elementary education check sheets show a requirement of one or more “world” courses, and one institution seems to require many as four. The information from the checklists, however, does not correspond either with the interview data, which show less than a third of the SCDE respondents reporting that their requirements included international courses, or with the current teachers’ responses indicating that barely half had taken a required non-U.S. general education course. Nonetheless, even if 25% of the checklists or 70% of the interviewees did not indicate a requirement for world history, geography, or politics, it may be that the students get some such exposure through their general education courses. (Many of the checklists were unclear about whether general education courses might be in addition to what is listed.)

Indeed, at the start of each interview, more than 300 respondents said that one or more general education courses have international or comparative components (although such courses are not necessarily required for prospective teachers) – and the positive responses, in both phases, were well distributed in Arts and Sciences and SCDEs, as shown in Table 5. In the second phase interviews, more than 50% of the participants also reported a general education requirement of at least one international or comparative course; however Table 5 indicates less than half of the SCDEs so reporting, offset by higher proportions of A&S and senior administrators. 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. It is interesting to note also the exception that appears in Table 5: that in the phase focussing on training for elementary teachers, fewer SCDE deans and faculty reported a non-U.S. general education requirement than when the focus was on preparation of the secondary school teacher. Is it a coincidence that more deans in phase two also reported more international modules in general education courses, indicating that more general education courses are permeated with global content, or do the training programs for elementary teachers actually require less general education international content?

So, should the general education requirements for teachers-in-training be revised to provide more international exposure? Nearly 100% of the current teachers who answered this question – secondary and elementary – said “yes.” And when the current teachers were asked about how additional funds might best be targeted to increase international content, their top suggestion was adding or revising courses, and one might expect many of the desired courses to fit general education requirements. In the campus interviews, well more than half would like to see the general education requirements strengthened, vis-à-vis international, 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. Even so, it was noted by several that this might be the best approach for internationalizing the teacher training experience. Might this be a good way to meet the NASBE and CCSSO recommendations? It seems clear that the institutional context and the liberal arts curriculum – where teachers-in-training take most of their courses – need to provide most of the international exposure that prospective teachers may receive. How many Arts and Sciences faculty members pay much attention to the fact that their classes include students who will themselves be teachers one day?

**Table 5**  
**Internationalized Curriculum Options**

*as reported by*

<u>Options</u>	<u>Senior Admn.</u>		<u>A&amp;S</u>		<u>SCDE Deans</u>		<u>SCDE faculty</u>	
	<u>Ph.1</u> <i>N=31</i>	<u>Ph.2</u> <i>N=54</i>	<u>Ph.1</u> <i>N=64</i>	<u>Ph.2</u> <i>N=61</i>	<u>Ph.1</u> <i>N=16</i>	<u>Ph.2</u> <i>N=33</i>	<u>Ph.1</u> <i>N=28</i>	<u>Ph.2</u> <i>N=57</i>
International modules in general education courses	87%	96%	92%	97%	56%	85%	71%	74%
General education requirement of one non-US course	42%	68%	62%	66%	69%	48%	39%	28%
Possibility of a minor including non-US content	94%	96%	94%	92%	31%	91%	25%	53%
Possibility of a major including non-US content	87%	100%	92%	97%	75%	94%	71%	54%
Possibility of practice teaching in bilingual or international magnet school	-	-	-	-	91%	86%	92%	81%

*NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.*

Campus interviewees were also asked about adding or revising courses as strategies for increasing international content for the prospective teacher. Close to 95% liked this approach to internationalization, but again obstacles were mentioned. Several – and particularly deans – cited the cost, that money could be needed to provide faculty incentive, while others commented that faculty might not be interested, even wanting to protect favourite courses and interests. On the other hand, it was also pointed out that continuing course revision is part of good teaching. While injection of international content might not be appropriate for some SCDE courses, a number of Education faculty members opined that adding comparative modules could work well in their courses. Happily, some interviewees told me that revising courses to add international content is already happening at their institutions.

Another curricular approach is based on the assumption that the student training for an elementary education career can combine a major in education with a minor in another field. Indeed, as

both Table 2 and Table 5 indicate, a majority of the university interviewees (with some SCDE exceptions) reported offering minors that could have non-U.S. content. Actually, a majority of the current elementary school teachers reported doing undergraduate minors, 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 less than 10% were negative. A combination of Education major and liberal arts minor – much more likely for the prospective elementary school teacher than for the student preparing for secondary education, although it could require more time for degree completion – is probably reflected in Table 5, showing a big difference in the SCDE responses to the question about a minor in the first and second phases of the study.

### *Recommendations*

That institutions of higher education foster development of internationally-oriented curricula.  
That SCDEs review all courses in teacher education curricula for possible addition of international content.

In later parts of the interviews, a second question about minors probed options for the Arts and Science major interested in both international content and education. Few SCDEs offer a teacher education minor, and many of the Education interviewees initially responded negatively to the notion, commenting that a minor would not be sufficient for certification, and that it would be too much of a burden on the SCDEs' 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?

Possibly because many Arts and Sciences faculty acknowledged that they knew little about how their students might learn about teaching as a career option, some 90% of the A&S respondents favored an Education minor option for their students. However, if a formal minor is not possible, could an A&S major simply take a few courses in education? Most deans and faculty members responded that they could, but the Education interviewees frequently reported that some or all of their courses are closed to non-Education students and many others qualified their positive response with the condition that course enrollment priority is always given to students formally enrolled in the teacher education program.

Table 5 also shows that most of the institutions offer one or more major that has non-US content, at least according to the senior administrators and Arts and Sciences interviewees. The SCDE respondents, however, reflect interesting ambiguities. The deans, almost unanimously reporting the possibility of such a major, may have responded from an institutional point of view, while the much lower phase two response from faculty may reflect only what is possible for Education students. For the interviews related to preparation of the secondary school teacher, SCDE faculty would more likely be knowledgeable about liberal arts majors in fields such as history or geography in which their students might be majoring. For the prospective elementary school teacher, however, relatively few do an A&S major, and if they do, it is likely to be specially designed for such students – an example being California's Liberal Studies major. Another frequent A&S major for the prospective elementary teacher who does not major in education is psychology, a field whose faculty are generally not known for their international interests. However, that little more than half of the SCDE faculty interviewees concerned with the training for the elementary level recognized an option of a major with international content probably indicates that they were thinking only of majors in the education field.

The 54% of SCDE faculty who reported the possibility of an A&S major might also have been thinking of a double major – indeed when asked directly whether Education students could double major in an A&S field (with international content), about two thirds said they could, but they would not be able to complete their degrees within four years. And state legislatures are increasingly mandating that the requirements for teacher preparation be limited to four years’ worth of course credits, so that “qualified” teachers can more quickly begin to serve their communities. Space in the curriculum for the elementary school teacher-in-training is becoming more precious than ever.

A few other ways for teachers-in-training to get international exposure while at home were also touched on in the campus interviews. Do courses draw on the cultural resources of heritage communities in the United States? Less than half, at all kinds of institutions and in all categories, replied that they do, and a few Education students even commented that this strategy could be helpful. Education interviewees were also asked whether, in the practice teaching phase of the program, student teachers are mentored by in-service teachers with international experience and outlooks – and again the response was low, at all types of institution. SCDE participants were also asked whether students could be placed in bilingual or international magnet schools for their practice teaching, and, with most exceptions being at institutions far from such community resources, the large majority said that such opportunities are possible.

The current teachers were asked whether, to include the international background they felt they should have had, their undergraduate training should have been longer than eight semesters. While nearly two thirds of the first phase teachers liked the idea, more than two thirds of the second phase teachers did not. A more acceptable approach, they felt, would be the addition of international or comparative components to existing courses in both Arts and Sciences and Education.

Following the questions about strategies for change, senior administrator and SCDE 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, again, because of the perceived constraints related to certification requirements and increasing emphasis on standards and testing. Yet some did comment that perhaps their basic courses, on Educational Foundations and others, might be revised to include more comparative content. Perhaps this is another indication that efforts to increase international exposure for prospective teachers must be made primarily by faculty in the Arts and Sciences.

### ***Recommendations***

That SCDEs

- offer an effective introductory course, and even observational internships and a minor in education, open to all undergraduates, to reinforce advising about teaching career options,
- emphasize and increase options for observation and practice teaching in bilingual and international magnet schools, and
- include international orientation in the criteria for selecting teachers for students’ observation and practice teaching placements.



## Foreign Language Requirements

Another early question in all the campus interviews was whether the institution has a foreign language requirement. Less than 40% said yes, and roughly the same proportion said that there is a requirement only for some programs (usually BAs); the remainder didn't know, or said there was none. When the response about requirements was "some programs only," the exceptions, programs with no such requirements almost always included those for teachers-in-training. Table 6 shows the distribution of responses by type of institution in each phase.

**Table 6**  
**Foreign Language Requirements**  
*(percentage of interviewees)*

	<b>Research Us</b>		<b>Comprehensive Us</b>		<b>Lib. Arts Colleges</b>	
	<i>Ph. 1</i>	<i>Ph. 2</i>	<i>Ph. 1</i>	<i>Ph. 2</i>	<i>Ph. 1</i>	<i>Ph. 2</i>
Current requirements	<i>(N=77)</i>	<i>(N=88)</i>	<i>(N=72)</i>	<i>(N=87)</i>	<i>(N=9)</i>	<i>(N=25)</i>
Institution-wide	26%	33%	39%	44%	100%	64%
For some programs	34%	53%	18%	43%	-	-
Desirable requirements:	<i>(N=41)</i>	<i>(N=88)</i>	<i>(N=46)</i>	<i>(N=82)</i>	<i>(N=5)</i>	<i>(N=17)</i>
Should add or increase	66%	92%	83%	84%	60%	100%

*NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.*

Comparing the first and second phase interview responses, it is interesting to note that the proportions of interviewees reporting requirements at both comprehensive and research universities increased, although given the small sample this cannot be construed as reflecting a national trend. The proportion reporting a language requirement at liberal arts colleges is lower mainly because one participating college does not have one, although foreign language instruction is alive and well on that campus (its president told me that 70% of the undergraduates elect foreign language study). Perhaps a more important set of comparisons is from the data provided by current teachers: nearly two thirds of the elementary school teachers reported having met no undergraduate foreign language requirement. And more than 90% felt that their undergraduate training should have included it – an even higher proportion than the secondary school teachers' responses in the first phase.

Looking at responses from people in SCDEs in the two phases, I found the proportions showing some foreign language requirements, like the overall proportions, are higher in the second phase – but of course all the interviewees were asked about the entire university. More important, a second phase question asked SCDE respondents whether the elementary teacher education program includes foreign language study, and about 70% said it did not – and more than 90% reported no foreign language requirement for certification. Given how many requirements crowd the teacher training curriculum, perhaps it is surprising that as many as 30% did report a foreign language requirement for teacher training preparation; many wonder whether this might decrease further as education administrators struggle to meet the demands of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Another interesting aspect of the questions about language requirements is the finding of a surprisingly small number of campuses – only 35% – on which there were not discrepancies among responses about whether the institution has a university-wide foreign language requirement. The agreement and/or disagreement appeared at all types of institutions (research universities, comprehensive universities, and liberal arts colleges) and at any size institution. Faculty respondents,

and even advisors, in both Arts and Sciences and Education, seemed a little more likely to be in disagreement – in other words, probably poorly informed – than either deans or senior administrators.

An important question in the “Looking Ahead” section at the end of each interview was whether a language requirement should be added or increased for prospective teachers. In an ideal world, like the current teachers, over 90% of all the university respondents (both phases) would like to. However, the obstacles cited were many, and were reported in some detail in an earlier paper.<sup>17</sup> Here are some of them, first, from interviewees in Education:

- The most frequently cited issue was again time and space in the curriculum. A suggested solution was a focus on university admission requirements, further pushing the burden of foreign language instruction onto the K-12 schools.
- Some cited what was thought to be the prevailing methodology for language teaching, suggesting that to be helpful for the generalist teacher foreign language instruction should include significant cultural content.
- Several respondents noted that foreign language departments have insufficient faculty to offer the courses that would be needed, suggesting even that current department faculty themselves are opposed to such requirements because they prefer teaching advanced courses and, if an increased number of students are required to study foreign languages, the internal department balance could shift to favor language instruction (rather than literature) specialists.
- More advanced language instruction (to attain usable proficiency levels) is just not available on many campuses.
- Some opined that a foreign language requirement would deter applicants who might otherwise become good teachers.

In **Arts and Sciences** interviews many of the same issues were cited, but here the perspectives were a little different.

- A dean commented that it would be helpful to find ways for students to actually use foreign language more. Here, parenthetically, I might note that this was one of the many interviews when I had to explain what “Languages across the Curriculum” might entail;<sup>18</sup> fewer than 30% of the more recent interviewees could tell me that it is a possibility on their campuses.
- Staffing was cited by several as potentially problematic.
- The timing of language offerings was a problem related to requirements at some institutions: More specifically, when introductory language courses meet five hours a week, the cost and scheduling consequences of having a requirement are heavy. On the other hand, when language courses meet only once or twice a week, development of meaningful competence is very slow and the value of the investment dubious.

Senior administrators (provosts, presidents and vice-presidents, and directors of offices of international programs) mentioned all of these issues, with a little more emphasis on costs (of all sorts, including availability of needed faculty), the need for better pedagogy, and attention to usage other than literature.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, “Language Instruction and Prospective Teachers: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations,” presented at the ILR Showcase, July 2005 and available at [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org).

<sup>18</sup> I.e., non-language courses, such as history, actually offered entirely or in part in a language other than English.

### ***Recommendations***

That state and local governments remove all exemptions for significant foreign language competence for teacher trainees in all humanities and social science fields, at all education levels.

That institutions of higher education strengthen requirements for foreign language training for all undergraduates, with a goal of attaining at least conversational proficiency in a second language.

Anticipating interviewees' suggestions that students should be learning foreign language prior to admission to university (or community college), this project did include a few questions about the undergraduate training of foreign language teachers. Education respondents were asked whether teachers are being trained for foreign language instruction at the elementary level. The majority said "no;" most certification for foreign language teaching is for K-12 which, I was told, could cover language teaching in elementary schools and could be combined with a general K-5 certification. Many added that schools in their states do not teach foreign languages at the elementary school levels, so the emphases in K-12 pedagogy for prospective foreign language teachers is really on the secondary level. Of the foreign language faculty interviewees asked about their career advising, 60% did say that they talk with their students about teaching careers. But even among the language faculty only 20% felt they were prepared to help their students "discover their vocations for teaching."

Interestingly, in the campus interviews, when asked how, if additional funds were available for internationalization, the interviewee would like to use them, *not one person* – in any category of respondent – suggested anything directly related to foreign language instruction, unless "more study abroad" might be so construed (however, this is unlikely, since very few reported foreign language requirements for study abroad). Current teachers did a little better; with nearly 10% of the elementary school teachers urging a priority to improved availability of foreign language instruction if outside funding became available. However problematic, this is an aspect of internationalization for the teacher-in-training that really needs attention. A recent *Washington Post* poll showed foreign language study to be the second most frequent subject that people wished they had paid more attention to as students, and the subject that most college graduates regret not studying more.<sup>19</sup> This is another indication of the nation's serious need for more foreign language fluency, and for the teachers who can make it happen. The data from this research only begin to indicate the extent of the challenge in the NASBE and CCSSO recommendations.

### ***Recommendations***

That state and local governments add an endorsement for K-6 foreign language instruction.

That accrediting agencies recommend distinctly different programs for training foreign language teachers for the elementary and secondary levels.

That professional associations increase their attention to solutions for the demand and supply problems of foreign language teachers, at all levels of instruction (K-12 and postsecondary).

## **Experience Abroad**

Most institutions, while having an infrastructure for study abroad programs and while saying that prospective teachers could study abroad, actually reported little or no actual participation by

<sup>19</sup> *Washington Post*, August 24, 2006, page A-2.

teachers-in-training; internships abroad for prospective teachers are just about as rare. The usual study abroad participation rate for prospective teachers was reported in these interviews to be less than 1%, and the percentage is possibly less for internships abroad. The latest data from the Institute of International Education indicate that only 4% of the students who do study abroad are in Education, and that the 2005 proportion even decreased slightly from the previous year.<sup>20</sup> Nonetheless – or perhaps as a corollary to the low participation story – Table 7 shows that Education interviewees were a little more eager for increased study and internships abroad activity than the overall survey participants. Jumping ahead to the data in Table 8, it is interesting to see that an even higher percentage of current teachers (82%) think that teacher training should include a study abroad experience. This is particularly interesting because in the second phase interviews we learned that more than 55% of the responding teachers had never studied or lived abroad; in the first phase of the project a number of people told me that teachers can be certified for foreign language instruction without any experience in a region where the target language is spoken.

**Table 7**  
**Institutional Responses about Study and Internships Abroad**

	<u>SCDE</u>	<u>All Other</u>
	<i>N=162</i>	<i>N=224</i>
Study abroad is an option	86%	95%
Internships abroad are an option	74%	77%
Would like more study abroad participation	76%	71%
Would like more internships abroad	61%	51%
* Incentive funds should target study abroad	17%	25%
* Incentive funds should target financial aid for study abroad	17%	13%

*\* Responses to open-ended questions*

*NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.*

Internships abroad were generally cited as options for undergraduates a bit less than study abroad as an activity, by 76% of all the respondents. However, although nearly 74% of the Education respondents said that internships might be arranged and more than half of the Education respondents would like to have more internships, second phase interviewees at eleven institutions reported that internships abroad are just not possible for the elementary school teacher-in-training. Others cited many obstacles, among them issues related to placement and supervision. Of the teacher preparation programs that do offer an overseas internship option, the participation numbers are likely to be less than ten/year.

**Table 8**  
**Current Teachers' Responses about Study and Internships Abroad**

	<u>Study Abroad</u>		<u>Internships Abroad</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>Elem.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Elem.</u>
	<i>N=119</i>	<i>N=64</i>	<i>N=119</i>	<i>N=64</i>
UG program included	32%	34%	8%	11%
UG program should include	82%	74%	59%	55%

*NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.*

<sup>20</sup> Presentation by Peggy Blumenthal of the Institute of International Education on December 7, 2005 at the American Council on Education.

How students even learn that study or internships abroad could be an option and how they are prepared for it were explored at several points in most of the interviews and are discussed in greater detail in a paper prepared for NAFSA.<sup>21</sup> Just as for other aspects of the internationalizing dilemma, it is clear that the advising process is key. A number of advisors told me that it is possible for a student to work through the many general education, major, and pre-certification requirements, and include study abroad and even foreign language study within four years, but only if the planning starts very early.

### Post-Program Integration

University interviewees in Education, as well as senior administrators, were asked about the integration of overseas experience into the prospective teachers' preparation. While the majority do think that study abroad is integrated with the home campus curriculum, in Education it was barely more than half of the respondents, compared with more than 80% of the senior administrators. And yes, the student could get course credit for the completed study abroad, although more often than not it would be restricted to general education requirements. A few replied rather off-handedly that it would be up to the student's advisor.

Education respondents and current teachers were asked about follow-up to overseas programs – how students are, or should be, helped to evaluate and integrate their overseas experiences with on-campus coursework. To both parts of the question, some twenty interviewees indicated that no effort is made and a few said that evaluation and integration were dependent on students' initiative. From those who are making an effort to help students with their “re-entry,” some of the routes are as follows.

- Journaling is used by several to foster evaluation during the overseas program, as are on-line discussions.
- “Debriefing” or “exit interviews” were mentioned by more than a dozen, either on site or after return.
- Special advising – or reliance on advisors – was also cited by more than a dozen.
- Some institutions have a special course for returnees; one cited a “post-practicum seminar” for those returning from internships.
- Presentations on campus were also mentioned by several, sometimes to classes, also to student clubs, to brown bag lunches, during international education week, and sometimes in connection with OIP student recruitment for a next round of overseas programs.
- A few students work for the OIP after their return.

Integration of overseas programs with the on-campus curriculum is attempted in a great variety of ways, probably more than these conversations covered. Nonetheless, one Education dean commented that it is “very hard.” The important role of the advisor was again mentioned frequently, to assure that the student's overseas program is “curriculum-relevant” and that appropriate follow-up courses are taken. Even more frequently mentioned was encouragement to students to draw on overseas experience in their subsequent papers and class presentations. (Here I should have asked how the instructors know which of their students have this experience to draw on. Do OIPs play a role in informing faculty about this resource?) In addition –

- the teaching portfolio preparation includes an overseas component,
- capstone courses are expected to include findings from any overseas experience,

---

<sup>21</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, “Study Abroad and the Undergraduate Preparation of K-12 Teachers,” prepared for NAFSA meetings in Montreal, May 2006, and available at [www.internationaleadvice.org](http://www.internationaleadvice.org).

- a required research project on practice teaching is shared with other students, or a senior project might be based on experience abroad, and
- students are encouraged to use overseas examples in their own work on lesson plans.

Senior administrators also underlined the importance of advance planning and advisors' roles in assuring the relevance of the student's experience abroad. One university president would like to have returnees assume a formalized mentoring role for students about to go.

The current teachers also offered ideas about integrating study and internships abroad with the on-campus undergraduate curriculum. Many, of course, like the university respondents, emphasized the importance of returnees' presentations to classes and student clubs on campus, with one specifying that the presentations include photos and other artefacts from the experience. Returnees' roles in finding "new recruits" were also mentioned. The teachers' additional suggestions are –

- writing up notes about their experience to be on file for others to read;
- continuing their foreign language classes;
- contributing to in-service programs for current teachers; and
- contributing to a course on comparative education.

Perhaps the reader will find no new ideas here (or in the longer paper on my website), but given the number of interviewees who seemed not to have even thought about effective integration of overseas experiences as an aspect of campus internationalization, it seems likely that these relatively low-cost activities could represent some reinforcing and clarifying changes for students. Many of the activities could also be instructive for the classmates who may not have had an overseas opportunity.

### More Experience Abroad for Future Teachers?

All the university interviewees were asked to think strategies for achieving more international exposure for prospective teachers. Study abroad is very close to the top of the list, with some 70% of all interviewees (including current teachers) wanting to have more – and as Table 7 shows, Education respondents were even more enthusiastic about study abroad as a strategy than the overall survey participants. However, when asked about priorities ("how would you target a modest amount of incentive funding?"), many fewer Education respondents than others would give priority funding to study abroad.

What are the challenges to having more teachers-in-training participate in overseas programs? The Education interviews revealed many reasons, the most-mentioned being financial expense – expense for the student and/or the organizing and home institutions and/or faculty supervision time. Another short commodity in teacher training programs is time, and it was very frequently cited as a problem for students interested in studying overseas. Senior administrators added a few more issues to the list. Several noted that more program options are needed, but that they are difficult to work out, particularly with a limited amount of OIP staff time available. Safety issues, and worries about terrorism, (particularly on the part of parents) were also mentioned.

Another set of issues may be more frequent at comprehensive universities, where the majority of teachers are trained – and where increasing numbers of students are first generation university students with little travel experience, where many have families and hold jobs while they are studying, and where an increasing proportion of students do their first two years at a community college. However, notwithstanding the number of problems related to study abroad, nearly all of the people

interviewed, in all categories, felt that study abroad participation should be increased, at the very least by adding (as a first step) short term programs which can at least introduce the hesitant to the satisfactions of learning about another culture through first-hand experience.

Although fewer in Education were interested in increasing overseas internships, those favoring more internships abroad – a majority of both university interviewees and current teachers – reported challenges similar to the issues related to study abroad. In this part of the discussion, it was clearer that faculty experience and contacts abroad are key elements for all kinds of Education internships. Because most states require at least half of the student teacher’s practicum to be done in the certifying state, the length of time for an internship is very likely to be much less than a semester; for this reason, some recommended that (again, in an ideal world) internships be preceded by a study abroad experience in the same country. Another suggestion was for a practicum to be in a country where school would be in session during the U.S. institutions’ summer break, thus not interfering with the “normal” student schedule on the home campus. Both the Arts and Sciences and the senior administration interviewees were mostly concerned with sufficiency of staff and supervision, and several also mentioned language competence issues which, interestingly, were not cited by any of the Education respondents. One OIP director pointed out that the infrastructure costs for internships are noticeably higher than for study abroad programs.

Interestingly, a few Education students felt that they needed more options, to get better multicultural experience, overseas or in heritage communities in the United States. Overseas experiences seem a little more possible for students planning to be secondary school teachers than for the elementary school trainee.

To the final question, on priorities for internationalizing, not only was study abroad high on the priority list, but a number of interviewees suggested that funds be used for financial aid for study abroad and/or development of more programs, to offer a greater variety of options for students wanting to study overseas. Less than half as many would want to use such funds for overseas internship programs.

***Recommendations***

That state and local governments revise their regulations about practice teaching, if necessary, to allow credit for pre-service observation and internships in other countries for at least part of the student teaching experience,

That institutions of higher education 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.

That SCDEs integrate study and internships abroad into the professional training of teachers, and

require that prospective foreign language teachers have at least one semester of overseas experience in an area where the target language is spoken.

**Certification and Accreditation Issues**

Realizing more than ever the controlling roles of state certification requirements and newly developing subject standards, we asked questions about both in the conversations with teachers and with SCDE respondents, particularly in the second phase. Only 6% of the second phase SCDE interviewees could tell me that certification requirements include some foreign language competence and only 21%

said some international knowledge is required. In the first phase the question was asked only of in the teachers, who were mostly at the secondary level, and less than 20% reported an international component in their certification requirements. One might conclude that little international exposure is required for either elementary or secondary school teacher preparation.

Actually, the teachers’ responses to questions about certification and subject standards may be a little more nuanced, and are summarized in Table 9. It is not really possible to explore differences between the first cohort and the second because only two questions on these topics were asked in both phases. In both inquiries, large majorities of the current teachers reported that certification requirements have changed in recent years and do not think that the changes reflect globalization issues – indeed, the percentage saying that certification changes reflect globalization is lower in the more recent interviews with elementary school teachers. About two thirds of the responding elementary teachers reported that the standards which they are now required to meet (and also the standards for the tests that their students must pass) do not reflect increasing globalization. Furthermore, of those who said the changes do reflect globalization, few could specify what the changes have been; a few mentioned “multicultural,” agreeing, however, that “international” is not the same. At least one said the change was actually toward less international content, citing deletion of a world history requirement.

**Table 9**  
**Certification and Standards Information from Current Teachers**

	<b><u>Phase 1 Teachers</u></b>		<b><u>K-5 Teachers</u></b>	
	<i>N=65</i>		<i>N=64</i>	
	<b><u>Yes</u></b>	<b><u>No</u></b>	<b><u>Yes</u></b>	<b><u>No</u></b>
Certification requirements include an international component	20%	80%		
Certification changes since you began teaching?	82%	18%		
Certification requirements changed in recent years?	89%	11%	73%	6%
Do the certification changes reflect globalization?	29%	71%	18%	82%
Subject standards modified to reflect increasing globalization?			32%	64%
Have subject standards required additional training?			50%	50%
Are adequate resources available on international topics?			55%	45%
Do you use internationally oriented web-based materials?			48%	52%

*NOTE: Rarely did all participants respond to all of these questions; the percentages are based on the number of respondents (yes or no) for each question.*

Again we see that the challenge laid down by the recent reports from NASBE and the CCSSO is enormous. Both the accreditation process and state boards of education, as well as the educators themselves, could provide leadership for the needed changes. A few teacher education programs, facing their accreditation reviews, have emphasized their special efforts to increase the international components in their programs, but most of the people I talked with reported that their internationalizing initiatives are limited by policies set by their state boards, and by the demands imposed by NCLB. It was encouraging to find that nearly half of the elementary teachers are making an extra effort to use



internationally-oriented web-based materials, but the other half may be represented by the teacher who wrote simply, “I don’t teach international topics.”

While more than 70% of the responding teachers did feel that their international experience helps as they carry out their teaching responsibilities, a number of states are now imposing lower limits on the number of courses a teacher-in-training may be required to take before graduation, which may further limit realistic international options for the prospective teacher. Again, until accreditors and state boards of education to adopt teacher preparation policies favoring international content – and foreign language requirements – good advising, availability of international courses, and improved requirements at the university level whenever possible, will be crucial in providing teachers with a modicum of international understanding to share with their students.

Although most of the participating current teachers had attended workshops organized by area or international programs at universities, it is interesting that relatively few suggested that special funds be targeted to provide more such workshops. Little more than half felt that adequate resources (of any sort) were available to them on international topics. However, when asked whether teachers-in-training should be encouraged to attend internationally-oriented workshops for in-service teachers, some 90% percent found this a good idea.

***Recommendations***

That state and local governments include international and global perspectives in requirements for endorsements and certification, to recognize the interrelationships of disciplines and cultures and

facilitate integration of international content in continuing professional development for current teachers, through workshops and special courses.

That accrediting agencies include requirements for international exposure, through coursework, foreign language study, and study and internships abroad, in accreditation criteria for all teacher education programs.

That professional associations give increased attention to strategies for improving international components in testing standards, in publications and at meetings.

**FACULTY**

Faculty members, in Arts and Sciences and in Education, were nearly half of the respondents for this project, and their views therefore figure importantly in all of the issues discussed. They were the most frequently cited as initiators of university internationalization efforts by senior administrators and by their deans. Clearly they play a role both formally and informally in the advising of students. And most have had opportunities for some kind of overseas experience. What might be the impact of such experiences? Nearly all agreed that it affects teaching. Most of the responses on the kinds of impact are shown in Table 10. These findings, and particularly the large number of respondents reporting the attitudinal shifts resulting from faculty experience abroad, could seem to confirm the usefulness of one of the SCDEs’ earlier approaches to internationalization (sending faculty abroad).

However, an earlier interview question had asked about the reasons for faculty overseas travel, and very few – only 10% – mentioned course development. The course revisions reported in Table 10 were mostly very incidental impacts, such as using a greater variety of examples in existing courses, while the

**Table 10**  
**Impact of Faculty Experience Abroad**  
*as estimated by interviewees*

<u>Impact</u>	<u>A&amp;S</u> <i>N=105</i>	<u>SCDE</u> <i>N=113</i>	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>N=76</i>
Course revisions	89	97	68
New courses	18	6	3
Study abroad encouraged	18	12	18
Attitudinal shifts	31	57	21
New pedagogies	14	10	5
Faculty presentations	20	10	3

*NOTE: These are responses to an open-ended question.*

estimates of resulting new courses, or even major revisions, were few. And at the end of the interviews, when questions were asked about preferred priorities for more internationalization should funds become available, course development was high on the collective list of activities.

- 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. 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 can advance campus internationalization.
- Facilitation of **course revision**, with or without overseas travel, was favored by many – over 90% in phase two. From the interviews with senior administrators, it seemed clear that most institutions have funds that could help faculty do this, subject to their interest and university priorities. Remembering the importance of A&S courses for prospective teachers, I was encouraged to find that this approach is urged also in the American Historical Association’s recent report on internationalization to the ACE.<sup>22</sup>

Other ways for faculty to facilitate course development and revision were also discussed.

- A surprising 75% (in phase two) liked **joint Arts and Sciences and Education faculty workshops** to solve specific curriculum issues (related to internationalization), 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 Science faculty member with substantial numbers of Education students could find helpful, with Education methodology experts contributing to choices of content and presentation that could be most useful to the prospective secondary or elementary school teacher.<sup>23</sup>
- **Team teaching**, by Education and Arts and Sciences faculty, was also looked on favorably, by well over 85% of the respondents in the second phase of the project – and it might be noted as

<sup>22</sup> Noralee Frankel, and others, *Internationalizing Student Learning Outcomes in History: A Report to the American Council on Education*, December 2006, at <http://www.historians.org/teaching/ACE/Taskforcereport.cfm>.

<sup>23</sup> This approach is also urged by Laura M. Westhoff in “The Historian’s Role in Teacher Education” in *Perspectives*, 44:9 (September 2006), 35 and Fritz Fischer in “Preparation of Future History Teachers: The History Department’s Role” in *Perspectives* 44:12 (December 2006), 19.

well that all of the responding senior administrators liked the concept. 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 strategy has seemed to work. Might internationally-oriented history faculty, for example, consider a team-teaching assignment with experts on the social studies methods courses which are required for most elementary and secondary school teacher training programs?

Yes, these activities could cost some money. However, I can report that every interviewee (who was asked) noted the existence of institutional 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?

Another possible stumbling block, of course, could be simple inertia. In the second phase more than 90% of the interviewees said that schedules can be flexible to permit time on internationalization efforts. Senior administrators in both phases were asked whether departments have enough flexibility to carry out changes, and more than half reported that they do; a few paused, noting that some departments are more flexible than others. And indeed, as noted earlier, little more than half of the SCDE interviewees felt that their curricula have enough flexibility to permit changes.

#### ***Recommendations***

That institutions of higher education foster the development of internationally-oriented curriculum through, for example,

- individual faculty grants (particularly for general education courses), and
- joint workshops for Arts and Sciences and Education faculty.

Might international visitors and faculty make a difference? Most interviewees reported that their institutions have them, and many said they do make a difference, but the international faculty, like the international students, sometimes tend to be in fields quite removed from the teacher training curricula, particularly for the less specialized elementary teacher programs. While some of the current teachers think there should be more international faculty, senior administrators specified ways in which their help is solicited as part of their internationalizing efforts. For example, offices of international programs have organized special faculty seminars and presentations by international faculty to help with program development, on the home campus and overseas. Many find them an important resource for student (and faculty) mentoring and study abroad program information; they are often called upon to make special class presentations.

The interviews indicated 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 in the second phase – more than 80% of SCDE participants, 85% in A&S, and 76% of the senior administrators – 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. Student advising, in which faculty play an important role, has been discussed in an earlier section of this report. And at the beginning of this section I cited the important role of faculty in initiating internationalizing efforts.

### *Recommendations*

That institutions of higher education foster the development of internationally-oriented curriculum through, for example, hiring faculty with international training and experience.

That accrediting agencies include requirements for international exposure through faculty qualifications in their criteria for all teacher education programs.

## **GOVERNANCE AND POLICY ISSUES**

### **OIP Activity**

On many of the campuses visited an office of international programs (OIP) initiates and supports a wide range of activities that contribute to international experiences for K-12 teachers. What were the OIP functions that I was told about? The question I asked about their roles and services was an open-ended one, and I occasionally did a bit of prompting in this part of the interview, but the responses detailed in Table 11 are nonetheless helpful. For comparison purposes, the table also shows data reported in 2005 by the Association of International Education Administrators and available on its website.<sup>24</sup> The two sets of data on study abroad and international students are fairly consistent, but many of the categories of activity recorded by me and by the AIEA do not exactly match, because the AIEA survey used several categories that were either more general or more specific than what was reported to me in the interviews. In addition, the AIEA data distinguish between primary and secondary OIP functions. Here I should also note that while my question was open-ended, the AIEA survey provided a menu of possibilities, essentially limiting the responses to the activities as listed. On the other hand, the AIEA data do include categories mentioned by few if any of my interviewees.

A close examination of the two sets of data is useful with respect to our central questions about internationalizing the prospective teacher's undergraduate experience. Many of the AIEA respondents have responsibilities for area and international studies majors and minors, while comparatively few of my respondents so reported for their OIPs. Contrasting responses seem similar for faculty and curriculum development. On the other hand, the AIEA menu did not include any activity related to advising – nor did my interviews reveal that function in this part of the conversation. However, later in my interviews, many OIP participants did report participation, for varying periods of time, in freshman orientation. Whether or not they are training other advisors, OIP staff seem to be doing some advising themselves.

Among the 38 institutions reporting some kind of OIP, campus-wide variations in the reporting of their functions were striking, indicating possibly significant amounts of misunderstanding about their roles, and potential. Faculty members were more numerous out of step with the senior administrators than their proportions in the entire survey – again, with serious implications for their advising roles. Arts and Sciences deans also seemed a little less likely to be fully informed about the services that the university's OIP can provide.<sup>25</sup> Apparent incomplete information exchange could play a role in diminishing the effectiveness of internationalization efforts not only for prospective teachers but for students (and faculty) throughout the institution.

Points where my data are particularly relevant to teacher education issues are the perceptions of the OIP in other parts of the institution – “All Others” in the second column of figures in Table 11. About a third of the non-OIP interviewees reported OIP help with international travel, but fewer than

---

<sup>24</sup> [www.aieaworld.org](http://www.aieaworld.org) (under Campus and Administrative Programs)

<sup>25</sup> The OIPs and their roles are discussed in more detail in Schneider, “...The Roles of OIPs...”

25% of the responses told of other activities that would contribute to faculty development, such as grant application assistance, curriculum development, or a seminar program. As noted, few (5%) seemed to be aware of the OIP work in the administration of area or international studies majors and programs, which was reported by nearly 20% of the OIPs themselves. Put a little differently, my raw data show that of the 14 campuses where the senior administrators reported OIP assistance for curriculum development, less than half were campuses where any other interviewees mentioned this possibility. Interestingly, at seven others, where OIPs themselves did not report providing encouragement for curriculum development, such OIP assistance was cited by other interviewees, although more likely by people in Arts and Sciences than in Education. SCDEs, like A&S, probably could get help from OIPs for a variety of internationalization efforts.

**Table 11**  
**Functions of University Offices of International Programs**  
as reported by interviewees, compared with AIEA data

<u>Function</u>	<u>OIPs</u> <i>N=56</i>	<u>All Others</u> <i>N=237</i>	<u>AIEA Survey</u> <i>primary/secondary</i> <i>N=76</i>
Study abroad	38	190	
Exchange programs, linkages	23	44	
Program development (for study abroad, exchanges)	16	35	
Internships abroad	4	5	
<i>Study abroad, exchanges</i>			88% / 9%
International students	33	158	
International visitors, lecturers	24	79	
<i>International students &amp; scholars</i>			80% / 13%
Facilitating faculty travel	19	78	
Facilitating curriculum development	11	32	
Facilitating grant applications	3	13	
Faculty seminars	2	6	
<i>Faculty/curriculum development</i>			24% / 53%
ESL program	6	7	
<i>International training/ESL</i>			40% / 33%
<i>Area, international, foreign language studies major/minor</i>	7	13	20% / 43%
Film, speaker series, festivals	15	33	
International house	2	3	
Passport application acceptance	3	4	
Fundraising	2	0	
<i>Other</i>			44% / 44%
<i>International representation</i>	2	0	80% / 20%
<i>Community outreach</i>	4	4	59% / 24%
<i>International contracting</i>	0	0	38% / 33%

*NOTE: AIEA reporting categories are italicized.*

Interestingly, in their reports of OIP functions, very few interviewees (less than 1%) mentioned improving campus communication about international options. A conclusion I draw from this, combined with the data in Table 11, is that Offices of International Programs, charged with institution-wide facilitation of a variety of internationalizing activities and services, may need to work harder to make their current services better known. Given the focus of my research on teacher education, I was of

course wondering whether faculty and deans in Education were less informed about OIP services, and while this may be the case, the data seem to indicate more clearly a need for improved connections between OIPs and both Education and A&S – and probably other university units as well.

***Recommendations***

That institutions of higher education strengthen the role of campus-wide offices for international services and programs, and effectively provide information about them institution-wide and track characteristics described in this report for evaluation, research, and planning purposes, for all undergraduate programs, including those in professional schools.

**Incentives**

Another aspect of the information flow has to do with understanding how internationalization efforts may be initiated – and funded. After faculty (see previous section), the next most frequently cited initiators 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 the state offers their institutions some encouragement, but no help for internationalization efforts. A few noted encouragement from consortia such as the United Negro College Fund. And were SCDE respondents encouraged to internationalize by the priorities of their professional associations? Although most hesitated before responding, half of the faculty said they were (by at least one association), while 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.

Another incentive for internationalization efforts might be in the institution’s mission statement. Does it include “international”? Although I did not make any effort to measure each institution’s internationalization efforts, it was interesting to get a variety of responses from senior administrators; a few, even at institutions that seem quite active internationally, were clear that “international” is not in their institutions’ formal mission statements, although it might be in its more detailed goals or strategic plans. More telling, perhaps, were the responses from SCDE deans and faculty about their mission statements – in the first phase, 49% said it includes international, and the percentage went up to 52% in the second phase. If the change is significant, it is likely more a sign of the times than indicating a significant difference between secondary and elementary education. The type of institution seems to make no difference on this question, either with senior administrators or people in Education. And indeed, these responses are more positive than those reported in a 2003 ACE report,<sup>26</sup> in which only 35% overall answered the same question positively.

What other incentives might be offered to further internationalize the teacher training experience? An institution with no sabbatical program does offer “special leaves” that can enable faculty to undertake relevant travel and curriculum projects. Although few reported an international activity criterion for faculty promotion and tenure, a large majority did report possibilities for credit in

---

<sup>26</sup> Laura Siaya and Fred M. Hayward, *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2003), 102.

promotion and tenure decisions for international activity, under headings of service and/or research, for example. Special faculty grants for curriculum development were mentioned, and some institutions might “top off” other grants to facilitate time away from home, but several mentioned difficulties in finding such grant money.

Although outside grant funding can play a part in the initiation of internationalizing efforts, the responses to questions about the actual sources of incentive funding were surprisingly mixed. Nearly 40% of the (non-student) Education interviewees just did not know or would even venture a guess about what funding sources might exist. Some U. S. Government agencies were mentioned by many, particularly by respondents at comprehensive universities – most likely FIPSE, Department of State, USAID, and the Department of Education (Titles II, III, and/or VI), as well as NIH and NSF. UNESCO and UNICEF were 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.

The senior administrators were asked, in addition, how their internationalization efforts really are funded; the large majority (85%) said that much was done with internal funds. Some use revenues from their ESL programs. Some conduct fund-raising for specific activities and for endowments to assure future funding. In this relatively small sample, comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, compared with the research universities, seem 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. Here it was particularly surprising to hear only three out of the 161 interviewees at comprehensive universities (and none at liberal arts colleges) mention the Department of Education’s Title VI which provides funding for programs intended to develop exactly the kinds of activities we were discussing.

### ***Recommendations***

That professional associations give increased attention to strategies for improving international components in the preparation of teachers, in publications and at meetings.

That outside funders improve their dissemination of information about resources available to strengthen international and area studies and foreign language programs and their potential impact on the training of K-12 teachers,

provide funding support for a wide variety of activities to strengthen undergraduate international exposure, and

develop effective networks for disseminating information about resources for prospective and current teachers.

## STRATEGIES

In previous sections many strategies for improving the international exposure of K-12 teachers-in-training have been suggested. Table 12 offers some comparisons, showing all those that interviewees were asked about, as well as a few others elicited in response to the final question about how they would want to spend a little extra money if it were available (for the purpose). The first footnote should be emphasized: in many interviews, particularly in the first phase, only a few of the strategy questions were asked, and the percentages are based on the number of interviews for which there was a response. It should also be noted that the many of the positive answers were qualified; in an ideal world, the respondents would like to see the activity happen, but few hesitated to mention obstacles, many of which have been described in earlier sections. Perhaps it is not surprising that the positive responses were very frequent for most of the suggested strategies at this point in the interview, after participants had been thinking about the subject for a while.

In this iteration of strategies (Table 12) the SCDE responses for the second phase, focusing on elementary education, are separated from the SCDE totals, to see whether there might be any remarkable differences between the elementary- and secondary-focused responses. The percentages of positive second phase SCDE answers may be a little higher for most of the suggested activities, but probably not remarkably so. The only strategy for which the second phase SCDE participants were less enthusiastic is internships abroad; the elementary school teachers were even less interested, with little more than half liking the idea, compared with 75% in favor of study abroad – as noted in an earlier section.

A few strategies not discussed in previous sections may also be worth noting. One was more involvement of international students in extracurricular or curricular activities. More than 70% of the phase two participants like the idea, but several noted some practical problems with doing so. Few international students are undergraduates in Education, so the involvements – whether curricular or extracurricular – would likely have to be relatively formalized. At a couple of institutions, for example, I learned about pairing of international and U.S. students to help with English language learning and cultural adjustments – but several people commented that making such arrangements requires significant staff time. And such programs do not necessarily involve Education students, although they surely could. At another institution an effort is made to draw on international student resources as part of the outreach programs for in-service teachers – again, a strategy that might not directly impact undergraduate teachers-in-training, unless they are encouraged to attend such workshops. It was also noted that international students tend to have their own clubs – and that, like students in Education, their schedules are very heavy. Perhaps it is not surprising that no current teachers suggested this as a strategy.

Although listed in order of decreasing positive responses, a ranking of suggested strategies in Table 12 is probably not very significant because, as noted, in the first phase the number of questions asked was often affected by time constraints. However, the ordering of priority targets may take on more significance, since the question was open-ended. Respondents often mentioned more than one activity, but none were suggested by the interviewer. Although study abroad is high on the list, it is important to note that both faculty development and course revision, especially if combined, are much higher. And the reader may note that respondents in Education seem collectively much more interested in faculty development (which should lead to course revision) – overall, and for prospective elementary school teachers – than study abroad as a priority activity.



**Table 12**  
**STRATEGIES FOR INTERNATIONALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION**  
*by type of respondent*

<u>Activity</u>	<i>both phases, per</i>				<u>In-Service</u>	
	<u>A&amp;S</u> <i>n=139*</i>	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>n=85*</i>	<u>SCDE</u> <i>n=162*</i>	<u>Phase 2 SCDE</u> <i>n=99*</i>	<u>Elem. Tchrs</u> <i>n=64*</i>	<u>Project Total</u> <i>n=450</i>
<b>Suggested Strategies</b>						
Strengthening advising and career counselling systems	99%	100%	88%	95%	32	<b>347</b>
More study abroad	100%	98%	98%	99%	29	<b>328</b>
Facilitating course revision/more international courses	100%	100%	99%	100%	17	<b>299</b>
Joint A&S and SCDE faculty workshops for curricular development	99%	95%	99%	99%		<b>291</b>
Adding a foreign language requirement <i>OR</i>	43%	34%	52%	55%	36	<b>169</b>
Changing (increasing) the foreign language requirement	54%	45%	20%	23%	4 **	<b>118</b>
Sending faculty abroad for course development	99%	97%	97%	99%		<b>276</b>
Changing/increasing general education requirements	91%	80%	84%	86%	35	<b>243</b>
More internships abroad	97%	100%	99%	90%	17	<b>238</b>
A&S/SCDE team-taught courses	92%	88%	96%	98%		<b>216</b>
Involving more international students in extracurricular or curricular activities	100%	98%	97%	98%		<b>205</b>
Encouraging SCDE minor in international or area studies	92%	86%	92%	93%	23	<b>187</b>
Recruiting students with international interests	98%	90%	89%	90%		<b>181</b>
Creating an education minor for A&S majors	90%	65%	72%	74%		<b>119</b>
<b>** Priority Targets:</b>						
Faculty development	37	33	50	37		<b>121</b>
More study abroad	32	23	27	20	7	<b>109</b>
Course revision/new courses	30	20	26	14	16	<b>105</b>
Financial aid for study abroad	14	21	51	23	7	<b>98</b>
Internships abroad	10	5	21	19	8	<b>43</b>
More study abroad programs	7	7	12	9		<b>26</b>
Student travel					13	<b>22</b>
Advisor workshops	15	4	3	1		<b>22</b>
Foreign language requirements			6	3	5	<b>12</b>
Outreach (for in-service teachers)					7	<b>7</b>
More international faculty, visitors					4	<b>4</b>

\* Percentages, where calculated, are on the basis of number of respondents to that question only.

\*\* Responses to open-ended question

## CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the most important finding from this phase of the project is the extent to which it confirms the data collected in the first phase. Strengthening advising about international options remains at the top of the list of recommended strategies, as are faculty and course development. The findings have provided no reason for dropping any of the recommendations arising from the first phase report and in fact serve to underline their relevance. This report's fairly specific recommendations and suggested strategies indeed appear to fit well with the calls to action in the recent NASBE report and the CCSSO policy statement.

Throughout this report I have tried to find distinctions between the sets of data for secondary and elementary teacher education programs, to little avail. If there are differences in advising processes from the first to the second phase of the project, they are more likely attributable to an increasing professionalization of the advising function, moving away from reliance on faculty for the early part of the undergraduate experience. It is clear that better international information is needed for the advising of both elementary and secondary teachers-in-training – not to mention the relevance of more career advising to encourage teaching among the internationally-oriented A&S majors.

While the data gleaned about curriculum also indicate that much more international content could, and should, be included in the training for all prospective teachers, these data do not point to differences in the current general education requirements for elementary and secondary school teacher preparation. It is clear, however, that the elementary teacher-in-training is less likely to do a traditional A&S major, so more adjustments are needed to be sure that the curriculum is strengthened internationally – more attention to a minor with international content might be one solution, in addition to internationalizing revisions in general education courses. As recommended by the CCSSO policy statement, my interviewees also felt that a major curricular need is foreign language study, which is seemingly a bit more rare in the current elementary education training program than in secondary level programs. Furthermore, training for K-6 foreign language teachers seems noticeably wanting, notwithstanding the apparent increases in foreign language programs for the elementary grades.

The foregoing report mentions a number of suggestions for the reader to ponder in the search for ways to avoid leaving any teacher behind as more and more international issues intrude on our lives. Most sections of this report include suggestions for practices that could increase attention to internationalizing activities, practices that interviewees have tried or suggested in the course of our conversations. In addition, we have developed a fairly extensive set of formal recommendations from the study – 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. They are interspersed in relevant sections of the report and also listed together here in a final section.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### *For state and local governments:*

- include international and global perspectives in requirements for endorsements and certification, to recognize interrelationships of disciplines and cultures;
- remove all exemptions for significant foreign language competence in teacher training in all humanities and social science fields, at all education levels;
- add an endorsement for K-6 foreign language instruction;
- revise regulations about practice teaching, if necessary, to allow credit for pre-service observation and internships in other countries for at least part of the student teaching experience; and
- facilitate integration of international content in continuing professional development for current teachers, through workshops and special courses.

### *For accrediting agencies:*

- include requirements for international exposure, through coursework, foreign language study, faculty qualifications, and study and internships abroad, in accreditation criteria for all teacher education programs; and
- recommend distinctly different programs for training foreign language teachers at the elementary and secondary levels.

### *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 on international options, and website support, for students, for faculty, and for professional advisors;
  - foster development of internationally oriented curriculum, through, for example,
    - individual faculty grants (particularly for general education courses),
    - joint workshops for 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 institution-wide;
- 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.

***For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:***

- review all courses for possible addition of international content (see above);
- integrate study and internships abroad into the professional training of teachers;
- emphasize and increase the options for observation and practice teaching in bilingual and international magnet schools;
- require that prospective foreign language teachers have at least one semester of overseas experience in an area where the target language is spoken;
- strengthen the international components of academic and career advising services, in cooperation with other university and community college advising services;
- offer an effective introductory course, and even observational internships and a minor in education, open to all undergraduates, to reinforce advising about teaching career options; and
- include international orientation in the criteria for selecting cooperating teachers for students' observation and practice teaching placements.

***For professional associations:***

- give increased attention to needs and strategies for improving international components in testing standards and in the preparation of teachers, in publications and at meetings; and
- increase attention to solutions for the demand and supply problems of foreign language teachers, at all levels of instruction (K-12 and postsecondary).

***For outside funders:***

- improve dissemination of information about funding resources available to initiate and strengthen international and area studies and foreign language programs and their potential impact on the training of prospective teachers;
- provide funding support for a wide variety of activities, as indicated above – including such activities as academic and career advising – that can strengthen the international options available for, and known to, all undergraduates and particularly those who might consider teaching careers; and
- develop more effective networks for disseminating information about options and resources for prospective and current teachers.

## To Leave No Teacher Behind

### Advisory Group

Jonathan Friedlander  
Assistant Director, Center for Middle East Studies  
Director of Outreach Programs  
International Studies and Programs  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA

Anne A. Janson  
Director of Personnel \*\*  
Radnor Township Public Schools  
Radnor, PA  
\* [Associate Professor of Education, Rosemont College]

Elizabeth Mahan  
Associate Executive Director  
Office of International Affairs  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, CT  
\* [Director, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies]

JoAnn McCarthy  
Assistant Provost for International Affairs  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA  
\*\* [Dean, International Affairs, University of South Florida]

Sarah M. Pickert  
Professor, Department of Education  
The Catholic University of America  
Washington, DC  
\* Department Chair

\* position at the beginning of the entire project

\*\* position at the beginning of this phase of the project



## Site Visit List

	<b>State</b>	<b>Research Univ.</b>	<b>Comp. Univ.</b>	<b>Liberal Arts Col.</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>
Appalachian State University	NC		✓		14,000
Arizona State University	AZ	✓			44,000
University of Arizona	AZ	✓			35,000
Ball State University	IN		✓		18,500
Beloit College	WI			✓	1,200
Boston University	MA	✓			22,000
Bridgewater State University	MA		✓		9,750
California State University, Northridge	CA		✓		31,000
Central Washington University	WA		✓		7,600
Cheyney University	PA		✓		1,600
Clark Atlanta University	GA		✓		4,850
University of the District of Columbia	DC		✓		5,200
Emporia State University	KS		✓		6,500
Florida Gulf Coast University	FL		✓		6,000
Florida International University	FL	✓			34,000
Hampton University	VA		✓		6,000
Indiana University	IN	✓			36,500
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	PA		✓		13,500
University of Kansas	KS	✓			25,000
Kansas State University	KS	✓			22,000
Miami University	OH	✓			15,000
Michigan State University	MI	✓			52,000
Millersville University	PA		✓		7,800
University of Minnesota	MN	✓			50,000
Montclair State University	NJ		✓		15,500
University of New Mexico	NM	✓			24,750
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	NC	✓			18,300
Occidental College	CA			✓	1,875
Ohio State University	OH	✓			51,000
Old Dominion University	VA	✓			20,800
Pacific Lutheran University	WA		✓		3,500
San Diego State University	CA		✓		34,000
University of Southern California	CA	✓			28,000
St. Cloud State University	MN		✓		16,000
St. Mary's College of Maryland	MD			✓	1,800
University of South Florida	FL	✓			42,000
Swarthmore College	PA			✓	1,475
University of Washington	WA	✓			30,000
West Virginia University	WV	✓			23,000
Western Michigan University	MI	✓			30,000
College of William and Mary	VA	✓			7,000





## Interview Protocol for Use in Schools of Arts and Sciences

### A. Defining Program “Internationalization”

1. How is the Arts and Sciences College internationalizing?

- study abroad?
- service or internships abroad?
- overseas experience(s) for faculty?
- a foreign language requirement, and if so, what is it?
  - institution-wide?
  - or for some departments/colleges only?
- inclusion of “international” or comparative modules in general education courses?
- general education requirement of 1 or more non-US or comparative courses?
- offering one or more minors in international, area, or foreign language study?
- offering one or more majors in international, area, or foreign language study?
- international students serving as resources for courses or related activities?
  - and/or heritage communities serving as resources?
- setting up/supporting international/foreign language house(s)?
  - or foreign language clubs/tables?
- languages-across-the-curriculum?
- foreign visitors?
- international film or food festivals?
- model UN or OAS program?
- hiring, promotion, and tenure policies?
- other?

2. If sending faculty overseas is used as a strategy for internationalizing, what kinds of overseas experience are encouraged?

Do faculty go overseas in equal proportions throughout the university (or mostly from A&S)?

How do such faculty experiences overseas affect the on-campus teaching program?

### B. Internationalization

1. Have the “internationalization” initiatives at your institution come from senior university administrators?

and/or senior A&S administrators?

and/or faculty?

and/or students?

and/or alumni?

foreign visitors (faculty or others)?

and/or others in the community?

and/or the availability of outside funds?

2. What incentives are offered for internationalizing efforts?

- release time?

- flexible assignments?

- faculty development grants for travel?

- facilitation of the grant application process?

- credit for international activities in hiring, promotion, and tenure?

3. Does the university have an office for international programs that serves both A&S and the SCDE?

What kind of services does it provide?

### C. Curriculum in General

1. Can Arts and Sciences students take courses in the SCDE?

Do they?

2. Can a history (or political science, etc.)/language major get certified to teach in elementary school?  
How?

#### **D. Specialization in the Curriculum**

1. Do you have a special major designed for prospective elementary education teachers?
2. Are A&S majors able to do a second major, or the equivalent, in SCDE?
3. Are A&S majors able to do a minor or the equivalent in the SCDE?
4. Are courses on how to teach foreign language(s) offered in A&S  
or in the SCDE?

#### **E. Advising**

1. Does the formal student advising system include  
special staff for advising?  
faculty?  
other students/TAs?  
use of website?  
special offices, such as an Office of International Studies/Programs?
2. How are advisors kept abreast of changing rules (and opportunities) for students?
3. How do students learn about internationally-oriented academic and co-curricular activities?
4. Are advisors in a position to encourage students to participate in internationally-oriented extracurricular options, such as language houses?
5. How do A&S students learn about career possibilities in the teaching field?
6. For those A&S students interested in teaching, who does their career counselling?  
And their academic advising?
7. How are advisors prepared to help students in foreign language and in international and area studies fields discover their vocations for teaching?
8. How might the advising system be strengthened (for students interested in both education and international and foreign language studies)?

#### **F. Looking ahead/Final Thoughts**

1. How can international subject area courses be more available to SCDE students preparing to be elementary school teachers?
2. *[For example]* What kinds of strategies, arguments, or incentives might be effective – and what might be the obstacles – for
  - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
  - encouraging/facilitating course revisions
  - adding a foreign language requirement?
  - or changing (increasing) the foreign language requirement?
  - more study abroad?
  - more internships abroad?
  - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
  - including A&S with SCDE faculty for team-taught courses?
  - organizing joint A&S and SCDE faculty workshops for course or curriculum revision?
  - strengthening the advising and career counselling systems?
  - encouraging SCDE students to do a minor in international or area studies?
  - creating an education minor for (A&S international or area studies) majors?
  - recruiting students with international interests
  - involving more international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?
3. What sources of incentive funding are available to help with the process?  
How would you recommend that outside incentive funding be targeted?

## Interview Protocol for Use in Schools, Colleges, or Departments of Education

What % of UG enrollment are transfer students?

### A. Defining Program “Internationalization”

*[Make clear that ESL is not included in this project’s frame of reference.]*

1. For your SCDE, does an “internationalized” curriculum for pre-service teachers include
  - study abroad?
  - service or internships abroad?
  - overseas experience(s) for faculty?
  - hiring, promotion, and tenure policies?
  - a foreign language requirement, and if so, what is it?
    - institution-wide? or for some departments/colleges only?
  - inclusion of “international” or comparative modules in general education courses?
  - general education requirement of 1 or more non-US or comparative courses?
  - offering one or more minors in international, area, or foreign language study?
  - offering one or more majors in international, area, or foreign language study?
  - setting up/supporting international/foreign language house(s)?
    - or foreign language clubs, tables?
  - international students serving as resources for courses or related activities?
    - and/or heritage communities serving as resources?
  - attendance at internationally-oriented in-service workshops by undergraduates?
  - languages-across-the-curriculum?
  - foreign visitors?
  - international film or food festivals?
  - model UN or OAS program?
  - mentoring of students by in-service teachers with strong international outlook?
  - other?
2. Is **study abroad** an option in the pre-service curriculum?
  - How many elementary SCDE students participate? Don’t know?
  - How do you perceive a student’s study abroad experience being integrated with the on-campus curriculum?
  - Can students receive course credit for study abroad?
3. Is **practice teaching abroad** an option in the pre-service curriculum?
  - How many elementary SCDE students participate per year? Don’t know?
  - Where are students placed?
  - How are students supervised during their overseas internships?
4. How do you prepare students for **study abroad** or **practice teaching abroad**?
  - Foreign language requirements?
  - Training in cross-cultural communication?
  - Relevant general education requirements?
  - One or more specific (destination) country history and culture courses?

5. How are students helped to evaluate and integrate their overseas experiences with their on-campus coursework?
6. Do students have the option of practice teaching in a bilingual or international magnet school in the U.S.?
7. If sending faculty overseas is used as a strategy for internationalizing, what kinds of overseas experience are encouraged?  
How do such faculty experiences overseas affect the on-campus teaching program?
8. Do you have instructors from other countries on your faculty?  
How are they contributing to your internationalization efforts?

**B. Internationalization**

1. At your SCDE have there been efforts to “internationalize,” however, you might define it?
2. If so, has the initiative/impetus come from
  - senior university administrators?
  - senior SCDE administrators?
  - and/or faculty?
  - and/or students?
  - and/or alumni?
  - foreign visitors (faculty or others)?
  - and/or priorities of professional associations?
  - and/or others in the community?
  - availability of grant funds?
  - (internal and/or external?)
3. Does the university have an office for international studies that serves the SCDE?  
What kind of services does it provide?
4. What incentives are offered for internationalizing efforts?
  - release time?
  - flexible assignments?
  - faculty development grants for travel?
  - facilitation of the grant application process?
  - credit for international activities in hiring, promotion, and tenure?
5. Is “international” included in your SCDE’s mission statement?

**C. Curriculum in General**

1. Can the elementary education curriculum be completed in 4 years?  
If so, are students ever encouraged to take longer?
2. Do requirements for the elementary education major include international courses?  
or foreign language courses?

**D. Teacher Certification Requirements**

1. Do your state’s certification requirements for elementary education specify international knowledge?  
or foreign language competence?
2. If so, what performance-based assessments do you make for these competencies?
3. Have certification requirements changed in recent years?  
How?

## **E. Specialization in the Curriculum**

1. Are elementary education majors able to do minors in (A&S)?
2. Are elementary education majors accepted for (double) majors in (A&S)?
3. Are (A&S) majors accepted to do minors in elementary teacher education?
4. Do you prepare foreign language teachers for elementary education?
5. Are courses on how to teach foreign language(s) offered in (A&S) or in the SCDE?
6. Do all elementary education majors receive instruction in teaching students with limited English?
7. Is instruction available to use WWW resources for teaching international content?
8. Do you have a checklist for course requirements for prospective elementary teachers?

## **F. Advising**

- \*1. Does the formal student advising system include
  - special staff for advising?
  - faculty?
  - other students/TAs?
  - use of website?
  - special offices, such as an Office of International Studies/Programs?
2. Are advisors trained about the international content and exposure needed by elementary school teachers?
3. How are advisors kept abreast of changing rules (and opportunities) for students?
  - And of curricular options outside the SCDE?
4. How do students learn about internationally-oriented academic and co-curricular activities?
5. How might the advising system be strengthened (for students interested in both education and international and foreign language studies)?

## **G. Looking ahead / Final Thoughts**

1. What would you most like to do to internationalize?
2. *[For example]* What kinds of strategies, arguments, or incentives might be effective – and what might be the obstacles – for
  - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
  - encouraging/facilitating course revisions
  - adding a foreign language requirement?
  - or changing (increasing) the foreign language requirement?
  - more study abroad?
  - more internships abroad?
  - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
  - including A&S with SCDE faculty for team-taught courses?
  - organizing joint A&S and SCDE faculty workshops for course or curriculum revision?
  - strengthening the advising and career counselling systems?
  - encouraging SCDE students to do a minor in international or area studies?
  - creating an education minor for (A&S international or area studies) majors?
  - recruiting students with international interests?
    - involving more international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?

3. Does your curriculum have enough flexibility to permit the changes you feel are needed?
4. What sources of incentive funding are available to help with the process?
5. How would you want to have outside incentive funding targeted?

## **Interview Protocol for Use with Senior Administrators**

### **A. Defining Program “Internationalization”**

*[Make clear that ESL is not included in this project’s frame of reference.]*

1. How is your university internationalizing?
  - study abroad?
  - service or internships abroad?
  - overseas experience(s) for faculty?
  - a foreign language requirement, and if so, what is it?
    - institution-wide?   or for some departments/colleges only?
  - inclusion of “international” or comparative modules in general education courses?
  - general education requirement of 1 or more non-US or comparative courses?
  - international students serving as resources for courses or related activities?  
and/or heritage communities serving as resources?
  - setting up/supporting international/foreign language house(s)?  
of foreign language clubs/tables?
  - offering one or more minors in international, area, or foreign language study?
  - offering one or more majors in international, area, or foreign language study?
  - languages-across-the-curriculum?
  - foreign visitors?
  - international film or food festivals?
  - Model UN or OAS program?
  - hiring, promotion, and tenure policies?
  - other?
  
2. Are all of these international options (above) available to undergraduates throughout the university?
  
3. If **study, service, or internships abroad** are options as part of the undergraduate curriculum, how are students prepared for the experience?  
  
Do you expect a student’s overseas experience to be integrated with the on-campus curriculum?  
If yes, how?
  
4. If sending faculty overseas is a strategy for internationalizing, what kinds of overseas experience are encouraged?  
  
Do faculty go overseas in equal proportions throughout the university?  
How do such faculty experiences overseas affect the on-campus teaching program?  
How are faculty experiences overseas funded?  
Does university policy encourage faculty to seek and accept international fellowships and grants?
  
5. Do you have instructors from other countries on your faculty?  
  
How are they contributing to your internationalization efforts?

### **B. Internationalization**

1. What incentives are offered faculty for internationalizing?
  - release time?
  - flexible assignments?
  - faculty development grants for travel?
  - facilitation of the grant application process?
  - credit for international activities in hiring, promotion, and tenure?

2. Who has provided the initiative for internationalization at your university?
3. What are the sources of financial support for your university's internationalization?
4. Does the university have an office for international studies?  
     What kind of services does it provide?  
     For the entire university community?
5. Is "international" included in your mission statement?

**C. Advising**

1. Is undergraduate advising done in the same way throughout the university?
2. Does the formal undergraduate student advising system include  
     special staff for advising?  
     faculty?  
     other students/TAs?  
     use of website?  
     special offices, such as an Office of International Studies/Programs?
3. How might the advising system be strengthened (particularly for students interested in both education and international and foreign language studies)?

**D. Looking ahead / Final Thoughts**

1. What would you most like to do to internationalize?
2. *[For example]* What kinds of strategies, arguments, or incentives might be effective for initiating internationalization for the pre-service education of teachers at your university?
  - changing/increasing the general education requirements?
  - encouraging/facilitating course revisions
  - adding a foreign language requirement?
  - or changing (increasing) the foreign language requirement?
  - more study abroad?
  - more internships abroad?
  - sending faculty overseas for a curriculum revision assignment?
  - including A&S with SCDE faculty for team-taught courses?
  - organizing joint A&S and SCDE faculty workshops for course or curriculum revision?
  - strengthening the advising and career counselling systems?
  - encouraging SCDE students to do a minor in international or area studies?
  - creating an education minor for (A&S international or area studies) majors?
  - recruiting students with international interests?
  - involving more international students in extra-curricular, or curricular, activities?
3. Do departments have enough flexibility to carry out changes that may be needed?
4. What sources of outside incentive funding are available to help with the process?  
     Targeted how?



## Interview Protocol for Use with K-5 Teachers

### A. Teacher's background

UG major:	Year of graduation:
minor:	Year of certification:
Language requirement?	
Internationally-oriented electives?	Social science?
	Foreign language?
	Other humanities?
Graduate work?	Field?
Years of teaching experience:	
Current teaching assignment:	State:
Level:	Subject:
Have you ever lived or studied outside the U.S.?	
Why are you attending this workshop?	

### B. Respondent's (Undergraduate) Curriculum

1. Do you feel that you had enough pre-service training in the subjects you are now teaching?
2. Were content courses for pre-service teachers taught in the School/College/Department of Education (SCDE)?
  - or in Arts and Sciences (A&S)?
  - or both?

If in the SCDE, were A&S faculty involved?

3. If you were an elementary education major, were you able to do a minor?

### C. Teacher Certification Requirements

1. Have the certification requirements changed in recent years?
2. Do you see changes (in certification requirements) that reflect increasing globalization?
  - If so, what are the changes?

### D. Subject standards

1. Have subject standards been modified recently in your state or area to reflect increasing globalization?
2. Have subject standards required you to have additional subject area training?

### E. Curricular (Teaching) Resources

1. Are adequate resources (such as textbooks, multimedia resources, and in-service opportunities) available to enhance your teaching on international topics?
2. Do you use internationally-oriented web-based materials?

### G. Program "Internationalization"

*[For use with teachers whose UG majors were A&S or SCDE]*

			and should it have included	
	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>
1. Did your undergraduate program include				
study abroad?				
practice teaching abroad?				
foreign language requirement?				
If so, what should it be?				
general education requirement				
- of 1 or more non-US or comparative course?				
inclusion of "international" or comparative modules?				

(Did your undergraduate program include)	and should it have included			
	yes	no	yes	no
requirement of a minor in a discipline such as history or geography, with inclusion of non-North American-oriented courses in the minor?				
requirement of a major in a discipline such as history or geography, with inclusion of non-North American-oriented courses in the major?				
special advising about international components?				
attendance at in-service teacher workshops on international topics?				

2. To maximize benefit from study abroad should pre-departure requirements include
  - foreign language requirements (as applicable)?
  - intercultural communication training?
  - background information on specific country history and culture?
3. If practice teaching abroad should be part of the pre-service curriculum, should the preparatory curriculum include
  - foreign language requirements (as applicable)?
  - intercultural communication training?
  - one or more specific country history and culture courses?
  - other?
4. How might students be helped (after an overseas program) to evaluate and integrate their experiences of study or internships abroad with their on-campus undergraduate coursework?
5. What special activities did you undertake to get international exposure while you were an undergraduate?

### G. Advising

1. When you were an undergraduate, did the formal student advising system include
  - special staff for advising?
  - faculty?
  - special offices, such as an office for study abroad?
  - other students/TAs?
  - use of website?
2. Which was the most important for you?
3. Might the formal student advising system have improved your preparation for teaching?
  - How?
4. If you were not an education major, did the formal student advising system include exploration of the possibilities for a teaching career?
  - Should it?

### H. Looking ahead/Final thoughts

1. What kinds of changes in your pre-service training could have given you a more “internationalized” outlook on your teaching?
2. Should the undergraduate training of elementary teachers be expected to take more than eight semesters to accommodate these changes?
  - If so, how many?
3. If you had international experience in your preparation, did it help you in getting your job?
  - And in your teaching responsibilities?
4. If outside funding were available to “internationalize” your undergraduate training, what should be the target of those funds?