

Internationalization – and History – in the Training of K-12 Teachers

Findings from Research on the Undergraduate Training of K-12 Teachers

The past year's *Perspectives* have brought us lively and provocative AHA discussions about teacher education, the importance of history in K-12 curricula, and the internationalization of history – which is very encouraging, coming after I proposed doing this paper on internationalization and history in the training of K-12 teachers. I have been working on these topics directly or indirectly for several years, with grants from the U.S. Department of Education to study the problems and prospects for internationalizing the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers here in the U.S. Now I want to report briefly on my findings and recommendations, and to suggest some important implications for AHA members. The findings touch on several aspects of the student experience – advising, curriculum and faculty development, language instruction, overseas experience, and governance.

What got me involved in this project? After many years as a program officer at the U.S. Department of Education, urging Title VI-funded grantees to forge effective curricular linkages with professional schools, and particularly Education, I became part of a research team evaluating the long-term impact of one of those programs.¹ For that project we asked one or two questions about teacher training, but the responses seemed unrelated to the preparation of future teachers (focusing rather on faculty development or current teachers), so with the press giving increasing attention to the deficiencies of K-12 education, research seemed needed to learn about the obstacles to an internationalized curriculum for prospective teachers – and ways to overcome them. For work on the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers, my first grant was completed in 2003,² and focused on preparation of the secondary school teacher. The current grant builds on the first, with emphasis now on undergraduate preparation for elementary level teaching. The resulting papers are posted on my website for those who want more details about the findings on the various relevant threads; the final report will be posted there too. All three grants have been funded – competitively – under the HEA Title VI International Research and Studies Program.

Methodology

The methodology has been similar for both teacher education projects. I collected the data in nearly 400 structured but open-ended interviews with deans, faculty, and advisors in both Arts and Sciences and Education, with Education students, and with senior administrators. Although many of the questions were similar for all groups, somewhat different protocols were used for Arts and Sciences (A&S), for the Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs), and for senior administrators. Most interview questions

¹ 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.

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

were the same in both phases, but, drawing on the data from the first phase, a number of second phase questions included menus of possible responses – which elicited more systematic data on several topics.

In addition, 119 current teachers shared their ideas by interview or by questionnaire, using still another set of questions. A majority of the participating teachers are working at the elementary level.

The university interviews were conducted on 41 campuses at both research (20) and comprehensive (17) universities and at liberal arts colleges (4), nationwide, in 19 states plus DC, on both coasts and in the midwest, the southeast and the southwest. 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 in second site visits or by telephone. The average number of interviews per campus was more than six, resulting in a daunting amount of data which I hope to summarize enough to provoke discussion. However, with relatively small numbers of respondents in several sub-categories (such as Education advisors), the study is still exploratory, pointing to topics that need to be studied further, and more systematically.

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

Defining Internationalization

Findings from a few studies in the 1970s and 1980s indicated that internationalization efforts in teacher training programs concentrated on only two types of activity – sending a few students abroad for a semester or so, and sending faculty abroad, although with no special assignment or mandate. Because other research has shown that fewer than 5% of all undergraduates are able to study abroad,³ and because no research has demonstrated that faculty travel automatically affects course content,⁴ our definition of internationalization includes a wide range of on-campus activity as well as various opportunities abroad. The first interview question asked about a series of activities that might be taking place at the institution. Most were direct questions, but respondents were invited to report other activities as well. My final report will include discussion of these responses – information, it should be emphasized, that came from the interviewees and is not necessarily definitive about their institutions' resources and services. The data can be analyzed by type of institution and by source (i.e., A&S, SCDE, and senior administrators).

Here, by way of summary, I will point out that, while including student and faculty experience abroad, the list, shown here in Table 1, covers some twenty other activities as well, mostly on the home campus. Perhaps the good news in this table is that the comprehensive universities – where most K-12 teachers do their undergraduate work – seem to be doing a wide variety of internationalizing activity and even possibly a bit wider than the research universities. However, the other side of this coin is probably that research universities may not in fact be exercising as much “internationalizing” leadership as they think – at least from the information I found in the interviews. I might note another interesting bit of information here: Only one interviewee out of nearly 400 mentioned attention to the advising process, a matter for more discussion below.

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

⁴ Findings in this study indicate that faculty members seldom travel for course development reasons, although many assume that faculty travel does affect course content.

Table 1
Interview Responses: Defining Internationalization

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Comments</u>
	N=386	Reported by interviewees...
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%)	
Language requirement		Nature of requirement not specified
- institution-wide	140 (36%)	Reported by only 25% at research universities, 74% at liberal arts colleges
- only for some departments/colleges	123 (32%)	SCDEs rarely have requirement
Possibility of a major in discipline such as history, including non-US content	329 (85%)	80% or more in all categories
International students as cultural resources in courses	321 (83%)	Least at research universities and by SCDEs
International module(s) in general education courses	310 (80%)	Least for SCDEs, and at research universities
Possibility of a minor in discipline such as history, including non-US content	297 (77%)	Reported by less than 65% in SCDEs
General education requirement of one non-US or comparative course	214 (55%)	Less than 50% in SCDEs, and by only 26% in liberal arts colleges
* Heritage communities as cultural resources in courses	144 (37%)	More than 40% at comprehensive universities
* Language-across-the-Curriculum	70 (18%)	More than 25% only at research universities
** Internet, international video hook-ups	10 (3%)	
** Curriculum permeated with non-US content	4 (1%)	Only reported at liberal arts colleges
** Student theses	1	
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

Well, do all of these activities really concern participants at this AHA conference? Senior administrators were asked whether all of the activities we had discussed were available to undergraduates throughout the university; the answer was uniformly “yes,” indicating that all could have an impact on students in Education and other professional programs. Just as important, as most AHA members know, and as readers of the discussions in *Perspectives* have been reminded, any undergraduate student in both elementary and secondary teacher certification or licensure program must take the majority of her or his courses in Arts and Sciences fields, some to meet general education requirements and some to meet the highly prescribed curricular requirements for certification. History faculty are surely involved with curriculum discussions and are likely to have prospective teachers at least in introductory level classes. And they may also be advising students, so their awareness of the full range of possibilities for students to be “internationally” exposed takes on relevance in that context too.

Findings

At this point, let me anticipate one or two questions. Is increased “internationalization” for prospective teachers needed? What activities are deemed desirable?

The current teachers responded clearly on these points.⁵ Generally, only about half of the teachers participating in the survey felt that they had had enough pre-service training in the subjects they are now teaching – and most reported getting their “content” training in Arts and Sciences. A majority of them had not had an undergraduate foreign language requirement, yet 90% wish they had. About half reported meeting a general education requirement of one or more non-U.S. courses, while 97% felt there should be such a requirement. While only 17% had done a required minor that included non-North American-oriented courses, more than 75% said there should be such a requirement. Indeed, the introduction to the AHA’s recent report to the American Council on Education about internationalization⁶ states that “Such a perspective is essential if [students] are to make sense of the world they confront.”

Two thirds of the responding teachers reported that the recently modified standards which they are required to meet (and also the standards for the tests that their students must pass) do not reflect increasing globalization. At the same time, many of the Education deans, faculty, and advisors participating in the project clearly recognize the basic need for this country to do more to develop a globally competent workforce, and are searching for ways to increase their students’ international (and “multicultural”) exposure, but feel seriously constrained by the many curricular requirements for their students, combined with state-level demands for reductions in time-to-degree to alleviate teacher shortages. Several commented that the interview had given them some ideas, and they in turn passed on many ideas to the interviewer.

Advising

Strengthening of academic and career advising systems came out at the top of the list of suggested strategies for “internationalizing.” Indeed, it was a topic that just about all interviewees wanted to talk about. Some 85% of the interviewees felt that the process needs improvement — and in the more recent phase, the percentage was even higher at research universities. Only 10% of the current teachers had received special

⁵ These were discussed in more detail in a presentation prepared for the Wisconsin Outreach Conference, available at www.internationaladvice.org.

⁶ 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>.

advising about international options and nearly 90% said their undergraduate experience should have included it.

At nearly all the institutions where interviews were conducted, the students preparing for teaching careers enter their postsecondary training through Arts and Sciences, where they take required general education courses and other prerequisites for the Education programs in their first two years. Do students in professional programs make the best use of their pre-major options for international exposure? The students I interviewed indicated that they probably had not, even at institutions with a wide range of international activities. Internationally-aware advising, even before matriculation, could make a difference in course selection, particularly for students wanting a study abroad experience and surely for those interested in foreign language study.

Who does undergraduate academic advising? The patterns vary not only from institution to institution but also from college to college, and even department to department, within institutions. Most academic advising is done by faculty, although increasingly it is done by professional advising staff, with faculty serving a “mentoring” role. The advisors – faculty or professional staff – are most likely based in Arts and Sciences (at the college level for “undeclareds” and in departments for majors). The practices I learned about are generally similar to those reported by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA).⁷ However, for Education students the advising pattern becomes increasingly confusing and is all the more important, particularly for the many who transfer from other institutions (70% was the proportion cited in one interview), usually community colleges, and/or who may be first generation college students.

Many institutions (and particularly the liberal arts colleges) do not offer a teacher education major, so students preparing for teaching do Arts and Science majors – this is most likely for the secondary level, but can be the case for prospective elementary school teachers as well. Indeed, in California, where K-12 teachers are required to have done a major in the liberal arts, universities in the CSU system usually offer special content liberal arts majors for students preparing for teaching careers. Students who have decided on career goals early in their undergraduate years are normally enrolled in the teacher education program along with the Arts and Sciences major. Advising by Education staff and faculty is usually available only after these students have been accepted for a teacher education program or, in some instances, when they are considering applying for it, and it normally focuses on what students need to know and do to meet certification requirements. The advising for “content” is most often in Arts and Sciences – and, I would venture, often by faculty in history departments.

How do students receive information about international options and activities? The question was asked in both the Education and Arts and Sciences interviews. Respondents most frequently thought that posters were the medium (although one remarked that fliers about international activities are rarely even posted in the College of Education building!). Also mentioned as information sources were classes, faculty, and other advisors, then the student paper, clubs, and various meetings. Why were faculty and other advisors not mentioned most frequently? Yes, most faculty said, they are in a position to advise students about the full range of curricular and extracurricular activities that increase international exposure. Perhaps they – you? – should be encouraged to do more. Indeed, nearly 350 respondents, including current teachers, would like improvements in the academic and career advising systems. Even on campuses where faculty reported that advising was working well, students said that improvements were needed. But what might be done?

⁷ Wesley R. Habley, and Ricardo H. Morales, *Current Practices in Academic Advising: Final Report on ACT's Fifth National Survey of Academic Advising* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1998), 13. NACADA, 1998)

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

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

- sending advisors on overseas missions, such as evaluation of study abroad programs;
- addition of international options to the standard advising checklist menu;
- special attention to international options in the advising for first year students;
- increasing the international content of freshman orientation;
- improved website information; and
- more open houses for international programs, including foreign language “days.”

Arts and Sciences interviewees were also asked questions on career advising. How do Arts and Sciences majors learn about teaching careers? Advisors were most frequently cited, although not by much. A few faculty members told me that they did not encourage teaching because it might not be well paid, and most respondents said quite frankly that they are not prepared to help their students discover their vocations for teaching. Is this an area that history faculty/advisors might productively re-visit?

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

Curriculum Development

As noted above, the course requirements for prospective teachers are very prescriptive, since the courses needed for certification or licensure are added to at least twice as many “content” and general education courses, leaving little room for electives. From more than half of the institutions visited I obtained advising checklists, but found that making comparisons between them is not simple for reasons such as their reliance on institution-specific codes (not explained on the sheet itself), likely overlapping course titles and content (from one institution to another), and imprecision about the general education requirements that could fill some of the apparent gaps. Less than a third of the checklists show the possibility of any electives (which could be foreign language or other internationally-oriented courses), and for that third the average number of elective courses is less than three.

The good news is that at least 75% of the checklists show a requirement of one or more “world” courses, and one institution seems to require many as four. Furthermore, even if 25% of this sample did not seem to have a requirement for world history, geography, politics, or literature, it may be that general education courses provide some such exposure. Indeed, as each interview began, in both phases, more than 300 respondents said that one or more general education courses have international or comparative components. In the second phase of interviews, more than 50% of the participants reported a general

education requirement of at least one international or comparative course. Should the general education requirements be changed, to add more international exposure? More than half would like to see that happen, but most acknowledged that it would require a great deal of intra-university negotiation to do so, that adding to the general education requirements would be impossible, and that making substitutions could raise many hackles. Yet it was noted by several that this might be the best approach for internationalizing the teacher training experience. Put a little differently, the institutional context and the liberal arts curriculum need to – somehow – provide most of the international exposure that teachers-in-training may receive.

A large number of the current teachers also suggested that having more international courses would be an effective approach, if funds were available. But many university respondents reported that space in the curriculum for additional courses in teacher education programs is very limited, or non-existent, because state legislatures are pressing for prompt completion, capping the number of required courses for the teacher-in-training. What about lengthening the undergraduate teacher education program to be longer than eight semesters? Fewer than a third of the current elementary teachers liked that idea, but the majority of secondary school teachers (many of whom had done graduate work) favored it. A more generally acceptable approach would be the addition of international or comparative components to existing courses in both Arts and Sciences and Education. Indeed, high on the list of preferred strategies for internationalizing teacher education is facilitation of course revisions, or the addition of more international courses (suggested particularly by current teachers). And the AHA report on internationalization focuses on ways to improve international perspectives in general education courses in not only American history but also world history and Western civilization.⁸

Another curricular approach is based on an assumption that the student training for an elementary education career does a major in that field, but can minor in another. When Education interviewees were asked whether Education students might be allowed to minor in internationally-oriented subjects, nearly 75% said yes, and only about 5% were negative. A surprising number of current teachers also liked this approach. How many of you and your colleagues have students whose minor is your field or a discipline that can include non-U.S.-focussed courses, while majoring in Education?

A second question about minors probed options for the Arts and Science major: Might an education minor for Arts and Sciences majors be an effective approach for recruiting prospective teachers? Few SCDEs offer a teacher education minor, or any education minor – teacher certification programs are more demanding than “minors” – and many of the Education interviewees initially responded negatively to the notion, emphasizing that a minor would not be enough for certification. Furthermore, many Education courses are not open to non-Education students. Might a minor serve as an introduction to the profession for the Arts and Sciences – area studies – major, and ultimately serve to shorten a post-baccalaureate certification program for the student who eventually decides on a teaching career? Well, come to think of it, that might be a good idea... The Arts and Sciences faculty I talked with were close to unanimously in favor of an Education minor option for their students. Could you work with your Education colleagues to open more courses for non-Education students and to develop a minor in Education for your majors?

Following the questions about strategies for more internationalization, 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 and 92% of the Arts and Sciences respondents opined that departments do have enough flexibility, while close to 50% of the Education

⁸ Noralee Frankel, and others, *Internationalizing...*

interviewees felt that they do not, probably because of the constraints related to certification requirements and increasing emphasis on standards and testing. So let us now move to more information about how the faculty might make changes.

Faculty Development

Early in the interviews faculty were cited most as the sources of initiative for internationalization efforts. And for the final question asked of all the university interviewees, about how they would want to use a hypothetical outside grant of funds for internationalizing teacher education, a substantial number would target both course revision and faculty development. What kinds of activities were discussed to encourage faculty in the internationalization effort? I asked direct questions about several specific activities.

- As noted, facilitation of **course revision** was favored by many – over 90% in phase two. In the interviews with senior administrators, it seemed clear that all of the institutions visited have funds that could help faculty do this, subject to their interest and university priorities. Again, this approach is implicitly urged as well by the AHA report to the American Council on Education.
- Helping faculty to **work abroad on course development** was favored by many (78% in phase two), in Education as well as in Arts and Sciences – although few (barely 7%) reported having done foreign travel for this purpose. Asked whether faculty experience abroad affects teaching, a large majority replied that it does, particularly citing course revisions which might at the very least be use of more varied examples. At one or two institutions I heard about faculty grants for overseas travel for a variety of primary purposes, but always with a condition that an impact on a course syllabus also be demonstrable. It was also noted, by many, that faculty who travel overseas are much more likely to encourage students to do the same. So it seems that facilitating overseas experience for faculty can advance campus internationalization in several ways.
- **Joint Arts and Sciences and Education faculty workshops** to solve specific curriculum issues (related to internationalization) were approaches liked by a surprising 75% (in phase two), notwithstanding the qualifications voiced by some respondents in Arts and Sciences that the Education folks would probably not like it – and vice versa. In fact, I heard increasingly about successful efforts of this sort already under way, often facilitated by an institutional Center for Teaching and Learning. This might be an exercise that the Arts and Science – and particularly history – 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.⁹
- **Team teaching**, with 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. As you know, administrative problems abound for such efforts (who gets credit for the enrollments? and who pays for the teaching time?), but when deans have found special funding, the concept has seemed to work. Might 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?

⁹ 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.

Yes, the foregoing options 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.

Foreign Language Requirements

As noted earlier, 90% of the current teachers wished that they had attained some foreign language competence as undergraduates. Also, many of the university participants in this project felt that attaining some proficiency in a foreign language is an important piece of the undergraduate experience for prospective teachers. Yet although about two thirds of the respondents reported a language requirement at their institutions, most of those requirements apply only to Arts and Sciences majors. As Table 1 shows, if there is a university requirement, the Education student is very likely to be exempted, except at liberal arts colleges. About 70% of the Education respondents reported no foreign language courses among the elementary education program requirements, and more than 90% reported no state certification requirements for foreign language competence – quite a contrast to the wishes of the current teachers. Of the Education respondents in universities about 70% would like to add or increase a foreign language requirement; the percentage was much higher among the senior administrators and in Arts and Sciences.

Interestingly, however, Education advisors and students and current teachers were the only categories of respondents who would give priority to foreign language instruction if extra funds were available. The obstacles to adding a foreign language requirement are many, the principal one being the limitations on time in the undergraduate teacher education curriculum. Other obstacles cited were the orientation of the foreign language faculty (seemingly more interested in literature than in language instruction), lack of interest within foreign language departments themselves, and inability to teach to a high enough – i.e., usable – proficiency within the limited time that might be available.

Another foreign language question that may be of interest to historians is “Languages-across-the-Curriculum,” which could give faculty members an opportunity to teach and/or use readings in foreign languages. Many interviewees knew nothing about it, even at research universities. Languages-across-the-Curriculum may be an unrealistic goal in the teacher education curriculum, but I mention it in part because several interviewees mentioned, as an obstacle to having a language requirement for prospective teachers, that the language training offered at their institution is unrelated to students’ interests in fields other than literature. Perhaps the existence of such options (and faculty capabilities) would offer different perspectives in courses the student in a professional training program might take.

Other issues related to foreign language requirements and instruction were discussed at a conference on language teaching¹⁰ in 2004 and will be covered in my final report. They should be considered central to planning for internationalization, yet I heard on a campus known for its international orientation that few faculty members see foreign language instruction as a key to internationalization, and that it’s been the language faculty who resist having a requirement, not wanting to teach disinterested students. Furthermore, my data show rather surprising lack of campus knowledge about the existence and/or nature of language requirements, at all types of institutions (research universities, comprehensive universities, and liberal arts colleges) and irrespective of size – on only 41% of the campuses I visited were there consistent responses. This has interesting implications for both advising and overall curriculum planning (and evaluation).

¹⁰ Ann Imlah Schneider, “Language Instruction and Prospective Teachers: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations.” Presented at the Interagency Language Roundtable Showcase, July 29, 2005 and available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

International Experience

As noted earlier, many have defined international education as study abroad. Although the focus of my research has been on the home campus undergraduate experience, I did ask questions about study abroad and have written up those findings too.¹¹ While study abroad was favored as a strategy by more than 90% of my respondents, an appreciable number knew of no Education students actually participating in a study abroad or overseas internship program.

I did learn about several related issues that need to be addressed to make any kind of overseas experience more effective for students. They concern the relationship of study abroad to requirements in the general education part of the curriculum, how the experience may be integrated with the major (or minor), whether internships abroad are feasible (or can be made so) for teachers-in-training, what pre-program preparation is most effective (and needed), and what follow-up practices can increase its effectiveness for returnees, and their fellow students. A number of interviewees, and current teachers, felt that follow-up courses or seminars, and encouragement of presentations and papers drawing on the overseas experience, could serve to amplify the impact of the students' overseas experiences. Here too is a realm in which historians' practices could make a difference – for all students.

Under this heading might also be mentioned the on-campus roles of international students and faculty. Although more than 80% of the campus interviewees reported having international students serve as resources in courses, more than 70% in the second phase agreed that it would be a good idea to involve more of them in curricular and extracurricular activities. About international faculty, in the second phase all of the senior administrators reported having them, but their potential impact may not be institution-wide – at one institution it was noted that nearly all the international faculty are in scientific fields. So do international faculty actually contribute to internationalization? Yes, they do, almost unanimously – through their different perspectives and methodologies, special presentations, faculty seminars, and help in developing exchange and study abroad programs. But how many are teaching the courses taken by students in the professional schools? A surprising number of Education respondents could think of only one or two.

Another question about international influence on the home campus was whether the resources of heritage communities are drawn on in course syllabi. Here the response was less unanimous, although two thirds of the second phase respondents did report use of this kind of teaching resource.

Governance and Policy Issues

On most campuses, a key player in the internationalization process is the Office of International Programs. Your campus probably has one, and it probably provides you and your department with important services such as administration of study abroad and exchange programs, recruitment of international students and faculty, and organizing events such as lectures and film festivals. Additional functions may include providing assistance for outside grant applications and special seminars for faculty.

Directors of such offices were almost always among the interviewees for this project on each campus; the discrepancies between their reports of what they do and the other information garnered on the same campus is another aspect of the topic,¹² and will of course be included in my final report. One discrepancy that might interest historians was emphasized when I compared my data with information from a

¹¹ Ann Imlah Schneider, "Study Abroad and the Undergraduate Preparation of K-12 Teachers," available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

¹² Ann Imlah Schneider, "Research on Internationalizing Teacher Education: The Role of OIPs, and Underrepresented Groups" presented at the AIEA meeting in February 2006 and available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

recent survey done by AIEA.¹³ While my interviews showed relatively few respondents (other than OIP directors) mentioning faculty or curriculum development as an OIP activity, the AIEA data indicate that as many as 75% of its (OIP) respondents cite activity in faculty and/or curriculum development.

Another K-12 policy realm important for historians is formulation of much-discussed standards and certification requirements which I mention here only to acknowledge their relevance and importance. The related issues are discussed in several *Perspectives* articles,¹⁴ and to some extent in another of my papers.¹⁵

Answers to my question about the initiation of internationalization efforts offer more advice for historians. Faculty were the most cited initiators – and from my experience in administering Title VI grants, historians are prominent among such activists. After faculty, the next most frequently cited were senior university administrators (although in a number of conversations they were described as “very supportive” rather than initiators), then college administrators (i.e., Arts and Sciences and Education deans). Some respondents ventured that their institutions had some encouragement, but no actual help from the state for internationalization efforts. And about 80% of the Arts and Sciences respondents – and 73% of the Education faculty – reported impetus for internationalization coming from foreign visitors. These are all sources of support that history faculty should strive to keep “in the loop” if and when they work on international program development.

While you are probably very aware that outside grant funding can play an important part in the initiation of internationalizing efforts, you may be interested to know that the responses to questions about actual sources of incentive funding were very 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 – most likely FIPSE, Department of State, USAID, and the Department of Education (Titles II, III, and/or VI), and also NIH, and NSF. Surprisingly relatively few (for example, a scant 24% of the research university interviewees in the second phase) mentioned the Department of Education’s Title VI. If you are interested in knowing more about that resource, you should visit <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/index.html>.

Conclusions

Given the key players’ pessimism about funding sources, it is not surprising that many of the strategies suggested, and liked, by a considerable number of respondents, are not very expensive. Improved advising might simply make better use of already-existing resources, for example. Many campuses have programs to help faculty improve and update their teaching, so adding an international strand to that activity might similarly be quite cost-effective, or rather, in effect, already budgeted. And historians, as part of the teacher-training community, can and should play a leading role in making the needed changes.

The prospective teacher is trained primarily in the Arts and Sciences and among the Arts and Sciences faculty historians particularly need to give serious attention to their impact on that training by working with faculty in Education, through improvements in course requirements, through faculty and curriculum development to increase the international content of as many courses as possible, and through an advising system that is sensitive to the real options – and needs – for as much international exposure as possible.

¹³ www.aieaworld.org (under Campus and Administrative Programs)

¹⁴ For example, in May and September 2006.

¹⁵ Prepared for the 2006 Wisconsin Outreach Conference, available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

Do you still need to be persuaded to take a more active role in the undergraduate training of teachers? Please remember the current teachers' responses, wishing they had had more non-U.S. courses, more study and internships abroad, more foreign language training, and better advice about the full range of international options.

We have developed recommendations for state and local governments, accrediting agencies, professional associations, outside funders, Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, and institutions of higher education generally. All will be included in the final report, which I hope to have ready and posted on my website within the next few months. For purposes of this paper, I include the recommendations that could be most useful to AHA members. I hope you will also take note of the many questions and suggestions in the foregoing. And of course I welcome your questions, suggestions, and comments.

Recommendations

For institutions of higher education generally:

- implement a wide range of strategies for increasing international exposure for pre-service teachers, among them –
 - add formal international components to student advisory services, beginning in the pre-application phase, to assure the feasibility of maximum international exposure within normal time-to-degree constraints;
 - provide training, and website support, on international options for students, faculty, and professional advisors;
 - foster development of internationally oriented curriculum, through, for example,
 - individual faculty grants (particularly for general education courses),
 - joint workshops for both Arts and Sciences and Education faculty, and
 - hiring faculty with international training and experience;
 - strengthen requirements for foreign language training for all undergraduates, with a goal of attaining at least conversational proficiency in a second language; and
 - review policy and practice for the integration of study and internships abroad in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements.

For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:

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

For outside funders:

- disseminate more widely, and particularly to the teacher education community, information about funding available to initiate and strengthen international studies and foreign language programs that are available to strengthen the training of prospective teachers; and
- provide funding 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.