

## **Promoting International Options for the Teacher-in-Training A Research Report**

What can be done to expose an undergraduate teacher-in-training to the diversity of the wider world, in this era of “globalization”? And what might be the obstacles to curriculum “internationalization” for the prospective teacher? These were my questions some seven years ago when I began a quest for answers. The purpose of this presentation is to share findings from my resulting research on the problems and prospects for internationalizing the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers in the U.S.

You may have another question: Why is “internationalization” needed? The first part of an answer is simply to mention the many current news stories that involve other countries and our relations to them, indicating the extent to which today’s students must be trained to appreciate diversity – and to compete – on a global scale. In 2006 some 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> 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> Then, 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> NACADA members working with prospective teachers should take note.

Meanwhile, my research has yielded other answers, along the same line: The large majority of the current teachers in my study wished they had had more foreign language study, more non-U.S. courses, and study abroad. Few, as undergraduates, had had special advising about international options and a whopping 95% of them felt that their undergraduate experience should have included it.

It will probably be no surprise to NACADA members and conference participants that the most salient findings from my research point to advising, and particularly first-year advising, as a crucial in any

---

<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)

efforts to expose prospective teachers to more international options, including study abroad and foreign language training, to prepare them to help others (their own eventual students) begin to appreciate the world's diversity. So, are advisors trained about the international content and exposure needed by teachers? Nearly 75% of the Education folks that I interviewed think that they are not. Nor is "international" mentioned in the detailed 2003 Academic Advising Standards and Guidelines of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, although diversity and respect for other cultures are among the criteria. Many – more than 85% of my recent interviewees – felt that student advising about international options should be improved, and I heard a lot of suggestions about how to do so.

This evening I can share some ideas about how advising systems could be – should be, and on some campuses have been – tweaked to strengthen this important dimension of teacher training, notwithstanding the many constraints in the teacher education curriculum.

But first, a little background. 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 with Schools of Education, I became part of a research team evaluating the long-term impact of one of those programs.<sup>4</sup> Although that project included one or two questions about teacher education, but it did not yield much helpful information about 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. My first grant, completed in 2003,<sup>5</sup> focused mainly on the undergraduate, pre-service training of the secondary school teacher – and I reported on that to some of you in Salt Lake City. The current grant builds on the first, with emphasis now on undergraduate preparation for elementary level teaching. All three grants were competitively awarded under the U. S. Department of Education's Title VI International Research and Studies Program.

Also by way of background, I might report that from the preliminary research for this project I learned that previous work on the subject<sup>6</sup> had pinpointed two activities that have been used by Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs) 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 faculty who were sent overseas had no mandate to internationalize their course offerings on their return, and that little attention was given to the students' general, home-campus experience. So more research on options and strategies was needed.

## **Methodology**

The methodology has been similar for both teacher education research projects. The data were collected in nearly 400 structured but open-ended interviews (conducted by myself) with deans, faculty,

---

<sup>4</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, and Barbara B. Burn, *Federal Funding for International Studies: Does it Help? Does it Matter? Long-Term Impacts of Federal Funding on International Studies and Foreign Language Programs: A Research Report*, University of Massachusetts (Amherst), 1999.

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

<sup>6</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).

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, for SCDEs, and for senior administrators. Questions about advising were asked primarily of the SCDE and Arts and Sciences respondents. Most interview questions 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 seems to have elicited more systematic data on several topics. Another difference in the second phase is that most interviews were completed, if necessary by telephone. Both of these adjustments elicited more systematic and complete data on several topics for the second phase interviews.

In addition, using still another set of questions (also somewhat revised in the second phase), views were collected by interview or by questionnaire from nearly 120 current teachers, the majority of whom are working at the elementary level. They too were asked about their experience with advisors.

The total number of teacher and university respondents is over 500. All the second phase protocols will be included in the final report, soon to be completed.

Another important part of the project's methodology has been a small group of advisors who have met at several points in the process and have contributed as well through electronic discussions. They were drawn from the ranks of Education faculty, the K-12 teaching community, Title VI National Resource Center directors and outreach coordinators, and senior university administrators. They have helped enormously in refining the interview protocols and procedures and in reviewing the findings, recommendations, and dissemination strategies.

Considerable thought was given to development of a representative sample in setting up the interview schedule. The university interviews were conducted on 41 campuses (actually 42, with one dropped in 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 included. 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. The average number of interviews per campus (in person or by telephone) was more than six.

However, because the numbers of respondents in several subcategories (such as Education advisors) are relatively small, the study must be considered an exploratory one, pointing to topics that need to be studied further, and more rigorously. Furthermore, because of the nature of my own contacts with many of the institutions, it is probable that the data collected are somewhat biased in favor of the need for more internationalization throughout our educational system. In any event, the amount of data collected for further analysis is daunting; only a small portion is summarized in this paper.

### **Defining Internationalization**

As already noted, findings from earlier studies indicated that internationalization efforts in teacher training programs concentrated on only two types of activity – sending a few students abroad for a semester (or less) and sending faculty abroad, often with no special assignment or mandate. Because other research has shown that fewer than 3% of all undergraduates are able to study abroad,<sup>7</sup> and because my research

---

<sup>7</sup> Madeleine F. Green, "Joining the World" in *Change*, May/June 2002; the absolute numbers have increased some since 2002, but the proportion of total postsecondary enrollments has not, according to Madeleine Green, quoted in

indicates that the percentages are even lower for prospective teachers,<sup>8</sup> our internationalization definition was broadened to include many on-campus activities 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 responses to the “defining” question, ultimately describing more than 25 activities, will be included in my final report and in the meantime are available on my website, as part of other papers.<sup>9</sup> The activities cover a broad range of campus activity – curriculum plus extracurricular and overseas activities. NACADA members may find it notable that only one university interviewee (of the nearly 400) volunteered that her/his institution’s internationalization efforts have included the advising system.

Generally, of course, respondents in the advisor category were familiar with most of the international resources that I asked about, but even so, comparing their responses to others at the same institution, I did not find complete consistency, particularly on issues such as language requirements, overseas internships, and even the general education requirements. (Unfortunately, because time was limited in many of the interviews with advisors, all too often I was not able to spend time on this question. Nor did my interviews include a substantial number of professional advisors.)

## **Advising Patterns**

### **Who Does It?**

Who does undergraduate academic advising was a question asked of nearly all respondents on each campus. The responses are summarized here in Table 1. 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, the senior administrators were asked whether advising is done the same way throughout their institutions and about half told me that it is not. However, it may be relevant that while about 70% of the senior administrators at research universities reported that the advising system is the not same throughout their institutions, about the same proportion of senior administrators at comprehensive universities reported the opposite. One might wonder whether this is a difference between research and comprehensive universities or, possibly, whether this might be evidence that senior university administrators are just not sufficiently familiar with their institutions’ advising systems.

Overall (returning to Table 1), while the most frequent advising source was reported to be faculty at all types of institutions, professional advising staff are clearly playing a very important role, as NACADA members doubtless expect, particularly for first and second year students. Indeed, I learned that increasingly, particularly at large institutions, professional staff are advising departmental majors, with faculty serving a “mentoring” role. The percentages indicating reliance on professional advising staff are substantial at both comprehensive and research universities, and among respondents in SCDEs.

---

“The Global Campus: American Colleges Connect with the Broader World,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (Washington, DC, March 2, 2007) A37.

<sup>8</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).

<sup>9</sup> Ann Imlah Schneider, “Educating Prospective K-12 Educators – and Others – Internationally” (November 2005) available at [www.miami.edu/main/isas05](http://www.miami.edu/main/isas05) and [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org), and “Internationalization and the Professional School: Findings from Research on the Undergraduate Training of K-12 Teachers” (September 2006) available at [www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org).

On the other hand, faculty were nearly always reported as advisors at the liberal arts colleges, often with an official advising office (probably staffed by a part time faculty member) available as needed, it was emphasized, only to support the faculty. A very high percentage also cited faculty as advisors at

**Table 1**  
**Interview Responses about Advising Sources**  
*by types of institutions, with comparisons to SCDEs and current teachers' experience*

<u>Source</u>	<u>Comprehensive Universities</u> <i>N=161</i>	<u>Liberal 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.*

comprehensive universities, although the proportion there went down in the 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>10</sup> The academic advisors for prospective teachers – faculty and professional staff – seemed most likely based in Arts and Sciences, at the college level for “undeclareds” and in departments for majors.

Comparing the data from the second research phase, with its emphasis on elementary education, with the first phase data, it is curious to find that for most categories the response ratios are not very different, but that fewer (proportionally) cited professional staff at research universities than in the first phase, which emphasized teacher training for the secondary school. Might students of elementary education in research universities be a little more dependent on faculty for good advice? That could be unfortunate, because the proportion (of university respondents) citing faculty as advising sources in research universities also went down from the first to the second phase (and perhaps because a few administrators were very strong in not wanting faculty to do any formal advising). From the current teachers, overall a large majority reported getting advice from faculty (compared with about half for professional staff). Of the elementary school teachers, over 80% reported academic advising by faculty, and less than 60% by professional staff, while about half reported both faculty and 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. It is interesting that the lowest university response rate for the advising done in such special offices was at

<sup>10</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.

research universities. Although NACADA data show relatively little reliance on peer advising,<sup>11</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 orientation for overseas programs, drawing on the experience of students just returned from study or internships abroad.<sup>12</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. 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 some prospective elementary school teachers, are likely to do A&S majors; while some elementary education teachers-in-training do major in education, many A&S courses are still required. The SCDE advisors’ expertise is the myriad requirements for certification or licensure rather than in the “content” side of the curriculum.

At the majority of institutions visited for this project, the advising process is well established. However, there are exceptions. A few universities do not require advisor approval of course choices, even for the prospective teacher, so that the academic advisor’s role, if finally consulted relatively late in the student’s career, can be quite circumscribed. And for the SCDE 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 all too many students.

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

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.

Interviewees in both Arts and Sciences and Education were a little taken aback to be asked how advisors are “kept abreast of changing rules (and opportunities) for students.” It was an open-ended question, and most interviewees did offer answers. The main sources are listed in Table 2. It could be argued that many of the categories are overlapping: for example, that “department visits” probably mean meetings (but not necessarily!), as could “word of mouth,” “workshops,” and “faculty orientation.” However, the interviewees seemed to understand the distinctions, often reporting more than one of these.

A close look at the responses is instructive, showing considerable consistency among types of institutions and, comparing deans and faculty, possibly also indicating some “disconnects.” The research universities seem to use meetings and e-mail a bit less than liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities, although one might expect both to be more necessary at the large research university. It is also interesting, indeed curious, that faculty at larger institutions (research universities) might seem to rely on

---

<sup>11</sup> Mabley and Morales, *Current Practices*, 42.

<sup>12</sup> See Schneider, “Study Abroad and the Undergraduate Preparation of K-12 Teachers” ([www.internationaledadvice.org](http://www.internationaledadvice.org)) for more detail about study abroad findings.

**Table 2**  
**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> <i>N=40</i>	<u>Faculty &amp; Advisors</u> <i>N=76</i>	<u>Deans</u> <i>N=8</i>	<u>Faculty &amp; Advisors</u> <i>N=13</i>	<u>Deans</u> <i>N=43</i>	<u>Faculty &amp; Advisors</u> <i>N=80</i>
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, catalogue	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.*

“word of mouth” more than deans or faculty at other types of institutions where one would expect more informal interactions. And it is also curious that deans at research and comprehensive universities seem to attribute more importance to advising workshops for circulating information than many of their colleagues, a point I’ll return to in a minute.

Because the question about the advisors’ sources of information was an open-ended one, many made comments that add texture to the discussion. 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!” At the same institution, a long-time faculty member dismissed the question, saying that getting the needed information out is not an issue. A dean at a larger institution noted that the network of professional advisors works well, but that the faculty members who advise majors are not as well informed. 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.” And an advisor at another (large) institution agreed, replying “osmosis!” A few respondents cited the role of the registrar’s office. Among the Education interviewees, state-level meetings and workshops were often cited, but again, without being clear how the information might be transmitted from 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 Arts and Sciences) remarked that special and constant “lobbying” with advisors is necessary – indeed, it seems that particularly at larger institutions formal systems for spreading information to those doing the advising, not to mention advising about international options, may be rather uneven.

Comparing the interview responses in the first and second phases of this research project could show a few changes over time.

- Across the board, reliance on *newsletters and memos* seems decreased – from nearly 50% in the first phase to less than 25% in the second.
- “*Word of mouth*” decreased even further,

- 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.
- Like *faculty orientation*, websites were still not much cited by interviewees.
- More recently, in the second phase, it seems that deans, and respondents in comprehensive universities, attribute more importance than the first phase respondents to *meetings*, and
- to *e-mail*, for transmitting new information that advisors might need, but not so in research universities, where the more recent percentages reporting use of meetings and e-mail are a bit lower than before.

It seems likely that many of these changes, where they exist, are attributable to changing times rather than to differences in the advising services for prospective secondary, compared to elementary, teachers.

Another possible trend worth noting at both comprehensive and research universities – and according to data from the deans – 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 what strategies might work to improve the international components 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 workshops on advising is indeed a funding issue.

Here I might also report that no one mentioned NACADA’s training resources. Might NACADA consider including international components in *its* resources?

### *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 she/he learns about these possibilities was the next question, 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 and including the students, was posters, or fliers (79%). 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. Other sources were also mentioned: admission materials, residence halls and foreign language houses, videos, socials for study abroad returnees, the student union, study abroad fairs, celebrations of international education week, the university radio and TV stations, and catalogues. High school awareness and counselling were also suggested. Among the *least* cited were advisors (8%). Because the 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, but it does seem likely that there would be few differences on this point.

However, from comparison of responses at the three types of institutions, exceptions to the general drift of the responses above may be worth noting. 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 an important role, as does “word of mouth,” while their offices of international programs and student clubs and meetings seem to be less active than at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges. If advising activity is an indicator of institutional internationalization efforts, then it might seem that the comprehensive universities may be more proactive about internationalization than many research universities.

A sobering aspect of the responses to this question is how many of the information sources for students may be too much taken for granted – how seldom cited were sources such as freshman orientation that one might expect to be high on the list. Pre-freshman information was even less cited, yet students in teacher education programs must start planning for most international activity even before they register for freshman year classes. Most interesting is the fact that 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 of student initiative. And at one research university I heard that fliers about international activities are rarely even posted in the Education buildings – further diminishing the possibility that students in Education programs might learn about any kind of international option.

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, surely including advisors like yourselves.

### **Recruiting Future Teachers**

Most of the interview questions 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 but undecided about their ultimate career plans? In the Arts and Sciences interviews I asked three questions, all open-ended, about career counselling. Again, the interviewees were surprised to be asked. For many, with the possible exception of foreign language faculty, steering students toward a teaching career seemed to be a new idea.

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

The responses were sparse for the first question about how A&S students learn about career possibilities in the teaching field. Only at comprehensive universities did a substantial number of interviewees (75%) cite advisors, probably reflecting the original missions of their institutions (as “normal schools”). The comparable percentages were 40% at liberal arts colleges and only 16% at research universities. Deans were a little more likely to point to advisors’ responsibility on this point, although faculty and advisors themselves, particularly at comprehensive universities, also acknowledged it. Career counselling offices and career fairs (combined) are also major sources of information at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, while they were cited by less than half of the respondents at research universities.

Looking at the data in another way, a majority of the deans, faculty, and advisors cited the career counselling offices, and their career fairs. Other sources of career information, mentioned by four or fewer respondents each, were pre-application orientation, freshman orientation, an introductory course, volunteer

internships or service learning projects, and brochures, as well as meetings on careers organized by A&S departments, sometimes bringing in alumni and others to talk about their experiences. A few others relied on recruiting that might be done by the institution's SCDE. Several, again, noted reliance on 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 is apparently rather low on the agenda of Arts and Sciences faculty and advisors.

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

The next question on career counselling 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 send them to the SCDE; less than 20% would send them to both the career office and the SCDE. Interestingly, a substantial number suggested that the faculty advisor would provide career counselling – which led to the next question:

### *How Are Advisors Prepared for Career Counselling?*

The question was actually a little more nuanced: "How are advisors prepared to help students in foreign language and in international and area studies fields discover their vocations for teaching?" Several deans were quite frank, responding that there is very little preparation, that advisors try to respond only to questions posed by students, or 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, but on all too many campuses I heard that such interactions are relatively rare. Some urged students to undertake some volunteer activities that involved teaching, to test their interests. A few mentioned, again, the introductory freshman course, or cited occasional meetings for advisors about career counselling, but mostly they were "learning by doing" and just did not know about any preparation for this kind of advising – a situation of possible concern for all students, not just those with international interests.

### **What might be done?**

The final question on advising asked how to strengthen the system for advising about international exposure and the final group of interview questions asked in several ways about strategies for improving international exposure for teachers. While many ideas were offered, 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.

Another question about advising was asked only of the Arts and Sciences interviewees – whether advisors are in a position to encourage students to participate in "internationally-oriented" extracurricular options, such as foreign 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 previous paragraphs. The responses to the various questions indicate that international options are rarely a part of advisors' agendas.

### The Checklist

I did learn early in the project that most advisors have developed checklists to guide students directly and/or guide advisors' discussions with students, but 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 two required courses that might be described as "international." On the other hand, little more than 25% have any foreign language requirement, and of those that do, the average requirement is minimal.<sup>13</sup> The sheets seldom show space for electives for teachers-in-training, confirming the problem most frequently cited as an obstacle to "internationalization" of the prospective teacher's program: very limited space in the curriculum, combined with state-level pressures to reduce the time required for their training.

Even more to the point, however: not one of these checklists appears to provide a reference to optional international experiences. The one possible exception – even among institutions with "international" in their mission statements – is a large research university with web pages for checklists that include a sidebar link to study abroad information. In two other instances, the packages that I was given with the checklist information about requirements and curricula included fliers for overseas internship options. Even though none of the interviewees reported any 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 training, since most of the options (referenced in the "defining" section) are available on most campuses.

### More OIP Interaction

Although two of the campuses visited did not have offices of international programs (OIPs), the majority – 95% – do. Even the campuses without such offices were making plans to establish them, and the roles of such offices are being strengthened on the many campuses where they do exist.<sup>14</sup> Although in many instances the OIP office staff may be stretched too thin, it is likely to be 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;
- including advisors in the evaluation of overseas programs;
- participation in freshman orientation;
- workshops for all advisors (faculty, professional advising staff, and admissions officers);
- organizing an "advisors' night" at the OIP;
- improving interactions with advisors at two-year colleges, possibly with a special series of workshops;
- organizing study abroad fairs;
- networking with an advisor knowledgeable about study and internships abroad in each department;

---

<sup>13</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>14</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).

- strengthening international components of initial faculty orientation;
- organizing debriefings by faculty returning from overseas trips;
- formation of a university-wide committee to develop international initiatives and provide liaison with departments;
- attendance at department meetings, to update faculty about coming international activities;
- encouraging more attention to international content in curriculum committee deliberations;
- preparation of materials about international options for both advisors and students;
- distributing such materials in all advising offices;
- organizing student meetings;
- 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.

One hopes that NACADA members welcome such initiatives. Indeed, perhaps you will encourage your OIP to take on any of these activities that may not be happening yet on your campus – and then participate enthusiastically. Nearly all the students I talked with felt that more could and should be done to inform them about the possibilities for international exposure. You should be further encouraged to do so by the responses of current teachers. Nearly 90% reported that as undergraduates they had not had special advising about international options, and 80% felt that a stronger formal advising system could have improved their preparation for teaching.

Might there be obstacles? Most of you will probably answer “yes!” Problems that I heard about most frequently are the related issues of limited time, staff, and money. One dean mentioned a mindset that needs to be changed – that advising has too long been considered to be strictly a monitoring function. Another cited inertia. On a few campuses I heard about union contracts that specify faculty as the only advisors, implying more organizational challenges to systematic change, and on one such campus, I learned that required faculty office hours are also limited by the union contract. A few faculty suggested that advising would be taken more seriously if included in their own evaluations. 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. A small number of faculty claimed to know very little about the advising system, but most did have ideas to share, as reflected above.

Another set of challenges in improving 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 the 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.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The foregoing report mentions a number of suggestions for increasing attention to international exposure – for adding diversity – in the advising processes. In addition, we have developed a fairly extensive set of formal recommendations arising 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. All will be included in the final report, which will be ready soon and which I will post on my website. For purposes of this presentation, I include a partial list of the formal recommendations related (now or prospectively) to advising, as they are probably most relevant to participants in this conference. Here is a partial list of recommendations for your consideration:

### ***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;
  - 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:***

- 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; and
- 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 for 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.

In addition, I would urge NACADA to give more visibility to international dimensions as it contributes to the professional development of its members.

Thank you for your attention. I would be pleased to have your comments and suggestions on this important topic.