

Study Abroad and the Undergraduate Preparation of K-12 Teachers

Can undergraduates who want to be teachers include an overseas experience in their preparation? The answer is yes, but in the real world few actually do. The purpose of this presentation is to share findings from my current research on the problems and prospects for internationalizing the undergraduate training of K-12 teachers in the U.S. The main focus of the project is on the domestic, home-campus curriculum, but the study has yielded a number of findings that will interest NAFSA members and conference participants.

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.¹ Although that project included one or two questions about teacher training, the responses to some general “teacher education” questions seemed to focus on faculty development or on outreach to the current K-12 teacher rather than on the undergraduate preparation of future teachers. So when the press was giving increasing attention to the deficiencies of K-12 education in the late 1990s, research seemed needed to learn more about the obstacles to an internationalized (and thus, of course, improved) curriculum for prospective teachers – and ways to overcome them. My first grant, completed in 2003,² focused mainly on the undergraduate, pre-service training of the secondary school teacher. The current grant builds on the first, with emphasis now on undergraduate preparation for elementary level teaching. All three grants 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 in the preliminary research for this project, I learned that previous work in the field³ had pinpointed two activities that have been used by Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education to “internationalize” their programs. One is study abroad for students, and the other is sending faculty abroad. However, it quickly became clear that very few students in teacher training programs were actually doing 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 being given to the students’ general, home-campus experience. Although this overall project focuses on home-campus activity, it has included a number of questions related to study abroad.

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 summarized in *International Studies Perspectives*, April 2004, vol. 5, #3.

³ 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).

Methodology

The methodology has been similar for both of my teacher education projects. The data were collected in nearly 400 structured but open-ended interviews (conducted by myself) with deans, faculty, and advisors in both Arts and Sciences and Education, with Education students, and with senior administrators. Although many of the questions were similar for all interviewees, the interview protocols' emphases differed for Arts and Sciences, for Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs), and for senior administrators. Questions about study abroad were asked primarily of the SCDE and senior administration respondents. The emphases, and most of the questions, were the same in both phases, but the original interview protocols were somewhat revised for the second phase, the main change being that, drawing on the data from the first phase, a number of second phase questions included menus of possible responses – in other words, more detail for some questions. Another difference in the second phase is that in nearly all instances when the interview time was too limited, I completed the conversation later by telephone. Both of these adjustments elicited more systematic and complete data on several topics for the second phase interviews.

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 overseas experience.

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

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, NRC 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 of opinion. To some extent, the sites were chosen because of the researcher's contacts, but many were responses to "cold calls;" in only one instance did an institution decline to participate. 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 was more than six. For the 23 institutions included in both phases, additional second-phase interviews were conducted either by telephone or in second site visits. 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 systematically. Nonetheless, the amount of data collected is daunting; only a small part is summarized in this presentation.

Defining Internationalization

As already noted, findings from a 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, usually with no special assignment or mandate. Because

other research has shown that fewer than 5% of all undergraduates are able to study abroad,⁴ my internationalization definition was broadened to include a wide range of on-campus activity as well as a variety of overseas experiences. To set the stage accordingly in the campus interviews, the first question asked about a series of activities that might be taking place at the institution. Most were direct questions, but respondents were also invited to report other activities.

The many responses to the “defining” question – ultimately describing more than 25 activities – will of course be included in whatever final report I do and in the meantime are available separately and on my website, as part of a paper prepared for an International Studies Association meeting last November.⁵ The activities cover a broad range of campus activity, but at the top of the list is study abroad, with over 90% of the respondents reporting it as a possibility for students at their institution, as shown in Table 1 below. However, NAFSA members may be interested to know that at least one institution reported having no study abroad options for students, unless organized by individual faculty members, and no office to manage study or other activity abroad for students, in part because institutional resources are lacking and in part because of the nature of the student body, which is made up entirely of commuters, a large number of whom are part timers with job and family responsibilities.

Many institutions, while having some infrastructure for study abroad programs, reported little or no participation by teachers-in-training. Indeed, the highest participation rate was about 4% of students in a teacher preparation program – at an institution close to the Mexican border, where location facilitates an almost local exchange program. The more usual study abroad participation rate for prospective teachers was reported in these interviews to be less than 1%. The latest data from the Institute of International Education indicates that only 4% of the students who do study abroad are in Education, and that the 2005 proportion has even decreased slightly from the previous year.⁶ Nonetheless – or perhaps as a corollary of the low participation story – the Education interviewees were a little more eager for increased study

Table 1
Institutional Responses about Study and Internships Abroad

	<u>All</u> <i>N=386</i>	<u>SCDE</u> <i>N=162</i>
Study abroad is an option	91%	86%
Internships abroad are an option	76%	74%
Would like more study abroad participation	73%	76%
Would like more internship participation	55%	61%
	<i>N=247</i>	
One or more specific country history and/or culture courses should be required	9%	7%
Foreign language should be required	6%	6%
OR requirements depend on country/ program	32%	18%
Intercultural communication training should be required	45%	36%

⁴ Madeleine F. Green, “Joining the World” in *Change*, May/June 2002; the numbers have increased some since 2002.

⁵ Ann Imlah Schneider, “Educating Prospective K-12 Educators – and Others – Internationally” (November 2005) available at www.miami.edu/main/isas05 and www.internationaleadvice.org.

⁶ Presentation by Peggy Blumenthal of the Institute of International Education on December 7, 2005 at the American Council on Education.

abroad activity than the overall survey participants. Jumping ahead to the data in Table 2, it is interesting to see the even higher percentage of current teachers (82%) who think that teacher training should include a study abroad experience. This is particularly interesting because in the second phase interviews we learned that more than 55% of the responding teachers had never studied or lived abroad.

Internships abroad were generally cited as options for undergraduates a bit less frequently than study abroad as an activity, by 76% of all the respondents. However, for the prospective teacher an overseas internship of any sort is a much less likely option. Although nearly 74% of the Education respondents said that internships might be arranged and more than half of the Education respondents would like to have more internships, second phase interviewees at eleven institutions reported that internships abroad are just not possible for the elementary school teacher in training. Of the teacher preparation programs that do offer an overseas internship option, a few reports on the number of participants were in the 20-25/year range, and one or two were higher, but the numbers are more likely to be less than ten/year – in percentage terms, usually less than 1% of the teachers-in-training. The Education interviewees were a bit less enthusiastic about wanting more internships abroad than they were about study abroad, probably because of the complicated logistics needed for placement and supervision. Fewer than 10% of the current teachers had done internships abroad, in contrast to their responses about study abroad, and the majority favoring such an internship option for future teachers was also smaller than for study abroad (Table 2).

Preparation for Overseas Experience

How students even learn that study abroad could be an option was explored at several points in most of the interviews. It became clear that the advising process is key, and that inclusion of any and all international exposure, particularly overseas, must be addressed in pre-freshman advising for the would-be teacher. 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 early. (I will deal with advising issues in more detail in another paper, and will argue that advising is crucial to the entire internationalization process.) A few commented that study abroad for teachers in training must be done during the first two undergraduate years, rather than the more traditional junior year, because of the on-campus required courses leading to certification and only open to upperclassmen.

At all kinds of institutions, I heard that students learn about “international” mostly through posters and fliers, and also (but less frequently) from faculty, advisors, and class presentations. Sources also cited were the student paper and Offices of International Programs. And how do advisors learn about international options? A good question, and it brought a variety of answers, some quite unsatisfactory. When asked about the impact of faculty experience overseas, a number of interviewees mentioned that faculty returnees give much more encouragement to study abroad experiences for their students. Similarly, when asked about the impact of having international faculty on campus, respondents often cited their assistance with and encouragement of study abroad programs.

Questions about how students actually are, or should be, prepared for study abroad programs were asked in the Education and senior administrator interviews, and in the survey of current teachers. Table 1 shows some of the institutional responses. Generally, few reported (or knew of) requirements that study abroad, or internship, participants take one or more specific country history and/or culture courses,

although several, particularly those in the Office of International Programs (OIPs)⁷ group, added that the pre-departure orientation does include background instruction on the destination country.

Similarly, foreign language requirements for all study abroad programs seem to be relatively rare. However, nearly a third of all interviewees added that the foreign language requirements depend on the destination country. One might have expected that just counting the students planning to be K-12 foreign language teachers would yield stronger indications for this requirement – but it turns out that many states permit certification of foreign language teachers even when they have had no experience in a country where “their” language is spoken. (Foreign language issues are discussed in more detail in a paper presented last summer at the Inter-Agency Roundtable Showcase⁸ and will be covered again, of course, in my final report.) Interestingly, the proportion of Education interviewees reporting language requirements “for some countries” was much less, perhaps reflecting a greater tendency to send students to English-speaking countries or, for internships, to American (usually Department of Defense) schools overseas.

Related to the foreign language requirement issue was a question about pre-departure training in intercultural communication. It seems to be required a little more often than any level of foreign language proficiency, but the amount of this training varied considerably – and it was still reported by less than half, among both the Education and senior administration interviewees.

Interviewees in the senior administration category had some interesting additional answers to the question about preparation. Several, whose students were likely to participate in programs organized by other institutions, said simply that the orientation was the responsibility of the provider, or that the orientation was primarily “in country.” Others cited courses that serve as preparation or some special preparatory workshops with both faculty and students, particularly when the study abroad is a short-term overseas module in an on-campus course. One interviewee mentioned inclusion of parents in the

Table 2
Current Teachers: Responses about Study and Internships Abroad

	<u>Study Abroad</u>		<u>Internships Abroad</u>	
	<u>All</u> N=119	<u>Elem.</u> N=64	<u>All</u> N=119	<u>Elem.</u> N=64
UG program included	32%	34%	8%	11%
UG program should include	82%	74%	59%	55%
Foreign language (as applicable) should be required for	91%	95%	97%	96%
One or more specific country history and/or culture courses should be required before... [going] abroad	95%	91%	99%	98%
Intercultural communication training should be required for	95%	93%	99%	98%

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.

⁷ Ann Imlah Schneider, “Research on Internationalizing Teacher Education: The Role of OIPs, and Underrepresented Groups,” presented at the AIEA February 2006 Conference and available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

⁹ Ann Imlah Schneider, “Language Instruction and Prospective Teachers: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations,” presented at the ILR Showcase, July 29, 2005, and available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

orientation programs. Some Offices of International Programs insist on individual interviews with all prospective study abroad participants. And again the role of advisors was frequently noted.

University interviewees in Education, as well as senior administrators, were asked a few more questions about overseas experience as part of the prospective teachers' preparation for. The majority did think that study abroad is integrated with the home campus curriculum, but in Education it was barely more than half of the respondents. And yes, the student could get course credit for the completed study abroad, although more often than not it would be restricted to general education requirements. A few replied in a rather off-handed way that it would be up to the student's advisor. I'll discuss this in a little more detail later.

The current teachers were also asked questions about what preparation should be required for study and internships abroad, and their answers are shown in Table 2. Again their responses compare interestingly to the university responses, with even higher percentages, including the elementary teachers, opining that overseas programs should be preceded by specific country history and/or culture courses, by foreign language study, and by intercultural communication training.

Teaching Internships Abroad

As noted earlier, internships abroad for teachers present a number of logistical challenges. For starters, many states require that a significant part, or even all, of the prospective teacher's practicum be done in the state. Some require that the practice teaching be in an American setting, which can be an American school abroad or a part of the Department of Defense school network. Of those who were able to tell me about their placements, 25% were using the DoD schools, 22% had worked out arrangements with American overseas schools, and 53% were able to make placements at local schools. Most – 75% – undertook practice teaching abroad rather than the observation phase because, I learned, students' observation experience, which precedes practice teaching, is normally a part of a required Education course. On the other hand, several Education interviewees do prefer organizing an observation experience abroad, probably because of certification and evaluation requirements related to the practicum.

And how are the student teachers supervised for their practice teaching overseas? A variety of methods are used, often in combination. Some rely on host teachers and/or host university faculty. A few reported bringing prospective supervising host teachers (and/or university faculty) to their institutions for special orientation and familiarization with American methods and expectations from the internships – in some instances, because such training is required by state law. Occasionally a host university faculty member will be made an adjunct to the home (U.S.) campus to meet state requirements. Home campus faculty are often sent abroad to observe for a few days during the students' internship period. Seldom did I hear about home university faculty spending the entire internship period on site. Several universities seem to rely heavily on e-mail correspondence with the students overseas, in combination with videos recording student performance. Curiously, on the same campus I sometimes got differing responses to this question, which probably indicates that most programs use more than one approach to student supervision. Another arrangement, although rare, is a consortium one, with a lead institution organizing and supervising internships abroad for several SCDEs.

Post-Program Activity

Education respondents and current teachers were asked about follow-up to overseas programs – how students are, or should be, helped to evaluate and integrate their overseas experiences with on-campus

coursework. These were clearly issues that many interviewees had not thought about, and responses were sparse, particularly in the first phase of the project. To both parts of the question, some twenty interviewees indicated that no effort is made. However several commented that they should give the matter increased attention. A few said that evaluation and integration were dependent on the students' initiative. Others, after reporting on internships, said that because the overseas experience took place at the very end of the undergraduate experience, there was no opportunity for post-program evaluation, although at least one reported that students returned after graduation for an evaluation workshop.

From those who are making an effort to help students with their "re-entry," several routes are followed.

- Journaling is used by several to foster evaluation during the overseas program, as are on-line discussions.
- "Debriefing" or "exit interviews" were mentioned by more than a dozen, either before or after return.
- Special advising – or reliance on advisors – was also cited by more than a dozen.
- Some programs have a special course for returnees; one cited a "post-practicum seminar."
- A few have organized special receptions for returnees.
- Presentations on campus were also mentioned by several, sometimes to student clubs, to brown bag lunches, during international education week, and sometimes in connection with OIP student recruitment for a next round of study abroad programs.
- Articles for newsletters and campus papers are another encouraged presentation format.
- Presentations off campus are also encouraged, at professional and other meetings.
- A few students work for the OIP after their return.

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

- during their time abroad students are required to submit audio tapes and written assignments.
- the teaching portfolio preparation includes an overseas component.
- capstone courses are expected to include findings from any overseas experience.
- a required research project on practice teaching is shared with other students, or a senior project might be based on experience abroad.
- students are encouraged to use overseas examples in their own work on lesson plans.

Senior administration interviewees voiced a few more ideas about the curriculum integration question. They also underlined the importance of advance planning and advisors' roles in assuring the relevance of the student's experience abroad. One university president would like to have returnees assume a formalized mentoring role for students about to go. Another initiative is an organization for students who have travelled abroad or want to.

The current teachers were also asked about how study and internships abroad might be integrated with the on-campus undergraduate curriculum, and a surprising number offered ideas. Many, of course, like the university respondents, emphasized the importance of returnees' presentations to classes and student clubs on campus, with one specifying that the presentations include photos and possibly other artefacts from the experience. The returnees' role in finding "new recruits" was also mentioned. The teachers' additional suggestions are –

- writing up notes about their experience to be on file for others to read;
- continuing their foreign language classes;
- doing community service with heritage communities, in a language-related area;
- participating in in-service programs for current teachers;
- contributing to a course on comparative education; and
- presentations to K-12 classes.

Perhaps the reader will find no new ideas here, but given the number of interviewees who seemed not to have even thought about this aspect of campus internationalization, it seems likely that some of these relatively low-cost activities could represent some reinforcing and clarifying changes for students.

Study Abroad for Future Teachers?

All the university interviewees were asked to think about a variety of strategies – and the problems that might be related – for achieving more international exposure for prospective teachers. Like the data on defining internationalization, data on the responses about strategies are available in the paper prepared last November.⁹ Study abroad is very close to the top of the list. Some 70% of all interviewees (including current teachers) would like to have more – and as Table 1 shows, Education respondents were even more enthusiastic about study abroad as a strategy than the overall survey participants.

What are the challenges to having more teachers-in-training participate in overseas programs? The Education interviews revealed many reasons, the most-mentioned being financial expense – expense for the student and/or the organizing and home institutions and/or faculty supervision time. Finding home campus replacements for faculty who direct overseas programs for a year or semester can be a problem. Some felt there are problems for students needing to use financial aid overseas. Another short commodity in teacher training programs is time, and it was very frequently cited as a problem for students interested in studying overseas. In order to increase the supply of teachers, a number of states are now imposing, or even lowering, limits on the number of courses a teacher-in-training may be required to take before graduation. Here is where good advising can play an important role, helping the student work out a plan in which any study to be done in another institution (internationally) would meet requirements for either general education or the subject major – or even one or more of the courses required for certification.

Another important issue is probably more 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. Many have families and hold jobs while they are studying, making time away from home and work very difficult. And added to these demands is the increasing proportion of students at both research and comprehensive universities who do their first two years at a community

⁹ Ann Imlah Schneider, "Educating Prospective K-12 Educators – and Others – Internationally" (November 2005) available at www.miami.edu/main/isas05 and www.internationaleadvice.org.

college. Indeed, the percentage of transfer students in teacher training programs was reported to be as high as 75% on at least one campus. Again, advising at early stages of the students' college career is crucial.

The Education interviews revealed other issues as well. Problems related to credit transfer are well known to organizers of study abroad programs. A few interviewees cited the need for an effective campus infrastructure in support of study abroad, and others commented on the (administrative) time and resources needed to organize effective and appropriate programs overseas.

The interviewees in Arts and Sciences cited a few more problems. One suggested concern about lowered enrollments on the home campus if many students spent significant time elsewhere. Another noted that more variety in programs is needed, that the current options, particularly for full academic year programs, are too "Euro-centered." That many overseas programs can only serve to meet general education requirements, rather than being related to a major, was also noted. One or two faculty members expressed a wish for more involvement in the choices of overseas program options.

Senior administrators mentioned most of the above, and added a few more issues to the list. Several also noted that more program options are needed, but that they are difficult to work out, particularly with a limited amount of OIP staff time available. One provost mentioned that it is challenging to work out international linkages that are sufficiently reciprocal. Safety issues, and worries about terrorism, (particularly on the part of parents) were also mentioned. However, notwithstanding the number of problems related to study abroad, nearly all of the people interviewed, in all categories, felt that study abroad participation should be increased, at the very least by adding (as a first step) short term programs which can at least introduce the hesitant to the satisfactions of learning about another culture through first-hand experience.

Although, in an ideal world, fewer in Education were interested in increasing overseas internships, those favoring more internships abroad reported challenges similar to the issues related to study abroad. Many of the challenges in setting up overseas internships for teachers have been described in an earlier section. In this part of the discussion, it was clearer that faculty experience and contacts abroad are key elements for all kinds of Education internships. Because most states require at least half of the student teacher's practicum to be done in the certifying state, the length of time for an internship is very likely to be less than a semester; for this reason, some recommended that (again, in an ideal world) the internship be preceded by a study abroad experience in the same country. Another suggestion was for a practicum to be in a country where school would be in session during the U.S. institutions' summer break. Interestingly, a few Education students felt that they needed more options, to get better multicultural experience, in heritage communities in the United States or overseas.

Discussing internships, both the Arts and Sciences and the senior administration interviewees were mostly concerned with sufficiency of staff and supervision, although several also mentioned language competence issues which, interestingly, were not cited by any of the Education respondents. One OIP director commented that the infrastructure costs for internships are noticeably higher than for study abroad programs.

Another strategy suggested was more involvement of international students in extracurricular or curricular activities. More than 70% of the phase two participants like the idea, but several noted some practical problems with doing so. Few international students are undergraduates in Education, so the involvements – whether curricular or extracurricular – would likely have to be relatively formalized. At a couple of institutions, for example, I learned about pairing of international and U.S. students to help with

English language learning and cultural adjustments – but several people commented that making such arrangements requires significant staff time. And such programs do not necessarily involve Education students. At another institution an effort is made to draw on international student resources as part of the outreach programs for in-service teachers – again, a strategy that might not directly impact undergraduate teachers-in-training. It was also noted that international students tend to have their own clubs – and that, like students in Education, their schedules are very heavy. Perhaps it is not surprising that no current teachers suggested this as a strategy.

A final question for all participants dealt with priorities for internationalizing: “If you received a modest amount of outside incentive money for internationalizing the training of K-12 teachers, how would you target its use?” Study abroad was again high on the priority list; a number of interviewees elaborated on the theme, suggesting that funds should be used for financial aid for study abroad and/or development of more programs, to offer a greater variety of options for students wanting to study overseas. Less than half as many would want to use such funds for overseas internship programs. Only the current teachers and a few Education interviewees would give priority to adding foreign language requirements (which could strengthen interest in and preparation for study abroad). And no one, in any category, suggested giving priority funding to more involvement of international students.

Advising

The importance of advising has been mentioned at several points in the foregoing, and indeed, the most-cited strategy for internationalizing the undergraduate experience of prospective teachers is advising. In the university interviews, more than 70% of the interviewees felt that international components of the advising system could be improved – and about 80% of the responding teachers said that their international preparation might have been helped by a better advising system. Less than 10% (of the current teachers) reported that they had had special advising about international components for their training. Should such advising be available to them? Yes, said 95%. So advising will be the subject of another paper, as well as an important topic in the full report; meanwhile, the reader may be interested in the findings particularly relevant to study abroad questions.

Who does undergraduate academic advising? As often as not, I learned, it is not done the same way throughout the institution. The patterns vary not only from institution to institution but also from college to college, and even department to department, within institutions. Most academic advising is done by faculty, although increasingly, even for departmental majors, it is done by professional advising staff, with faculty serving a “mentoring” role. The advisors – faculty or professional staff – are most likely based in Arts and Sciences, at the college level for “undeclareds” and in departments for majors. However, for Education students, who need to meet requirements for both a major and certification, the advising pattern becomes more complicated, while being all the more important. And for the prospective Education students transferring from a community college, the complicating gaps are even greater.

In the university interviews, Education participants 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? From one OIP I heard that the advising network needs to be thoroughly infiltrated!

- The most frequently cited suggestion from Education, Arts and Sciences, and senior administrators, was more advisor training about students’ international options.
- How many advising checklists include study abroad, foreign language instruction, and/or other internationalizing options?

- How many advisors (professional staff and/or faculty) have participated in the evaluation of study abroad programs?
- Workshops for faculty and advisors on how to incorporate gleanings from study abroad experience in subsequent classes could help.
- Workshops for community college advisors were also suggested.
- Several urged doing more with “international” in freshman orientation, and even with high school counsellors.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The foregoing report mentions several suggestions for increasing participation in study abroad programs by teachers-in-training for the reader to ponder. In addition, we have developed a fairly extensive set of formal recommendations from the study – for state and local governments, for accrediting agencies, for professional associations, for outside funders, for Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, and for institutions of higher education generally. All will be included in the final report, which I hope to have ready by next fall. For purposes of this presentation, I include a partial list of the recommendations related (now or prospectively) to study abroad, as they are probably most relevant to participants in this conference. Here is the pared down list of recommendations for you:

For state and local governments:

- include international and global perspectives in requirements for endorsements and certification, to recognize interrelationships of disciplines and cultures;
- remove exemption for significant foreign language competence in teacher training in all humanities and social science fields, at all education levels; and
- revise regulations about practice teaching, if necessary, to allow credit for pre-service observation and internships in other countries for at least part of the student teaching experience.

For accrediting agencies:

- include requirements for international exposure, through coursework, foreign language study, faculty qualifications, and study and internships abroad, in accreditation criteria for all teacher education programs.

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; and
 - review policy and practice for the integration of study and internships abroad in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements;
- strengthen the role of campus-wide offices for international services and programs, and effectively provide information about them; and
- track characteristics described in this report for evaluation, research, and planning purposes, for all undergraduate programs, including those in professional schools and advising services.

For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:

- integrate study and internships abroad into the professional training of teachers;
- 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 professional associations:

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

For outside funders:

- 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; and
- develop more effective networks for disseminating information about options and resources for prospective and current teachers.

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

Ann Imlah Schneider, Ph.D.
International Education Consultant
Washington, DC
www.internationaledadvice.org