

The State of Teacher Training for K-12 International Education

for conference on

Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education: National Needs and Policy Implications
at Duke University

Abstract

Intrigued by press reports about shortcomings in teacher preparation and drawing on previous research and twenty-five years of experience in administering Title VI grants, the author, supported by a Title VI research grant, conducted 174 interviews, using structured but open-ended protocols, with deans, faculty, student advisors, students, and senior administrators at twenty-four institutions with programs for training secondary school teachers. In addition, views were received from 65 current teachers with international interests. The results contribute to preliminary findings about the international components (and lack thereof) for teacher training in the United States and recommendations that could make a difference in preparing teachers for our increasingly interconnected world.

The findings and recommendations from the study touch on curriculum and certification issues, foreign language study, programs for study and internships abroad, faculty resources, the roles of offices of international programs, funding sources, and, most important, student advising. Recommendations are directed to state governments, accrediting agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education generally, schools, colleges, and departments of education, outside funders, and future researchers.

The undergraduate curriculum for prospective teachers usually requires many general education courses and a liberal arts major in addition to the education courses and practice teaching needed for certification; foreign language requirements, if any, are likely to be minimal and study abroad programs for prospective teachers, like overseas internships, have seemed rarely feasible. Education faculty may have experience with foreign travel, but there has been little encouragement to them to incorporate their international experience and understanding in their teaching.

Among the strategies for improving the international exposure for undergraduates planning to be teachers are, perhaps most importantly, improvements in student advising systems, particularly for the first two years when courses of study are planned, for students planning to teach and for students in the arts and sciences, with international interests, who might be interested in teaching careers. Institutions' offices of international programs, whose services may be incompletely understood in schools of education, could facilitate improvements in the advising systems and in further faculty and curricular development. Such offices might also be useful in fostering course development and related faculty re-tooling, as well as providing information about funding sources for such initiatives. Funding agencies, in turn, need to encourage applicant interest in a full range of innovative initiatives that could lead to infusion of international content and other exposures to different cultural contexts as part of the training of elementary and secondary school teachers.

Introduction

This paper shares findings and recommendations from my current research, *A Study of the Prospects for Internationalizing Teacher Education*. The project was funded under the Title VI research program, but of course the findings and recommendations are entirely my responsibility.

Inspiration for the study came from a variety of sources. As many readers will know, I worked for quite a few years at the U.S. Department of Education as a program officer, mostly for the Centers and Fellowships programs. Starting in 1973, we were constantly urging grantees to strengthen linkages with Education, but year after year the National Resource Center reports indicated little change. After leaving the Department I was involved in a three-year evaluation of the long term impact of the Title VI undergraduate international studies program,⁰ and that research revealed little about what approaches might get more international content into the undergraduate education of teachers. As the results of that study were published, the press was giving much attention to shortcomings in teacher preparation, so, always thinking of the international dimensions of the issue, I wanted to learn more about why teachers might be ill-prepared to introduce their students to the factors contributing to both conflict and cooperation in today's world. In recent years several organizations have published policy papers on improving teacher education and on the need for more international perspectives in teacher education (AACTE,¹ ACE, AASCU, AAU, CCSSO, and others²). But what nuts and bolts need to be installed to get the desired results, and what the obstacles are, did not seem to have been sufficiently addressed. Conversations with a number of people in the field indicated that this research was needed.

Research Methodology

The methodology chosen for the project was based on approaches that seemed to work well in the previous study—a small group of knowledgeable advisors from the fields involved (an experienced teacher, people from colleges and departments of education, and arts and sciences/area studies experts) and data collection from structured interviews. My advisory board strongly urged that the research be focused on teacher training for either elementary or secondary education, and we chose secondary. The challenges are a little different for elementary teacher training, but many of these findings will likely be relevant and helpful in the training of teachers for all levels.

My advisors helped with formulation of the interview protocols and have been reviewing the findings and recommendations. I collected data on twenty-four campuses in ten different states across the country through 174 open-ended but structured interviews, with deans, faculty, student advisors, students, and a variety of senior administrators. Five of the twenty-four institutions are private, two are liberal arts colleges, ten are comprehensive universities (most with strong histories of teacher education) and twelve are research universities. One HBCU and at least two Hispanic-serving institutions were included. While the tendency might have been to choose institutions where internationalization is proceeding well, it was also important to learn about those where there has been less progress and the problems are clearly drawn. Furthermore, it was interesting to find that the problems cited and solutions suggested were similar and, respectively, equally daunting and imaginative in both research and comprehensive universities. Table 1 provides more detail about the sites and interviewees.

In addition, 65 current teachers were interviewed or completed the interview protocol as a questionnaire. Ten of them are elementary school teachers, and most of their responses are

Table 1
Interview Sites and Respondents

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>No. of Interviews</u>
Comprehensive Universities	9	1	
Arts and Sciences			37
Education			26
Senior Administration			15
Liberal Arts Colleges		2	
Arts and Sciences			5
Education			3
Senior Administration			1
Research Universities	10	2	
Arts and Sciences			35
Education			36
Senior Administration			16
Current Teachers			65

essentially similar to the reactions of the 53 secondary and middle school teachers (and the two who are now teaching in community colleges). The elementary school teachers were more likely to have majored in education as undergraduates, but like all the others had also done graduate work, often in a subject (or “content”) field. The teachers seem quite representative geographically, being based in twelve states. Half of them received their undergraduate degrees since 1980, and the remainder since 1955; more than half majored in history, political science, or social studies, and the remainder in a variety of social sciences and humanities fields. They had an average of fifteen years of teaching experience.

Four different interview protocols were used, one each for —

- deans (and/or associate deans), faculty, student advisors, and students in schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs),
- deans (and/or associate deans), advisors, and faculty in schools of arts and sciences (A&S),
- provosts (and/or associates), presidents, vice-presidents, and directors (and others) of the offices for international programs (Senior Administration), and
- current teachers.

The advisory group tried to pare down the number of questions, but even so in many instances the protocols were too long for the time available for individual interviews. Because the study is essentially exploratory, it was deemed permissible for the interviewer to be selective about which questions to ask without jeopardizing the project's integrity. Consequently, the reader will note variety in the base numbers (the "N"s) in the tables that follow and repeated qualifications (such as "of those who were asked") in the discussion of data.

Most of the questions in each protocol were similar, but with some exceptions—requirements for study abroad were not discussed in the Arts and Sciences interviews, for example, and in the final set of questions, the "looking ahead" section, the menus of possible strategies were not exactly the same. On the surface it may seem surprising that a number of questions deal with the wider university context, but the decision to do this was quickly validated by responses showing the extent to which undergraduate students in teacher training programs are in fact taking a substantial selection of courses outside their Schools, Colleges, or Departments of Education.

The interview protocol formats were a mixture of suggested menus and open-ended questions; each interview was different, depending on time made available and the interests and expertise of the interviewee. Even though the numbers of people in most subgroups are relatively small, the overall results do point to recommendations that could make a difference in preparing students to be more effective teachers in our increasingly interconnected world. The findings touch on curriculum and certification issues, foreign language study, programs for study

and internships abroad, faculty development, the roles of offices of international programs, funding sources, and—most important—advising.

What is “Internationalization?”

In the interviews, the first questions were about definitions of “internationalization”—the kinds of internationally-oriented activities, academic and extracurricular, that are taking place on each campus. Many who work on higher education internationalization, particularly in the teacher education field, seem to have thought primarily in terms of overseas experiences for faculty and students as the best strategies for internationalizing, and those certainly came out high on the list from this study, as they have in other surveys.³ However, the focus of my research is on home campus-based activities. Table 2 shows the most-cited activities—the many

Table 2
Interview Responses: Defining Internationalization

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Total</u> <i>N=159</i>
Study abroad	151
Faculty going abroad	131
Possibility of a major in discipline such as history, including non-US content	124
International students as cultural resources in courses	117
International module(s) in general education courses	111
Internships/practice teaching abroad	102
Language requirement	
- institution-wide	36
- for some departments/colleges	60
Possibility of a minor in discipline such as history, including non-US content	95
General education requirement of	
- one non-US or comparative course	79
- two non-US or comparative courses	19
International, foreign language clubs	75
Foreign visitors	49
International house or dormitory floor	45
Mentoring by current teachers with international outlook	(<i>N=59</i>) 29

ways in which students acquire content as well as other forms of international exposure.

International visitors to campus were not included on any of the formal interview schedules, but many interviewees (37%) cited their presence as important. Other activities were described as well; among them were international video hook-ups (7%), hiring and promotion policies (4%), and film and food festivals (14%). Language-across-the-Curriculum efforts were mentioned only at research universities, and rarely at that (4%); in an interesting contrast, I heard about student theses and summer research projects (abroad) only at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges.

Who initiates internationalization efforts? The most cited were faculty and senior university administrators. What about Arts and Sciences or Education Deans as initiators of such changes? Students were mentioned more often than either! The least-cited were professional association priorities and university offices of international programs (OIPs). I will discuss the OIPs a little later. It is interesting—indeed, sobering—that professional associations were perceived by the people I interviewed as relatively unimportant in providing leadership on this, particularly in light of the efforts that many professional associations seem to be making these days with respect to teacher education and internationalization.

Curriculum Issues

In the Arts and Sciences

The most confusing set of issues related to the teacher education is curriculum. I quickly learned that most prospective secondary and middle school teachers do a liberal arts major (or an equivalent); that seems less often the case for students preparing for elementary school teaching.⁴ Many states specify a minimum number of credit hours in the major required for subject

licensure (at the secondary level); data from the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) show considerable variations among states, between 24 and 69,⁵ as does recent information from the U.S. Department of Education.⁶ A cursory review of subject distribution requirements for specially created for teacher education (in social studies and history) indicated that most do include a few international courses, such as World Geography or East Asian History. A significant number of interviewees, in all categories, felt that more such courses, and more comparative components in current courses, should be in the curriculum. Indeed, the more recently minted current teachers reported insufficient preparation in their subjects, and a significant number reported little if any international exposure as undergraduates.

Conversations with faculty teaching international or area studies courses revealed another dimension in need of attention—that the faculty teaching such courses, particularly at institutions with strong teacher education programs, need to pay more attention to the needs of prospective teachers in those courses, and should work with Education faculty to make appropriate revisions. The interview data on another set of questions suggest that respondents in Arts and Sciences are quite unfamiliar with the constraints of the teacher trainees' curricula and, similarly, that SCDE respondents were not fully informed about A&S (and international) options and course content. How many of you who teach foreign language or area or international studies courses know which of your students are planning to be elementary or secondary school teachers? And are you familiar with the content and approaches that they will need to teach effectively?

Most of the Education student's coursework is in fact in the arts and sciences because, in addition to the content major, students planning to be teachers, like most undergraduates, take a large number of general education, or core curriculum, courses—requirements for that alone range from 30 to over 60 credit hours on the campuses I visited. Do any (i.e., at least one) of the general education courses have international or comparative modules? Seventy percent of my interviewees said they do. At a liberal arts college people were rather puzzled by the question—commenting that just about all of their courses have international components, that college policy is to have the entire curriculum internationally “permeated.” And how many respondents said that to meet general education requirements at least one non-U.S. or comparative course is needed? About 60%. And at least two? Less than 20%. So increasing the international content of the large number of courses in the general education category, combined with strengthened course requirements for the major, would go a long way toward improving international exposure for prospective teachers. But not far enough.

Foreign Language Instruction

Another subject in the interviews was foreign language requirements and instruction. A recent study by the American Council on Education showed that at least 57% of college-bound high school students want to continue foreign language study⁷—and indeed most of the institutions that I visited do have various foreign language requirements for some of their undergraduate programs. However, within those universities, a surprising number of interviewees were unclear about what the requirement might be and, in addition, it became clear that few Schools, Colleges, or Departments of Education students have a foreign language requirement as part of the training for secondary school teachers. In contrast, a large proportion

of the Education students I interviewed were disappointed—even angry—that they had not been able to gain more foreign language proficiency as undergraduates. Furthermore, 84% of the current teachers felt that their preparation should have included foreign language study, or more of it.

The first interviewee responses to questions about foreign language requirements are shown in Table 2 (*Defining Internationalization*). Here, Table 3 provides more detail about that data, by institutional type, combined with information from the final set of questions about strategies. Keeping in mind that the data are from a limited number of institutions, the reader may nonetheless note that research institutions appear to be less likely to have requirements than comprehensive universities or liberal arts colleges, and that interest in increasing language

Table 3
Foreign Language Requirements
(per interviewees)

	<u>Comprehensive Universities</u>	<u>Liberal Arts Colleges</u>	<u>Research Universities</u>
Current requirements	(N=72)	(N=9)	N=77
Institution-wide	39%	100%	26%
For some programs	18%		34%
Desirable requirements:	(N=46)	(N=5)	(N=41)
Should add or increase	83%	60%	66%

requirements is also less at research universities. Could foreign language departments at research universities tend to be less interested in the challenges of providing language instruction?

Of those who were asked, 88% of the senior administration category, 61% of the Arts and Sciences, and close to 70% of the SCDE interviewees want to increase foreign language requirements for undergraduates. (Data on this are also provided in Table 9.) Close to half of the Education deans with whom the question was discussed told me that they would like to have a

foreign language requirement for their students, but the challenges for having that happen were too daunting. It has already been noted that most of the current teachers urge foreign language requirements for prospective teachers—and that SCDE students recognize the importance of attaining some foreign language competence.

Why, then, are foreign language requirements for prospective secondary school teachers so rare? Mostly, it was said, because students in teacher training programs have very crowded curricula as they meet the substantial general education requirements, complete their major, and prepare for certification—all, some states require, within four years and as little as 120 semester credit hours. However, several academic advisors said that with careful planning Education students could work in some, or more language instruction.

Another category of challenges (the *real* reasons, some said candidly) was also cited—that foreign language departments do not have the faculty resources to teach more introductory level courses, that the supply of language teachers is limited, and/or departments are unwilling to allocate precious tenure track positions to specialists in language teaching. A third set of problems revolves around departmental boundaries (“turf!”) and reluctance to upset a painfully-negotiated status quo. Postsecondary institutions and outside funders need to give much more attention to finding solutions to the problems dogging the foreign language instruction field and should take steps to require foreign language training for prospective teachers.

And what about the training of K-12 foreign language teachers? The critical need for them has recently been recognized by U.S. Department of Education.⁸ Like other prospective teachers, the pre-service foreign language teachers complete requirements for a major in the field

in which they expect to be certified or licensed. Does their preparation include a course on language pedagogy, and if so, who teaches it? Several foreign language faculty members (about 20 were among the A&S respondents) replied “Wouldn’t that be good!” The question was a surprise for many—indeed it was not clear whether all the responding Education deans and faculty realized that it could be a different course from the general methods course required for certification. When taught, usually in the foreign language department, the instructors always seemed to be the foreign language faculty. And does the training of language teachers include study in a country in which “their” language is spoken? It is apparently required for surprisingly few programs—again a matter of some distress for the students planning to be foreign language teachers. Several people emphasized the importance of obligatory study abroad for prospective foreign language teachers.

At the end of the interviews, the subject was future strategies that could strengthen foreign language requirements and instruction for prospective teachers. Some of the responses have already been described; in this context, more than 70% of the interviewees think that strengthening of some sort for foreign language instruction is needed. A few more suggestions emerged during the final minutes of the interviews:

- Teachers-in-training could be encouraged to study foreign language intensively during the summer, preferably overseas,
- Other programs for foreign language immersion should be developed, and
- Foreign language training for all faculty should be encouraged, which, in turn, could facilitate
- More programs for (on-campus) Language-across-the-Curriculum.

Study and Internships Abroad

Related to curriculum issues is—or should be—study abroad. Although many of the people I interviewed wanted to increase participation by prospective teachers in study abroad programs, it was noted that the current participation rates for Education students are close to zero on most campuses, again largely because of curriculum pressures. Other deterrents are that

- too few overseas programs are appropriate, and creditable (for general education or for the major) for Education students,
- planning for study abroad, particularly for pre-service teachers, needs to start at the beginning of freshman year, or even before,
- financial aid opportunities are insufficiently developed,
- sufficient counseling may not be available to students who have little travel experience, and
- faculty and other advisors themselves need a better appreciation for experiencing other cultures that they can share with their advisees.

It was interesting that relatively few people reported prerequisite requirements for study abroad as deterrents. Foreign language proficiency, relevant general education courses, or country-specific history, political science, or culture courses are seldom required (but may be encouraged); however, most interviewees did report cross-cultural communication training to be part of the orientation process. (Some did note that certain study abroad programs do require foreign language competence, that it depends on the program and the country.) In contrast, about two thirds of the current teachers felt that study abroad should be part of the prospective teacher's training – and they strongly urged that preparation for it include foreign language training, relevant general education courses, and particularly country-specific history or culture courses. In an ideal world, one might hope not only that prospective teachers would have sufficient preparation for study abroad, but that their overseas study would be creditable as an

integral part of their general education or major course requirements—several interviewees mentioned a need to improve coordination between departments and the study abroad administration about course credit and relevance to the major.

Internships abroad were cited enthusiastically by many interviewees, including those in Arts and Sciences, indicating that the universities are gaining experience in administering such programs, yet practice teaching overseas seemed almost as rare as study abroad for Education students, and the overseas sites that I heard most about were Department of Defense overseas schools, which are not very likely to offer strong immersion experiences in a foreign culture. A major deterrent to having practice teaching abroad is the frequent existence of state rules requiring that practice teaching be done in the certifying state; the logistics of adequate supervision are also somewhat daunting, although faculty assured me it can be done. A few SCDEs are working on overseas school observation experiences, when students are not yet at the practice teaching stage. In place of (or even in addition to) internships abroad, might students be placed in bilingual or magnet schools for their practice teaching? Over 90% of the Education respondents said they could be; some responded with enthusiasm while from others the answer was somewhat laconic.

However, time abroad seems rare for Education students; let us return to our focus on the domestic curriculum that should have an impact on many more prospective teachers.

Certification

As mentioned, in addition to their liberal arts courses, prospective teachers must prepare for certification, usually taking set courses in Education—perhaps eight—and doing a prescribed amount of practice teaching, which is likely preceded by an observational internship. From the

interviews it seemed that relatively few of the required Education courses include comparative information, with perspectives from other countries. The faculty teaching them may have had some overseas experience, but there has apparently been little incentive to revise courses as a result. An important point has been made by an Education faculty member (not an interviewee in this study) who has examined the challenges of “internationalization” and stresses the importance of restructuring social studies methods courses to include cross-cultural approaches and thinking.⁹ At least one interviewee urged preparation of more specialized courses on teaching methods that would include international components. On the Arts and Sciences side, have any of you who are teaching history, political science, or geography, for example, been at all involved with the social studies methods course(s) in your SCDE?

Another question asked in the SCDE interviews was whether it is possible for pre-service teachers to be mentored by teachers with an international outlook. Table 2 shows us that nearly thirty Education interviewees reported that some of this is happening as students are placed for their observational internships and practice teaching, but it was also pointed out that such placements are normally quite haphazard and that checking the mentor-teachers’ qualifications on this point is low priority.

How hard and fast are certification requirements, and what determines them? It seems to be a fast-changing set of domains.¹⁰ State legislatures may play strong roles, as do some state Boards of Education, but I also heard from Education deans that they (the SCDEs) really have considerable latitude, that the key is accreditation, through NCATE (the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) and its member organizations rather than the state bureaucracies. Several deans added that the increasing number of mandates from the accreditors is

unlikely to include anything “international.” So, in their program reviews, it seems important for accrediting agencies to include requirements for international exposure through coursework, foreign language study, study or internships abroad, faculty qualifications, choice of in-service teachers to mentor pre-service teachers, and even internationally oriented extracurricular activities.

Many interviewees mentioned the importance of the standards that are coming into play, for subject content (with state-wide testing) and for teacher competence. So who are the players? NCATE, of course. Also ASCD (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Standards Consortium), ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium), NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification), NBPTS (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards), and many others at the national and state level. Efforts have been made in recent years to foster more internationalized approaches,¹¹ but again it is an evolving situation.

The responses of current teachers to questions about certification and standards are interesting, and are shown in Table 4. Although nearly 90% of the responding current teachers reported recent changes in certification requirements, very few recalled any international components in the process. Indeed, it is interesting that the proportions reporting international

Table 4
Certification Information from Current Teachers

<u>Certification:</u>	<u>All Teachers</u> <i>N=65</i>		<u>Recent Teachers</u> <i>N=32</i>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Requirements include an international	20%	80%	20%	80%

international component				
Changes since you began teaching?	82%	18%	62%	38%
Changes in recent years?	89%	11%	75%	25%
Do recent changes reflect globalization?	29%	71%	23%	77%

components for certification are exactly the same in more recent cohort of teachers as they are for the entire group. Over 70% of the current teachers who answered the question reported that recent changes in their own certification (and re-certification) requirements do not reflect globalization, but about 65% of all the teachers did find that recent changes in subject standards reflect increasing globalization. For re-certification, some of the current teachers commented that the recent emphasis has been on technology, yet many of the tests for which they have to prepare their students now include international components. This surely presents challenges for those of you who provide in-service training for teachers as well as for those of you preparing prospective teachers for their initial certification.

Faculty Resources

To strengthen the international components of the curriculum (in Arts and Sciences and in Education), between 88% and 100% of the people asked liked the idea of some kind of faculty development—figures very consistent with findings of the study evaluating the Title VI Undergraduate International Studies program¹² although differing somewhat from the results of the AACTE’s recent survey of Education deans and department chairs, which showed continuing interest in faculty travel (purpose unspecified) but virtually none (5%) in developing international courses.¹³ In contrast, although with a much smaller sample, in this study about

70% of the Education deans—and 92% of those who were asked—liked the idea of some kind of faculty development, and nearly half (of all the Education deans) suggested course revisions.

A strategy liked by more than 90% of those asked, in both Education and Arts and Sciences, was travel abroad for faculty to work on new courses or course revisions. (Several people pointed out that course revision can also be done without overseas travel!) Interestingly, none of Education faculty interviewees had yet traveled abroad for that purpose, yet many other reasons for foreign travel were cited—research, conferences, seminars, visiting lectureships, program development and supervision, and consulting. Asked what the impact of any faculty experience abroad might be, interviewees cited course revisions and enrichment most, but other suggested benefits were presentations in faculty seminars, more appreciation for study abroad, new pedagogies, and attitudinal shifts. There were some hesitations about encouraging travel for course development, however—that travel to facilitate course revisions might distract from faculty research, that faculty members might not be interested, that there could be risk in creating the “two week wonder,” and of course that it would cost. Nonetheless to most respondents it did seem that encouragement of any overseas experience for faculty could likely engender course revisions *and* that campus follow-up, with a faculty seminar program (not to mention small grants specifically for course revision), could spread the benefits both directly and indirectly to students.

Another well-received suggestion (by those who responded to the question, which was posed separately from the foreign travel questions) was the idea of curriculum development workshops, particularly those that would be joint, with Arts and Science and Education faculty together working on a topic of mutual interest, about ways to improve the international exposure

for their students/prospective teachers—and improve the articulation between Arts and Sciences and Education programs. Several people did acknowledge a current lack of communication—indeed on one campus while an Arts and Sciences interviewee liked the idea but doubted that Education people would (“they’re holed up in their fortress over there”), an Education respondent who liked the idea doubted that Arts and Science faculty would be interested. Clearly the communication gaps are real, and well-prepared “internationalizing” workshops could offer useful bridges. Other possible obstacles to workshops of this sort were cited, and would need to be dealt with in the planning process: The potential cost was noted, particularly if buy-outs of faculty time, or special summer grants, are needed. A few people thought that such workshops could bring too much challenge to departmental jurisdictions. Several people said that this approach would need an “enticing focus;” other sections of this paper suggest a few potentially useful topics. Happily, on at least two campuses, good experience with this kind of initiative was reported.

Actually, the idea of including probing questions about joint workshops came from a grantee under Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA), on Teacher Quality Enhancement.¹⁴ Grants under that program, so far, have focused on Math and Science, but one of its principal objectives is to foster better communication between faculty in Arts and Sciences and in Education. Although the legislation currently has many conditions (requiring partnerships with “high need” local educational agencies, for example), “internationalizing” them in the reauthorization process should be considered. Indeed, a recent issue of *Science* carried an editorial suggesting (albeit a little indirectly, but explicitly targeting HEA reauthorization) that

people in the science field should also be imbued with better understanding of foreign policy issues in this increasingly interconnected world.¹⁵

As noted, more than three quarters of the people who responded to questions about strategy—and over 80% of the faculty and deans—urged some form of workshops, travel, and/or course development. Deans of Arts and Sciences may have been a little more enthusiastic about such faculty activities than their Education counterparts, but the faculty in both Education and A&S were equally interested—and particularly liked the possibility of having workshops that would include both SCDE and A&S faculty for discussion of curricular issues. Additional suggestions related to faculty resources are:

- Hiring more faculty with international and area studies qualifications,
- Including international factors in criteria for faculty promotion and tenure,
- Fostering faculty participation in seminars abroad (such as those offered by the CIEE, the Council for International Education and Exchange), and
- Organizing familiarization travel abroad (particularly in connection with study and internship programs) for faculty and administrative staff.

Other problems related to faculty resources have been discussed in relation to foreign language instruction, and few strategies for resolving them were suggested. Possibilities (in an ideal world) could be additional faculty training in pedagogy and establishment of more tenure track positions for specialists in language teaching. Development of programs for Languages across the Curriculum, requiring proficiency and use of a foreign language for subjects other than literature, could also have reverberations for faculty in foreign language departments.

Offices of International Programs

As noted earlier, another finding from the interviews was that the responsibilities and services of universities' offices for international programs (OIPs) appear not to be widely or fully understood throughout their universities. A closer look at the data on functions of OIPs, shown in Table 5, as the OIPs reported them and as they were reported by all other respondents, reveals that although such offices are increasing their functions, information about the services that they may provide is rather incomplete. A number of responsibilities for those offices were cited by their staff, but Education interviewees seemed even less aware of OIP services than people in Arts and Sciences. The numbers were perhaps even less dramatic evidence than my impressions "on the ground" at campuses where from one interview to the next the information was quite inconsistent. The roles of these offices are really evolving on many campuses; in fact in at least three instances the office had just been or was about to be given a higher status at the institution,

Table 5
Functions of University Offices of International Programs
as reported by interviewees

<u>Function</u>	<u>reported by OIPs</u> <i>N=18</i>	<u>All Others</u> <i>N=74</i>
Study abroad	16	56
International students	16	44
International visitors, lecturers	15	17
Exchange programs, linkages	14	11
Facilitating faculty travel	1	18
Facilitating curriculum development	4	12
ESL program	4	2
Study abroad program development	1	4
Film, speaker series	0	5
International festivals	3	0
Facilitating grant applications	3	0
Faculty seminars	2	0

Fundraising	2	0
International studies major/minor	1	0

so the added responsibilities might not be fully known for that reason. A previous study has indicated that as university internationalization processes take hold, the central offices for international programs have grown;¹⁶ a question that might be explored is whether a strong OIP can itself speed up university-wide internationalization, or whether it is simply one of many results. In any case, my report will recommend that OIP directors make their services and activities better known throughout their institutions, and particularly among the Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, where they are sometimes less known, and therefore have been less used, than in Arts and Sciences.

Student Advising

One of the OIP functions that is generally recognized is their work in advising students about study and internships abroad, and that leads to discussion of an aspect of the undergraduate experience that has long interested me—the potential role of student advising in the internationalization process. This project gave me an opportunity to learn more about it.

I found that just about every university campus visited for this project has an advising staff—and I also found that some 85% of those who were asked (including 70% of the student advisors themselves) said that student advising needs improvement, particularly with respect to the international opportunities and needs of prospective teachers. Most of the advising systems that I encountered do fit the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) model of a

professional advising center for “undeclared” undergraduates and faculty advising for students who have decided on a major.¹⁷ The exceptions were the two liberal arts colleges visited, where all advising is done by faculty, and another where the faculty union head (and the Vice President) told me that by contract only faculty do advising, so the advising center is in fact staffed by faculty members. Table 6 shows the interviewees’ responses to the question about advising sources, by type of institution and for the Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education and

Table 6
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=72</i>	<u>Liberal Arts Colleges</u> <i>N=9</i>	<u>Research Universities</u> <i>N=68</i>	<u>SCDEs</u> <i>N=54</i>	<u>Current Teachers</u> <i>N=62</i>
Professional advising staff	59	6	63	48	28
Faculty	72	9	57	50	49
Website	40	8	48	32	4
Special offices, such as OIP	38	8	39	26	12
Peers/TAs	20	7	31	15	17

current teachers. Interestingly, the interviews indicated a little more reliance on professional advising staff—and a little less faculty involvement—at research universities than at the comprehensives. Peer (or teaching assistant) advising was cited as a part of the formal advising possibilities by less than half of the interviewees, which is also consistent with NACADA data.¹⁸ Websites were mentioned in the interviews more often by (optimistic) senior administrators and faculty than they were by students or advisors.

However, the advising needed for prospective teachers is more complicated than for most liberal arts subjects. At nearly all of the institutions I visited students apply to the university for general admission and only subsequently to Education, possibly as late as their junior year, with the result that their pre-major academic advising, if any, is done by the advising staff, usually

located in Arts and Sciences. At some universities Education students, once accepted for a teacher education program, receive all of their advising in the SCDE. At others, the advising by Education staff is limited to certification preparation, so students must rely entirely on Arts and Sciences staff and faculty to deal with the rest. And for at least one institution students apply directly to the School of Education for freshman admission, and Education faculty and staff remain the formal source of all their advice. Thus the roles of advisors in the Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education vary considerably.

Training for Advisors

How do advisors—faculty or professional, Arts and Sciences or Education—get the information they need to share with their advisees? One person summed up the situation by responding simply “haphazardly.” Some shrugged and said, “Well, we read the catalog.” As Table 7 shows, meetings were the most frequently cited source, followed closely by e-mail, then

Table 7
Advisors’ Information Sources
by type of institution

<u>Source</u>	<u>Comprehensive Universities</u> <i>N=57</i>	<u>Liberal Arts Colleges</u> <i>N=6</i>	<u>Research Universities</u> <i>N=44</i>
Meetings	38	5	30
E-mail	37	4	26
Newsletters, Memos	28	4	21
Workshops	16		14
“Word of mouth”	9		7
Handbook, catalog	7		3

newsletters and memos. Workshops were cited by only 28% of the respondents to this question, but several said they wished there were some—or more. Occasionally orientation sessions for new faculty were mentioned. Advising is usually a major faculty function, yet it is rare for faculty to be evaluated for this part of their work.¹⁹

It was clear on all campuses in my survey that a number of internationally-oriented courses are offered, and that most institutions can provide serious foreign language instruction. But how to get more of those courses included in the curricula of prospective teachers? My report recommends that the various advisors, and particularly those impacting students' first two undergraduate years, including admissions officers, have additional information and training *not only* about student opportunities for international exposure—for example, through foreign language training, through other course choices, through planning for study abroad programs, and through various extracurricular activities—*but also* that advisors be imbued with the importance of learning about the wider world as they prepare students for their eventual roles as teachers.

Meanwhile, until that happens, how can advising help with this? Yes, the certification requirements are important factors, but many have told me that a lot of discretion is possible within the overall undergraduate context—that with careful planning and advising the prospective teacher can include language training and study abroad in his or her study plan and that many other internationally oriented courses and extracurricular activities can be worked into a student's undergraduate experience. Several people told me that (on their campuses, at least) foreign language courses can meet certain general education requirements other than formal language requirements. And how can advisors be persuaded to work this out? A frequent suggestion was added training, with programs of workshops about international options for advisors. NACADA's data indicate that 62% of their reporting institutions do have training programs for advisors,²⁰ which contrasts with the barely 30% of my interviewees reporting workshops on advising. An extension of this is a recommendation that advisors (both faculty and professional

staff) travel with faculty or other organizers of study programs and internships abroad to observe, and even evaluate, their impact and potential.

When talking about the mechanics of the advising process, several people mentioned an advisor's checklist, but noted that it did not include international activities—so advisors' checklists should include a full range of international options. Interviewees had many other suggestions about improving the advising patterns and substance. Among them were

- creation of an overarching unit to funnel information (including international) to advisors,
- Evaluating the advising work of both faculty advisors and the professional advising staff.
- updating the advisors' handbook to improve coverage of international options,
- website revisions to include better information about international options,
- more SCDE/A&S “interface” in charting the advising processes,
- personal visits to departments by OIP staff,
- greater use of students returned from their overseas experiences in advising about study abroad,
- increased attention to dormitory staff and clubs as part of the advising system,
- improved coordination with the advising done at community colleges to facilitate international options for transfer students, and
- changes in the advising structure to give more emphasis to international.

The mentoring of student teachers particularly during their practice teaching experience might also be described as a form of advising. As already noted in the discussion about certification, it was covered only glancingly in interviews, and only in the SCDE interviews with respect to definitions of internationalization. Pre-service mentoring has been described as a

critical element in the preparation of “globalized” teachers,²¹ but it did not get a strong response during the interviews—to many the concept seemed new. That leads to another advising recommendation, that Schools of Education assure that criteria for selecting teacher mentors include international interest and experience. A related suggestion was that in-service teacher workshops on international topics be opened to pre-service teachers, thereby not only exposing the prospective teacher to new subject matter and approaches but also fostering contact with potential mentors with international interests. One Education dean suggested that students might go abroad teamed with a current teacher or faculty member, but the purpose of such a foray was not specified—one could imagine an observational experience, or even a research project, with an important advising component as well as the content—and affective—learning involved.

Career Advising

Another category of advising that my research found to be insufficiently explored with students is career preparation. How many Arts and Sciences students with foreign language and other international interests are aware that teaching, even teaching overseas, might be a rewarding career for them? One A&S faculty member told me that he and his colleagues are enthusiastic about describing career options to graduate students, but quite ignore that role vis-à-vis their undergraduate advisees. Of the current teachers who were surveyed nearly half felt that more attention should have been given to career advising and preparation when they were undergraduates; many who were Arts and Sciences majors reported no advice about the possibilities of a teaching career. What might be done to improve A&S undergraduates’ exposure to the possibilities here? Exposing Arts and Sciences undergraduates with international interests to the possibilities of teaching careers is another issue that needs attention. One strategy could

be an introductory course in Education open to Arts and Sciences majors; it was rarely an option on the campuses visited—with the stellar exception being a liberal arts college where a third of every entering class usually elects to take the introductory Education course. Another suggested strategy was offering more opportunities for undergraduates to volunteer in local schools.

Paying for the Internationalization of Teacher Education

Another set of questions injected notes of pragmatism—how have internationalizing efforts been funded and what sources are suggested for future improvement? Table 8 gives details about the responses for each protocol category. For past funding, very few respondents—senior administrators or people in Education (Arts and Sciences interviewees were not asked)—cited Title VI, or indeed other government or outside private sources, yet at least half of the twenty-four institutions visited are currently, or have in the past been, Title VI grant recipients. Most internationalizing initiatives were deemed to be funded internally. And for the future? Again, no interviewee in the Education category cited Title VI and only two seemed to think of

Table 8
Funding Sources for Campus Internationalization
per interviewees

<u>Source</u>	<u>Current</u>			<u>Prospective</u>		
	<u>A&S</u> <i>N=0</i>	<u>SCDE</u> <i>N=14</i>	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>N=19</i>	<u>A&S</u> <i>N=27</i>	<u>SCDE</u> <i>N=12</i>	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>N=12</i>
Title VI	<i>n.a.</i>	0	3	12	0	5
Other U.S. Government	<i>n.a.</i>	2	2	10	2	5
Foundations	<i>n.a.</i>	1	4	7	1	6
State legislatures	<i>n.a.</i>	0	5	0	0	1
Business, other private sources	<i>n.a.</i>	0	2	9	0	2
“Grants” (source not specified)	<i>n.a.</i>	5	2	0	5	0
Internal university	<i>n.a.</i>	13	15	7	4	1

any other government possibilities—the main funding source, if any, was again expected to be internal. The responses of senior administrators and people in Arts and Sciences were a little different, but it was interesting that even of the 27 Arts and Sciences respondents on this question less than half appeared to be aware of Title VI possibilities; a few mentioned FIPSE (the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education). On the other hand, it is also interesting that earlier in the interviews about half of those asked about the initiators of internationalization cited the availability of grant funds.

Here seems to be another challenge for all funding agencies, and for universities’ offices of international programs that might initiate activities in need of outside support. Outside funders need to make a greater effort to publicize their resources; before doing so, their own staffs should review their expectations, requirements (written and unwritten), and the scope of their assistance to potential applicants to assure flexibility, encouragement, and responsiveness to innovative internationalizing initiatives.

Strategies for Internationalizing Teacher Education

The final section of the protocols asked the interviewees to look ahead and suggest strategies that might help on their campuses, and also (when time permitted) to indicate what the obstacles might be to these approaches. A menu of about fifteen strategies was drawn on by the interviewer; a few activities were listed on only one or two of the protocols. And actually, for reasons of time and relevance, the entire list was covered in very few of the interviews, yet additional activities were added in significant numbers by interviewees, mostly in response to more general questions (“What would you most like to do to internationalize?” and “If you had some extra funding for internationalization, how would you target it?”). No list of possible activities or strategies was used in the interviews with current teachers, so their responses were made without the prompts offered in the other interviews. The highlights of a combined list are

displayed in Table 9, *Suggested Strategies for Better Internationalization of Teacher Education*, and are arranged, roughly, in descending order of frequency. Most interviewees, obviously, liked more than one strategy. Many of the activities—but not all—have been cited and discussed in previous sections of this report, under headings of university internationalization, curriculum, study abroad, foreign language study, faculty resources, and advising.

And indeed student advising comes out at the top of the list of strategies needed to improve the international exposure of prospective teachers, with between 85% (in Education) and 100% (in senior administrative positions) responding positively. In addition, 51 of the current teachers said that prospective teachers should have special advising about international components, and all of the more recently trained teachers responded positively on this question, although only thirteen (20% of all the current teachers) suggested better advising when asked more generally about the changes that could have given them a more “internationalized” outlook for their current teaching. Details about the advising data and suggested strategies for improvement are discussed in an earlier section.

Table 9
Suggested Strategies for Better Internationalization of Teacher Education
per interviewees

<u>Activity</u>	<u>A&S</u> <i>N</i> **	<u>SCDE</u> <i>N</i> **	<u>Senior Admin.</u> <i>N</i> **	<u>Current Teachers</u> <i>N</i> **	<u>Total</u>
Strengthening academic and career advising systems	63 / 65	29 / 34	29 / 29	13	134
* More study abroad	28	36	24	33	121
Faculty development:					
Workshops to facilitate curricular development	43 / 43	25 / 26	n.a.	1	69
Curricular development workshops with A&S and SCDE participants together	50 / 52	29 / 30	16 / 16	n.a.	95
Faculty travel abroad for course development	30 / 31	30 / 32	15 / 17	n.a.	75

Any of the above	55 / 58	39 / 43	21 / 22		115
* Adding/revising courses	31	20	18	26	95
Changing/increasing general education requirements	26 / 28	18 / 18	11 / 15	9	64
Foreign language requirements:					
Adding one, or	15 / 20	15 / 18	11 / 12	n.a.	41
Increasing it	21 / 29	5 / 8	11 / 13	n.a.	37
Should have one	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	55	55
* More internships abroad	8	15	2	11	36

* These responses were volunteered by interviewees.

** The actual questions that were asked varied with time available for each interview and the interests of the interviewee. When a second number is shown it is the number of interviewees responding for that question.

Respondents were encouraged to react to several kinds of faculty development, and many did. Allowing for the overlaps, over 90% of the interviewees responding to questions about strategy urged some form of workshops, travel, and/or course development. Arts and Sciences deans may have been a little more enthusiastic about these faculty activities than their Education counterparts, but faculty in both Education and Arts and Sciences appeared equally interested. That the next most frequent suggestion is the addition or revision of courses with international content is likely no accident—retooling of faculty could of necessity accompany changes in course offerings.

For foreign language instruction, on the other hand, the responses in Table 9 do not overlap. Issues related to foreign language requirements and instruction were discussed in an earlier section. Here, as we look at strategies for the future, the important data are the substantial percentages of people answering the question who feel that strengthening of some sort of foreign language instruction is needed—73% of the A&S interviewees, close to 80% of the Education interviewees, and nearly 90% of the senior administrators. And 85% of the current teachers feel that it is important. Can these indicators be ignored?

Study abroad was a popular strategy known to all even though SCDE participation is very limited. Increasing participation was among the most-mentioned suggestions, and several people commented that more varied programs, such as short intensive courses or brief components of regular courses that could be more easily worked into the teacher education program, would be helpful. Additional ideas were:

- Including homestays for study abroad programs,
- Exploring of more short-term study abroad options to fit student teachers' schedules,
- Organizing additional sources of financial aid for students otherwise unable to participate,
- Requiring study abroad of prospective social studies teachers as well as those preparing to teach foreign languages, and
- Including Education undergraduates in internationally-oriented research and overseas development projects.

Issues related to general education requirements were also mentioned in an earlier section. Few if any were happy with their current situations, but there was general agreement, unfortunately, that making changes would be difficult. Nonetheless, of those who were asked the final interview questions, Table 9 shows very high proportions favoring changes (which might include decreasing overall requirements) that should be made to facilitate more international content, with an inevitable impact on the training of teachers. As mentioned earlier, the most frequently suggested route for doing this was course revisions, to add international modules or comparisons to existing courses, rather than adding new courses and arguing about what could be dropped. Additional suggestions with potential curricular impact are

- Broadened (i.e., more international) degree requirements in all disciplines,
- Strengthening the library resources for international, area, and foreign language study, and

- Adding the possibility of an “international” certificate for student transcripts, particularly for those in Education.

A few activities were not included in earlier discussions, or in very many of the interviews.²² In the conversations about defining internationalization (see Table 2), 130 interviewees reported that international students are serving, formally or informally, as cultural resources in classes and other campus activities. Might this resource be more formally and extensively drawn on? Many people early in the interviews pondered the question, remarking, “Well, we should do more of that.” Other possibilities about students as resources were also discussed. Several people suggested that more be done to increase the international student population on campus so that the U.S. students would have more informal exposure to people from other cultures. Several people suggested that more could—and should—be done to facilitate interactions between international and U.S. students. Although the question was not asked in the A&S interviews, twenty interviewees, most of them in Education, thought that a greater effort might be made to recruit students with international interests, thus providing pre-service teachers another form of international exposure.

A few additional recommended activities are also extracurricular. Current teachers, asked about their international activities as undergraduates, were more likely to cite extracurricular activities than the courses taken. A question asked in the early part of the campus interviews had to do with foreign language or international residence halls or houses. It was surprising how many people did not know the answer to this question—and on what a small number of the campuses there seems to be such a facility. Indeed, I soon added to the question: “And do you have foreign language and/or international clubs?” The answer was usually affirmative. However,

many added, very few Education students participate. From a few people I heard that the Education students, feeling that their interests may be rather different from regular Arts and Sciences majors, do not feel particularly welcome in relevant extracurricular activities or, again, that they do not have time. Arts and Science interviewees were asked whether advisors are in a position to encourage students to participate in internationally-oriented extracurricular options, such as foreign language houses, and more than half replied that they could. Several commented that Education students particularly should be encouraged to participate in the wealth of internationally-oriented extracurriculars available on most campuses. This is another item that should be added to the advisors' checklist. Other suggestions in the "extracurricular" realm are:

- Additional internationally-oriented cultural programming, and
- Increased alumni involvement in university internationalization (such as alumni colleges abroad).

Clearly the interviewees warmed to the subject! They have provided the researcher and the reader with a rich panoply of ideas, many of which are already in place on one campus or another. But I found no complete model already in existence, just many good elements of what, if combined, could be a very internationally-oriented program. Further development of more of these activities could significantly strengthen the international dimensions of the training of teachers.

Recommendations

The full list of recommendations is directed to state governments, accrediting agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education generally, schools, colleges, and departments of Education, future researchers—and outside funders. The main outside funder that we are most familiar with is the U.S. Department of Education, and most of the

recommendations could probably be fostered through its current statutory frameworks, although the implementing regulations might need some adjustments. Agency staff could interpret the existing law fairly broadly to implement the recommendations—or perhaps you, and those working on the actual reauthorization process, will find that incorporation of more direction and prescriptive detail in the statutes is needed. But that is a next step, not what we are discussing here. Perhaps you will suggest additional recommendations, or perhaps you will let me know that some of what follows is totally unrealistic.

For state governments:

- include international components in requirements for endorsements and certification across all fields;
- revise regulations about practice teaching, if necessary, to permit pre-service observation and internships in other countries for at least part of the student teaching experience; and
- facilitate training in international issues as part of the continuing professional development for current teachers, through workshops and special courses.

For accrediting agencies:

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

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.

For institutions of higher education generally:

- consider a wide range of strategies for increasing international exposure for pre-service teachers, among them—

- review and assess the full range of campus resources for international exposure, and their accessibility, particularly for students in teacher education programs;
 - add formal international components to student advisory services, beginning in the pre-application phase, to assure the feasibility of maximum international exposure within the normal time-to-degree constraints;
 - provide training on international needs and students' options for both faculty and professional advisors;
 - foster development of internationally oriented curriculum, through individual faculty grants, through workshops for both Arts and Sciences and Education faculty (together), and through the hiring of internationally-trained faculty;
 - strengthen requirements for foreign language training to a minimum of two full college years 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 abroad in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements;
- consider ways to evaluate advising staff (including faculty) performance;
 - seriously explore sources of U.S. government funding, and particularly including programs under HEA's Title VI and the Fulbright-Hays program for administrators and advisors as well as for faculty;
 - strengthen the role of campus-wide offices for international services and programs, and effectively provide information about them; and
 - track many of the characteristics described in this report, for internal evaluation, research, and planning purposes.

For Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education:

- explore ways to integrate study and internships abroad into the training of teachers particularly in the social sciences and humanities for the secondary school level;
- add requirements for significant foreign language competence to the training for prospective secondary school teachers in all humanities and social science fields;
- require that prospective foreign language teachers have at least a semester of overseas experience in an area where "their" language is spoken;

- emphasize and increase the options for observation and practice teaching in bilingual and magnet schools;
- include international experience in criteria for choosing current teachers as mentors for teachers-in-training;
- strengthen the international components of academic and career advising services, in cooperation with other university advising services; and
- expose Arts and Sciences students with international interests to the challenges of teaching careers, by offering an effective introductory course and even observational internships.

For outside funders

- provide funding for a wide variety of activities—including such activities as advising—that can strengthen the options available for, and known to, all undergraduates who might consider teaching careers;
- increase attention to solutions for the demand and supply problems of foreign language teachers, at all levels of instruction (K-12 and postsecondary); and
- disseminate more widely, and particularly to the teacher education community, information about the funding available to strengthen and initiate international studies and foreign language programs that can be available in the training of prospective teachers.

For future researchers, this project has shown many topics in need of further analysis; indeed, it should really be described as preliminary for most of the topics covered. More attention particularly could be useful for

- the interrelationships between study abroad and the domestic curriculum;
- the strategies needed to “internationalize” the training of elementary school teachers;
- the many dimensions and levels of advising and their potential impact on the international content of undergraduate education; and
- the roles—actual and potential—of university offices for international programs; and models of internationally oriented programs for training secondary school teachers.

Does a model program exist for training internationally competent teachers? Many programs have initiated effective internationalizing activities, but readily acknowledge that more is needed. The stronger programs may be at comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges where innovation could be more easily accomplished. Ironically (and based on my limited sample), research universities, institutions that have received most of the Title VI funds, may not be the leaders in internationalizing the training of teachers. Much work is still needed in the development of programs that will provide the newly-minted teacher an adequate understanding of world cultures and problems for use in preparing our children for their roles in our increasingly interconnected world.

⁰ Ann I. Schneider and Barbara B. Burn, *Federal Funding for International Studies: Does It Help? Does It Matter? A Study of the Long-Term Impacts of Federal Funding on International Studies and Foreign Language Programs* (Amherst, MA: International Programs Office, University of Massachusetts, 1999).

¹ American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, *Guidelines for International Teacher Education* (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1989).

² American Council on Education, *To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1999) and Council of Chief State School Officers, "International Dimensions of Education: Position Paper and Recommendations for Action," CCSSO website (www.ccsso.org/intlpol.html) accessed October 1999.

³ Sarah Pickert, "Changing Views about International Education in American Teacher Education Programs" (Washington, DC: ERIC Document No. ED460092, 2001).

⁴ Council of Chief State School Officers, *Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education: 2000* (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000), 37-40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 39.

⁶ U.S. Department of Education, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge* (Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, 2002), 12.

⁷ Fred Hayward and Laura Siaya, *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report of Two National Surveys about International Education* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2001), 56.

⁸ U. S. Department of Education, "Secretary Paige Announces \$35 million in Grants to Recruit and Train New Teachers" (Washington, DC: Office of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Education, October 15, 2002)

⁹ Merry M. Merrifield, "Institutionalizing Cross-Cultural Experiences and International Expertise in Teacher Education: The Development and Potential of a Global Education PDS Network," *Journal of Teacher Education*, no. 1 (January-February 1995), 22.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Education, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge*, 6 *et seq.*

¹¹ H. Thomas Collins, Frederick R. Czarra, and Andrew F. Smith, "Guidelines for Global and International Studies Education" in *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, edited by Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger, and Roxana Ma Newman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 226-243.

Also, Frederick R. Czarra, *Global Education Checklist*, Occasional Paper (New York: The American Forum for Global Education, 2002)

¹² Schneider and Burn, *Federal Funding*, 17.

¹³ Pickert, "Changing Views about International Education..."

¹⁴ James Middleton, College of Education, Arizona State University, interview by author, Tempe, AZ, November 16, 2000.

¹⁵ Donald Kennedy, "Aftermaths," *Science* 298 (November 29, 2002), 1679.

¹⁶ Schneider and Burn, *Federal Funding*, 43.

¹⁷ Roberta Flaherty, Executive Director, National Academic Advising Association, interview by author, Manhattan, KS, September 26, 2001.

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ Habley and Morales, *Current Practices in Academic Advising*, 18, 23, 30.

²⁰ NACADA website (www.ksu.edu.nacada), accessed July 2002.

²¹ Merrifield, "Institutionalizing Cross-Cultural Experiences ...," 23-25.

²² In addition, some items on the original list quickly seemed irrelevant or very impractical—more cross registration, joint A&S/SCDE faculty appointments, a double major, and a minor in international studies for the prospective teacher, for example.

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