

**STREAMLINING INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AT A MID-ATLANTIC STATE
UNIVERSITY: CONTEXT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

by

Anna Tigan

An education leadership portfolio submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Spring 2020

© 2020 Anna Tigan
All Rights Reserved

**STREAMLINING INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AT A MID-ATLANTIC STATE
UNIVERSITY: CONTEXT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

by

Anna Tigan

Approved: _____
Chrystalla Mouza, Ed.D.
Director of the School of Education

Approved: _____
Gary T. Henry, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Education and Human Development

Approved: _____
Douglas J. Doren, Ph.D.
Interim Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and
Dean of the Graduate College

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Zoubeida R. Dagher, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of education leadership portfolio committee

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Chrystalla Mouza, Ed.D.
Member of education leadership portfolio committee

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Lauren P. Bailes, Ph.D.
Member of education leadership portfolio committee

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Ravi Ammigan, Ph.D.
Member of education leadership portfolio committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This acknowledgement page should be a leadership portfolio on its own because of the number of true leaders who supported this endeavor. My profound gratitude goes to my advisor, Dr. Zoubeida Dagher. She continuously inspired me throughout the process with her wisdom, expertise and sense of reality. And the number of hours she spent reading my “internationalization scenarios” will live in history. She is *the* paragon of a research advisor. I would also like to thank my committee members: Dr. Chrystalla Mouza, Dr. Lauren Bailes, and Dr. Ravi Ammigan. They gave me constructive feedback and encouragement and helped me narrow down my topic. In addition, I would like to thank former Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, Dr. Carol Vukelich, for giving me an opportunity to join an exciting international education project at the university. In addition, I would like to acknowledge staff of the School of Education, especially David Hannah and Jessica Henderson for their expert advice and patience with me. I would also like to thank the donors of the Lydia C. Dunlap scholarship for funding the last stages of the proposal. I am beyond grateful to my parents, Vladimir and Olga, for being the best parents in the world. Their love and discipline helped me go through many hurdles of life. I also would not be who I am today without friendship of my aunt Svetlana who remains to be my top cheerleader on the other side of the Atlantic. My daughters, Sasha and Daria, make me look forward to every single day. You are my everything. Finally, my late grandparents, Anna and Ivan, always taught me that education opens all doors in this life. I love and miss you every day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 PROBLEM ADDRESSED.....	8
3 IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES.....	18
4 REFLECTIONS ON IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES RESULTS.....	29
5 REFLECTIONS ON IMPROVEMENT EFFORT RESULTS.....	47
6 REFLECTIONS ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT.....	52
REFERENCES.....	56

Appendix

A. ELP PROPOSAL.....	59
B. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	103
C. ANALYSIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES.....	153
D. ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEM ANALYSIS.....	193
E. EVALUTION OF A PDME PROGRAM.....	211
F. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION PLANS AND INITIATIVES FROM PEER AND ASPIRATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.....	224
G. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FACULTY VIEWS ON INTERNATIONALIZATION.....	259
H. IRB EXEMPTION LETTER.....	290

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Summary of professional improvement goals.....	27
Table 2	Recommendations and what artifact they refer to.....	46
Table 3	Evaluation of the professional development program.....	217
Table 4	Comparative analysis of internationalization plans of five universities.....	241
Table 5	Articulated support for the DoE's internationalization.....	265
Table 6	Student intercultural competence development through curriculum.....	267
Table 7	Students' preparedness for global careers through on-campus internationalization.....	272
Table 8	Degree of encouragement to participate in international activities.....	274
Table 9	Extent of support inviting visiting faculty/scholars from abroad.....	276
Table 10	Influencing factors to invite visiting faculty members.....	277

ABSTRACT

This Educational Leadership Portfolio (ELP) provides recommendations on internationalization strategies for the Department of Education (DoE) at a Mid-Atlantic State University (MASU). These recommendations are based on the premises that most U.S. institutions of higher education are responding to global challenges and pressures to internationalize their programs, curricula, and degree offerings. Findings of this portfolio demonstrate that a given DoE has the capacity to build on internationalization practices parallel to university-wide strategies while adhering to its own specific goals.

Artifacts illustrate the efforts I made to develop these recommendations. Efforts began with conducting literature and policy reviews on the topic. I also conducted an organizational review of a sponsoring agency as an illustrative example of how international partners might differ from U.S. higher education institutions in their approach of considering what constitutes a reliable institution for international students. Understanding these nuances will save U.S. higher education institutions time and money because principles of customer service and stakeholder engagement are a priori present in the U.S. higher education system (Lapovsky, 2019). Similarly, when U.S. higher education institutions engage with international sponsors, they need to understand that successful partnerships are a result of accepting and understanding the norms and principles of operation as seen by the sponsors. Sometimes (as discussed in Appendix D)

international institutional partners have different management mechanisms than U.S. counterparts.

Next, I developed a program evaluation plan for an international professional development program currently administered by MASU. Although conducting a longitudinal study for programs like this will be a challenge, recommendations provided in the artifact can be considered in the context of similar customized programs that the Department of Education can initiate with other global partners. I then conducted a comparative analysis of written strategic institutional plans of MASU's comparator institutions or Schools/ Departments of Education to analyze how internationalization is articulated in those plans and what specific initiatives serve as a sign of success for those institutions. Finally, through conducting a faculty survey I was able to identify the perceptions of the DoE faculty towards different aspects of internationalization and identify the areas of interest for further internationalization.

As a result, I developed four recommendations that the Department of Education at MASU can consider to potentially streamline efforts in internationalization. These recommendations include forming a faculty task force; expanding on communication and interaction with institutional partners and volunteer ambassadors to expand on domestic internship opportunities in international education; conducting educational seminars for faculty and staff to explain the benefits of internationalization; and capitalizing on the Department's domestic and international reputation by promoting its programs to international students and scholars. These recommendations, if implemented in whole or

in part, can serve as a solid ground for continuous internationalization of the Department of Education at MASU. The University already demonstrated strong commitment to internationalization by incorporating internationalization strategies and initiatives in the Strategic Plan and participation in the American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Laboratory for the 2019-2020 cycle. Because ACE Internationalization Lab focuses on strategies developed for institutions rather than individual departments, recommendations of this ELP focus on the DoE's capacity and articulated interest in internationalization and how those fit with institutional mandate for internationalization.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This Educational Leadership Portfolio (ELP) addresses a complex question: how can a Department of Education at a particular public mid-Atlantic university operationalize internationalization policies and strategies? Is there a need for internationalization? And is there faculty support for doing that?

I did not approach this specific topic easily, possibly because I assumed that every U.S. higher education institution would automatically reflect on the global developments and introduce policy implementations on the programmatic and curriculum spectra. But after conversations with the faculty at the DoE, I was surprised to learn that internationalization-per-se was not identified as an area of intellectual or research investment. However, the Mid-Atlantic State University can be considered a recognized leader of internationalization through student abroad programs. The university was at the forefront of establishing the first student abroad program in the United States. Today, MASU offers 100+ programs in about 40 countries-- and over 30 % of MASU undergrads study abroad at least once. But the majority of students will not participate in those programs for different reasons, including financial. Are there other ways for students to get better understanding of global processes through domestic experiences?

Curriculum exposure to international education issues, interactions, and developing intercultural competence through coursework can arguably be the most affordable proxy for acquiring related skills and knowledge. My interest in, and

research on this topic reflects my previous education, experiences, and interests. I have been in the field of international education since my college years in Ukraine. I was the first Peace Corps facilitator for a large public university in Eastern Ukraine. I then continued my career as an educational advisor for the American Councils on International Education through the Public Affairs Section of the U.S. Embassy in Kyiv, Ukraine. I volunteered for multiple international initiatives while pursuing my second graduate degree in the U.S. and then worked on educational partnership initiatives first for one of the embassies of the Persian Gulf countries (“Cultural Office”) in Washington, DC and then a customized professional development program from the Middle East (“PDME”). The latter is a joint initiative of the Ministry of Higher Education of a foreign country and the Mid-Atlantic State University. Now I am working as an Associate Director of International Programs and Services at the American University in Washington, DC. I have also been a member of the Embassy Dialogue Committee which is a standing committee of the largest international education organization in the world. I also continue to be a passionate educator having taught language classes to students as young as three years old and as old as ninety-three. Thus, my selection for the topic is not random. It is an attempt to contribute positively to an excellent institution that has raised me as a researcher and scholar by proposing internationalization recommendations. These recommendations, if implemented in full or in part, are likely to strategize internationalization initiatives of the department and further integrate intercultural competence in coursework.

Included in this portfolio are seven artifacts that describe the research I conducted in relation to different aspects of internationalization and how their different components can be contextualized for the Department of Education (DoE) at MASU. A description of each artifact follows.

1. ELP Proposal Document (Appendix A). This document describes the plan I originally designed to research how internationalization can be efficiently implemented in the DoE context. When I submitted and defended my proposal I was working as a program coordinator for the PDME program, so some of my recommendations were based on observations working for the program. In summer 2019 my professional affiliation changed when I accepted a position at the American University in Washington, DC. MASU also started an Internationalization Lab Process with the American Council on Education. Because I was no longer a part of a professional development partnership program that MASU and DoE hosted for the teachers sponsored by the Ministry of Education of a Middle-Eastern country, I decided to expand on my research to internationalization strategies instead of focusing on partnership only. Additionally, because I am now affiliated with a US university in a full-time role, I decided to drop the domain name for my individual professional website and not include it in my artifacts.
2. Literature Review (Appendix B). The literature review laid out the groundwork for this research. This artifact established a research base and outlined how

institutional internationalization in the United States has progressed from being synonymous with study abroad programs to a more complex and dynamic concept that includes skills development for global employability of students, curriculum redesign to integrate internationalization concepts, faculty engagement in internationalization, and others.

3. Analysis of U.S. Higher Education Policies (Appendix C). This artifact analyzed how internationalization policies of U.S. higher education are shaped. This analysis provided an understanding on what steps the university can take to improve its “global visibility” by engaging with U.S. government entities including the U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, etc. This artifact also addressed important issues of interaction and engagement with non-governmental entities, such as Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the George Soros Foundation, and some supranational actors in international higher education, such as the European Union.
4. Evaluation of the PDME Program (Appendix D). This artifact was an example of a program evaluation that could be administered by the DoE and a sponsoring agency. This program is part of a larger reform plan initiated by a foreign government in the Middle East. One of its goals is provide comprehensive professional development training to its K-12 teachers. As such, I worked both as an educational administrator and a research advisor to a group of teachers from many content areas, including Arabic language, art, computer science,

science, family studies, and mathematics. I designed a program evaluation module that can potentially be used for future cohorts of this initiative or for similar programs that MASU chooses to participate in.

5. Organizational Problem Analysis of the “Cultural Office” (Appendix E). This analysis of the “Cultural Office” can serve as a proxy for understanding the issues that U.S. universities including the Mid-Atlantic State University face when they collaborate with sponsoring agencies that sponsor many international students. The region continues to be a crucial global strategic partner for U.S. universities as it sponsors a large number of students for degree programs. Thus, understanding how decision-making on approving or disapproving the universities works can inform key players at MASU and DoE when they decide to engage in partnerships.
6. Comparative Analysis of Internationalization Plans and Initiatives from Peer and Aspirational Institutions (Appendix F). This artifact was designed to compare MASU’s overall institutional internationalization plan to those of institutions that were close in ranking for education programs according to the *U.S. News and World Report*. Usage of institutional comparative data is common for higher education professionals and policy makers (Brinkman & Krakower, 1983; Prather & Carlson, 1991). Thus, for this part of research I intentionally decided to focus on analyzing MASU’s plans against comparator institutions (as identified by the Office of Research at MASU) and analyze how their internationalization strategy is reflected in their strategic plans whether they

have education-specific strategic plans or not. Those schools include: Georgia State University (public university; # 45 for education); North Carolina State University (public university; # 45 in education and a comparator institution of MASU); Purdue University (public university; # 45 for education and a comparator institution of MASU); Rutgers (public university; # 50 for education, and a comparator institution for MASU). The Mid-Atlantic State University is ranked # 45 by the U.S. News and World Report (“US News and World Report”, 2020).

7. Faculty Views on Internationalization (Appendix G). This study was conducted to explore how the faculty at the Department of Education perceive internationalization and if there are any areas of internationalization that faculty is interested in exploring in more depth. For the purposes of the research I applied Knight’s (1997) definition of internationalization and included this definition in the introductory part of the survey. Ultimately, I wanted to find out how strongly the faculty at the Department of Education view internationalization as it relates to potential policy changes (e.g. including considering international experience as a criterion for promotion and tenure) and possible curriculum changes to develop intercultural competence of students. Additionally, I wanted to get faculty opinions on what internationalization initiatives or activities they think would benefit or challenge them. I designed and administered a survey (IRB approval letter is included in Appendix H) that included closed-and open-ended questions that allowed faculty members to

provide additional details. Adjunct faculty were not included in the survey because they do not participate in the department's governance. Thus all the responses submitted (with a 25% response rate) were from the voting members of the DoE.

My goal in the following chapters is to summarize and reflect on what I learned about theories, policies, and implementation of internationalization in higher education and how they can apply to a specific context- the Department of Education at a Mid-Atlantic State University. Thus, this document is organized into six chapters and seven appendices that describe my exciting and at times challenging journey. In chapter one, I described all the artifacts I completed for this project. All artifacts are included in the Appendix section of the paper. In chapter two, I discuss why I considered the insufficient focus on internationalization as an issue for the Department of Education given that the resources and faculty expertise are abundant for excelling at advancing internationalization practices at a partnership, curriculum and intercultural competency-building level. In chapter three, I discuss feasible improvement strategies as they can apply to the Department of Education. In chapter four, I summarize the results of improvement strategies for enhancing the internationalization of the DoE and propose a set of four recommendations. In chapter 5, I reflect on the findings and then conclude the paper in chapter 6 by highlighting my journey through the program and how I have grown as a scholar, public diplomacy professional, and educational leader.

Chapter 2

PROBLEM ADDRESSED

This chapter establishes the need to improve internationalization strategies for the Department of Education (DoE). This is a timely goal as it aligns well with the Mid-Atlantic State University's (MASU) strategic plan and its recent partnership with the American Council on Education through Internationalization Lab initiative. This chapter broadly describes what internationalization entails as a theoretical concept and the practical considerations that follow. It also discusses why it is important to integrate internationalization as a working concept in the practices of the DoE.

Internationalization of higher education is often contextualized depending on a geopolitical environment. With the end of the Cold War, the United States higher education community and policy makers started to recognize the need to prepare university graduates for growing challenges and opportunities of the interconnected world. Global engagement became an important part of strategic plans at major research universities, smaller liberal arts and community colleges. Furthermore, after tragic events of September 11th the need to internationalize created a new discourse for global recognition of higher education institutions. As Peterson and Helms indicate, “higher education needed to produce graduates with the ability to understand and prevent threats to US security and build the mutual understanding that might resolve the conflicts behind such threats” (Peterson & Helms, 2013, p. 28).

For the purposes of this research I applied the definition of internationalization in higher education as first introduced by Knight in her seminal work in 1994 and further developed in subsequent works. I introduced the same definition in the faculty survey for consistency purposes. The most comprehensive definition states that “internationalization of higher education is a process of integrating international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003). Knight’s definition assigns a dynamic rather than static role to internationalization. She sees it as a process where stakeholders have evolving roles and where all functions of a higher education institution (academic, research, and contribution to society) are met.

Overall, internationalization is one of the most talked-about topics in higher education today. Policy makers, educational administrators, and stakeholders view internationalization of higher education as a diversification and tangible application of global processes (Green & Olson, 2003; Hudzik, 2015; Institute of International Education (IIE), 2019). In my practice as a federalism orientation leader for the International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP) of the U.S. Department of State and currently an Associate Director for International Programming at American University in Washington, DC, I receive a lot of announcements from international stakeholders such as Deputy Ministers of Education, parliamentary leaders, and non-profit managers

about opportunities for internationalization that they offer. Indeed, increased global student mobility with top ten countries for global engagement (China, India, US, Brazil, Indonesia, Russia, Japan, Turkey, Iran, and Nigeria), rising demand for higher education, the growth of excellent universities worldwide and information technology that overcomes distance issues have turned an already complex landscape of international higher education into to a hard-to-navigate-through mix of opportunities and challenges (“Open Doors 2018”, 2018). Institutions react differently to this call. Many institutions see the absolute necessity in internationalization and make internationalization part of their strategic plans or create specific internationalization strategic plans. How those plans reflect the need to internationalize is discussed in subsequent chapters.

For my research I focused on one unit-Department of Education- at a Mid-Atlantic State University. MASU is a land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant state-supported institution that consists of eight colleges. Department of Education is housed within one of its colleges. The mission of the DoE is to provide “innovative, demanding, and multidisciplinary education” (“CEHD Strategic Plan”, 2016). As part of a land-grant university, the DoE is committed to serve the needs of the state in preparing educators and educational leaders that have the knowledge and skills to work with diverse student population.

Internationalization of curriculum is one way to prepare undergraduate and graduate students to work with racially, culturally, and ethnically diverse groups of students. It can be defined as “incorporation of international, and/or global dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study.” (Leask, 2009). Freedman (1998) stated that “curriculum must reflect the complexities of global existence” (Freedman, 1998, p. 50). Khalideen (2006) expanded on this sentiment and put curriculum at the center of institutional internationalization because it can improve global consciousness of students and faculty (Khalideen, 2006, p. 1). Through teaching, research, and service curriculum internationalization is likely to result in the overall improved quality of higher education and what it has to offer in terms of post-graduate employment and employment mobility (Knight, 2004). But it is hard to imagine successful internationalization without faculty buy-in. For this ELP I wanted to research how the faculty at the DoE perceives internationalization.

Research shows that in order to receive widespread faculty support the engagement of *all* faculty is critical. For example, Green and Shoenberg (2006) stated that “it is comparatively easy to get the enthusiastic agreement of a small group of committed people” while generating sufficient support from skeptical and undecided faculty members is equally important (Green & Schoenberg, 2006, p. 22). However,

faculty support cannot be gained immediately, it is a process. Four recommendations of this ELP can serve as a guidance for the DoE leadership to further advance the mission of the Department.

As mentioned before, the mission is to provide innovative education that positions alumni as leaders who are competent to address various critical issues in education. Because those issues are constantly evolving with global developments, addressing them through the prism of intercultural competence will be beneficial (Deardorff, 2006; Leask, 2009). In this ELP I rely on the definition of intercultural competence developed by Darla K. Deardorff (2006). Deardorff defines intercultural competence as “the ability to develop targeted knowledge, skills, and attitudes that lead to visible behavior and communication that are both effective and appropriate in intercultural interactions” (Deardorff, 2006). Building such a competence is not an easy task and faculty play a vital role in it. By accepting the importance of building intercultural competence in students, faculty also inadvertently contribute to internationalization of the curriculum (Rizvi, 2007). The latter is then a key factor in institutional internationalization, a priority of U.S. higher education, and in some ways a criterion for a program or institutional selection by students and sponsors (ACE, 2012; Green & Olson, 2008; Mestenhauser, 2011). Thus, internationalization of curriculum and building intercultural competence in MASU students will benefit institutional

stakeholders including students and faculty and improve the institution's position with international partners.

And still, some experts may argue that MASU is already recognized for its internationalization initiatives through administering student study abroad programs. Indeed, as mentioned before, for a long time the university has been known as a leader in administering those programs. Yet even today, participation in such programs is not necessarily an equitable approach to international education because of the anticipated additional tuition and living expenses' cost among other reasons. Additionally, most study abroad programs are offered in English where courses are taught by the same professors as in their home institutions. So students pay extra to be exposed to the same discourse that they would otherwise receive at their home institutions. These are just some potential challenges for justifying that traditional study abroad programs as an adequate proxy for internationalization of programs.

Thus, in an effort to support the university's interest in improving internationalization from a more equitable angle, I decided to take the case of one academic unit within the MASU, the Department of Education, as the focus for this study. The ultimate purpose was to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations that would incorporate faculty perspectives and findings from a comparative analysis of internationalization practices of peer/aspirational institutions and departments. The

recommendations can be implemented in whole or in part depending on the leadership support and identified institutional priorities.

Organizational Role

My current role at the American University in Washington, DC is an Associate Director for International Programs and Services. I started in this position in July 2019 and I am in charge of leading a team tasked with designing and delivering programmatic activities for over 2,000 international students and scholars from over 180 countries. In this role I also oversee all communication, evaluation, and assessment with institutional partners while also developing partnerships with foreign embassies and diplomatic missions in Washington, DC. I started in this position right after I left my assignment with the Department of Education at MASU as a program coordinator for the PDME.

In 2018, the Mid-Atlantic State University won a grant from the Ministry of Education of a Middle Eastern country to administer a one-year professional exchange program for forty-eight teachers. The participants represented academic content area teachers (ACT) and English as a Foreign Language teachers (EFL). Twenty-three teachers were content area teachers. The others were EFL teachers. Content areas represented the following fields: science, mathematics, special education, art, computer science, and Arabic language. During the first cycle, I served as a program coordinator

for all ACT teachers. Concurrently, I was tasked to serve as a Professional Learning Community (PLC) mentor for three teachers: one art teacher and two Arabic language teachers. In the latter capacity, I served as a research advisor to help the teachers create a research-based educational plan for implementation in their home country.

In 2019-2020 the university was honored with receiving another grant to administer the next cycle of the PDME program. For this cohort, the number of academic content teachers on the program increased to twenty-five while the number of EFL teachers has decreased to twenty-three. The total number of participants in the 2019-2020 cohort did not change and remained at forty-eight. Throughout my tenure at the program my duties focused on streamlining program responsibilities to create a mutually beneficial learning and culturally adaptive environment for program participants. I co-designed and delivered workshops on developing intercultural competency, cultural misunderstandings, academic integrity, and other issues. Specifically for content teachers, I was in charge of co-planning and co-facilitating pre-arrival webinars, content seminars in the areas of literacy, mathematics, computer science, and science. I maintained communication with state public schools and teacher supervisors in elementary, middle, and high schools. In addition, I was tasked to serve as a PLC mentor to five teachers representing the following fields: Arabic language (3), art (1) and religion (1). I also served as a liaison between faculty of the Department of

Education, PDME project director, and two principal investigators. Furthermore, I participated in program development through evaluation of program workshops and seminars and synthesizing data for presentation to the program sponsors.

In addition, though I left a full-time position with the Cultural Office, I continue to consult for the program evaluation committee there through my role as a member of the Embassy Dialogue Committee. I mostly assist with research and evaluation of graduate programs to be added or removed from the list of approved programs following criteria approved by the Ministry of the country. This is an important task because other countries in the area historically rely on the list as well.

Furthermore, since 2011 I have been managing federalism orientation lecturers and briefings for global participants of the International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP) sponsored by the U.S. Department of State. IVLP is the premier professional exchange program of the United States government that seeks to promote professional cooperation between global leaders and their U.S. counterparts (“About IVLP”, 2019). In this capacity I also design and deliver trainings for junior staff focusing on intercultural competence and cultural diplomacy. So far, I have conducted over a thousand orientations for leaders from over one hundred and eighty countries. Thus, in all of my assignments and projects I have been involved in initiatives that target

internationalization of higher education and improvement of intercultural dialogue between private and government actors.

Thus, when I started the Ed.D. program at the Mid-Atlantic State University I realized that the Department of Education can potentially leverage its faculty expertise to support the university's goal of strengthening its internationalization efforts. In order to develop viable recommendations, I completed the research tasks described in the seven artifacts. I believe that the resulting recommendations can support the Department of Education's effort in preparing its graduates to address critical educational issues facing local and global communities.

Chapter 3

IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

The previous chapter introduced the concept of internationalization and demonstrated that there are opportunities for the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University to systematize them. This chapter describes the research strategies I used to understand some aspects of internationalization that are most relevant to the DoE's context.

My interest in the topic was also driven by the fact that I could not find an elective on international or comparative education at the DoE when selecting my coursework. However, the enthusiasm and engagement of the DoE faculty who were involved with the international professional development program for the PDME showed that there is interest and excitement among some faculty to bring their experiences to an international level.

Thus, I focused my efforts on synthesizing theories on internationalization, my experiences working for policy institutions, sponsoring agencies, and lately a partnership program between MASU and PDME administrators to create a set of recommendations for the DoE. For example, for over a year I served as a direct research advisor to three international participants in the PDME program while also serving as a program specialist for twenty-three content teachers in that program. As a

result of this work, artifact four (Appendix E) describes the steps I proposed to conduct a program evaluation of the program. In this artifact I also point out that it is a challenge to conduct evaluation of programs when longitudinal studies are not feasible. Cultural differences, level of transparency and accountability that are likely to be different for participating international partners can also be a challenge to overcome. Understanding institutional partnership, however, is still an important endeavor for faculty and professionals.

Historically, international partnerships fell into two categories: Exchanges and collaborations for technical assistance (Klasek, 1992). Today's partnerships, however, take a wide variety of forms, but one of the most central goals of improving international visibility of the institution through international partnership is to enhance teaching and student learning and to build institutional reputation and prestige ("Internationalization in Action: International Partnerships", 2016).

Indeed, considering multiple international opportunities available, the question that many colleges and universities face is how to pursue, manage, and sustain global engagement activities in a planned and coherent way. Literature searches and discussions with the Embassy Dialogue Committee colleagues suggested that there is no one correct way to do it. Sometimes, universities identify particular geographic and/or academic priority areas for collaboration. For example, PDME program has a strong

leadership and English language development components- two areas where MASU demonstrates high level of expertise. In other cases, institutions seek to deepen and expand on existing partnerships. Who and when a U.S. institution partners with depends a lot on the international partner's discretion.

For example, Cultural Office partners with all accredited institutions in the United States that are highly ranked. All partnerships are formalized through Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). However, as it is the case with most institutional agreements, many relationships start on a personal level when either professors from the country of origin or American professors there are able to leverage knowledge of both systems and can launch partnerships between departments, for example. With time, these partnerships can grow into institutional partnerships and become sustainable. Eventually, they become part of comprehensive institutional internationalization strategy.

The American Council on Education (ACE) defines comprehensive internationalization as “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions” (“CIGE Model”, 2019). The CIGE model was a culmination of several surveys of U.S. institutions of higher education

(IHE) and was developed as a useful tool for assessing internationalization. It includes “six interconnected target areas for initiatives, policies, and programs”.

1. Articulated Institutional Commitment: Strategic planning, internationalization committee, campus stakeholders, and assessment.
2. Administrative Leadership, Structure, and Staffing: Senior leadership and international office.
3. Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes: General education requirements, internationalized courses in the disciplines, co-curriculum to address global issues, student learning outcomes, and technology.
4. Faculty Policies and Practices: Tenure and promotion policies, hiring guidelines, faculty mobility, and on-campus professional development.
5. Student Mobility: Credit transfer policies, financial aid and funding, orientation and re-entry programs, ongoing support and programs for international students.
6. Collaboration and Partnerships: Partnerships with institutions and organizations abroad; community collaborations, and on-campus networks.

Although the purpose of the research was not to evaluate institution-wide internationalization based on the model, it can still be used to develop recommendations

for the Department of Education because the Mid-Atlantic State University is currently going through a two-year (2019-2021) Internationalization Lab process of the ACE that is based on the CIGE model. For example, the DoE can decide to use some or all the model's components as a measure of its degree of internationalization.

As such, examples and lessons learned can serve as a reference. For example, PDME or similar contractual arrangements are of particular importance to the Department of Education because they become an example of a sponsored partnership with a long-term effect. ACE's publications and policy papers encourage U.S. institutions to view partnerships not as beneficial set of actions to improve the institution's global standing but more of an opportunity to make a long-lasting impact on global education. At the same time, institutions have to be practical and allow for shared responsibilities in partnership administration to take place. For example, in 2016, ACE ran a survey to assess the state of internationalization at American colleges and universities. Data collection was a multistage process where the survey was first sent to provosts; subsequent requests to participate were sent to senior international officers, presidents and other decision-makers. In the end "ACE received a total of 1,164 valid survey responses from colleges and universities nationwide with an overall response rate of 39.5 percent" ("Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses, 2017 Edition", 2017). The findings reveal that seventy-two percent of respondents indicated

that “internationalization accelerated in recent years” with “over forty percent of institutions having articulated a formal strategy for international partnership” and “thirty percent of institutions employing a staff member whose primary responsibility is developing international partnerships” (“Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses, 2017 Edition”, 2017).

Moreover, ACE also tracked activities employed by highly active and less active institutions in internationalization. Institutions exercised different strategies following recommendations from leaderships and institutional needs. Many institutions depend on institutional partnerships as a path towards internationalization (“Internationalization in Action: International Partnerships”, 2016; Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014; Helms, 2015; Hudzik, 2015; Klasek, 1992; “What Does It Mean to Be Strategic”, 2016). Because institutional partnerships are important for institutions, the roles that leaders play are very important too. Leaders can wear many hats as they serve as a “nexus and point of internal cohesion” around institutional global engagement (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014). Ideally, a person in charge of international partnerships would be attuned to research, teaching, and negotiating. In addition, this person needs to know financial structure of the home university and be educated on the legal matters of international contracts. To be favorably viewed by overseas partners, such a person would have to be a faculty member. Thus, it is clearly a very complex role and one of

the solutions can potentially be mapping responsibilities for different offices and departments as suggested by the research of the Institute of International Education (Institute of International Education “IIE”, 2011).

Aside from the level of responsibility it might also be a challenge to assign that role to a tenure-track faculty member because not all institutions consider international experience or education for tenure. That trend is changing, however. Participants of the 2016 ACE’s survey indicated a slight increase (from 8 to 10 %) in the “percentage of institutions that specify international work or experience as a consideration in faculty promotion and tenure engagement” (“Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses, 2017 Edition”, 2017).

To examine the impact of the PDME program I developed a one-group design because it was a reasonable fit for program evaluation (See Appendix E). In Appendix E, I described the purpose and justification for the program as per the RFP, justified my selection of a one-group design as an evaluation and assessment method and addressed threats to internal validity that included history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, and selection bias. I also discussed how evaluation can be enriched through collecting more data from the participants, PLC mentors, workshop leaders, and host teachers during each cycle/ phase of the program. Due to cultural differences, participants are unlikely to participate in many surveys. But the majority of the participants welcomed

one-on-one discussions about intercultural clashes with their advisors, host teachers, program coordinators and program leaders. Their feedback prompted me to consider the readiness of the Department of Education's staff to engage with future professional development or other internationalization projects.

From my experience studying at the DoE at MASU and working on an international partnership project that involved many dynamic and dedicated faculty members I learned that no internationalization project or component of its implementation can get off the ground unless it gets a solid support from the faculty and staff. Thus, my second major undertaking was to examine the "internationalization climate" of the Department of Education through administering a faculty internationalization perception survey.

It is understood that faculty buy-in is a must in any type of modification to existing policies or practices at higher education institutions. But without faculty support no changes are possible because faculty are major stakeholders in the internationalization process and their support is crucial. The content and justification of the faculty survey were grounded in research. For example, Stohl states that "if we want to internationalize the university, we have to internationalize the faculty" (Stohl, 2007). Indeed, recent literature provides some insight into faculty engagement in institutional internationalization but understanding how faculty perceive their role in the

internationalization of the educational process requires further research (Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Hudzik, 2015; Stohl, 2007).

As such, the survey was developed for the purpose of providing baseline data from which to suggest improvements and strategize internationalization initiatives for the Department of Education. Full-time faculty, in particular, are main stakeholders when it applies to internationalization within the Department because faculty usually provide institutions with “actionable information on important and timely issues” (“Using the HERI Faculty Survey”, 2020). Findings from the survey can be possibly used to inform the DoE’s strategic planning in internationalization strategies, faculty recruitment, retention and promotion, and starting a discussion within the DoE on how internationalization of the curriculum and engaging in productive partnerships can positively contribute to student learning experiences.

Prior to conducting the survey, I framed theoretical foundation for developing survey questions to address three overarching research questions (Appendix G).

- 1) How strongly do the faculty at the Department of Education view internationalization as an important mandate for the DoE?
- 2) What internationalization initiatives or activities do the faculty at the Department of Education find the most beneficial and/or the most challenging?

- 3) How important it is for the faculty of the Department of Education to consider international experience for hiring and tenure processes?

After receiving an approval from MASU's IRB (see Appendix G), I emailed a link to an online survey to 57 full-time faculty members at the Department of Education using MASU's Qualtrics platform on November 13, 2019. Two follow-up reminders were sent on November 26, 2019 and December 9, 2019. Table 1 presents my research/professional improvement goals and the steps I took to understand those goals:

Table 1. *Summary of Professional Improvement Goals*

What I hope to understand better	Methods that enabled me to get the insights	Data sources I used
How international partnership programs can be improved through evaluation.	Consideration of three programmatic "strands": assimilation of participants, structured English language development, and structured professional and leadership development. Faculty answers to survey.	Proposed using: Pre-and post-program TOEFL test; Reading, Writing, and Speaking skills' assessment in accordance with ELI policies; submission of a research-based Capstone proposal in compliance with proposal requirements. Post-workshop written assignments; post-workshop surveys; notes of field supervisors (for immersion experience.) Data were not formalized but observations were noted and discussed with leadership.
How aspirational/peer institutions or schools/departments of education integrated internationalization into their strategic plans.	Document analysis of strategic plans.	Strategic plans of: Georgia State University, North Carolina State University, Purdue University, Rutgers University, and the Mid-Atlantic State University.
How the faculty express their views towards different aspects of DoE	Faculty answers to survey.	Online survey responses of 14 DoE faculty members to 16 closed and open-ended questions.

“internationalization” and their role in it.		
--	--	--

Chapter 4

REFLECTIONS ON IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES RESULTS

This chapter analyzes findings from artifacts that I developed throughout this ELP project and how these artifacts helped me formulate four internationalization recommendations for the Department of Education. The recommendations were developed based on input from the theoretical framework and definition of internationalization by Knight (1997), analysis of internationalization policies of the U.S. higher education, MASU's strategic plan (working document), comparative internationalization analysis of aspirational institutions and colleges/schools of education, and CEHD's Strategic Plan of 2016. From a practical standpoint, these recommendations integrated findings of the DOE's faculty survey conducted in November 2019 (Appendix G), with findings from the evaluation of a PDME program (Appendix E), and analysis of Cultural Office (Appendix D).

Findings from Artifacts

I firmly believe in the importance of increasing awareness for internationalization in the Department of Education at MASU. Although interpretations of the definition differ, the basic components include internationalization of curriculum, faculty engagement in developing intercultural competence of students, and development and sustainability of international partnership opportunities. The artifacts

helped me do just that- collect data that are potentially relevant for the Department of Education, ground those data in the theories of internationalization and provide practical recommendations. For example, results of the faculty survey demonstrated that 57 % of respondents agreed that intercultural competence of students can be improved through curriculum (Appendix G). And seventy-nine percent of respondents expressed some level of agreement (“somewhat agree”, “agree”, and “strongly agree”) that on-campus internationalization is likely to prepare students for global careers. These and other findings are arguably timely and important, especially because MASU expressed the need to improve systematic internationalization by having invested money and human resources in joining the ACE Internationalization Lab. In addition, because U.S. higher education system is decentralized, these recommendations can be implemented without major policy changes for the institution. If desired, the Department’s leadership can establish a time frame and a strategy for implementation and then run an evaluation of how successful (or not) the implementation was.

While I worked on the recommendations for about three months, I worked on other artifacts for several years. For example, the literature review and policy analysis (Artifacts two and three) helped me create a structural framework to consider how internationalization is defined by researchers and practitioners and how universities utilize the decentralized system of higher education governance in the United States.

Artifact three specifically (“Analysis of Higher Education Policies”) helped me better understand how US higher education policies are governed. Artifact four (“Organizational Problem Analysis of the Cultural Office”) came as a result of my almost eight-year work as a graduate program evaluator there.

Research on Artifacts three, four, and five provided me with a deeper understanding of higher education policies and how those policies are integrated in the work of international partners. This can be of particular interest to the DoE at MASU if it seeks closer collaboration with international partners that have a more centralized higher education system than the United States.

Artifact five (“Evaluation of the PDME program”) proposed the evaluation of three improvement strands for the program: “assimilation of participants”, “structured English language development”, and “structured professional and leadership development.” For each strand I used different observation or assessment methods and implementation domains. They are all described in detail in Appendix E. After working on a program for over one year, one of the crucial findings is that even if longitudinal studies might be a challenge with programs like PDME, a one-group design as a type of a formal design is feasible. It is a practical approach that can help principal investigators, program managers and staff to make adjustments or changes to the program so that it is favorably viewed by program sponsors. In this case, if the

institution (in this case MASU) agreed to the model of partnership where international sponsors are not only major stakeholders but also primary decision makers then the institution inadvertently puts a focus on such partnerships as a part of an acceptable model for partnerships as part of internationalization.

Although threats to internal validity (maturation, testing, instrumentation) and external validity (selection bias) exist, there are several ways how one-group design can be enriched. Prior to completing my assignment with the program I suggested to introduce individual intake interviews for participants to extract more detailed information about their professional goals while in the United States. Based on this feedback, MASU program partners could design a more customized program.

Artifact six focused on the comparative case study analysis of internationalization plans for MASU's aspirational institutions. Researching what criteria and priorities peer institutions consider as important and how these priorities are met can be of important consideration for MASU in general and DoE in particular. One of important findings is that all four peer institutions had a clear rationale for internationalization plans and they outlined justification for including internationalization in their strategic plans. Mechanisms for internationalization varied from institution to institution but so did the priorities. For some (e.g. NC State

University) internationalization priorities focus on the development and sustainability of strategic partnerships. For others, internationalization is a permeating concept that deals with areas of research, curriculum, competency building, in and out of classroom communication and so on.

While conducting this research I relied on strategic plans' analysis offered by Allison and Kaya (2005) and on an analysis of structural components suggested by Holcomb (2001). Allison and Kaya (2005) suggested analyzing strategic plans following a rubric. Such an approach leaves less room for interpretation and instead adheres to concrete measurable categories. According to Stevens and Levi (2005) a "rubric can help inform decision-making... and specify quality expectations (Stevens & Levi, 2005, p.3). During the analysis, I noticed some commonalities in the discourse of strategic plans. First, all strategic plans recognize that universities play a central role in knowledge and competency building. Thus, a particular university in some ways is tasked with educating leaders of tomorrow. Second, all strategic plans outline four or five pillars or priorities to meet the developmental goals of the institution. Third, all plans capitalize on the already existing foundation of academic, research, and social support at their institution and describe desired outcomes when changes or innovative programming are introduced.

Upon completion of this analysis I inferred that the differences usually relate to the operationalization stage. For example, which unit, if tasked, should focus on collecting data on what particular internationalization initiatives are important for a particular campus? Or alternatively, what initiatives that a department undertakes (if any), are more prone to success for internationalization than others? This analysis helped me with my effort to explicitly point out internationalization goals that can be implemented by the DoE if its leadership chooses to focus on internationalization as a strategic goal. Clearly, faculty's role cannot be underestimated in achieving that.

The survey enabled me to understand faculty's views on internationalization (Appendix G). The survey revealed that there is significant ambiguity and confusion among the participants about the meaning of internationalization. But even then 99 % of faculty members who participated in the survey agree that on-campus internationalization is likely to give students a better understanding of global processes.

Based on the survey information I was able to understand the DoE's faculty perception on internationalization and how the faculty can help the DoE further develop its internationalization strategies. Some faculty were more in favor of study abroad experience and studying about countries/ cultures as contributing factors to internationalization rather than curriculum internationalization. Other comments stated

that internationalization is relevant only when the research is on “sociology, political science, anthropology, or policy topics” and that MASU should focus on its mission to “to put its energy to the state’s needs.” (See Analysis in Appendix G).

And yet over eighty percent of respondents feel encouraged to participate in international activities. Some stated that “leadership should provide more financial resources for international cooperation, initiatives, exchanges and conferences”. Respondents recognized that there are many “faculty, staff and students who have rich international experiences that can be assets to the departments and the university but their talents are not tapped.” Thus, to further engage with faculty it will be beneficial to understand why (or why not) they share the belief that internationalization is a priority for the Department. Without a doubt, the survey’s findings could be bolstered with semi-structured follow-up interviews in order to get more insight into what areas of internationalization are of particular importance to different faculty members. This however, was not undertaken, and is one of the limitations of this study.

The findings from the various artifacts presented in this chapter provided the basis for formulating concrete recommendations on how to advance departmental internationalization initiatives while still supporting faculty research agendas. For example, specific goals and extent of the departmental internationalization can be

assessed based on recommendations from the faculty task force (Recommendation 1); discussion with faculty, students, and staff (Recommendation 2), feedback from students who did their internship or externship in international education organizations (Recommendation 3), and feedback from international alumni of MASU. The specific implications of these recommendations are discussed below.

Recommendations for Internationalization

After concluding the research described in my artifacts, I developed four internationalization recommendations for the Department of Education. These recommendations are particularly significant and timely because the University is currently participating in the ACE's Internationalization Lab. As discussed previously, Internationalization Lab is a strategic and institution-specific two-year initiative of the American Council on Education ("About ACE Lab", 2020). As university leaders stated: "the goal is to amplify MASU's impact as an international university with an optimized foundation for dynamic administration, education and programming" ("Global Education Initiative", 2019).

Because of my aspirations to continue being a leader in international education and my recent affiliation with the Department of Education as a PDME's program coordinator, I am hopeful that the recommendations listed below will be useful for the DoE's leadership and faculty. However, because these recommendations are based on

public records (internationalization strategic plans and documents that are posted on university websites) and a limited number of faculty that responded to the survey, more data and research will be needed to improve these recommendations.

Recommendation #1. Form a faculty task force on internationalization.

Those faculty members that share interest for internationalization might serve as a locomotive for researching and finding international research and teaching funding opportunities. Internationalization fits some faculty research interests (see Appendix G) and also relates to the DoE's mission. As discussed in Chapter 2, the DoE is committed to preparing educational leaders who can work with diverse groups of students and who can incorporate those skills when pursuing global careers. Faculty can be instrumental in assisting the DoE's students doing that. Faculty can also forge connections with global partner institutions that have similar research topic interest in addition to developing new interdisciplinary research areas or topics that will be of interest for all parties.

Furthermore, the task force can be instrumental for developing strategies on how to increase international content and intercultural awareness in the coursework for undergraduate and graduate students at the Department of Education. One such example can be to promote research and practice by non-US and non-Western academics to challenge students' points of views and further develop critical thinking skills. Because

assignment to this taskforce can count towards the faculty's service workload, no budgeting commitment is anticipated. However, this recommendation will require broader institutional support in terms of promoting and publicizing the initiative on the website and social media.

This recommendation derives from several artifacts. First, literature review (Appendix B) and analysis of U.S. higher education policies (Appendix C) demonstrate that even though faculty views on internationalization do not necessarily align, faculty commitment is essential for internationalization of curriculum, development and sustainability of international partnerships and projects, and ultimately for institutional internationalization. Viewing internationalization as a holistic process where engagement and support of all stakeholders is needed, ACE (2012) determined that for successful implementation of internationalization, faculty commitment is instrumental where internationalization of curriculum is the “centerpiece of internationalization” (ACE, 2012; Green & Olson, 2008).

The support for doing that was demonstrated in the faculty survey (Artifact G). One respondent noted that “the sheer exposure to multiple points of view is likely to broaden and enhance students’ points of view which might better prepare them for a global workforce.” Another one stated that on-campus internationalization “raises awareness about global careers but more importantly, enables them [students] to feel

knowledgeable to be competent enough to apply for them. Even if they are not interested in these careers, they will be better prepared to work with international colleagues.”

This recommendation parallels the ACE’s CIGE Model (2019) (“CIGE Model”, 2019). CIGE Model was briefly reviewed in Chapter 3 of the ELP. Although I did not intend to evaluate internationalization at the MASU according to this model, the model can be useful for implementation of recommendations. For example, the faculty task force might start with concentrating on addressing target area # 1 (Articulated Institutional Commitment); target area # 3 (Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes); target area # 4 (Faculty Policies and Practices); target area # 6 (Collaboration and Partnerships) while also considering context and departmental interests of the DoE at MASU.

Additionally, it is possible that the faculty task force will meet some challenges. For example, faculty can be reluctant to consider internationalization as a priority for the department or they may not have a clear understanding of what internationalization entails. The results of the survey demonstrated reluctance of some faculty members to consider international experience as a criterion for tenure and promotion. Others (four out of twelve respondents) opposed to considering it for promotion. I also realize that even though faculty survey results were important for developing this recommendation,

the sample of respondents was rather small (fourteen responses) and thus might not be representative of the Department's overall interest in internationalization. The second recommendation addresses some of those challenges.

Recommendation #2. Raise awareness about benefits of internationalization through introduction of seminars and roundtable discussions for faculty and staff.

Faculty and staff might benefit from understanding what internationalization means for the Department's needs and advancement. Faculty comments revealed that some faculty were confused about the term even though the definition of internationalization was provided in the beginning of the survey (Appendix G). Because staff was not surveyed, I was not able to make any inferences about staff perceptions on internationalization aside from having informal conversations. However, it is more likely than not that both faculty and the staff would need some additional support from leadership on how to connect institutional goals for internationalization with individual scholarly agendas and research of the faculty while also attracting staff to be part of internationalization initiatives. Integrating internationalization priorities outlined through the ACE Lab process can provide links between overall institutional internationalization and disciplinary priorities of individual faculty members.

These priorities are traditionally discussed in strategic plans and this is the reason why I conducted a review of institutional or departmental strategic plans of

MASU's peer institutions. The findings are presented in Appendix F. Indeed, strategic plans of peer institutions can be useful for MASU but because they are public documents I could only rely on the actual wording of the documents and could not infer the underlying reasons for selecting certain strategies or preferring specific internationalization initiatives over the others. In the future, it would be helpful to survey faculty members of those institutions and conduct semi-structured interviews with their leaders.

An example of such a study was conducted on two institutions: Duke University and the University of Richmond. Childress (2010) described how both institutions operationalized their internationalization plans and engaged the faculty. She mentioned that "both institutions committed resources, developed infrastructure, enhanced communication channels, and supported faculty to connect their scholarly agendas with internationalization plans" (Childress, 2010, p. 167). She concluded that this should be an intentional process where institutional internationalization goals do not trump faculty agendas but instead integrate with the latter. Support for international research and teaching as well as recognition of international experience for promotion and tenure varies for the DoE faculty. For example, one respondent to the faculty survey stated that "colleagues with international experience provide us with a new way to view the problems of education and educating pre-service teachers, and they can serve as a great

resource for forming international partnerships that benefit our students and the institution.” Another one stated that “international experience should be a plus because educational research has been internationalized.” But there were others who were more hesitant and stated: “I think it should be considered but I am not sure how much it should be weighed” or “absolutely should not, unless international curriculum and collaborations are the main responsibility of the position.” (Appendix G)

Similar to Recommendation #1, this recommendation also aligns with target areas outlined in the CIGE Model (“CIGE Model”, 2019). These target areas are # 1 (Articulated Institutional Commitment); #2 (Administrative Leadership, Structure, and Staffing); and # 6 (Collaboration and Partnership). Indeed, internationalization should be inclusive of all stakeholders- students, faculty, staff, and administrators because they all are participants in the process and internationalization policies affect their everyday modus operandi (Brinkman & Krakower, 1983; Klasek, 1992). The precise mechanisms of how these target areas should be addressed can be discussed by the DoE leadership.

In general, I believe that it will be beneficial for the Department of Education to open a conversation with faculty and staff then raise awareness and further educate them about the topic. One of the challenges can be associated costs. Based on my previous experiences, I found that partnering with peer institutions to initiate such trainings or attracting international partners to co-deliver trainings can lower the cost.

Recommendation # 3. Streamline communication and interaction with MASU's Global Institute, Office of International Students and Scholars, and DoE volunteer ambassadors. The purpose of this is to create or access internship opportunities with state, federal and international education associations like the Institute for International Education (IIE); NAFSA (Association of International Educators), International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), American Councils for International Education and others. It also opens up opportunities to involve MASU graduates, like myself, in promoting or supporting internationalization efforts through long-term collaboration with the DoE. This recommendation aligns with target area # 6 of the CIGE Model (Collaboration and Partnerships) because that target area specifically talks about the importance of community and institutional collaborations ("CIGE Model", 2019). By developing mechanisms of on-campus and institutional collaborations the DoE will further advance in internationalization.

However, I understand the challenges that this recommendation presents. The complex structure of the international higher education in the United States and the implications for domestic students and international partners were discussed in detail in Appendix B, C, D, and E. One of the challenges can be an additional cost associated with participating in these internships. For example, most of international education associations and organizations are either in New York or in Washington, DC. MASU

students will have to pay extra living expenses and it might not be something that they anticipated initially. One of the potential solutions can be in the form of scholarships or sponsored internships that the university could offer following a similar mechanism to the one currently used for administering study abroad scholarships.

Recommendation # 4. Capitalize on DoE's domestic and international reputation. The DoE's ranking (# 45 according to the *U.S. News and World Report*) is a sign of a positive reputation that can leverage to welcome more international students, scholars, and visiting professors from multiple regions of the world. It is important to remember that international students contributed \$45 billion to the U.S. economy in 2018 ("IIE Open Doors Report", 2019). The Mid-Atlantic State University hosts 68% of the state's international student population, the total economic contribution is about \$126.8 million (2018) which supports 1,594 jobs ("OISS, Fall 2019 statistics", 2019). There are multiple studies that outline what criteria are important for international students when they select particular institutions in the United States. Many of them name *U.S. News and World Report* ranking as a leading criterion for selection. For example, Bowman and Bastedo (2008) who conducted a study on students' selection criteria for college attendance at the University of Michigan in 2010 concluded that university ranking in the *U.S. News and World Report* not only affects decision-making of students but also results in the fluctuation of submitted applications the following

year (Bowman & Bastedo, 2008, 2011). Researchers also found that moving up or down in the rankings had a very strong impact on the institutions, especially those in the top-tier category (top 25).

Similar to other recommendations, one of the challenges can be an additional cost to promote the Department of Education. One of the solutions to that can be creating a network of international alumni who are educational leaders in their countries. Importance of building sustainability of projects or initiatives is discussed in Appendix B and C specifically because policy formation in higher education, especially in the United States with its decentralized system initiates at a grass-root level where individuals (faculty or staff) have an interest to promote a program or school. As a professional, I concur with this opinion and plan to volunteer to further promote the Department of Education, its programs and offerings to international partners.

Furthermore, alumni can be recruited to represent the Department of Education in regional and international conferences mitigating the cost of attendance for MASU faculty and staff. These recommendations can be discussed with the DoE and MASU leadership and further steps can be taken to implement them.

Table 2 summarizes the four recommendations to the DoE and shows what artifacts contributed to developing these recommendations.

Table 2. *Recommendations and Corresponding Artifacts*

Number	Recommendation of the DoE	Reference to Artifacts
1	Form a faculty task force on internationalization.	Literature Review (Artifact B) Analysis of Strategic Plans of Peer Institutions (Artifact F) Faculty Survey (Artifact G)
2	Raise awareness about benefits of internationalization for faculty and staff	Artifacts B-G.
3	Streamline communication and interaction with MASU's Global Institute, Office of International Students and Scholars, and DoE volunteer ambassadors.	Literature Review (Artifact B) Program Evaluation of the Professional Development Program (Artifact E) Analysis of Strategic Plans of Peer Institutions (Artifact F)
4	Capitalize on domestic and international reputation.	Artifacts B-G.

Chapter 5

REFLECTIONS ON IMPROVEMENT EFFORT RESULTS

My improvement goal was to create a set of internationalization recommendations for the Department of Education. I think the overall approach was successful even though I changed three professional affiliations while pursuing this my degree. I started my Ed.D. program when I worked as a graduate program evaluator and Senior Graduate Advisor for sponsored programs. Because I relocated to DE, I remained on several professional boards and groups including serving on the Embassy Dialogue Committee which is a standing committee within the largest international education association in the world- NAFSA. While at MASU, I started working for a unique, custom-made, highly recognized PDME that remains to be a partnership between a foreign Ministry of Education and MASU.

I learned that managing an international exchange program for the university was more challenging than for the international partner. Prior to engagement in this project I was in charge of a multi-million dollar budget for scholarship students and scholars at the Cultural Office. I was part of a decision team on what seminars, conferences and workshops to approve or not for the students. With the PDME, I was wearing multiple hats. I was a research advisor to three students, a program coordinator (with scheduling, logistics and programming responsibilities) for twenty-three teachers,

workshop leader and co-leader while also serving on a higher education leadership panel for the Embassy Dialogue Committee in Washington, DC.

When I initially met with my advisor and spoke with the DoE leadership, I got a sense that the DoE can potentially benefit from discussing the ways that the Department can pursue various global opportunities that would engage the faculty and staff. But it is only logical that faculty would want to see some results and examples. Because I was affiliated with an international sponsoring agency, I was able to provide some feedback on the criteria considered by the sponsoring agencies that I either worked for or collaborated with in Washington, DC. Similarly, as a program coordinator for the PDME, I was able to convert my intercultural competency skills acquired at the Cultural Office and collect feedback from PDME teacher participants to improve program implementation. Introducing intake one-on-one interviews with program participants created a better starting point for program administrators. Based on the feedback and participants' interests, we were able to find good matches for participants in public schools as compared to the previous year. Exit interviews and simplified formats for final reflections were also a success among participants and resulted in positive feedback that they provided to their sponsors.

Participating in the PDME became a mind shift experience for many participants. Many want to continue their graduate education at MASU. But in order to

seek support from their governments, they have to demonstrate that the choice of a higher education institution is a good investment. For many sponsors, a good investment equals to a *U.S. News and World Report ranking* only. From my conversations with the faculty and leadership at MASU I understand that there are multiple processes and interactions happening between different constituents in an effort to make programs more competitive yet accommodating to students. Unfortunately, that type of data is not typically considered in rankings' assessments. For the most part, international students only look at figures and numbers posted by the *U.S. News and World Report*. When they analyze the data further, they see that colleges that attract students with higher scores also have higher rejection rate. Thus, those colleges are perceived not only as highly selective but also as “trying to purchase the academically meritorious students by providing some sort of merit scholarships” and thus adding more recognition to an academic experience at a particular institution (Jaschik & Lederman, 2016).

Understanding that international students generally put a higher weight on the ranking of the institution and pay more than domestic students in tuition and fees should not be ignored by the faculty and staff. In the MASU context, the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) does a lot of programming for international students but tapping international students scholars by the Department itself should take

place and become a sustainable mechanism. The Department, following the proposed recommendations in this proposal should focus on learning more about students and scholars' interests and research areas. These students are likely to become leaders in their countries and can arguably make an impactful change even on the ranking policies. Developing more concrete mechanisms for engagement of international students and their experiences is advisable to further demonstrate MASU's and DoE's commitment to the state, region, and global community. Ultimately, the leadership can collaborate with university partners to identify the areas where it can become more attractive as an intellectual and professional development hub for educators and aspiring policy makers in education.

Similarly, working closer with the faculty at the DoE and raising their awareness about the benefits of introducing concepts of intercultural competence and internationalization in general can be beneficial. One of the suggestions for implementation can be borrowed from peer institutions. For example, many institutions offer courses in international or comparative education. They also include internationalization in their institutional or departmental plans which, in turn, serves as a roadmap for future directions. I analyzed data from the faculty survey in Appendix G and would be happy to present these findings at one of the roundtables or colloquia that the DoE organizes. Overall, this research is a stepping stone to approach

internationalization as a potential area of strategic interest for the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University. Subsequent research is likely to build up on this foundation.

Chapter 6

REFLECTIONS ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

The Ed.D. program provided me with multiple opportunities to grow as an educational leader. The curriculum exposed me to qualitative and quantitative research methods in the field and taught me how to conduct program evaluation for challenging international exchange programs. In the two full years without a single break I went through many moments of speculation, self-assessment and evaluation as well as belief in people who surrounded me and helped me pursue this journey. I grew as a scholar, critical thinker, and team-player.

Like many of my colleagues I struggled between enrolling and pursuing a PhD program at the start. In 2003 I finished my second master's program in international affairs. In 2017 I started the Ed.D. program. During the 14-year gap, I completed numerous projects for the American Councils for International Education, IREX, Rotary International, USAID, the World Bank and other international non-profit and educational organizations. But I always knew that I wanted to achieve the highest academic degree in the field that I am most passionate about- international education.

The Ed.D. program at MASU seemed to be a great fit: I could get a solid foundation in qualitative and quantitative research methods while also develop my own research focus. The coursework allowed me to integrate my practical experiences into

research projects. For example, through EDUC 828 I learned how to critique quantitative and qualitative articles in educational research. Prior to starting the Ed.D. program I pursued graduate degrees in applied linguistics and international affairs. In either of those fields research approaches were different. This course in particular exposed me to the methods of analysis that I did not apply before. Once I complete the ELP and continue with the research in the field, I plan to administer a faculty internationalization perception survey in other universities in the United States and then apply those research approaches to collaborate with my peers in European and Eurasian institutions. I am already in the early stages of collaboration with the Ministry of Education in Kazakhstan to conduct a workshop on leadership in international education. That is where EDUC 828 came as an important course. The instructor provided guidance and the coursework provided sufficient training in critical assessments of quantitative and qualitative research-based articles. Instructor's flexibility allowed me to select articles for analysis in my field. Several of those articles are included in my literature review presented in Appendix B.

Next, because physical communication with international partners is a challenge, I wanted to enroll in an elective EDUC 611 in addition to a required EDUC 818 to improve my educational technology skills. My final project for EDUC 818 was designing a professional website www.globaledconsult.com which I potentially can use as an interactive platform for communication with colleagues and students. I plan to continue

consulting for sponsoring agencies and international universities in the future and through the website I will be able to provide information and comprehensive resources. Furthermore, delving into curriculum design in EDUC 897 reassured me that my interests in international education do not end in policy analysis. At heart, I am also a teacher and instructor. The course gave me an opportunity to design a sample course syllabus on international education for undergraduate students. Even though I have not taught this course yet at American University, within my first six months of employment I have designed and delivered three workshops incorporating intercultural competence and cultural awareness for domestic and international students. Finally, I geared my program evaluation project for EDUC 863 towards my ELP artifact (Appendix E). In that class I learned about different evaluation approaches and used a logic model for the PDME program evaluation.

In the future I plan to apply the skills and knowledge I acquired throughout the Ed.D. program to build up on my leadership skills. I also hope to build up on my evaluation skills and apply them in a higher education context. For example, I am currently designing a series of workshops on intercultural competence specifically targeting international graduate students at the American University. To be successful in this endeavor, I will follow similar steps that I pursued for my proposal: conduct literature review on the topic, run a comparative analysis of what peer institutions designed relevant

to the topic and conduct a pre-workshop survey for international graduate students to better understand their needs and interest in improving intercultural competence and overall campus experience.

I then plan to enter additional educational contexts and address new challenges such as designing an online course in international education and/or comparative higher education policies. My work in the Ed.D. program and professional roles I performed for MASU and other government and non-government organizations equipped me with solid understanding of research methods in the field. But because the field of international education is a rather fluid field that can be affected by policy changes and geopolitical developments, I know I have to be flexible with my roles in the field. Luckily, internationalization of higher education is a flexible field and offers opportunities in teaching, consulting, policy development, etc. I will also use my relationships through NAFSA and EDC to explore additional opportunities in the field.

REFERENCES

- About ACE Lab (2020). Retrieved October 23, 2019 from <https://www.acenet.edu/Programs-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning/ACE-Internationalization-Laboratory.aspx>
- Bird, A., & Osland, J.S. (2004). Global competencies: An introduction. In H.W. Lane, M.L. Maznevski, M.E. Mendenhall, & J. McNett (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity* (pp. 57-80). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo, M. N. (2008). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 50(5), pp. 415-436. doi: 10.1007/s11162-009-9129-8.
- Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo, M. N. (2011). Anchoring effects in world university rankings: Exploring biases in reputation scores. *Higher Education*, 61(4), pp. 431-444.
- Childress, L. K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. (2006). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.
- Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58(4), 491-504.
- Freedman, K. (1998). Culture in curriculum: Internationalizing Learning by Design. In J.A. Mestenhauser & B.J. Ellinhoe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum* (pp. 198-228). Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.
- Global Education Initiative (2019). Retrieved September 25, 2019 from <https://www.MASUel.edu/MASUaily/2019/september/internationalization-laboratory-global-priority/>

- Green, M. F., Olson, C. L., & American Council on Education. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: a user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Institutional and International Initiatives.
- Green, M. F. (2011). Lost in translation: Degree definition and quality in a globalized world. *Change*, 43(5), 18-27. <https://doi-org.MASUel.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.599288>.
- Green, M. F. (2012). Measuring and assessing internationalization. Retrieved October 15, 2018 from www.nafsa.org/epubs
- Green, M.F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Higher Education Research Institute (2007). <https://heri.ucla.edu/>
- Hudzik, J. K. (2015). *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success*. London; New York: Routledge.
- IIE Open Doors Report (2019). Retrieved January 5, 2020 from <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Open-Doors-2019-Media-Information>
- Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2016). The 2016 inside higher education survey of community college presidents. *Planning for Higher education*, 45(1), 127-142.
- Khalideen, R. (2006). *Internationalizing the curriculum in Canadian universities: Considering the influence of power, politics and ethics*. Paper presented at Internationalizing Canada's Universities Symposium, Your University.
- Lapovsky, L. (2019). The higher education business model: Innovation and financial sustainability. Retrieved March 3, 2020 from <https://www.tiaa.org/public/pdf/higher-education-business-model.pdf>
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205-221. doi:10.1177/1028315308329786

- Mestenhauser, J.A. (2011). *Reflections on the past, present, and future of internationalizing higher education*. Minneapolis, MN: Global Programs and Strategy Alliance at the University of Minnesota.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Internationalization of curriculum: A critical perspective. In M. Hayden, J. Levy, & J. Thompson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of research in international education* (pp. 390-403). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Stevens, D.D., & Levi, A.J. (2005). Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Students in International Education*, 7(4), 379-403. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303923
- University Students Abroad (2020). Retrieved January 30, 2020 from <https://www.udel.edu/global/study-abroad/>

Appendix A

ELP PROPOSAL

My Educational Leadership Portfolio (ELP) will address a question: How can the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University improve its on-campus internationalization?

Organizational Context

The Department of Education is part of the College of Education and Human Development at the Mid-Atlantic State University. According to the Department's statement, it is "a nationally recognized and authoritative source of knowledge about the practices that impact students' academic and social development and educators' professional development" ("Director's Welcome", 2019). The DoE's faculty is comprised of over 60 faculty members that work with a student body that is currently over 1000 students in undergraduate and graduate programs. The graduate programs are ranked number 45 by the U.S. News and World Report for 2020 ("U.S. News Best Education Schools", 2019). In 2018 it placed in top 150 positions in the Shanghai Global Ranking for programs in education. The Department offers an undergraduate degree in elementary teacher education and a number of master's and doctoral programs including a Ph.D. in Education, Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, Master's degrees in Educational Technology, Literacy, Special Education, TESOL, Teacher Leadership and School Psychology.

DOE's faculty are highly recognized for their research contributions, particularly in the fields of mathematics education, learning sciences, educational technology, literacy education, and state and national educational policies. Furthermore, faculty members bring tremendous expertise to the design, delivery and implementation of professional development programs for teachers. The Institute for Global Studies facilitates students' participation in study abroad semesters and internships.

In addition, the Department of Education is now a crucial partner in the PDME program. It is a one-year professional development program for K-12 teachers fully sponsored by the foreign government and administered by the College of Education and Human Development of which the Department is part of and the English Language Institute. The overarching goal is to prepare education professionals to serve as change agents to effectively apply newly gained skills and knowledge to their contexts overseas. The main program components include the English language development, curriculum and instructional strategies, and leadership. All three components are interrelated, interconnected and integrated throughout the program. English development is the focus of the first six months of the program and leadership training, content and pedagogical professional development are the foci of the second part of the program.

My goal is to use my professional experiences at the PDME program and other experiences at the Cultural Office and International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP) to design a set of recommendations for the Department of Education to improve its international visibility.

Organizational Role

a) Current Role

My role at the College of Education and Human Development was a program coordinator. In 2018, the Mid-Atlantic State University won a proposal to administer a one-year professional exchange program for forty-eight international teachers. The English Language Institute within the College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Education within the College of Education and Human Development administer the program. The participants represented content area teachers (ACT) and English as a Foreign Language Teachers (EFL). Twenty-three teachers were content area teachers. The others were EFL teachers. Content areas represented the following fields: science, mathematics, special education, art, computer science, and Arabic language. During the first cycle (Cohort II) I served as a program coordinator for all ACT teachers. Concurrently, I was tasked to serve as a Professional Learning Community mentor for three teachers: one art teacher and two Arabic language teachers. In the latter capacity,

I served as a research advisor to help the teachers create a research-based educational plan for implementation in the country.

In 2019-2020 the university was honored with receiving another grant to administer the PDME program (Cohort III). For this cohort, the number of academic content teachers increased to twenty-five while the number of EFL teachers has decreased to twenty-three. The total number of participants in the 2019-2020 cohort did not change and remained at forty-eight. My duties focused on streamlining program responsibilities to create a mutually beneficial learning and culturally adaptive environment for program participants. Specifically for content teachers I was in charge of co-planning and co-facilitating program seminars, workshops and information sessions. In addition, I was tasked to serve as a PLC mentor to five teachers representing the following fields: Arabic language (3), art (1) and religion (1). I also serve as a liaison between faculty of the Department of Education, PDME project director, and two principal investigators. Furthermore, I participated in program development through evaluation of program workshops and seminars and synthesizing data for presentation to the program sponsors.

In addition, though I left a full-time position with the Cultural Office, I continue to consult with the program evaluation committee there through my role as a member of the Embassy Dialogue Committee. I mostly assist with research and evaluation of

graduate programs to be added or removed from the list of approved programs following criteria approved by their government. This is an important task because many other international partners rely on the list of the Cultural Office.

b) Past Role/ Continuous Role

Between 2010 to 2017 I served as an Advisor and Academic Unit Leader of the Graduate Department at the Cultural Office. In this capacity I was responsible for the oversight of scholars sponsored by several entities. The number of supervised scholars differed from one hundred to almost three hundred. I also supervised staff of three accountants, two executive assistants, two translators, and three academic advisors. I managed programmatic budget. Part of my responsibility was to coordinate outreach activities with U.S. and Canadian universities and to serve as a liaison with U.S. and Canadian institutions who seek bilateral academic, research, and training partnerships with the international partners. In 2012 I was also honored to join a program evaluation committee as a representative of the graduate department. The committee was comprised of the diplomatic senior leadership, Directors of the Graduate, Undergraduate, and Program Evaluation departments, a program evaluator for undergraduate programs and a program evaluator for graduate programs.

Recommended programs are communicated to the Ministry of Higher Education

through diplomatic channels and upon confirmation become officially recognized by the Ministry for authentication purposes of degrees.

Furthermore, since 2011 I have been managing federalism orientation lecturers and briefings for global participants of the International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP) sponsored by the U.S. Department of State. IVLP is the premier professional exchange program of the United States government that seeks to promote professional cooperation between global leaders and their U.S. counterparts (“About IVLP”, 2019). In this capacity I also design and deliver trainings for junior staff focusing on intercultural competence and cultural diplomacy. So far, I have conducted over a thousand orientations for leaders from over one hundred and eighty countries. Thus, in all of my assignments and projects I have been involved in initiatives that target internationalization of higher education and improvement of intercultural dialogue between private and government actors.

One of my professional priorities has always been public diplomacy where institutional international partnerships are a key component. For example, starting 2012 I have been collaborating with my colleagues at higher education institutions of NAFSA’s Region VIII to design workshops and sessions focusing specifically on cultivation and sustainability of partnerships. Some of the highlights include an International Education Council’s workshop on collaboration and partnerships with

U.S. universities: challenges as seen by the cultural missions of the GCC countries (Washington, DC 2012-2014) and a NAFSA international presentation on cultivating sustainable partnerships between sponsoring embassies and higher education institutions (“Cultivating Sustainable Partnerships”, 2016).

c) How the portfolio will contribute to my professional growth

When I started my Ed.D. program at the Mid-Atlantic State University I realized that internationalization efforts at the Department of Education can be better streamlined and systematized. Besides, there is no internationalization strategic plan for the College of Education and Human Development, and there is no course offered to undergraduate or graduate students that would address developments in international or comparative education. At the same time, I realized that there is an immense potential to capitalize on the DoE’s expertise to improve the Department’s visibility as a reliable partner in international education. For example, when I served on the program evaluation committee for the Cultural Office, the first criterion considered for recommendation or rejection of the program was the U.S. News ranking of the university, U.S. News ranking of the program itself, and professional accreditation of the program, if applicable. Regionally-only accredited universities were *never* approved and are unlikely to be approved in the near future due to a sufficient number of nationally accredited programs. This approach is also adopted by other countries.

From the feedback that I receive from my EDC colleagues and participants of the IVLP program that represent Ministries of Education or Ministries of Higher Education, many global partners from Brazil, China, India, Malaysia, the EU, Russia and others also look into those criteria as a “must” for further review and approval of exchange programs, degree-granting programs and potential academic partnerships for funding. The Department of Education has all the credentials to demonstrate. Many of them are important but many international actors, both private and public, still rely on the U.S. News Report to determine if obtaining education in a particular program is worth the investment. MASU’s Department of Education has a strong hold: it is number 45 out of 385 schools in the US being a tie with Temple University, Purdue University-West Lafayette, Georgia State University, and North Carolina State University- Raleigh. U.S. News ranking of the university and the graduate program are two key determining factors for many sponsors to approve the program and authenticate academic degrees obtained through that program.

Thus, I became interested in researching the topic of internationalization further to see if specific recommendations can be developed for the Department of Education. Prior to joining MASU, my immediate experience was work for a sponsoring agency which was part of a highly centralized educational system. As I represent a university that is part of a highly decentralized system, it requires a set of different skills, such as

flexibility, extensive collaboration with project partners, faster turn-around of decision-making, etc. Developing internationalization recommendations as part of my ELP can be used as suggestions by the DoE leadership in increasing its internationalization strategies without incurring much financial resources to conduct extensive studies. As a professional, I plan to further advance my career in international higher education and obtain a position within International Student and Services Office at a top U.S. university, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the U.S. Department of State, or for an exchange program administered by another government entity (e.g. Department of Defense or Department of Commerce) of the U.S. federal government.

I attended all required doctoral classes for the Ed.D. program that focus on policy formulation and educational research at MASU. I also attended PhD level classes in Critical and Interpretive Methods and Advanced Qualitative Research Methods that helped me strategize my research approach and be more selective in using research data. There are several ways how this portfolio contributed to my growth as a higher education professional and contributed to internationalization research of the Department of Education.

First, by conducting literature review I improved my understanding of the current international higher education landscape and how the Department of Education can capitalize on the current global developments to improve its internationalization

strategies. Whether I continue my career in international education administration or policy analysis, advancing my critical analysis skills will be very helpful.

Second, I applied my survey skills to conduct a survey of the DoE's faculty. In the future I plan to conduct interviews with the faculty and leadership to determine what areas of internationalization are of particular importance to them and then outline common themes or discuss discrepancies.

Third, when I clarify intellectual property rights on maintaining a professional website while I am officially affiliated with a U.S. higher education institution, I plan to further develop the site that can focus on highlighting specific institutional internationalization initiatives and how internationalization policies can be integrated for institutional policies. Because I plan to continue consulting for sponsoring agencies in the future, the purpose of the website will be to provide information on the current trends and research in international higher education. For example, it will address how nationally ranked but regionally focused institutions like MASU can improve their global visibility without necessarily investing so much of their resources into study abroad programs that arguably have the shortest internationalization effect out of all other possibilities.

Problem Statement

Internationalization is one of the most pressing and popular topics in higher education today. Policy makers, educational administrators, and stakeholders view internationalization of higher education as a diversification and tangible application of global processes. As a contractor for the International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP) of the U.S. Department of State, I get feedback from global education leaders about opportunities for internationalization in higher education that exist in their countries and how those are similar or different to what US universities exercise. For example, specifically for management of international partnerships many large universities developed centralized management frameworks where major strategic partnerships are overseen by the central unit but training partnerships or short-term exchanges are managed by individual departments (Helms, 2015; Hudzik 2015). The number and variety of international education exchanges is constantly growing. Indeed, increased global student mobility with top ten countries for global engagement being China, India, US, Brazil, Indonesia, Russia, Japan, Turkey, Iran, and Nigeria, rising demand for higher education, the growth of excellent universities worldwide and information technology that overcomes distance issues have turned an already complex landscape of international higher education into to a hard-to-navigate-through mix of opportunities and challenges (“Open Doors 2018”, 2018).

Institutions react differently to this call. Many institutions see the absolute necessity in internationalization and make internationalization part of their strategic plans or create specific internationalization strategic plans. Examples of the latter include the University of Minnesota, University of Colorado (Boulder), University of Arizona, etc. Motivations to invest in internationalization and anticipated challenges, however, differ. For example, the American Council on Education (ACE) as a proxy for articulating U.S. higher education policies has been at the forefront on running a longitudinal study on assessing American colleges and universities' perception on the need for internationalization. In their 2016 survey on *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* they concluded that "institutions are optimistic about their internationalization progress" and that internationalization is largely impossible without shared values for the need to internationalization by faculty, students, and staff ("Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses, 2017 Edition", 2017).

The need for global visibility and recognition is no longer an aspiring desire, it is an unavoidable reality. International partnership can be a start in improving such a visibility. Indeed, the need for such a visibility was outlined in the CEHD's Strategic Plan (SP) that was adopted on May 6, 2016. Specifically, Goal 3 of the Plan focuses on forming "partnerships with more diverse institutions to create feeder programs to our undergraduate and graduate programs" ("CEHD Strategic Plan-Updated", 2016). Some

may argue that MASU is already recognized for its internationalization initiatives through administering study abroad programs. Their impact and importance was discussed in previous chapters. Yet even today, participation in such programs remains an unattainable goal for many students because of an unavoidable financial cost, other opportunities to gain international experience, such as travel, internship, and volunteering. In an effort to improve the university's internationalization, I decided to approach the issue from a different, more equitable and policy angle and design a set of recommendations for the Department of Education of the College of Education and Human Development. These recommendations incorporate faculty perspectives and data from peer/ aspirational institutions and departments that already included internationalization into their strategic documents.

While I pursued two of the three graduate degrees in the United States, I understand and accept the concerns other educational systems might pose. One of the challenges for any foreign institution to comprehend the U.S. system is a lack of a centralized body that oversees institutional policies of U.S. universities. Overseas partners, whether it is a government entity (e.g. Ministry of Education) or a university may express a legitimate concern about how international projects can be sustained in the absence of “contractual guarantees” from a particular government agency. Trust in the United States as a reliable partner in international education has recently been

shaken. For many years, through legislature and public diplomacy efforts, the U.S. built a profile of a reliable partner and leader in international education, especially higher education. This trust was also fostered by the executive branch. For example, in 2000 President Clinton issued a Memorandum on International Education Policy which, among other things, outlined “support for teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students” (“Memorandum on International Education Policy”, 2000). Largely, these policies were supported by the administration of President Obama too. What we observe today is that announcements of President Trump have given rise to xenophobic attitudes where the United States is no longer viewed as committed to internationalization as before (Zezeza, 2017). Thus, this policy vacuum has a potential to be replaced by university initiatives, such as: short-term faculty and students’ exchange programs, institutional partnerships, development of dual degrees in collaboration with international institutions, etc.

Many U.S. institutions have been proactive in designing and implementing internationalization strategic plans. The 2014 survey from the International Association of Universities revealed international collaboration as either the first or second internationalization priority in nearly every region of the world (Eggen-Polak & Hudson, 2014).

For my proposal I focused on researching whether the Department of Education already has mechanisms in place to capitalize on its positionality (ranking, geographic location, presence of diverse international faculty and students, etc.) to address the department's internationalization priorities or additional steps are needed to improve its international visibility and generate, develop, or sustain strategic international partnerships.

Improvement Goal

I share the belief that institutional internationalization should be improved through a set of cohesive goals and objectives clearly understood by executives, faculty, students, and staff. Because my expertise is largely in public diplomacy and internationalization of higher education initiatives, I decided to focus on studying this topic in depth and understand it from MASU lens, specifically how the issue is perceived by the DoE constituents. The latter include faculty, students, staff, and community-at-large. It is a new perspective for me because prior to PDME, I never worked for a public university with a regional focus. However, my engagement in the international program like PDME prompted me to apply my skills and vision to help the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University to capitalize on its positionality and improve its international visibility through international partnerships as a way of comprehensive internationalization.

Back in the 1990s, international partnerships fell into two categories: exchanges and collaborations for technical assistance (Klasek, 1992). Today's partnerships take a wide variety of forms, but one of the most central goals of improving international visibility of the institution through international partnership is to enhance teaching and student learning and to build institutional reputation and prestige ("Internationalization in Action: International Partnerships", 2016). My specific goal is to expand on the CEHD's Strategic Goals of 2016, to focus on the Department of Education and develop a set of internationalization recommendations to expand on the Strategic Plan of 2016 of the CEHD specifically for the Department of Education.

Indeed, considering multiple international opportunities available, the question that many colleges and universities face is how to pursue, manage, and sustain global engagement activities in a planned and coherent way. Literature research and my experiences suggest there is no one correct way to do it. Sometimes, universities identify particular geographic and/or academic priority areas for collaboration. For example, PDME program has a strong leadership and English language development components- two areas where MASU demonstrates high level of expertise as an institution.

Thus, for this research I wanted to examine the internationalization climate of the Department of Education. Does its faculty have a vested interest in devoting their

time and expertise in exploring those opportunities? How do full-time faculty understand internationalization? How do they differentiate between on-campus internationalization and international opportunities?

In the future, I would like to interview international faculty of the DoE, other faculty members of the DoE, graduate students, and staff on their perception of DoE's internationalization. I am very passionate about helping the DoE to become a leader in international education, but I am not sure to what extent this passion is shared

For this ELP, I focused on running a faculty survey to find out how much support the DoE's faculty is ready to give for internationalizing DoE's curriculum, developing students' intercultural competence, support the leadership in exploring partnership opportunities with global institutions as well as introducing international experience as a selection criterion for hiring the new faculty or considering it for tenure.

My hope in disaggregating the data is to see whether the faculty and leadership (internal vision) already have a preliminary plan for developing international partnerships and specific areas of the School's expertise that they want to capitalize on. If such, my recommendations would then incorporate the internal vision with external opportunities. External opportunities will be studied through publicly available documents of foreign Ministries of Education, EU policy documents, and selected case studies of global universities that successfully pursue internationalization through

partnerships. Furthermore, I plan to participate in NAFSA International Conference taking place in Washington, DC, between May 26 and June 1, 2019. I plan to attend a pre-conference workshop on international partnerships and then meet with representatives from global universities to discuss the challenges that they face with international partnerships. It will help me get a clear external picture on the issue.

Internally, feedbacks from the faculty will allow me to identify potential members of the task force who can be leaders in developing a systematic approach of the DoE's internationalization strategy through partnerships. I will then run a cross-reference analysis of what internal stakeholders identify as priority areas and what external actors determine as a priority. In addition, review of case studies will help me see common themes of success (or failures) when it comes to partnerships. I want to expand on the current vision for internationalization and make specific contextual recommendations on how to use faculty resources to develop the network of partnerships in the next five years.

Indeed, educational opportunities are now vast and the benefits of international partnerships cannot be underestimated. However, as the world is getting more competitive, it is necessary to identify the right partners for the right purposes early on in the partnership process. Potential academic linkages and collaborations should be rightfully identified. The latter requires time, intellectual and financial investment, as

well as vision. My goal in this project is to propose to the DoE a practical set of recommendations for developing a comprehensive internationalization plan. I plan to use data and information from institutions that already have an established track record of utilizing international partnerships as internationalization tool and also create a match tool using existing competencies of the DoE's faculty and how those competencies can be of interest to potential international partners.

Description of Planned Artifacts

1. Literature Review

The first artifact is a literature review that describes internationalization processes in higher education. This artifact ties to my goal by establishing a research base outlining how institutional internationalization in the United States has progressed from being synonymous with study abroad programs that a particular university offered to a more complex and dynamic concept. The latter includes internationalization of curriculum and improved intercultural competency of students and faculty as a result of it, international partnerships, student mobility and global employability, and others. These developments are important for institutional growth and competitiveness on a global market, but they are also important for outlining trends in international higher education policy development.

I decided to largely abstract myself from evaluating internationalization of higher education in the United States through the prism of study abroad programs because it would be a relatively straightforward task to accomplish. Indeed, much of research shows that study abroad programs pursue very beneficial objectives such as students' exposure to global issues and a certain improvement of intercultural communication skills (Douglas & Jones-Rikkers, 2001). Similar to internship experiences, these programs can be very beneficial to some students and less so to the others. Moreover, unlike some internship experiences where participants are paid, study abroad programs are costly on the consumer's side.

Instead, internationalization can be achieved through exercising less costly options considering that internationalization is not a static but a dynamic process that is prone to change and modification (Knight, 1997; De Wit, 2002). As such, functional institutional partnerships can be viewed as solutions to internationalization because they allow global institutions to work together to maximize their resources (Olson, 2013; Lee et.al, 2012). Indeed, expanding opportunities for global employability create a new requirement for higher education, such as cross-cultural affinity, intercultural competency, and better understanding of other discourses (Deardorff 2006, 2011). These competencies and skills also meet larger goals, such as international security and global well-being. It is therefore not surprising that institutional partnerships have

become more strategic, more articulate, and more concrete. Institutions do not want to invest just to generate as many partnerships as possible. Instead, they want to share resources and seek high returns on investments. Inadvertently, they want to improve their global visibility too. However, any university should be concerned about sustaining and balancing institutional partnerships. Resources are finite making partner selection a rigid process and an evaluation of partnership programs a necessity. The Institute of International Education- global leader in facilitating strategic partnerships for governments and institutions- suggests that identifying whom to collaborate with and how to track engagement of partners are “critical considerations” for any internationalization strategy (“What Does It Mean to Be Strategic”, 2016).

A recent discussion with the Associate Director at the Global Institute at the Mid-Atlantic State University affirmed that MASU has a decentralized nature for initiating and sustaining partnerships when the latter are introduced and sustained by departmental efforts. As I am affiliated with the College of Education and Human Development and Department of Education within the College, I feel professional urge to work together with faculty and staff at the Department of Education to provide information and research findings as to who the actors in international higher education policies are, how the School can better engage in global initiatives through partnerships, and how partnerships can be modified softly should the geopolitical landscape shift

between the United States and the country of a partner institution. This artifact can later be used by the Department of Education to design relevant seminars, speakers' series, workshops, etc.

2. Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Current Policies and Future Directions

Even though U.S. higher education is decentralized in nature, it is still prone to geopolitical developments. This artifact analyzes how internationalization policies of U.S. higher education are shaped when changes occur in a geopolitical landscape. In order to better understand how the higher education system in the United States operates, I analyzed a primary policy document developed by experts from the American Council on Education ("Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education System", 2015). The policy document under analysis is important for two reasons. First, current administration at a federal level (executive branch) has been unable to formulate the course for internationalization. Partially, the inaction can be explained by President Trump's rejection of public diplomacy approaches of his predecessors. This rejection is not linked to former Presidents' political affiliation. Instead, it is more of an ad hoc call to reject everything that was done before him. Thus, experts in international higher education policy are left with nothing better than to rely on the ACE's documents and predictions. Second, the ACE is the key point of contact on higher education matters

for congressional staff and members of the executive branch at federal agencies. Due to this “professional weight” assigned to it by practitioners, researchers, and policy makers, the Council’s recommendations have been considered as expert views (Peterson & Helms, 2013; Stone, 2016).

The purpose of this investigation was to describe and explain how U.S. higher education internationalization policies are shaped, what opportunities and/or challenges the decentralized system presents for domestic and international partners, and how educational leaders (including K-12 leaders) may better engage in internationalization efforts. This artifact is very important because it serves as a tool for the College of Education to understand where the university stands in terms of its “global visibility” and how it can engage better with U.S. government entities (such as Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Education, Department of Homeland Security, etc.) and private entities (such as the George Soros Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation), or supranational entities (such as the European Union). It provides a comprehensive conceptual understanding of the complexities of international higher education system but also equips an informed practitioner, scholar, or a deal-breaker on a university side of who the major actors are and how to consider the current picture of international actors as an independent variable for institutional success.

3. Evaluation of the PDME Program

This artifact will be an evaluation of the program that I currently administer for the DoE. Program evaluation is a comprehensive and a systematic process of “collecting, analyzing and applying information from multiple sources to inform decisions about a program, course, or project” (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 1999). This process would be impossible to perform without evaluators who understand the purpose of the program under evaluation and having a clear picture of who stakeholders are. At the same time, evaluators are expected to possess advanced critical thinking, analytical, and comparative analysis skills. The latter are particularly important for international initiatives.

PDME is a twelve-month customized program fully sponsored by the foreign government and administered by universities in the United States, New Zealand, Australia, and Finland. According to Vision 2030, there are three main goals of this National Transformation Plan. They can be narrowed down to achieving governmental operational excellence, improving economic enablers, and enhancing standards of living. PDME is a transformative program that aims to improve teachers’ English language, leadership and professional skills. Through these transformations the teachers are seen as beacons of new approaches to problem-solving and changes in policy approaches in a highly centralized country. Additionally, because of a special

role assigned to educators on raising future generations of leaders, the educators are viewed as change agents who will transform educational system in their country.

In accordance with three program strands (English language development, professional development and leadership development), I am particularly interested in creating a logic model for the program, run a program analysis and create an appropriate research design for the program. In order to better understand participants' professional and academic interests, one-on-one interviews with program participants can be conducted. I will conduct individual interviews in May-June 2019. Obtained information will allow the Department of Education to adjust program implementation for other cohorts of the program or apply findings for similar programs in the future. For example, last year we were unable to accommodate special-area teachers in Art (one participant) and Arabic language (two participants.) They were asked to participate in workshops and seminars that were targeted for other teachers, such as computer science or mathematics. One of the reasons is that those interviews (or rather orientation conversations) were not conducted. Additionally, individual interviews are particularly important in a Middle Eastern culture because as my eight-year experience with another regional partner demonstrates, even though participants oftentimes act as representatives of collectivist culture in their encounters with American managers, each

program participant usually has an *individual objective* that he/she pursues during one year of participation (Hofstede, 2003).

Surveys conducted at the end of each workshop at pre-immersion stage will allow me and my colleagues to select what additional workshops can be offered to participants to better reflect on their professional interests. This information will also be synthesized, discussed with the School's leadership, and possibly help the Department of Education to create similar customized programs to offer to potential global partners due to the rise of the latter. For example, many high-profile universities offer customized programs to help customers (individuals, sponsoring agencies, and governments) develop "necessary tools to address... *your* organization's unique challenges and opportunities" ("Customized Programs at McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University", 2019).

Next, three-way advisory sessions between host teachers, field supervisors, and international teachers will also be part of a formative evaluation to see whether the teacher professional objectives and program goals are met. In the pilot cohort field supervisors noticed that many international teachers preferred to observe and not directly engage or participate in classroom activities with their American counterparts. When asked how they would self-evaluate their engagement level, they would almost always assign themselves the highest marks explaining that "we are guests and we are

showing respect to a host teacher by not intruding in the educational process.” Clearly, it is interpreted very differently by host teachers. Thus, intervention during early advisory sessions will allow me to develop more interculturally adaptive criteria to evaluate teachers’ engagement levels while also improving intercultural competency of host teachers. Development of intercultural competency should ideally be included in any institutional internationalization plan. With the case of the Department of Education, it is particularly important because more and more we are dealing with education professionals coming from different linguistic, cultural, intellectual and aspirations’ backgrounds.

Next, conducting an impact evaluation of the program will be a challenge and will require a close collaboration with international stakeholders. At the moment, teachers are ready to embrace the initial “cold shoulder” from their supervisors when they get back home. But in exit interviews many of them sounded very optimistic about their readiness to face those challenges and still implement their action plans. Support from colleagues, PLC advisors and Department of Education experts will be instrumental in this endeavor. I expect that by the end of the second year of the program for MASU, the College of Education and the Ministry of Education will be able to cooperate more closely to conduct an impact evaluation of the program. It will bring collaboration between two primary stakeholders to a new level. In my turn, I

expect to continue communicating with content-area and advise on professional development/ continuing education opportunities in the United States.

Understanding the nuances of this partnership will allow me to develop a more interculturally comprehensive set of recommendations for the Department of Education. This is an example when I will apply the approach of De Wit and Knight (1997) and state that this program (or any other similar program in the future) is an example of internationalization strategy for the Department of Education and an opportunity to make a statement on the global internationalization scene (as cited in De Wit, 2002). The Department of Education submitted a request for proposal where the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development is a principal investigator. I also share the belief of my international education colleagues that thematic networks, strategic partnerships and international trainings cannot be arranged by top-down initiative and management only. Common research and training interests between DoE and international participants might form the basis for subject-oriented international cooperation. It can be identified through submission of joint proposals for participation in international conferences and workshops, online webinars, etc. I will identify those areas of potential collaboration through my interaction with the participants during individual meetings, targeted workshops and seminars, and pre and post workshop questionnaires.

4. Organizational Problem Analysis of the Cultural Office

The Cultural Office was established in Washington, DC in the 1950s to administer and supervise implementation of higher education policies of their governments while also maintaining close connections with each other to streamline higher education activities in North America. In 2007 and then continuously between 2010 and 2017 I worked for the Cultural Office. I also served as a liaison between the Cultural Office and its counterparts. These were professional engagements through Embassy Dialogue Committee. The Committee is a standing committee of NAFSA- largest international education organization in the world. Because of my engagements in event-planning and graduate program evaluations projects, I am very familiar with how other Cultural Offices operate.

Organizational analysis of the Cultural Office can serve as a proxy for understanding the issues that U.S. universities face when they try to proactively collaborate with sponsoring agencies from the area (See Appendix D). This organizational problem analysis is in some ways unique because I continuously worked for the organization for over seven years, starting as an Academic Advisor and being promoted as a Graduate Unit Coordinator and primary evaluator for graduate programs in the United States. In the latter capacity I was evaluating graduate programs offered by higher education institutions in the United States and Canada. Thus, my assignments

and corresponding responsibilities transformed over a few years and I acquired sufficient knowledge and skills to be able to apply it in my other career aspirations.

Since the 1950s, the Cultural Office has facilitated the studies of degree-seeking students in the United States. Rebuilding of the country's economy after the war in 1990s was matched with a rapid growth in population and subsequent demand for provision of educational opportunities. Government and private sectors understood that the finite nature of the country's natural oil reserves and the need to develop a post-industrial economy required investments in educating the youth and providing them with competitive skills. Domestic market represented by only one state university could no longer cope with that demand. Thus, the government (through the Ministry of Higher Education) reassessed its higher education policy and started to increase the number of government sponsored students. Currently, there are over 5,000 students under the supervision of the Cultural Office in Washington, DC. The head of the office is the Cultural Counselor who is traditionally assisted by Cultural Attaches. Although Cultural Counselors and Attaches benefit from a diplomatic status in the United States, they are not career diplomats. They are typically appointed by the Undersecretary for Higher Education and remain in their positions for two to three years. Many university representatives do not directly interact with those appointees, but even if they try to establish those connections, their requests are delegated to mid-level and lower-level

management. The latter have many limitations on what information and to what extent they can provide. However, understanding those limitations as well as getting a clearer picture of what a sponsoring agency “kitchen” looks like presents a very valuable artifact. Knowing this, the Department of Education can save time, money, and human resources instead of investing in high expectation partnerships that can result in “null” effect.

In some sense, this artifact is also a useful tool for universities to view partnerships in a broader sense. For example, right now the universities focus on establishing connections and signing memoranda of understanding directly with the cultural offices or missions. However, sometimes this process can be very long and may not result in a sought resolution. Instead, individual departments and schools (including the Department of Education) can shift the focus and instead connect directly with Schools of Education at international venues (e.g. NAFSA international conference) or through regional conferences. Similarly, professional connections can generate new linkages with partners overseas. For instance, I can connect with my colleagues at the Cultural Office to promote initiatives of the Department of Education and seek potential areas of mutual interest for collaboration.

5. Comparative Analysis of Internationalization Plans and Initiatives from Peer and Aspirational Institutions

Comparative analysis of strategic and international plans of peer and similar ranked programs will allow me to find common themes and then further evaluate whether those themes will be applicable or of interest to the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University.

This artifact will be important for two reasons. First, it will provide information on how other Schools or Colleges of Education incorporated internationalization into their strategic plans and what particular areas of internationalization were important to them. Analysis of common themes will allow me as a researcher to run a needs-based analysis for internationalization specifically for the DoE's context at MASU. I will research and implement an analytical platform to evaluate internationalization plans and then research how an existing framework at MASU can be improved. I will analyze institutional (or departmental when available) strategic plans seeking for specific mentioning of internationalization first. Second, I will look into how internationalization is defined and applied in those policy documents. Specific areas of inquiry will look into domestic internationalization through curriculum, partnerships, and student-faculty exchanges. Other areas of internationalization not previously discussed will also be of research interest.

This artifact is also important because I want to help the Department of Education to systematize its internationalization strategies. I understand that the university is already recognized for its study abroad initiatives and it was the first institution to offer study-abroad programs in the United States. That achievement on its own is unprecedented and worth an avalanche of recognition. After World War II, education abroad connections underwent rapid reformation not only expanding on the destinations for interested students but also evolving into two-way student and faculty exchange (Hoffa & DePaul, 2010). Hoffa and DePaul indicated that the impact of these extended collaborations has been profound not only for participants but also for institutions. And still many American undergraduates are truly challenged to participate in study-abroad programs because those programs are costly. Others might be (still keeping the affordability criterion in mind) more skeptical thinking that they can wait till graduation and participate in global externships to improve their employability. That is the reason why I want to focus on other areas of internationalization and not study abroad programs.

6. Faculty Views on Internationalization

As the role of higher education institutions has changed over the years, so did the role of faculty members. Higher education institutions nowadays are constantly dealing with competing priorities, such as enrollment management, ranking, external funding, etc. Within these changes, faculty are often caught in competing priorities as well. As discussed before, much of research on internationalization is focused on organizational internationalization. Much less research is available on how internationalization of institution attracts or affects faculty (Sanderson, 2007).

However, there are already many ways where faculty members engage that can be attributed to overall internationalization of the institution or department: international teaching and research, reviews of international publications and/or publishing in languages other than English in international publications, providing expert opinions on international issues to supranational organizations like the World Bank, maintaining membership in international organizations, etc.

And yet, “not all faculty members consider international research, teaching and creative work to be central to their individual academic mission and professional success and therefore have no reason to engage” (Dewey & Duff, 2009). My goal for this artifact is to find out four things. First, for the faculty that engages in

internationalization efforts, what are the motivating and what are the discouraging factors when engaging in internationalization initiatives. Second, in their opinion, what internationalization efforts will be most beneficial for the Department of Education. Third, what international partnerships, in their opinion, are the most challenging for sustainability- between departments, institutions, or government entities (e.g. Ministries of Education) and the Department of Education. Fourth, for those faculty that are not involved in internationalization efforts, I would like to know what the deterrent factors are.

It is possible that the latter category will provide me with quality data for analysis. For example, it could be that the faculty are in support of internationalization in general and would like to initiate certain projects themselves, but their unit or university does not provide material support (Engberg & Green, 2002). In this scenario faculty are left on their own and do not want to engage in international initiatives with their personal funds. Unfortunately, because of the lack of financial support, international initiatives in general and partnerships in particular can be seen by faculty as “additional work with little or no benefit” (Lebeau, 2010). The underlining reasons are yet to be researched.

I plan to conduct DoE's faculty survey in fall 2019 with a number of open-ended questions. The survey will allow faculty members to provide a narrative that is specific to their field and to their research.

There will be no limitations as to length of the open-ended responses. Then I will be able to see if there were any overlaps or descriptions of similar phenomena in different words and combine codes (e.g. not every faculty member is engaged in intercultural topics and traditionally views internationalization as an opportunity to teach abroad). Compiled results will allow me to get a picture on the faculty's perception as it relates to internationalization and then combine faculty recommendations with other findings. I will rely on some existing instruments developed by Green and Olson because it is widely used by universities seeking to improve their internationalization strategies or practices and because it draws on the resources developed through the ACE's experiences nationwide (Green & Olson, 2003).

Some sample questions might include:

- In your opinion, does the Department of Education collect information on the faculty's language capacity, international background, interests, and experiences? If so, where is this information available and how is it used? What is the faculty composition and experience? To what extent do faculty come from other countries, have extensive international experience, speak multiple

languages, co-author with international colleagues, and take international sabbaticals?

- In your opinion, does the Department of Education gather information on the attitudes of faculty toward international learning? If so, how is this information used?
- In your opinion, to what extent does the Department of Education invite visiting faculty/scholars from abroad? To what extent and how does their presence contribute to institutional internationalization?
- In your opinion, does the Department of Education consider international experience in hiring faculty or in the promotion and tenure process?
- In your opinion, to what extent do faculty perceive international learning as an important element of the educational process at the institution?

I will ask the same questions to the executives (the Dean of the College and the Director of the Department of Education) seeking for my factual responses (skipping “in your opinion” part). I will allow me to compare perceptions with the actual policy in place.

7. Recommendations for internationalization- analysis of internationalization plans of peer institutions

This artifact will examine how MASU's peer institutions integrated internationalization in their institutional or departmental strategic plans. Despite different approaches to internationalization (centralized vs decentralized), universities face similar challenges: positioning themselves as reliable entities to provide quality education and grant degrees recognized by authoritative bodies (accreditation institutions, ranking companies, etc.) and stakeholders (students, parents, potential employers, governments, etc.) and improving students' knowledge and skills to be successful in the global era. Furthermore, universities also serve as catalysts for scientific research to solve societal problems. Staying competitive and trying to solve societal problems requires joint institutional effort and comparative perspective.

Many institutions put a strong focus on institutional partnerships. Sustainability of partnerships is important because it allows continuing transfer of experiences, knowledge, and technology. According to the OECD, long-term partnerships offer "public diplomacy benefits which are certainly important to the United States and perhaps to the partner countries" ("Assessment of the Higher Education Partnerships for the Global Development Program", 2004). As a public diplomacy professional I see the value in higher education partnerships in the domain of improving public diplomacy

image of the country as well. In the absence of government-led quality assurance frameworks for international partnerships, stakeholder engagement roles have to be carefully considered and weighed (Helms, 2015; Hudzik, 2015).

Many institutions express their policy direction through strategic plans where internationalization is part of either institutional strategic plan or part of a strategic plan of a particular department or school. Barnetson (2001), Allison and Kaye (2005) suggested looking at strategic plans as documents that can be analyzed following a certain rubric or a set of criteria rather than a process which can be a subject to interpretation. According to Stevens and Levi (2005) “rubric can help inform decision-making, articulate performance measures, and specify quality expectations” (Stevens & Levi, 2005). Driscoll and Wood (2007) add that rubric gives way to collaborative modification. Adopting these approaches can ideally serve as a foundation for higher education institutions to learn from each other and to prepare to respond to shifting opportunities or challenges irrespective of their nature. In the artifact I will research what areas of internationalization are important for peer institutions and run a comparative analysis based on the selected rubric.

REFERENCES

- About IVLP (2019). Retrieved July 7, 2019 from <https://eca.state.gov/ivlp>
- Allison, M., & Kaye, J. (2005). *Strategic planning for nonprofit organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley
- American Council on Education. (2012) *CIGE model for comprehensive internationalization*. Retrieved January 15, 2019 from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>
- Assessment of the Higher Education Partnerships for the Global Development Program (2004). Retrieved January 7, 2019 from <https://www.oecd.org/derec/unitedstates/35838050.pdf>
- Barnetson, B. (2001). Performance indicators and chaos theory. In M. Cutright (Ed.), *Chaos theory and higher education: leadership, planning and policy* (pp. 145-158). Baltimore: Peter Lang
- College of Education and Human Development Strategic Plan- Updated (2016). Retrieved October 13, 2019 from <https://www.cehd.MASUel.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CHED-strategic-plan-2016.pdf>
- Comprehensive Internationalization Framework (2019). Retrieved October 17, 2019 from <https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/Internationalization/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>
- Cultivating sustainable partnerships between universities and sponsoring agencies (2016). Retrieved September 15, 2018 from <http://www.eventscribe.com/2016/nafsa/fsPopup.asp?Mode=presInfo&PresentationID=128228>
- Customized programs at McCourt School of Public Policy, Georgetown University (2019). Retrieved October 15, 2019 from <https://mccourt.georgetown.edu/execed/customized-programs>

- Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. (2006). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, (149), 65-79.
- Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58(4), 491–504.
- De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: a historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Chestnut Hills, MA: Boston College, Center for International Higher Education and the Program in Higher Education.
- Director's Welcome (2019).
Retrieved November 1, 2019 from
<http://www.education.MASUel.edu/directors-welcome/>
- Douglas, C. & Jones-Ridders, C. (2001). Study abroad programs and American student worldmindedness: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 13(1), 55.
- Engberg, D., & Green, M. (2002). *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, D.C: American Council on Education.
- Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson R. (2014). Internationalization of higher education.
Retrieved October 15, 2019 from
<https://www.scribd.com/document/347015006/Egron-Polak-E-Hudson-R-2014-Internationalization-of-Higher-Education>
- Green, M. F., Olson, C. L., & American Council on Education.
(2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Institutional and International Initiatives.

- Helms, R.M., (2015) *Internationalization U.S. higher education: Current policies, Future Directions*. Retrieved June 5, 2018 from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Current-Policies-Future-Directions-Part-2-US.pdf>.
- Helms, R.M. (2015). *International higher education partnerships: A global review of standards and practices*. American Council on Education: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement.
- Hoffa, W., DePaul, S. C., & Forum on Education Abroad. (2010). *A history of US study abroad: 1965-present*. Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad.
- Hofstede, G. (2003). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hudzik, J. K. (2015). *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Internationalization in Action: International Partnerships (2016). Retrieved October 15, 2019 from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/IIA-Intl-Partnerships-P1-Final.pdf>
- Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education System (2015). Retrieved April 10, 2019 from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalizing-U-S-Higher-Education-Current-Policies-Future-Directions.aspx>
- Klasek, C.B., And Others, & Association of International Education Administrators, C.I. (1992). *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED362112&site=ehost-live>
- Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1(1), 27-44.
- Lebeau, L. G. (2010). The international mobility of the American faculty: Scope and challenges. *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*, 41-47.

- Lee, A., Poch, R., Shaw, M., & Williams, R. (2012). *Engaging diversity in undergraduate classrooms: A pedagogy for developing intercultural competence* (ASHE Higher Education Report, 38(2)). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.
- Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses (2017). Retrieved October 18, 2018 from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Mapping-Internationalization-2017.pdf>
- Memorandum on International Education Policy (2000). Retrieved October 18, 2018 from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/WCPD-2000-04-24/pdf/WCPD-2000-04-24-Pg878.pdf>
- Open Doors Report (2018) Retrieved from May 25, 2019 from <https://stMASUyinthestates.dhs.gov/2018/11/open-doors-report-a-record-high-number-of-international-stMASUents>
- Olson, C.L. (2013). A Canadian lens on facilitating factors for North American partnerships. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(3), 228-243.
- Peterson, P. & Helms, R. (2013). Internationalization revisited. *Change* 45(2), 28-34.
- Quality Matters Rubrics and Standards (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric>
- Rossi, P., Freeman, H., & Lipsey, M. (1999). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sanderson, G. (2007). A Foundation for the Internationalisation of the Academic Self. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(3), 276-307
- Stevens, D.D., & Levi, A.J. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Stone, J., (2016). Awarding college credit for MOOCs: The role of the American Council on Education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(36-42), 1-12. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.1765

- Study abroad for students (2020). Retrieved January 28, 2020 from <https://www.udel.edu/home/global/study-abroad/students/>)
- Sutton, S.& Obst, D. (2011) Developing strategic international partnerships: models for initiating and sustaining innovative institutional linkages. New York, NY: Institute of International Education.
- Weiss, C. H. (1998). Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- What Does It Mean to Be Strategic (2016). Retrieved October 15, 2018 from <https://www.iie.org/en/Learn/Blog/2016/07/2016-July-International-Partnerships-What-Does-It-Mean-To-Be-Strategic>
- Zezeza P. (2017). Internationalization of higher education in the era of xenophobic nationalisms. Retrieved October 15, 2018 from https://www.nafsa.org/ /File/ /zeleza_internationalization.pdf

Appendix B

LITERATURE REVIEW

I. Comprehensive Research on Internationalization

a) Understanding Internationalization

Internationalization of higher education is often contextualized in a geopolitical environment. With the end of the Cold War, the United States higher education community and policy makers started to recognize the need to prepare university graduates for growing challenges and opportunities of the interconnected world. Global engagement became an important part of strategic plans not only at major research universities but also in smaller liberal arts and community colleges. Furthermore, after September 11th, the need to internationalize created a new discourse for global recognition of higher education institutions. As Peterson and Helms indicate, “higher education needed to produce graduates with the ability to understand and prevent threats to US security and build the mutual understanding that might resolve the conflicts behind such threats” (Peterson & Helms, 2013, p. 28).

Thus, higher education internationalization is happening parallel to other trends in global processes such as rapid exchange of goods, services, and ideas where a certain relationship is established between external (global) and internal (national) processes. The level and depth of interaction between the two is not clearly defined by the

educational research community and many indicate that the degree to which globalization is welcomed is still tied to culture and socio-economic experiences in a particular context (Sorge, 1983; Zmas; 2015). And yet, there is a certain level of ambiguity between “internationalization” and “globalization”. Mitchell & Nielsen (2012) provided a succinct outline of the difference specifically for the higher education context. In their research they concluded that “internationalization is something higher education institutions **do** while globalization is something that is **happening to** them” (Mitchell & Nielsen, 2012). For example, higher education institutions can prioritize on what approach to take on for internationalization. As Knight (1994) initially defined, approaches to internationalization can differ because they may be activity approaches, competency approaches, process approach and ethos approach (Knight, 1994). The activity approach focuses on curriculum development, faculty exchanges, and programming for international students. The competency approach presupposes the development of intercultural skills and acquisition of new (intercultural) knowledge. The ethos approach focuses on creating a classroom culture where multiple, not just Western discourse is emphasized and intercultural perspectives are valued. The process approach combines all three and focuses on achieving sustainability of internationalization initiatives by bringing them to a policy level and articulating the intent for internationalization in policy documents, such as strategic plans.

Furthermore, globalization is a complicated phenomenon that touches upon many areas of research and practice “stubbornly resisting easy interpretation and application” (Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002). Internationalization is more frequently applied as a concept that determines a *relationship* between a particular institution and an “outside world”. These relationships can be institutionalized (e.g. international rankings, achievement scores, number of publications, etc.) or personalized. The latter can be a relationship between two or more institutions and represent a positive dynamics between the participants. Examples of such relationships can be short and long-term projects between universities and funding agencies (e.g. Rotary International) as well as university-to-university initiatives on student exchanges. For many institutions, internationalization is a sign of an upward mobility, particularly if institution lacks brand “tags” that others like Harvard, Cornell, London School of Economics, Milano Polytechnic, Moscow State, and others have. Knight (1997) also adds that “globalization can be thought of as the *catalyst* while internationalization is the *response*, albeit a response in a proactive way” (Knight, 1997).

In today’s competitive world, higher education institutions respond to increasing external pressure by developing a consumerist, market-oriented mentality where education is a product or a good that can be branded and then exchanged in an open market (Altbach, 2004; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Slaughter and Rhoades argue that

“the academy has shifted from a liberal arts core to an entrepreneurial periphery, “where market dictates how academic process and research developments evolve (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In this context, internationalization of higher education can also be “tagged” by some as an opportunity to make more money for university and the fastest way to do so is arguably study abroad programs. In the United States, the latter are usually short-term programs in geographically safe and prosperous countries. Building or developing intercultural competence is not a primary goal nor an assessment criterion of these programs.

Evaluating internationalization of higher education in the United States through the prism of study abroad programs would be a relatively straightforward task. Much of research shows that study abroad programs pursue very beneficial objectives such as students’ exposure to global issues and developments (Douglas & Jones-Rikkens, 2001) as well as improvement of intercultural communication skills (Langley & Breese, 2005). Indeed, similar to internship experiences, these programs can be very beneficial to some students and less so to the others. In any case, study abroad programs are unlikely to be considered by experts as comprehensive solutions to campus internationalization.

For example, participation in study abroad programs comes with an additional cost. Also, participation in study abroad programs might delay students’ progress in

graduation because the latter are offered at specific semesters/times (typically, summer for Europe or winter for Australia.) Finally, I admit that my own academic and professional bias does not allow me to attach an added value to study abroad programs. In Europe, where I received my undergraduate and first of my two Master's degrees, with the adaptation of the Bologna Process (that includes unification of curriculum and formal academic structures), the concept of "study abroad" is perceived very differently. Policy implications of the Bologna Process (BP) will be discussed in detail in a forthcoming chapter, but it is important to mention that this educational policy initiative of the European Union allows any admitted and matriculated student to pursue coursework within any approved institution in one of the forty eight countries- members of the Bologna agreement- **free of charge**. Indeed, the concept of free higher education provided by the government of your state a priori by the fact that you reside in the state let alone by the government of a foreign state sounds bizarre and unrealistic in a U.S. context. But in the context of countries that are part of Bologna Process agreement, any student can start a program at a university in one country, continue in another, and return to defend thesis or proposal in his/her institution at the end of the program.

Arguably, internationalization of domestic curriculum creates "opportunities for refinement" instead of limitations and challenges (Lee et.al, 2012). Many scholars consider internationalization to be a dynamic process (Knight, 1997) where curriculum

internationalization contributes to building intercultural competence of all participants of the educational process “within a holistic framework inclusive of cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains” (Deardorff, 2011; Deardorff 2015; Kegan, 1994; Kehm, 2007; Lee et al., 2012).

And yet, approaches to internationalization can vary and institutions of higher education in the United States consider the development of interculturally competent students as a primary goal of internationalization efforts. My formal and informal conversations at MASU prompted me to think that faculty members and administrators alike approach the subject from a more “marketing” perspective equating internationalization with material gains from institutional partnerships and above-mentioned study abroad programs. As a practitioner in the field, I align my theoretical framework of internationalization with those scholars that see internationalization as a result of a successful implementation of institutional policies to build intercultural competence of students.

The subsequent chapters will discuss how building intercultural competence can align with political, economic, academic, and cultural/social rationales of internationalization.

b) Understanding Intercultural Competence

Intercultural competence is a complex notion that oftentimes falls a victim to idiosyncratic perceptions. Klemp wrote that “competence can be measured. But its measurement depends first on its definition” (Klemp, 1979). Research community is rather unilateral in viewing intercultural competence/competency as an outcome of intercultural development (Deardorff, 2009; Stier, 2006). For example, many scholars understand intercultural competence/ competency as the “ability to accommodate cultural differences into one’s reality in ways that enable an individual to move easily into and out of diverse cultures and to adjust naturally to the situation at hand” (Bennett, 2004; Hammer, 2012). Literature analysis demonstrates that while there are similarities in perception of intercultural competency as an outcome of intercultural development, there is no agreement among research community as to assessment mechanisms of such a competence.

Many agree that while intercultural competence and “global awareness” (Green, 2012) are important informal outcomes of a modern university, it is implied that students cannot be explicitly taught these competences. Similarly, it is rather a dilettante opinion to consider contacts, interactions, and informal engagements with international students as sufficient to develop intercultural competence (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Indeed, students arrive to graduate programs with different life experiences,

professional dispositions, and future career aspirations. They also come with different intellectual abilities and richness of prior experiences. Some are more prone to seek opportunities to collaborate formally with international peers or expand on intercultural communication through classroom discussions or informal events. Others do not necessarily focus on seeking those opportunities because they do not yet understand their potential value or deem those interactions relevant to their professional goals.

Cultural differences and attached values to power distance, individualism, and other cultural significances/ characteristics were thoroughly researched by Professor Geert Hofstede, Dutch social psychologist whose research and practice have been focused on developing a theory of cultural dimensions. Hofstede and his followers understand culture as a “collective mental programming of the human mind that distinguishes one group of people from another” (Hofstede, 2003). Between 1967 and 1973, Hofstede assessed the values of over 160,000 IBM employees from seventy countries that spoke twenty languages (Hofstede, 2003). For data analysis Hofstede focused on differences between countries applying an “explorative factor analysis” in order to detect differences in provided answers depending on the origins of respondents (Hofstede, 2003). He found three factors and split one into power distance and individualism/collectivism. The other three were: uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/ femininity, short-term/long-term orientation. Overall, Hofstede defined culture as “the

collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others” (Hofstede, 2003). From a research standpoint, Hofstede’s definition of cultures was based on rather common psychological, anthropological, and sociological characteristics of a specific cultural category. From a statistical standpoint, however, the theory was criticized for “a lack of statistical independence” thus blaming Hofstede that each sub-culture category was not individually researched, analyzed or assessed. (Behrens, 2007).

For the purposes of this research, it seems practical to first outline the distinctive characteristics of each dimension. First, “power distance” includes the spectrum of solutions to unequal power distribution in a particular country. The higher the score is, the higher the acceptance of unequal power distribution is in that country. For example, Saudi culture scores very high on the power distance (95 vs 40 for the United States). The individualism/collectivism dimension shows whether individuals in a particular cultural context function within a loose social framework where decision-making largely depends on an individual choice or a collective authority. Saudi Arabia scores low on individualism (thus, being a “more collective culture”) whereas the United States is a highly individual culture. Third, the masculinity/ femininity index illustrates which roles are typically associated with a particular society (“female” as more tender and socially oriented and “male” as more competitive) dominate in that particular

country. It is not within the scope of this research to focus on gender associations or associative gender belongings, such as transgender, transsexual, etc. Surprisingly, Saudi Arabia and the United States show very similar scores here: 60 (Saudi Arabia) vs 62 (USA) which demonstrates a rather common view among sample population on traditional (female vs male) gender roles within both cultures. Fourth, for the “uncertainty avoidance” dimension higher score corresponds to the desire of country members to avoid ambiguity. Also, Saudi Arabia scores 80 on “uncertainty avoidance” while the US average is 46. This can be understood the following way: the higher the score, the stronger the members of the respective country “intend to avoid ambiguity” (Hofstede, 2003). As discussed above, this research does not focus on analyzing which country-specific discourse is “better” and which one is “worse” as these notions are prone to idiosyncratic perceptions and cultural upbringings as well as they can be influenced by limitations of geopolitical interest or comprehensive worldview. Yet, Hofstede’s work is significant in a sense that it generated fruitful discussions within research community and practitioners alike.

For example, even in his first edition of the *Culture’s Consequences* that was published in 1980 he suggested that a further research would be needed in anthropology, sociology, psychology, medicine, and other applied fields like business and law. From a curriculum standpoint, I am comfortable to refer to Hofstede’s

classification as a foundation to understand intercultural differences. For example, from my previous and current professional engagements as a simultaneous and consecutive interpreter and through my seven-year work as a federalism orientation lecturer for the International Visitors Leadership Program where I have conducted over one thousand orientations and federalism briefings for participants of this premier international program sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, I (inadvertently) witness proofs or verifications for differences of cultural dimensions as researched by Hofstede. For example, interrupting a speaker and adding ideas to the conversation during its execution is a sign of interest and engagement for some Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, and South American cultures. In contrast, participants of the program from Japan or South Korea would unlikely interrupt any presentation and would rarely ask questions even at the end of an orientation. I observed similar patterns of behavior in graduate classes. Interculturally competent teaching strategies can allow university instructors to anticipate these differences and utilize them as opportunities for learning and cultural enrichment within the classroom environment.

c) Intercultural Teaching Competence

Internationalization is becoming inevitable in higher education contexts and instructor's intercultural teaching competence is growing in importance. Fantini (2009) defines intercultural teaching competence (ITC) as the “ability of instructors to interact

with students in a way that supports the learning of students who are linguistically and culturally different from the instructor or from each other” (Fantini, 2009). In this case, instructor’s ability to interact with students can be interpreted as a process and a desired result. In other words, instructors themselves, while performing multiple roles in the classroom (facilitator, knowledge-sharing experts, advisors, etc.) inadvertently build up on their initial level of intercultural competence even if they initially possess a high level of it. Indeed, attitudes, skills, and knowledge base of intercultural competence develop because each time an instructor teaches a course, he/she does not teach it to the same set of students and no discussions are the same. Thus, each class and course results in constructing a *common intercultural competence* for instructors and students to achieve “common learning goals” (Fantini 2009; Spitzberg & Chagnon, 2009).

The very first building block to achieve intercultural competence in classroom is communication. During communication process between students and instructor, it is imperative to bridge cultural and linguistic differences. For example, within the PDME program in 2018-2019, the CEHD offered opportunities to twelve international participants to enroll in graduate courses. Those participants have high IELTS scores and are high achievers in the ELI language program. In addition, some teachers hold graduate degrees from regional universities and from English-speaking countries including the United States. Erroneously, some instructors assume that proficiency in

English is the only requirement for teachers to succeed in those courses and in their academic experience in the United States. In other words, both sides such as US teachers and MASU PLC leaders on the one hand and international participants on the other hand might lack adequate intercultural competence to accept each other's differences and create a shared "in-class" intercultural identity and mutual understanding of what constitutes achievement or academic success.

And still, intercultural competence is much more complex. In previous sections, we largely focused on theories and perceptions of cultural attributes as perceived by Western experts (*Western paradigm*). Consequently, we assessed the need and opportunities for internationalization from the Western perspective on the example of the Mid-Atlantic State University. Indeed, many of the prevailing theories in intercultural communication and intercultural competence were written by Western experts (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars, Hamden, and Turner 1993; Deardorff, 2006). These theories encompass norms, behavioral patterns, and expectations as cultivated by Western, largely individualistic discourse. In this discourse, intercultural competence can be seen as development of individual skills and characteristics necessary to successfully interact with people from different societies and cultures to achieve individual goals.

At the same time, it is clear that educators play a critical role in bringing students in their physical or hybrid classroom to a new level of intercultural competence which becomes a synergy of students' prior experiences and those of the instructor. The knowledge, behaviors, experiences, narratives, and attitudes demonstrated by educators in this interaction influence both teaching and learning environments (Sleeter, 2001a). Thus, classroom and online discussions should be facilitated considering these differences and building up on intercultural competence of both sides.

For example, lack of adequate intercultural competence skills is one of the biggest challenges that I observe while working with staff members and consultants (e.g. field supervisors) of the PDME program. Western discourse values are oftentimes imposed on the participants expecting them to comply with the expectations of the program by mere assumption that "this is how we do it here in the United States and your government wants to comply with the rules of the program." Strategically, reaching an intercultural consensus is much more beneficial in cultural diplomacy, intercultural communication, and international education. Sides can and should listen to each other's perspectives to better understand the status quo on the issue even if final resolution is an unattainable goal. Intercultural competence can be included in departmental and programmatic developmental goals where perspective taking and revision of instructional approaches to meet student and participant needs will be central

(Bennett, 2004; Deardorff, 2006; Paige, 1996). Creating a task force within the CEHD on how intercultural competence of instructors and staff can be developed seems like the first step on improving it within the College. The logistical mechanism for forming a committee inviting host experts and integrating best practices from high-profile and successful institutions in the United States and globally should become first feasible steps to supporting the university's expressed commitment to internationalization.

d) Developing Intercultural Competence of University Students

Irrespective of recent negative international policy developments, the United States still offers beneficial opportunities to international students, scholars, and those seeking short-term professional development and research opportunities. According to data provided by the Department of Homeland Security (which grants most international student visas and keeps statistics on international students studying in the United States) there were 1.21 million international students in the United States in December 2017 (Boston Globe). While international students acquire formal degrees by participating in classroom activities, they navigate cultural and value differences in and outside of classrooms. These experiences are likely to contribute to intercultural experiences as well. The question is, though, how to appreciate, critique, and apply this acquired knowledge to personal and professional experiences while still pursuing your formal university degree? For example, many experts agree that universities need to

“educate their students for global citizenship, to keep pace with their peers, to better serve the national and international community” (Biddle, 2002, p. 7). Others focus on connection between global competence and civic responsibility (Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg, 2012). In addition, today’s reality dictates that university graduates should possess critical thinking, and professional adaptability skills to increase their prospects of obtaining a job not only in their country of origin but also globally. Many researchers refer to this qualification as “employability”, where “increased job performance, skills, and unique personal development characteristics” play a key role in global professionalism (Deardorff, de Wit, & Heyl, 2012; Deardorff & van Gaalen 2012; Knight 2012).

Accordingly, universities need to provide students with sufficient incentives and awareness of the importance of building intercultural competence. The issue is, however, what this competence entails. In this research we already discussed that intercultural competence is seen by many as an important outcome of higher education internationalization (Knight, 2014), but there is no unified approach among research community and practitioners on the exact definition of intercultural competence and how it should be developed in university settings. Moreover, both global and intercultural competences are used interchangeably with “intercultural communication”

or “intercultural communicative competence” being at the center of it (Krajewski, 2011).

In the sections above we applied conceptual understanding of “intercultural competence” as a dynamic and continuously developing skill rather than result on its own. And because it is a skill, “it should be possible to assess it and to document its existence and progress” (Krajewski, 2011, p. 13). Consequently, a conceptual framework consisting of strands of intercultural competence can be tentatively developed in students. Analysis of the available literature on the topic demonstrated that there are at least three models of intercultural competence: a compositional model, a developmental model, and a mixed model with elements of both.

A compositional model was presented by Jonas Stier in 2006. In his research he focused on two key domains: content-competencies and processual-competencies. Stier states that “content-competencies predominantly have a static character and refer to the knowing... aspects of the *other* and *home* cultures” (Stier, 2006). These can include history, linguistic heritage, verbal and non-verbal behavior, stereotypes, gender relationships, symbols, and others. Processual competence is dynamic in nature and includes intrapersonal competencies and interpersonal competencies. Intrapersonal competencies include cognitive skills such as self-reflection, role taking, problem-solving as well as emotional skills. The latter include ability to cope with feelings and

emotions, such as uncertainty, ambiguity, frustration, etc. In Stier's opinion, these emotions can be triggered by "unknown cultural settings" (Bochner, 1982) but can be controlled by an individual in order to avoid culturally insensitive behavior or reactions. Interpersonal competencies consist of interactive skills which include understandings of nonverbal signs and cues, emotional responses, as well as communication competence, and situational sensitivity (Stier, 2006). Thus, according to Stier, it is through the development of both domains that intercultural competence can be developed.

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Maturity of King and Baxter Magolda (2005) presupposes that intercultural competence goes through "three domains of development: initial, intermediate, and mature." While initial level of competence is hard to evaluate, it is the "mature level of competence" that appears important. According to the researchers, at this level of competence, an individual is able to challenge his/her worldviews and beliefs and has the capacity (and ability) to engage in interactions with those who do not hold the same worldview (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). However, as this brief analysis illustrates, both approaches are very theoretical in nature and are not supported by any empirical studies in order to be considered as prevailing theories for understanding and assessment of intercultural competence of students.

Thus, Deardorff's pyramid and process model of intercultural competence selected for this introductory research for the CEHD's context remains to be the most applicable. The latter model was developed as a result of a study conducted in 2006. Then, university administrators were asked to provide their thoughts and understandings of intercultural competence as a student outcome. Indeed, the limitation of the study was that the designed questionnaire was not targeting international, heritage, and domestic students, but was rather focused on administrators. The questionnaire was submitted to seventy-three higher education administrators in the accredited not-for-profit institutions in the United States and generated twenty-four responses. As a result of the study, elements of intercultural competence were ranked by highest acceptance. There are some similarities and parallels with theoretical models of intercultural competence developed by King & Baxter Magolda (2005) and Stier (2006). For example, the most popular definition of intercultural competence was the communication ability. Concretely, it was the "ability to communicate appropriately and effectively in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (Deardorff, 2006, p. 249).

The second most important definition included elements of intercultural competence in terms of the "ability to shift frame of reference appropriately and adapt behavior to cultural context; adaptability, expandability, and flexibility of one's frame

of reference/ filter” (Deardorff, 2006). This “shift in frame” is noticeable in both models (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Stier, 2006).

Components of intercultural competence were then summarized in Deardorff’s research and rated according to their impact on developing intercultural competence. Indeed, because this research did not include feedback from students, we cannot *a priori* consider it reflective of students’ views on intercultural competence that can be acquired, improved or even worsened while in college. But through the analysis of data in Deardorff’s research, it is possible to conclude that it is through the attainment of attitudes, skills, and knowledge about intercultural differences that an individual can develop internal feelings of empathy, flexibility, and appreciation for intercultural diversity. This, in turn, can facilitate an effective communication between members of culturally diverse groups leading to a constructive dialogue to solve mutual problems, achieve consensus on issues, or resolve misunderstandings. For example, in accordance with Deardorff’s model, “listening” as a skill is crucial for communicating effectively across cultures. In my own practice, I notice that as I increased time for individual advisory sessions for the international teachers with whom I work, our communication significantly improved. I let them speak and raise issues at their speed and with considerations for their cultural norms and then pose the questions leading them to answer those questions from a third person perspective. For example, most recently, I

discussed with the teachers what kind of workshops would they like the DoE to organize for them and why. Instead of offering them the workshops that we previously designed for other groups of domestic and international groups, the faculty was ready to not only customize previously designed workshops but also develop new ones based on the teachers' expressed interest.

In some ways, these individual advisory sessions were also an attempt to improve my own intercultural competence. Sleeter (2007) suggested that teachers' engaging in "experiences other than their own is an essential step in the development of intercultural competence" (Sleeter, 2007). I share Sleeter's belief that intercultural learning cannot occur without impactful experiences where "people are challenged to make sense of their new environment and accommodate to the difference" (Sleeter, 2007). Realizing that even though I considered myself an interculturally aware professional, I still approached many concepts from a Western and even U.S.-based connotation. Yet I also realized that the program specifically focused on shifting mindset for the PDME teachers as well to acquire some of the Western based approaches to teaching. So for both sides it was an immersion experience where building up on cultural assets and differences was the start of a work on intercultural competence both in terms of a process and content.

II. Internationalization as a Policy Direction

a) U.S. Government Stakeholders

There are three primary mechanisms by which government-sponsored internationalization policies and programs are established in the United States: legislation, executive action, and agency-designed initiatives. Legislation mechanism includes Congressional acts, proposed and passed by the US Congress, articulation of short-and long-term policy goals, and appropriation of federal funds to carry out programs and activities. Executive action includes a *deliberate and strategic* move by a particular President to affect specific programs through continuation of the programs or their modifications. For example, a recent conundrum with a so-called “travel ban” put on hold many international exchange and partnership programs between universities and foreign governments, universities in the U.S. and international universities, and other types of bilateral and trilateral partnerships. The ban had a negative effect not only on relationships between engaged entities but also on an international image of the United States as a reliable partner in international education.

In general, initiatives of the U.S. government are a result of cumulative efforts of many organizations that promote U.S. foreign policy efforts through several domains, including education, technology, professional development, security, etc. For example, IREX and American Councils for International Education promote U.S. government

vision in education, civil society, and professional training in selected regions worldwide. And yet, even though these organizations have a somewhat independent say regarding sponsorship and support mechanisms, in order to get funding from the U.S. government, they still have to adhere to international policy priorities in specific regions. Similarly, foreign governments pursue their own agendas that are important to them in a wider geopolitical perspective. For example, the government of one Middle Eastern country is sponsoring degree studies (undergraduate and graduate) of around 100,000 nationals in the United States. The effect of this initiative is immense both domestically and internationally. Domestically, the country welcomes well-educated and trained bilingual workforce. Internationally, this type of initiative is illustrative of how partnerships can be developed even when political structures and policy mechanisms in the United States and the Middle Eastern country are different.

In the United States, there are three federal departments that are mandated through federal legislation to carry out internationalization-related policies and programs related to higher education. They are: Department of State, Department of Education, and Department of Defense. As paradoxically as it may sound in contexts of other countries and systems, but the Department of Education is not a primary department for either determining international education policies nor for implementing them.

Through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the Department of State administers educational programs related to inbound and outbound student exchange programs. Many of these programs operate under the umbrella of the Fulbright program (“Fulbright Program History”, 2018). The Fulbright-Hayes Act of 1961 consolidated laws pertaining to internationalization of the U.S. education system and even today remains the defining policy document for international programs administered by the U.S Department of State.

The Department of Education (DoE) plays a less recognized but still an important role in internationalization efforts. It administers foreign language and area studies programs governed by the Fulbright-Hayes Act and Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (The history of Title VI and the Fulbright-Hayes, 2018). Similarly, the Department of Defense (DoD) focuses on foreign language and area studies. Through the National Security Education Program (NSEP), the DoD awards individual scholarships to study foreign languages abroad and awards institutional grants to develop and enhance foreign language curricula within the United States (National Security Education Programs, 2018). NSEP is authorized by the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (Title VIII, National Security scholarships, fellowships, and grants, 1991).

International policies in general and international higher education policies in particular can be more reactionary in nature and are likely to be determined by external factors more than domestic developments. Indeed, in many discussions through my coursework at the DoE we talked about how a public problem ignites policy discussions. I consider that type of policy formation a more predictable process as compared to formulation of international higher education policies. First, the legislation structure is in place already for domestic issues. Whenever there is an emerging policy problem (e.g. current strict enforcement of the “zero-tolerance” immigration policy by the Trump Administration where a child born in the United States is a subject to US laws), the executive branch and the general public operate with what law has to say on the issue. Interpretations of the law can vary but at least the basic operational structure is in place. And secondly, it is in the best interest of the President of the United States to be accountable to the general public if the President wants to get reelected for the second term or leave a legacy. Yes, some anachronisms of the U.S. election process (Electoral College for example) cannot guarantee that the public opinion will prevail at minimum, the President in the first term can *react* to a public opinion and make shifts to the endorsed policies rather soon in the implementation stage (Trump changes course on immigration, 2018). This is what happened with recent implementation of policies. The president reacted to a bi-partisan public opinion since he has many things at stake

with a reelection. Would he react the same way if he were finishing his second term, for example? That *is* the question.

For international higher education, though, the general public in the United States is not a major stakeholder. For example, I am currently managing federal government orientations for the Capital Communications Group- a major subcontractor for the US Department of States' International Visitor Leadership Program. In 2015 NPR article, Kim Lawton cited Akram Elias, (the President of the company) who summarized those policies and commented that the policy conflict is there because in domestic context, almost *none of the policies* originate with the government whereas internationally, "almost *every single foreign policy and security policy* issue originates with the government" ("Do Americans Care about Foreign Policy?", 2015). This creates a paradoxical situation because many US citizens justify US actions overseas by holding US (and thus the government) to the highest standards of freedom and democracy while they want less and less government in their own lives.

b) Policy Documents on International Higher Education

In the absence of a specific federal agency in charge of higher internationalization policies in the United States, several professional education associations and organizations fulfill that role. For example, associations such as NAFSA, ACE (American Council on Education), and IIE (Institute of International

Education) have gained a solid reputation among domestic and international constituents to voice U.S. internationalization policies. Consequently, international stakeholders associate U.S. policies with directives and analyses provided by these associations, and not the U.S. government as such. Thus, policy documents developed by these organizations serve as a foundation for analysis of the U.S. higher education policies. For example, the American Council on Education (ACE) began developing its approach to internationalization “in recognition of the need for institutions to find a transformative process for it” (Smithee, 2011). American Council on Education (ACE) is a premier educational policy organization that is also a convener of higher education associations and agencies. It is cited in national U.S. media more often than any other educational organization or agency which, in itself, speaks about top-notch reputation of the organization. It is the expertise of its staff and members that allowed ACE to truly ace the establishment of the Internationalization Laboratory first and then create a key policy document, such as *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Current Policies, Future Directions* (“Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education”, 2015).

First, the above-mentioned document identifies policy actors involved in internationalization and describes rationales and motivations underlying policy actors’ strategic approaches to the internationalization of higher education. Second, it provides a summary of existing federal legislation and initiatives on the subject matter. It

succinctly yet thoroughly discusses both sustainable (long-term) and new initiatives. However, because the current administration did not come up with a comprehensive internationalization plan or articulated strategic development plan for internationalization of education as part of the foreign policy, it is challenging to predict which of the initiatives described in the policy document of 2015 will be sustained. Third, the policy suggests a debate on whether a comprehensive national internationalization policy or strategy as seen in other countries (e.g. Canada, Australia, China, Germany) or regions (EU) is feasible and even desirable for the United States and if yes, what additional steps are required to expand on the status quo that we inherited from previous administration/s?

Thus, this policy document serves as a framework for policy makers and institutional leaders on federal, state, and local levels to better position themselves within the fluid system that is prone to political influences of the executive branch of the federal government.

c) Significance of the Policy

The policy is important for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, the current administration (executive branch) has been known for the lack of action in formulating the course for internationalization. Partially, the inaction can be explained by President Trump's rejection of public diplomacy trends of his predecessors irrespective of their

political affiliations. Thus, visionary experts in international higher education policy have to rely on the ACE's documents and predictions. Second, the ACE is the key point of contact on higher education matters for congressional staff and members of the executive branch at federal agencies. Due to this "professional weight" assigned to it by practitioners, researchers, and policy makers, the Council's recommendations have been considered as expert views (Peterson & Helms, 2013; Stone, 2016).

This policy is also a valuable document for beginner practitioners in the field. It outlines the roles of federal agencies involved in higher education internationalization. These agencies include the U.S. Department of State, Education, and Defense. Because the role of the federal government in the United States is different from the roles of central or national governments in other federal systems (selected countries of the EU, Canada, Brazil, and Russia), it was important to include a succinct comparative analysis on the ability of the federal government to "promote and sustain those policies" for the benefit of all educational entities (Tamtik, 2017).

However, despite multiple attempts by organizations like the ACE and NAFSA (Association of International Educators) as well as supporting data from the European Union and the Bologna Process Initiative, a comprehensive national policy for the internationalization of U.S. higher education has not yet taken place and that is why it might be challenging for individual institutions and academic units (such as the DoE)

to aggressively pursue internationalization of curriculum (“Bologna Process”, 2018).

The ACE policy document allows us to distinguish at least three reasons why the formulation of a national policy has not happened yet.

First, as discussed above, there is no central body in the United States to formulate and implement those policies. None of the federal agencies engaged in internationalization initiatives exert any significant influence over public or private higher education institutions in the United States. Yet, institutional buy-in is vital for government policies and programs to be effective. In the U.S., however, autonomy of institutions is an integral principle of higher education system and prescriptions from above are usually viewed negatively.

Second, U.S. higher education system is massive and very diverse. A “one-fit-all” national policy can be seen as a threat to that diversity or an attempt to make changes to the system without consulting major local stakeholders of the process: students, parents, faculty, staff, etc. Thus, it will be challenging to create a national policy that will be comprehensive yet still contain enough specificity to be meaningful and effective to meet the needs and expectations of each individual institution.

A mitigating factor for the challenges above could be provision of financial support. A national policy scaffolded by programs that are backed by funding coming directly from institutions could start a dialogue between national agencies and

educational institutions. This interdependence could be the beginning of a new internationalization policy. I plan to continue researching this policy looking closer into power players of the current structure and their influence on maintaining inter-institutional partnerships and curriculum internationalization.

d) Visible and Hidden Actors of the Internationalization Policy

In the United States, there are multiple policy actors involved in higher education policy development and implementation. Aside from three major (visible) participants discussed above (Department of State, Department of Education, and Department of Defense), there are many non-governmental organizations receiving administrative and programmatic funding from those and other federal departments. Many international organizations like the Institute of International Education (IIE), World Learning, Global Ties USA, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) formulate their organizational missions rather carefully: partially, in accordance with traditions of the U.S. public diplomacy based on open competition, empowerment of civil society, and others.

And yet, international education organizations can choose to play a more proactive role in setting up direction for internationalization of U.S. higher education. Arguably, it can be done by making “baby steps” adjustments. For example, many international education organizations can achieve a higher public profile by changing

main website page messages. IREX's message states that "we strive for a more just, prosperous, and inclusive world" (IREX, 2018). American Councils' message states "we prepare citizens, institutions, and nations to succeed in tomorrow's world" (American Councils, 2018). The IIE's mission statement says: "we work to build more peaceful and equitable societies by advancing scholarship, building economies and promoting access to opportunity" (IIE, 2018). These messages are captivating and powerful. They help organizations position themselves as serious and solid partners with the international community and become a beacon for international higher policy in the absence of such from the federal government itself.

On the other hand, in the U.S. context, formulation of higher education policies is open to other actors, such as higher education institutions. U.S. universities are able to have a powerful policy voice by advocating internationalization and benefiting from decentralization of higher education system. Some researchers suggest that "there are opportunities for institutional entrepreneurs to advocate a particular change and either adopt an innovation straight away or to adapt innovations" (Brookes & Huisman, 2009). Thus, ad hoc policies of the current Presidential administration can be converted into a powerful tool that universities can use to position themselves as international higher education leaders. Truly, many experts see ad hoc policies of the current administration as a minus. As an optimist, I see it as an opportunity for institutions to have a larger say

in policy formulation and diversification of their internationalization curricula. The reality is that with ad hoc international policies of the current administration, universities across the country are experiencing financial loss and a detrimental enrollment effect (International Student Enrollment, 2018). Thus, the economic consideration in this case prompts U.S. universities to think about taking a more proactive role in policy formulation and change their role from “hidden” actors of internationalization into “visible” ones.

Universities create a viable alternative to international non-profits on policy formulation and implementation because they are not bound by the same limitations as the latter. International non-profits (as they receive the bulk of their funding from the government) fall under regulations and limitations of federal policies and practices. Thus, public perception of the activities these organizations oversee or manage is often associatively linked to the federal government’s position on a particular issue. In other words, whatever initiative American Councils, IREX or any other organization introduces- it is referred to as a U.S. government project or a project supported by the government. If a bilateral relationship between a certain country and the United States changes, the associative link is transferred to organizations associated with the U.S. government. For example, in 2014-2015 the Russian government shut down programs and activities of IREX and the American Councils. For many years both organizations

promoted U.S. education and partnership programs between Russian Federation and the United States. The movement to shut down those programs as “propaganda” originated in the Russian Duma (Parliament) once the Duma passed the appropriate law.

Officially it is referred to as “On Amendments to Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation regarding the Regulation of the Activities on Non-Profit Organizations Performing the Functions of a Foreign Agent”. According it, all non-profit organizations that receive foreign donations and engage in “political activity” should declare themselves as foreign agents (European Commission on Democracy through Law, 2017).

Thus, by limiting opportunities to engage Russia in international education (specifically with U.S. initiatives), the government of Russia created a legalization mechanism to limit international higher education exchanges under the pretext of domestic security. Thus, it is only logical to conclude that domestic security policy in some countries can overarch global needs in higher education. It is an important finding and requires further research in international higher education policy.

d) Inter-Government Initiatives on the Example of the Bologna Process

From its early days of formation, the United States (as a new sociopolitical entity on the global map) did not strive to have influence in the field of international

education. Indeed, it is challenging to talk about international higher education engagement for the country that did not exist on the world map prior to proclaiming independence in 1776 (while Bologna University alone was established in 1088). Today, we see that universities often deviate from a trajectory of being solely academic institutions of higher learning. Many universities introduce online programs and degrees, others minimize their idle capital by using campus facilities and offering courses all year round (e.g. Mid-Atlantic State University). Others attach attributes like study abroad programs, athletics, and even geographic location as a marketing tool. Thus, even if we consider today's American university a "private good", conceptual understanding of what is today's American university is not an easy answer (Labaree, 2018).

European universities have developed and continue to develop differently because of a particular higher education modality in Europe (Antunes, 2006). Education is still viewed by the majority of Europeans *as a right* and *an intellectual privilege*. That's why tuition costs are very minimal (if at all) and admission's criteria rarely depend on anything other than students' academic achievements in high schools. The European Union, as a combined sociopolitical entity, took a step further in unifying higher education policies of individual countries. This process and strategies are now known as the Bologna Process originating from the Bologna Declaration. The Bologna

Declaration dates back to 1999 when Education Ministers from France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom agreed to “to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a worldwide degree of attraction” (Bologna Declaration, 1999). Commitment to promoting European higher education as competitive and world-class was recognized in subsequent communiqués and policy documents in Prague in 2001, Berlin 2003, Bergen in 2005 and in biennial meetings afterwards. The strategy document known as “Strategy of European Higher Education Area” was signed in London in 2007.

The six objectives of the Declaration (1999) were:

1. Adopt a system of easily understood and comparable degrees to promote European citizens’ employability and international competitiveness.
2. Adopt a system of two main cycles, undergraduate (Bachelor’s) and graduate (Master’s).
3. Establish a unified system of credits- such as the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and strengthen credit transfer.
4. Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles for students, teachers, researchers, administrators, and staff.
5. Promotion of quality assurance.

6. Promotion of curricular development, inter-institutional cooperation, mobility schemes, and integrated programs for study training and research.

Thus, some of the significant steps of this policy are intended to promote European higher education in order to enhance its world-wide attractiveness and competitiveness as well as strengthen cooperation with other regions based on partnerships, intensifying policy dialogue and furthering recognition of qualifications (“Bologna Follow-Up Group”, 2007). Establishment of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) was also a way for the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG) to inform non-European partners and policy makers that in times of many deregulations in higher education (Europeans prefer not to use the term “education market”), a united policy was needed to regulate educational policies, to retain domestic but also attract international students to high quality and established institutions.

For the U.S. context, however, the conundrum of higher education market became even more complicated with the emergence of alternative forms of educational courses or degrees (e.g. massive open online courses, branch campuses, joint degrees, interdisciplinary degrees, etc.) In many ways, for well-ranked and established universities, the stakes became even higher: how can an institution maintain its reputation through high academic ranking, program accreditation with professional agencies like AACSB, ABET, NSTE while also make their admission’s requirements

more flexible to attract international and “cash-paying” students? In addition, global acceptance and reputation among peers are equally important. The challenge is indeed multifaceted.

For European institutions, the establishment of linkages with institutions within and outside of Europe is a way to positively reshape international public image to amend some of the negative perceptions associated with colonialism. For example, bi-regional relations between the EU and Latin America and the Caribbean have created the EU-LAC Higher Education Area. The goal of such an entity is student/research mobility, improved interinstitutional cooperation and creation of a systematic assessment of degrees with the creation of a comparative credit system. Another strategy of interinstitutional partnership relies on cooperative and jointly designed programs to improve inter-institutional networking and partnerships. Some of these initiatives were so well-received and accepted that they resulted in programs and projects like Erasmus Mundus and Erasmus Mundus Plus, Tempus, Marie Curie Actions, Asia-Link and many others (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2014; Sutton, Buck, & Obst, 2011). Many American partners always wonder where the funding for those projects is coming from. In the context of the European Union, it is usually the tax money of individual member-states of the EU with lesser contributions (which are oftentimes voluntary) from non-EU countries. For the purposes of this research, I am

going to abstain from political debate about whether it is a beneficial or detrimental mechanism for education per se, but in his assessment of global impacts of the Bologna Process, Professor Zmas (2015) mentioned that “the Bologna Process promotes competition along the lines of obtaining the largest possible impact from the expected benefits”(Zmas, 2015). Some share the opinion that the Bologna Process gave Europe a powerful mechanism to affect sociopolitical processes not just in the European Union but also regionally (in non-EU member countries like Ukraine, for example) and globally.

A survey conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU), found that internationalization of higher education in Europe and the United States is perceived differently by the constituents (Egron- Polak & Hudson, 2014). Today, to make a quick economic return on education, U.S. universities are focused on attracting international students with learning outcomes not being given as much attention. European universities, on the other hand, are focused on improving teaching and learning, and partnerships, and international students’ awareness about internationalization of experiences coming third (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014). It is clear that internationalization policies of a particular institution are shaped by the expected benefits of students after graduation and an ability to respond to external economic and geopolitical drivers. In the European context, it can get even more

complicated due to the growing influence of anti-immigration and anti-globalization political parties. In the United States, higher education policies are determined by demographic trends, business, and industry expectations. Therefore, traditional universities in the United States and Europe operate somewhat differently. For example, in Europe, the Erasmus program provides a general framework, funding, and a domain for higher education development in accordance with geopolitical dialogue between participating nations. For European universities, an outgoing academic mobility (students, professors, short-term researchers, etc.) is a *natural* part of Europeization, while in North America internationalization of curriculum is arguably a much cheaper option for success because brand name universities, such as Harvard, MIT, Stanford, University of Michigan and others capitalize on their institutional prestige than affiliation with the U.S. system of higher education. Other universities, like the Mid-Atlantic State University, for example, is not at a luxury to do so. As discussed above, internationalization of curriculum is one of the most effective way to improve its global profile and competitiveness among other global universities and the leadership of the Department of Education can explore this venue as well.

The Influence of the Bologna Process Outside of Europe

It has been discussed that one of the main objectives of the Bologna Process is to achieve a conducive transnational cooperation between institutions in order to

achieve a cohesive quality assurance for the European higher education. The impact of meeting this objective and sustaining its implementation is well documented and discussed in relevant literature (Brookes & Huisman; 2009; Crosier & Parvela, 2013; Hartmann; 2008; Zgaga; 2006). For example, in the assessment of Bologna Process policy documents, Pavel Zgaga, professor of the Centre for Education Policy Studies in Slovenia discussed how Bologna Process helps streamline higher education policies in the countries that signed the agreement but also how systematic changes through this process affect global shifts in higher education policies. Undoubtedly, these shifts cannot and should not occur without local adjustments and geopolitical influences of domestic actors. Zmas mentions that “national visions, political will, economic demands, social objectives, administrative regulations, cultural traditions, ideological norms and philosophical ideals can metamorphose the Bologna action lines as they are incorporated into each higher education system (Zmas, 2015, p. 728).

Indeed, global higher education world is changing rapidly with more regional centers appearing on the map and many nations strategizing their policies to increase their regional and global influence. For example, according to a recently released report Project Atlas by the Institute of International Education (IIE), there are several leaders that are actively promoting their higher education models (IIE, 2018). For example, by 2022 Canada is planning to host 450,000 international students (their numbers increased

from 300,000 in 2017 to almost 400,000 in 2018); Japan's target is 300,000 by 2020; Germany's- 350,000 and China's- 500,000 by 2020. It is harder to make predictions for the United States because higher education is a market that is prone to many fluctuations depending on the foreign policy of the federal government, changes in cost, availability of funding for research, etc.

Other countries also have their concerns regarding expanding its international student population and expanding on the curricula. For example, for some time Australia has been a significant player in international education scene. However, the global impact of the Bologna Process sets new challenges and opportunities for Australia too. One of the concerns was coming not from Europe but rather from other regional partners, such as South Korea and China. This "regional push" started to show a shift "from a mainly inward-oriented higher education internationalization" to a more balanced approach (Wu & Zha, 2018). Additionally, China started to show more interest in compatibility of their national higher education system with the Bologna Process (Zmas, 2015). Thus, even a traditionally protectionist academic environment such as Chinese cannot continue to operate on the old model that is not receptive to global pressure of internationalization of higher education.

The realization of a possibility to lose regional influence led Australian decision-makers to sign a joint declaration with the European Union to support

cooperation on issues of “qualifications frameworks, benchmarking and quality assurance in the higher education sector (Figel & Bishop, 2007). One of the steps undertaken by the Australian government was to encourage Australian universities to promote a diploma supplement which would “improve the transparency of graduates’ qualifications” (Zmas, 2015). Similar to any other initiative coming from above, it was not received favorably by all. For example, some university leaders expressed a concern that standardization of criteria would come at the expense of universities’ “autonomy and academic freedom” (Zmas, 2015). In addition, Australian education has traditionally looked at Canada and the United States as models of higher education mechanisms leaving European higher education initiatives in the periphery of its interests. And yet, growing regional cooperation with China, South Korea, New Zealand and other hubs of international education created conditions for Australia to create an Asian-Pacific Higher Education Area similar to the Bologna Declaration (“Bologna Declaration”, 1999). Thus, importance of regional cooperation (centralization of policies) prevailed over individual success stories of selected universities in the United States. In 2006, twenty-seven Ministers of Education from the region signed the Brisbane Communiqué, according to which “the need for recognition of professional qualifications, promotion of quality assurance mechanisms, and further internationalization of the Asia- Pacific educational system” was stressed

taking into account the distinctive features, particularities, and other global engagements of participating countries (Zmas, 2015). Thus, Australia and its counterparts voiced their interest in creating a blended system of international cooperation, both through promoting strengths of each national educational system and emphasizing the need for regional cooperation.

Unfortunately, the United States remains antagonistic to any government-to-government cooperation agreements in higher education. A minor interest was expressed in the report by the “Spellings Commission” (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). The writers and experts of this report expressed a growing concern about U.S. “blindness” in terms of need for regional cooperation that should be brought to the federal government level. Even then, the United States was at a risk of losing its dominant role in attracting international students, initiating international partnerships, and promoting an internally challenging curriculum in colleges and universities. Yet the Spellings report did not address concrete risks of potential losing its central place in international higher education because of other countries’ willingness to adopt or integrate the BP methods for unification of their higher education systems. If we summarize the discoveries of this paper, it is possible to indicate that it happened because American higher education system is highly decentralized and because U.S. higher education institutions are operating on a market model rather than a Humboldtian

model of higher education at the core of which is a holistic combination of research and studies and not market gains.

REFERENCES

- Antunes, F. (2006). Globalisation and Europeification of education policies: Routes, processes and metamorphoses. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5(1), 2.
- Behrens, L. (2007). *Konservierung von stereotypen mit hilfe der statistik*. Koln: Institute für Linguistik, Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Bennett, J.M., & Bennett, M.J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J.M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 147-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming interculturally competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education*. Newton, MA: Intercultural Resources Corporation.
- Biddle, S. (2002). *Internationalization: Rhetoric or reality?* New York, NY: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Bochner, S. (Ed.) (1982). *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction*. Sydney: Pergamon Press.
- Bologna Declaration (1999). The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Retrieved January 15, 2018 from http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf
- BFUG (Bologna Follow-Up Group) (2007). European higher Education in a global setting. A strategy for the external dimension of the Bologna Process. Retrieved January 15, 2018 from [http:// www.ehea.info/Uploads/Documents/Strategy-for-EHEA-in-global-setting.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Documents/Strategy-for-EHEA-in-global-setting.pdf)

- Bologna Process (2018). Retrieved January 15, 2018 from https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process_en
- Brookes, M., & Huisman, J. (2009). The eagle and the circle of gold stars: Does the Bologna process affect US higher education? *Higher Education in Europe*, 34 (1), 3-23.
- Carnoy, M. & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? A comparative approach. In *Comparative Education Review*, 46, 1-9.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2004). Internationalization: In search of intercultural competence. *International Educator* (1059-4221), 13(2), 13-15. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=507904341&site=ehost-live>
- Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. (2006). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241-266.
- Deardorff, D. K. 1. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011(149), 65-79. 10.1002/ir.381 Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=60135443&site=ehost-live>
- Deardorff, D. K. 1. (2015). Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success. *International Educator* (1059-4221), 24(3), 18-19. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=102539596&site=ehost-live>
- Dessoiff, A. (2006). Who's not going abroad? *International Educator*, 15(2), 20-27.
- Do Americans care about foreign policy? (2015). Retrieved October 2, 2018 from <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/blog/americans-care-foreign-policy/>.
- Egron- Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014). *Internationalization of higher education: Growing expectations, fundamental values. IAU 4th Global Survey Report*. Paris, France, International Association of Universities.

- Figel, J., & Bishop, J. (2007). *Joint declaration between the European Union and Australia*. Brussels: European Union Commission.
- Fulbright Program History (2018). Retrieved May 15, 2019 from <https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright/history>
- Green, M. (2012). Global citizenship: What are we talking about why does it matter? *Trends and Insights for International Education Leaders*. Retrieved from: <https://globalhighered.wordpress.com/2012/03/11/global-citizenship/>
- Hammer, M. (2012). The Intercultural Development Inventory: A new frontier in assessment and development of intercultural competence. In M. Vande Berg, R.M. Paige, & K.H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad* (pp. 115-136). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing
- Helms, R.M., (2015) *Internationalization of U.S. higher education: Current policies, future Directions*. Retrieved June 7, 2018 from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Current-Policies-Future-Directions-Part-2-US.pdf>
- Hofstede, G. (2003). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education System (2015). Retrieved October 15, 2018 from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalizing-U-S-Higher-Education-Current-Policies-Future-Directions.aspx>
- IREX (2018). Retrieved September 25, 2018 from <https://www.irex.org/>.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kehm, B. (2007). Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 260-273.
- King, P.M., & Baxter Margolda, M.B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 571-592.

- Klemp, G. O., Jr. (1979). Identifying, measuring and integrating competence. In P. S. Pottinger & J. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Defining and measuring competence* (pp. 41-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1(1), 27-44.
- Krajewski, S. (2011). *The next Buddha may be a community: Practicing intercultural competence at Macquarie university, Sydney, Australia*. Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridgescholars.com/download/sample/61027>
- Labaree, D.F. (2016). An affair to remember: America's brief flight the university as a public good. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 50(1), 20-36.
- Langley, C.S., & Breese, J.R. (2005). Interacting sojourners: A study of students studying abroad. *Social Science Journal*, 42, 313-321.
- Lee, A., Poch, R., Shaw, M., & Williams, R. (2012). *Engaging diversity in undergraduate classrooms: A pedagogy for developing intercultural competence*. Association for the Study of Higher Education Series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. .
- Mitchell, D. E., & Nielsen S.Y. (2012). Internationalization and globalization in higher education. Retrieved October 15, 2018 from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3e6c/1173f21907959cd4d1fe47ab4109795f50d9.pdf>
- National Security education programs (2018). Retrieved October 15, 2018 from <https://www.nsep.gov/>
- Open Doors Report (2018). Retrieved February 25, 2019 from <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Open-Doors-2018-Media-Information>

- Paige, R. M. (1993). On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 1–20). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press
- Peterson, P. & Helms, R. (2013) Internationalization revisited. *Change*, 45(2), 28-34.
- Rumbley, L.E., Altbach, P.G., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp.158-178). Los Angeles, CA: Sage
- Russia Cancels Exchange Program (2014). Retrieved March 7, 2018 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/05/world/europe/russia-cancels-exchange-program-after-a-stMASUent-sees-us-asylum.html>
- Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2007). Preparing teachers for multiracial and underserved schools. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools* (pp.171-190). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 94-106.
- Smeeth, M. (2011). *Forces shaping institutional decisions on internationalization*. Paper presented at the 2011 NAFSA Annual Conference: Vancouver, Canada.
- Sorge, A. (1983). Culture's consequences (Book Review). *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 625-629.
- Stier, J. (2006). Internationalization, intercultural communication and intercultural competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 11, 2-12.
- Stone, J., (2016). Awarding college credit for MOOCs: The role of the American Council on Education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(36-42), 1-12.

- Tamtik, M. (2017). Who governs the internationalization of higher education? A comparative analysis of macro-regional policies in Canada and the European Union. *Comparative & International Education*, 46(1), 1-15. Retrieved on July 15, 2019 from <http://search.ebscohost.com.MASUel.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=124890589&site=ehost-live>
- The History of Title VI and Fulbright-Hayes. Retrieved June 23, 2018 from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/iegps/history.html>
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. Boston, MA: Nick Brealey Publishing.
- Trump changes course on immigration (2018). Retrieved January 14, 2019 from <https://www.today.com/video/trump-changes-course-on-immigration-signs-executive-order-to-keep-families-together-1260742723716>
- U.S. Department of Education (2006). <https://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>
- Zmas, A. (2015). Global impacts of the Bologna Process: international perspectives, local particularities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative & International Education*, 45(5), 727-747.
- Watkins, D.A., & Biggs, J.B. (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives*. Hong Kong, PRC: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19. doi:10.2307/2391875
- White, M. M. (2003). The university in transformation: global perspectives on the futures of the university. *NACADA Journal*, 23(1/2), 113-114.
- Wu, H. & Zha, Q. (2018). A new typology for analyzing the direction of movement in higher education internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(3), 259-277.

Appendix C

ANALYSIS OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES

I have selected to analyze a policy *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Current Policies, Future Directions* (“Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education,” 2015).

This policy has been developed by the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) in 2015. The Center is a part of the American Council on Education (ACE). Since 1918, the ACE has been analyzing federal higher education policies. Due to the decentralized nature of the U.S. higher education and the absence of an “overarching” government body in charge of internationalization policies of higher education, the policies and recommendations developed by the Council are of particular importance to international educators, higher education and K-12 leaders. In addition, ACE policies are viewed by many experts as a synthesized articulation of international education policies of several federal agencies tasked with implementing and coordinating international initiatives.

The policy first identifies policy actors involved in internationalization and describes rationales and motivations underlying their internationalization actions and activities. Then it provides a summary of existing federal legislation and initiatives on the subject matter. The policy discusses both sustainable (long-term) and new initiatives. However, since current administration did not yet come up with a

comprehensive internationalization plan or articulated strategic development plan for internationalization of education as part of the foreign policy, it is challenging to predict which of the new initiatives described in the policy document of 2015 will be sustained. Third, the policy suggests a debate on whether a comprehensive national internationalization policy or strategy as seen in other countries (e.g. Canada, Australia, China, Germany) or regions (EU) is feasible and even desirable for the United States and if yes, what additional measures are required to expand or build up on current policies and strategies?

Thus, this policy serves as a framework for policy makers and institutional leaders on federal, state, and local levels to better position themselves and their institutions within the fluid system that is prone to political influences of the executive branch of the federal government.

Significance of the policy

The policy is important for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, the current administration (executive branch) has been unable to formulate the course for internationalization per se. Partially, the inaction can be explained by President Trump's rejection of the public diplomacy trends of his predecessors irrespective of their political affiliations. Thus, visionary experts in international higher education policy are left with nothing better than to rely on the ACE's documents and predictions.

Second, the ACE is the key point of contact on higher education matters for congressional staff and members of the executive branch at federal agencies. Due to this “professional weight” assigned to it by practitioners, researchers, and policy makers, the Council’s recommendations have been considered as expert views (Peterson & Helms, 2013; Stone, 2016).

This policy is also a valuable document for beginner practitioners in the field. It outlines the roles of federal agencies involved in higher education internationalization. These agencies include the U.S. Department of State, Education, and Defense. Because the role of the federal government in the United States is different from the roles of central or national governments in other federal systems (selected countries of the EU, Canada, Brazil, and Russia), it was important to include a succinct comparative analysis on the ability of the federal government to “promote and sustain those policies” for the benefit of all educational entities (Tamtik, 2017).

However, despite multiple attempts by organizations like the ACE and NAFSA (Association of International Educators) as well as supporting data from the European Union and the Bologna Process Initiative, a comprehensive national policy for the internationalization of U.S. higher education has not yet taken place and that is why it might be challenging to assure individual institutions and even K-12 leaders to pursue

internationalization of curriculum. From the policy document, it is possible to track at least three reasons why the formulation of a national policy has not happened yet.

First, as discussed above, there is no central body in the United States to formulate and implement those policies. None of the federal agencies engaged in internationalization initiatives exert any significant influence over public or private higher education institutions in the United States. Yet, institutional buy-in is vital for government policies and programs to be effective. In the U.S., however, autonomy of institutions is an integral principle of higher education system and prescriptions from above are usually viewed negatively.

Second, U.S. higher education system is massive and very diverse. A “one-fit-all” national policy can be seen as a threat to that diversity or an attempt to make changes to the system without consulting major local stakeholders of the process: students, parents, faculty, staff, etc. Thus, it will be challenging to create a national policy that will be broad but not too general and still contain enough specificity to be meaningful and effective to meet the needs and expectations of each individual institution.

And yet, a mitigating factor for the challenges above could be financial support. A national policy scaffolded by programs that are backed by funding coming directly from institutions could start a dialogue between national agencies and institutions. This

interdependence could be the beginning of a new internationalization policy. I plan to continue researching this policy looking closer into power players of the current structure and their spheres of influence.

Part 2A. Assessment of my own ideological stance through values

As I completed a self-assessment of an ideological stance/values of orientation (Fowler, 2000, p. 116), I put values of “quality, efficiency, order, and individualism” on top of my list. I was surprised to discover that a chosen selection of values classified me as a “religious and business conservative.” However, considering that the scale was limited to a domestic (a.k.a. American) cultural interpretation discourse, I remain to be very optimistic about my overarching global liberal values. Being a religious and business conservative in a European (or even Eurasian) discourse invites a totally different set of values to be incorporated in the construct of “being conservative.” However, for the purposes of this research, I will not focus on the differences of those sociocultural attributions. And yet, I do have to admit that if I had to answer those questions when I was a university student in late 1990s and early 2000s, it is more likely than not that I would have answered the questions differently. Partially, I believe my answer would have been explained by my experiences as an undergraduate and then graduate student in a highly centralized and moderately centralized educational systems (Ukraine and Germany). Today, however, many European institutions (particularly

privately funded) are transitioning from a Humboldtian model that historically focused on a holistic combination of research and studies to a more marketing model (While, 2003). The latter is prevalent in U.S. higher education where education is viewed as any other commodity and thus market laws of supply (university degree) have to meet the demand (student interest in a particular higher education institution.) However, in a European context, the EU Commission- through its network of analysts and advisors- is tasked with regulating education policies. For higher education specifically it means that the Commission is performing the role of an overarching authority delivering respected policies through legal mechanisms and entities. As an insider (first as a student and then as an international education practitioner working with European agencies like DAAD in charge of German academic exchanges or the British Council), I never felt the “need” to seek an alternative to a centralized system: majority if not all of my education-related questions were efficiently addressed through the hierarchy of the centralized system.

I understand that the values discussed above were shaped over the years and reflect on my personal and professional experiences specific to a geopolitical environment at the time. But they also shaped my professional stance of understanding educational reforms as they can be interpreted through contextual references of European integration (the Bologna Process) or Eurasian collaborative initiatives, for

example. The EU Commission outlines that “higher education and its links with research and innovation plays a crucial role in individual and societal development and in providing the highly skilled human capital and the articulate citizens that Europe needs to create jobs, economic growth, and prosperity” (“EU Activities in the Field of Higher Education”, 2018). These are very ambitious yet humanistic goals putting growth and prosperity of society at the center. Thus, though the system is centralized (reflecting on my value of “order”), it does not exist to “destroy” innovation or individual ambitions.

On the other hand, the decentralized system in the United States allows actors such as businesses, private foundations, and politically connected private citizens to participate in forming U.S. higher education policies internationally. One example is businessman George Soros whose philanthropic entity- Open Society Foundations (OSFs)-has been operating since 1979 providing grants and scholarships to individuals and organizations worldwide. The stated goal of the OSF’s initiatives is “to build vibrant and tolerant democracies” (“About Us: Mission and Values”, 2018). Clearly, Soros and OSFs could not achieve such influence without support and political endorsements of key figures in the U.S. foreign policy. In the United States, where lobbying and advocacy are not illegal, the rule of *who knows whom* transcends into a higher education policy field too. It allows decision-makers at federal agencies to

endorse projects put forward by influential interest groups or public figures. In my opinion, this mechanism is possible because bureaucratic check points, including the Ministry of Higher Education or Department of Higher Education, are not there. I realize that this idea is indeed debatable and can expand to a discussion about how lobbying is different (or not) from corruption. For the purposes of this project, I will abstain from a further criticism of the system.

Considering that private and public actors can “juggle” with higher education prompted me not to select “fraternity” or “liberty” for example as ideological values. I also disagree with Fowler (Fowler, 2000) who states that if you chose “equality” among your values, then you are leaning toward “liberalism.” Thus, if I did not choose “equality” among the values, then do not lean toward “liberalism”? I can say that as education leaders, we first have to determine what we concretely understand under equality and what equality in higher education would be (e.g. gender equality in terms of access to higher education, employability equality, racial equality, global equality, etc). I believe this debate is very timely specifically considering a deteriorating image of the United States as a higher education destination largely thanks to policy-lacking actions of the current administration.

Part 2 B. How (as Educational Leader) I can work to handle ideological conflict

Fowler states that when people's "beliefs are challenged- directly or indirectly- people become distressed" (Fowler, 2000, p. 118). As a researcher and international educator, I do not get distressed but instead make an attempt to critically analyze a policy and/or direction for future application and trajectory change within the context of the organization or institution I work for. For example, I realize that there are certain guiding principles in a centralized system of higher education that I value. At the same time, I realize that U.S. system of higher education which is much younger and was founded on different principles than the European one will unlikely ?? become more centralized in the future. I can see certain positive signs in this.

For example, the U.S. system of higher education is more flexible for external influence over policy formulations. As subcontractors of the U.S. Department of State, many international education organizations (Counterpart International, American Councils, IREX, etc.) engage former Senators and members of the House of Representatives as speakers and policy analysts at workshops, seminars, roundtable discussions, and conferences. Thus, these power players acquire a voice in public diplomacy and become meaningful participants of the process. These actions become particularly important for tumultuous times of ad hoc policies that we are witnessing

today with the current administration. It will be hard to “change” or “tweak” higher education policies in more centralized systems, but decentralization allows to “broaden the debate” where international non-profit organizations and policy makers represent the community engagement similar to what Fowler described in the book section on “Opening the Democratic Process” (Fowler, 2010, pp. 119-120).

Another strategy I can apply to manage my ideological conflict between “centralized” and “decentralized” systems is recognition that “decentralization” allows agencies retain a certain level of authority when selecting the direction of internationalization efforts, including regional preferences for strategic alliances (e.g. China, Russia, Germany) or specialization focus (e.g. biochemistry, technology, counter-terrorism). Such arrangements are initiated by top key players including Ministries of Education in centralized countries and presidents of colleges or universities in the United States. An example can be a 2018-2019 PDME program for K-12 international teachers. According to the program objectives, forty-five teachers will spend one year in the United States to improve their English language and pedagogical skills. The College of Education and Human Development of the Mid-Atlantic State University will facilitate their faculty mentoring program and school practices. The CEHD was selected because of its reputation in the field of education, faculty expertise, and high national ranking of the program. In this case, it is the Mid-

Atlantic State University and the Ministry of Education of foreign country will have a large say over administration and implementation of partnership. But it is the faculty members (as mentors) and teachers in DE public schools that will be “supplying” international teachers with professional, leadership, and evaluation skills that might be different in their home country. Thus, it is the educators that become active participants of this internationalization project.

In his article related to the role that schools can play in building a new social order, George Counts did not specifically focus on international higher education, yet his ideas can be applied to universities and faculty members interested in collaboration: “teachers should not think of their problem primarily in terms of organizing and presenting a united front to the world, the flesh, and the devil. They must be prepared to stand on their own feet and win for their ideas the support of the masses of the people. Education as a force for social regeneration must march hand in hand with the living and creative forces of the social order” (Romanish, 2012). Counts understood that government and private actors should not distort the social reality of educational pursuits where educators can be *the* agents of social change. In this regard, in accordance with the discussion offered by Alexander (p.10) I am willing to partially give up my preferences for the “more centralized” policies in international higher

education to promote social change within the decentralized system of a U.S. higher education.

Part 3A: How will the policy be determined?

There are three primary mechanisms by which government-sponsored internationalization policies and programs are established in the United States: legislation, executive action, and agency-designed initiatives. The legislation mechanism includes Congressional acts, proposed and passed by the US Congress, establishment of short-and long-term policy goals, and appropriation of federal funds to carry out specific activities. Executive action includes a deliberate and strategic move by a particular president to affect specific programs through continuation of the programs or their modifications. For example, a recent conundrum with a so-called “travel ban” put on hold many international exchange and partnership programs between universities and foreign governments, universities in the U.S. and international universities, etc. Those agreements and relationships were developed for many years and affected many stakeholders (including employment) negatively.

In general, agency-designed initiatives originate from individual agencies that develop internationalization-related policies and programs that further their missions and strategic goals. They allocate funding for these activities from different sources, including private sponsorship and state financing. For example, the government of one

Middle-Eastern country in the Persian Gulf Area is sponsoring around 100,000 degree-seeking students in the United States. The effect of this initiative is immense both domestically and internationally. Domestically, the country welcomes well-educated and trained bilingual workforce. Internationally, this type of initiative is illustrative of how partnerships can be developed even when political structures and policy mechanisms are different.

In the United States, there are three federal departments that are mandated through federal legislation to carry out internationalization-related policies and programs related to higher education. They are: Department of State, Department of Education, and Department of Defense. As paradoxically as it may sound in contexts of other countries and systems, but the Department of Education is not a primary department for either determining educational policies nor for implementing them.

Through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the Department of State administers educational programs related to inbound and outbound student exchange programs. Many of these programs operate under the umbrella of the Fulbright program (Fulbright program history, 2018). The Fulbright-Hayes Act of 1961 consolidated laws pertaining to internationalization of the U.S. education system and even today remains the defining policy document for international programs administered by the U.S Department of State.

The Department of Education (DoE) plays a less recognized but still an important role in internationalization efforts. It administers foreign language and area studies programs governed by the Fulbright-Hayes Act and Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (The history of Title VI and the Fulbright-Hayes, 2018). Similarly, the Department of Defense focuses on foreign language and area studies. Through the National Security Education Program (NSEP), the DoD awards individual scholarships to study foreign languages abroad and awards institutional grants to develop and enhance foreign language curricula within the United States (National Security Education Programs, 2018). NSEP is authorized by the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (Title VIII, National Security scholarships, fellowships, and grants, 1991).

International policies in general and international higher education policies in particular are more reactionary in nature and are determined by external factors more than a domestic interest group push. Indeed, in many discussions in EDUC839 we talked about how a public problem ignites policy discussions. I consider that type of policy formation a more predictable process as compared to formulation of international higher education policies. First, the legislation structure is in place already for domestic issues. Whenever there is an emerging policy problem (e.g. current strict enforcement of the “zero-tolerance” immigration policy by the Trump Administration where a child

born in the United States is a subject to US laws), the executive branch and the general public operate with what law has to say on the issue. Interpretations of the law can vary but at least the basic operational structure is in place. And secondly, it is in the best interest of the President of the United States, per 22nd Amendment passed in 1951, to be accountable to the general public if he (or hopefully also she in the future) wants to get reelected for another term. Yes, some anachronisms of the U.S. election process (Electoral College for example) cannot guarantee that the public opinion will prevail at minimum, the President in the first term can *react* to a public opinion and make shifts to the endorsed policies rather soon in the implementation stage (Trump changes course on immigration, 2018). This is what happened with recent implementation of policies. The president reacted to a bi-partisan public opinion since he has many things at stake with a reelection. Would he react the same way if he were finishing his second term, for example? That *is* the question.

For international higher education, though, the general public in the United States is not a major stakeholder. For example, I am currently managing federal government orientations for the Capital Communications Group- a major subcontractor for the US Department of States' International Visitor Leadership Program. In 2015 NPR article, Kim Lawton cited Akram Elias, (the President of the company) who summarized those policies and commented that the policy conflict is there because in

domestic context, almost *none of the policies* originate with the government whereas internationally, “almost *every single foreign policy and security policy* issue originates with the government” (Do Americans care about foreign policy, 2015). This creates a major public conflict because many US citizens justify US actions overseas by holding US (and thus the government) to the highest standards of freedom and democracy while they want less and less government in their own lives. This is a paradox on its own.

Part 3B. How will I (as an education leader) influence leadership actions)?

As a leader, I would start changing this policy incrementally. I would start by introducing a seminar at the College of Education and Human Development at the Mid-Atlantic State University. Through the seminar, I intend to improve intercultural competences of the third and fourth-year students of the College while also contribute to intercultural competence development of students in the Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs of the college. It would be an elective course.

In this sense, my professional interests combined with the Mid-Atlantic State University’s *Delaware Will Shine* (2014) strategic plan will establish an interest-group driven platform to drive internationalization policy from bottom-up. This interest group will include faculty, students, and professionals at organizations like NAFSA to engage in the project. Fowler states that “interest groups have a long list of policy changes they

would like to see- when the time is ripe they turn them into legislative proposals.”

(Fowler, 2000, p. 175.) I believe that the time is ripe for internationalization of MASU’s curriculum, because though the intent for internationalization is outlined in policy documents, there is lack of implementation of internationalization curriculum, specifically at the College of Education and Human Development.

Yet, if we compare this initiative to a “new legislative bill”, then according to Fowler, it has to be fought not only “on the front of words, but also money” (Fowler, 2000, p. 182). The argument is that the CEHD at the Mid-Atlantic State University, though strategically positioned between two political and financial centers of the country (Washington, DC, and New York City) does not offer a single course on international/cross-cultural/or comparative education. Unlike Washington, DC universities where *all* DC universities are in a consortium agreement and thus students can take elective classes in any institution without incurring additional fees the Mid-Atlantic State University operates on a one-size-fits-all model. The students are “stuck” with the curriculum and classes offered by MASU only. In today’s reality when every field is becoming more globally competitive, education cannot stay behind. In fact, I believe it should be at the forefront of globalization. Thus, the major stakeholders in the internationalization of MASU’s curriculum should be not just students and faculty,

but also parents, local businesses seeking exposure to a global market, and state legislators.

4A. Who are the visible and hidden actors in the policy.

There are multiple policy actors involved in the policy development and implementation. Aside from three major visible participants (Department of State, Department of Education, and Department of Defense), there are many non-governmental organizations receiving administrative and programmatic funding from the departments. Many international organizations like the Institute of International Education (IIE), World Learning, Global Ties USA, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) are formulating their organizational missions and act accordingly to fulfill the vision of the U.S. government on internationalization efforts.

Though Fowler's focus was on state-level educational actors, some of the comments can be applied to international education actors. First, Fowler argues that many groups, such as NAACP and La Raza, "do not lobby on most education issues, but may become intensely involved regarding a few policy controversies that touch them closely" (Fowler, 2000, p. 138). Similarly, international education organizations become increasingly proactive when the rights of international students studying in the United States are at risk or become violated. This can prompt international organizations to change their public messages through changing their front page website

public messages about their missions and goals. For example, the IREX's public message states "we strive for a more just, prosperous, and inclusive world" (IREX). This message is appealing from a public policy perspective for domestic and international audiences alike. From the international standpoint, it positions IREX as a reliable and equitable international organization that is ready to match U.S. resources with global educational needs. From a national perspective, the public message transcends a mere "organization-only" voice into a more powerful voice that involves and engages U.S. universities (as hidden actors of internationalization process). Through this voice the universities can lobby legislators to introduce and sustain more transparent, clear, and dialogue-open international education policies. This is a much-needed public action. With ad hoc international policies of the current administration, universities across the country are experiencing financial loss and a detrimental enrollment effect (International Student Enrollment, 2018). Thus, the economic consideration in this case prompts U.S. universities to change their role from "hidden" actors of internationalization to "visible" ones. And the burden of communicating their dissatisfaction with public policies is partially carried out by non-governmental organizations.

Similar to the IREX's public message, the IIE's mission statement says: "we work to build more peaceful and equitable societies by advancing scholarship, building

economies and promoting access to opportunity” (IIE, 2018). This powerful message can be contextualized and applied for the domestic context as well. Even semantically, both sentences use the plural personal pronoun “*we*” to make the message stronger (possibly using a similar powerful application from a politically meaningful and appealing opening sentence of the Declaration of Independence). In the cases of the IIE and IREX, the visible actors are using the power of persuasion as an “overt attempt to affect the behavior of others by convincing them that the desired behavior is good” (Fowler, 2000, p. 27).

Both organizations under analysis are based in the United States with offices in many countries. The reputation of the organizations and their public perception overseas is oftentimes associated with the United States in general. Thus, whenever the relationships between a host country and the United States (e.g. Russia) become hostile, the office of a non-profit organization can shut down and the activities are completely stopped. This happened with IREX and the Americans Councils for International Education who for many years promoted U.S. education and partnership programs between Russian Federation and the United States. The movement to shut down those programs as “propaganda” originated in the Russian Duma (Parliament) once it passed the law about “Foreign Agents”. Officially it is referred to as “On Amendments to Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation regarding the Regulation of the Activities on

Non-Profit Organizations Performing the Functions of a Foreign Agent”. According to the law passed in 2012, all non-profit organizations that receive foreign donations and engage in “political activity” should declare themselves as foreign agents (European Commission on Democracy through Law, 2017).

Thus, by limiting opportunities to engage Russia in international education (specifically with U.S. initiatives), the government of Russia created a “legalization” mechanism to limit international higher education exchanges to “justify outcomes with reason” where reason is domestic security (Wirt & Kirst, p. 323). In this case, it is only logical to conclude that domestic security policy overarched global higher education polities.

Aside from U.S. universities described above, there are other hidden domestic actors who also oppose international higher education policies of the U.S. government. Many of those actors associate anything “international” with illegal immigration. For example, it is no surprise that many policy actors (including religious advocacy organizations) maintain a rather conservative, anti-immigration profile. Since it is indeed a challenge to bring data-driven conclusions as a counterargument to their beliefs, it might be more beneficial to somewhat deviate from a policy perspective and run an allegory. Our illusions and delusions stem from conscious or unconscious *wishes*, e.g. Columbus’s belief that he had found a new route to the Indies

was a delusion based on his wish that he had done so. So, because we cannot prevent skeptical and conservative interest groups to from lobbying their representatives and Senators in Congress, we can start by educating students in schools and universities on what globalization in education entails and that it cannot be really stopped irrespective of some people or governments' (as in the case of Russia) beliefs.

4B. Consider these Actors in your Engagement Strategy.

At the moment (considering very tumultuous times in U.S. federal policies that include international higher education), my expectations for changing those policies remain to be more humble yet focused. For example, right now I am working on designing a seminar on Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University. Part of this initiative is to lay out a practical plan for the College of Education and Human Development to become an agent of change for the whole institution while also incorporating a bi-partisan perspective on U.S. politics. As many of us learned from federal/state/local elections- politics defines policies. Thus, if we want to gain momentum as a College or an institution, we cannot be dormant in our approach. Furthermore, we do *need* support from the faculty at the Mid-Atlantic State University, colleagues and partners from outside organization, such as NAFSA, IIE, IREX, etc., and we can only hope for students' interest in this elective course.

As I mentioned earlier, this course will contribute to the realization of the *Delaware Will Shine* strategic plan (policy) and, ultimately, to the U.S. higher education internationalization policy. To create a successful institutional engagement, I first plan to gather a working group of faculty members who are interested in participating in this initiative. This will help me design a viable and *realistic* plan for the DoE to launch this seminar. Creating a working group would empower each participant with a voice on the content and direction of the seminar. Clearly, faculty members at this point have more power resources than I do, but this is not a new situation for me. Personally, I have been a new comer in many political and business initiatives but was never much humbled by either expectations nor challenges. Indeed, faculty has a “competent authority” and Director of the Department of Education and the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development combined have a “legal authority” to either approve or disapprove the launch of such a course. I will try to capitalize on their powers and influence to help me work with students (especially in a launching year) by assuring the students that they *are*, in fact, major stakeholders in launching this seminar because participation in it will increase their global employability, critical thinking, and applied professional skills.

I will exercise my power of persuasion through the following. First, the DoE is the only public school in the DC/NY area that does not offer any coursework in

international or comparative education. Our major competitors (University of Maryland and Rutgers University) both pride themselves on having well-established international education partnerships and programs. Other regional universities (The George Washington University, Temple University, University of Pennsylvania, and others) are truly the beacons of international higher education initiatives in the area. The DoE can potentially join those institutions and, if need be, through a consortium or partnership agreement should be ready to first *learn* how the courses or seminars in international higher education can be implemented. That will require “skillful and committed leaders” (Fowler, 2000, p. 29). Second, I can engage professional network of experts whom I have professionally known for over ten years through successful projects in Washington, DC through the Embassy Dialogue Committee or several NAFSA interest groups to apply the federal-level expert knowledge “know how” to assist the CEHD develop “realistic plans and programs” (Fowler, 2000, p. 29). Many of those contacts are either former faculty members at leading universities or managers at international education organizations, including IIE, IREX, and American Councils for International Education or legal experts in a federal government. They can help me create well-planned agendas for the course to present to the university authorities.

And yet I realize that for a public school like the Mid-Atlantic State University, cooperation with faculty will be essential. If the seminar gets approved and gets

running, the university will expand on its visibility as a reliable partner in international education, and will be able to apply for more grants with the U.S. Department of State, host exchange students sponsored by IREX, the IIE, and other international education non-profit organizations. Clearly, as a dedicated public servant, I will be open to provide my expertise and contacts to get more exposure for the university on a federal and international level. Additionally, I will be able to build up on my credentials as a professional in the field and build up my profile as a university instructor in international and comparative higher education while also helping MASU to join a policy network of institutions “to coordinate a wide range of efforts to influence policies” (Fowler, 2000, p. 138).

Faculty engagement and potential publications related to international education issues will create a higher visibility for the Mid-Atlantic State University as a research institution and will potentially attract more international sponsors to invest in international education initiatives with the institution. At this point, the CEHD is hosting the first round of a professional development program for 23 international teachers. Thus, the foreign government already became a hidden actor in developing policies for the DoE because several faculty members are involved in this project. The Ministry of Education basically guides the DoE faculty engaged in the project as to what’s an accepted “assessment tool” and what’s not. Luckily, I have worked and

advanced my career with a similar culture. Thus, as a leader, I am more realistic in matching expectations of the DoE and the Ministry of Education. I keep sane perspectives in place and try to create a dialogue between two polar cultures to make a mutual advance in educational and public policy agendas.

5. Policy instruments: identifying the ones in place and weighing them for appropriateness (as they relate to the policy under analysis).

Policy makers of international higher education policy and implementers of it (based on analyzing *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education* document) are likely to agree that this document has not been developed from scratch with no prior existing international/ global projects or programs. Also, it was not created in a vacuum of relationships between states, nations, supranational entities (e.g. the European Union), or regional geopolitical agreements (BRICS, NAFTA, etc.). Moreover, it is precisely through economic, political, and international security projects that many international education projects were introduced (e.g. Fulbright or Edmund S. Muskie scholarship program). For some time, academic student exchanges, study abroad programs, international conferences and symposia, short and long-term partnerships, research initiatives, and internationalization of curricula have all been strong indicators of international collaborations between higher education institutions. Those and other initiatives form constructs of internationalization and/or globalization of higher

education. And even though those constructs are all related to education, the driving force for their initiation, implementation and sustainability is not altruism and desire to make the world a better place. Instead, *market* interests determine what partnerships in higher education are in demand and how they can be created, developed, and sustained. The paradox is, however, is that many of those partnerships (especially as they relate to shifting geopolitical interests of the United States) cannot survive without support and protection of the United States' government (Redden, 2015).

The policy under analysis addresses several different categories of international partnerships, paying lesser attention to study abroad programs. The latter are usually expensive to participate in, they are administered in war-free zones with comfortable weather, and oftentimes study abroad courses are taught by professors from home universities. Thus, they are “bland” from a research perspective. Two other constructs of internationalization/globalization present more interest in terms of instrumentation: student mobility (both inbound and outbound) and university partnerships.

The first category is international student mobility and subsequent employability of graduates with foreign degrees. Hannaway and Woodroffe state that “market-based policy instruments introduce competition and choice” (Hannaway & Woodroffe, 2003, p. 4). Thus, allegorically, for many participants or actors in higher education as described in previous chapters of this paper, a university degree from the United States

or participation in an exchange program becomes a proxy for prestige of a U.S. higher education system in general. Moreover, in simple economic terms, they deliver the output that is competitive and worldwide marketable. Indeed, families in many countries- unbeknownst to them- make choices about international education vouchers. As Hannaway and Woodroffe argue “parents who have more educational choices choose more challenging curricula, stricter academic requirement, and more structures and discipline-oriented environments” (Hannaway & Woodroffe, 2003, p. 6). Indeed, there are many nuances but parents (or sponsoring governments as patrons) act like corporations seeking to maximize profits on their tangible (money) and intangible (time) investments. It is done so that the graduates of those institutions would become “privileged policy instruments that nations can deploy in rhetoric to further their self-interests” (Vincent- Lancrin, 2004). In this case, education as a social and academic practice loses a conceptual battle to market forces. Thus, it is the economic/ market power players that decide where exactly international students should obtain their education to capitalize on their investments. Consequently, for the areas of student mobility and subsequent employability, U.S. higher education policies are very peripheral.

The situation is different with another policy instrument of the U.S. higher education- capacity building of institutions. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) classified

capacity-building as a “generic class of policy instruments” (p. 134). University partnerships can be seen as strategic alliances between institutions to promote a mutually beneficial research or academic endeavor. Partnership universities can view education as a tradeable service. My eight-year experience with the Embassy Dialogue Committee of NAFSA demonstrated that overseas university partners generate their initial interest in a bilateral relationship with a particular U.S. institution under the following premise: “let us see what *you* have to offer and we will show you what *we* have.” This approach is neither new nor unique. In fact, it is enforced by the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) that was established by the World Trade Organization (Enders, 2004; Tilak, 2008). Per this agreement, the United States- like any other member- is required to comply with the requirement of permitting the trade in education as a service where institution-to-institution projects and partnerships are encouraged.

McDonnell and Elmore (1987) state that “capacity-building has expectations of future returns” (p. 139). They elaborate further on this concept stating that “the fundamental property of system-changing policy is the distribution of authority, not money” (p. 140). Theoretically, it could be the case, but strategic partnerships rise to fruition because of executive leadership that typically initiates those partnership. Additionally, financial support for the launch of the partnership is provided by the side

that is more in need of an educational service. At the moment, as I engage with an exchange program for international teachers, I observe multiple requirements imposed by the foreign sponsor on the English Language Institute (ELI): ELI teachers have to mark students absent for the whole day of instruction if they come to class 10 minutes late. The rhetorical question remains: is it really important to treat established international participants of the program the same way as we (the Mid-Atlantic State University) treat high school graduates? And even then, is it productive for capacity-building of this prospective long-term partnership?

Furthermore, academic partnerships are not static entities. They originate, develop, improve, sustain or die. The trajectory of partnership development depends on at least two variables: international relations between two partner countries and institutional relationships. McDonnell and Elmore did not address international initiatives but their analysis of domestic educational programs can be applied to the international context as well. For example, they stipulate that the “costs of capacity-building accrue to the government making the investment and society in general, but the ultimate beneficiaries are future members of society” (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987, p. 139). Government actions can help sustain partnerships or destroy them. For example, *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education* was completed in 2015 prior to election of President Trump. The document provided several examples of successful international

education partnerships that were managed through the federal government. For example, starting 2010, the Department of State's Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs has enabled the Public Affairs Sections at the U.S. embassies in Kabul and Islamabad to award grants to U.S. institutions to establish multi-faceted partnerships with universities in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Partner institutions were identified by the State Department post in each country, with an eye toward capacity building in particular geographic regions or academic fields. Grant activities included faculty professional development and exchanges, curriculum reform initiatives, the co-development of teaching materials, and joint research. By 2016, nineteen grants have been awarded for Pakistan collaborations and nine projects have been funded for Afghanistan ("Securing, Stabilizing, and Developing Pakistan's Border Area", 2009). However, with so-called "Muslim ban" that suspends admission of foreign nationals to the United States from several predominantly Muslim countries, those initiatives suspended indefinitely. Thus, capacity-building of those partnerships are subject to change not because of the lack of financial support, but because beneficiaries (which include institutions, research and academic centers, etc.) remain at a mercy of the executive branch of the U.S. government.

Thus, I believe that due to the decentralized higher education system in the United States, current policy-making instruments, such as market mechanisms for

student mobility and capacity-building for institutional partnerships are unlikely to be replaced. While American degree continues to have value, policy actors (students, parents, and governments) will have a choice to select a destination institution. Similarly, institutional partnerships are created not for the immediate goal but instead with “the expectation of future returns” (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987, p. 139). It is unfortunate, however, that sometimes policy interventions- as described above with Afghani and Pakistani grants- limit capacity-building potential of important international collaborations.

6A. Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation Issues Related to the Policy. 6A. *Consider implementation, monitoring, and evaluation issues related to this policy. How does this policy fit with your organization’s goals and priorities? What implementation challenges have you faced or do you anticipate facing?*

Unlike many other GATS countries (see part 5 of the paper), the U.S. international higher education policies are very unique. It is the result of decentralization that U.S. federal system allows. Unlike many centralized systems like the European Union, Australia and Canada, American policies are closely linked to the mission and goals of *individual* federal agencies, such as the Department of Education, Department of Defense, and Department of State primarily. Because the Department of State and the Department of Defense are more powerful players (resource and influence-wise), public diplomacy and national security goals are more visible than academic goals or institutional capacity-building rationales. In my future work, as I

discussed in previous chapters, I plan to dedicate more time and efforts to developing international higher education curriculum for institutions that do not have that component in their programs (e.g. the Mid-Atlantic State University). Potentially, it can improve students' intercultural competence and increase their chances in global employability. If this plan materializes and I receive support from faculty members, executive decision-makers I will introduce a course in Comparative and International Higher Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University. This course is projected to give a jump start to a new concentration or minor, such as global and comparative education, for example. Thus, evaluation of the federal policy will no longer be an issue. Instead, evaluation of the program itself will require compliance with credit requirements, institutional for coursework, per institutional accreditation, and comparison of this course to similar courses at established institutions.

While seminar plans remain viable, at the moment I am working on an institutional capacity-building component of the internationalization policy through providing programmatic support to a PDME. Traditionally, the U.S. federal government has not been directly involved in this type of partnership unless they present a direct or "perceived" threat to the national security (see discussion above.) Thus, no clear guidelines have been formulated for monitoring and evaluation of institutional partnerships. Bi-lateral partnerships can be understood as mutually

beneficial arrangements where both parties benefit in one or more ways. They also can be seen as an example of a “loose coupling” where “coupled events (here partners) are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical and logical separateness” (Weick, 1976, p. 3). Indeed, the Department of Education, as a partner, can still continue to maintain its reputation and not lower its admissions or credit-award requirements, for example. However, we should also understand that as partners on the project, we are “momentarily attached” and should keep the “identity, separateness, and boundaries of the elements coupled” (Weick, 1976, p. 4). Thus, the foreign government might have its own criteria (and in fact, they do) that the participants need to comply with, so when we try to communicate to the participants that they have to comply with our internal policy only without *adapting* those rules to the requirements of their domestic authority, it does not seem like an equitable solution to this partnership.

I believe that for future operation of this and similar partnerships, a clear multifaceted and multicultural quality assurance framework will be needed. Alexander states that “change is likely to occur if you enact policies that are doable” (Alexander, p. 154). I am not seeking to influence bilateral relations of two countries, but forming an interest group that would have sociocultural and academic expertise in both

environments would be the first step for creating a successful framework for monitoring and evaluation of the project.

Next, this partnership is fully and completely financially supported by the foreign government yet programmatically monitored and evaluated by a U.S. partner, and more so, by one unit within a university- the English Language Institute. As we discussed in several sessions in this course, visible and invisible actors have a large say on the policy development. And as the discussed partnership demonstrates, there are many loopholes between expectations of the sponsor and the actual implementer of the partnership. These loopholes can transform from being problems to becoming opportunities under the right management that can exhibit adequate sociocultural competence for this particular discourse.

6B. Policy Implementation Plan.

There is no cohesive implementation plan for institutional partnerships per se. Typically, there are too many actors (visible and invisible ones) engaged in institutional partnership. And that's the reason many institutions create departments and hire personnel to meet the needs of their international partners which they hope will lead them to developing sustaining institutional partnerships (Gieser, 2015). Creating new departments and hiring new personnel is not considered a faulty strategy in the United States- traditionally, many managerial decisions on different levels presuppose

replacement of staff or restructuring. However, for international education partnerships specifically, a comprehensive internationalization plan should be in place. For example, the Mid-Atlantic State University already has a comprehensive strategic plan in place. Other institutions try out many strategies during initial implementation stages of the partnership just to prove that they can do it. Mid-Atlantic State University's commitment to internationalization is outlined in the Strategic plan *Delaware Will Shine* (2014) which was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 12, 2015. Also, in 2015 MASU received NAFSA's Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization in "recognition of the excellence in integrating international education across all aspects of the University" (Delaware Will Shine, 2014, p. 3). Thus, the intent for internationalization is outlined in policy documents. However, there is a lack of implementation of internationalization curriculum, specifically at the College of Education and Human Development.

From a practitioner's perspective who works on a bilateral initiative involving a foreign government and a public U.S. higher education institution, my implementation plan will include the following three steps:

- 1) Creating a well-defined description of partnership (mission statement, program goals, and objectives) while outlining the expectations of teachers themselves from this one-year partnership;

- 2) Developing cohesive standards for participation in English as a Foreign Language classes and content workshops organized by the Department of Education;
- 3) Designing a framework for expectations as they apply for participants of a bi-lateral partnership. Participants would include PDME teachers, faculty members, executives, support staff, teachers and leaders from local schools, etc.

These standards have to be discussed with a sponsoring organization and the Mid-Atlantic State University. Faculty can be informed about different strategies for faculty engagement through resources provided by organizations like NAFSA, ACE, individual embassy contacts/advertisements at focus magazines and newspapers, etc. Furthermore, institutions can fast-forward creation of programs and policies to engage more faculty in bilateral relationships.

REFERENCES

- About us: mission and values (2018). Retrieved June 14, 2018 from <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/about/mission-values>.
- Bitzer, E. e. (2010). A university department as a community of practice: A quality promotion perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(1), 15-31.
- Do Americans care about foreign policy? (2015). Retrieved June 23, 2018 from <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/blog/americans-care-foreign-policy/>.

- Enders, J. (2004). Higher education, internationalization, and the nation-state: recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*, 47(3), 361-382.
- EU activities in the field of higher education (2018). Retrieved June 14, 2018 from https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education_en.
- European Commission on Democracy through Law (2018). Retrieved June 26, 2018 from [http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=cdlad\(2014\)025-e](http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=cdlad(2014)025-e).
- Fulbright program history (2018). Retrieved June 24, 2018 from <https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright/history>
- Hannaway, J., & Woodroffe, N. (2003). Policy instruments in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 27, 1-24. Retrieved January 30, 2018 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3568126>
- Helms, R.M., (2015) *Internationalizing U.S. higher education: Current policies, future directions*. Retrieved June 15, 2019 from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Current-Policies-Future-Directions-Part-2-US.pdf>
- International Enrollment Drop (2018). Retrieved June 10, 2018 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/02/us/international-enrollment-drop.html>
- IREX (2018). Retrieved January 30, 2018 from <https://www.irex.org/>
- McDonnell, L., & Elmore, R. (1987). Getting the job done: alternative policy instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 133-152. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163726>
- National Security Education Programs (2018). Retrieved June 10, 2018 from <https://www.nsep.gov/>
- Peterson, P. M., & Helms, R. M (2013). Internationalization revisited. *Change*, 45(2), 28-34. doi:10.1080/00091383.2013.764261

- Redden, E. (2015). Trade anxiety. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved June 10, 2018 from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/02/06/european-university-association-raises-concerns-about-possible-trade-deals>.
- Romanish, B. (2012). George S. counts: Leading social reconstructionist. *Vitae Scholasticae*, 29(1), 38-54.
- Securing, Stabilizing, and Developing Pakistan's Border Area with Afghanistan (2009). Retrieved May 10, 2018 from <https://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09263sp.pdf>
- Stone, J. (2016). Awarding college credit for MOOCs: The role of the American Council on Education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(36-42), 1-12. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.1765
- Tamtik, M. (2017). Who governs the internationalization of higher education? A comparative analysis of macro-regional policies in Canada and the European Union. *Comparative & International Education*, 46(1), 1-15. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.MASUel.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=124890589&site=ehost-live>
- The History of Title VI and Fulbright-Hayes. Retrieved June 1, 2018 from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oie/iegps/history.html>
- Tilak, J.B. (2008). Higher education: A public good or a commodity for trade? *Prospects*, 38(4), 449-466.
- Title VIII (1991). National Security scholarships, fellowships, and grants. Retrieved May 10, 2018 from <https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/laws/david-l-boren-national-security-education-act-1991>
- Trump changes course on immigration (2018) Retrieved May 10, 2018 from <https://www.today.com/video/trump-changes-course-on-immigration-signs-executive-order-to-keep-families-together-1260742723716>
- Mid-Atlantic State University 2014 Strategic Planning Initiative. (2014). *Delaware Will Shine*. Retrieved January 11, 2018 from <http://www1.MASUel.edu/research/delawarewillshine/DelawareWillShine-FINAL.pdf>

Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2004). Key developments and policy rationales in cross-border post-secondary education. *Internationalization and trade in higher education: Opportunities and challenges*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved February 17, 2018 from <https://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/33730082.pdf>

White, M. M. (2003). The university in transformation: Global Perspectives on the futures of the university. *NACADA Journal*, 23(1/2), 113-114

Appendix D

ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEM ANALYSIS OF A CULTURAL OFFICE

Part A: Context and a Problem of Practice

Since the 1950s, the Cultural Office (CO) of the Embassy of one of the Middle Eastern countries in Washington, DC, has facilitated studies of international students in the United States. Prior to the regional war in early 1990s, the number of students in the U.S. remained stable and did not exceed 1,000. Country's rebuilding of its economy after the war was matched with a rapid growth in population and subsequent demand for provision of educational opportunities. Government and private sectors understood that the finite nature of country's natural oil reserves and the need to develop a post-industrial economy required investments in educating its youth and providing them with competitive skills. Domestic market represented by only one state university could no longer cope with that demand. Thus, the government (through the Ministry of Higher Education) reassessed its higher education policy and started to increase the number of government sponsored students. Currently, there are over 5,000 students under the supervision of the Cultural Office in Washington, DC. The head of the office is the Cultural Counselor who is traditionally assisted by Cultural Attaches. Although Cultural Counselors and Attaches benefit from a diplomatic status in the United States they are not career diplomats. They are typically appointed by the Undersecretary for Higher Education and remain in the positions for two or three years. Prior to diplomatic

appointments, they had worked as faculty members at the leading university in the country. They are expected to return to their faculty positions once their contracts expire. There is no option to extend those contracts.

Certain limitations in employment exist for lower management too.

Traditionally, lower managers at the CO are drivers, office assistants, “messengers”, and advisor assistants. Traditionally, these positions are occupied by the citizens of a South-Asian country who are sponsored for special types of work visas. If someone from this category chooses to voluntarily leave CO or gets fired, they only have a limited time to return to their country or find another diplomatic employment.

Most middle managers of the organization are advisors in the placement, authentication, undergraduate, and graduate departments. There are also four departmental directors, but their managerial roles change depending on individual leadership styles of acting Cultural Counselors. The change may occur when the structural configuration of the Cultural Office changes from Simple Structure (where directors are treated similar to other subordinates) to Machine Bureaucracy when directors perform everyday supervisory responsibilities. All middle managers are qualified professionals who hold bachelor’s and Master’s degrees from U.S., Canadian, or British universities and do not depend on the employment for visa sponsorship.

Thus, the vertical coordination is prevalent at the Embassy where upper management helps ensure “predictability and uniformity” through control of the local staff (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 51). Autonomy level remains low for lower and middle management. There are signs of periodic lateral coordination especially prior to visits of high-level university officials or Ministry delegations. However, these efforts are still performed under management assumptions that employees are passive and have little ambition (“Theory X”.) In country-specific context, these assumptions are likely to have socioeconomic roots. For example, high income levels, government-sponsored support systems and the ability to pay for hired help in homes, such as maids, nannies, cooks, and drivers, has led to a belief that lower and middle managers at the CO also hired help. Thus, they are paid for performing the required services and are expected to comply with all the instructions of the upper management. This managerial approach has not changed for many years. As a result, in 2016-2017 academic year, twelve out of twenty-five middle managers (mostly undergraduate advisors) resigned. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of State changed the regulations for hiring foreign workers. All currently employed lower-level managers from Southeast Asia will no longer be able to be employed by the CO once their current visas expire. Thus, the organizational problem can be formulated as follows: in the next two years, when three of four directors retire, lower managers leave because of visa restrictions, what organizational

reframing should take place to retain middle level managers at their jobs and to preserve CO's status as a reliable partner in international education.

Part B. Framing the Problem. Political Frame

In late 1990s and early 2000s, the average employment term for graduate advisors at the CD was ten years and the average employment term for undergraduate advisors (with the exception of firing) was over twenty years. To put it simply, people would only leave if they retired, relocated or received a lucrative offer. Starting salaries were above market rates for similar jobs in Washington, DC, area. The benefits package included health insurance, generous vacation time, regular office hours, and observance of all federal and national holidays. Undergraduate advisors supervised two hundred students and graduate advisors supervised one hundred students. For many people with families, it was an excellent and unmatched employment arrangement.

From the political frame perspective, “organizations host a complex web of individual and group interests” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 186.) The CO is not an exception. Upper management strives to generate support and acceptance for their policies from students, parents, and the Ministry. Generating support among students and parents is important because all top managers will be returning home upon expiration of their contracts. Counselors’ policies and actions in the United States

determine their popularity at home. Their subsequent domestic careers depend on public perceptions of their actions as leaders. Because outsourcing country is very small country, a popular saying that “everyone knows each other” becomes particularly important for returning Counselors and Attaches. Thus, while in the United States, they tend to avoid any conflicts with students and parents. Securing a good stand with U.S. universities is also important because many Counselors and Attaches return to the United States to continue their research and speaking engagements.

The middle managers pursue different goals. Most new hires seek experiences in international organization hoping to acquire solid communication and managerial skills while also improving proficiency in Arabic. However, once they start working, they submerge into a system where a top manager (Cultural Counselor) would exercise coercive power upon display of insubordination or questioning the authority. During the first three months (trial period) most middle managers would not speak up about their frustrations. For example, many dissatisfactions originate after encounters with students who are not complying with regulations of the sponsor and blame the advisors for imposing those regulations. The students express their anger to upper managers while middle managers attempt to provide more details about why such situation occurred in the first place. A conflict may arise because upper management is traditionally siding with students considering them important stakeholders. Often, the

Counselor may even dismiss advisors' explanations and counterclaims as demonstrations of defense and self-protection.

From a political frame perspective, such a conflict might not necessarily be a negative thing. Instead, Bolman and Deal (2003) argue that "organizational conflict is natural and inevitable" (p. 394) and thus upper and middle managers should coordinate their efforts in adjusting strategies for the organizational success. Unfortunately, many new advisors who do not have professional or cultural background in the Middle Eastern studies are unaware of the fact that a common regional norm is that the person in charge is *always* right which weakens the bargaining position of the staff. In addition, many students position themselves as "bosses" exercising coercive power through intimidation. They may raise voice during phone conversations and not give advisors a chance to respond to the inquiries. Students can be very explicit in blaming advisors for their own mistakes. Common statements include: "no one ever told me I could not take two online classes my first semester"; "my advisor never communicated with me regarding deadlines for study plans", "I did not attend orientation session because no one reminded me it was mandatory", etc. It is not a cultural norm to negotiate with the subordinates (that's how students see advisors), instead, they immediately communicate their side of the story to the parents so that the parents also create additional channel of communication with the Cultural Counselor. Thus, the

advisors feel the effects of the coercive power from the upper management, students, and parents.

Similarly, lower-level managers experience the coercive power worsened by expressed frustrations of the middle-level managers. As Bolman and Deal state, “openness carries risks, and it is hard to be effective when you are ambivalent, uncomfortable, or frightened” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 167). Many lower-level managers cannot leave the embassy because of visa status, they have few marketable skills, have a limited ability in spoken and written English, and have no degree granted by a western institution. Because I worked with many of those employees for over eight years, I do not think they are likely to express their dissatisfaction with the current model. It is the middle-level managers who possess advanced degrees and competitive market skills who can be agents of change within the organization. Some mechanisms will be discussed in Part D.

Part C: Reframing the problem through other three frames

Structural

Bolman and Deal (2003) stated that “the structural frame is rooted in traditional rational images but goes much deeper to develop versatile and powerful ways to understand social architecture and its consequences” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 41).

Since 1950s, the Cultural Office has been building up relationships with universities by sponsoring students to pursue academic degrees, arranging professional exchanges for medical doctors and dentists, sponsoring qualified American students to pursue their language studies in a foreign country, and facilitating faculty exchanges. This work cannot be done by executives only. It is performed by middle and lower-level managers. Bolman and Deal state that “it works best when team members bring well-developed communication skills and enjoy participation” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 98). As we mentioned in the first part of the analysis, the employees bring good communication skills but contrary to the above suggestion, their engagement starts diminishing after their *Western style* of communication - that typically puts stress on individual responsibility, hard work, and perseverance - is criticized as “aggressive” by students and parents. This is where the cultural misunderstanding occurs. Traditionally, American culture promotes individualism and proactive approach in decision-making. This foreign culture, on the other hand, is more collectivist in nature and is characterized by longer periods of consultation and decision-making. Thus, when a middle-level manager, for example, makes a decision to suspend scholarship payments due to valid reasons, students do not comprehend such tactics and start exhibiting aggressive behavior.

Considering that one of the objectives of the CO is to support a unique cultural experience for international students, the upper management should provide more support in trying to create a vibrant cross-cultural experience for the students by also accepting cultural differences of the employees. In his article, Schmidtlein discussed how organizational acceptance can be contextualized. He states that “institutional research staff, to gain acceptance, must be both reasonably familiar with organizational theory and be able to accommodate tensions between their own theoretical and normative perspectives and those of other institutional staff” (Schmidtlein, 1999, p. 573). Schmidtlein continues the discussion and says that the effectiveness of decisions is evaluated on the basis of economic standards of rationality” (Schmidtlein, 1999, p. 574). If we apply these concepts to the Cultural Office, we observe that the upper-level managers already exhibit Western standards of organizational behavior in their partnership work with university officials. Thus, they can also apply them in their supervisory work with middle managers to better understand the advisors’ perspectives. As such, advisors should not feel that they are imposing their sociocultural values on the students, but that they are part of the “Helgesen’s web of inclusion” and that their values are in sync with organizational values or vice versa (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 98). Indeed, upper managers should support autonomy in decision-making for middle and lower-level managers and support lateral coordination. In this case, it is possible to

a consensus by delegating some of the managerial responsibilities in defining accountability and level of authority to unit coordinators. Unit coordinators can serve as “mediators” between upper managers and the rest. I believe these professionals should be equipped with empirical knowledge and research skills to develop role analysis techniques in order to clarify role expectations and obligations of the upper management and staff. They can also be in charge of studying interdependency points between upper managers and lower managers (one can’t exist without the other) to improve cooperation among members. Finally, regular meetings (formal and informal) should remind organizational members about the mission of the Cultural Office and that all team members are there to achieve their collective purpose of promoting the foreign country as a reliable international education partner.

Human Resources

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), the human resource leader demonstrates support of the individual and works to facilitate participation and open communication. Leaders who apply the “theory of empowerment” are instrumental in making their employees self-actualized and self-realized by providing them with opportunities to learn, share their expertise, and develop ownership of the acquired knowledge and experience (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 356). At the moment, I believe that the Human Resources Frame is disbalanced in two ways: the leaders are not providing enough

opportunities for lower and middle managers to advance professionally; and second, lower and middle managers are exploited and risk losing their jobs if they express dissatisfaction.

By signing a contract with the Cultural Office, employees understand that they work for the foreign government with its own laws and practice standards that might be different from the ones accepted in the Western cultures. Many of my colleagues refer to it as an “intellectual sacrifice” because no matter how long you stay in your position and no matter how good you are as a professional, there are very scarce opportunities for advancement. Leadership positions can only be filled by the nationals and all “domestic” leadership positions (e.g. Directors) have been filled by people who have not left their positions for more than thirty years. It is only recently (three years ago) that lack of promotion started to be openly discussed with job applicants. Prior to that, job candidates “assumed” that there were opportunities for growth and promotion within the organization. This disclosure is a positive thing because it allows some candidates to refuse job offer in good faith but also allows others to have a realistic picture of their career advancements.

Even though the opportunities for promotion are limited, upper management could help improve lower and middle managers “self-actualization” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 117). One solution can be to finance staff participation in various conferences

and workshops organized by the U.S. Department of State, Institute for International Education and similar organizations. This would create a more positive image of the Cultural Office as an organization functioning under Theory Y assumptions versus currently accepted Theory X.

The second concern is exploitation. When lower and middle managers sign employment contracts, the contracts do not mention how many students are assigned to each employee. During an interview, if a candidate asks that question, a Counselor would provide an approximate number. However, very often, due to unforeseen circumstances or budget cuts, that number would grow significantly. For example, some of my colleagues started working with 150 students and in a year ended up supervising almost 400 of them. Considering that advisors may not work overtime, this workload becomes unbearable and stressful. It may result in deteriorated health and psychological issues. It would be helpful if the CO provided clear guidelines (open communication) during the hiring process as to how many students employees in lower and middle management positions can expect to work with. Also, upper management should introduce training days when those advisors who are more efficient in working with a large number of students could lead training seminars to share their strategies with the others.

Symbolic

Bolman and Deal (2003) indicate that organizations have a certain degree of symbolic frame. The symbolic frame “abandons assumptions of rationality” and organizational story can be told through myths and symbols. Unfortunately, in case of the CO, each stakeholder attributes different meanings and symbols to his or her role within the organization. For example, many students see the CO as a place where *all* of their problems in the United States can be resolved immediately. Until 2015, the general practice was to respond to inquiries within 24 hours. Unfortunately, even then students would send several emails within that time to remind about their issues or complain why their issue was still not addressed. Once the number of students per advisor increased, the Cultural Counselor issued a memo that each student’s request would be answered within three business days. Students were urged not to send additional emails unless it was a life-threatening emergency.

The upper management views the CD as a cultural and educational representation of the country. There are U.S. and foreign country flags in the main hall and the visitor’s center is constructed in traditional design with international crafts on the exhibit. All university representatives and guests admire the beauty of the sight and the unique design of it. Upon arrival, they are usually offered traditional tea, coffee, and sweets. It usually creates a welcoming atmosphere that also leads to creating a

positive image of the country. Similar to the video we watched in the classroom about NCAA athletes when the advertisers used the images of ethnically diverse groups of student athletes to represent “all” student athletes as also academically successful students, the upper management wants to highlight the positive image of the country through symbols and myths at the Embassy.

My observation is that lower and middle managers enjoy both the ceremonies at the CO and the cultural uniqueness of their workplace. However, when their professional initiatives are not supported by upper managers and stakeholders, they start to experience lack of organizational pride. The more meetings they attend with upper managers and university representatives, the more disconnect they feel between what is said in meetings and what is done in reality. It would be helpful if the upper management would promote the positive image of the organization through also recognizing talented advisors who work with the students. The stories of “heroes and heroines” can be included in a newsletter that the Embassy sends to universities. Additionally, the advisors can be nominated to represent the Embassy in different official meetings in Washington, DC universities and organizations. Consequently, though the symbolic frame of the CO might be found in some cultural traditions, it has not yet achieved its full potential on an organizational scale. This potential can be achieved if effective reframing takes place and advisors’ engagement is recognized.

Part D: Reflection and specific leadership actions undertaken to address this problem based on the analysis

As we stated before, in the next two years there will be some changes in the composition of the Cultural Office. Three out of four departmental directors will be retiring and all employees who are currently on visas will have to leave (unless some will change status.) Many middle managers are actively searching for jobs. Though upper management will also change in two years as a result of a diplomatic rotation, current leaders can start the groundwork of the organizational change.

As discussed in classroom, international and multicultural organizations face issues that are not necessarily present in culturally homogenous organizations. Geert Hofstede defined power distance as the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations accept that power is distributed unequally. The foreign country is a high power-distance country which means that “people accept a hierarchical order in which everybody has a place and which needs no further justification. Centralization is popular and subordinates expect to be told what to do. The lower management accepts this code of relationship more readily because they also come from high power-distance countries (e.g. the Philippines). The middle management, however, displays a different set of professional expectations. Majority of middle managers are either U.S. citizens or residents who represent U.S. values. The United States is a low power-distance

country with an exceptionally high “individualism” level (91 vs 25 for the foreign country.) Creating a more common culture will be “a powerful form of organizational glue” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 249). Upper management can introduce and participate alongside with middle and lower managers in professional development seminars, attend cultural training workshops organized by several universities in Washington, DC, or invite a consultant to design intercultural training programs. With time, staff will likely be more understanding of cultural behaviors of power players and try to find solutions through having a dialogue. And the leaders will understand that by developing a common culture, they are improving organizational climate and motivate personnel to stay in the job.

Furthermore, middle managers can also substantively contribute to the organizational transformation. For example, most managers are “concerned for task” more than they are “concerned for people” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 341). When students call their advisors to share their concerns, most advisors immediately ask the students to send them an email instead of explaining everything via phone. Indeed, having a documented conversation is important but this can be done as a follow-up email *after* a phone conversation took place. The nationals prefer in-person conversations, they like to share and establish a personal relationship with their advisors. By “integrating task and people”, middle managers can improve their

intercultural communication skills and thus be better positioned in their bargaining power with the upper management. Alignment with political frame can also give middle managers a long-term advantage. For example, as we mentioned in the analysis, the nationals represent a collective culture. They share their feedbacks and impressions about their interactions with embassy employees immediately. If students have bad experiences, they are not shy to share them with the heads of the office. Thus, by formally learning more about cultural values of the students, the middle managers can strengthen their intercultural skills. This can be achieved through reading, attending open seminars or requesting an organizational leader to give a presentation detailing some cultural and attitudinal differences.

Consequently, both the leaders and the managers can build the bridge through communicating why and how they perceive the same problem differently (political frame). Gradually, the diplomatic appointees (formal leaders) and middle managers (informal leaders) can translate this intercultural dialogue to negotiating employment conditions (HR frame), creating more flexibility in structure by delegating more responsibilities to those middle managers who demonstrated advanced leadership qualities in an intercultural organization and creating supervisory positions for them (e.g. Assistant Director) or promoting them to become a Director (structural frame). Finally, the administration is capable of recognizing achievements and aspirations of the

lower and middle-level managers and reward them either financially with end-of-year bonuses and by providing those managers with opportunities to be a part of a larger international education community by financing their participation in professional conferences (symbolic frame.)

REFERENCES

- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crist, J.T. (2017). *U.S. Universities and international branch campuses*. Retrieved October 10, 2018 from http://www.nafsa.org/Professional_Resources/Browse_by_Interest/International_StMASUents_and_Scholars/Network_Resources/International_Enrollment_Management/U_S_Universities_and_International_Branch_Campuses/
- Schmidtlein, F. A. (1999). Common assumptions about organizations that mislead institutional researchers and their clients. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(5), 571-587.

Appendix E

EVALUATION OF A PD PROGRAM

Program Name, Description, and Strategies: Building Leadership for Change through School Immersion.

The Mid-Atlantic State University was selected to implement a comprehensive 5-Phase professional development program for a group of English language teachers (23-25) and a group of Math, Computer Science, Science and other content teachers (23-25), serving the overarching goal of a Middle Eastern country in preparing education professionals to serve as change agents in their respective home institutions in pursuit of a country's transformation plan. The program draws on outstanding resources and vast experience at the Mid-Atlantic State University for training and professional development of K-12 educators. Program goals and strategies are implemented through a plan that addresses the core components of the training program over the five phases of the targeted twelve-month training period: (1) improving English language proficiency; (2) developing innovative classroom instructional practices; (3) developing transformative leadership skills; (4) providing opportunities for K-12 school immersion experiences; and (5) supporting the development of an innovative Action Plan through faculty collaborative mentoring. Each component is interrelated and integrated throughout the program, with English language development factoring more

heavily during the first six months. All strategies of program implementation are aligned with expectations and requirements of three major stakeholders: Ministry of Education of the sponsoring country; Mid-Atlantic State University (with ELI and CEHD as major stakeholders implementing the project); and participants themselves. These strategies are implemented in accordance with the program theory described below.

Program Theory

The following assumptions form the basis of the program theory for a professional development program for international K-12 teachers administered by the Mid-Atlantic State University and host partners in DE public schools.

1. **Selection of program participants** will lead to improved dissemination of information about MASU prior to arrival which will lead to improved communication with program staff. Improved communication with the PDME program staff will increase knowledge about program expectations. Increased knowledge about program expectations will improve confidence in the PDME MASU support system leading to increased assimilation into the university environment. Increased assimilation into the university environment will lead to increased confidence in community belonging. Increased confidence in

community belonging will *improve (participants') English language skills and intercultural competence.*

2. **Structured English Language Development Activities** will lead to increased access to structured EFL classes, leading to increased participation in the structured EFL classes. Increased participation in the structured EFL classes will lead to improved academic English language skills. Improved academic language skills will lead to improved communication with PLC mentors and host teacher which will lead to increased exposure to varied discourses in education. Increased exposure to varied discourses in education will lead to *improved (participants') English language skills and intercultural competence.*

Contextual Conditions

The following contextual conditions are necessary for the PDME Program implementation:

1. Funding for program activities by the Ministry of Education of the sponsoring country.
2. Funding for program evaluation.
3. Availability of Professional Learning Community advisors who are CEHD and ELI faculty mentors.

4. Availability of field supervisors to support teachers' immersion experiences.
5. Availability of professional development workshops developed, designed and delivered by the CEHD faculty to fit content area needs of international teachers.
6. Availability of transportation services to transport female students (who are not willing to obtain a driver's license) from home to MASU and/or to state public schools to guarantee uninterrupted immersion experience.
7. Availability of transportation services to transport participants to cultural excursions and professional conferences in Philadelphia, New York, and Washington, DC.
8. Availability of support system including:
 - academic advisor
 - housing coordinator
 - tutoring service through the ELI to ensure positive professional and leadership development experience of all the participants.
9. Access to MASU facilities including library, prayer areas, and conference areas for final capstone project presentations.

Evaluation Design:

The following evaluation approach and design will be used to conduct the PDME evaluation.

Evaluation Approach

I will use a program theory approach to evaluate the PDME program.

Considering that program evaluation originated as a Western discourse approach for assessments, I will apply the most fitting descriptive scenario to reflect on the pragmatic needs of all involved stakeholders in my program. Theory-wise, since 1980s, several notable evaluators, such as Huey Chen, Peter Rossi, Michael Quinn Patton and Carol Weiss contributed to expanding on the definition and theoretical definition of the program theory. In practice, program theory applications vary. But at its core, a program theory explains a process when interventions result in outcomes. All other positive inputs considered, ideally, positive inputs result in positive outcomes. This approach to evaluation is relatively new and surprisingly simple. Historically, significance of program theory in evaluation is detailed in Carol Weiss's 1995 publication "New Approaches to Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives." Furthermore, due to the "focus on causal linkages... program theories are depicted using a mostly linear logical approach illustrating linked chains of causes and effects (Rossi et al., 2019). Thus, objectives (early, intermediate) and long-term goals will provide an indication of changes for international K-12 education system through their leaders. The latter are participants of the PDME program. A program theory evaluation will provide an important indication (that can be shared with the Ministry of

Education of a foreign country as a major stakeholder of this program) if a program (as administered by the Mid-Atlantic State University stakeholders) can achieve the desired results when properly implemented (Rossi et al., 2019; Weiss, 1998). Relying on Weiss (1998), “in program theory of change, the evaluation has grounds for confidence that it understands not only what is going on but how program effects are taking shape as well” (Weiss, 1998, p. 195). Thus, program theory will allow me to illustratively demonstrate to major stakeholders (MASU, participants, and Ministry of Education) at what points/ nodes additional data can be collected to provide more information.

How evaluation approach will be implemented within the evaluation?

For the purposes of this program, I will evaluate three strategies- referred to as “strands” in the RFP and determined as key areas of assessment by major stakeholders who provide 100% of funding for the project: “assimilation of participants”, “structured English language development”, and “structured professional and leadership development.” For each strategy, the following observations and assessment methods will be used to result in the implementation domain.

Table 3. *Evaluation Plan for the PDME Program 2018-2019*

Evaluation Strategy/Strain	Observation or Assessment Method	Implementation Domain
Assimilation of participants	Participants' (oral) feedback and participation in Canvas discussion groups (in writing).	Participants' responsiveness; submissions of Canvas entries.
Structured English Language Development Activities	Pre-and post-program TOEFL test; Reading, Writing, and Speaking skills' assessment in accordance with ELI policies; submission of a research-based Capstone proposal in compliance with proposal requirements.	Participation in all class activities; graded assignments and projects; quality of submitted capstone proposals.
Structured Professional and Leadership Development Activities	Post-workshop written assignments; post-workshop surveys	Participant responsiveness and quality of submitted assignments.

Evaluation Design

To examine impact of the PDME program, a *one-group design as a type of a formal design will be used*. Because Mid-Atlantic State University is hosting program participants only for the second year on a row, a one-group design is a reasonable fit for

program evaluation for several reasons. First, one-group design “examines a single program” (Weiss, 1986, p. 191). The RFP does not include nor plans to incorporate any comparative analysis between administration of a similar program between host institutions in the United States. It also does not include comparative analysis between institutions in the United States vs institutions in New Zealand, Australia, and Finland. The latter three remain to be top destinations to attract and host participants for the program. Second, one-group design allows program administrators to conduct informal interviews and clarify with the program participants as to “what the before situation was” (Weiss C., 1986, p.192). In other words, it allows an evaluator to connect participants’ previous teaching experiences in a foreign country, with their immersion pedagogical experiences in the United States. Because participants’ experiences prior to coming to the United States varied, an evaluator should exercise intercultural competence to assess what the “reasonable basis” for educational success **was** for the group in general (Weiss C., 1986, p. 192). Third, as an evaluator, I should be aware that program participants engage in the program differently depending on their family situation. Family and religion are two most important pillars for Middle Eastern cultures. The evaluation design (specifically surveys with open-ended questions and face-to-face interviews) will also incorporate participants’ feedback on what makes (or would make) this program successful.

PDME duration and scope: March 29, 2019 to March 28, 2020. Five phases: Orientation (March 29- April 5); Intensive Language Skill Development (April 8 through June 21); Educator Professional Development (July 1 through August 16); Professional Development & School Immersion (August 26 through December 20); Targeted Immersion & Capstone (January 6 through March 28, 2020). During phases 2 and 3, participants will attend formal ELI classes and will be assessed for their language achievement based on the assessment criteria developed by the ELI. All 47 participants (males and females) will be tested in CBT TOEFL upon arrival to the United States. This score will be used as a baseline for their English language proficiency. Formal ELI classes with focus on oral intelligibility, fluency, listening comprehension, vocabulary, reading, writing, and academic English skills. Classes will be tailored to participant needs as program progresses. Participants will engage in differentiated research and writing course integrating key program outcomes.

During Phases 3, 4, and 5 teachers will focus on professional and leadership development through the following: interactive workshops focusing on technical training in participants' specific disciplines, incorporating innovative approaches to various educational challenges; Professional Learning Community (PLC) advisory meetings with faculty mentors; school shadow visits with targeted observation assignments; immersion placements tailored to participants' project goals and readiness;

and Action Plan collaborative guidance with mentors and K-12 host teachers. A mixed-method approach will be used to collect data from program participants, workshop leaders, host teachers, PLC faculty advisors, and school immersion field managers during phases 3, 4, and 5. Surveys distributed at the end of each workshop will allow investigators to analyze what topics were of most interest to participants in order to include those topics in the RFP for 2020-2021 cycle. Host teachers' feedback will allow the program team to do an intervention and find different placements for program participants or ask host teachers to co-teach for two or more participants. In accordance with Weiss, because "before and after data will be supplemented with during-during-during" data, the evaluation will be able to say much about how the program is working" (Weiss C., 1998, p. 193).

One threat to internal validity is *history*. Unlike a within-subjects experience, it is not possible to test participants in the treatment condition and then in an "untreated" control condition. Participants have no choice to not participate in the immersion experience or workshops for example. If the perception of the American K-12 educational system has changed among the participants, then it could be due to other explanations other than mandated participation in all program activities. For example, participants communicated with educators on campus, national/international

conferences, attended their colleagues' events in other states, or PDME program was mentioned often in social media and national TV, etc.

Another threat to internal validity is *maturation*. PDME participants might have become more receptive to Western discourse in general (education, culture, tradition, business ethic, etc.) only because they spent a year in the United States. For example, a year-long program when a participant cannot leave the country would inadvertently make participants more adaptable to accepted norms and expected behaviors in the United States.

Next, the threat to internal validity can be *testing*. For example, just the fact of completing a survey at the end of a professional development workshop could affect participants' response about the subject matter or content of the workshop. Simply completing the survey could have inspired further thinking about a certain topic which would not have happened without introduction of a certain topic through the workshop or seminar.

Another threat to one-group design is *instrumentation*. Over time, participants may become fatigued from answering survey responses honestly or they might acquire professional skills and knowledge outside of the workshop that will make them more

prepared to participate in the workshop and provide responses to a post-workshop questionnaire or they can be less careful in providing their responses.

One of the threats to external validity will be *selection bias*. As a team at the Mid-Atlantic State University, we do not know how the participants were selected and whether they are representatives of their “teacher population” in their country. Making generalizations will be very difficult. But in accordance with Weiss, one-group design program evaluation for the PDME is a practical solution because when funding agencies need to see concrete results from a particular cohort. Furthermore, stakeholders (the Ministry of Education) might be responding to political pressures. For example, if the group is not demonstrating progress or is not satisfied with the design, development, and implementation of the program at the Mid-Atlantic State University, the responsible decision-makers who selected Mid-Atlantic State University as a host institution can lose their jobs.

Evaluation Enrichment

There are several ways in which a one-group design can be enriched. First, more data can be collected from participants, PLC mentors, workshop leaders, and host teachers during the cycle of the program. Due to culture specifics, participants are

unlikely to effectively participate in more surveys, but many of them welcome one-on-one discussion about challenges they face with their PLC advisors, host teachers, and program coordinators. Based on their feedback, MASU can focus on how to make a program more unique and make it stand out among other peer institutions in the United States (if they are selected) or even international partners.

At the same time, this feedback and assessments will allow program administrators to use best practices, techniques, and information to then apply these assessments and discoveries to similar sponsored programs that are also likely to be evaluated as a one-group design. Unfortunately, time-series design as an extension of a one-group design is unlikely for this particular program (participants reside in a foreign country with a heavy government control over internet resources and data-sharing), otherwise, with tech advances it will be the next step for evaluators to track whether the participants' professional practices improve immediately and remained constant or they improved and then dropped under the pressure of the system.

Appendix F

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION PLANS AND INITIATIVES FROM PEER AND ASPIRATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Context and Purpose

Usage of institutional comparative data is common for higher education professionals and policy makers (Brinkman & Krakower, 1983; Prather & Carlson, 1991). The data provide university leaders with a useful tool to compare institutional achievements in areas of strategic importance. Because institutional priorities, size, budget considerations and other categories are not the same, it is unlikely that areas of strategic development will be identical either. At the same time, learning from peer institutions is important because their experiences and overcome milestones while creating and implementing internationalization strategies can help the DoE to avoid some pitfalls and mistakes. It is also important to recognize that “the process of selecting comparator institutions can ... be very political and fraught with problems” (Prather and Carlson, 1991).

In 2016, the office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at the Mid-Atlantic State University compared MASU with other private and public institutions in the United States on six milestones. The first milestone is a diverse and stimulating

undergraduate academic environment. This milestone looked at freshman to sophomore retention levels starting from 2003; four-year graduation rates (comparators and trend); six-year graduation rates (comparators and trend); six-year graduation rates by African American, Hispanic and International (comparators and trend); and STEM percentage by African American, Hispanic, and Female students. The second milestone compared MASU to other premier research and graduate universities (looking at a number of doctoral degrees granted, total research expenditures, and research expenditures for full-time faculty). The third milestone addressed excellence in professional education looking at the percent of professional programs at MASU and other institutions and number of master's degrees granted. The fourth milestone is titled "Initiative for the Planet" and looked at the number of doctoral degrees granted in environmental and energy area. The fifth milestone compared the percentage of international undergraduate and graduate students. The sixth milestone titled "Engaged University" focused on the trends in endowment assets.

Thus, the list of comparator institutions developed by the Mid-Atlantic State University includes public and private institutions that are comparable in achievement for the listed six milestones. Only two of the milestones somewhat address the goals and purposes of internationalization. Those categories tally in the percentage of international graduate students (milestone 5) and the six-year graduation rate where

international students are listed alongside with ethnic minorities in the United States (milestone 1). Because the focus of this research is internationalization recommendations for the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University and not the whole institution, it is helpful to review strategic plans of schools and colleges of education when they are available.

For my research I reviewed MASU comparator institutions as outlined by the Office of Research at MASU and see how internationalization strategy is reflected in strategic plans of these institutions. I also decided to compare the Department of Education at MASU (ranked # 45 in 2020) with similar-ranked schools or programs in the United State whether they have School-specific strategic plans or not. Those schools include: Georgia State University (public university; # 45 for education); North Carolina State University (public university; # 45 in education and a comparator institution of MASU); Purdue University (public university; # 45 for education and a comparator institution of MASU); Rutgers (public university; # 50 for education and a comparator institution for MASU). Three institutions (North Carolina State University, Purdue University and Rutgers University) appear on the Comparator Institutions list of MASU.

Pursuing this strategy is important for three reasons. First, because the outcome of this research is to design a set of internationalization recommendations for the Department of Education at MASU, it is important to analyze the criteria or concepts peer schools applied in their strategies for internationalization. Second, it is important for me, as a researcher, to find out whether internationalization strategies of similar-ranking institutions view internationalization similarly to what MASU envisions as an internationalization path.

Literature Review and Analytical Framework

Prior to evaluating internationalization strategic plans of universities, it is important to research how the definition of *strategy* translates for higher education. Pearson (1990) discussed strategy in its application of setting direction and developing a “focused concentration of effort through time” (Presley & Leslie, 1999). Presley and Leslie stated that strategic planning in higher education is important because it can improve practice (Presley & Leslie, 1999). Furthermore, Morpew & Hartley (2006) indicate that strategic planning provides guidance and direction for an organization. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that outlining strategies and creating a strategic plan as a result can help a higher education institution to create a response system for any unforeseen challenges it might experience on the path of internationalization. Knight’s

(1994) mode of internationalization suggests that strategic plan is a *must* in creating strong foundation for translating institutional commitment of internationalization into a feasible and practical operationalization.

In addition, experts believe that strategic plan in place makes it easier for external and internal constituents to monitor institutional progress (Clayton & Ash, 2005; Morpew & Hartley, 2006; Taylor & Pfeiffer, 2000). Childress (2010) also supports the need for institutional articulation of its goals in the form of a written strategic plan because those plans then become “part of a supportive culture needed to springboard institutions into the operationalization phase” (Childress, 2010). Additionally, research demonstrates that creating a strategic plan and opening it for discussion with institutional stakeholders can serve as a tool to “develop a buy-in” (Childress, 2010). As discussed in previous chapters, the stakeholders would include faculty, administrators, staff, students, and others. It is also possible that there might be disagreements between and within those groups. Disagreements can arise at any stage of strategic plan development or implementation. For higher education purposes specifically, though, the *implementation* of the strategic plan is where the biggest disagreements between the constituents emerge (Bartell, 2003; Morpew & Hartley, 2006; Stier, 2004).

For the purposes of this analysis, I reviewed multiple research publications on higher education planning and analysis. Some research findings are of particular interest because they conclude that higher education systems, particularly those ones that are more profit-driven like in the United States should demonstrate more flexibility and be adaptable to geopolitical changes (Barnetson, 2001). As it is challenging and unnecessary to constantly adjust education systems to reflect on those changes, it is more feasible to modify institutional policies instead.

Many institutions express their policy direction through strategic plans where internationalization is part of either institutional strategic plan or part of a strategic plan of a particular department or school. Barnetson (2001), and Allison and Kaye (2005) suggested looking at strategic plans as documents that can be analyzed following a certain rubric or a set of criteria rather than a process which can be a subject to interpretation. According to Stevens and Levi (2005) a “rubric can help inform decision-making, articulate performance measures, and specify quality expectations” (Stevens & Levi, 2005). Driscoll and Wood (2007) add that rubric gives way to collaborative modification. Adopting these approaches can ideally serve as a foundation for higher education institutions to learn from each other and to prepare to respond to shifting opportunities or challenges irrespective of their nature.

For this analysis, I relied on the criteria of strategic plan analysis that are suggested by Olson, Green and Hill (2005, 2006). Specifically for structural components I relied on Holcomb's (2001) framework, which includes the following components: introduction, organization's (university's) history and profile, executive summary, summary of core strategies, goals and objectives, process for evaluation of the outcomes as major parts of strategic plan evaluation. According to this framework, the *introduction* should briefly and clearly state the university's need for the Strategic Plan. *Organization (University) History and Profile* should outline university achievement (in this case in terms of internationalization) and how institutional culture has been integrated in its internationalization initiatives. *Mission, Vision, and/or Value Statements* should serve more of an inspirational purpose to make institutional partners, stakeholders, and constituents believe in the purpose of internationalization and outline necessity to internationalize. *Summary of Core Strategies* is where a lot of potential but also a lot of thorough discussion is needed. *Goals and Objectives* are important because they include practical considerations, such as budget, administrative, and governance considerations answering the questions of how, when, and by who internationalization strategic goals and objectives should be addressed. Another important component of an (internationalization) strategic plan assessment should describe the *Strategy for Evaluating*

Outcomes. As such, it should include mechanisms, performance indicators, deadlines, and other progress factors to assess each stage of internationalization process.

Indeed, envisioning, designing, and evaluating an internationalization strategic plan requires flexibility (Swenk, 2001). While evaluating plans of comparator/peer institutions, I was looking for common themes and descriptions. Chance and Williams (2009) provided a general outline of assessment for a strategic university plan which I took the liberty to apply for my research but still modify to include important criteria for internationalization.

Chance and Williams (2009) first provided several definitions of strategic planning. For example, they referred to Presley and Lesley (1999) who defined the main goal of strategic planning in higher education as enhancement of practice. They later moved on with the discussion and concluded that today's reality of higher education presents different opportunities because the world of higher education is changing fast and reflects on societal and global changes. In some ways, strategic planning becomes a process that "seeks opportunity" (Chance & Williams, 2009). Once an institution understands that strategic planning should reflect collective vision but also is ready to accept the challenges that might arise during implementation of the strategic plan, it has the basic mechanism in place to respond to those challenges. In other

words, envisioning anticipated issues or concerns with implementation and operationalization of strategic plan becomes a collective shared vision by stakeholders.

In this sense, strategic planning in higher education mirrors strategic planning in business. Indeed, the authors refer to Leslie and Fretwell (1996) who asserted that strategic planning works best when it is a “continual process of experimentation” that allows multiple approaches to co-exist and multiple contexts to be included in the plan. The challenge then is how to assess the effectiveness of such a plan. Unfortunately, there is a lack of substantial literature on the topic, particularly when it relates to assessing and evaluating strategic internationalization plans. Chance and Williams indicate that unintended circumstances can further jeopardize the assessment process. Indeed, constantly changing geopolitical reality and global processes further complicate the issue.

And yet, developing a rubric for assessing strategic plans can be a start in resolving the issue. They view rubric as a tool that institutions can use but each institution can decide how to use the tool based on its needs. The authors developed a rubric based on recommendations of Driscoll and Wood (2007). According to the rubric, each vertical column represents the level of quality and each horizontal row comments on specific components of the strategic plan. As Chance and Williams (2009)

suggested, typical components of a complete plan reflect on the Holcomb's framework (Holcomb, 2001) and include the following: introduction, organization's history and profile, executive summary, summary of core strategies, goals and/or objectives, support, process for evaluation of the outcomes (Holcomb, 2001). It is important to understand that these sections can be expanded and universities and departments can add additional criteria to contextualize the needs.

Analysis Plan and Methodology

As previously mentioned, this research was grounded in the definition of internationalization as developed by Jane Knight (Knight, 1994). In her work, Knight defined internationalization as a "process of integrating an international/ intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of their institutions" (Knight, 1994, p. 21). As such, Knight developed her research on the foundation that internationalization of higher education is a dynamic concept which cannot exist without a solid foundation. Such foundation is an internationalization plan. Only upon a clear development of an internationalization strategic plan where priorities and roles of all participants are clarified and strategic areas of institutional internationalization are outlined, a successful operationalization can occur.

However, many obstacles exist. One of the obstacles to internationalization can be a stakeholders' satisfaction with the existing structure. Some of those issues were discussed in the chapter on the DoE's faculty perception of internationalization. As results demonstrated, some faculty members are very enthusiastic about internationalization initiatives including international partnerships, cooperation, inviting international visiting scholars, developing intercultural competence of students as part of curriculum at home institutions, etc. Others are more hostile to, for example, considering international experience as part of hiring or tenure process and share the opinion that the university should not forget its primary mission which is to serve the state population. However, it is possible that some faculty members might not concentrate on the fact that the landscape of higher education is changing fast and many higher education institutions worldwide become powerful players in the higher education industry. With global trends evolving and paradigm shifts happening very often, internationalization is part of this continuum. In this case, internationalization plans can help mobilize the support and involvement of faculty throughout the institution, department or school. This support becomes a crucial factor in the implementation of internationalization (Aigner et al., 1992; Knight, 1997). The plans become "google maps" for diversifying the curriculum and stimulating implementation of internationalization activities.

Understanding that the study of internationalization plans of peer institutions, colleges and/or departments can shed light on how the Department of Education can develop its internationalization plan, I decided to research what criteria or priorities other peer and aspirational institutions put as a focus of their internationalization strategies. A priori, aside from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and its proximity to New York City, MASU is another centrally located institution close to Washington, DC and New York City. That factor alone is a strong criterion for international students and scholars alongside with the School's ranking and reputation. The importance of those was discussed in previous chapters. These and other considerations should be weighed in by stakeholders when creating or modifying strategic plans or any type of internationalization policy documents.

Because this research is an attempt to provide recommendations to the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University on internationalization, I selected to choose a qualitative, multiple case study method and compare internationalization strategic plans of peer institutions and/or Schools and/or Departments of Education in those institutions. Similar to other qualitative research methods, there are limitations to this approach. For example, all information that I used in the analysis was pulled from the publicly available sources. I did not access any working documents or conducted interviews with administrators or faculty members at

those institutions to draw more extensive conclusions. Moreover, the data for this research were not longitudinal in nature and thus I did not analyze how internationalization priorities of peer institutions changed or evolved from the time when they introduced the first version of the internationalization strategic plan. However, it is still useful for this research and subsequent research that I plan to undertake in the future.

Additionally, it would be helpful to conduct semi-structured interviews with institutional participants who either helped design internationalization plans, served as focus-group members or fulfilled other roles. If I performed interviews, then I would be able to find out: 1) what were the motivating factors for institutions to develop internationalization plans; 2) how those plans were developed and what the process was; 3) how monitoring and evaluation of implementation of those plans occurred. I would then perform triangulation to cross-validate the data from officially published documents and feedbacks from those partners.

Findings

For this study I found that document analysis was the most appropriate and cost-effective qualitative research method (Glesne, 2006; Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2002). I looked at the institutional strategic plans and departmental plans

when available. First, internationalization was included in strategic plans of all peer institutions, in some cases internationalization was part of the departmental/ school plan. All four peer institutions had a clear and concise statement of rationale for internationalization plan or internationalization articles in the overall institutional strategic plans. All four also clearly stated institutional mission, vision, strategic planning process and the justification for including internationalization in their plans. Georgia State University and North Carolina State University developed clear institutional strategic plans and Purdue University has an overarching strategic institutional plan with each school/college adhering to its college/ institutional plan for some time. For example, the Department of Education developed its first strategic plan in 2003 and is currently on its fourth strategic plan. Rutgers U has a designated center called the Centers for Global Advancement and International Affairs (GAIA) that is responsible for identifying, pursuing, and developing all international initiatives within Rutgers units. The table below provides more information relying on the analysis criteria of Allison and Kaya (2005) and on an analysis of structural components suggested by Holcomb (2001). Internationalization steps/criteria are reflected as well. As a researcher, I also considered it important to include specific mechanisms or initiatives how each step/criterion was met or not. Those were: Introduction, Organizational History and Profile, Executive Summary, Mission/Vision/Values

Statement, Summary of Core Strategies and examples of internationalization-in-practice through projects and coursework.

The Mid-Atlantic State University is currently revising its Strategic Plan. In September 2019, the Office of the President sent out a draft of a revised plan seeking feedback and comments from students, faculty, and staff. The document outlined MASU's current priorities and how they relate to the mission of the institution. In the Strategic Vision portion, the need for "global engagement" was outlined. The statement says: "the need for [planning the future] is urgent for ... Mid-Atlantic State University with a global reach to help shape our shared future." In other words, the need and desire for MASU to be global is clearly stated in the document. The document then transitions to outline five priorities of success, which include: enhancement of success of students; building an environment of inclusive excellence; strengthening of interdisciplinary and global programs; and fostering a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship. The priority that addresses strengthening of interdisciplinary and global programs lists a set of activities that are targeted to achieve this goal. It states that "the university recognizes the transformative impact that travel and global study of diverse cultures can have on our students". It also adds that "we are committed to creating even more opportunities to cultivate global citizens who value peace, cooperation and human rights, in alignment with our values for inclusiveness." Furthermore, a more concrete

internationalization goal states: “to develop our students as global citizens, we will expand our efforts to internationalize MASU and consider ways to grow and diversify our international enrollments, extend global partnerships with higher education institutions and strengthen study abroad programs.

Clearly, it is important that such a document has been open to discussion with MASU community. If I were to compare this document to strategic plans of other aspirational/ peer institutions, I would notice some commonalities. First, all strategic plans recognize the central role that each particular institution plays in developing a new generation of leaders. Second, all strategic plans outline four or five pillars or priorities in order to meet the developmental goals of the institution. Third, all plans capitalize on the already existing foundation of academic, research, and social support at their institution and describe desired outcomes when changes or innovative programming is introduced.

At the same time, there are differences across these documents. For example, as Table 4 illustrates, NC State, Georgia State, and Rutgers University were very clear in describing who was in the task force or advisory committee for developing strategic plans and what the roles of those people were. Some institutions (e.g. NC State) put a focus on strategic partnerships whereas others included internationalization component

into each (Purdue's College of Education) or some goals (Mid-Atlantic State University). When the table field is empty, it means there was no clear indication that the pertinent information was included in the plan. In the future, I would like to conduct semi-structured interviews with key players of strategic plans' implementation to see how those plans were operationalized and what issues the departments ran into when operationalizing strategic plans.

Table 4. *Comparative Analysis of Internationalization Plans of Five Universities*

Name of University	Georgia State U	NC State	Purdue (College of Ed strategic plan)	Rutgers	MASU (2019 Draft)
Introduction	Clear and concise; statement of rationale and updates; individual initiatives and progress is updated every five years.	NC State mission, values, vision, peer institutions, strategic planning process, and five goals are clearly outlined.	Clear, concise, and data-driven description of the COE, its programs, program accreditation, and prior strategic plans are discussed. First COE strategic plan was developed in 2003. COE is on its fourth strategic plan ending in 2020.	The Centers for Global Advancement and International Affairs (GAIA) is responsible for leading, developing and promoting international initiatives with all Rutgers units. This strategic plan “outlines GAIA’s plan for integrating international engagement into every aspect of the university’s plan.	Clear and concise; the need for collaborative work between students, faculty, staff, and alumni and community members is outlined. The need for “ongoing dialogue” on determining strategic priorities is outlined as essential.

<p>Organization history and profile</p>	<p>Plan provides pertinent information about GSU; history of the Strategic Plan of 2011.</p>	<p>Plan provides clear explanation on the need and importance of the strategic plan to reflect “challenges and opportunities faced by an increasingly diverse citizenry in an increasingly interconnected world”.</p>	<p>From the first strategic plan development in 1992 Deans of the College were at the forefront of forming a strategic plan committee and review committees to make recommendations.</p>	<p>The draft provides brief information about the university and indicates that the updated strategic plan is building on previous campus-wide strategic planning processes. No specific mentioning of a task force or advisory committees who will be charged with developing a final product.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>Executive Summary</p>		<p>Clear description of who constituted a task force. Installation motto of “Locally Responsive, Globally Engaged” provided a theme for a series of campus forums held by the Strategic Planning Committee.</p>		<p>Advisory committee consists of faculty and staff advisory group.</p>	
---------------------------------	--	---	--	---	--

<p>Mission, Vision, and Values Statement (institutional and/ or departmental)</p>	<p>Five major goals with supporting initiatives were identified and adopted by faculty, staff, and students. Mission and vision “are inspirational and expressed in passionate terms” (Chance & Williams, 2009).</p>	<p>Five major goals were listed and then each was described in detail. Each goal clearly stated Strategies, Accountability Guidelines, High-Impact Educational Experiences;</p>	<p>Five major goals for <i>Purdue Moves</i> were listed and then each was described in detail.</p>	<p>Four pillars/ strategic priorities of the plan: Global Education (int-l studies and research); Global Programs (campus internationalization); Global Relations (partnerships with universities, governments and communities abroad; Global Services (support for Rutgers community and visitors with immigration and other relevant issues.) Internationalization of curriculum is important and facilitation of faculty and student access to international organizations to enhance students’ courses is outlined.</p>	<p>Five key priorities were identified and supporting activities were listed. Key priorities: “to enhance the success of our students; to build an environment of inclusive excellence; to strengthen interdisciplinary and global programs; to foster a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship; and to invest in our intellectual</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

					and physical capital.” Corresponding activities are listed to meet each goal but the language is more reflective of a vision rather than concrete activities.
--	--	--	--	--	---

			The clearly described vision of the COE has a global “mission” of the COE clearly described.	South Africa Initiative (since 2001).	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

<p>Summary of Core Strategies and examples of “internationalization-in-practice” through projects and coursework.</p>	<p>Goal 5 <i>“Achieve distinction in globalizing the university”</i> identified five strategic countries in which to focus its activities internationally: Brazil, China, Korean, South Africa, and Turkey.</p>	<p>Goal 2 <i>“Enhance Scholarship and Research by Investing in Faculty and Infrastructure”</i> includes a specific goal of “recruiting and retaining leading scholars whose work is widely acknowledged as influential in their fields and the world.”</p>	<p>Vision of the COE states: “COE’s individual and collaborative efforts will enhance the welfare of the citizens of Indiana, the United States, and the world”.</p>	<p>The need for internationalization is outlined “we must be fully engaged in the challenges of our world and contribute our expertise in an integrated manner in order to find solutions.” Development of students as global citizens is identified as a priority and in order to do that, MASU will “consider ways to grow and diversity</p>
--	---	--	--	--

					international enrollments, extend global partnership with higher education institutions and strengthen study abroad programs.” No concrete projects or coursework is mentioned.
--	--	--	--	--	---

	<p>More than 90 bilateral agreements have been established. Each task force has developed an external advisory board of prominent civic, community, and academic leaders who are dedicated to advance initiatives in focus countries.</p>	<p>Goal 5 <i>“Enhance Local and Global Engagement through Focused Strategic Partnerships”</i> includes three strategies that focus accordingly on:</p>	<p>Goal 1: “Increase the research productivity and national/international impact of College of Education centers.”</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>The Global Partnership for Better Cities program provides grants to internal faculty groups to travel to partner universities in South Africa and Hong Kong and develop proposals with local scholars. Topics of research include: “transnational and migrant wellbeing, urban resilience” and others.</p>	<p>1) Supporting and providing opportunities for increasing students’ civic and global knowledge, experience, and perspectives.</p>	<p>“Develop partnerships throughout the state, nation, and globally to disseminate research, influence policy, and foster collaborative research.”</p>		
--	---	---	--	--	--

	Office of International Initiatives (since 2015) is responsible for strategic integration and coordination of the university's international partnerships, initiatives, program development, and others.	2) Supporting and providing incentives for faculty and staff to engage in collaborative global scholarship;	Goal 2: "continue to incorporate quality field experiences, service learning and global experiences into the COE's undergraduate and graduate programs."		
--	--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Global Studies Institute (since 2014) with a core interdisciplinary faculty, focuses on pressing international problems and opportunities through collaborative research, undergraduate and master's degree programs, outreach activities and international centers.</p>	<p>3) Enhancing active and sustainable partnerships, locally, regionally, and globally.</p>	<p>Goal 3: "Investigate and engage in data driven decision making about the experiences of faculty and students participating in international engagement activities and/or study abroad."</p>		
--	---	---	--	--	--

	<p>Largest number of international students come from China, India, and Korea mirroring national trends in international student enrollment.</p>	<p>The university <i>encourages and supports</i> activities that will expand on the students' understanding of their place in the global community, community-engaged study abroad and internships; meaningful Co-Op education including global opportunities and capstone projects with communities around the globe.</p>	<p>“Create and maintain partnerships with national and international universities that enhance the discovery, learning, and engagement missions of both institutions.”</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>A Faculty Mentoring Program for Visiting Scholars was created to assist interested partners with professional development for their faculty.</p>	<p>Bilateral partnerships with over 150 institutions in more than 60 countries. Focus-to strengthen and develop partnerships with “strategically selected, outstanding international universities that can provide our faculty and students with multifaceted, high-quality experiences.”</p>	<p>“Model excellence in preparing students to live and work in a multicultural and global society.”</p>		
	<p>Courses offered at CEHD:</p>	<p>No concrete examples are included.</p>	<p>“Continue the development of international distance-learning opportunities.”</p>		

	<p>Undergraduate and Graduate: Field Experiences in Int-l Education</p> <p>Graduate: International Experiences and Issues in Education; Issues in International Education (online).</p>		<p>“Recruit, support, and retain a graduate student population that reflects the diversity of cultures in the nation and the world.”</p> <p>Goal 4: “Model inclusiveness”: “student, faculty and staff diversity- ethnic, gender, and international.”</p>		
--	---	--	---	--	--

			<p>“courses related to globalization, multiculturalism, and/or diversity”</p> <p>“course syllabi infused with relevant multicultural and global content.”</p> <p>“scholarship related to globalization, multiculturalism, and/or diversity.”</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCES

- Aigner, J. S., Nelson, P., & Stimpfl, J. (1992). *Internationalizing the university: Making it work*. Springfield, VA: CBIS Federal.
- Allison, M., & Kaye, J. (2005). *Strategic planning for international organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45, 43-70.
- Brinkman, P. & Krakower J. (1983). *Comparative data for administrators in higher education*. Retrieved November 11, 2018 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED246826.pdf>
- Chance, S., & Williams, B.T. (2009). Assessing university strategic plans: A tool for consideration. *Educational Planning*, 18(1), 38-54.
- Childress, L. K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Green, M. F. (2002). Joining the world: the challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education. *Change*, 34(5), 12-21.
- Holcomb, E.L. (2001). *Asking the right questions* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2002). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 295-328.
- Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. Canadian Bureau for International Education, (7), 1-14. Retrieved December 11, 2019 from <http://www.cbie-bcei.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Internationalization-Elements-and-Checkpoints.pdf>

- Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1(1), 27-44.
- Merriam, S.B. Caffarella, R.Sa., & Baumgarter, L.M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Morphew, C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (3), 456-471.
- Olson, C.L., Green, M.F., & Hill, B.A (2005). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, DC. American Council on Education.
- Olson, C.L., Green, M.F., & Hill, B.A (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Prather, J. & Carlson C. (1991). Using institutional comparisons for administrative decision support. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research, San Francisco, CA.
- Stevens, D.D., & Levi, A.J. (2005). Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning. Sterling, VA: Stylus publishing.
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalization, Societies, and Education*, 2, 83-97.
- Swenk, J.P. (2001). Strategic planning and chaos theory: are they compatible? In M. Cutright, (Ed.) *Chaos theory and higher education: Leadership, planning, and policy*. Baltimore: Peter Lang.
- Taylor, A. L., & Pfeiffer, C. M. (2000). Strategic change in colleges and universities (Book Review). *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 507-510.

Appendix G

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FACULTY VIEWS ON INTERNATIONALIZATION

Introduction

The background in Chapters 1, 2, and 3 as well as Literature Review in Appendix B framed the theoretical foundation for developing survey questions to address three overarching research questions.

- How strongly the faculty at the Department of Education views internationalization as an important mandate for the DoE?
- What internationalization initiatives or activities the faculty at the Department of Education find the most beneficial and/or the most challenging.
- How important it is for the faculty of the Department of Education to consider international experience for hiring and tenure processes.

The objective of this survey was to learn more about the perception of internationalization as seen by the faculty of the DoE. Traditionally, faculty design, develop and deliver program curriculum, but not only. Faculty recognition (or not) of internationalization as an important policy development for the institution can determine the direction the latter can take. Understanding that internationalization as a concept is open to multiple interpretations, the research goal was to also collect some descriptive data as to how the faculty at the DoE understands internationalization of the School in particular and university in general.

Methods

An online survey using Qualtrics platform was originally sent on November 13, 2019 to 57 full-time faculty members at the Department of Education after receiving an approval from MASU's IRB. I submitted a project as a principal investigator on October 25, 2019 and received an exempt letter on November 8, 2019. Because I did not conduct a survey in other comparator institutions, I did not need an approval of other IRBs. In all, 14 full-time tenured faculty members started the survey and 12 completed the survey. One person declined to participate. Two reminders were sent using Qualtrics function of sending reminders to those who did not start the survey. Considering that the survey was sent prior to the Thanksgiving holiday and reminders were sent right before winter break, this response rate is relatively high.

Open-ended questions sought to collect narratives from the faculty that would be specific to their fields of study and research. Microsoft excel was used to calculate all percentages used for discussion and open-ended responses allowed me to get a better understanding on how full-time faculty at a particular school (the DoE at MASU) views internationalization and whether the researcher's vision for the School's strategic internationalization echoes with the faculty.

Survey Questions

- 1) To what extent do you agree with the following statement: on-campus internationalization is likely to give students a better understanding of global processes (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree?) Please provide some comments on what prompted your answer.
- 2) To what extent to you agree with the following statement: on-campus internationalization is likely to prepare students for global careers (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree?) Please provide some comments on what prompted your answer.
- 3) Many scholars consider intercultural competence as the “ability to accommodate cultural differences into one’s reality in ways that enable an individual to move easily into and out of diverse cultures and to adjust naturally to the situation at hand” (Bennett, 2004; Hammer, 2012). In light of this definition, to what extent do you agree with the following statement: student intercultural competence is largely developed through curriculum (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree)?
- 4) If you strongly agree, agree, or somewhat agree, can you share how you see it done from your perspective or subject area?

- 5) If you somewhat disagree, disagree or strongly disagree, can you provide some explanation as to why not? Examples can include: not my content, have no time, I do not feel I have necessary skills to integrate intercultural competence in my classroom curriculum, I need further training, other- please provide explanation).
- 6) To what extent do you agree with the following statement: on-campus internationalization is likely to prepare students for global careers?
- 7) Please provide some comments on what prompted your answer.
- 8) To what extent do you feel encouraged to participate in international activities? (Very encouraged, encouraged, fairly encouraged, slightly encouraged, not encouraged?)
- 9) What is the source of your encouragement or discouragement? Check all that apply: colleagues, students, departmental leadership, university leadership, my own interests, other (please provide explanation).
- 10) Where do you learn about international activities on campus? MASU main website, CEHD's website, Study Abroad Office, Office for International Students and Scholars, the Institute for Global Studies, none of the above, other (please specify).
- 11) In your experience, what types of international activities have been encouraged by the Department of Education or other offices at MASU? Check

all that apply: teaching a course in an overseas institution for a foreign audience, participation in international conferences, publications in international journals, peer-to-peer collaborations, field research, volunteering in a foreign country, other (please provide explanation).

12) To what extent do you, as a faculty member at the Department of Education support inviting visiting faculty/ scholars from abroad? (Very supportive, supportive, fairly supportive, slightly supportive, not supportive).

13) Your level of support for inviting visiting faculty members is based on the following factors. Select all that apply: opportunity to collaborate with peer researchers in a MASU setting, opportunity to showcase my research in the field, opportunity to showcase departmental research, opportunity to provide individual mentoring to international scholar/s, opportunity to support institutional linkages through collaborative research with international scholars, opportunity to receive a reciprocal invitation to visit the institution of a visiting scholar, increased visibility among department and university colleagues based on hosting the visiting scholar, insufficient financial support for collaboration with international peers, lack of interest in international collaborations, other- please explain.

- 14) Do you think the Department of Education should or should not consider international experience in hiring faculty? Please provide rationale for your answer.
- 15) Do you think that the Department of Education should or should not consider international experiences in the promotion and tenure processes? Please provide rationale for your answer.
- 16) Do you have additional thoughts about internationalization that you wish to share?

Findings and Analysis of the Faculty Survey

In order to adapt my recommendations on internationalization policies for the Department of Education, I needed to understand how faculty at the Department of Education in MASU understands and perceives internationalization. The survey provided baseline data from which to suggest improvements and strategize internationalization initiatives for the Department of Education.

Open ended questions sought to collect narratives from the faculty that would be specific to their fields of study and research. Microsoft excel was used to calculate all percentages used for discussion and open-ended responses allowed me to get a better understanding how tenured faculty at a particular school (the DoE at MASU) views internationalization and whether the researcher's vision for the School's strategic internationalization echoes with the faculty.

Data Analysis

The first question asked the faculty to what extent they agreed with the statement that on-campus internationalization is likely to give students a better understanding of global processes. None of the responses fell into the categories of “disagree”. Results of responses are provided in the table below. The first question asked: “to what extent do you agree with the following statement: on-campus internationalization is likely to give students a better understanding of global processes?”

Table 5. *Articulated Support for the DoE’s Internationalization*

Degree of agreement	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Agree	3	21%
Somewhat Agree	3	21%
Strongly Agree	8	57%
Total	14	99%

For the narrative part, there were 9 complete responses.

Some responses linked on-campus internationalization efforts of students to intercultural competence, e.g. “on-campus internationalization can expose American MASU students to new perspectives on global and local processes”, “on-campus internationalization can promote intercultural learning and can help students notice

and critically reflect on their own cultural values”. Even though the definition of internationalization applied for this research was provided in the beginning of the survey, two respondents were not sure on the definition and commented in the narrative: “it will depend on what is meant by internationalization” and “I am not sure what campus internationalization is”. The following were various perspectives mentioned in the narratives:

- “Study abroad experiences or studying about countries/cultures would give students a better understanding of global processes.”
- “The sheer exposure to multiple perspectives, I think, holds promise to introduce cognitive dissonance into students’ minds. Their internal wrestling- and perhaps external wrestling during classes or in other types of conversations is likely to broaden and enrich their own perspectives.”
- “Most of our students have limited international exposure, and many do not have the means or financial support to take study abroad programs. On campus internationalization efforts can potentially offer all students equal access to important international trends, internships and work opportunities, and a broad range of possibilities they would not have known about. It can help take the students out of their insular cultural milieu and equip them with cultural knowledge and tools to be successful in the 21st century. By understanding knowledge and practices from different countries, they develop

more open-ness towards other-ness and more appreciation of diversity at many levels.”

- “The more we can support our students to understand and engage with the international and global dimensions of educational leadership, the better our programs can support these efforts.”
- “Although there is no substitution for travel abroad, on campus initiatives can correct biases and misconceptions.”

Overall, common ground among responses generally acknowledged: (a) the need for students to engage and learn about global processes; (b) intercultural learning can help students get new perspectives on global and domestic processes; (c) on campus internationalization can potentially provide access to global knowledge of students.

Question # 3 asked the participants to what extent they agreed with the statement that student intercultural competence is largely developed through curriculum. Findings are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Student Intercultural Competence Development through Curriculum*

Degree of Agreement	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
No Response	2	14%
Disagree	1	7%
Somewhat Disagree	3	21%
Somewhat Agree	7	50%
Strongly Agree	1	7%
Total	14	99%

Eight participants provided comments, one comment stated “travel” and one comment stated: “I have not seen this done.” Others provided insightful comments that are extremely valuable for this and subsequent research. For those who “*strongly agreed, agreed, or somewhat agreed*”, the comments included:

- “If by curriculum is meant “studying about” other countries/ cultures, then I agree that this develops student intercultural competence... I would say the larger part of intercultural competence is developed through study/travel abroad experience.”
- “I feel like it is a combination of curriculum, instruction and assessment-not just curriculum. I’d suggest that students gain exposure to non-dominant points of view, and that’s the role of the instructor.”
- “The curriculum is not the only means of course but a strong medium for promoting this ability... because accommodation of cultural differences ceases to be an option that student choose to turn on and off. It becomes a medium for grasping a number of concepts, and understanding that different countries use different practices that maybe effective at attending to some issues we struggle with. For example, by incorporating effects of educational policies abroad, students become more open and willing to examine domestic policies instead of taking them for granted.

Internationalizing the curriculum supports the development of critical thinking, and helps students see that there is no such thing as neutral knowledge, but that knowledge and practices are inherently situated in and function within cultural assumptions.”

- “I think that curriculum in part contributes to learners’ development of intercultural competence. Instructional settings can provide readings, experiences, assignments to explore culture (one’s own, others, differences). A curriculum can also encourage perspectives and underlying theory on the nature of culture. It can foster connections and discourse among people from different cultures. I say somewhat because there are so many experiences external to curriculum that support the development of intercultural competence. Although this might also be dependent on how one defines curriculum.”
- “In the history of education in America undergraduate course, students are often stunned to learn certain episodes in our past. For instance, they rarely know that Native Americans were encouraged to leave their families to enroll in boarding schools in the late 19th century. They had no idea that one third of Italian immigrants returned to Italy. Their grasp of history of desegregation improves greatly by reading court cases. And so on...”

- “I do agree that curriculum can help but actual physical contact with face-to-face interactions also is necessary. Curriculum certainly could help scaffold such interactions.”

There were four comments for those respondents who “*somewhat disagreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed*”. Those comments included:

- “When I talk to students about culture, I use the concept of cultural humility, not cultural competence. I think cultural humility can be facilitated through curricula, but relationships are also necessary to cultivate humility.”
- “I believe that we can develop curricula and in-class experiences that can support our students’ development of intercultural competence, but the ability to accommodate cultural competence comes primarily from experiences outside our personal cultural contexts. I believe that the volume and quality of these experiences is the most important vehicle for developing this competence.”
- “I am not sure that concepts like “cultural competence” are useful and not potentially harmful (e.g. manipulative). For example, the definition itself prioritizes cultural “easiness”, “naturalness”, and “smoothness” so valued in many American middle-class and upper-class communities.”

- I believe that cultural competence is developed more through experience than curriculum. However, if the curriculum includes systematic experiences as part of the curriculum, that might affect my answer.”

Overall, common ground among those who were in the “agree” category generally acknowledged: (a) intercultural competency of students can be developed through the *combination* of curriculum and “external experiences”; (b) internationalizing the curriculum supports the development of critical thinking.

Two responses in the “disagree” category also commented that cultural competence is developed through experiences, thus the respondents do not deny the importance of developing intercultural competence in students, but put a more significant weight on the experiences than curriculum in developing such competencies. However, two respondents disagreed on the concept of “intercultural competence” per se. One response cited the elitist connotation of the term itself. Another response cited “cultural humility” as a more appropriate term to use. It is unclear, however, what definition of cultural humility the respondent applied in this case.

Questions 6 and 7 addressed the extent to which faculty agreed with the statement that on-campus internationalization is likely to prepare students for global careers and asked to provide some comments on what prompted their answer. Two

participants did not respond to this question and did not provide comments. Out of 12 respondents to the question, the distribution is as follows (Table 7):

Table 7. *Student Preparedness for Global Careers through On-Campus Internationalization*

Degree of Agreement	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
No Response	2	14%
Disagree	1	7%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7%
Somewhat Agree	4	29%
Agree	3	21%
Strongly Agree	3	21%
Total	14	99%

More detailed feedbacks included responses addressing the topics below:

- Global employability - “interest and motivation to seek global careers”, “exposure to multiple points of view is likely to broaden and enhance students’ points of view and better prepare them for a global workforce”; “even if students are not interested in global careers, they will be better prepared to work with international colleagues”
- Global competency and cultural competency through experiences and knowledge acquisition- “it is hard to imagine having a global career without any prior first-hand international experience”; “global careers can vary so much, if our students learn a foreign language VERY WELL, that is a huge boost”.

One response commented that it is “self-evident” that on-campus internationalization will prepare students for global careers just as “teaching computer programming might lead to a career in coding.” Overall, it appears that the faculty is avoiding the usage of on campus or domestic “internationalization” as a precondition for global employability of students. One comment mentioned: “we might mean different things, the term is quite opaque.” Another one linked internationalization to international (government) policies and stated: “I think that the current counter-globalization and anti-immigrant political trend on nationalism is temporary.” One of the comments stated that “value of cultural immersion through study abroad, exchanges” cannot be overestimated.

Next set of questions addressed faculty’s interest in international activities on campus and off campus. Questions 8 and 9 asked to what extent faculty felt encouraged to participate in international activities and what was the source of their encouragement/discouragement. Fourteen participants responded to this question. The distribution is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: *Degree of Encouragement to Participate in International Activities*

Degree of Encouragement	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
No Response	2	14%
Not Encouraged	2	14%
Fairly Encouraged	2	14%
Slightly Encouraged	3	21%
Encouraged	4	29%
Very Encouraged	1	7%
Total	14	99%

With regards to sources of encouragement or discouragement, eight respondents selected “university leadership” and seven responses named “departmental leadership.” Six respondents selected “my own interests”, five selected “colleagues”, and four selected “students”. Three respondents selected “other” and provided comments “unclear question”, “once students are here, they become a powerful motivator”, “college initiatives overseas.”

Questions 10 and 11 asked from where the faculty learn about international activities on campus and what type of international activities are encouraged by the Department of Education. Because participants could select several responses, the distribution is rather homogenous: of twelve respondents, four indicated MASU’s main website, CEHD website, Office for International Students and Scholars, and the Institute for Global Studies as main sources. Five participants indicated a Study Abroad Office; and six respondents indicated “other” as a category. The listed

categories were: “MASU Daily”, “MASU Daily articles and direct emails from other departments- mainly HDFS”, “announcements sent through email or through the weekly faculty update”, “word of mouth”, “Dean and Director suggesting international initiatives to get involved with”, “ELI”.

On question 11 (types of international activities), twelve respondents provided answers and seven respondents (approximately 58%) said that “teaching a course in an overseas institution for a foreign audience” has been encouraged by the Department of Education or other offices at MASU. Six participants (50 %) said that it was participation in international conferences; five that it was “peer-to-peer collaborations”, three participants (25%) said that it was publications in international journals; two that it was “volunteering in a foreign country” and one that it was “field research”. Among other categories and comments were the following:

- “Doing a study abroad semester/teaching DOE students in some other country”
- “My impression is that the School tends to be silent on specifics, but if I engage in any of the above, I find the Director to be very supportive of my efforts.”
- “Study Abroad”
- “Winter session courses”
- “The PDME helping international teachers in residence for a year here at MASU.”

Questions 12 and 13 asked about the extent of support for inviting international faculty and what the motivating factors are behind that support. Question 12 specifically asked to what extent faculty members support inviting visiting faculty and scholars from abroad. None of the respondents said that they are “not supportive.” The implication of selecting this category will be discussed in the discussion section of the chapter. The responses to question 12 are recorded in Table 9.

Table 9: *Extent of Support Inviting Visiting Faculty/ Scholars from Abroad*

Degree of Support	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Slightly Supportive	1	8%
Fairly Supportive	2	17%
Supportive	1	8%
Very Supportive	8	67%
Total	12	100%

Answers to question 13 provided further insight into what motivates faculty members to seek collaboration with international visiting faculty members. The distribution of numbers is provided in Table 10. Multiple answers were allowed.

Table 10. *Influencing Factors to Invite Visiting Faculty Members*

Factor	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Increased visibility among department and university colleagues based on hosting the visiting scholar	4	12%
Insufficient financial support for collaboration with international peers	1	3%
Lack of interest in international collaborations	1	3%
Opportunity to collaborate with peer researchers in a MASU setting	8	24%
Opportunity to provide individual mentoring to international scholar/s	5	15%
Opportunity to receive a reciprocal invitation to visit the institution of a visiting scholar	3	9%
Opportunity to showcase departmental research	2	6%
Opportunity to showcase my research in the field	2	6%
Opportunity to support institutional linkages through collaborative research with international scholars	6	18%
Other	2	6%
Total	34	

Two respondents provided answers under “other” category: one responded was unclear about how the question was formulated and commented: “honestly, I am unsure what this item is exactly asking. For the *opportunity to showcase my research in the field*, is it me as a DoE faculty member that gets to show my research or it is the faculty member that we are inviting that should showcase”. Another response stated: “making connections (and friends) with international peers and learning more about how their cultures work.”

Question 14 asked the respondents if they think that the Department of Education should or should not consider international experience in hiring faculty? Eleven participants provided their responses. The responses ranged from being very supportive of factoring in the international experience for hiring faculty to uncertainties about how that experience should be considered if at all.

- “It depends on whether this experience contributes to the teaching and scholarly requirements of the position.”
- “The DOE should consider international experience as one of many other factors that offer a holistic portrait of a potential faculty member. The chance to broaden and enrich POVs (points of view) of our faculty, generally, and our students, particularly, hosts great promise to better prepare both groups for the world of tomorrow.
- “I think that international experience should be considered as an asset because of the diversity and perspectives the new hire is likely to bring. It helps diversify the faculty which is one of the goals in MASU’s strategic plan.”
- “I think international experience should be considered in the category of desired qualifications, but not required qualifications. Applicants to positions may have had differing access to opportunities for international experience based on their career and life trajectories.”
- “I think it should be considered but I am not sure how much it should be weighed.”

- “We should. Colleagues with international experience provide us with a new way to view the problems of education and educating pre-service teachers, and they can serve as a great resource for forming international partnerships that benefit our students and the institution.”
- “Sure, it is nice to consider but not everyone could afford foreign travel. Not sure how much “book reading” plays into it.”
- “It all depends on the position. For some areas (like SCA) it would be valuable.”
- “That’s a tough one. When hiring assistant professors at our lowest rank, many applicants will not have international experience. At the higher ranks, on the other hand, international experience becomes more reasonable to require. Another possibility is to recruit international candidates at the lower ranks. Our school does not do that intentionally, but it has happened a few times.”
- “I think that international experience should be a plus because educational research has been internationalized. Science and research do not know national boundaries.”
- “Absolutely should NOT, unless international curriculum or collaborations are the main responsibility of the position.”

Similar opinions were expressed by the faculty in answering question number 15. The question asked if international experiences should be considered in the promotional and tenure processes. It also asked respondents to provide rationale for their answers. The responses ranged from categorical “no” to “international experience

should be considered part of the promotion and tenure processes.” Provided answers were:

- “No”
- “This is a complicated one. If it is valued, it should count. Are international experiences mentioned in the DOE P & T document? I would say: no or indirectly to be fair. My impression that is valued when examining dossier at times of promotion and nothing the candidate’s presentation at international conferences or receiving international awards.”
- “The DoE should consider international experiences as one of many parts of the promotion and tenure processes. To *require* international experiences, though, is a step too far because some faculty members have research agendas that are more “fundable” by external agencies compared to others.”
- “No. Our current P and T guidelines are fine, and they do not mention international experience.”
- “It should not be a requirement or criterion for promotion if this has nothing to do with the faculty member’s research topic or courses s/he teaches.”
- “I think it depends on the individual and their research/teaching. It is very difficult for faculty with young children to conduct international research or teach abroad so it could introduce bias to the tenure process. Also, some of our faculty focus on specific US populations for which there is no clear

international parallel. For these researchers, an emphasis on international experiences could introduce unfair bias.”

- “For promotion to full professor, having an international reputation should be part of the requirements and it should be considered a plus for promotion to associate professor.”
- “As with all P and T issues, promotion must be related to workload. And if research, teaching, or service has an international component, it should, of course, be considered.”
- “Again, it should be considered to be a plus.”
- “Again, this is desired rather than required. The opportunities for international experience will vary by faculty member, due to area of research expertise, field within education, even personal circumstances.”
- “Absolutely should not because tenure and promotion processes are set in the bylaws and international experience is not a criterion upon which faculty are evaluated. Additionally, I would be again adding this additional criterion to the current guidelines.

The final question asked for faculty’s additional thoughts on internationalization that they would like to share. Six responses were received.

- “Internationalization is a broad term. How it should play a role in courses or scholarship for any given faculty member or course instructor would depend

greatly on what their research interests are or what the course goals are. Where a course or research program is getting into sociology, political science, anthropology, or policy topics, internationalization would be relevant.”

- “For any internationalization effort to work, there needs to be a clear vision and mission, and faculty and staff and students should have a voice. I think there are many faculty/staff/ students with rich international experiences that can be assets to their departments and to MASU, but their talents are not tapped. There is so much they can do to support an internationalization agenda if they are recognized for the knowledge, they have to chart new paths and support the intellectual rigor (not just procedures) that on-campus internationalization efforts require. Thank you for the opportunity to share my ideas with you! Good luck on your study!”
- “Wish the questions had been clearer but GOOD LUCK!”
- “Although I support it, I also feel that our traditional land grant mission obligates us to focus our energy on State.”
- “International students enrich our classrooms. I learn so much from them and in class I encourage them to participate and share their cultures and explain how things we do here in the USA are viewed from other international perspectives.”

- “I think the MASU, CEHD, and DoE have to provide more financial resources for international cooperation, initiatives, exchanges and conferences.”

Discussion

There was almost a unanimous agreement among faculty members that on-campus internationalization is likely to give students a better understanding of global processes. Faculty members indicated that many students do not have the means to participate in study abroad programs or travel overseas, thus exposing them to multiple perspectives at home institutions can provide more cost-effective opportunities to understand global processes and engage in them. This approach is shared by the researcher and I discussed what problems can arise if we equate internationalization of higher education with study abroad programs and exchanges only. Furthermore, faculty recognized that DoE’s support is important for student engagement in “international and global dimensions of educational leadership.”

Additionally, faculty provided very valuable feedback on how they perceive the relationship between intercultural competence of students and curriculum. Even though only 58% of faculty said that they “somewhat agree” that intercultural competence is largely developed through curriculum, open-ended responses provided some clues to such responses. For example, some faculty see internationalization of curriculum as a medium for understanding different theories and practices that supports development of critical thinking of students; others said that curriculum can

foster connections and discourse among people from different cultures.” Others put a central focus in developing intercultural competence of students to external factors, such as interactions, travels, internship experiences, and others. One response suggested that “cultural competence” is a biased term that prioritizes “cultural easiness” and one response suggested to use the term “cultural humility” instead of a cultural competence. Most comments, however, are consistent with the current research in the field that views intercultural competence as a long-lasting skill that should be constantly developed in educational settings. It should be developed parallel to or in addition to external communications in order to equip students to be successful in a global society. As a researcher, I was very pleased to see that most of the faculty recognize such a need.

However, even though the definition of “internationalization” applied for this particular research was provided in the beginning of the survey, there still was some confusion among some faculty members regarding the definition. Some indicated that the term is “opaque” and others continued to associate internationalization with study abroad, travels, and international experiences. These responses prompted me to think that when I continue working on this research topic in the future, I will define the term “internationalization” even more narrowly, however, it might remain to be a challenging task because there is no general consensus even within academia on the exact definition of the term.

It is also worth recognizing that although faculty's perception on internationalization differed, there was more consensus and support for *concrete* international engagements, such as teaching a course overseas, inviting international faculty, expanding on international initiatives, etc. For example, 58% of respondents said that the university encouraged them to teach a course overseas and 67% of respondents are very supportive of inviting a faculty member from overseas to teach at MASU. Clearly, there is an interest in international peer-to-peer collaboration and further development of institutional linkages.

Another area where the faculty appear to be more protective of their views and beliefs is inclusion of international experiences in hiring decisions, tenure and promotion policies. Many recognized the value of international experience, one participant even stated that for "promotion to full professor, international experience should be part of the requirements", and still some faculty members were unsure of the mechanisms how to weigh in the international experiences and what they should be compared to. Some participants were very skeptical about international experiences stating that they are fully satisfied with the current bylaws for promotion and would vote "no" if international experiences had to be added. It is unclear, however, what the underlining reasons are for such a categorical view and in the future, I would like to include interviews with faculty members to get a more complete picture on faculty perceptions.

In the final question, I asked faculty members to provide any additional comments they might have about internationalization. These responses further illustrated that there is a discrepancy in the faculty's understanding of the term and acceptance of internationalization as a necessary reality for higher education in the 21st century. One faculty member recognized that internationalization is a broad term but only found its relevance to research fields that are limited to social sciences. Another member recognized the importance of internationalization but commented that energy should be focused on State. Two respondents were vocal about the need to provide more financial resources for a variety of international initiatives. And one response echoed the researcher's opinion for the need to have a clear institutional mission on internationalization where other stakeholders like students and staff will have a voice. The same respondent stated that international experiences of these stakeholders should be better tapped by the institutional leadership.

Implications for Practice

In addition to continuing building its reputation as a leading Department of Education in the United States, the DoE has a potential and sufficient faculty support to be more proactive in internationalization of curriculum and practices. Internationalization strategies and their implementation can better prepare students for global careers in education and improve their intercultural competence without or in addition to study abroad experiences. Such a cohesive development is necessary

because education careers for which the Department of Education prepares students are not limited to teaching in State schools only. Education is a comprehensive and constantly evolving field and many faculty members recognized and mentioned that in their written responses to the survey.

Below are several take-outs from the survey.

1. Faculty generally agrees that on campus internationalization efforts can potentially offer all students access to international trends, internships, and work opportunities that they would not have known about otherwise.
2. Faculty members generally agree that on campus internationalization can promote intercultural learning and help students notice and critically reflect on their cultural values.
3. Faculty are generally supportive of viewing curriculum as part of institutional/on-campus internationalization, some more than the others are encouraged to support and engage in development of intercultural competence of students. This could be due to misconception, misinterpretation or misinterpretation of the term “intercultural competence.” Further discussion might be helpful to clarify those.
4. Importance of international experience/s, collaboration/s, funding and other contributions to faculty internationalization can be discussed with the faculty to see the possibility of including them in the desired hiring and tenure criteria.

Many faculty members already support including those criteria in the promotion/ tenure process (P & T), others are not sure how that would work within the currently existing framework for P & T. Further research is needed to understand the reasons for categorical rejection of considering those criteria in the guidelines.

Conclusion

This study was necessary to better understand faculty perceptions on internationalization at the Mid-Atlantic State University. The response rate was good considering that it was distributed around Thanksgiving holiday. But I also hoped that the topic would attract more faculty to complete the survey. The response rate can be explained by a number of factors. First, the survey topic might be more sensitive than others. Because the Department of Education at the Mid-Atlantic State University currently does not offer courses in international education, a survey topic might have been more appealing to international faculty members or those who are already engaged in international education initiatives in the school. Educating the faculty about internationalization efforts on campus and conducting a similar survey in the future might increase faculty support for these efforts.

I recommend that survey findings be discussed with the faculty at one of the faculty meetings and that the findings of this survey be used as the basis for future inquiries into the topic. Additionally, it will be helpful to discuss what other

aspirational schools are doing in terms of curriculum internationalization or encouraging faculty members to seek out international opportunities aside from traveling abroad. The chapter of comparing internationalization plans of aspirational institutions with existing schools of department of education discussed how other schools addressed including internationalization-at-large (through curriculum, programs, collaborations, partnerships, etc.) as part of their either strategic institutional plans or strategic departmental/school plan. Some of the initiatives can possibly be applied for the DoE's context at the Mid-Atlantic State University.

Appendix H

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD EXEMPT STATUS APPROVAL



Institutional Review Board
210H Hullihen Hall
Newark, DE 19716
Phone: 302-831-2137
Fax: 302-831-2828

DATE: November 8, 2019

TO: Ganna Tigan
FROM: University of State IRB

STUDY TITLE: [1511461-1] School of Education Faculty View on Internationalization.
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
EFFECTIVE DATE: November 8, 2019

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # (2)

Thank you for your New Project submission to the University of State Institutional Review Board (UD IRB). According to the pertinent regulations, the UD IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT from most federal policy requirements for the protection of human subjects. The privacy of subjects and the confidentiality of participants must be safeguarded as prescribed in the reviewed protocol form.

This exempt determination is valid for the research study as described by the documents in this submission. Proposed revisions to previously approved procedures and documents that may affect this exempt determination must be reviewed and approved by this office prior to initiation. The UD amendment form must be used to request the review of changes that may substantially change the study design or data collected.

Unanticipated problems and serious adverse events involving risk to participants must be reported to this office in a timely fashion according with the UD requirements for reportable events.

A copy of this correspondence will be kept on file by our office. If you have any questions, please contact the UD IRB Office at (302) 831-2137 or via email at hsrb-research@udel.edu. Please include the study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

www.udel.edu