

# 国際ファカルティーデベロップメント参加レベル評価 Assessing the Level of U.S. Faculty Participation in International Faculty Development Opportunities

平塚 広義 HIRATSUKA, Hiroyoshi

● 国際基督教大学教育研究所  
Institute for Educational Research and Service, International Christian University



国際ファカルティーデベロップメント, 大学の国際化, 大学組織

international faculty development, internationalization, university organization

## ABSTRACT

大学に所属する教授陣は、大学組織の変革に最も重要な要素であり、とりわけ教授陣の学術専門性の国際的・異文化的発展は、大学組織の国際化に大きく貢献する可能性がある。しかし、現在米国大学に所属する教授陣の多くは、自身が国際的・異文化的側面を取り込むような学術経験や博士課程での訓練を受けているわけではないので、今回取り扱う質・量的研究から導き出されているように、教授陣の国際化の難しい問題点である。それでも、教授陣の一部では、自身の学術専門性の国際的・異文化的側面を発展させることの必要性を示しており、また、そのような具体的な取り組みも行っている例もある。各教授が、国際ファカルティーデベロップメントを通して、自らの学術専門性の国際的・異文化的側面の発展を目指すことにより、大学組織の国際化にも大きく貢献する可能性を秘めている。

The lack of integrating international and intercultural dimensions in American faculty members' scholarship hinders the internationalization of colleges and universities in the United States. While U.S. faculty members rate international academic experience highly for students and their colleagues, faculty members' own international academic exposure is lower than their peers overseas. This study noted a lack of international academic training during graduate education. Several U.S. faculty members in this study recognized the need for significant re-education in order to internationalize their scholarship. U.S. faculty members who were included in this analysis cited the importance of international faculty development opportunities to contribute to internationalizing U.S. faculty members based on their positive outcomes and impacts. International faculty development appears to contributing to integrat further international and intercultural dimensions into their

scholarship. The first step toward encouraging such opportunities is to understand the current level of U.S. faculty members participation in international faculty development.

## 1. Introduction

Globalization is a force for change in academics and higher education institutions around the world. Many scholars in U.S. colleges and universities have also recognized globalization as a force of change in their fields of specialization. "We are convinced that as the world has become increasingly interdependent, and national academic boundaries have been blurred, science and scholarship are becoming increasingly international" (Altbach & Lews, 1996, p. 3). A new wave of change, globalization, has influenced the basic existence of many industries and professionals today, and U.S. higher education is no exception.

Globalization and the internationalization of higher education institutions around the world are separate but dynamically inter-related phenomena (de Wit, 2002; Knight and de Wit, 1999). The influence of globalization on institutions of higher education is unavoidable, but the internationalization of higher education institutions can be a creative response for coping with globalization forces. "Globalization can be thought of as the catalyst while internationalisation is the response, albeit a response in a proactive way (Knight and de Wit, 1999 p. 14). Altbach (2004) also argued that while globalization is often considered to bring optimistic benefits, there might be greater negative impacts that continue to create unequal and unjust outcomes. In this kind of environment, the internationalization of higher education institutions and their scholars becomes a more complicated phenomenon than other transformative changes the universities have faced in the past. Therefore, each university has to come up with strategic actions to balance the needs of institutions when they consider engaging in the internationalization.

However, until recently, internationalization has been absent from many U.S. colleges and universities' institutional mission statements, policies, and operational objectives; and internationalization tended to be specialized in a small group of scholars where internationalization was of direct academic interest their disciplines such as International Relations and Area Studies. "Globalization has changed these frames [framework of international education in the previous era] but our universities and educational systems have often been too slow to adjust to dramatic changes such as those we face today" (Mestenhauser, 2003, p. 6). The internationalization of U.S. higher education institutions emerges as a necessary transformation process which needs to be taken into account by many stakeholders of U.S. colleges and universities.

The lack of mission, objectives, and activities regarding internationalization has been an issue for many national higher educational systems around the world today, but it seems to be a greater national problem for U.S. colleges and universities. For example, Siaya and Hayward (2003) drew the following conclusion about the national trend of the internationalization efforts by liberal arts schools in the U.S.:

And yet, compared with other types of four-year institutions, liberal arts colleges were the least likely to include internationalization in their mission statement, list it as a priority in their strategic plan, or have assessed their efforts in the last five years (p. ix).

Lacking a vision of internationalization within the institutional mission statement or strategic planning seems like a national tendency of U.S.

colleges and universities. A clear mission, vision, or integrated strategic plan for the internationalization of higher education institutions is an urgent issue for many academic administrators, policy makers, and individual faculty members.

Faculty members are considered an integral part of the internationalization of a higher education institution, especially for internationalizing the academic experience of colleges and universities. According to Mary Lynn Allen (2001), international experience provided an important background and connection for professors to teach about intercultural issues in disciplines related to education. Allen stated, "Several students stated that a few professors shared their own international experiences and talked about intercultural or multicultural issues related to teaching in their classroom" (p. 26-27). Their concrete international exposure and professional experience allow faculty members to apply their scholarly experience into their research, teaching, and service. Allen further suggested that surveying faculty members in order to explore their perspectives regarding challenges to internationalization would be an interesting research question (p. 49).

Dr. Susan Cole, the president of Montclair State University in New Jersey believed that the internationalization of academic experience for students cannot be achieved without faculty members' own internationalization. "Begin in the classroom. Bring in some exciting speakers and get the faculty engaged in the intellectual excitement of internationalizing their curricula. Provide incentives and support for faculty who take up that initiative... Begin with faculty excitement because that's where the front line is" (Cole, 2003, p. 88). She argued that international faculty development opportunities and incentives energize them to integrate international and intercultural dimensions into their research, teaching, and services (2003).

However, the level of U.S. faculty members'

effort to internationalize their scholarship appears to be relatively unknown. The author attempts to analyze the current level of U.S. faculty members' participation in international faculty development opportunities and international academic activities to expand their scholarship and integrate international dimensions into their academic activities at their home institutions.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

In the U.S. and other Western countries, teaching, research, and services are shared as the central mission and the core principles of higher education institutions and scholarship. "For over a century, the stated mission of American higher education has been to provide teaching, research and service. In most instances, the three purposes have been listed with the implication of equal importance" (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1996, p. viii). Today, this concept of scholarship also has often become more common among higher education institutions and scholars in many other countries outside of North America and Europe.

For the purpose of this article, the term, "internationalization" is based on the working definition of Knight and de Wit (1997). "Internationalisation of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution" (p. 8). The mission of U.S. higher education institutions and their scholars are inseparable entities, and the scholarship of faculty members has been the core foundation of U.S. higher educational institutions. "The work of intellectual life included not only the scholarship of discovering knowledge, the scholarship of applying knowledge, and scholarship of teaching... (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, p. 2). Boyer (1990) enlightened the three basic principles of scholarship by expressing his thoughts with the following statement: "Theory

surely leads to practice. But practice also leads to theory. And teaching, at its best, shapes both research and practice.” (p.16).

Thus, the internationalization of scholarship and faculty development, based on these descriptions, means the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into faculty members’ teaching, research, and service at their home institutions. The particular focus of this study based on the definition of internationalization centers around the level of faculty members’ participation in international faculty development opportunities and international academic activities (research, teaching and services) at U.S. colleges and universities. Without grasping the current level of U.S. faculty members’ participation in international faculty development opportunities and their engagement in international scholarship, encouraging them to participate in different international faculty development opportunities becomes impossible, and will not contribute to greater participation.

### **3. Analyzing Existing Studies on Faculty Members’ International Mobility Related to International Faculty Development Opportunities**

#### **3.1 Importance of faculty members’ involvement in the internationalization of U.S. Colleges and Universities**

When one discusses about the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities, faculty members and their integration of international and intercultural dimensions into their research/teaching/service become a critical factor for the internationalization process. In *Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities* (Grant and Johnson, 2003, p. 2) identified the following criteria related to faculty members and scholarly activities as specific measurements of internationalization: study by international students and international faculty

in the U.S., faculty exchanges, curricular activities, co-curricular activities, international visitors, and international development. In a similar list, Ellingboe’s suggestions for internationalizing higher education (2002) included for faculty members to contribute to internationalization:

- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Faculty with international teaching and research experience
- Study and research abroad opportunities for students (and faculty-led short-term programs)
- Integrating international students and international visiting scholars, professors, and researchers into campus life (p. 27)

Ellingboe’s list only reinforces that faculty members are key to the internationalization of academic experience throughout higher education institutions. U.S. faculty members with different international and intercultural dimensions included in their research, teaching, and services are understood and accepted (Ellingboe, 2002; Grant and Johnson, 2003), and the role of faculty is recognized as an important part of internationalizing U.S. colleges and universities. Internationalization is considered an organizational transformation that touches various aspects of the organizational structure.

However, fragmented organizational policy, disintegrated systems, and simply a non-international academic professional environment provide few opportunities for such international ideas to be implemented (Carter, 1992). Even though faculty members are considered an important part of the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities, faculty members’ international/intercultural background and influence on providing international educational experiences are not accurately studied. There are only a few accounts of faculty members’ actual level of international/intercultural orientations, the actual level of their involvement in international/

intercultural scholarly activities remains relatively unknown.

The recent study on the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities, *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* by Siaya and Hayward (2003) by the American Council on Education (ACE), provides a more comprehensive view on internationalization including a focus on faculty members. The study examined the status of internationalization in U.S. postsecondary education and identified any noticeable changes since ACE began their studies on the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities. The following findings demonstrate the attitudes of faculty members towards internationalization:

- There was strong support for internationalization among students, faculty and the public.
- The majority of students and faculty reported that they had a variety of international travel experience and some foreign language learning.
- The personal interest of faculty and staff greatly contributed to the internationalization effort on campus.
- The majority of students and faculty expressed support for international activities, but failed to participate in these activities (p. viii).

Particularly, the data on internationalization at liberal arts colleges found specific characteristics that fostered in internationalization.

Liberal arts college faculty were the most supportive of international course requirements, compared with faculty at other types of institutions. They also were the most likely to report that they had taught an international course, incorporated reading from foreign authors into their curriculum, and integrated new technologies to enhance the international dimensions of their courses (p. ix).

Siaya and Hayward clearly captured the positive attitude of faculty members toward internationalizing the academic experience at U.S. colleges and universities. The analysis demonstrates that U.S. faculty members are supportive of academic experience in many ways, and positive about students engaging in different kinds of international academic experience such as foreign language training and education abroad.

Naturally, these descriptions lead one to assume that the faculty members support for international and intercultural academic experience is due to their own professional and scholarly engagement as they integrate international/intercultural dimensions into their teaching, research, and service. However, U.S. faculty members actively engaging in international academic activities appear to be less than their positive support for their students' academic engagement abroad.

### 3. 2 Review of Existing Statistical Data

The first and foremost important factor for internationalizing scholarship is for faculty members to gain international academic experience through their teaching, research, and service, so that they can reflect their international academic expertise onto their scholarship at home institutions. Traditionally, organizations such as the Institute of International Education (IIE), the Fulbright Scholars programs, and the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) have been involved in academic exchange and international seminars for faculty members, and they have tracked the movement of faculty members across borders, and kept records of the participants in different international faculty development programs.

For example, Open Doors by IIE presents the record of international scholars coming into the United States. According to the statistics in 2002, 86,015 international scholars were involved with academic activities in the United States (p. 86).

Unfortunately, Open Door does not have records on U.S. faculty members going overseas. However, one way to track that kind of data related to U.S. faculty members is to count the number of graduate students who are conducting research projects overseas: 1,150 doctoral students were participating in some type of academic activities overseas (p. 62). There is also a category called graduate (unspecified), which reports 4,845 students being involved in research activities outside of the U.S. This group does not identify which level of graduate programs, but some of the students can be considered to be part of their doctoral programs.

The Fulbright Scholar program is a traditional exchange program where U.S. faculty members engage in international academic activities. In the 2002 annual report, Fulbright Scholar programs, administered by the State Department, awarded grants to 934 U.S. participants who studied and taught, or conducted post-doctoral research in 111 countries. Moreover, Fulbright programs administered by the Department of Education, the Fulbright-Hayes Faculty Research Abroad programs, granted fellowships for 29 scholars, and the Doctoral Research Dissertation Research Abroad Program offered full-time dissertation research grants for 165 Ph.D. candidates in languages and areas not commonly taught in the U.S. (p. 17-18).

Obviously, a fewer number of U.S. faculty members (or potential scholars) conduct international academic activities than non-U.S. faculty members coming to the U.S. for their scholarship. In 2002, a total number of 7123 U.S. faculty members (and potential scholars) engaged in international academic activities compared to 86,015 non-U.S. scholars coming to the U.S. This shows that the tendency for U.S. faculty members to go abroad is much less than their counterparts, and illustrates a lower level of engagement in international scholarship among U.S. faculty members compared with their peers in other countries.

Moreover, a more comprehensive study illustrates a similar picture of the limited involvement of U.S. faculty members in international academic activities. The survey conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching provided the following information about U.S. faculty members and their academic natures and international orientation:

- 65 percent of U.S. participants indicated no international experience, which is the least travelled faculty in the study.
- Only 20 percent of the U.S. participants, primarily from large research universities, answered that they have worked with non-U.S. colleagues in the past decade.
- Teaching abroad is particularly uncommon and only 14 percent indicated they had done so in the past ten years (Altbach and Lewis, 1996, p. 338)

According to Altbach and Lewis (1996), U.S. faculty members are less likely than faculty members in other nations to think that connections with scholars in other countries are important to their work. They also are less likely to believe that they need to read international academic publications in order to keep up with their disciplines. Moreover, they are less likely to think that the curriculum at their institutions should be more international in focus: "...international consciousness in all of the countries in the survey, except in the United States, is quite high in certain ways, actual international involvement is somewhat limited" (Altbach & Lewis, 1996, p. 3).

As a result, the U.S. faculty members appear to be contradictory in their academic ideology and actual practice. While U.S. faculty members generally favor internationalism in academia and scholarship, they have less international academic experience and engage in international academic activities on

a less frequent basis. Haas (1996) concluded, "For U.S. faculty, there seems to be a 'colonial,' and 'we know what is best' strain, running through the academic mindset regarding internationalism in higher education" (p. 388). Also, he observed that while full-time academics generally hold positive views regarding the merits of interaction with their counterparts overseas, the interaction is not as active as it appears (1996). These existing studies provide information about U.S. faculty members' lower level of engagement in international academic activities lends less authenticity to the U.S. institutions' claims of internationalization compared with their peers abroad.

The overall current demography of U.S. academia toward scholarship internationalization is a mixed phenomenon. There seems to be a gap between U.S. academics' internationalist attitudes and the level of U.S. faculty members' active participation in international academic activities to integrate international/intercultural dimensions into their scholarship. On the other hand, one way to improve and increase the international/intercultural dimensions of their scholarship is international faculty development. While the specific number is not shown, exploring the level of their participation in international faculty development opportunities is an interesting investigation. The current status of U.S. faculty members and their detailed involvement in international academic activities is a necessary issue to be further investigated if the overall nature of academic experience at U.S. colleges and universities becomes more internationally/interculturally rich.

### 3.3 Analysing Qualitative Accounts of Recognition for International Faculty Development Needs

U.S. faculty members' involvement in international academic activities is recognized by the members themselves as a necessity for the future of the U.S. academic profession. Some faculty members have

identified their own needs for additional faculty development to take part more effectively in the internationalizing academic experience at home institutions.

Some professors are aware of their shortcomings due to the lack of international/intercultural curriculum in their graduate training, and are confronted with new challenges for which they are not necessarily prepared. Crittenden (1994) stated, "I did not study sociology from a global perspective, and to incorporate such a perspective into my teaching will require pretty serious substantive self-reeducation" (p. 2). Osnes-Talyor (1994) identified a similar problem from her own experience by offering the following statement. "I had to become global myself before I could expect to infuse an international perspective into my work" (p. 8). Self-identification by U.S. faculty members shows that certain scholars recognize their own limitations with their scholarships in an international context, and are willing to expand their scholarship to enriching their academic disciplines by making them more international/intercultural.

Gaining international academic experience leads to the expansion of professional specialization including the internationalization of scholarship. International academic experience of U.S. faculty members and the impacts on their scholarly activities are reflected in their interactions with students inside and outside of their classroom at their home institutions. Boyer (1990) acknowledged that certain concerns of scholarship today are truly "global and transcending national boundaries," and asked, "can we define scholarship in ways that respond more adequately to the urgent new realities both within the academy and beyond?" (p. 3). This statement brings up the need for U.S. faculty members to more frequently engage in international faculty development opportunities or scholarship, so that they themselves become more internationally- and interculturally-trained scholars.

### 3. 4 Impacts of International Faculty Development Opportunities on U.S. Faculty Members and their Scholarship

Several limited accounts exist currently to illustrate the impacts of international faculty development participation outcomes among U.S. faculty members. These accounts identified the different impacts of U.S. faculty members' participation in international faculty development opportunities: curriculum design, teaching contents, and student interactions.

For example, the International Faculty Development Seminar (IFDS) organized by CIEE provides international faculty development opportunities for U.S. faculty members. CIEE kept a record of evaluation for its long-standing Seminars to trace the progress of faculty members engaging in international academic activities. According to Oberst (1999), IFDS has enrolled 1,563 people from 613 colleges and universities so far. Oberst commented: "The data coming out of the IFDS files are tantalizing. They bring us closer to being able to build a persuasive, data-based case for the effectiveness of international faculty development that includes structured visits overseas and a directed curriculum" (p. 86).

Furthermore, Tjede Merlini McVey (2002) investigated the impact of international faculty development seminars in *Exploring the Impact of International Faculty Development Seminars on Teaching*. The study discovered that the most notable impact of international faculty development seminars was on course content and interactions with students, even though the overall positive impact on teaching was not as much as expected. International experience is the most essential background piece when considering the promotion of an internationally oriented educational experience.

Individual universities may also actively promote international faculty development opportunities as a part of their internationalization efforts. Faculty members who participated in the University of

Richmond International Faculty Development (IFD) described the experience as life-changing (Kelleher, 1996). "By including their own newly acquired knowledge in their courses, faculty participants have consciously linked the overseas experience to the goals of a liberal arts education" (p. 325). As a result of IFD participation, overseas experience develops motivation to promote the international programs amongst the participants at home institution. The University of Richmond IFD connects their faculty members' daily academic activities at home to the institutional mission and its internationalization.

Kelleher (1996) claimed that internationalization cannot be achieved without an internationalized faculty. As a sociologist, Crittenden (1994) argued that increasing the acceptance and support for this effort among sociologists leads to the internationalization of curriculum instead of just introducing additional materials and perspectives. Osnes-Taylor (1994) expressed her understanding of the internationalization of teacher education by stating, "Internationalization of teacher preparation happens as each of us teacher educators widens our perspective on where we fit into the bigger world" (1994, p. 8). Integrating international and intercultural dimensions into faculty members' scholarship becomes as important as the change in course offerings, curriculum development, and other components of academic activities at U.S. colleges and universities.

The level of internationalization among faculty members reflects the depth and width of international/intercultural experience received through their own training and development. Woolf (2002) remarked on the issue of international educators and agreed that educating faculty members themselves leads to educating students on the international acquired qualities members developed through their international academic experience.

The issue for educators in an international



context is not to deny the reality but rather to teach ourselves (and thus our students) to reach across and beyond these inventions to find out what ‘true dialog’ might mean, to seek a voice that will both transcend and encompass dissonance and harmony. (p. 13)

Hovde (2002) also argued, “As with students and staff, the best international education for faculty can only occur overseas, for the gains in learning skills and gaining confidence are far greater abroad than at home” (p. 19). Faculty members must have first hand international and intercultural professional experience in order to really reflect that experience into their academic approaches and scholarship.

As the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities tends to be an individual experience of each college or university (Merckx, 2003), the internationalization of scholarship among faculty members is also uniquely individual in nature and endeavor. The essential question is: how can U.S. faculty members enrich their academic expertise internationally/interculturally, so that the academic experience at home becomes more international and intercultural for their students? Kecht (2000) raised a question regarding internationalizing the academic experience at home in the U.S.:

For us as educators in the U.S., the pressing concern must be how we can disseminate existing knowledge and generate new knowledge in such a way that our students will be aware of the new realities and, more importantly, ready to shape these realities for the well-being of our global village. (p. 1)

Developing faculty members to be able to integrate their international and intercultural dimensions into their scholarship directly influences the quality of international/intercultural academic experience at home institutions. International faculty development is essential for U.S. colleges and universities that

are intending to internationalize the academic experience.

#### **4. Conclusion: Challenges of Increasing U.S. Faculty Members’ Engagement in International Academic Activities**

Several studies emphasized the importance and positive impact of faculty members’ participation in international faculty development opportunities and their involvement in the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities. While faculty members’ attitudes toward internationalizing the academic experience of students at U.S. colleges and universities are positive, their actual engagement in international academic activities themselves are less than their peers overseas. At the same time, some U.S. faculty members recognize their inadequacies, and they are willing to participate in different international faculty development opportunities for further enrichment and integration of international/intercultural dimensions into their scholarship for the internationalization. Some studies also illustrated positive outcomes of U.S. faculty members’ participation in international faculty development opportunities and the positive impact of their academic activities in their classrooms. There are some promising results coming out of these different studies should further exploration on this topic be continued.

One of the many challenges in evaluating the international faculty development levels of U.S. faculty members centers around the limited availability of studies available. Available works written on U.S. faculty members’ participation in international faculty development opportunities still remain scarce. Only in the last two decades, have several individual scholars, practitioners, professional groups and organizations attempted to record more inclusive data on the internationalization of higher education institutions including the roles of

faculty members (Siaya & Hayward 2003; Engberg and Green, 2001; ACE, 1995; Lambert, 1989). Unfortunately, resources and data on U.S. faculty in international faculty development opportunities still remain limited, and as a result, outcomes and impacts of such activities remain inconclusive.

Moreover, a lack of clear understanding about the outcomes of international faculty development opportunities does not assist the current situation. Identifying and evaluating different kinds of outcomes and impacts will further encourage more faculty members to participate in international faculty development opportunities like IFDS. Oberst stated that the IFDS staff, the sending institutions, and the individual participants should "...make more effort to specify the outcomes expected from these seminars" (1999, p. 73). The key for promoting and encouraging international faculty development opportunities for U.S. faculty members is identifying and evaluating specific criteria for the outcomes and impacts of international faculty development. This would clarify the ambiguity of purpose and objectives in international faculty development opportunities.

Many faculty members who are interested in internationalizing their scholarship claim they are not prepared with knowledge and/or skills to achieve this goal. Peterson (2000) recommended institutions "to take stock of what the study abroad opportunities look like for U.S. faculty" (p. 14). Furthermore, Peterson continues,

If faculty play such a critical role in international education, then shouldn't we be talking more about study abroad opportunities for those who teach? Otherwise, if we do succeed in getting greater numbers of our students to study abroad, might we end up with faculty members who are less worldly than their students? (Peterson, 2000, p. 13-14).

Hovde (2002) echoed this statement by saying, "The best way to improve a program is to make good faculty even better and more numerous. Faculty development is the best investment a college or program can make in its future" (p. 19). International faculty development opportunities for U.S. faculty members have to be the priority of many U.S. institutions of higher education, but the single most difficult question remains unsolved: "Who will teach the teachers?" (Mestenhauser, 1992, p. 72).

One way to encourage U.S. faculty members to engage in international faculty development is to support them in leading a group of students for short-term education abroad programs. For example, short-term education abroad program can play an interesting role for new faculty members to expand their teaching at an international level. Working with more experienced faculty members, the new faculty member can shadow the experienced faculty member to lead a group of university students to teach during a short-term education abroad program during spring, summer, or winter breaks. Video-conferencing with a partner university and its peer faculty members abroad to conduct a joint course is another way to expand their scholarship into international and intercultural dimensions. Besides CIEE's IFDS and Fulbright opportunities, individual universities can conduct their own approaches for international faculty development.

Scholars and faculty members, these individuals are specialists of teaching and learning, and their motivation and enthusiasm can overcome different obstacles of integrating international and intercultural dimensions into their scholarship. As a teacher educator, Osnes-Taylor (1994) expressed, "My desire was to help make connections among people of different cultures" (p. 7). Faculty members' source of motivation for promoting the international educational experience appears to be from their own personal or professional overseas experience, and providing more international

faculty development opportunities only ignite such personal and professional motivation for their own scholarship expansion. As a result of such professional development and internationalization of scholarship, U.S. colleges and universities can benefit in their internationalization efforts and their adjustments to globalization in the long run.

## References:

- Altbach, P. (2004). Globalization and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World. *Tertiary Education and management*, (1), 1-20. Retrieved from [http://www.bc.edu/bc\\_org/avp/soe/cihe/pgal/pdf/Globalization\\_2004.pdf](http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/pgal/pdf/Globalization_2004.pdf)
- Altbach F. G. (Eds.). (1996). *The International Academic Profession: Portraits of Fourteen Countries*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Altbach, F. G. & Lewis, L.S. The Academic Profession in International Perspective. 3-48
- Haas, J. E. The American Academic Profession. 343-388.
- Allen, M. L. (2001). *Study Abroad and Education Major: A Vital Connection*. Unpublished master thesis, School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont, USA.
- American Council on Education (1995). *Educating Americans for a World in Flux: Ten Ground Rules for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Institutional and international initiatives.
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A Comprehensive National Policy on International Education*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Institutional and international initiatives.
- Barnhart, B. Ricks, T & Spier, P. (1997). Faculty Roles. In Hoffa, W.W. and Pearson, J. (Eds.). *NAFSA's Guide to Education Abroad for Advisers and Administrators*, (2nd ed., 37-56). Washington D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Carter, H. M. (1992). "Implementation of International Competence Strategies: Faculty." In Klasek, C. B. (eds.). *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Washington: Association of International Education Administrators. 39-51.
- Crittenden, K. S. (1994). Foreigners in our midst: Resources for Internationalizing the Sociology Major. *Teaching Sociology*, 22(1), 1-9.
- de Wit, H. (2002). Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis. Praeger Pub.
- de Wit, H., & Knight, J. (1999). *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*. Paris, France.: OECD.
- Knight, J & de Wit, H. (1997). *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education.
- Ellingboe, B. J. (2003, Summer). *Finding Your Path: Working Effectively with an Internationalization Consultant*. *International Educator*, 12(3), 22-29.
- Engberg, D. & Green, M. F. (2002). *Promising Practices: Spotlighting Excellence in Comprehensive Internationalization*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Department of Education. (2002). *Annual Report: The Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board*. Washington D.C.: <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/fulbright/ffsb/annualreport2002/part1.pdf> <Accessed September 15, 2004>
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., Maeroff, G. I. (1996). *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Green, M. F. (2003). *The Internationalized Campus: A Strategic Approach*. *International Educator*. 12(1). 13-21.
- Hovde, P. (2002) Building institutional support. In Spencer, S. E. & Tuma, K. (eds.). *The Guide to Successful Short-Term Programs Abroad*. (11-23). Washington D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities*. (2003). Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Grant, M. A. & Johnson, M. M. Introduction. 1-4
- Cole, S. A. Montclair University: Ten Noteworthy Institutional Programs. 85-88
- Kelleher, A. (1996). *Learning from Success: Campus Case Studies in International Program Development*. New York City: Peter Lang Publishing Inc
- Kecht, M. R. (2000). Are faculty ready for global competence? *Languages Across the Curriculum: Interdisciplinary Structures and Internationalized Education*. Columbus; National East Asian Languages.
- Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (2002). *Human Resource Management: Essential Perspectives. Second Edition*. Cincinnati: South-Western The Thompson Learning.
- McVey, T.M. (2002). *Exploring the Impact of International*

*Faculty Development Seminars on Teaching.*

Unpublished master thesis, School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont, USA.

Merkx, G. W. (2003). The Two Waves of Internationalization in U.S. Higher Education. *International Educator*, 12(1), 6-12.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (2003). Building Bridges. *International Educator*, 12(3), 6-11.

Oberst, B. S. (1999). *A Decade of Experience: Data from the Council on International Educational Exchange's International Faculty Development Seminars*. London: Journal of Studies in International Education. 73-87.

Open Doors. (2002). Report on International Educational Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education.

Osnes-Taylor, T. A. (1994). "Going Global," One educator at a time. In Easterly, J. L. (Eds.). *Promoting Global Teacher Education: Seven Reports*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators. 7-14.

Peterson, P. M. (2000). The worthy goal of worldly faculty. *AAC & U Peer Review*. Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities. 13-17.

Pettit, R. W. (2003, Summer). Waking a Sleeping Giant. *International Educator*, 12(3), 30-37.

Rodenburg, T. C. & Beynon, J. (2002, Summer). Across the Great Divide: International Development and Faculty. *International Educator*, 11(3), 24-27.

Siaya, L. & Hayward, F. M. (2003). *Mapping Internationalization of US Campuses: Final Report*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Woolf, M. (2002). Harmony and Dissonance in International Education: The limits of Globalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(1). London: Sage Publication. 5-15