

Internationalizing Teacher Education in the United States: A Teacher Educator's Journey from Conceptualization to Implementation

Erica DeCuir, Ph.D.
Albany State University

Abstract

This article offers guidance to teacher educators who seek to internationalize courses or curriculum in higher education. Through reflective practice (Bolton, 2010), I describe my process for internationalizing an undergraduate course for pre-service teachers enrolled in an early childhood education program. The research question that guided this process is: how can I integrate global content into an undergraduate course for teacher education in the United States? My journey through course revision, from conceptualization to implementation, is detailed in this article. My goal is to inspire more internationalization efforts in U.S. teacher education programs to facilitate global competency among future teachers.

Keywords: internationalization; internationalizing curriculum; teacher education; pre-service teachers; cultural diversity; culturally-responsive teaching

Internationalization of higher education curricula is gaining momentum in the United States due to rising globalization in both private and public sectors of the economy. Digital technologies allow U.S. businesses to expand beyond national borders with unprecedented speed, and they depend on a highly-skilled and globally-competent labor force to keep pace with growing demand. Similarly, public sector careers—particularly within service and defense agencies—frequently involve cross-cultural challenges that require not only some measure of global competency, but shared language acquisition as well. The university's role within this economic transition cannot be understated; colleges and universities are charged with producing skilled professionals who can maintain the country's economic development and global competitiveness (Grimmett, 2009). They must equip tomorrow's workers with adequate training to succeed in an interdependent

world or risk obsolescence in an age of digitization. Thus, internationalization initiatives have grown popular on college campuses seeking to contend with the challenges and opportunities of escalating globalization.

To many, teacher educators are likely leaders of campus-wide internationalization efforts in higher education. Internationalization requires faculty training in cultural diversity, learning styles, curriculum development, and instructional differentiation—all specialized areas within teacher education programs and departments. However, teacher educators have responded slowly to internationalization and fail to lead the charge for quality curriculum and instructional support (Reynolds, Chitiqa, Mungoshi, 2013). Most teacher educators recognize the value in preparing future teachers to address cultural and linguistic diversity in schools, but lack conceptualization of how to integrate international studies as a curricular focus in teacher education (Roberts, 2007, p. 10). Strict policy regulations, densely-packed courses, and clinical training requirements permit little flexibility for examining global paradigms within education. These internal pressures, coupled with a general tendency to focus teacher preparation on local schooling needs, prevent the field of teacher education from taking a systematic approach to internationalization.

This article offers guidance to teacher educators who wish to internationalize courses or curriculum in higher education. Through reflective practice (Bolton, 2010), I describe my process for internationalizing an undergraduate course for pre-service teachers enrolled in an early childhood education program. The research question that guided this process is: how can I integrate global content into an undergraduate course for teacher education in the United States? My journey through course revision, from conceptualization to implementation, is detailed in this article. My goal is to inspire more internationalization efforts in U.S. teacher education programs to facilitate global competency among future teachers. I begin with my conceptual framework for understanding internationalization in teacher education.

Conceptual Framework

Globalization, within the context of higher education, is defined as “economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight,

2007, p. 291). Internationalization reflects an institution's response to globalization that can be seen in its academic programs and initiatives (p. 291). The scope and substance of campus internationalization is expressed in a variety of ways (Knight, 2004; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006). West (2009) presents three case studies that illustrate the range of internationalization efforts in teacher education programs: 1) international student teaching placements, 2) international experiences through conferences, study abroad, and guest speakers, and 3) comprehensive internationalization through advisory boards, international research, and global content integration. Of the three approaches, student teaching placements offer the most intensive cross-cultural exchanges. Typically, pre-service teachers in the United States complete a semester-long or year-long student teaching placement as a capstone experience in their teacher training. Most obtain student teaching placements in local schools, but international placements can provide rich cultural experiences by facilitating both global content knowledge and language acquisition (Kulkarni & Hanley-Maxwell, 2015; Quezada & Alfaro, 2007; Stachowski, Richardson, & Henderson, 2003; Walters, Gauri, & Walters, 2009). Unfortunately, very few pre-service teachers reap these benefits. Just under 1.5 percent of all U.S. students enrolled at institutions of higher education in the United States engaged in some type of study abroad program in the 2013-2014 academic year, and an even lesser percentage of minority cultural groups did so (IIE, 2016a). Cost, fear, and regulatory limitations on student teaching prevent large-scale adoptions of international student teaching placements in teacher education.

International experiences such as conferences, guest speakers, and short-term study abroad programs support internationalization efforts only marginally. Guest speakers are widely used in teacher education programs to increase pre-service teachers' knowledge and awareness of diverse cultures. For example, Joseph & Hartwig (2015) discuss how participation in an African music workshop helped to facilitate multicultural understandings among pre-service teachers in Australia. Guest speakers taught African culture through song and music, and they modeled classroom practices like call-and-response as alternative ways of teaching. Pre-service teachers gained valuable tools to support culturally-responsiveness: content knowledge *about* Africa's cultural diversity and strategies adapted *from* African cultural styles of teaching. International conferences and other short-term study abroad experiences are also popular, but quality and participation

levels vary. Vatalaro, Senate & Levin (2015) found that quality short-term study abroad programs for pre-service teacher education can enhance global competency by developing content knowledge, cultural awareness, and self-awareness. However, the low number of participants in these programs limits the benefits of internationalization to only a few (p. 51). International experiences through short-term travel or guest speakers can result in meaningful learning experiences but are viewed as add-ons to general curriculum studies. In the end, intercultural understanding achieved through these means benefit very few pre-service teachers and thus fail to make a lasting impact on teacher education programs.

Developing an infrastructure for internationalization in teacher education programs would be the most comprehensive approach for transformative change (Koziol et. al., 2011). Comprehensive internationalization includes study abroad programs, guest speakers, and international events, but also consists of faculty development, globally-focused research projects, and internationalized curriculum. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) first laid guidelines for comprehensive international teacher education in 1989 (AACTE, 1989). They outlined seven key areas, ranging from campus curricula to partnerships with local school districts, which reflect a robust agenda for internationalizing teacher training in the United States. Since then, AACTE has published several reports on comprehensive internationalization; other organizations such as the American Council on Education (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006) and International Institute of Education (IIE, 2016b) also developed their own comprehensive models. Key to establishing an infrastructure for comprehensive internationalization is course development that results in the integration of global content with core topics of study, rather than as marginal additions to course syllabi.

My process for internationalizing an undergraduate teacher education course is informed by a comprehensive approach to internationalization. My institution regularly hosts study abroad programs and international speakers, but these initiatives are isolated from general curriculum studies where critical analysis can be achieved. I strategically revised a general teacher education course in an effort to establish an international infrastructure within the program. I drew upon Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari's (2009) targeted definition of internationalization as the "integration and infusion of an international dimension as a central part of a university's programs" (p.

5). This process includes curriculum and instructional modifications that integrate an international dimension into course content, rather than adding it to the course syllabus as an isolated topic. By integrating a global perspective into required, as opposed to extra-curricular, coursework, I use internationalization as a transformative agent for preparing pre-service teachers for a culturally-diverse, interdependent world (Mahon, 2010).

Methodology: Procedures for Internationalization

I examine my procedures for internationalization in this article using reflective practice. Reflective practice has a variety of definitions and interpretations, but Bolton (2010) offers the best general definition: it is a practice of engaging in deliberate thinking about the values and theories that inform action. Reflection is the foundation of many teacher education programs (Loughran, 2002), a way of supporting continuous learning through self-assessment. Teachers use reflective practice to study their own teaching methods and determine changes to improve curriculum and instruction (Larrivee, 2000). Similarly, teacher educators use reflective practice to support continuous improvement in course development, programs, and policies. Reflection on my procedures for internationalization can lead to continuous learning for myself and for other teacher educators who gain developmental insight based on my process through course revision.

Curricular Focus

The overall goal of my internationalization project was to facilitate global competency, but I still had to identify specific curricular aims for internationalization. I considered three things: global competency, professional standards for licensure and program accreditation, and the needs of local school districts. Globally competent pre-service teachers have cultural sensitivity and “the ability to consider diverse methods of teaching and reflect upon how those methods apply to their careers” (Vatalaro, Szente & Levin, 2015, p. 44). This description is consistent with Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) teaching standards that regulate early childhood education programs and establish best practices for teaching in culturally-diverse classrooms (InTASC, 2013). Cultural diversity is also important to school districts throughout our southwest Georgia region. Local schools have large African-American student populations, but there is

also a strong minority population of international and immigrant schoolchildren identified as English-language learners (ELLs) in schools. ELLs are those whose first language is not English and are in the process of acquiring English as a second language, primarily in K-12 schools, around the country (Ovando, Combs, & Collier, 2006). These students represent diverse racial and cultural backgrounds and often require classroom support to meet academic expectations. ELLs are discussed broadly in our educational programs, but instructional differentiation to support their academic growth is not adequately covered. Topics tend to focus on general strategies that support English language development without specific attention to cultural diversity. Given these points of consideration, I decided the curricular focus of my internationalization process should prepare pre-service teachers for understanding the nature and needs of international and immigrant schoolchildren identified as ELLs in local school districts. This curricular focus requires integrating an international dimension into core curriculum and academic content (cultural diversity, culturally-responsive teaching, and lesson planning for elementary school students). It also supports global competency in pre-service teachers by promoting cultural sensitivity towards ELLs and specific methods to support learning and achievement in elementary schools.

Course Selection

I decided to target the required course, *ECEC 4400 Social Studies/Diversity/Language Arts*, in this internationalization project. The course description reads: “A study of the social studies curriculum for toddlers, preschool, and grades K-4. An exploration of multicultural concepts of the family, neighborhood, and society” (ASU 2012-2015 Undergraduate Catalog, p.157). I selected this course because its focus is social studies education and it prepares pre-service teachers to plan lessons that teach topics in history, geography, economics, and government. Multiculturalism is already an embedded topic in the course, which made the course a good choice for fully integrating cultural diversity (and ELLs) as a curricular focus.

This course is taught each spring semester as a standard three-credit course. It is required for all pre-service teachers enrolled in the early childhood education program during their junior year of study. Course revisions to support internationalization were conceptualized and

implemented during the spring 2016 semester. The spring 2016 course enrollment consisted of twelve (12) pre-service teachers with an average age of 21 years. The course was offered on Tuesdays (one hour and 30 minutes) and Thursdays (one hour and 30 minutes) each week. I administered the course as the sole instructor of record.

Learning Objectives

The course syllabus provides a framework for designing curriculum, instruction, and assessment to attain academic learning objectives prescribed for the course. To determine course objectives, I balanced required academic content to maintain teacher licensure standards with relevant topics to promote cultural diversity within an internationalized classroom context. I identified three course objectives that reflected core academic content needed to satisfy licensure standards for teacher education. These course objectives require pre-service teachers to 1) apply learning strategies for teaching social studies, 2) incorporate national and state curriculum standards for teaching social studies, and 3) explain culture and characteristics of various groups in K-12 schools. I included three additional course objectives that explore the nature/needs of international students who are classified as ELLs in K-12 schools. These objectives infuse internationalization into the required academic content by placing emphasis on ELLs within our study of social studies teaching and learning. Internationalized learning objectives require pre-service teachers to 4) explain culture and characteristics of ELLs, 5) describe culturally-responsive teaching strategies for different cultural groups, including ELLs, and 6) apply culturally-responsive teaching strategies in a daily lesson plan that includes curriculum, instruction, and assessment for all students including ELLs. These learning objectives, and the course's overall focus on internationalization, were outlined in the course syllabus and discussed on the first day of class.

Teaching Methods

This course utilizes technology and web-based formats, a hybrid classroom model, scholarly writing, and peer teaching as instructional strategies to deliver course content. The hybrid classroom model in this instance means that some course content is delivered to students outside of the classroom using taped lectures, videos, or other pieces of technology.

Each Tuesday, a face-to-face class is offered to introduce course content through in-class activities such as cooperative learning, peer teaching, or modeling. Modeling is process method of teaching where effort is placed on the process rather than the product (Harris, 1983). On Thursdays, there is no face-to-face class; pre-service teachers read course texts and engage in online discussions via the internet to deepen their knowledge and understanding of course content. They also complete a learning task using assigned instructional resources (video lectures, primary sources articles, readings, and web resources). Pre-service teachers demonstrate knowledge of theory, research, and practice through scholarly writing. They complete four short essays that include relevant citations of both seminal and current works in research literature. Writing assignments are designed to emphasize critical analysis and research-based instructional practice. Finally, pre-service teachers engage in peer teaching to demonstrate their application of course content. These teaching methods were used to organize curriculum and instruction prior to the internationalization process, but they were modified to integrate cultural diversity and ELLs as a core curricular focus.

Curriculum and Instruction

The first internationalized course objective required pre-service teachers to explain the term *culture*. I began my instruction with a brief lecture on the nature of culture as defined by pioneering sociologists (Boas, 1911; Hurston, 1928) as well as contemporary scholars in the fields of education and psychology (Hofstede, 2001; Sleeter, 2001). I then introduced a video recording of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's "The Danger of a Single Story" found in a *TED Talk* series presentation via the internet (Adichie, 2009). Adichie's *TED Talk* encourages Western audiences to beware of a single story, or narrow view, of international cultures observed through media and television. We engaged in a class discussion on the nature of culture and isolated popular stereotypes of various cultural groups, both within and outside the United States. I provided pre-service teachers a distinction between a cultural identifier and a stereotype: cultural indicators generalize the behaviors and values of most members of a group, whereas stereotypes are based on assumptions made from observing only a few members of a group. I then challenged pre-service teachers to identify the diversity within their own cultural backgrounds. Only by exploring the complexity of their own cultural identities could they begin to see other

cultural groups beyond the single story. They received long, rectangular strips of multicolored paper, a square piece of paper, and a small circular piece of paper. They assembled their pieces of paper into a peacock design (the circular shape is the head, the square shape is the body, and the strips are the peacock's feathers). They were instructed to identify aspects of their culture on each strip of multicolored paper, which became "feathers" in the peacock design. After peacocks were assembled, pre-service teachers worked in pairs to share their cultural backgrounds with each other. They explained how their own cultural background included language, religion, values, holidays, and goals—characteristics based on socialization, rather than biology.

With their deeper understanding of culture, pre-service teachers then worked together as a whole group to craft their own definition of culture, one that would serve as a conceptual framework to guide further instruction. The class settled on a definition similar to one espoused by Ebert & Culyer (2008), in that culture "represents the attitudes, values, and beliefs that influence the behavior and traditions of a people... These are social, not biological, dimensions" (p. 59). I ended our study on the nature of culture by providing pictures of different students representing various cultural groups in schools within the United States. I asked pre-service teachers to identify students' cultural background. After a few guesses from the class, observant pre-service teachers then remarked that they could not complete the task; they could not identify a student's cultural background based on physical features alone. They had gained a deeper conceptual understanding of culture that was not wholly defined by race. I concluded that an elementary school student whose race is Black may culturally identify as African-American, Ghanaian, or Jamaican. Similarly, a student whose race is Asian may culturally identify as American, Chinese, or Chinese-American. The teacher cannot choose a student's cultural identity. The student must self-identify her own cultural heritage, just as pre-service teachers did in the earlier peacock activity. Teachers must resist relegating students into purely racial categories, because this practice ignores cultural assets that can be used to understand and support students' cognitive and social development in schools. Defining culture is an essential course objective for understanding and appreciating the richness of international cultures and an essential premise of culturally-responsive teaching in schools.

The second internationalized course objective required pre-service teachers to describe culturally-responsive teaching practices used to support various cultural groups, particularly international and immigrant students who are classified as ELLs, in schools. To build content knowledge in culturally-responsive teaching, I delivered a short lecture on its history, beginning with multicultural education in the 1970s, followed by culturally-relevant pedagogy in the 1990s, and finally culturally-responsive teaching in contemporary research literature. Pre-service teachers read articles in culturally responsive teaching theory (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995), research (McIntyre & Hulan, 2013; Ware, 2006), and practice (Sleeter & Cornbreth, 2011), before examining popular cultural groups in local schools, particularly ELLs. They were then divided into three small groups and tasked to identify characteristics of various cultural groups—not physical characteristics, but cultural assets. The purpose of this instructional activity was to identify positive behaviors, values, ideas, customs, and expectations of various cultural groups. Pre-service teachers listed cultural assets on large display boards. I instructed them to search scholarly databases to find research literature supporting the cultural assets they identified in their small groups. After research, some cultural assets were added or removed from the display board. For example, African-American cultural assets included musical expression, storytelling, and cooperative learning. Cultural assets among ELLs included bilingualism, visual literacy, and global perspectives. After identifying some of the cultural assets of various student groups, I questioned the success of traditional teaching methods used in elementary classrooms. I asked pre-service teachers to debate the efficacy of long lectures, individualized worksheets, and silent reading for various cultural groups. They quickly surmised that traditional methods were not the most effective pedagogical approach when teaching various cultural groups because they did not adequately address students' cultural needs. I further explained that culturally responsive teaching includes instructional practices that *respond to* (or build upon) students' cultural assets, thereby strengthening the link between teaching and learning. A teacher can read an entire textbook to students as a method of teaching academic content, but it does not mean that students are learning. Learning occurs when instruction connects academic content to students' lived experiences (cultural, linguistic, and social). Instruction for ELLs, for example, should build upon these students' strengths in visual literacy by engaging them with videos, pictures,

and role play. After delivering this content knowledge, I demonstrated key instructional strategies—cooperative learning, simulations, and visual vocabulary—through modeling. In this context, I modeled (or demonstrated) instructional activities for elementary classrooms, and pre-service teachers participated in role play as elementary students. After teaching demonstrations, pre-service teachers reflected on the instructional activities through think-alouds and journaling. They then worked together in small groups to create a list of instructional supports targeting various cultural groups, including ELLs.

Finally, the last internationalized course objective required pre-service teachers to apply their knowledge of culturally-responsive teaching practices in a daily lesson plan. I began instruction by requiring pre-service teachers to identify and describe some of the cultural assets of students they observed in their field experiences in local schools. They received guided notes for discussing culture with elementary school students and prompting students to share their cultural heritage. This activity was necessary for pre-service teachers to identify the specific cultural factors within their educational environments that would be used to inform instructional decision-making in the lesson plan. To facilitate curriculum development, I arranged pre-service teachers into small groups and provided them the state's social studies curriculum standards. They were asked to select a curriculum standard to target in their lesson plan. Working together in small groups, pre-service teachers created T-charts that reflected two lists: one list indicated all their content knowledge, or knowledge about the core concept featured in the curriculum standard; and the other list indicated their pedagogical content knowledge, or basic concepts, terms, and enduring understandings elementary school students needed to learn in order to meet academic expectations of the curriculum standard. The distinction is significant; this activity prepares pre-service teachers to transfer their content knowledge (i.e., knowledge of history and economics) into pedagogical content knowledge, or knowledge of subject matter for *teaching*. After pre-service teachers identified pedagogical content knowledge necessary for teaching their selected curriculum standard, they were tasked to find curriculum resources such as library, media, and text materials to accompany the lesson plan. I directed pre-service teachers to find curriculum resources that reflected the cultural diversity of the students they observed in field experiences at local schools, particularly ELLs. Pre-service teachers were

required to show differentiation—either through curriculum or instruction—to support ELLs. Examples include the use of visual strategies to teach vocabulary, heterogeneous groups to support read aloud and think-alouds, and global perspectives through reading materials.

Assessment

Pre-service teachers' learning outcomes were informally assessed through participation in class demonstrations, scholarly writings, and online discussion forums. The daily lesson plan was used as the key assessment for the course. The lesson plan reflected pre-service teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of elementary social studies, but it also reflected levels of cultural sensitivity and capacity to provide instructional support to cultural groups and specifically ELLs. The rubric used to assess pre-service teachers' knowledge contained five indicators: content accuracy, pedagogical content knowledge, interactive component, writing quality and mechanics, and components of the lesson plan (See Table 1.).

Findings

My rationale for internationalization through course revision was to facilitate global competency among pre-service teachers enrolled in an early childhood education program. The specific curricular focus (and final international outcome) required pre-service teachers to demonstrate knowledge on the nature and needs of international and immigrant schoolchildren identified as ELLs in local school districts. The lesson plan was used as the key assessment in the course. The lesson plan was assessed using a Likert scale rubric consisting of five indicators. These indicators were also aligned to professional standards for teaching required by licensure and accreditation agencies and the College of Education (See Table 1.). I assessed summative scores on the overall rubric and the pedagogical knowledge indicator to determine whether pre-service teachers satisfied course expectations. Of the twelve pre-service teachers enrolled in the course, 42% earned a target rating in every indicator. The average score was 9 out of a possible 10 points, which equals a 90% summative score for the entire class. In the category of pedagogical knowledge, 67% earned a target rating and 33% earned an acceptable rating. The average score was 1.6 out of a possible 2 points, which equals an 80% summative score in the pedagogical knowledge category. This data shows that at least 80% of pre-

service teachers successfully demonstrated both their knowledge of social studies teaching and learning and strategies that offer instructional support to ELLs.

Despite these positive findings, I did encounter some challenges to internationalizing the course. First, it was difficult to find course readings that retold the stories of immigrant and international students enrolled in K-12 schools throughout the United States. Journal articles offered valuable research and theory on the nature of ELLs, but personal narratives that evoke empathy and cultural understanding were difficult to find. Second, instructional time devoted to internationalized learning objectives resulted in decreased instructional time to examine other topics in social studies education, such as the influence of high stakes testing or technological integration. These topics had been studied prior to internationalization, but were eliminated or briefly mentioned during course revision.

Table 1

Rubric for Lesson Plan

Category / Professional Standards	Unacceptable – 0	Acceptable - 1	Target – 2
Content Accuracy CF 1a NCSS IV InTASC 4k, 4h	Information is generally accurate but lacks sufficient content knowledge. Candidate fails to show evidence of curriculum development and/or proper instructional planning.	Most information is accurate and clearly stated. Candidate shows limited content knowledge. Lesson lacks depth and indicates basic curriculum development.	All information is accurate and clearly stated. Candidate demonstrates accurate content knowledge and evidence of substantial curriculum development.
Pedagogical Content Knowledge CF 2a;2b NCSS III InTASC 5k	Fewer than three instructional strategies are described; Strategies do not address culturally diverse or special needs learners; No attention to developmental	A wide variety of instructional strategies are described and aligned to specific learning outcomes; Strategies address culturally diverse or special needs learners;	A wide variety of instructional strategies are described and aligned to specific learning outcomes with defined standards for mastery; Strategies address culturally diverse or special needs learners;

	appropriateness and/or differentiation.	Developmentally appropriate and some attention to differentiation.	Developmentally appropriate with strategies for differentiation.
Interactive Component CF 3b	Little or no use of technology or active learning to facilitate student engagement. Lesson does not demonstrate student learning.	Some use of technology or active learning to facilitate student engagement. Lesson somewhat demonstrates student-centered learning.	Use of technology and/or active learning to make lesson interactive and facilitate student learning.
		Lesson somewhat demonstrates student-centered learning.	
Writing Quality and Mechanics	Language choices are limited and include slang and improper grammar. Language does not reflect vocabulary or concepts integral to social studies teaching.	Language used is mostly appropriate but word choices/ideas only somewhat reflect vocabulary and concepts integral to social studies teaching.	Lesson plan reflects quality writing and mechanics. Language is appropriate and word choices/ideas reflect vocabulary and concepts integral to social studies teaching.
Components of Lesson Plan	Included 2 of the 7 components	Included 3 – 5 of the 7 components	Included 7 of the 7 components
Total Points			/10

Note. The College of Education Conceptual Framework (CF) includes guiding principles for program development in the College of Education; The National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) set national standards for social studies teachers; and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards outline principles and practices for teacher education programs and inform accreditation processes at national and state level.

Finally, the course's hybrid format proved challenging during the internationalization process. Pre-service teachers were responsible for completing course readings and posting to online discussion forums during the Thursday (hybrid) days. Most foundational knowledge of cultural diversity, achieved through reading and responding to theory and research, were taught during these online class sessions, but pre-service teachers seemed less engaged in posting online responses. Some pre-service teachers only posted basic or superficial responses to theory and research readings, and it was difficult to stimulate deeper analysis through use of probing questions. To overcome these challenges in the future, I plan to collaborate with international faculty members on campus to find quality books and

articles that share personal experiences of immigrants and international students in the United States. I also plan to allow pre-service teachers to lead online discussions and require a word count for online responses. Overall, my internationalization project was successful in promoting global competency among pre-service teachers, and challenges to curriculum and instruction and be remedied.

Conclusion

To internationalize courses or curricula in teacher education, teacher educators must balance the needs of local school districts and professional agencies with the desire to incorporate an international dimension that facilitates global competency. This would ensure commitment to internationalization that moves beyond the margins and into general curriculum studies. Through my process of internationalizing coursework, I found an international dimension that served both elements. I strategically revised course content to incorporate three international learning outcomes that would address cultural diversity, culturally-responsive teaching practices, and lesson planning. These topics are already supported by local schools and professional agencies, and an international component that broadens cultural diversity to include ELLs is a natural extension within teacher education. Successful campus internationalization efforts depend mainly on faculty's commitment to incorporating an international approach or dimension into their courses (Alkarzon, 2016). Therefore, teacher educators must make stronger commitments to internationalizing their courses or curriculum. Internationalization through course revision and/or development prepares future teachers to develop a generation of global citizens to lead our nation into the 21st century. If future teachers lack proper role models for facilitating global citizenship in teaching and learning, then they will be unprepared to do so themselves.

References

- Adichie, C. (2009). The danger of a single story. [TED Talk web video]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9Ihs241zeg>.
- Albany State University. (2016). *ASU 2012-2015 Undergraduate Catalog*. Retrieved from <https://www.asurams.edu/academic-catalog-0/>.

- Alkarzon, A. (2016). The influence of faculty exchange programs on faculty members' professional development. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 30, 1-16.
- Altbach, P.G. & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AATCE). (1989). *Guidelines for International Teacher Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Boas, F. (1911). *The mind of primitive man*. New York: MacMillan.
- Bolton, G. (2010). *Reflective practice: writing and professional development* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Ebert, E. & Culyer, R. (2008). *School: An introduction to education* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grimmett, P. (2009). International teacher education: Liberal cosmopolitanism revisited or postmodern trans-nationalism. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36(4), 7-29.
- Harris, M. (1983). Modeling: A process method of teaching. *College English*, 45(1), 74-84.
- Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's consequences. Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Hurston, Z. (1928). How it feels to be colored me. Retrieved from <http://www.ycps.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/How-it-Feels-to-be-Colored-Me-by-Zora-Neale-Hurston.pdf>.
- International Institute of Education (IIE). (2016a). *2015 Open Doors Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors#.V3642PkrLIU>.
- International Institute of Education (IIE). (2016b). *IIE Network handbook for international educators: Resources for networking and internationalizing your campus*. New York: Author.
- Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). (2013). *InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0*. Washington D.C.: Author.

- Joseph, D. & Hartwig, K. (2015). Promoting African music and enhancing intercultural understanding in teacher education. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 12(2), 1-13.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches and rationale. *Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Koziol, S., Greenberg, J., Williams, L., Niehaus, E. & Jacobson, C. (July, 2011). *Internationalizing teacher education: A systemic initiative*. Glasgow, Scotland: International Conference on Education for Teaching.
- Kulkarni, S. & Hanley-Maxwell, C. (2015). Preservice teachers' student teaching experiences in east Africa. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 42(4), 59-80.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Larrivee, B. (2000). Transforming teaching practice: becoming the critically reflective teacher. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 1(3), 293-307.
- Loughran, J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 33-43.
- Mahon, J. (2010). Fact or fiction? Analyzing institutional barriers and individual responsibility to advance the internationalization of teacher education. *Teaching Education*, (21)1, 7-18.
- McIntyre, E., & Hulan, N. (2013). Research-based, culturally responsive reading practice in elementary classrooms: A yearlong study. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 52,2851.
- Olson, C., Green, M., and Hill, B. (2006). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education (ACE).
- Ovando, C., Combs, M., & Collier, V. (2006). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Quezada, R. L., & Alfaro, C. (2007). Biliteracy teachers' self-reflections of their accounts while student teaching abroad: Speaking from "the other side." *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 95-113.
- Reynolds, T., Chitiga, M., & Mungoshi, D. (2013). A consortium model for internationalizing teacher education. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(3), 62-72.

- Roberts, A. (2007). Global dimensions of schooling: Implications for internationalizing teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 9-26.
- Sleeter, C. (2001). *Culture, difference, & power*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sleeter, C. & Cornbreth, C. (2011). *Teaching with vision: Culturally responsive teaching in standards-based classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stachowski, L., Richardson, W. J., and Henderson, M. (2003). Student teachers report on the influence of cultural values on classroom practices and community involvement: Perspectives from the Navajo reservation and from abroad. *The Teacher Educator*, 39(1), 52-63.
- Vatalaro, A. Szente, J. & Levin, J. (2015). Transformative learning of pre-service teachers during study abroad in Reggio Emilia, Italy: A case study. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15(2), 42 - 55.
- Walters, L. Garii, B., & Walters, T. (2009). Learning globally, teaching locally: incorporating international exchange and intercultural learning into pre-service teacher training. *Intercultural Education* 20(1), 151-158.
- Ware, F. (2006). Warm demander pedagogy: Culturally responsive teaching that supports a culture of achievement for African American students. *Urban Education*, 41(4), 427–456.
- West, C. (2009). *Internationalization of Teacher Education: Three Case Studies*. Retrieved from https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/InterTeacherEducation3CaseStudies.pdf.
- Zolfaghari, A., Sabran, M. S., & Zolfaghari, A. (2009). Internationalization of higher education: Challenges, strategies, policies and programs. *U.S. - China Education Review*, 6(5), 1-9.

About the Author

Dr. Erica DeCuir is assistant professor of Teacher Education in the College of Education at Albany State University. Her research centers on curriculum and instruction, educational history, and educational policy. She is also the Director of the Summer Learning Academy, a STEM-based summer enrichment program that

serves as a teaching laboratory for education majors. Dr. DeCuir obtained her doctorate in Teaching and Learning from Georgia State University, a master of teaching degree from Teachers College, Columbia University, and a bachelor of arts degree in History from Washington University in St. Louis.