

Internationalizing Courses: A Faculty Development Process

Nneka Nora Osakwe, PhD.
Albany State University

Abstract

A core strategy for campus internationalization lies with well-trained faculty who can embody international and intercultural learning into their courses. Because over 90% of US students do not study abroad, the urgency to internationalize courses is even greater now than ever. Few research publications focus on course internationalization process and practical pedagogy for achieving success for students' international and intercultural learning, especially in minority serving institutions. This article describes the process and outcome of a course-internationalization project at Albany State University, Georgia. The purpose of the project was to develop the skills, knowledge and professional competencies of faculty to impact students' international and intercultural perspectives. The professional development process involves a five-phase model that culminates in the publication of outcomes by faculty members who implemented the course internationalization project funded by Title III. The process, outcomes, and challenges discussed in this article will guide other institutions who plan to engage in similar projects.

Keywords: internationalizing courses, Internationalization process, faculty professional development, curricula internationalization, internationalization outcomes, international education

The discourse of campus internationalization, an in-house phrase in the field of international education, has a growing literature on concepts and best practices in various continents. International education associations, institutions, and scholars in the field define and set criteria for excellence especially for institutions of higher education. Understanding the various definitions and perspectives of curriculum internationalization is important in attaining set goals on curriculum internationalization projects. Jane Knight, a forefront specialist in the area, established an early definition of internationalization, which guided many scholars in international education.

Her most current revision defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). The Association of International Educator (NAFSA) sees it as: “the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education.” It explains that for the process to be fully successful, it must involve active engagement of the academic community in global networks and partnerships (2008). Other scholars like Hans de Wit, as part of an European Parliament study, defines curriculum internationalization as an “intentional process of integrating international, intercultural or global dimensions into the purpose, functions, and delivery of post-secondary education to enhance quality of education and research for all students and staff...” (2015). Some earlier advocates of international education hold stronger view about internationalization.

Josef Mestenhauser, a distinguished international Emeritus Professor at the University of Minnesota, has contributed six decades of pioneering research and practice in international education suggests a holistic definition and offers that “internationalization of higher education is a program of major educational reform designed to ensure that higher education produces globally thinking and knowing students able to work anywhere on a short notice without prior preparation.” Mestenhauser’s internationalization perspective includes the actual knowledge gained- student learning outcome. He suggests a transformational approach that does not segment international education from the main curriculum and in his words, internationalization should “serve to explain when, why, and how people in various culture do and think differently from the way we do” (Mestenhauser, 2015, p. 4).

Rationale for Internationalization

Despite the varied definitions of internationalization, a growing number of scholars agree that international education is a critical component that should make up the curriculum in higher education. The rationale abounds in numerous literature reiterating the positive impact of curriculum internationalization on not just the student, learning institution, but local communities, states, the nation, and international communities. Early studies by American Council on Education (ACE 1997, 1998, 2000) on International Education Exchange, and by many scholars including Lambert 1989; Siaya

& Hayward (2001); Childress (2006) and Mestenhauser (2002, 2011, & 2015) all affirm the need for students in American institutions of higher learning to graduate with knowledge of the world and be accepting of cultural heterogeneity and diversity as a way of life in an interconnected world. However, research studies by American Council on Education (ACE) found that most students in American institutions lack global awareness, second language fluency, and international knowledge of their major disciplines. This lack of awareness might constitute problems for students eventually about relating and succeeding across borders. The situation validates the need for the call on campus internationalization, especially taking strategic steps to increase students' global learning outcomes.

Scholars also agree that curriculum internationalization should count in the measures for assessing educational excellence. The NAFSA's nine-point criteria for excellence in Senator Simon's Award for comprehensive internationalization of higher institutions and the Institute of International Education (IIE) eight-point criteria for The Heiskell Award establish broad guidelines for accessing institutional excellence. However, what is not clear is the guidelines for a teacher who wants to internationalize his or her instruction. How would such an instructor access the nature of course internationalization in higher education and the implementation effectiveness, especially in actualizing students' global learning outcomes? The difficulty arises from set traditions and inflexible structure of educational systems. But even more challenging is the internationalization pedagogy and implementation procedure in various disciplines. The literature and research points to policies, theories, and criteria for achieving excellence in internationalization at mostly broad institutional level, and they are all like sign posts that do not actually lead people to their destinations. They simply point to the venues. The field of international education need more practical guidelines for instructional implementation of course internationalization and scholarly publications on faculty's course internationalization experiences in varied environments: classroom, online, and abroad as well as illustrations of the learning outcome. There is need for more reports and evidences of success or lack of it and what more needs to be done to actualize the goal. The project reported here is intended to bridge this gap.

Many institutions of higher education have adopted different strategies to internationalize their campuses, mainly through education abroad; internationalizing the curriculum across schools, divisions, departments, and disciplines; internationalizing co-curricular programs, research and faculty exchange; supporting of international faculty, scholars and students and creating opportunity for global learning arising from proper integration. In addition, there have been administrative changes to acknowledge the rising importance of international education. Most often cited is the consolidation of offices focused on international education, appointment of assistant or associate Provosts to oversee those offices, and in some cases a name change of these endeavors: for example, from “Office of” to “Center for” International or Global Education.

At the core of the strategies is professional development of faculty members to effectively internationalize their courses. Course instruction reaches all students enrolled in an academic institution. Green (2012) explains that internationalizing course instruction on campuses directly impacts more students, since only estimated 10% of U.S. students travel to study abroad. This seemingly low national average is even high considering that in some states like Georgia only 2% study abroad (USG-OIE Report, 2016). In Historical Black Colleges and Universities, like Albany State University, Georgia the percentage is even lower because many students cannot afford the extra funds required to engage in study abroad programs (Osakwe and Albritten, 2015).

Rationale for Faculty Professional Development on Internationalization

Having an understanding and a clear perspective of internationalization is expected from all faculty members in higher education because undergraduate and postgraduate students are expected to acquire international and intercultural learning on graduation. Twenty-first century graduates need to have a diverse and knowledgeable world view. They need to understand not just the international dimensions of their field of study but to possess an interdisciplinary global knowledge of the cultural and political differences that impact policies. It is critical too that they can communicate in another language even at the least level of proficiency, recognizing that while English is the dominant language, they will enhance their future and gain insight into other people of the world by studying their languages and

culture. However, as Crosling et. al., (2008) observe, there has been much emphasis on the attributes for graduates to acquire global skills and operate internationally with limited guidance on how to implement curriculum internationalization (Edwards et al. (2003), so students actually acquire these skills. It is often assumed that faculty has the knowledge and pedagogy required for internationalization of curriculum, and that implementing process comes natural with all faculty members in higher education. But the truth is that most faculty members are not knowledgeable about culture (Menstenhauser, 2011), and global issues they are meant to integrate in their courses to impact students' learning. The explanation for this inadequacy could be either due to lack of exposure to global knowledge or having themselves gone through an education system that is deficient in impacting the competencies under discussion. Embarrassing as it may seem, obviously, faculty members cannot impact what they lack unless an intentional effort is made through professional development. For this reason, it becomes worrisome that very little attention is given to professional development and scholarship related to course internationalization pedagogy and student learning outcomes; many discussions about internationalization has progressed without much discussion about how teachers implement the process in their courses and the level of success so far. Quite a few literatures exist on what instructors know about internationalization and their implementation procedure. Related to this discourse, Sanderson reiterates the importance of internationalization of the "Academic Self." In his words "Being accepting of cultural difference and knowing something of other cultures have a pivotal place in internationalization at the level of the individual teacher," (2008, p.282).

There is no doubt that internationalization of the personal and professional self is a precursor to successful course internationalization by faculty members to positively change students' global perspectives. Much as institutions of higher learning expect a faculty member's self-responsibility in the global development of self, it is critical that they intentionally plan professional development that help faculty members in the process of curriculum and course internationalization, including assessing set objectives to ensure attainment of students' international and intercultural learning. This process involves a shift in paradigm, from theory to practice. A key question that drives professional development of faculty to internationalize their

courses is: How can teachers/professors internationalize their courses with successful student global learning outcomes? This question was the foregrounding of the proposal I submitted to Title III for the Faculty Professional Development Project on Internationalizing Existing Courses at Albany State University (ASU) in Georgia. The remainder of this paper provides a background to the project, discusses the project goal, objectives and a five-phase process model of professional development, which I developed for implementing the program. I also discuss the success and challenges we experienced and lessons learned for future actions.

The Background to the Project

The Faculty professional development project I report here is one of several efforts on internationalizing the curriculum at Albany State University (ASU), Georgia. When I joined the university in 2004, there had been several projects in the area and Dr. James Hill's article in this special issue provides a comprehensive overview of these projects. Out of these, the first that I was a part of when I assumed duty at ASU was initiated by Dr. Claude Perkins, former Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate School, through a Title III funded faculty development project that lasted for three years (2003 to 2006). Dr. David Adewuyi, the project director, reports that forty-two (42) faculty members participated in the project. The faculty participants were selected across ASU four (4) colleges and ten (10) departments, and they produced 58 internationalized syllabi used in teaching courses that impacted 650 students (2007). As a faculty participant in this project, I revised my existing composition course, Rhetoric and Advanced Writing (ENGL 3204) to integrate intercultural and international perspectives into the course (Osakwe, 2007) and developed a new course, English as a Global Language (ENGL 4990). I shared my implementation of the revised course in one of the outcome presentation sessions and eventually became one of the train-the-trainers and a writing consultant for documenting the project's overall outcome (Osakwe, Fields, Courtoy, and Singh 2007). I also participated in a U.S. Department of Education Project directed by Dr. James Hill. The project involved faculty across the disciplines in developing new courses and revising existing ones to develop a program of study for a B.A. degree in International Studies at ASU. As a participant in this project and a faculty member in the Department

of English, Modern Languages, and Mass Communication, I also developed a new course, Intercultural Communication, for a 300 level English course that would be one of the courses for the B.A program in International Studies. Unfortunately, there has been a long delay in approving the program at the University System level, so the International Studies Program has not taken off and most of the newly developed courses are not being taught. One of the major outcomes of Dr. Perkins, Dr. Hill's, and other similar internationalization projects at ASU is that they created awareness about curriculum internationalization and provided faculty members, like me, the opportunity to read, research and engage on the discourse and practice of curriculum internationalization, which no doubt impacts the students' international learning outcome.

After my Fulbright Hay's Fellowship in Singapore and Malaysia, I was even more invigorated to expand my content and pedagogical skills to incorporate Singapore and Malaysia's historical, cultural, political, social, and health issues into the composition courses I taught. This international and cultural course infusion process was required of all Fulbright fellows. From the final research papers submitted by my students, there is no doubt that they benefited immensely from listening to my stories, viewing all my pictures, video clips, and researching further about the two countries as part of their composition process. They were strongly motivated to learn to write by the international and intercultural perspectives introduced into the composition course. For me, the course integration process was rigorous, but I learned to rethink everything I was used to, expand, and diversify my content and instructional style. My composition instruction process became more learner-centered as I assigned students projects that forced them to explore, research, and add more to the information they have already received to develop their various topics and research papers. Writing and reporting my Fulbright outcome in a presentation at Clayton State University after a semester course-implementation helped to shape my internationalization perspectives and the framework for this project.

When I became the director of Global Programs in 2010, one of my main goals was to inspire other faculty members across disciplines to internationalize their courses. So, my major strategic plan was to continue the faculty internationalization project, with a focus on all existing ASU courses. However, due to administrative changes, shift in administrative

priorities, and lack of funding for international education programs, this plan did not materialize until 2015. It was then that my proposal for Title III funding was approved because of a refocus on international education at the heels of Dr. Arthur Dunning's arrival as the president of Albany State University. At his maiden presentation to his executive board, held at Albany Technical College on February 5, 2014 he reiterated the importance of international education, particularly study abroad and the need to develop strategies ensuring that many more students study abroad, and that they imbibe and appreciate other cultures. He reaffirmed the importance of international education by using himself as having lived in various continents, to exemplify its benefits. He reaffirmed the importance of international education in the city local newspaper, *The Albany Herald*, April 9, 2016. He reiterated the importance of the *local reaching out globally* by citing ASU's "established relationships with international partner universities in China, Ghana, Nigeria, Belize, and Trinidad and Tobago, and said, "We're not alone, and not unique, in realizing the importance of thinking globally." Dr. Dunning's positive remarks are indication of his support for international education, which reflects the administration's priority to internationalize the campus, ensured by Title III support for this project for the 2015-2016 academic year. It exemplifies the important role of institutional administrators in advancing campus internationalization.

In fall of 2015, I worked with the former Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dr. Abiodun Ojemakinde to develop a framework, which included forming the Comprehensive Internationalization Committee, which I co-chair with Dr. James Hill. The committee was charged to develop a strategic framework for implementation of a Comprehensive Internationalization Strategic Plan for ASU. The committee also embodies five sub-committees charged to develop initiatives and activities through: (a) Education Abroad, (b) Faculty Professional Development, (c) Curriculum and course instruction, (d) Campus Programs and Facilities, (e) International Students Enrollment and Engagement and International Collaboration. (Appendix A–Comprehensive Internationalization Strategic Framework Plan). The sub-committee on curriculum internationalization helped to develop a rubric for internationalizing existing courses and revising the ASU Syllabus Template to guide internationalized learning outcomes. It was necessary that preliminary focus be on the syllabus, which is an instructional

guideline that provides the objectives and expected learning outcomes of a course including the subjects to cover, method, and guideline for the course instruction and the assessment procedure. The syllabus is often a key to effective educational planning, course instruction and assessment. Syllabus revision was the first requirement in internationalizing any course in this project. As faculty members implemented their revised courses in a semester teaching, they were expected to do so with flexibility, reflecting learners' needs, interests, and environment.

Internationalization of Existing Courses: Project Goal

The project goal was to develop the faculty's knowledge and implementation in the process of internationalizing courses they are already teaching so that students will learn global citizenship competencies as they graduate from ASU. The focus was on approved existing courses to ensure that internationalized course syllabi are implemented so that students benefit from the project. From past experiences, some of the newly developed internationalized courses were never taught due to delays in curriculum approval. The course-internationalization in this project stresses transformation of content, objectives/learning outcomes, activities/tasks, pedagogy, and assessment to embody international and intercultural perspectives. In sharing implementation outcomes, faculty participants are required to follow guidelines that compel them to show how they implemented this process and the learning outcome and challenges observed. As Leask (2014) rightly observes there is need to move beyond theory and approaches of what students will experience to actual instruction, learning, and assessment. The faculty program emphasized the process of implementing internationalization to ensure that students' global learning is impacted.

The following Objectives guided the faculty development project:

1. Increase faculty awareness and knowledge about internationalization, historical perspectives, and philosophical framework/rationales for internationalizing the curriculum/courses.
2. Engage faculty in critical review of curriculum internationalization resources-research, pedagogy, including development of internationalized objectives, learning outcomes, activities, tasks, projects, and assessment tools.

3. Increase faculty awareness and sensitivity about knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the mind to target and embody in selecting content and determining instructional style for internationalizing courses.
4. Review and practice pedagogical processes of internationalized instruction.
5. Engage faculty in sharing internationalization outcome via presentation, reporting and publishing of course-internationalization outcomes for ripple effects.

Methodology: Faculty Development Process

The Professional Development Process was implemented through the following Five-Phase Model. The remainder of this paper will focus on this process.

Phase 1: Project Planning and Pre-workshop Process

Phase 2: Faculty Intensive Workshop

Phase 3: Faculty Instructional Implementation of a Semester
Course(s) Revision

Phase 4: Implementation Results through the Faculty Symposium

Phase 5: Publicizing Outcomes through Journal Article Publication
(Optional)

Phase 1: Project Planning and Pre-Workshop Process

Phase 1 is a two-month planning and pre-workshop phase. It was used for liaising with management, researching, reading, modifying syllabus template, and working with the internationalization committee. Effective planning is critical in implementing curriculum internationalization. Planning helps to develop strategic process, resources, to achieve project goal and objectives. The Office of Global Programs worked in collaboration with Academic Affairs, Curriculum sub-committee of the ASU Comprehensive Internationalization Committee to develop the criteria and outline for course internationalization. This included modifying the university's existing syllabus template to include international and intercultural learning objectives, contents, activities/projects, and learning outcomes. The added modifications to the syllabus were also used as check-list for selecting submitted proposals from faculty. The call for proposal invited submission from faculty members in all four colleges to

internationalize the existing courses they are already teaching. The invitation provided guideline for proposal submission, available incentives for participating in project, and required faculty members to read basic concept articles on curriculum internationalization which accompanied the call for proposal. The incentives for participation in the project included a small stipend if they completed phases 1 through 4 of the project and publication opportunities at the end of the project. The rationale imitates from organizational learning and human behavior scholars who observe that people generally participate in activities for which they are rewarded (Armstrong & Brown, 2006; Benabou & Trirole, 2003; Brown, 2001).

Publicizing Outcomes through Journal Article Publication (Phase 5), is an optional phase included to provide incentives for participation from faculty interested in scholarship. There is no doubt, though, that most faculty members were intrinsically motivated to participate in the project as advertised stipends were quite minimal. Fourteen (14) Faculty members were selected for the project from College of Education, College of Arts and Humanities, College of Business and College of Science and Health Professions. Those selected received preparatory extra reading resources and articles to familiarize themselves with the basic concepts of curriculum/course-internationalization and process before the workshop. Faculty members had an option to internationalize one or two courses starting with revising their courses using the provided syllabus template. Some faculty members submitted two revised syllabi in their application. In all twenty (20) revised course-syllabi were submitted, reviewed and approved for the project (see Appendix A. Those who submitted approved syllabi were invited to attend an intensive one-day workshop on Curriculum Internationalization with a focus on integrating global content in courses, designing instructional activities and projects, transforming instructional process and assessment to impact students' global learning outcomes.

Phase 2: Faculty Intensive Workshop

The workshop involved fourteen (14) faculty members from four colleges (Arts and humanities, Science and Health Professions, College of Education, and College of Business) and seven departments (Teacher Education; English, Modern Languages, and Mass communication; Math and Computer Science; Natural and Forensic Sciences; History, and Political

Sciences; and Health Management). The workshop program covered basic concepts and historical perspectives on curriculum internationalization reflecting stages of development in the United States and implementation in various institutions including Albany State University. It also had sessions on infusing international and intercultural perspectives in instruction, Learning outcomes and assessment in internationalization. Participants had a hands-on workshop session in groups to practice selecting international and international topics and developing objectives with aligned instructional activities/projects and assessment tools. They shared group work in presentations, accompanied by a critique and feedback session. At the end of the training, all the participants received workshop materials and extra reading resources to support their implementation process, the next phase.

The workshop consultants were three: Dr. Michael Smithee, a specialist in international educational exchange and training as well as the editor of *International Research Review (IRR) Journal*. He researched and provided national and international resources on curriculum internationalization and practices in the United States and beyond, discussed basic concepts, shared models of course internationalization successes in various institutions and presented acclaimed strategies for infusing international perspectives in courses. Dr. James Hill, The Chair of English Department at ASU and the project director of various funded curriculum internationalization projects at ASU, provided historical perspectives of curriculum internationalization at ASU. The details of his presentation are provided in this special issue journal.

Dr. Osakwe, the project director for course internationalization, focused on internationalization concepts: definition, rationale, characteristics and pedagogy, covering the process of course internationalization- planning, the syllabus and syllabus check-list for course internationalization (Osakwe, 2014), Identifying and discussing international learning objectives, and assessment aligned with objectives and learning outcomes. The session ended with a group activity for hands-on practice on developing international and intercultural content, objectives, learner-centered activities/tasks/projects with aligning assessment measures. Groups presented and dialogued over their workshop production. At the end participants had several research articles, and resources for continued professional development of the academic self, since it is evident that apart from the development of

instructional skills, faculty needs to also critically examine and improve their international and intercultural knowledge as well as long-held values and beliefs which impact professional practice and students' international and intercultural learning outcomes (Turner & Robson, 2008; Sanderson, 2008).

Phase 3- Faculty Instructional Implementation of a Semester Course(s) Revision

It was intended that faculty implementation begin with one semester, in which faculty participants would teach and assess the courses they identified for revision. This revision was expected at least to be at the level of infusing international and intercultural elements into existing courses. At best, the revision could be holistic and in some cases the infusion could be several sub-units of a course, or just one sub-unit of a course; the sub-unit being a significant part of the course. During this process, spring 2016, the faculty participants all had access to internationalization materials to read and use as needed. They also had access to the consultants for questions within the semester. Some critical questions that guided faculty during this process were: (a) What international and intercultural learning objectives and outcomes am I set to achieve (b) What other content information do I need in order to attain the objectives (c) What type of learner-center projects/activities/tasks do I need to create to actively engage students so they can learn and attain set goals (d) How do I assess students to make sure they learned the intended objectives and what are the indicators of assessing the international and intercultural learning outcomes (e) Generally what makes my course internationalized and different from what I was teaching before. Even though faculty members were guided by these questions during implementation, several of them explained they had difficulty maintaining the focus because they were worried about derailing from their usual course content. Those in college of education testified to the difficulty of internationalizing courses and at the same time covering expected education standards stipulated for teacher education. Details of some of the challenges experienced during implementation are incorporated in the articles in this Special Issue Journal. At the end of the semester, faculty participants presented their project outcome in May 2016 and were expected to continue teaching the internationalized version of their courses thereafter.

Phase 4- Implementation Results through the Faculty Symposium

In this phase, faculty fellows shared the result of the course implementation through a faculty symposium open to the university community at the end of the semester. Twelve out of 14 faculty fellows shared their internationalization outcomes at the forum. These fellows revised 20 syllabi used in teaching internationalized courses to 344 students. In a 20-25 minute-session, each presenter shared their course revision process, international and intercultural course components, modified objectives, students' projects, research activities, aligning assessments, learning outcomes, challenges and future intended modifications.

The presentations showed that students who took the courses were motivated to engage in projects that challenged them to research international and intercultural aspects of their courses. They were made to compare educational, social, and cultural systems of the U.S. and other countries, and were challenged to reflect critically on differences and similarities in practices from an objective rather than ethnocentric perspective. For example, Dr. Dorene Medlin's Early Childhood Science Education class (read details in her article), required students to research and compare the primary science instructional practices in the U.S.A with those of other countries selected and to report their findings in research papers as well as oral presentations, as part of the final course assessment. Three of Dr. Medlin's students shared findings revealing superior instructional practices by some foreign countries, and as a result, a resolve on their part to recommend a review of science instruction practices in local area school. Also, Dr. Erica Decuir's Pre-service Teacher Education class (also reported in this Issue) provided an illustration of the creative use of videos (TED Talk series-recording of Chimamanda Ngozi Achebe) to expand cultural awareness, and to help pre-service teachers to develop lessons designed to discourage bias in learners they would be teaching.

In his two courses, History of Latin America and Principles of Geography, Dr. John Williams (Department of History and Political Science) used a comparative framework to enhance internationalization and show how urban studies and the exploration of world cities improves students' international knowledge. His presentation also illustrated the special benefits to students when their instructor has personal global experiences to share, which adds quality to the content learned and thus motivated them to

conduct further research and enhance learning outcome. The following list provides the titles of participant faculty presentations at the final symposium of the project.

1. Internationalizing the Music Course through Learning about Other Countries by Dr. Mihoko Nodo, Department of Fine Arts
2. Internationalizing Speech Courses: Fundamentals of Public Speaking by Dr. Florence Lyons, Department of Fine Arts
3. Internalization Mathematical Finance Course at Albany State University by Dr. Zephyrinus C. Okonkwo, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
4. Culturally-Responsive Strategies for English-Language Learners (ELLs) in Mainstreamed Classrooms: A Primer for Pre-Service Teachers by Dr. Erica DeCuir, Department of Teacher Education.
5. Reading, ‘Riting, ‘Rithmetic, and Globalization: Expanding Teacher Education Students’ Global Consciousness through Course Readings and Activities by Dr. Tiffany D. Pogue, Department of Teacher Education
6. An International Comparative Study of Early Childhood Science Education by Dr. Dorene Rojas Medlin, Department of Teacher Education
7. Using Urban Studies and the Exploration of World Cities for Internationalizing Curriculums in History and Geography by Dr. John E. Williams, Department of History and Political Science
8. The Traveling Gaze: Internationalizing the Curriculum through Multimedia Texts by Dr. Candice A. Pitts, Department of English, MDL, and Mass Communications
9. Exploring the Levant by Dr. Erwin Ford, Department of English, MDL, and Mass Communications
10. The Impact of Internationalization on Earth Science Learning by Dr. Liqui Zheng, Department of Natural and Forensic Sciences

11. Evaluation of Crimes and Crime Scene Reconstruction in some Selected Countries by Dr. Uzoma Okafor, Department of Natural and Forensic Sciences
12. Internationalizing Graduate and Undergraduate Mathematics Courses at Albany State University, Georgia by Dr. Chinenye Ofodile, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

Phase 5-Publicize Outcomes through Journal Article Publication (Optional)

After the presentation in Phase 4, project fellows were encouraged to write about the process and experiences in developing their course internationalization. The dissemination of a well-constructed elaboration would provide future faculty cohorts of the ASU project, as well as other interested scholars in higher education, with a clear view of the process of developing an internationalization course modification. Included in this article would be rationales, processes, challenges, outcomes, and reflections. As a point of departure, these journal articles would provide analysis and steps for future implementation of internationalized courses. This phase was also added because many faculty members are inspired by additional scholarship that result from their participation in the course-internationalization project. Seven of the twelve faculty fellows could produce journal articles from their implementation process and outcomes. Dr. Michael Smithee (Smithee Associates), the editor of International Research Review (IRR) Journal, collaborated with Dr. Nneka Nora Osakwe (Director of Global Programs) in structuring report themes, format, and supervising and editing final articles before submission to external reviewers. The articles in this special issue are the result of the Course Internationalization Project.

Project Challenges and Limitations

1. Realizing the professional development objectives of this project would require more time than a semester or an academic year permits. Hence most of the faculty cohorts will need more time, reading, researching, and engaging in internationalization conferences and seminars to attain the expected competency for greater impact on students' international learning outcome. What the

project achieved is to spur faculty members to internationalization action, and it is unpredictable the direction each participant will go. All depends on the level of motivation and commitment by individual members.

2. A major challenge in the project is time limitation and last-minute changes. Even though the goal was to access the project outcome from a semester's instruction from the same cohort of students, the process of implementing course internationalization requires a much longer time than a semester permits. Some of the faculty presenters reported they made major changes in their contents and syllabus at different stages of implementation because their initial plans did not materialize. For example, Dr. Dorene Medline, whose course was designed around an expected visiting scholar from Columbia, who eventually could not come, had to restructure the entire course. Such changes as it were resulted in delays that would have required more time, but the semester time-frame was limited, so she had to proceed rapidly with a new plan.
3. It is normal for projects to evolve as new knowledge and observations from previous iterations allow improvements. Planners should continually review the literature for new expressions of models and processes. Assessing the process of faculty development is important to the improved implementation of the project. A critical aspect of this project, as in many described in the literature, is the time faculty can devote to the process. Such projects at other institutions have begun with week-long workshops, a nearly ideal context from the developer's point of view, only to realize after one or two iterations that such a long workshop is not sustainable in many institutional environments. Other, more parsimonious, approaches had to be taken. A faculty course internationalization learning community can be considered as part of the professional development process to ensure regular meeting of the faculty and exchange of scholarly ideas among the faculty fellows as they implement the project. Also, regular interaction with internationalization consultants on campus help to sustain motivation as faculty members implemented the internationalization of their courses.

4. The challenge of professorial time to engage in faculty development is a critical component. There is need for continual improvement in the process of engaging the faculty in cross-cultural and pedagogical topics. Ensuring meetings and a regular exchange of scholarly ideas among the faculty fellows in the various cohorts can integrate course internationalization as a learning community. It is important to ensure these regular meetings and opportunities for exchange among faculty occur after the professional development training.
5. The reports in the IRR Journal are preliminary outcomes of professional development of faculty in course internationalization. There is no doubt that subsequent semester teaching of these faculty fellows will yield further positive international learning impact on new sets of students. These students will benefit from the enhanced global content and improved pedagogy.

Future Professional Development and Course Internationalization Prospects with the Newly Consolidated ASU

Albany State University (ASU) consolidation with Darton College was announced on November 10, 2015 and the SACs approval became effective in January 2017. The newly consolidated ASU is continuing with international education as a firmly established component of Academic Affairs. Future progress in faculty professional development on course internationalization depends on continued administrative support and institutionalizing of international education. ASU has doubled the number of its faculty members as well as the number of students and courses now ranging from certificate to graduate level courses. The new institutional environment now includes East and West campuses. The joining together of two separated campuses has implications for internationalization, especially as the scope of programs has expanded. More funds will be required for capacity building and necessary faculty and staff professional development. It is anticipated that the administration will reaffirm its commitment to campus internationalization for the 2017/2018 academic year through the Academic Goals and Objectives from the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. As a result, the goals and objectives of the consolidation will require deans and chairs to collaborate with the Office of Global Programs in integrating curriculum internationalization in college and departmental expected learning outcomes.

It is also anticipated that the administration will take other strategic steps to institutionalize international education. To facilitate campus internationalization these steps include, increasing financial support for additional personnel by recruiting a full time International Student and Scholar Adviser (ISSA) and approving the hiring of a full time Study Abroad Coordinator (SAC) for the Office of Global Programs. Other strategic campus internationalization initiatives as outlined in the Comprehensive Internationalization Strategic Plan should continue with support and funding for faculty and staff development, the professional development of faculty to internationalize their courses, and for collaborative internationalization programs to be continued with various departments, colleges, offices, and units. The goal is to enhance the quality of students' learning outcome to include having a better understanding of self and others and having a broader cultural and international perspective upon graduation.

Conclusion

Course internationalization is critical in achieving the goal of campus internationalization, and faculty professional development is at the core of graduating students who have diverse and knowledgeable world view and can empathize, analyze, and understand political, cultural, economic, historical, environmental, scientific, and technological development. Such students can take advantage of their global competency to interact with individuals from a variety of backgrounds and cultures to live successful life and exude positive impact on their community and the world at large. Every institution of higher education should examine their unique situation and create or adopt best procedure to ensure the development of a core faculty who demonstrate personal and global competence and can integrate both international and intercultural perspectives into their courses. The faculty development process discussed in this article with illustrated outcomes held in faculty articles in this special IRR Issue is an example that can guide other institutions in their effort to internationalize courses in their campuses.

The Albany State University Course-Internationalization Project was funded by ASU Office of Title III, US Department of Education.

References

- Adewuyi, D. (2007). Faculty Training: Workshops on internationalizing the curriculum at Albany State University. In Osakwe, N. N., Fields, K., Courtoy, D. & Singh, A. (eds.). *Internationalizing the curriculum across disciplines: A Model from Albany State University (ASU)*. Albany, Georgia. ISBN No.: 1-4276-0963-2.
- Armstrong, M. A., & Brown, D. (2006). *Strategic reward: Making it happen*. London: Kogan.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business*. Buckingham, UK: Society of Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Benabou, R & Tirole, J. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Review of Economic Studies*. 70, 489-520.
- Bond, S. (2003). Untapped resources: Internationalization of the curriculum and classroom experience. *Canadian Bureau for International Education Research*, 7, 1-15.
- Brown, D. (2001). *Reward strategies: From intent to impact*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Crosling, G., Edward, R. & Schroder, B. (2008). Internationalizing the curriculum: the implementation experience in a Faculty of Business and Economics. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* Vol. 30, No. 2, May 2008, 107-121.
- De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood
- Dunning, A. (2016) Strengthening link between economic development, higher education is good business. ASU in The News-The Albany Herald Editorial, April 9.
- Edward, R., Croslings, G., Petrovic-Lazarevic, S., & O'Neill, P. (2003). Internationalization of business education: meaning and implementation. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 22(2), 83-192.
- Fontenot, O. (2017). 2017/2018 Academic Affairs Goal and Objectives, Office of the Provost, Albany State University, Georgia.
- Green, M. F. (2012). Measuring and assessing internationalization. NAFSA: Association of International Educators, www.nafsa.org/epubs.

- Green, M. F. & Olson, C. (2008). *Internationalizing the campus: A User's guide*. Washington: ACE-American Council on Education, Center for Institutional and International Initiatives.
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalisation of higher education. In H. de Wit & J. Knight (eds.), *Quality and internationalisation in higher education* (pp. 13-28). Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 5-31.
- Lambert, R. D. (1989). *International studies and the undergraduate*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Leask, B. (2014). Internationalizing the curriculum and all students' learning. In *International Higher Education*, 78, 5-6.
- Lingard, B. & Rizvi, F. (2010). *Globalising educational policy*. Routledge: Florence, KY, USA.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (2002). In search of a comprehensive approach to international education: A systems perspective. In W. Gruenzweig & N. Reinechart (Eds.). *Rockin in red square: Crucial approaches to international education in the age of cyberculture*. Muenster, Germany: Lit Verlag.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (2011). *Reflections on the past, present, and future of internationalizing higher education—Discovering opportunities to meet the challenges*. Minnesota: Global Programs and Strategic Alliance at the University of Minnesota.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (2015). "On the hologram of international education: with Raya Hegeman-Davis, Amy Lee, Nue Lor, & Rhiannon Williams." In R. D. Williams & A. Lee (eds.), *Internationalizing Higher Education*, 3-15. The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Office of International Education (OIE) (2016). University System of Georgia (USG). Report of International Education Activities 2009-2014. www.OIE_Report_2009-2016.Usge.edu
- Osakwe, N. N. & Albritten, D. (2015). Report: Internationalization Status at Albany State University: State of the Act Investigation (Preliminary Findings), Presented at Albany State University(ASU) Graduate Symposium, February 2015.

- Osakwe, N. N. (2017). Internationalizing courses: A faculty development process. Presented at Winter 2017 GAIE Conference, Athens, Georgia, February 1-3.
- Osakwe, N. N. (2014) Internationalizing pedagogy using African literature: teaching composition lessons with Chimamanda Adichie's, My Mother the Crazy African" in Negash, G., Fronhne, A. & Zadi S. *At the Crossroads: Readings of Postcolonial and the Global in African Literature and the Visual Art*. New Jersey, U.S.: Africa World Press.
- Osakwe, N. N. (2007). Internationalized Rhetoric and Advanced Writing (ENGL 3204) in Osakwe, N. N., Fields, K., Courtoy, D. & Singh, A. (eds.). *Internationalizing the Curriculum across Disciplines: A Model from Albany State University (ASU)*. Albany, Georgia. ISBN No.: 1-4276-0963-2 (Chapter 4) p.42.
- Osakwe, N. N., Fields, K., Courtoy, D. & Singh, A. (eds.). *Internationalizing the Curriculum across Disciplines: A Model from Albany State University (ASU)*. Albany, Georgia. ISBN No.: 1-4276-0963-2.
- Perkins, C. G. 2007. The Conceptual framework for internationalizing the curriculum—A global perspective. In Osakwe, N.N., Shields, K., Courtoy, D., and Singh, A. (eds.). *Internationalizing the Curriculum across disciplines: A Model from Albany State University (ASU)*. Albany, Georgia. ISBN No.: 1-4276-0963-2. Office of International Education (OIE), Report (2016). University System of Georgia.
- Rhoades, R. & Szelenyi, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Stanford University Press: Palo Alto, CA, USA.
- Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 122 (3), 276- 307.
- Taylor, C. (2004). *Modern social imaginaries*. Duke University Press: Durham, USA.
- Turner, Y. & Robin, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the University*. U.S.A. Bloomsbury Publishing (bloomsbury.com).

Appendix A
Albany State University
Comprehensive Internationalization Strategic Plan (CISP)

Approved by ASU Comprehensive Internationalization Committee, 2016

Goal: The main goal of this Plan is Comprehensive
Internationalization of the Campus

Comprehensive Internationalization is a process embarked upon by progressive twenty-first century learning institutions to increase the number of graduates who acquire international learning. It involves a commitment confirmed through action and policy to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the curriculum and co-curriculum programs including teaching, research, and service mission of higher education (Hudzik and McCarthy, 2012).

Focus Areas:

1. ***Education Abroad***: increase the number of students who participate in Study Abroad, international internship and research, service learning; and the number of study abroad collaborations and faculty led programs and enhance international and intercultural learning.
2. ***Professional Development***: increase awareness, interest, and involvement of faculty and staff in international education and the number of faculty who internationalize their courses.
3. ***Curriculum***: increase the number of internationalized courses and develop a Global Citizenship (or Distinction), minor and certificate to impact students' international learning on graduation.
4. ***Campus Programs and Facilities***: increase international awareness of campus and community via campus life and creating international co-curricular activities with community collaborations and faculty and staff outreach to the global. Also enhance international visual outlook of the campus.

5. ***International Student Enrollment and International Collaboration:*** increase the number and diversity of international students' enrollment and retention and the number of international collaborations, aware that international students are a great resource for internationalizing the campus through planned curricular and co-curricular activities.

Appendix B
Curriculum Internationalization Fellows
with List of Courses Internationalized
Spring 2016 Cohort

Name	Department	Course Title
Dr. Erica Decuir	Teacher Education	SSCI 5581: Social Studies for Global Understanding
Dr. Erica Decuir	Teacher Education	ECEC 4400: Social Studies/Diversity/Language Arts
Dr. Erwin Ford	English, MDL, and Mass Communications	ENGL 2111: World Literature
Dr. Florence Lyons	Fine Arts	COMM 1100: Fundamentals of Public Speaking
Dr. Dorene Medlin	Teacher Education	ECEC 4354: Science for Young Children
Dr. Chinenye Ofodile	Math and Computer Science	MATH 1113: Pre-calculus with Trigonometry
Dr. Uzoma Okafor	Natural and Forensic Sciences	MATH 5214: Differential Equations
Dr. Uzoma Okafor	Natural and Forensic Sciences	FOSC 2130: Crime Scene Investigation
Dr. Zephyrinus C. Okonkwo	Math and Computer Science	MATH 1211: Calculus I
Dr. Candice Pitts	English, MDL, and Mass Communications	MATH 2411: Basic Statistics
Dr. Anthony Owusu-Ansah	Teacher Education	ECEC 3355: Developmental Reading

Dr. Candice Pitts	English, MDL, and Mass Communications	ENGL 2111: World Literature
Dr. John E. Williams	History and Political Science	ENGL 1102: English Composition
Dr. Tiffany Pogue	Teacher Education	EDUC 2120: Exploring Socio-cultural Perspectives on Diversity in Educational Contexts
Dr. Sandra Washington	HealthCare Management	MGHC 4035 Healthcare Marketing MGHC 4421 Insurance for Healthcare Professionals

Appendix C
Internationalizing Courses at ASU: Faculty Symposium
First Cohort Presentations Topics on May 6, 2016

1. “Culturally Responsive Strategies for English-Language Learners(ELLs) in Mainstreamed Classrooms: A Primer for Preservice Teachers” by Dr. Erica DeCuir, Department of Teacher Education
2. “Internationalizing Speech Courses: Fundamental of Public Speaking” by Dr. Florence Lyons, Department of Fine Arts.
3. “Internationalizing Graduate and Undergraduate Mathematics Courses” at Albany State University, Georgia by Dr. Chinenye Ofodile, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
4. “Using Urban Studies and the Exploration of World Cities for Internationalizing Curriculums in History and Geography” by Dr. John E. Williams, Department of History and Political Science
5. “The impact of internationalization on Earth Science Learning” by Dr. Zheng Liqiu, Department of Natural Science
6. “Internationalizing the Music Course through Learning about Other Countries” by Dr. Mihoko Noda, Department of Arts
7. “Evaluation of crimes and crime scenes reconstruction in some selected countries” by Dr. Uzoma Okafor, Department of Natural and Forensic Sciences
8. “An International Comparative Study of Early Childhood Science Education” by Dr. Dorene Medlin, Department of Teacher Education
9. “The Traveling Gaze: Internationalizing the Curriculum through Multimedia Text”, Dr. Candice A. Pitts, Department of English, MODL and Mass Communication
10. “Exploring the Levant.” By Dr. Erwin H. Ford, Department of English MODL and Mass Comm.
11. “Internationalizing Mathematical Finance Course” by Dr. Zephyrinus C. Okonkwo, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.
12. “Reading, ‘Riting,’ ‘Rithmetic,’ and Globalization: Expanding Teacher Education Students’ Global Consciousness’ through Course Readings and Activities” by Dr. Tiffany D. Pogue, Department of Teacher Education.

Appendix D
Approved Syllabi in 2003-2006 Title III Funded Project
2004 Summer Approvals

Name	Course #	Course Title	New or Revised
Agazie Marzine	SOWK XXX	Aspects of International Social Work	New
Amankwa Adansi	SOCI 2013	Families: Comparative Sociology	New
Ashley Willie	XXXXXXXX	Mental Health from Global Perspective	New
Blanch-Payne E.	PSYC 3403	Cross-cultural Psychology	New
Boling James	CRJU 4635	Global Terrorism	New
Brown Barbara	MUSC 1133	Intro. To Music Literature	Revised
Bynum Leroy	MUSC 1180	Concert Choral	Revised
Campbell Wilburn	PEDH 3350	Globalization and American Sports	New
Dankwa Kwame	POLS XXXX	Politics of Globalization	New
Decuir Michael	MUSC 1123	World Music	Revised
Fontenot Florence	COMM 2020	Voice and Diction	Revised
Furro Tonyesima	SOWK 4460	International Social Welfare Policy	New
Ryan-Ikegwonu Pat	CRJU XXXX	Organized Crime: A World History	New
Konde Emmanuel	HIST XXXX	Introduction to Global Terrorism	New
Land Dan	PEDH 2272	Soccer	Revised
Martin Michael	MUSC 3133	Music History: Antiquity to 1750	Revised
Murfree Joshua	PSYC 4000	World Psychology and Global Issues	New
Ngwafu Peter	POLS 4822	Political Economy of Africa	New
Onyenwoke Nelson	SOCI 3380	The Urban World	New
Oommen Zachariah	FOSC 4290	Electron Microscopy	New
Pent Andrea	PEDH XXXX	Intermediate Yoga	New
Ragon Bruce	HEDP 3660	Current Issues in Health Education	Revised
Reed William	PSYC 3372	Psychology and Black Perspective	New
Rhymes R.	SOWK 3391	Issues in International Social Work	New
Sinclair Abraham	ARST 3082	Ceramics	Revised
Spearman Marilyn	SOWK 4310	Global Research	New
Vanderpuye Seyi	FOSC 4500	Bioterrorism: Global Safety Issues	New

Internationalized Curriculum Review Committee
Approved Syllabi – 2005 Summer

Department of Teacher Education

Name	Course #	Course Title	New or Revised
-------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----------------------

Beard Audrey	EDUC 3378	Creative/Effective Teaching	Revised
	EDUC 4400	Preparation for Teachers	Revised
Bembry Deborah	EDUC 2201	Foundations of Education	Revised
	ECEC 3200	Early Childhood Curriculum	Revised
Fields Kimberly	SPED 3367	Counseling Parents of Exceptional Children	Revised
	SPED 4420	Directed Observation of mentally retarded	Revised
Jenkins Patricia	ECEC 3322	Teaching Reading Using Children's Lit. & LA	Revised
	ECEC 4423	Corrective Reading in Early Childhood	Revised
Mitchell Marlon	EDUC 2210	Technology & Media for Teachers	Revised
	PSYC 2290	Foundations of Learning & Motivation	Revised
Nam sang	SPED 2230	Exceptional Children and Youth	Revised
	SPED 4440	Educational Assessment	Revised

College of Business

Ansari M.	ECON 3145	Banking and Foreign Exchange	Revised
Elimimian J.	BADM 3450	Issues in Global Business	New
	MKTG 4231	Global Marketing Strategy	New
Li Bingguang	MGMT 3106	Management Science & Operations	Revised
	MGMT 4205	Management Information Systems	Revised
Rogers Michael	MGMT 4128	Contemporary Business Issues	Revised
	MGMT 4199	Business Policy	Revised

Department of English & Modern Languages

Courtoy A. DiAnn	ENGL 2111	World Literature I	Revised
	ENGL 2112	World Literature II	Revised
Huang Hsi-Ling	ENGL 3301	Literature in Translation	New
	ENGL 4990	Chinese Drama and Culture Study	New
Kanwar Anju	HONR 2101	Honors Seminar III	Revised
Mundy-Shepard R.	ENGL 1101	English Composition	Revised
	HONR 1112	Honors Humanity	Revised
Osakwe Nneka	ENGL 3204	Rhetoric and Advanced Writing	Revised
	ENGL 4000	English as a Global Language	New

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

Singh Amitabh	CSCI 2102	Software for Global Application	New
---------------	-----------	---------------------------------	-----

Graduate Courses

Ansari M.	ECON 6108	International Trade and Finance	Revised
Li Feng	MATH 5511	World History of Mathematics	Revised

About the Author

Nneka-Nora Osakwe, PhD is Professor of English and Director of Global Programs at Albany State University (ASU), Georgia, and the guest editor of this issue of the *International Research and Review*. Her more than twenty-five-year career include being a teacher, researcher, ethnographer, children’s book writer, consultant, and administrator. She has published over three dozen book chapters, Journal articles, monographs, and edited 9 books & journals in the following areas: Communication skills, international education, English language pedagogy, teacher education, slave narrative, and children’s rights. She is a recipient of the Fulbright-Hays Faculty program in Malaysia and Singapore, and is a research fellow of the American Association of University Women (AAUW) at Clemson Houston Research Center. She is also a Rockefeller Foundation Resident fellow at the Bellagio Study and Conference Center, Italy, and a Study Fellow of the British Council/ODA at the University College of St Mark and St John, Plymouth, United Kingdom.

Dr. Osakwe leads campus internationalization at ASU and initiated the project “Faculty Professional Development on Internationalization of Courses” leading to the publication of this Special Issue journal. She serves as consultant on internationalizing the curriculum and is member of the NAFSA trainer Corp. She designs courses, develops study abroad programs and trains faculty to teach and lead programs abroad. She initiated and coordinated ASU first study abroad in Peru, China, and Ghana, and initiated ASU Global Issues, which publicizes study abroad stories. Dr. Osakwe has served as UNICEF International Consultant for improving teaching instruction in post conflict Sierra Leone and Nigeria, leading to the publication of training modules presently in use to sustain teacher training outcomes in these countries. Dr. Osakwe studied English, Curriculum Studies, and English Language Teaching (ELT) & Supervision of Instruction from Texas Woman’s University, (Denton), The University of Nigeria, The University of Jos, (Nigeria) and University College of St. Mark and St. John, Plymouth U.K. and earned a BA (Cum Laude) an MA, a PGDE, an M.Ed.,

and a PhD. She volunteers scholarship for NAFSA: National Association of International Educators, American Association of University Women (AAUW), Fulbright & Gilman's International Scholarship Programs, African Literature Association (ALA) and Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). She loves travels, music, motivating students to success, and mentoring young faculty members.