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The purpose of this study was to investigate the state of internationalization at the private Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs), and to identify select factors that drive or restrain the internationalization process at these particular institutions. The problem of practice explored by this study was that despite the research in U. S. higher education on internationalization, unique conditions exists, which impact comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. The problem of research addressed by this study was that although the literature indicates a wide array of approaches to internationalization in higher education, it does not include a study that specifically examines the unique challenges internationalization present to private HBCUs, or the applicable internationalization strategies given their unique institutional missions, cultures, histories, and priorities.
This mixed methods multicase study employed philosophical assumptions, the combined use of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, and a sequential explanatory research strategy to examine the state of internationalization at private HBCUs. As a result of the quantitative phase, an Internationalization Index was created to select two private HBCUs (one Highly Active and one Less Active) institutions engaged in internationalization. Data were collected by on-line surveys, interviews, document analysis and qualitative observations and analyzed through within-case and cross-case examinations.

The findings indicate that four of the eight dimensions of internationalization introduced in this study were the least utilized strategies for achieving comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. The study revealed that the absence of assessment of global learning outcomes, foreign students, an internationalization review and an internationalized curriculum as strategies severely restrained the ability of the private HBCUs of this study to successfully achieve comprehensive internationalization. The conclusion drawn from the findings suggest that it is critical for private HBCUs to integrate the goals of all eight dimensions (internationalization strategies) into one comprehensive strategic plan to achieve sustainable internationalization, and subsequently, aligned with other institutional priorities.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

As the 21st century unfolds, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and indeed universities everywhere, are undergoing unprecedented change and confronting multiple challenges brought on by the vast and complex processes of globalization and technological change. Powerful internal and external forces—political, economic and paradigmatic—are reconfiguring all aspects of the academic life and mission of institutions from teaching and research to service (Olukoshi & Zeleza, 2004). The need for redefining the role and defending the importance of HBCUs has never been greater. Proponents of HBCUs are hopeful that these institutions can balance successfully the demands of autonomy and accountability, expansion and excellence, equity and efficiency, diversity and differentiation, internationalization and scarce resources, as they address the new challenges of the knowledge economy and globalization.

The growing research on comprehensive and sustainable internationalization has aided countless institutions within the Academy to build on their success in internationalization and assist them in being more strategic in advancing these initiatives, accelerating and deepening their efforts, and positioning them to pursue funding and partnering opportunities for internationalization.
Relevant systematic studies on internationalization cover a broad variety of aspects from attempts at definition to analysis of practice. Institutional strategies of internationalization make up a sizeable number of publications and have become an increasingly important theme. In its 2005 report, *Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization*, the American Council on Education (ACE) discussed three major trends that have shaped the environment for internationalization:

First, is an intensified interest in international and global matters on many campuses across the country, the result of accelerating globalization and the growing consciousness—heightened by the events of September 11, 2001—that isolation is not an option. A second trend is the increasing emphasis on student learning, with the concomitant shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered pedagogy and assessment. And finally, the world of higher education has been reshaped by the growing presence of “new majority” students, that is, students who do not fit the profile of full-time, traditional age undergraduate students.

(p. v)

For nearly a century, the future of the United States of America has hinged on its ability to educate a globally competent citizenry. American higher education has been the principal vehicle facilitating the globalization of knowledge. The world as we currently know it is such that United States (U. S.) and global realities—economic, cultural, political, environmental, or social interpenetrate and mutually define each other. This factor is of such importance that to isolate U. S. studies from international studies is increasingly impractical. Deeply understanding different cultural and political
perspectives from outside of the U. S. helps to develop the intercultural skills students will need as citizens within an increasingly diverse and globally connected world.

Yet, the external environment has always been a powerful force pushing for change in higher education. The advent of World War II saw the establishment of the Fulbright Act of 1946. Subsequently, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was passed. Both events proved to be major turning points in the federal government’s intervention in education in general and reorientation toward international education in particular. The Fulbright Act established an exchange scholarship program for students and educators between the U. S. and other countries. NDEA’s creation was the result of the United State’s notion of their lagging behind the Soviets in math and science, and for the first time education was seen as a critical strategic defense of the United States’ during the Cold War. Since then government intervention and the external environment have continued to play varying roles in shaping the field of internationalization in U. S. higher education.

A natural progression from government intervention was the onslaught of research studies detailing in urgent language the need for higher education to internationalize their institutions. Scholarly research immediately called for U. S. higher education to cope with internationalization by rethinking the construct of disciplines, borders and other boundaries. The fluidity of production and services under the conditions of globalization means that course content and study abroad experiences need to be responsive to changing conditions here and abroad.
Today, we watch as such global realities as mass transportation and the internet instantly provide opportunities for empowerment and increased cross-cultural understanding. As educators, we emerged from the Cold War only to face a carefully disguised continuum of the nuclear standoff between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Soviet bloc, the genocides of Rwanda and Kosovo, the U. S. war on Iraq, Al Qaeda tactics and the United State’s withdrawal from international treaties. Now, more than ever, we are citizens of the globe, and right before our eyes the globe is being ravaged by disease, violent conflict, famine, poverty, and environmental destruction. Today’s students will interface with people from many parts of the world throughout their lives. They will be making choices as voters, consumers and workers whose effects will seep far beyond their perceptions and potentially come hurling back with uncertain consequences.

On September 11, 2001, the failure of our intelligence apparatus became a cataclysmic national liability. Not only did nearly 3,000 individuals die on that tragic day, but our nation’s arrogance that we could persist in our ignorance of the rest of the world also came to a screeching end. The 9/11 attacks served as the primary impetus for another governmental intervention in international education. The late-Senator Paul Simon’s bold vision for U. S. study abroad resulted in the passing of the 2009 Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Act, as part of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 (H.R. 2410). This broad foreign relations bill includes innovative new programs like the Simon Act that enhances U. S. capacity to engage with the world. The Simon Act sets as a goal that in ten years time at least one million
American college students from diverse backgrounds will study abroad annually in locations across the globe, with an emphasis on destinations in developing countries (National Association of Foreign Student Advisors [NAFSA], 2007). Yet, in the absence of baseline internationalization across U.S. institutions, a majority of those one million students will return to their home campuses frustrated upon encountering a parochial campus culture and a Western-oriented curriculum.

A recent move of the Obama Administration, which represents the federal government's promotion of national leadership of international education, was the House and Senate’s convening of a conference committee to examine the differences between their respective bills reauthorizing the Higher Education Act. HR 4137 established in the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) an Office of the Assistant Secretary for International and Foreign Language Education, following the recommendation of the National Research Council’s 2007 report. It is supported by the Coalition for International Education, a group of over 30 national education organizations with interest in USDE’s international education programs. Many international educators viewed this move as not only necessary, but a signal that underscores multiple benefits.

The establishment of this office signaled the Obama Administration’s attempt to provide stronger leadership in directing the efforts aimed at international and foreign language education. The Office integrated and consolidated administration of all international education and foreign language programs under an executive-level person appointed by the President and reporting to the Secretary. With globalization and national security demands expanding the national need for Americans with expertise in
world regions and foreign language, a central coordinating office is imperative. Although a committed minority of educators has long insisted that learning about the world and about the interrelationship of national, international and global issues is indispensable to a high-quality education, these ideas have not been central to the national educational debate and reform agenda of the past 25 years (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005).

Although global competence is an important American value and educational priority, it can be difficult for individuals to have sufficient perspective about the many dimensions of internationalization. The task is especially difficult when encountering educational environments that have not strategically invested in creating institutional cultures that challenge the campus community to think globally, and think beyond what it has already learned to recognize. Throughout the Academy, college and university administrators and faculty earnestly try to infuse international dimensions into the academic enterprise, and they increasingly use global comparative approaches and terminology. Moreover, it is critical that American higher education strive to produce globally competent graduates that are not only sensitive to human needs globally, but who will anticipate and respond effectively to the changing world. Quite frankly, education should enlarge, enrich and deepen the vision of students.

There are approximately 106 accredited institutions (public and private) in the country designated by the federal government as Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs). In recent years, these institutions have had to develop aggressive programs to compete with better resourced, mainstream institutions for future students, faculty and staff. Savvy students, faculty and staff are increasingly looking for environments that not
only provide quality academic programs, competitive scholarships, salaries/compensation packages, but also environments that respect diversity and inspire graduates to be contributing global citizens. Ironically, HBCUs were founded on a similar, but dual purpose of producing literate, humane individuals, and helping motivated, but less prepared students overcome earlier educational deficits. Especially critical has been the historical concern of HBCUs to demonstrate to the status quo that black undergraduates develop best when the environment supports their attempts at intellectual endeavors and extracurricular involvement. However, despite these imperatives, little research has been undertaken at HBCUs to document and analyze institutional policies and practices that promote internationalization or hinder progressive change.

The mission of HBCUs in the United States of America is complex and uncommon demands have often been made on their administrations to keep them financially afloat. Historically, HBCUs have had to satisfy the often conflicting objectives of the philanthropists who financed them, the students who attended them and a society that offered limited opportunities to their graduates. Yet, many of these institutions have survived for more than a century (Jones & Weathersby, 1978). The current global economic crisis is forcing the Academy in general and HBCUs in particular to give serious attention to reimagining their academic enterprises. Ironically, the landmark book Stand and Prosper (Drewry & Doermann, 2001) offers timeless advice for HBCUs; words that are applicable to how these institutions currently struggle
to create 21st century institutions with integrated strategies devoted to sustaining internationalization, or deal with being deemed socially irrelevant environments:

All of these colleges will need to reassess their competitive strengths and the possible missions that lie ahead of them. All must remain aware of the history that lies behind them. All, whether they want to or not, will have to change. The story of the private black colleges is a story of success against extremely high odds...But in 2020, it is reasonable to assume that, just as in 1896, 1915, 1954 and 1964, the private black college will be part of the American landscape. (pp. 287-288)

Undoubtedly, some HBCUs are slowly dealing better than others with the realization that the development of a comprehensive internationalization plan is one of the salient issues facing 21st century higher education. More importantly, this means that it is imperative to ask tough questions of the HBCUs that are not improving in this regard. Much of the research on internationalization has been applied to the vast majority of predominately white institutions (PWIs) of higher education in the United States. However, HBCUs represent another segment of the Academy whose historical responsibility has been to provide a sense of hope for the African-American community at-large. A community having experienced such egregious and horrific assault could not afford institutions of higher learning with such a narrow mission of individual uplift solely. Nothing about our liberation as a people has been about the individual (Pinkard, 2000).
If HBCUs represent the largest education consortium of minority serving institutions in the United States, then without a doubt these centers of intellectual thought and activism also represent a resource for transforming the collective status of African Americans. African Americans have always believed in education as transformative, redemptive and liberating. Even in the dark and desolate circumstances of forced servitude, African Americans understood that there was an intrinsic power in knowledge. Perhaps because a cultural system of customs, laws, attitudes and behaviors conspired to prevent us from the act of knowledge, we ached for the opportunity (Pinkard, 2000).

Although the current leadership and direction of HBCUs is not necessarily clear, the story of HBCUs is continuously evolving. What is clear, however, is that internationalization of the U.S. higher educational system is one of the critical factors in the United States maintaining its position as a world force in the 21st century. HBCU’s full ascendancy and future survival depends on their ability to adopt the best practices in comprehensive internationalization and retain the uniqueness of their historical mission. While quantitative data may obfuscate the current internationalization efforts of HBCUs, their collective history underscores a legacy of a robust production of globally competent graduates. Internationalization was once at the very core of their academic enterprises.

For example, HBCUs have a long deep history of academic exchanges with Africa and African universities that range from the highly practical facilitation of economic and technological development, to the intensely intellectual. Many of the international programs established at HBCUs have long histories such as those at Clark Atlanta, Howard, and Lincoln Universities, whose international programs are just as old
as their institutions. Often springing from the missionary work of religious groups, HBCUs utilized their meager resources to establish, broaden and strengthened linkages with Africa and Africans long before the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs were ever created. As early as 1899, Tuskegee Institute (now University), under the leadership of Booker T. Washington, was instrumental in establishing academic linkages with Africa by sending a team of agricultural experts to improve cotton production in the former German African colony of Togo.

As colonial rule was being consolidated throughout the continent, it was virtually impossible for Africans to receive a college education there. Yet, word traveled steadily to Africa of the well-spring of HBCUs being established in the United States. Cheyney University (Pennsylvania) was the first in 1837, followed by Lincoln University (Pennsylvania) in 1854, Wilberforce University (Ohio) in 1856, Fisk University (Tennessee) in 1866, Howard University (Washington, DC) and Morehouse College (Georgia), both in 1867, Hampton University (Virginia) in 1870, and Tuskegee University (Alabama) and Spelman College (Georgia) in 1881.

By the 1880s, Southern African men and women were being sent to U. S. institutions, mostly to the all-black Wilberforce University (Ohio), under the auspices of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The noted South African feminist Charlotte Manye was one of the first to be admitted to and graduate from Wilberforce with a B.S. degree in 1901. Consequently, it can be said that Manye and her African female colleagues were both empowered and vexed by their observation of the provocative North American feminist discourse that began to gain momentum at the time.
An unmistakable global vision aggressively sprouted from the charter missions of HBCUs. As these institutions came into being against a backdrop of horrific hatred and racial brutality (Pinkard, 2000), the student learning goals HBCUs crafted were the results of blacks folks' triumph over struggle and a richness of racial pride borne of deprivation. A natural progression from these institutions' early establishment was the production of graduates who were concerned with global processes, interested in diverse cultures, in possession of intercultural skills, and preparing for local and global citizenship.

As a result, HBCU alums, like Oliver John Golden, a former Tuskegee student and mentee of renowned biochemist George Washington Carver, led the first delegation (1924) of five African Americans to Moscow to study at the Communist University for Oriental Workers in Russia. After the completion of his studies and subsequent return to the U. S. in 1927, Golden, would lead a subsequent delegation of 13 black specialists (a list approved by George Washington Carver) with practical experience in the creation of cotton industries back to Russia. Among that number was 34 years old Jarvis Christian College professor John Sutton, an agricultural chemist with degrees from Tuskegee, the University of Iowa, Drake and Columbia. Another of Carver's recommendations was George Tynes, a 25 years old graduate of Wilberforce and a specialist in breeding fowl.

As the leader of this young delegation of idealists and romantics, Golden had noticed that all the migrants going to the Soviet Union in the 1920s were white. He was also persuaded that help needed to be given to the non-European peoples of the Soviet Union—the Uzbeks, Turkmen, Chukcha—who had been colonized and who in American
terms were ‘colored’ (Golden, 2002). Golden’s example of international migration would soon be duplicated by Langston Hughes (Lincoln University ’29) and many other HBCU graduates of the day.

There were numerous other examples of early internationalization efforts at HBCUs. They began to evaluate their leadership and make strategic decisions regarding who best should lead them. In 1889, Biddle University (now Johnson C. Smith University) was the first HBCU to appoint a black professor and in 1891 became the first HBCU to appoint a black president. Early internationalization of the curriculum was evidenced by Howard University professor, William Leo Hansberry, becoming the first professor in the U. S. to teach a course on African Civilization in 1922.

Further evidence of their capacity to produce globally competent graduates could not have been bettered underscored by Ana Julia Cooper, who became the first black female to earn a Ph.D. (History) from the University of Paris-Sorbonne in France (1924), and only the fourth African-American woman to earn a doctoral degree. Cooper’s early education began at the North Carolina HBCU, St. Augustine’s College, and she would become one the most prominent African-American scholars in U. S. history. So revered was her intellectual contribution that today on pages 26 and 27 of every new U. S. passport contains the following Dr. Cooper quote, “The cause of freedom is not the cause of a race or a sect, a party or a class—it is the cause of humankind, the very birthright of humanity” (U. S. Passport, pp.26-27). In 2009, the U. S. Postal Service released a commemorative stamp in Cooper’s honor.
The emphasis and orientation of HBCUs have always been a direct result of the unique experiences and perceptions of African Americans. The orientation of HBCUs is derived from the contradictions, ambiguities, tensions and ambivalence of African American life in the United States. A pervasive assumption is that students of HBCUs will acquire a set of values, a spirit of social service, moral sensitivity and a sense of social and moral responsibility that will remain with them after graduation. HBCUs aim to reinforce and deepen certain socioethical impulses of their students, which should be inherent in a globally competent citizen (Cook, 1978).

Today, in order to be competitive, HBCUs are forced to consider aligning their general mission with PWIs, but they can never forget their unique and special purpose. Collectively, their academic missions consist of the development of human excellence, superior education and training, nourishing creative imagination and leadership. Coupled with that mission is the commitment to developing moral character and producing better men and women with a passion for social justice and righteousness everywhere in the world. Ana Julia Cooper (St. Augustne’s College), W.E.B. Dubois (Fisk University), Kwame Nkrumah (Lincoln University), Booker T. Washington (Hampton University) Martin Luther King, Jr. (Morehouse College), and Ambassador Andrew Young (Howard University) were not accidents. They were the purposeful creations of the leadership development centers that have always been HBCUs.

A capstone of black America has always been its educational institutions. HBCUs have brought in talented youth from all over the world and polished them into leaders of international prominence and the strategy of a dual academic enterprise has
always been at the heart of their success. Over the next several years, the world could continue to face a genocidal civil war in Iraq, a wave of nuclear proliferation, even more Islamic extremism and a demagogues’ revolt against globalization. A provocative question is what type of leadership will be necessary to lead this country through a potentially challenging dance of world politics? HBCUs have a rich history of producing leaders and change agents. It is urgent that these institutions in particular understand what PWIs have already figured out—that success after the undergraduate years will largely depend on global competence.

Currently, HBCUs across the country are re-imagining their self-concepts and missions. The resurgence of global learning in higher education and the global challenges that flood our news has all but forced HBCUs to revisit their dual academic missions and seek ways to globalize their campuses. As a result, they must seriously consider establishing new international affairs units and introducing “international” quality enhancement plans into their institutions’ strategic plans. As the nation’s largest producers of African-American leadership, HBCUs face the difficult challenge of attracting a greater number of its students to the various aspects of global learning. In addition, they should be aggressively seeking ways to restructure their curriculum to meet the growing demand for skills in the analysis and solution of contemporary global problems, including the special need to prepare African-American students for career opportunities and service in this area.

HBCUs with demonstrated international academic offerings are solid beginnings upon which to build a comprehensive internationalized academic program. However,
given HBCUs unique clientele, competition, histories, locations, and mission, comprehensive and interdisciplinary academic programs (international majors, minors, concentrations or certificate programs) have to be considered for inclusion if global competence is to be an institutional goal. By their nature, the interdisciplinary programs parallel the breadth of vision and synthesis of insights in global education.

As the Chief International Officer (CIO) at four progressive institutions (two HBCUs and two PWIs), the researcher has been challenged by how much work needs to be done to realistically produce the types of graduates needed to change the world. Even with the commitments to their dual academic responsibility, the ascendancy and evolution of HBCUs as producers of global leaders is far from complete. The world is changing very rapidly and so too must the academic enterprise of HBCUs. As this nation’s best source of black leadership, it is imperative that HBCUs collectively begin to “re-imagine” their dual academic mission to include a comprehensive and sustainable approach to internationalization.

Statement of the Problem

This study proposes to investigate the stage of readiness of private Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs) as it relates to select benchmarks for comprehensive internationalization. In particular, this study seeks to examine the driving and restraining forces for comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. Attempts to gather information on the internationalization efforts of private HBCUs are hampered by the fact that research in this domain is not easily accessible.
There are no major research institutions that claim to collect data on this phenomenon in a comprehensive way. In general, available data on HBCUs have been historically inconsistent, incomplete or unavailable. The most recent studies (Green, 2005; Green & Olson 2003, 2008; Green & Shoenberg, 2006; Klasek, Garavalia, & Kellerman, 1992; Olson, Evans, & Shoenberg, 2007; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005, 2006) over the last two decades, have neither examined the driving forces for or the restraining barriers to comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs.

The problem of practice explored by this study is that despite the research in U. S. higher education on internationalization, unique conditions may exists, which impact comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. The problem of research addressed by this study is that although the literature indicates a wide array of approaches to internationalization in higher education, it does not include a study that specifically examines the unique challenges internationalization present to private HBCUs, or the applicable internationalization strategies given their unique institutional missions, cultures, histories, and priorities.

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the state of internationalization at the private Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs), and to identify select factors that drive or restrain the internationalization process at these particular institutions. By first broadly reviewing the state of internationalization activity at the 39-member institutions of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) and, next, by examining select strategies, used at two UNCF member institutions, to establish a comprehensive
internationalization plan, the researcher endeavors to identify and highlight selected factors that drive or restrain comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs.

**Research Questions**

With regard to the statement of the problem, and in accordance with the purpose of the study, the primary question that framed the data collection and analysis include: What are the *driving* and *restraining* forces of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs? This primary question is investigated through eight research questions, which further examine this study’s eight independent variables: (a) articulated institutional commitment, (b) assessment of global learning, (c) foreign students, (d) institutional infrastructure, (e) institutional leadership, (f) internationalization review, (g) internationalized curriculum, and (h) Study Abroad. The following research questions have been formulated to guide this study:

**RQ1:** How did an *articulated institutional commitment* impact comprehensive internationalization?

**RQ2:** How did an *assessment of global learning* impact comprehensive internationalization?

**RQ3:** How did *foreign students* impact comprehensive internationalization?

**RQ4:** How did *institutional infrastructure* impact comprehensive internationalization?

**RQ5:** How did *institutional leadership* impact comprehensive internationalization?
RQ6: How did an internationalization review impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ7: How did an internationalized curriculum impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ8: How did study abroad impact comprehensive internationalization?

Significance of the Study

Comprehensive internationalization within U.S. higher education depends upon the convergence of a number of internationalization strategies on a college campus. During the past decade, numerous presidents and provosts have expressed their intent to internationalize their institutions to equip students with the broad intellectual skills necessary to succeed in the global 21st century. Yet, no comparative or empirical studies have been completed explaining any trends, barriers, or unique conditions that impact comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. Obstacles embedded in institutional infrastructure, leadership and the lack of student global learning outcomes are largely responsible for HBCU’s inability to build comprehensive and sustaining internationalization operations. These strategies are often not components of an institution’s comprehensive strategic plan for internationalization.

This study fills the gaps in the literature through an in depth examination of two private HBCU case studies of internationalization to determine what private HBCUs have done to overcome endogenous challenges to conceive and subsequently implement comprehensive plans for internationalization. In addition, this study analyzes cross-case
findings and implications. As the most recent research suggest, an integrated approach to internationalization greatly increases an institution's ability to create a coherent approach.

This study adds to the literature on the internationalization of higher education in several overarching ways. Since Knight's 1994 study of the *Internationalization Cycle*, it has since been cited in three studies (Knight, 2001; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Qiang, 2003), but has never been tested empirically on private HBCUs. Thus, this study provides empirical data on internationalization at private HBCUs, as a result of testing Knight's cycle, which will aid U. S. higher education scholars and internationalization practitioners in understanding how private HBCUs proceed from articulating their commitment to internationalization to the impact their strategies have on comprehensive internationalization.

This study should encourage discussions among HBCU senior administrators and chief international officers about the best strategies to include in the strategic plan for internationalization on their campuses. These unique institutions' ability to expand knowledge about the people of the world (and their challenges) and produce graduates who will advance equity and justice both at home and abroad is predicated on the success of private HBCU's internationalization efforts. The research to date has yet to explore the organizational practices and principles of successful internationalization at private HBCUs.

**Summary**

Chapter One presented the background of the problem, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, and significance of the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to conduct a thorough review of relevant literature related to the focus of this study. The literature provides an overview of internationalization. The literature examines the dependent variable (comprehensive internationalization) and further explored the following independent variables: articulated commitment, assessment of global learning, presence of foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, internationalization review, internationalized curriculum, and study abroad.

Overview of Internationalization

The research supports that there are agreed upon strategies of internationalization. Throughout this study internationalization strategies will also be referred to as independent variables. The following are eight critical and recurring strategies associated with comprehensive internationalization:

- Articulated Institutional Commitment
- Assessment of Global Learning
- Foreign Students
- Institutional Infrastructure
- Institutional Leadership
Internationalization Review

Internationalized Curriculum

Study Abroad

Significant literature on the above referenced strategies exists and addresses their importance individually. As a result, many higher education institutions have been actively engaged in either developing or strengthening these strategies on their campuses. Successful internationalization efforts depend upon several important process questions (the “how”) that can be pivotal to success. Internationalization, similar to other significant changes, requires a thoughtful process, leadership and strategic investments (Green & Olson, 2003).

Although higher education increasingly recognizes the need to internationalize, a considerable gap exists between the rhetoric of global and international education and the reality of institutional activities and outcomes (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Many institutions across the country are working to advance internationalization, by changing the curriculum, encouraging students to study abroad, increasing international partnerships (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005) and increasing foreign student matriculation. For the past several decades, the above referenced international activities have constituted internationalization for the majority of U. S. higher education. Their response to the need for internationalization has been to enhance existing international activity or add new programs that did not previously exist.

As the research demonstrates (Harari, 1992), institutions need to reconceptualize the internationalization of undergraduate education as a “multi-faceted package” and not
as a series of strands that are dealt with in isolation of each other if dealt with at all. Yet, for HBCUs, where financial woes appear to be increasingly more challenging than at other types of institutions, internationalization presents some particularly steep challenges. In an era when the nation’s HBCUs are plagued by severe drops in their endowments, cuts in state funding and an increased demand by students for financial aid (Diamond, 2011), translating their interest in internationalization into action is a seemingly new kind of struggle.

At a June 2011 roundtable discussion as part of the Southern Education Foundation’s annual *HBCU Governance and Institutional Effectiveness Seminar*, an overwhelming majority of the HBCU presidents in attendance cited *money* as the biggest restraining force to their ability to underwrite, not only innovative initiatives like internationalization, but perennial challenges like retention and student persistence to graduation. Yet, a February 2011 survey conducted by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) asked the country’s 18 historically black land-grant institutions (public) about their internationalization efforts (McMurtrie, 2011), and found that money was not the only restraining force among the 14 institutions that responded. On the contrary, many of the responding institutions lacked trained staff in their international offices, and six of the institutions had no full-time employees in charge of campus internationalization. Moreover, the average institution had fewer than two people devoted to that area (McMurtrie, 2011).

While the research on internationalization underscores the urgency for U. S. higher education institutions to better prepare students to be globally competent, little
empirical research exists that examine the extent to which internationalization is a strategic institutional priority of HBCUs in general, or private HBCUs in particular. While a few private HBCUs have begun to enhance their capacity to develop infrastructure to support internationalization efforts on their campuses, their efforts have not resulted in or translated into a blueprint for their institutional counterparts to mirror. To be sure, U. S. higher education has begun to increase the amount of learning communities that meet regularly to foster engagement by key stakeholders through cross-institutional conversations related to effective strategies for internationalization. But, the private HBCU has been noticeably absent from these national circles, and the perspectives of the very few public HBCUs included in such dialogues have been highlighted to represent the sentiments of private black institutions as well.

Obviously, all HBCUs hold a critical position in the preparation of globally competent graduates who can help the nation meet multiple contemporary global challenges. Yet, the researcher has decided to focus primarily on the driving and restraining forces affecting the internationalization efforts of private HBCUs, and how they are responding to the urgent wave of internationalization moving through higher education to create "global" institutions.

As previously stated and the research suggest (American Council on Education [ACE], 2008), the above referenced eight internationalization strategies are ineffective if marginalized to disparate parts working in isolation. The integration of these strategies lies at the core of successfully implementing and sustaining comprehensive internationalization on any campus. The study investigated not only the impact of each
strategy (independent variable) on internationalization, but which independent variables were deemed driving or restraining forces at private HBCUs.

**Dependent Variable**

**Comprehensive Internationalization**

Comprehensive internationalization is a “strategic and integrated approach to internationalization in which institutions articulate internationalization as an institutional goal (if not priority), develop an internationalization plan driven by sound analysis, and seek to bring together usually disparate and often marginalized aspects of internationalization” (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006; p. vi). Successful internationalization plans are not only comprehensive, but sustainable as well.

Sustainable internationalization refers to an enduring process that leads to institutional transformation over time, built on an institutional vision for internationalization, a clearly articulated set of goals, and a strategy to integrate the internationally and globally focused programs and activities on campus (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Thus, sustainable internationalization is a central and guiding feature of the ethos or identity of an institution, rather than a set of “marginal activities disconnected from one another.” After nearly eleven years of researching internationalization in higher education, the American Council on Education concluded that it is a long-term undertaking, involving many people, usually requiring five to 10 years to become embedded in the fabric of the institution, and even longer to work its way into every department, program, and campus office.
ACE has not been alone in their efforts to expand institutional engagement in internationalization in U. S. higher education. Other recent and notable efforts are initiatives like the NAFSA: Association of International Educators September 2011 national webinar series, *Comprehensive Internationalization: Inspiring Campus-Wide Action*. This discussion was facilitated by two of the field’s leading experts and NAFSA senior fellows for internationalization, John Hudzik, Ph.D., former dean and vice president for internationalization at Michigan State University and JoAnn McCarthy, Ph.D., former assistant vice provost of international affairs at the University of Pennsylvania. As a participant in this webinar, the researcher, along with close to one hundred other international educators across the country, moved through what NAFSA deemed as the key action steps to get internationalization moving on a campus.

In June 2011, the Australian Government and Australian Education International commissioned a report, *Internationalization of U. S. Higher Education in a Time of Declining Resources*. The report examines the challenges of declining resources and internationalization efforts. For example, according to the report, twenty-nine U. S. state governments are planning cuts to their higher education budgets in 2011-12, with up to $1.5 billion in states such as California. The U. S. federal government’s stimulus funding began to run out in August 2011, and it has cut $45 million (or 40%) of the budget for international education programs under Title IV and the Fulbright-Hays Program (Green & Ferguson, 2011). The report’s concluding statement claims that “no matter how dire the funding situation, it is unlikely that U. S. higher education institutions, especially
research institutions, will retreat from expanding their international focus” (Green & Ferguson, 2011, p. 2).

But, how does the decline in the referenced resources affect private HBCUs efforts to build capacity for comprehensive internationalization, or integrate an international focus into their institution’s mission and other educational priorities? Sadly, no research has ever looked at this phenomenon. And, of the twenty-two experts on internationalization of U. S. higher education interviewed for the Australian report, not one had any direct professional experience with internationalization at HBCUs.

The fact that there is no single organizational model for comprehensive internationalization that fits all types of institutions is precisely why HBCUs need to begin defining their own path toward sustainable internationalization. This will undoubtedly require an enormous amount of transparency, as asking difficult questions will facilitate even more difficult answers. Consequently, this study specifically selected specific independent variables as a starting point for exploration. Institutional leaders of private HBCUs, like other institutions, that demonstrate success in internationalizing their campuses will do so by embedding internationalization strategies within the core mission of their institutions.

Yet, while the skills and knowledge acquired in international education are the same skills graduates need to succeed in a global economy (McMurtrie & Fischer, 2011), internationalization still does not rank among the top five priorities of a lot of U. S. institutions. Comprehensive internationalization’s intersection with the curriculum, institutional leadership, infrastructure, resources and the development of student global
learning outcome requires the commitment of a critical mass of faculty and administrators. These campus stakeholders are central to the institution’s ability to infuse an international and comparative perspective into their interactions with students.

**Independent Variables**

**Articulated Institutional Commitment**

All universities have missions, explicit or implicit (Davies, 1987) to be found in various locations (mission statements, policy papers, presidential reports, prospectuses). It would seem to be logical that a university espousing internationalization should have clear statements of where it stands in this respect, since mission should inform planning processes and agendas, resource allocation criteria; serve as a rallying standard internally; and indicate to external constituencies a basic and stable set of beliefs and values.

When considering comprehensive internationalization, the question of the *scope of internationalization* on a campus is an obvious one. Institutions must first wrestles with whether its internationalization efforts will be comprehensive or not. The inclusion of internationalization strategies such as teaching, research, global learning outcomes, study abroad, international exchange, technology transfer, foreign student recruitment, area studies, among others suggest a comprehensive approach to the scope of an institution’s plan. The institutional leadership should have explicit positions on the scope of its internationalization plans, since mission is as much about declaring what is not to be done, as what is to be done (Davies, 1992).

Articulated institutional commitment is defined as the extent to which an institution has written statements or established policies supporting internationalization;
and the extent that internationalization is an integral part of an institution’s identity and vision (mission and goals). According to ACE’s 2003 study, *Mapping Internationalization on U. S. Campuses*, few institutions have formally expressed their support for internationalization through institutional policies and practices. Typically, an institution’s mission and vision are expressed through its mission statement, strategic plan, formal assessments, recruitment products, study abroad guidelines and faculty promotion and tenure criteria.

These formal institutional documents and actions define the ideals and direction of the institution for students, faculty, and the public. By leaving internationalization out of these documents, it is likely to remain at the fringes, relying on interested individuals to support activities and initiatives (Siaya & Hayward, 2003). But, while articulating a commitment to internationalization will not solely result in greater campus-wide participation or interest, it will send a critical message and establish a framework for action.

Like ACE, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) for nearly two decades has embarked on a range of global initiatives in U. S. higher education in an effort to make global learning a key characteristic of undergraduate education. AAC&U’s research in this regard has both tracked and highlighted the role of global learning in a complex and shifting set of assumptions, goals and practices in liberal education. Their research of approximately two hundred liberal arts colleges, for example, discovered that a large and growing number of liberal arts colleges specifically indicate in their mission statements that their graduates should be prepared to thrive in a
future characterized by global interdependence (Musil, 2006). However, AAC&U also
discovered that among those same institutions, there was little evidence that students are
provided with multiple, robust, interdisciplinary learning opportunities at increasing
levels of intellectual challenge to ensure that they acquire the global learning professed in
mission statements (Musil, 2006).

Thus, the “internationalization” of HBCUs begins with the articulation of its
reimagined institutional goals. The particular institutional history and mission of HBCUs
are critical and relevant considerations regarding the internationalization process of these
types of institutions. In formulating a strategic response to internationalization, an
HBCU needs to examine its own institution’s unique clientele, competition, history,
location, mission and resources.

It is critical that HBCUs begin to join the growing number of institutions across
the country that have begun to value global learning as a central feature of their
educational responsibilities, incorporating it into their mission statements, dedicating
resources, and “reimagining” their curricula to make it available to all students. An
initial key step in this regard is devising various strategies of action related to the
institution’s particular mission. In fact, a small number of HBCUs have viewed the
strategy of internationalization with such importance that they have developed
accreditation quality enhancement plans (QEPs) as the vehicle to execute their
international education goals.

The early research on internationalization pointed to several possible institutional
goals/missions and related strategies to achieve varying levels of internationalization.
The following three goals/mission and related strategies were once prevalent in the field of international education. Three institutional goals/missions: *Global Awareness*, *Global Understanding* and *Global Competence* were once viewed as obtainable and sustainable levels of internationalization (Kedia & Cornwell, 1994). In addition, they provided guidance in terms of the three levels of knowledge an institution may decide to impart to its administrators, faculty and students. In Table 1, each succeeding goal/mission involves a greater commitment of resources and an enhanced focus by the institution on internationalization. For example, from a student development viewpoint where *global competence* is the ultimate goal, these levels can be viewed as succeeding stages of internationalization. Subsequently, student programs to support the referenced missions and strategies are developed as funding permits.

It should be noted that although the internationalization strategies are organized in Table 1 as appropriate to the three proposed institutional goals/missions, HBCUs, which historically are resources challenged, may only have the luxury of developing programs as funding becomes available. Considering the student as the end product, what does each of these strategies promise? In short, *global awareness* should develop students’ worldview and help them to begin problem solving and information collection in the work environment with awareness of any international implications they discover.
Table 1

*Institutional Missions and Related Internationalization Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL GOAL/MISSION</th>
<th>FACULTY &amp; ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL AWARENESS</td>
<td>- Internationalize existing functional area faculty - Garner support from deans &amp; administrators - Promote partnerships between faculty &amp; Student Affairs staff to develop international Activities</td>
<td>- International topics are integrated with existing courses</td>
<td>- Area studies - Language studies - Study abroad - Recruit international students - International Forums on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>- Add international Faculty - Reward international teaching and research</td>
<td>- Add a general international studies courses - Courses in functional areas in all academic divisions</td>
<td>- Study abroad programs - Foreign language programs abroad (continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL GOAL/MISSION</th>
<th>FACULTY &amp; ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td>- Establish an Office or Center of International Programs/Affairs</td>
<td>- International business degree Diaspora Studies major</td>
<td>- Overseas internships - Extended stay programs - Work abroad programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global understanding should provide knowledge and understanding in dealing with global trends (social, economic, and political). Students should not only have a worldview, but also be able to act on their knowledge confidently. Finally, global competence as a mission should prepare students to function effectively in a global environment.

Not all schools can afford to immediately pursue a strategy of global competence. However, in light of the challenge to compete with their peer institutions, it is not a bad idea for HBCUs to have global competence as a long-term goal. In recent years, a few HBCUs have realized global awareness with relative ease and a smaller number have achieved some measure of success in getting to global understanding. Yet, the leap from
awareness and understanding to complete competence is a transition that has not only
ceded most HBCUs, but has also been an enormously expensive transition to make.
HBCUs are better served by formulating their own approach depending on their unique
circumstances, commitment, aspirations, environment and resources. However, the
achievement of Global Competence as an HBCU’s institutional mission will depend in
large part on the resources available for achieving its internationalization goals.

Clearly, since an institution’s mission is as much about declaring what is not to be
done, as what is to be done, then any 21st century institution should have explicit
positions on the scope of its internationalization plans. Moreover, its articulated
institutional commitment should define and be underscored by written statements or
established policies supporting internationalization. For comprehensive
internationalization to occur, it needs to be an integral part of an institution’s identity and
vision (mission and goals).

While the development of articulated institutional commitments for
internationalization is a critical first step toward sustaining it, no discussion on
reimagining the mission and institutional goals of HBCUs would be complete without
examining first their unique set of clientele, history, and mission. The history of the
black college in America has embraced both the notion of service and the goal of training
for leadership in a complex technological society (Hedgepeth, Edmonds, & Craig, 1978).
As Martin Luther King, Jr. was completing his freshman year at Morehouse College in
1945, Morehouse President, Dr. Benjamin Mays, said in a radio address (Bennett, 1977):
It will not be sufficient for Morehouse College . . . to produce clever graduates, men fluent in speech and able to argue their way through; but rather honest men, men who can be trusted in public and private—men who are sensitive to the wrongs, the sufferings and injustices of society and who are willing to accept responsibility for correcting the ills. (p. 78)

Mays defined education as a moral experience that motivates one to be concerned about others, especially those who are oppressed and treated unjustly (Willie, 1978), and though Mays was not representative of all HBCU presidents, his ideologies and concepts of social change were certainly many aspired to. The idea of reform, of social change for a just society, is recurrent in the literature on the history and purposes of black colleges. The historical preeminence of this mission is attested to both in the number and quality of black professionals and leaders (Hedgepeth, Edmonds, & Craig, 1978) in all fields of human endeavor, who have graduated from HBCUs.

The purposes of black colleges are the products of many historical currents, some of which flowed together quietly, while others erupted in agonizing public controversy. Thus, wrote Gregory Kannerstein (1978), former Dean of Students at Haverford College:

Black colleges have grappled with the demands of inculcating academic values while not neglecting ethical and moral values, of serving educational goals while serving the community, of being open to all while remaining committed to a specific constituency, of responding to the pathology while promoting health, and of combating social injustice while never swerving in allegiance to American society. (p. 30)
This socioethical responsibility has been inherent to the mission of HBCUs, and is a direct result of the emphasis, orientation, vision and the climate for social morality that have always given the black college its raison d'etre. Yet, there is no substitute for excellence. Black colleges, therefore, must reject as false all counsel to pursue other priorities in the place of academic excellence, including cheap and vulgar conceptions of “relevance” (Cook, 1978).

Why the inclusion of historical anecdotes in the discussion about the internationalization of HBCUs? First, it is imperative that HBCUs examine carefully their unique history and mission when deciding how best to approach internationalization. Second, in order to successfully integrate a sustainable internationalization strategy, HBCUs should look for the international dimensions and implications in their missions that have historically fostered humanism, social idealism, imagination, and an awareness of the contradictions and accidents of the human predicament. Perhaps the most effective articulation of institutional commitment to internationalization will come from the HBCUs who decide to tackle internationalization on their own terms and in an effort to put their own unique imprint on internationalization in U. S. higher education.

The move toward comprehensive internationalization is an aggressive agenda for any institution, and especially for the often resourced-strapped private HBCU. The requisite mindset for action begins with a campus-wide discussion and understanding of the rationale, motivations and options to engage internationalization (Hudzik, 2011). Successful internationalization is the result of consensus being reached from all fractions
of the campus community. Thus, it is the development of a mindset of shared responsibility and collaboration. Finally, an institution’s mission and vision statements, along with policies and procedures to support internationalization, help to frame the aggressive internationalization agenda. An articulated institutional commitment to internationalization should represent a shared and compelling rationale for the ideal.

Assessment of Global Learning

A review of the literature on student learning outcomes assessment (Banta, Jones, & Black, 2009; Suskie, 2009; Leskes & Miller, 2006; Kinzie, 2010; Hovland, 2006; Musil, 2006; Rhodes, 2010) has revealed that assessment of student learning has been gaining tremendous momentum over the past two decades. Learning in its broadest sense can be defined as those activities and programs that challenge students and afford them the opportunity to grow. Arguably, for most campuses, the next big challenge is how to use effectively an astounding amount of data to improve student learning (Kinzie, 2010).

Revised institutional and program accreditation standards have motivated institutions to design curricular and cocurricular programs that address intended student learning outcomes. The intent is for academic programs to be presented in a manner that expands educational opportunities, encourages personal development, improves academic skills, and enhances the health and lifestyle of all members of the university community. The problem is that student learning outcomes assessments results are rarely being used to influence institutional improvements. Because accreditation is motivated by a compliance mentality, little attention is paid to the assessment interests and questions about student learning that are important to educational effectiveness (Kinzie, 2010).
While accreditation is clearly a powerful force driving assessment in U. S. higher education, it has created a tension between assessment for accountability and assessment for improvement. Inherent in this tension are the perceptions of some faculty who view assessment as a distraction from the more important work of teaching. Coupled with this faculty view is their assertion that grades are sufficient information about how well students are learning. Criteria for educational effectiveness, such as increased student retention and graduation rates are considered outside the purview and interest of faculty (Kinzie, 2010).

Accreditation in the U. S. is a voluntary and self-regulatory mechanism of the higher education community. It plays a significant role in fostering public confidence in the educational enterprise, in maintaining standards, in enhancing institutional effectiveness, and in improving higher education (Commission on Colleges/Southern Association of Colleges and Schools [SACS], 2004). The adoption in 2001 of the Principles of Accreditation by the Commission on Colleges introduced a focus on student learning that changed the approach to accreditation. This proactive approach to accreditation now pushes institutions to focus on student learning and its effectiveness in supporting and enhancing student learning. This increased focus on student learning outcomes is facilitated through the Commission on Colleges’ Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The QEP gives institutions the opportunity to describe a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning (Commission on Colleges/SACS, 2004).
The good news is the advent of accrediting agencies’ focus on enhancing student learning has expanded faculty purview to include an interest in assessment evidence from authentic student work that is directly related to teaching and learning. Today, faculty throughout the Academy are now having constructive discussions related to improvements in pedagogy as a result of developing more effective approaches to assessing student work. Another result of accreditation requirements as drivers for assessment of student learning has been the increased capacity of institutional leaders to ask legitimate questions of their faculty such as, How do they make academic decisions about what to teach, and how do they know what their students are learning (Kinzie, 2010).

The 30-year research produced by assessment scholar Linda Suskie is an especially rich body of work to examine for educational leaders interested scholarship that combines best practices related to organizing assessment, collecting data, reporting findings and using the results to improve overall assessment. As a vice president at the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, an accreditor of colleges and universities in the mid-Atlantic region of the U. S., Suskie is internationally recognized as an expert on a broad range of topics related to assessment in higher education. Yet, it is the accessibility of the language with which she communicates to a cross-section of audiences interested in the prevailing topics related to assessment research that makes her a special scholar of note.

Assessment novices, like this researcher, will find Suskie’s ideas regarding writing goals and objectives for learning, designing rubrics, and benchmarking extremely
easy to grasp. However, her biggest contribution to her field might be the way in which she makes otherwise complex assessment concepts understandable. Suskie (2009) book, *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*, is the result of her own observations of the dramatic changes within higher education during the intervening five years since the first edition of the book was published.

Over the past several years, Suskie’s work has been routinely cited by internationalization researcher (Childress, 2010; ACE 2005, 2008) for her insightful exploration of assessing attitudes, values, dispositions and habits of mind. As internationalization has gained momentum in higher education and the push for assessment evidence from authentic student work has become paramount, internationalization experts have looked to Suskie’s work for effective strategies to assess traits that are not easily observable. Global learning (or competence) is representative of those “ineffable” traits hard to evaluate or assess. Suskie is very clear on educational leaders not holding faculty accountable for things they cannot teach – as some traits are simply not teachable (Suskie, 2009). Yet, she also cautions that though some traits (or goals) may appear difficult to assess, they are not impossible to assess and assessment of them should not be abandon.

Another important question Suskie explores is, what decisions will our assessment results inform? This is an especially critical consideration for educational leaders either introducing internationalization for the first time or enhancing an already existing international program focus on campus. With this in mind, Linda Suskie’s *Assessment as a Continuous Four-Step Cycle* indicates that institutions proceed through
the following four steps to assess student learning: (a) establish student learning outcomes, (b) provide learning opportunities, (c) assess student learning, and (d) use the results to modify and improve student programs (Suskie, 2009, p. 4). Using the student as the focus of analysis changes the conversation about internationalization completely.

Although significant literature exists on determining and assessing student learning outcomes, a gap exists in understanding how to effectively apply the assessment of learning outcomes to internationalization, and combining that approach with one that focuses on institutional internationalization strategies (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Figure 1 illustrates Suskie's *Assessment as a Continuous Four-Step Cycle*, which indicates that institutions proceed through the following four steps to assess student learning:

**Figure 1**: Assessment as a Continuous Four-Step Cycle.

Suskie provides a roadmap for successful assessment programs and explores assessment tools including rubrics, assignments, portfolios, tests, and surveys. A well-
known scholar for her exhaustive research of assessment trends over the past 20 years, Suskie's theory underscores the importance of understanding and using assessment results in building sustainable internationalization operations. Suskie's (2004) study on *Assessing Global Learning* has never been applied to the unique environment of private HBCUs.

Although significant literature exists on determining and assessing student learning outcomes, a gap exists in understanding how to effectively apply the assessment of learning outcomes to internationalization, and combining that approach with one that focuses on institutional internationalization strategies (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Yet, Suskie's Four-Step Assessment Model provides a roadmap for successful assessment, which can be used to build a sustainable internationalization operation.

Specifying global learning outcomes and then considering how activities address these outcomes, again, shifts the discussion to ensuring that students can achieve these outcomes in multiple ways. Suskie's Four-Step Assessment Model stresses using the resulting information to improve student learning through content or pedagogy changes. The challenge for U. S. higher education is to make students conscious of exactly what they have learned and how their attitudes have or have not shifted. Also aligning global learning outcomes to internationalization strategies is a strategic way to guide efforts to review and assess institutional programs and activities. In effect, such alignment ensures an institutional process of developing goals and conducting assessment that underscore accountability.
Designing Effective Assessment: Principles and Profiles of Good Practice by Banta, Jones, and Black (2009) adds to Suskie’s approach by giving attention to assessing global learning through the use of a survey or e-portfolio approach. As the research on internationalization urges campuses to take an integrated approach to comprehensive internationalization, such an approach to assessing ineffable traits is critical. Institutions should look for collaborative efforts to assess global learning and identify necessary improvements in curriculum and related programs. Many institutions have articulated the goal of producing “globally competent graduates,” but few have clearly defined what this means or how they will know when they have achieved this goal (Banta, Jones, & Black, 2009). Findings that result from a survey or e-portfolio can be used to start conversations with key constituents including students, faculty, administrators and assessment personnel. These conversations are key components to Suskie’s above referenced fourth step, which suggest using assessment results to modify and improve student programs.

Few liberal arts institutions have developed comprehensive or integrated approaches to global learning (Hovland, 2006). For example, a 2006 Mellon Foundation-funded study of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), found that “there is little evidence that students are provided with multiple, robust, interdisciplinary learning opportunities at increasing levels of intellectual challenge to ensure that students acquire the global learning professed in the mission statement” (Hovland, 2006, p. 15).

Diamond’s (1998) Designing and Assessing Courses and Curricula: A Practical Guide is considered a pioneering resource in the field of student learning outcomes,
because of its strategic focus on goals, objectives and curriculum design which enable institutions to demonstrate the effectiveness of their academic enterprise. In addition, Diamond’s (1998) research underscores the importance of assessment to determine whether or not curricular and cocurricular programs and activities are achieving the defined learning outcomes.

Internationalization, like other curricular and cocurricular activities of higher education, has been dramatically affected by the research on determining and assessing student learning outcomes. Internationalization strategies at the majority of campuses in U. S. higher education are not strategically comprehensive or integrated; rather they are a series of international program strands that are dealt with in isolation. The shift to a student learning focus creates certain challenges for institutional comprehensive internationalization.

More than 10 years of mapping, measuring and building a strategic framework for internationalization in higher education has resulted in the realization, for higher education associations like ACE and AAC&U, that internationalization is best realized through the process of setting and assessing global learning outcomes for students. This is especially critical when an institution is not in a position to supply all or many of the standard internationalization strategies or global learning experiences for the many students that matriculate on their campus, like at many private HBCUs.

Campus internationalization in American higher education has been dramatically impacted by the shift from focusing on teaching to focusing on learning. In their report
Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization, Olsen, Green, and Hill (2005) assert:

Briefly stated, student learning outcomes are the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and habits of mind that students take with them from a learning experience...

Increasingly, both institutional and program accreditation require that the institutions or programs under review demonstrate that they are collecting evidence that students are actually achieving them. Faculty and administrators who see the need for improvement have pressured campuses to take student learning seriously. (p. 2)

Focusing purely on establishing international strategies/programs, without first focusing on the outcomes creates monstrous assessment challenges for institutions. In order not to overwhelm people, it is best to assess student learning by turning first to what is already being done. However, for private HBCUs that might be new to global learning outcomes assessment, taking an intentional approach to global learning offers the possibility for enhancing the education of all students by building on what students themselves—through their own inherited and self-chosen identities, communal legacies, and personal experiences—bring to the college experience (Musil, 2006). This point by Musil underscores many of the existing assessment strategies already employed by HBCUs. Yet, how this is actually assessed, whether through thematic learning communities, vertically integrated curricula, surveys, e-portfolios or other specifically designed data collection methods, could be the key to enhancing the academic enterprises of private HBCUs.
Now more than ever, assessing global learning outcomes of students is a critical responsibility of educational leaders in U. S. higher education. Moreover, because of their very specific missions and student clientele, the work of HBCUs in this regard immediately adds a unique perspective to a national focus concerned with U. S. students lagging behind students in other countries, and the types of student preparation needed to close the perceived gaps. Internationalization and its attention to global learning outcomes should not escape the accountability or transparency requirements with which other types of educational reforms are held.

Few people question the need to assess institutions’ programs in order to ensure that they are actually doing what they set out to do, namely produce educated persons (Rhodes, 2010). Thus, private HBCUs, with their rich histories and impressive production of graduates have arrived at a moment in their institutional stories when constructing viable global learning opportunities that generate transformational educational outcomes is critical to sustaining their relevance in the 21st century.

Clearly, the research on global learning outcomes assessment does not suggest that private HBCUs ease up on more historical concerns such as reading, writing, retention, and student persistence to graduation. It does highlight, however, the emergent importance of aggressively developing reliable assessment rubrics to sufficiently evaluate global learning (attitudes, values, dispositions and habits of mind) of our black undergraduates. Assessment is, first and foremost, an opportunity to start out with the good news—to tell the good story, and the rich and powerful legacy of private HBCUs is the result of many hands making light work of the necessary assessment of their students.
Before full credibility can be given to private HBCUs for the contributions they have made to internationalization, global outcomes and goals have to be defined, transparency has to be confronted to assess the current state, and broad base input is needed throughout the assessment process.

**Foreign Students**

The literature on global student mobility (Macready & Tucker, 2011; Open Doors, 2007, 2010) provides important analysis on the scale of foreign student mobility and enrollment trends in the U. S. The research on the prevailing foreign student recruitment trends (Green & Ferguson, 2010) in U. S. higher education provides an even broader context to the discussion of using foreign students as an internationalization strategy. ACE and the Association of International Education Administrators' (AIEA) nearly two decades of research on internationalization in U. S. higher education have revealed that the strategy least likely to be used to increase internationalization on campus is the effective use of foreign students. Finally, literature on institutional diversity in U. S. higher education offer critical considerations for educational leaders concerned with the composition of their student bodies.

The available information tells us that only a very small minority of the total world student population is internationally mobile—about 2% at tertiary level in 2007 (Macready & Tucker, 2011). The opportunity to study in another country is often a defining moment in students’ lives. According to Macready and Tucker, one important motivating factor is:
A Lack of suitable opportunities in the student’s home country . . . other reasons include a desire to enhance qualifications and employability back home, an intention to use study abroad as a path to work abroad, or a simple wish to experience another society and culture. (p. 2)

Foreign students can have a tremendous effect on the learning of U. S. students. And, many institutions have come to realize that having foreign students on their campus only enriches the educational experience for every student. When we ushered in the 21st century, many college and university leaders quickly realized the impact that foreign student matriculation could have on their capacity to actually become the kind of global institution they wanted to promote. Increasingly, however, universities and colleges value (foreign) students for economic reasons: the tuition fees paid by foreign students can be an important source of income, particularly at times of economic difficulty when other income sources are threatened (Macready & Tucker, 2011). In fact, the data already supports the fact that the economic benefits of foreign student mobility are significant.

For example, according to the U. S. Department of Commerce, foreign students contributed $19.9 billion to the U. S. economy in 2009-2010. Thus, it appears very likely that the big business of recruiting foreign students to the U. S. will continue to thrive. Macready and Tucker’s (2011) research, Who Goes Where and Why?, offers the following four reasons for this type of optimism:

1. **Population Growth**: rising birth rates in developing countries and increased demand for education at all levels.
2. **Development of Global Economy:** the emergence of China and India and other Asian countries, has resulted in a burgeoning need for the less affluent students to look beyond their borders to balance quality, cost, and accessibility of education.

3. **English Language Acquisition:** English is the *working language* of the global economy.

4. **Professional Positioning:** Studying abroad for foreign students opens up an array of academic and professional options not readily available to them in their home countries. (pp. 3-5)

Another important phenomenon of global student mobility also analyzed by Macready and Tucker is how foreign students decide which country to go to over another, which the researchers refer to as the twelve *Pull Factors*:

- High-quality study opportunities;
- Specialized study opportunities;
- Teaching in a language mobile students speak or want to learn;
- Traditional links and diasporas;
- Affordable cost;
- Internationally recognized qualifications;
- Good prospects of high returns;
- Post-study career opportunities in destination country;
- Good prospects of successful graduation within a predictable time;
- Effective marketing by destination country and/or institution;
- Home-country support for going there to study; and
- Helpful visa arrangements, for study and for work while studying. (p. 45-46)

A natural progression from examining the Pull Factors is to look at recent trends in foreign student enrollment in U. S. higher education. According to the Institute of International Education’s (2007), Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange:

With several thousand accredited institutions of all types offering a wide variety of programs and degrees, the U. S. higher education system has the capacity to accommodate a vast number of both domestic and international students. Although international students were enrolled in all types of higher education institutions in 2006-2007, they tended to be concentrated in a relatively small number of institutions. Almost 60% of the 582,984 international students in the U. S. in 2006-07 (335,791 students), attended just 156 institutions . . . The leading 25 institutions, all large doctoral/research institutions, hosted 19% of all international students and were located in just 14 states. (p. 10)

For a visual of the most recent data available on foreign student matriculation in U. S. colleges and universities, Table 2 shows the top 20 sending countries of undergraduates to the U. S. for the period 2009-2010. An important note is the fact that China, India and South Korea have traded positions 1-3 since the 2006-07 academic year.
Unfortunately, if one takes an even deeper look at foreign student enrollment trends from the perspective of the private HBCUs, the picture is a bit dismal. In 2007, for example, the total enrollment of all students at UNCF-member institutions was 54,205 students. Of that number, foreign student enrollments accounted for only 2% of the undergraduate student population (UNCF Statistical Report, 2010). Clearly, the message here is that HBCUs, for any number of reasons, have not strategically sought to count foreign student mobility and their subsequent enrollment as significant dimensions of their internationalization strategy and/or their strategic plan for enrollment.

Once again, foreign student recruitment is another opportunity to link institutional mission and capacity to comprehensive internationalization. Both the mission and
institutional capacity should drive the foreign student recruitment goal for enrollment management. The question any institution should be asking is not how many can we take, but how many can we support. From what the student mobility literature tells us, about the potential economic gains resulting from foreign student admissions, HBCUs have a solid opportunity to capitalize on foreign students whose decision to study in the U. S. are intrinsically tied to the above referenced Pull Factors. Many of the private HBCUs have long successful histories demonstrating similar traits.

However, few institutions have policies that encourage a balance of international students across disciplines, and this may not be particularly realistic. Foreign students come to U. S. institutions pursuing their own interests and often arrive at a particular institution as a result of a series of coincidences (Kuhlman, 1992). However, enrolling foreign students from a wide variety of national backgrounds will have a greater potential of exposing the domestic student body to a broader spectrum of the cultures of the world – an important objective of international educational exchange. On the other hand, policies at HBCUs regarding the admission, education and social integration of foreign students vary greatly from the comprehensive to the non-existent. The little research in this regard reflect ad hoc and expedient foreign student programming on black college campuses across the country.

Hence the lack of normative approaches in dealing with the foreign student population on U. S. campuses in matters that goes much beyond immigration regulations (Kuhlman, 1992). These factors require U. S. institutions to examine their assumptions about the reasons they enroll foreign students and their destinations once their studies are
completed. The world of learning and scholarship has often aspired to transcend national boundaries throughout history, and universities have traditionally been international institutions (Macready & Tucker, 2011). Here again, the historical experiences of HBCUs can serve as a pivotal reminder of their rich tradition with foreign student matriculation.

For example, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania began providing education to students from Africa in 1896 when their first two South African students were admitted. From 1896 to 1923, 23 South Africans had graduated. By the early 1930s, Lincoln was a small liberal arts college, with roughly 270 black students, the vast majority of whom were from the eastern states. In 1939 there were 319 students, of whom 15 were from Africa.

West African attendance at Lincoln was initiated by Nnamdi Azikiwe, who received his bachelor’s degree from Lincoln in 1930 and his master’s degree in 1933 from the University of Pennsylvania. It was Azikiwe who inspired Kwame Nkrumah and other West Africans to study in the U. S. and particularly at Lincoln where African students received a great deal of financial assistance (Sherwood, 1996). African students studying at U. S. black colleges during preindependence were different from their African colleagues pursuing degrees in British universities. Africans at British institutions were encouraged to join the small, educated elite on their return home. However, African students attending Lincoln had different ideas. As Ghanaian Ako Adjei (a Lincoln colleague of Nkrumah’s) explained, “Those going to England had no nationalist spirit, but looked upon England as their home . . . Our idea was complete independence . . . It
was schools like Lincoln that trained black young men and women to stand on their own feet” (Sherwood, 1996, p. 30).

African students at HBCUs during the 1930s were doing much more than merely standing on their feet. They were standing tall enough to one day lead nations. For example, Nnamdi Azikiwe, a Lincoln classmate of poet Langston Hughes (1929), Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall (1930), and musician Cab Calloway (1930), would become the first president of Nigeria on October 1, 1963. Dr. Hastings Kamuzu Banda, a graduate of Wilberforce Institute (now Central State University) in 1928 and Meharry Medical College in 1937 became the first president of Malawi on July 6, 1966. Kwame Nkrumah, a 1939 graduate of Lincoln University earned his Master of Science in education from the University of Pennsylvania (1942), would go on to become the first president of Ghana on July 1, 1960.

Once again, the above achievements of Africans should not be viewed as purely anecdotal, but used instead to underscore evidence of the charter missions of HBCUs, which was to produce the most profound intellectual and creative achievements of black people period. Their early charters strategically emphasized social justice for black people everywhere. Alas, the charge of HBCUs was so resounding and revolutionary that young idealists, even from preindependent Africa, came to their hollow halls seeking human fulfillment and, subsequently, contribute to the internationalization of black folks’ legacy of triumph over adversity.

While foreign student matriculation at HBCUs may once have been intrinsically linked to the African Diaspora, currently such trends are sparse among private black
colleges. According to the *Open Doors 2010 Report*, Nigeria and Kenya are the only Sub-Saharan African nations that appear on the above referenced report’s list of top twenty sending countries to U. S. colleges and universities. They appear as numbers 17 and 18, respectively.

The number of international students at U. S. colleges and universities jumped 5% to 723,277 during the 2010-11 academic year (including all levels: associate, bachelors, graduate and intensive English non-degree students). This increase was led by China (which sent an estimated 39,921 undergraduate students), and who for the second consecutive year was the top sending nation. India, the second top sending country, was followed by Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, Iran and Venezuela, according to the report.

The literature on foreign student recruitment trends sheds some light on the various impacts not having a comprehensive national strategy for foreign student recruitment can have on U. S. higher education in general and the private HBCU in particular. The boom in Chinese student recruitment and enrollment at U. S. institutions is a compelling case study. The rapid increase from China has been predominately at the undergraduate level. Without the increase in Chinese students, foreign student enrollment at U. S. colleges and universities would have declined by more than 10,000 in 2009-2010. However, as a result of the increase, many U. S. institutions are heavily focusing their recruitment efforts on China. For example, Colorado State University has opened an office in Shanghai with three part-time staff and may open other offices in China. These offices are funded by a special budget allotment that supplements the $45,000 general international recruiting budget (Green & Ferguson, 2011).
The case of China also helps to illustrate the many recruitment strategies many U. S. institutions are scrambling to use, in order to get their share of the income generated by the surge in Chinese matriculation. Some institutions choose to do it alone, work collectively, hire agents, or partner with one of the relatively new providers that combine recruiting with a bridge program to help students transition successfully to the U. S. higher education system (Green & Ferguson, 2011). However, like many institutions, the private HBCU has limited experience in foreign student recruitment and little to no travel budgets. Even as some private HBCUs are beginning to realize that recruiting foreign students is one solution to their financial woes, meager recruiting budgets have stifled their ability to send recruiters abroad.

Another growing trend, during the past 10 years, is the established websites of nearly half of all U. S. states to market to foreign students. In the absence of a nationally coordinated U. S. outreach effort, the idea of state-wide initiatives has rapidly spread as a cost effective way for institutions to pool their resources and efforts and enable even smaller or less well-known colleges to reach students around the world. To assist with the effort, the U. S. Commerce Department has reserved the URLs for all 50 state-association websites (Green & Ferguson, 2011).

Other recruitment strategies have picked up momentum as well. The use of agents, for example, is a current source of much debate in U. S. higher education. Objections to the use of agents are fueled by reports of abuses, unease over the commission structure and conflicting positions held by U. S. government agencies (Green & Ferguson, 2011). For instance, the Department of State refuses to work with agents,
while the Department of Commerce has steadily worked with agents throughout the years. Federal regulations ban the use of recruiters for U. S. students receiving financial aid, although there are no such restrictions with respect to (foreign) students. Additionally, some public universities are prevented from paying commissions for foreign students by state spending rules (Fischer, 2010).

Finally, the use of private sector organizations for recruitment, establishing effective institutional partnerships with universities overseas and establishing branch campuses abroad round out the foreign student recruitment strategies of many U. S. institutions. Yet, institutions with fewer resources and lower international profiles, like the private HBCU, may find the use of agents and other private sector entities to be a key to expanding their recruitment reach globally. Yet, the lack of a comprehensive national strategy for foreign student recruitment in the U. S. will continue to keep institutions with fewer resources on the fringe of the ever-growing foreign student recruitment business. The Obama administration has emphasized building educational exchanges and academic partnerships in emerging markets such as India and Indonesia, which situates education at the center of expanded economic, political, cultural and social constructions globally. But, emphasis is not a plan.

Yet, having many foreign students on a campus does not necessarily make that institution international either. Discussions about the presence of international students on U. S. campuses frequently point out that these students are often not integrated into campus life (Green, 2005). As a result, U. S. institutions have scrambled to accommodate the massive influx of not only Chinese students, but foreign students in
general. Foreign students bring with them rich experiences and unique cross-cultural perspectives that help to internationalize the campus and give the host country students first-hand opportunities to share learning with individuals from around the world.

However, foreign students face unique challenges as they attempt to adjust to a different campus life and culture, master written and spoken languages, comply with immigration regulations, meet the requirements of their academic programs, and prepare to return home to begin careers.

In institutions where the faculty and the administration are moving dynamically to internationalize the curriculum and the institution, foreign students usually feel very welcome and the interaction between them and U. S. students and faculty is thriving. Where these efforts to internationalize an institution are weak or absent, the trend seems to be for foreign students to feel somewhat isolated and to imagine that the faculty members in general and especially the American students, do not really care about their presence (Harari, 1992).

The literature on institutional diversity in U. S. higher education tells us that campuses that have foreign students and/or immigrant students should consider sponsoring workshops and faculty discussion groups on how the cultural diversity can be used as a resource in the classroom. In addition, campuses should strategically initiate or intensify discussions on increased foreign student recruitment in general and targeted programs for increasing integration and interactions outside of the classroom between foreign and U. S. students in particular. Yet, a critical undertaking regarding foreign
students is the need for a strategic discussion on diversity and balance at the leadership level.

In its *Guidelines for International Education at U. S. Colleges and Universities*, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) identifies the following six areas of concern for U. S. institutions of higher education in dealing with international students and scholars (Kuhlman, 1992):

- A clear purpose and rationale in enrolling international students.
- The existence of a professional staff in order to provide the requisite support services.
- The maintenance of a balanced cultural diversity within the international student body and faculty body.
- The educational and cultural resources that international students and scholars represent in U. S. campuses and the efficient use of these resources.
- The guidance and training of international teaching assistants on U. S. campuses.
- The help and assistance to be given by the professional staff in U. S. universities to ease the transition for international students and scholars before their home-bound journey (pp. 22).

The selection of the campus professionals who work directly with foreign students should not be handled lightly. Their role is critical to the use of foreign students as partners in the institution's effort to develop sustainable internationalization. They
provide information, advising, programs and services designed to make the experiences of foreign students as positive and productive as possible. The team of professionals who work with foreign students must develop, record, disseminate, implement, and regularly review their mission and goals. Their mission statements must be consistent with the mission of the institution and they must operate as an integral part of the institution’s overall mission.

HBCUs looking to make an impact in this area need to use the potential resources that foreign students represent. Foreign students can contribute greatly to the success of any travel and study abroad programs by providing the networking applicable to establishing these programs at foreign institutions. They can also have an impact on the overall view that minority students have of other cultures. The international students association on HBCU campuses could also be a viable resource in the creation of an international campus culture by being encouraged to organize co-curricular activities that fully integrate on a day-to-day basis the entire campus community.

Internationalization in higher education, in its simplest form, is a purposeful engagement with the world, and this engagement should be amenable to all institutional leaders. Presidents and chief academic officers at private HBCUs, for example, should frequently be facilitating campus discourse that addresses how the institution should engage globally, engage the foreign student market and support the foreign student population on their campuses. The private HBCUs, like any institution, are challenged by how best to sell or market their reputation overseas. Such international marketing has to be approached strategically, and not opportunistically.
Finally, the private HBCU needs to weigh a couple considerations. First, if the private HBCU continues to remain a closed institution, they continue the risk cycle of losing revenue, amenity and the very ambiance of a globally engaged environment. Second, for the private HBCU committed to internationalization, with an eye toward improving their foreign student engagement, they add a needed perspective to the ongoing national debate on economic versus educational value.

**Institutional Infrastructure**

It is imperative that institutions approach the process toward comprehensive internationalization with a measure of transparency. Asking themselves tough questions such as, *Is internationalization to be a thoroughly pervasive aspect of the institution or essentially marginal in nature?* If the former is the goal, then one would expect to see the evidence in the development of policies and practices in curriculum, financing, personnel, marketing (internally and externally), research and other institutional infrastructure consistently devoted to the international ethos of the campus (Davies, 1992). Gathering the best intelligence regarding what is feasible is the first and most critical step in the path to developing and sustaining comprehensive internationalization.

Major strengths and weakness in internationalization are determined by the nature and level of programs, personnel and financing in place to support it. The general contention is that many practices in this regard have been developed by universities for purposes not of internationalization per se, but general institutional management (Davies, 1992). Such institutional infrastructure may not be entirely supportive of or conducive to implementing a comprehensive and sustainable internationalization plan.
For comprehensive internationalization to occur at HBCUs the most important element must be the support of the institutional leadership. The support of institutional leadership can take the form of financial commitment, establishing an administrative office to coordinate and lead the process of internationalization, giving official support for a commitment to international education by incorporating it into the institution’s mission statement, or encouraging faculty and other administrators to seek outside funding (Overton, 1992). Regarding internationalization at HBCUs, the lack of an administrative arrangement which permits effective leadership to evolve towards accomplishing comprehensive internationalization has been the perennial reason more HBCUs have not been more successful in this regard.

The 1980s proved to be a pivotal period for international education. In many respects the internationalization of U. S. higher education began to come of age at this time, as it became abundantly clear that we were living in a global community—an interdependent world. U. S. higher education slowly began to be viewed as a critical element of American foreign policy, as it became more apparent that the challenges our country faced and the solutions we sought could not be determined by the U. S. acting unilaterally. Environmental degradation, economic debt, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (and their control), regional conflict, and international trade were all interrelated problems, and U. S. higher education were hearing the collective cries from constituents all around them to produce graduates skillfully equipped to create solutions to the world’s most challenging problems.
Around this same time the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) was founded, bringing together the chief international officers of U. S. institutions, and along with other professional organizations like NAFSA: Association of International Educators and Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), expanded and flourished by providing valuable advice and helping to shape the nature of internationalization in higher education in ways consistent with the need to produce globally competent graduates for an uncertain future.

The convergence of the emerging influence of professional associations for international educators, pressing global challenges and the fear that the United State’s global dominance was dissipating engineered a paradigm shift in U. S. higher education in the 1980s. Institutions were forced to strategically consider the possible dimensions of successful and sustainable internationalization. Institutional leaders who were among the first to commit to internationalization helped the Academy in general, discern that institutional infrastructure, administrative style, and organization varied greatly among U. S. higher education institutions. The administrative practices and patterns on each campus have been established through historical traditions, and these traditions shape the efforts to develop a strong international dimension (Rahman & Kopp, 1992).

The scope of the institutional infrastructure is a critical dimension of comprehensive internationalization. Its sustainability lies in the realization that international education needs to be given its own place in the life and being of the university (Rahman & Kopp, 1992). A major aspect of providing a “home” for internationalization is the appointment of a chief international officer (CIO) for the
institution. The reporting structure of the chief international officer is another critical element that often underscores the level and scope of the institutional infrastructure of internationalization on a given campus.

Some institutions have underscored their demonstrated commitments to internationalization by giving their CIOs titles such as Associate/Assistant Provost or Vice President for International Programs/Education, with direct reporting lines to the Provost/Chief Academic Officer. Under the direction of the CIO there is an opportunity to bring together all the key areas to internationalization—study abroad programs, international students/scholars, internationalization of the curriculum, international partnerships, and the strategic planning for overall international education. The development of this type of institutional infrastructure is critical to an institution's ability to develop a sense of international identity and to formulate international education objectives aligned with the institutional mission.

It should be noted here that central offices for international education or programs can be conceived in many different configurations. Some include academic international programs such as area and international studies; others are a de facto clearinghouse for international contracts, grants and development and technical assistance programs; yet others incorporate intensive English language programs. The different international education functions appear in any number of combinations across the spectrum of smaller and larger, private and public institutions of higher education in the United States (Rahman & Kopp, 1992). However, regardless of the mix of functions, the important
take away is the creation of a central authority with a direct reporting line to the provost/chief academic officer.

To support the above referenced institutional infrastructure, the establishment of an internationalization committee/taskforce comprised of representative faculty from each academic division/school is a critical catalyst to internationalization becoming pervasive on a campus. Finally, the trick is to provide a central focal point for things international, but not to be overbearing; to encourage cooperation, but not kill initiative; and above all, to exude commitment and conviction that “international” is the way of the future; and then to facilitate (Rahman & Kop, 1992).

**Institutional Leadership**

The internationalization of U. S. higher education is both inevitable and important, but progress requires vision and leadership (McMurtrie & Fischer, 2010). Institutional leaders need to send a much stronger signal than they currently do that they support internationalization. “Rhetoric is not going to get it done; presidents, chancellors and administrators have to commit ourselves and hold ourselves to public action” (McMurtrie & Fischer, 2010, p. A32.), said Nancy Zimpher, chancellor of the State University of New York, one of the country’s largest public-university systems. Setting clear gauges of international success, including targets for international student recruitment, study abroad and scholarly exchanges are a few specific strategies Zimpher believes will hold institutional leaders accountable. Further, both scholars and practitioners have found the institutions that tie their internationalization strategies to core institutional strengths will have greater success in the long run.
This latter point is of particular importance to the examination of the state of internationalization at private HBCUs. Scholars and experts on the challenges, development and survival of black colleges (Gasman & Tudico, 2008; Jones, Brown, & Freeman, 2004; Drewry & Doermann, 2001; Fleming, 1984; Willie & Edmonds, 1978; Thompson, 1973) have found that an HBCU’s history is grounded in a proud past and grows out of a challenging present. The individual histories of these institutions have proven over time that it has often taken the perseverance, courage and facilitation of the leaders of these institutions to keep black colleges central to the delivery of U. S. higher education.

Institutional Leadership is paramount to the realization of an institution’s internationalization goals. This is so because the fortunes of higher education rest, in large part, on how well leaders today can anticipate and shape the trends of tomorrow. College presidents are fully aware of this. The very question of whether their institutions will thrive (or in some cases, survive) hinges on their ability to make decisions today that will position their institutions to contend with changes that are over the horizon (ACE, 2008). Internationalization puts two sets of pressures on institutions (a) to prepare students for a different future, and (b) to be able as institutions to compete in an expanded market. Ultimately, however, the job of the president and their leadership team will vastly become to frame problems and engage people to develop solutions.

In order to understand the importance of institutional leadership on internationalization, this section will first discuss the role of institutional leaders from the educational leadership literature. Next, this section attempts to summarize the paucity of
research literature addressing primary characteristics of the policies, practices and leadership endemic to black colleges. In many specific respects, it is the institutional leadership of black colleges that make them unique. Understanding the fundamental characteristics that shape black colleges is critical to gaining a better understanding of U. S. higher education in general, and the black college's path toward creating comprehensive internationalization programs in particular. Finally, this section presents recommendations from the internationalization literature of practice, which specifically underscores institutional leadership as a major driver of an integrated implementation plan for internationalization.

In a speech given at the annual meeting of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), Arthur Levine, president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, said the question is not whether American higher education will become more internationalized but rather what a fully internationalized university will look like, and how long it will take for such change to occur (McMurtrie & Fischer, 2010).

The challenges of globalization underscores even more the urgency for college leaders to move quickly and decisively beyond mere rhetoric about internationalization and an articulated mission to produce globally competent graduates, and establish formal internationalization guidelines that position their institutions to be successful in an ever-changing global landscape. Charting any new direction in higher education requires careful attention to process. Even when anchored by the best ideas, strategic planning,
curricular reform and institutional capacity building can fail, if the change process is flawed or if the leadership is inadequate.

The literature on educational leadership (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2008; Owens & Valesky, 2007; Preedy, Glatter & Wise, 2006; Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Astin & Astin, 2000) explains that some “change” leaders fail to make the case for a new direction or convince stakeholders of its urgency. After deciding what needs to be done, many institutional leaders fail in their selection of the right people they need to do what needs to be done (assembling the appropriate champions). For example, various stakeholders must be empowered to own the international agenda and have a say in its development and implementation. The institutional leadership (boards of trustees, president, chief academic officer and chief international officer) has to lead and facilitate the necessary coherence that is required for successful internationalization.

Major aspects of the role of a president or provost/vice president of academic affairs in supporting comprehensive internationalization, is to identify other leaders and champions, to generate widespread enthusiasm and to harness it. “Making the case” is not a question of simply selling internationalization to the campus community. It requires guiding stakeholders as they explore the changing external environment, define excellence in today’s world, and clarify learning goals for students (Olson & Green, 2003).

According to Dr. Moses Norman, an HBCU graduate and chair of the Department of Educational Leadership at Clark Atlanta University:
Leadership is the art of exploiting the privilege of being in the position to influence the behavior and actions of others in such a way as to raise the high probability that previously established agency or institutional goals and objectives can be achieved at a high level of productivity... this privilege carries with it both responsibility and accountability for successful as well as failed results.

(M.A. Norman, personal communication, February 11, 2008).

Norman's definition is an appropriate framework in which to examine potential strategies for strategic leadership as it relates to comprehensive internationalization.

Upon further reflection of Norman's definition, we can reasonably assume that one of leadership's principal concerns is fostering "change," which suggests a rather transformational movement from where the institution may be now (Astin & Astin, 2000) to some future place or condition that is different. For example, the path to comprehensive internationalization at HBCUs, as with any organizational change, cannot be expected to be an entirely smooth process. Norman's definition also implies a degree of "intentionality," directing change toward some future end. Finally, his definition implies that leadership is inherently a "value-based" process. Yet, depending on the institutional type, institutions pursuing comprehensive internationalization may need to make certain modifications based on their institutional mission. In other words, effective institutional leadership requires that groups function according to the identified mission and shared values and individual members of the groups exemplify qualities and values (Astin & Astin, 2000) that contribute to the effective functioning of the group(s) leading the internationalization effort.
The integration of the group and individual goals related to developing comprehensive internationalization is an integral aspect of the role of institutional leaders. In essence, all transformational change efforts will require active involvement from the president and chief academic officer. For instance, Norman’s research on educational leadership focuses on three basic prerequisites for effective strategic leadership: (a) identifying what needs to be done, (b) convincing the people whose help you need, and (c) designing or causing to be designed a strategic plan. Developing the strategic plan for comprehensive internationalization as an institutional goal is no exception. After the appropriate SWOT Analysis (*Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunity, and Threats*) is performed, a careful examination of how the other units within academic and student affairs and the rest of the institution will be affected by the internationalization process is critical to complete. However, determining the appropriate strategic planning system is even more essential.

One aspect of determining what needs to be done is the central role senior leadership plays in providing a clear charge and deadlines and ensuring that the fruits of the internationalization efforts do not languish on a shelf (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006). However, when it comes to the president’s functional role, even a cursory reading of the literature on the college presidency will show that the list of functions that college presidents can be called upon to perform is a very long and diverse one: fundraising, public relations, consultation, budgeting, planning, articulating a “vision,” crisis management, mediation, staff development, consensus-building, and so on (Astin & Astin, 2000).
Yet, the planning, articulation of a vision and consensus building are often the most daunting assignments for presidents, and their inability to perform them well in many cases have been the deal breakers at the root of their demise. In the case of internationalization, institutional leaders skilled in educational operations will develop effective ways to explain clearly to all relevant groups how they could potentially be impacted by internationalization. Institutional leaders will also make sure the leadership team has an intellectual (and philosophical) understanding of sustainable internationalization. Next, leaders must help the colleagues around them internalize what internationalization means to them and open the possibility for more professional development to quickly close any intellectual gaps.

For example, central to a president’s or chief academic officer’s responsibilities is to help the other institutional leaders make better decisions regarding (a) the nature of the students whom they teach and support, which implies the health of students socially and academically, (b) the nature of the subject matter being taught to students; which implies that instruction is all about initiating, expanding and reinforcing, and (c) the strategies/procedures utilized to teach the students entrusted to the institution (M.A. Norman, personal communication, February 11, 2008). The quality of institutional leaders’ selective judgment in the above referenced areas, more than anything else, is what makes them effective educational leaders.

In Strategic Leadership and Educational Improvements, Margaret Preedy and her colleagues deal quite nicely with the notion of using the following three “lenses” to look at strategy development:
• **Strategy as Design:** is the view that strategy development is the result of analytic and evaluative techniques to establish clear strategic direction.

• **Strategy as Experience:** is the adaptation of past strategies influenced by the experience of managers and others in the organization.

• **Strategy as Ideas:** emphasizes the potential variety and diversity which exist in organizations and which can potentially generate innovation. (p. 142)

Most familiar with strategic planning may recognize the design strategy as the one most used by organizations to manage the strategic planning process. But according to Preedy and her colleagues, there are merits, as well as challenges in employing any of the three referenced strategy models. For example, when we consider the referenced lenses and an institution’s decision to use the occasion of the Reaffirmation of Accreditation as an opportunity to introduce comprehensive internationalization as its lead Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), it is clear that the institution is utilizing a combination of all the lenses to meet their internationalization objectives. SACS (2004) defines QEP as the opportunity to:

Identify a significant issue related to student learning, provide evidence that it has sufficient resources to implement, sustain and complete the plan; demonstrate that it has the means for determining the success of the plan and demonstrate that all aspects of its community were involved in the development of the plan. (p. 21)

Good institutional leaders have the capacity to successfully keep their colleagues conscious of the fact that their goal is to be innovative and their work a product of thinking outside of the box. In other words, the strategy, as ideas translate into planning,
should begin to reflect the institutional leader’s input as the principal champion of internationalization (such as the QEP process). The research on adaptive leadership (Owens & Valesky, 2007; Bennis & Thomas, 2007; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Kezar, 2001; Kezar & Eckel, 2002) illuminate why the ability to win other people over is an important trait of effective institutional leaders. In general, educational leaders have a far greater responsibility to get along with the people they supervise than subordinates have to get along with their leader. In the final analysis, the educational leader needs to be primarily concerned with his employees’ level of satisfaction and productivity.

In *Leading for a Lifetime: How Defining Moments Shape the Leaders of Today and Tomorrow*, Bennis and Thomas (2007) discuss what they believe to be the four basic qualities for leaders:

- Adaptive capacity
- Ability to engage others through shared meaning
- A distinctive voice
- Unshakeable integrity

They argue that the adaptive capacity of leaders is the essential competence that gives leaders the critical skills to understand context and to recognize and seize opportunities (Bennis & Thomas, 2007). This adaptive quality also leads to the educational leader’s development of resiliency—the ability to improvise in the face of challenges and adapt their day when conflict arises. Most importantly, the literature on adaptive leadership reminds educational leaders to voice “information,” not just vision. This is a key point, as in the absence of reliable information people begin to make things
up. Trying to make the case for internationalization, for example, without proper understanding of the internal and external drivers could be disastrous for an institutional leader.

As this study explores internationalization at private HBCUs, the research on strategic leadership (Preedy, Glatter, & Wise, 2006) offers additional guidance for educational leaders who must contend with politics. Strategic decisions are influenced by politics, and institutional leaders cannot be affected by the conflicts of interests within their institution. The research tells us that if there is no conflict within the institution, a leader will probably not have any innovation either. When a leader's ideas are challenged, they should require that this be accomplished by the challenger providing ideas of their own.

Faculty, staff and students have to be given time to be reflective and discover their own answers. Internationalization, as a relatively new institutional priority, requires building a broad base strategic and integrated plan. For it to work, institutional leaders have a responsibility to be highly strategic about modifying current institutional roles, rules and relationships in order to successfully navigate and participate in the change process.

The 21st century is witnessing a profound reimagination of higher education that is increasingly global in nature. Institutional leaders across the Academy have been forced to demonstrate their concern for both the impact of globalization on their institutions and the assessment of the learning outcomes of their students. The challenge for institutional leaders is to quickly understand how to best position their institutions
within global systems, integrate internationalization into core mission of the institution and effectively articulate the urgency of producing global competent graduates. For internationalization to have maximum impact, senior administrative leaders must lend the effort their visible, tactical and structural support (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006).

How leaders of private HBCUs (boards of trustees, presidents, chief academic officers and chief international officers), in particular, attempt to position themselves in the emerging global system is critical to their survival. Just as significant is how private HBCUs strategically carve out their own niche in the global system of higher education. Leaders of private HBCUs must begin to collectively consider the current external pressures that emphatically call upon them to internationalize.

Over the past 39 years, the literature on U. S. black colleges, on one level, represents scholarship committed to the survival and overall thriving of these institutions. On another, the literature captures the philosophical and intellectual battles over the relevance of HBCUs, since losing their monopoly on black higher education at the advent of desegregation. As this study’s focus is the state of internationalization at private black colleges and universities, the books of Drewry and Doermann (2001), *Stand and Prosper* and Thompson (1973), *Private Black Colleges at the Crossroads*, add great depth to the canon of existing literature on the subject. The two works are the only authored (as opposed to edited) comprehensive books on private HBCUs.

Once considered the “ebony towers” of higher education, private black colleges have historically been differentiated from their public institutional counterparts by the fact that “their growth generally outpaced that of other schools. Their endowments
tended to be healthier and their facilities remained more intact” (Drewry & Doermann, 2001, p. 126). On leadership at the private HBCUs, through three institutional case studies, Drewry and Doermann illustrate the power of sustained, focused and competent leadership in difficult times for all institutions. Yet, they are quick to clarify that effective presidential leadership is not the only source of sustenance for their select case studies of successful leadership. “Certainly, the presidents were at the center of action, but they could not control all of it and they understood that” (Drewry & Doermann, 2001, p. 179).

The hostile, threatening and non-supporting environmental conditions surrounding black colleges are related to the administrative styles of their executives (Willie & MacLeish, 1978), and black college president’s still are the most visible representatives of their institutions. With this in mind the urgency of these very visible and public educational leaders to confront the external drivers for internationalization on their campus is critical to their institution’s survival. A leader’s response to external pressures should be reflective of a collaborative approach, where the task of deciding how to respond is shared by all members of the academic community, and especially by those who are most likely to be affected by the plan (Astin & Astin, 2000).

The key to meeting the challenges presented by instituting comprehensive internationalization is effective leadership. Unless knowledgeable and focused leaders with talented staff set the path and encourage others to follow, folks tend to stand still. These days, immobility is not an option for postsecondary education (McDemmond, 2010). Whether leadership is being exercised by the president, provost or chief
international officer, the core task remains the same. Leaders are there to create momentum and energy for change. They are there to create the appropriate climate and conditions for others to carry out the important work of change. Finally, they are there to remove barriers to change and elements that reinforce the status quo. This study employed Knight’s (1994, 1999, 2004) definition of internationalization to frame the examination of strategies that affected comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs.

**Internationalization Review**

A carefully composed team, with broad representation from faculty and administration, is critical for conducting a productive review of current international programs and policies and crafting an action plan (Green & Olson, 2003). An internationalization review takes stock of the various international/global initiatives and programs on campus, evaluates the extent to which these activities achieve the institution’s goals for internationalization, and forms the basis for an internationalization plan (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). The review focuses on a broad range of internationalization strategies, including institutional commitment, global learning outcomes, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, curriculum and study abroad.

Depending on the institution’s available resources, timeframe and goals, a review can cover an entire institution or a specific college or unit. Aggregating and synthesizing information, often from a variety of sources, help determine if the institution is meeting
its stated goals and measure progress along the way. The review should address two basic questions (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005):

1. What would this institution look like if it were comprehensively internationalized? What is our vision for internationalization?

2. What is the current state of internationalization? How do we know?

First, institutions should be clear about the reasons they are embarking on an internationalization review. One primary reason should be their desire to situate the institution in a broader context than the campus and its local environment. Another important reason is to engage the widest audience possible in a discussion of internationalization. Such pervasive attention on internationalization goals, strategies and expectations increases the opportunities to measure its success in its core functions of teaching and learning. Finally, an internationalization review provides the institution the opportunity to use the results to improve upon their international activities. The process of the review and the continuous updating provides new visibility, coherence and urgency to their global agenda (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005).

**Internationalized Curriculum**

Twenty-two years ago, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) espoused that no undergraduate degree program could be considered adequate for then, or anytime in the future, if it did not require minimal curricular exposure to international and global content. Interestingly enough, two decades later the majority of U. S. higher education is still vexed by the appropriate levels and scopes of internationalization to implement on their campus. Yet, the curriculum is one of the most
obvious indicators of whether or not an institution is fulfilling its mission and fulfilling the needs of its students (domestic and foreign).

The internationalization of the curriculum requires an ongoing, collaborative, and interdisciplinary approach, which combines the support, knowledge, efforts, and skills of cross-culturally sensitive and globally oriented faculty, students, and administrators. In its simplest description, the internationalization of the curriculum is merely curriculum reform. Such reform must be broad based and approached with the learning objectives/outcomes as the basis for the reform.

Whether there is a pervasive infusion of international dimensions throughout the curriculum is a critical academic program concern. Among the many elements of internationalizing a campus, the curriculum stands out as the essential component of any internationalization effort if all students are to experience global learning in college. However, internationalizing the curriculum is not a simple adjustment, but rather a transformational and sometimes colossal effort. It affects all faculty, not just those who teach internationally focused courses in the general education curriculum or in a few majors. Internationalization provides a unique world perspective that affects academics’ view of their disciplines, scholarship, curricula and campus life.

Internationalizing the curriculum is the central mechanism that institutions can use to shape student learning. Though it is a complex task, which requires attention to general education, the major, and pedagogy, the faculty’s ability to lead this important work requires consistent attention to their own global learning. Internationalization
requires new pedagogies and ways of learning, which enable students to fully experience how other cultures and belief systems work.

The complexity of internationalization, the diversity of U. S. institutions and the strength of disciplinary traditions present enormous challenges to pervasive internationalization in higher education. Each institution that looks strategically at global learning must arrive at its own response to internationalization and develop strategies that complement their unique institutional profile. However, faculty buy-in is essential to an institution’s successful transformation to an internationalized curriculum, and effectively supervising such a colossal change means conceiving of the curriculum not as a collection of disconnected courses, but rather as an integrated and learner-centered system that fosters global learning.

Ideally, HBCUs that are serious about sustainable internationalization will appoint a Chief International Officers (CIO) to work extremely close with the academic leadership (deans, departmental chairs and diverse tenured faculty) in developing desired competencies related to new or reimagined global learning outcomes of students. An initial charge of the CIO should be to help the institution’s faculty specifically frame the following three basic questions:

- What are the characteristics of an internationalized curriculum?
- What factors contribute to the effective implementation of an internationalized curriculum?
- What are the outcomes and effects of an internationalized curriculum?
This charge may be initially challenged by a diverse faculty opinion regarding (a) the definition of internationalization, (b) the scope of work to achieve internationalization, and (c) the extent to which faculty believe the current curriculum is already internationalized. The latter may present the greatest hurdle, as faculty are parochial and, somewhat, less transparent in admitting that their own courses (thus, their scholarship) may not be contemporary or offer students a “global” lens. An additional charge of the CIO becomes discerning the best way to keep faculty away from defensive posturing when determining the international dimensions of existing curriculum in general and their courses in particular, and moving the internationalization of curriculum initiative toward a congenial process of generating ideas about how to broaden and deepen the level of internationalization. Conceptually, the role of the CIO should be to help faculty determine the desired learning outcomes of internationalization, which should then elicit a closer review of how the current curriculum helps students achieve them.

The research on the administration and supervision of instructional programs reminds us that all instruction is really about is initiating, expanding and reinforcing. “What we want our students to know” should be at the heart of any internationalization process/strategy. Yet, how we convince the faculty that this particular priority merits high visibility and resources (both human and capital) is probably the biggest challenge, considering the fact that many among the faculty have limited global exposure themselves. Nevertheless, a successful internationalization process considers the different modes of study, curricular interests and learning styles of diverse students.
Faculty members are the pivotal agents in providing this type of qualitative information. Therefore, the facilitation of this key group of specialists is a delicate undertaking, which, if done correctly can lead to revolutionary positive change that results in the production of the globally competent graduates this nation so desperately yearns.

For example, as the CIO at two HBCUs, the researcher tried to first validate the faculty; recognizing openly their expertise and challenging them to bring back to the larger community the examples of internationalization currently happening within their own disciplines. Next, the researcher tried to use the meager resources my authority afforded me to empower them to imagine what an infusion of international dimensions would look like in their division, department, alas, courses. Such validation and empowerment in most cases resulted in faculty from diverse disciplines joining together to construct new more holistic approaches to understanding how to make their area specialties more culture bound and international in nature. Finally, both HBCUs reached an understanding that an internationalized curriculum is a curriculum with an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/socially) in an international and multicultural context, and designed for domestic and foreign students (Bremer & Van der Wende, 1995).

Removing the “chore” from the process and creating an atmosphere for HBCUs to continue to mature to an elite status that rivals any institution pursuing the best African American minds should be considered one of the best strategies to get the faculty at-large engaged in the process of internationalization. However, the next goal, one of moving from the convinced “stakeholders” in internationalization to more pervasive faculty
agreement, is the more daunting task, which not many HBCUs have successfully engaged in. CIOs should be rather deliberate, albeit diplomatic, about keeping faculty honest regarding producing demonstrated evidence that their courses have international dimensions. Explanations about expected outcomes, complexity of materials, sequencing, and integration with other disciplinary concepts are superficial, untested and often simplistic. Many course syllabi make extravagant claims about the competencies and skills they teach students but the only evidence of such learning are the seat time and the grades (Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 1998).

The research literature offers the following three approaches to internationalizing the curriculum in higher education (Bond, 2003a, 2003b):

- **The Add-On Approach**: is the earliest used approach to internationalizing the curriculum and is characterized by adding international or intercultural content or themes to existing curricula and courses without modifying the original structure or pedagogical approaches (Banks, 2004).

- **The Infusion Approach**: infuses the curriculum (Bond, 2003b) with content that enriches students' cross-cultural understanding and knowledge of diverse cultures (Whalley, Langley, & Villarreal, 1997). The infusion approach focuses on the interdisciplinary nature of the internationalization of the curriculum and exposes students in all fields of study to international and multicultural perspectives.

- **The Transformation Approach**: is more difficult to adopt and the least utilized approach to modify the curriculum (Bond, 2003a, p. 5). This
approach, which is based upon the tenets of critical pedagogy, "encourages new ways of thinking, incorporates new methodologies, so that different epistemological questions are raised, old assumptions are quested, subjective data sources are considered, and prior theories either revised or invalidated" (Marchesani & Adams, 1992, pp. 15-16).

All three models have their merits, and there is opportunity to view them as progressive levels or steps. Possibly, the transformed approach could be considered the most desirable, as this type of curriculum aims to assist students with developing the required critical consciousness, values, awareness, skills, and knowledge of cross-cultural differences to thrive as global citizens. Finally, students are encouraged to explore and critically analyze reality through the lenses of diverse cultural and ethnic groups (Banks, 2002, 2004).

Kitano (1997) also suggests that the Transformation Approach to curriculum development provides the opportunity for students and teachers to share the power within the classroom and to learn from each other. Yet, for the academic leadership at the private HBCUs, the task of identifying the gaps between where they currently are regarding internationalizing the curriculum, and where they need to be. Yet, what will continue to sustain faculty interest in any institution’s process of internationalization will be the additional institutional resources devoted to keeping this initiative alive and relevant in the minds and livelihood of faculty.

Currently, as the CIO at a vastly growing public institution, a constant challenge is how to deliver to the faculty the resources that not only underscore their collective hard
work, but fuels their facilitated innovation. This is particularly critical at HBCUs, where resources are already strained, and dollars are put to initiatives that the leadership is serious about. If institutions fail to provide resources to their faculty’s efforts to internationalize the curriculum, they risk losing the pulse of the internationalization process (the faculty) in particular, and potentially the credibility of the CIO appointed to lead the internationalization effort in general.

**Study Abroad**

Programmatically, a flexible academic structure is a needed aspect of the infrastructure to facilitate interdisciplinary student movement and credit accumulation and transfer. The research on international education has consistently found that students who participate in study abroad programs experience lasting effects across a wide variety of academic and personal/social growth categories. Some colleges and universities are recognizing the positive cognitive and psychosocial benefits of study abroad for their students and are increasingly promoting international study as a strategy for preparing students for success in the global marketplace.

Many students have reported that their academic performance in a study abroad program was better than it would have been at home or that they learned and will retain the material to a greater degree than if they had been taught in a U. S. classroom. Younes and Asay (2003) found that the structure of study abroad programs appeals to different learning styles and noted that the students’ learning seemed to take place at many different levels.
Summary

Chapter Two presented an overview of internationalization and the review of literature of the various independent variables (articulated institutional commitment, assessment of global learning, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, internationalization review, internationalized curriculum and study abroad) on the dependent variable (comprehensive internationalization).
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

This chapter outlines the theoretical frameworks used to investigate the stage of readiness of private back colleges and universities as it relates to select benchmarks (independent variables) for comprehensive internationalization (dependent variable). Chapter Three also includes the definition of variables, other operational terms, and the relationship among variables, limitations and the chapter summary. The theoretical framework that supports this study is Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle.

Jane Knight’s Internationalization cycle has become the most highly used theoretical or conceptual perspective to explain the process of internationalization through which institutions should proceed to achieve their internationalization goals. Knight’s (1994) internationalization cycle suggests six phases of internationalization, which include (a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement (see Figure 2). Unlike the literature on the strategies of internationalization, where the importance of internationalization is dealt with by discussing each dimension individually, Knight’s cycle introduces an integrated approach to examining internationalization in higher education.
Figure 2. Internationalization Cycle

Knight’s contribution to the evolving cannon of research on internationalization is significant, because it provides a solid process framework. What it does not do, however, is make the connection between applicable strategies on a private HBCU campus and comprehensive internationalization given these institutions’ unique mission and culture.

In addition, Knight’s internationalization cycle is used to assist with explaining how select independent variables impact the process toward comprehensive internationalization. An articulated institutional commitment, assessment of global learning, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, internationalization review, internationalized curriculum and study abroad all serve as independent variables for this study.
Definition of Variables and Other Operational Terms

This section contains conceptual definitions used in this research study. Key terms include the following:

Dependent Variable

**Comprehensive Internationalization** is defined by Olson, Green, and Hill (2006) as:

A strategic and integrated approach to internationalization in which institutions articulate internationalization as an institutional goal (if not priority), develop an internationalization plan driven by sound analysis, and seek to bring together usually disparate and often marginalized aspects of internationalization. (p. vi)

Independent Variables

**Articulated Institutional Commitment** is defined as the extent to which an institution has written statements or established policies supporting internationalization; and the extent to which internationalization is an integral part of an institution’s identity and vision (mission and goals).

**Assessment of Global Learning** is defined as the systematic collection, review and use of information about international educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student global learning and development (Marchese, 1987).

**Foreign Students** is defined as the number of foreign students matriculating at an institution.
Institutional Infrastructure is defined as the extent to which a dedicated staff, office, task force and/or an established communication system is in place to support internationalization.

Institutional Leadership is defined as senior institutional leaders (presidents, chief academic officer, and/or chief international officer) with the authority and resources to coordinate or oversee an institution’s internationalization.

Internationalization Review is defined as the process of taking stock of the various international/global initiatives and programs on campus, evaluating the extent to which these activities achieve the institution’s goals for internationalization, and form the basis for an internationalization plan (ACE, 2003).

Internationalized Curriculum is defined as the extent to which international learning is infused throughout the curricular and an integral part of the academic offering of the institution; the elements of the curriculum and cocurriculum that foster international learning.

Study Abroad is defined as the extent to which opportunities exist to engage students to participate in education abroad at an institution.

Other Operational Terms

Developing a shared lexicon is an essential step in ensuring a shared understanding and vision of internationalization (Green & Olson, 2003).

Faculty Engagement is defined as the process of stimulating faculty interest and involvement in a particular initiative. This term is used interchangeably with developing faculty participation and involvement.
Global Learning is defined as a complex set of goals and outcomes to be coordinated across and throughout the institution . . . a vehicle for integrating multiple disciplinary perspectives and weaving together existing commitments to explore diversity, build capacity for civic engagement and prepare students to take responsibility for common global problems (Hovland, 2006).

Globalization is defined as the closer integration of the countries and peoples of the world which has been brought about by the enormous reduction of costs of transportation and communication, and the breaking down of artificial barriers to the flows of goods, services, capital, knowledge, and (to a lesser extent) people, across borders.

Highly Active Institutions is defined as institutions having a high level of integration of international/global themes and content in the teaching, research and service functions of an institution (ACE, 2005). Highly active institutions will be committed to assessing global learning, foreign student recruitment, an internationalization review and internationalizing the curriculum.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) are defined as institutions of higher education in the United States of America that were established prior to 1964 with the principal mission to educate African Americans.

Intercultural is defined most commonly as the encounter between people of different nation-states or Diaspora cultures.

International Education is defined as an all-inclusive term encompassing three major strands: (a) international content of the curricular, (b) international movement of
scholars and students concerned with training and research, and (c) arrangements
engaging U.S. education abroad in technical assistance and educational programs (Harari, 1992).

**Internationalization** is defined as the process of integrating an international and
intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service functions of a higher
education institution (Knight, 1994).

**Internationalization Committee** is defined as an on-going group that is (a)
comprised of faculty and administrators who represent a wide range of departments and
(b) charged by a senior institutional leader with authority and resources to coordinate or
oversee an institution’s internationalization.

**Internationalization Cycle** is defined as a sequence of six phases through which
a higher education institution proceeds in order to integrate an international dimension
into institutional systems and values (Knight, 1994).

**Internationalization Plan** is defined as higher education institutions’ written
commitments to internationalization, including goals, mission statements, vision
statements, implementation plans, allocated resources, or timelines.

**Internationalization Taskforce** is defined as a short-term group that is (a)
comprised of faculty and administrators who represent a wide range of departments and
(b) charged by the chief academic officer with a specific, time-limited task, e.g., the
development of an internationalization strategic plan.

**Less Active Institution** is defined as institutions having a low level of integration
of international/global themes and content in the teaching, research and service functions
of an institution. Less active institutions will not show evidence of their commitment to assessing global learning, foreign student recruitment, an internationalization review and internationalizing the curriculum.

**Multicultural** is defined as the diversity within a nation or community. In the United States, the term generally describes ethnic and racial diversity within our borders (Green & Olson, 2003).

**Operationalization** is defined as the process of implementing the different aspects of a strategy and creating a supportive culture (Knight, 1994). This term is used interchangeably with implementation.

**Sustainable Internationalization** is defined as the result of the process of integrating an international, or global, dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education (Knight, 2003). Sustainability has a time dimension and includes the extent to which an institution can maintain internationalization for more than one cycle of students (4 years) or beyond a grant funding period.

**The United Negro College Fund (UNCF)** is an *American* philanthropic organization that fundraises *college tuition* money for black students and general scholarship funds for 39 private *historically black colleges and universities*. The UNCF was incorporated on April 25, 1944.
Relationship among Variables

**Independent Variables**
- Articulated Commitment
- Assessment of Global Learning
- Foreign Students
- Institutional Infrastructure
- Institutional Leadership
- Internationalization Review
- Internationalized Curriculum
- Study Abroad

**Dependent Variable**
- Comprehensive Internationalization

Figure 3: Identification and Illustration of Variables

**Limitations**

One overall limitation of this study is that the study only focuses on African-American undergraduate students and does not factor in African-American graduate students. The quantitative phase of this study is limited by a 33% response rate (12 of 39 UNCF-member institutions responded to the surveys). Thus, the survey does not measure overall evidence of internationalization at all 39 UNCF-member institutions.

A second quantitative limitation is the fact that due to the small population of UNCF-member institutions, the researcher had to approach the survey as a *quasi-quantitative* data collection method. As a result, the researcher was unable to conduct a
Chi-square or correlation to test significance. With this in mind, the researcher built the survey instrument in order to conduct an item analysis, resulting in quantitative descriptions. Third, the results of the survey were self reported for the independent variables, and the instrument did not directly measure the dependent variable (comprehensive internationalization). The qualitative phase of this study is limited to two private UNCF-member institutions located in a rural area of Mississippi and a metropolitan area of Atlanta respectively.

Summary

Chapter Three presented the theoretical framework utilized to examine the impact of various independent variables (articulated institutional commitment, assessment of global learning, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, internationalization review, internationalized curriculum and study abroad) on the dependent variable (comprehensive internationalization) at two private HBCUs. Variables and other terms were defined and the limitations of the study were discussed.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter Four describes and analyzes the research methodology utilized in the investigation of the relationship between the independent variables (articulated institutional commitment, assessment of global learning, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, internationalization review, internationalized curriculum and study abroad) and comprehensive internationalization (dependent variable) at private HBCUs.

This chapter presents the philosophical worldview, research design, the population and sample, site selection, instrumentation, data collection strategy, data analysis methods, internationalization index, data presentation and overall summary.

Philosophical Worldview

Research experts agree that whether a qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods research design is employed, the approach to research involves philosophical assumptions. Researchers need to think through the philosophical worldview assumptions that they bring to the study, the strategy of inquiry that is related to this worldview, and the specific methods or procedures of research that translate the approach into practice (Creswell, 2009). Although philosophical ideas remain largely hidden in
research (Slife & Williams, 1995), they still influence the practice of research and need to be identified. The term *worldview*, coined by research expert John W. Creswell, is defined as “a basic set of beliefs that guide action” (Creswell, 2009, p. 6).

These worldviews are shaped by the discipline area of the student, the beliefs of advisers and faculty in a student’s area, and past research experiences. The types of beliefs held by individual researchers will often lead to embracing a qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods approach in their research (Creswell, 2009).

The pragmatic worldview guided the research design of this study. There are many forms of this philosophy, but for many, pragmatism as a worldview arises out of actions, situations and consequences rather than antecedent conditions. There is concern with applications—what works—and solutions to problems (Patton, 1990). Instead of focusing on methods, researchers emphasize the research problem and use all approaches available to understand the problem (Rossman & Wilson, 1985). The pragmatic worldview was an appropriate paradigm for this research, in order to serve as a philosophical underpinning for this mixed methods study. The pragmatic worldview aided this researcher in his attempt to convey the importance of focusing attention on the research problem, and then using multiple approaches and methods to derive robust knowledge about the problem.

This section explores why and how the pragmatic worldview framed this researcher’s investigation of the stage of readiness of private HBCUs as it relates to select strategies for comprehensive internationalization. First, it is important to note that pragmatism is not committed to any one system of philosophy and reality. This applies
to mixed methods research in that inquirers draw liberally from both quantitative and qualitative assumptions when they engage in their research (Creswell, 2009). In the way that pragmatists do not see the world as an absolute entity, mixed methods researchers look to many approaches for collecting and analyzing data rather than subscribing to only one method (i.e. quantitative or qualitative). The mixed methods researcher uses both types of data, because their goal is to provide the best understanding of their research problem, just as the pragmatist is in search of what works best for their situation.

Hence, through pragmatism, the researcher assumed that a private HBCU that truly aspires to develop a strategic and integrated approach to internationalization, which brings together usually disparate and marginalized aspects of internationalization, would be decidedly flexible in its approach/method to achieving pervasive internationalization on its campus. Since we know that the pragmatic worldview arises out of actions, situations, and consequences, rather than antecedent conditions, this philosophy enabled the researcher to focus on (a) the actions of senior leadership at HBCUs related to the critical need to internationalize their campuses, (b) the current state of internationalization at private HBCUs, and (c) how the senior leadership attributed meaning to internationalization and its relevance to institutional goals and the institution's future competitiveness. Finally, pragmatism opened the door to multiple research methods, and different assumptions, as well as different forms of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009).
Research Design

In order to address the problems of practice and research, this dissertation was designed as a mixed methods multi-case study. Several sources identify the origin of mixed methods research in the field of psychology and in the *multitrait-multimethod* matrix of Campbell and Fiske (1959) to interest in converging or triangulating different quantitative and qualitative data sources and on to a distinct methodology of inquiry (Creswell, 2009).

Mixed methods research is an approach to inquiry that combines or associates both quantitative and qualitative forms. It involves philosophical assumptions, the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches, and the mixing of both approaches in a study (Creswell, 2009). It also involves the use of both approaches in tandem so that the overall strength of a study is greater than either quantitative or qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). The increasing interdisciplinary nature of research has contributed to the growth, interest and popularity of mixed methods research. Thus, according to the pragmatic worldview, a mixed methods research design was an appropriate means through which to examine the stage of readiness of private HBCUs as it relates to select strategies for comprehensive internationalization.

The mixed methods approach presented numerous advantages over a purely quantitative or qualitative method for this study. There was far more insight to be gained from the combination of both quantitative and qualitative research than either form alone. Subsequently, their combined use provided an expanded understanding of the research problem. This latter point was a critical one for this researcher, as the mixed methods
research design offered him an opportunity to put himself into the process of illuminating the research problem. The mixed methods approach allowed the researcher to explicitly articulate his reasoning procedures and become self-reflective about his own perceptions and biases, a central characteristic of mixed methods research designs.

Challenges, however, do exist with mixed methods research designs. First, the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data is a rigorous and time consuming process. Yet, Creswell (2009) advocated using an embedded model. Second, the mixed methods approach requires the researcher to be familiar with both quantitative and qualitative forms of research. In order to address these challenges, the researcher first considered the timing (Creswell, 2009) of his quantitative and qualitative data collection, whether the data would be collected in phases or concurrently. Next, the researcher considered how best to weigh (or prioritize) the quantitative versus the qualitative data collected. Another final and critical consideration was deciding how and when to mix the two types of data in the study.

**Sequential Explanatory Research Strategy**

The result of reflecting on the referenced challenges and considerations led the researcher to specific decisions regarding research procedures and implementation strategies. First, the researcher chose to employ the **sequential explanatory strategy** (see Figure 4). It is characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data in a first phase of research followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data in a second phase that builds on the results of the initial quantitative results (Creswell, 2009).
The sequential explanatory design was extremely useful to the researcher in interpreting the quantitative results, which was thought to be a major primary form of data collection (e.g., surveys) in the first phase of the mixed methods approach. The next phase included a secondary qualitative form of data collection (e.g., interviews with some of the participants who completed the surveys), which was especially useful to the researcher in explaining in greater detail unexpected results that arose in the quantitative study.

Regarding the rigorous and time consuming nature of mixed methods research, the fact that both forms of data are not equal in size and rigor enables the study to be reduced in scope, and manageable for the time and resources available (Creswell, 2009). In addition, the steps of the sequential explanatory strategy were clear and straightforward and easy for a novice mixed methods researcher to implement.

Through the use of the sequential explanatory strategy, in the first phase of the study, the researcher collected data obtained from the Chief International Officers (CIOs) at UNCF-member institutions, who voluntarily completed an on-line survey, *Survey on*
Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions (see Appendix A). The survey endeavored to determine the characteristics of an institution “highly active” and “less active” in internationalization. Several years ago, the American Council on Education (ACE) conducted a literature review and convened an advisory board of experts in international education. Based on this input, ACE defined “highly active” to mean having a high level of integration of international/global themes and content in the teaching, research, and service functions of an institution (ACE, 2005).

Subsequently, ACE developed an institutional survey instrument measuring internationalization, using the following six dimensions to group the survey questions: Articulated commitment, academic offerings, organization infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students, and student programs.

The above referenced ACE institutional survey served as the foundation for the quantitative instrument subsequently used in this study, Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions. With permission from ACE (see Appendix B), the researcher modified the ACE instrument for the purposes of tailoring the results for this study and to provide a unique analysis of private HBCUs. The survey instrument was designed as an item-analysis and questions were confined to the independent variables.

Thus, section headings (or dimensions) of the survey instrument were renamed (and in several cases new ones were added) to be consistent with the eight select independent variables of this study. In addition, new questions were included in three new section headings/dimensions (Assessing Global Learning, Institutional Leadership
and Internationalization Review). Overall, the survey contained questions regarding the extent of private HBCU’s articulated commitment to internationalization, support from institutional leadership, international activities, funds to support such activities (for both students and faculty), and assessment of global learning. Though the instrument does not measure the dependent variable and has different scales of measuring one independent variable, the researcher analyzed each item individually and drew conclusions from the analysis based on percentages received per response.

A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. From sample results, the researcher generalizes or makes claims about the population (Creswell, 2009). The survey was the preferred type of data collection for the first quantitative phase of this study. The greatest advantage the survey gave the researcher was the rapid turnaround in data collection.

The Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions formed the basis for the development of an “Internationalization Index,” which was used to assign a level of internationalization for each HBCU respondent and allowed for categorization as highly active and less active. In order to create the Internationalization Index, most questions included in the survey lent themselves to quantitative analysis. However, in the development of the Index, the researcher eliminated several survey questions because they did not lend themselves to quantitative analysis or because of low response rate.

Based upon the literature review undertaken for this study, the survey questions were grouped into eight dimensions consistent with the following select independent
variables of the study: articulated institutional commitment, assessment of global learning, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, internationalization review, internationalized curriculum and study abroad.

**Multiple Case Study Research Design**

In the second qualitative phase of this mixed methods research design, the researcher specifically employed a multiple case study approach. In general, case study research is appropriate when the researcher exerts little control over the phenomenon (Yin, 1994, 2003). To underscore this point, the researcher had no control over research participants' perspectives on internationalization or related campus strategies. Moreover, research experts advocate that multiple case study research designs produce more compelling evidence as compared to single-case studies (Herriott & Fireston, 1983; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003; Creswell, 2005). The researcher purposely intended to use a multiple case study design in an effort to illustrate both similar and divergent perspectives and practices related to internationalization at private HBCUs. Yin (2003) suggests that the multiple case study design uses the logic of replication, in which the inquirer replicates the procedures for both cases.

This research design enabled the researcher to understand the complexities of each case and identify components that could be compared and contrasted across cases. Ultimately, using the same data collection, analysis procedures and research questions for both cases was especially critical to the researcher's ability to employ within-case and constant-comparative analysis, while better understanding the specific and unique issues related to each case. The researcher began the study with a full appreciation for the
distinct institutional differences (clientele, competition, history, location, mission and resources) among private HBCUs. The multiple case study design proved to be an appropriate mechanism to underscore these distinctions, while looking for common driving and restraining forces for comprehensive internationalization at these particular institutions.

Yet, like most of the design types the researcher reviewed, multiple case studies are not without their challenges or limitations. The following reflect a few of the challenges research experts have cautioned case study researchers to consider: (a) determining which case (or cases) is worthy of study, (b) deciding the boundaries of the cases—how it might be constrained in terms of time, events, and processes—may be challenging (Creswell, 2005), and (c) over simplifying or exaggerating a situation—“leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 377).

Though the researcher was the primary instrument for data collection and analysis, his advanced coursework in case study methodology, and consultations with higher education, internationalization, and quantitative/qualitative research experts were significant resources used to minimize the above referenced limitations. In fact, the multiple case study research design was purposely selected to help the researcher better understand the unique phenomenon of internationalizing the private black college from the in-depth lenses of two private HBCUs. The researcher took proactive measures to minimize the limitations of this design, by using the results of the quantitative data collection to help determine the cases to be studied, consulting with qualitative research
experts to construct realistic and appropriate boundaries and, consciously avoiding oversimplifications in the data analysis.

**Description of the Setting**

The participants for this mixed methods study were drawn from 37 of the 39 member institutions of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) (see Appendix C for 2010 UNCF institutional membership directory). Though there are officially 39 UNCF member institutions, one institution had lost its SACS accreditation at the start of this study, and one other institution does not offer undergraduate degrees. Thus, neither institution was included in this study. The UNCF member institutions were specifically selected as a population to examine for this study, due to their unique distinction as private Historically Black Colleges and Universities (see Appendix D for UNCF mission).

In addition to the UNCF member list, complete up-to-date email and contact information were made available to the researcher by UNCF's Institute for Capacity Building (ICB), which supported and promoted the researcher's accessibility to data. The researcher gained complete access to this information as a result of his doctoral practicum/internship placement with UNCF/ICB during the 2010 spring semester. As the researcher endeavored to investigate the stage of readiness of private HBCUs as it relates to select strategies for comprehensive internationalization, UNCF represent the United States’ oldest and lone consortium of private black colleges/universities.

UNCF member institutions represent a population dedicated to building on the strength and legacy of achievement of its members and support their efforts to continue to
be compelling and competitive choices for the growing number of African-American students seeking a college education, while acknowledging and honoring their unique institutional missions and cultures (UNCF, 2010).

The results of the survey distributed to the 37 UNCF-member institutions created the opportunity for the development of an Internationalization Index, and the subsequent selection of two UNCF-member institutions for in-depth qualitative analysis.

**Sampling Procedures**

**Quantitative Sampling:** The researcher consulted with internationalization expert, Dr. Barbara Hill, Senior Associate for Internationalization at ACE, regarding the specific research goals, select variables and planned modifications to ACE’s original survey (2003). Based on the expert advice given by Dr. Hill and quantitative survey results, the researcher used maximum variation to select three criteria as a preliminary basis for participation in this study. Maximum variation (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 2005) consists of determining in advance some criteria that differentiate the sites or participants, and then selecting the sites or participants that are quite different on the criteria (Creswell, 2005). The researcher embraced this approach very early in the study, as he assumed that this approach would increase the likelihood that eventual findings would reflect diverse or different perspectives on internationalization at select private HBCUs.

During early fall 2011, the researcher initiated the first phase (quantitative data collection) of this mixed methods research study using the researcher’s modified ACE survey instrument self-titled *Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member*
Institutions. In the quantitative survey, 12 of the 37 UNCF-member institutions responded (or 33%). The institutional survey also formed the basis for the creation of an "Internationalization Index." The Index was used to assign a level of internationalization to each of the 12 responding institutions, and allow for categorization as Highly Active or Less Active.

This categorization would become a variable used in further analysis (ACE, 2005). The Internationalization Index enabled the researcher to identify institutions that demonstrated the following three minimum internationalization criteria: an articulated institutional commitment, supportive institutional leadership, and an institution-wide internationalization taskforce/committee. Criterion-based sampling, a strategy of non-randomized selection (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 2005) was then used to select one Highly Active institution in internationalization and one Less Active institution. The criterion-based sampling method enabled the researcher to identify the above referenced minimum characteristics and locate two research sites based upon those characteristics.

The evidence of an articulated institutional mission and vision, which underscored the goal of global learning assessment, and senior institutional leadership facilitating the strategic planning of an institution-wide internationalization taskforce were worthy criteria for investigation in this study. Institutions classified as Highly Active in internationalization were those that demonstrated more than the three minimum dimensions identified through maximum variation. Whereas, the one Less Active institution selected for this study demonstrated at least the three referenced minimum dimensions. In Chapter Five, the researcher provides a detailed description of how the
Internationalization Index was created, the eight dimensions and scores, overall internationalization score, categorizations and analysis of the survey.

**Qualitative Sampling:** A small sample size was critical for this study. The researcher endeavored to purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study (Creswell, 2005). The decision to study only two sites in the qualitative phase of the study afforded the researcher the opportunity to collect extensive data about each site. The researcher was most interested in specific, detailed, contextual, in-depth and unique aspects of internationalization at the two select sites, rather than generalized knowledge from a large sample population. Thus, the select sample size for this study was small, in an effort to gain an in-depth understanding of the state of internationalization at private HBCUs.

Another important step in the sampling strategy involved confirming the interview participants, dates, times and locations via email and telephone. To give a deeper understanding of the contexts in which this multiple case study was conducted, both institutions studied are described in greater detail in Chapter Five, including information pertaining to their geographic locations, missions, demographics and any history with internationalization.

**Instrumentation**

Data collection instruments for this study were inclusive of the *Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions*, qualitative observations, qualitative interview protocols, and documentation. The credibility of each of these instruments was strengthened through triangulation and the instruments were based on research by
indicating a high degree of validity and reliability. This section will describe each instrument and how it was used.

*Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions:* Questions on the survey were developed based on the independent and dependent variables of this study. The survey was the result of the researcher's modifications to a previous ACE Internationalization Survey (2003). Permission to modify the ACE instrument was obtained by the American Council on Education (ACE) (see Appendix B). Permission to distribute the surveys was granted by UNCF's Institute for Capacity Building (ICB). Questions on the survey were developed and selected by the researcher under the advisement of his dissertation committee and Dr. Barbara Hill, internationalization expert at ACE.

Next, an on-line/web-based survey instrument for this study was built using the survey building program *Class Climate*, a commercial product primarily used by institutional research units of colleges and universities. Using this service allowed the researcher to create the survey quickly using a custom template. Once the completed surveys were submitted, the researchers used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software to analyze the survey responses through descriptive statistics, including frequency totals, percentages, and rankings. Once the institutional responses were submitted, and results generated through Class Climate, the researcher was able to prepare quantitative descriptive results.

To introduce the study and invite participation in the survey, the researcher included in his email to the chief international officers at the UNCF-member institutions
a cover letter, link to the on-line survey, a specific survey pin number and special survey instructions (see Appendices A and E). Like the original ACE survey instrument, the modified survey for this study included different types of questions, such as dichotomous (those with yes or no responses), open-ended and those with a range of response choices.

All questions lent themselves to quantitative analysis. However, open-ended questions were evaluated through a qualitative content analysis approach. This process involved coding key words, categories, and themes in order to group responses under thematic headings and present frequency of responses or percentages of respondents under each theme.

**Qualitative Observation:** The study utilized qualitative observations, a process by which the researcher takes field notes on the behavior and activities of individuals at the research site (Creswell, 2009). At the two UNCF-member institutions, the researcher employed an unstructured process of note-taking activities related to internationalization at both research sites.

Following the suggestion of research experts, the researcher used a protocol for recording the observational data. The use of descriptive notes was critical to the researcher’s ability to take notes for future analysis while observing. The researcher recorded his observations of participants, reconstruction of dialogue, descriptions of physical settings, accounts of particular activities and reflective notes from the researcher’s personal thoughts (Creswell, 2009).

**Interview Protocols:** The study used interview protocols to organize and ensure consistent data collection across the two institutions researched in this study. Separate
protocols were developed for the interviews with the institutions’ provost/vice president for academic affairs (see Appendix F), the chief international officer and the director of study abroad (see Appendix G).

The questions in each protocol were based on the research questions for the study and the researcher developed them in consultation with educational leadership, higher education and research methods faculty from the School of Education at Clark Atlanta University. The researcher conducted face-to-face interviews with the above referenced participants. The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with generally open-ended questions (Creswell, 2009). The interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. The researcher also took additional descriptive notes throughout the interviews.

**Documentation:** Documentation was collected for this study. Documents included a wide range of primary materials, such as institutional strategic plans, Quality Enhancement Plans (QEP), internationalization taskforce/committee meeting minutes, mission statements, meeting agendas, reports, to case and vision statements. Primary material is information directly from the people or situation under study (Creswell, 2005). Documents enabled the researcher to make inferences about the state of internationalization at the two institutions, which could be followed up on during the interviews. For example, from QEP documents, the researcher developed questions about institutional infrastructure to support comprehensive internationalization, which were subsequently asked in interviews.

However, some limitations to including documents as a data source are (a) institutional stakeholders may deliberately block access to particular documents, (b) most
documents collected were created for a purpose other than for this study, [and] bias reporting can occur, and (c) if documentation is not conducted in a thorough manner, biased selectivity can occur (Yin, 2003). Therefore, the researcher took extensive measures to conduct as thorough a collection of documents as possible.

The researcher reviewed extensively the websites of the two institutions to find information about their internationalization efforts, infrastructure, plans and/or activities. The institutional websites provided specific literature on overall institutional mission and vision. Prior to the on-campus face-to-face interviews, the researcher had in-depth conversations with the chief international officers at both institutions. During these conversations, the researcher was able to confirm his subsequent receipt of the following documents: institutional catalogue, names/titles of internationalization taskforce/committee members, any related meeting minutes, applicable QEP documents, institutional leader speeches, strategic plans for internationalization and any other documents that would provide insights into efforts to internationalize the institution. The documents analyzed for each institution is detailed in Chapter Five.

Validity and Reliability of Instruments: As the survey for this study was a modified instrument, the validity and reliability results of the original instrument was very important to the researcher. The researcher accounted for validity and reliability by using the results of the 2003 ACE Survey distributed to the 179 member institutions of the Association of International Educators Administrators (AIEA). Those early ACE results assisted in maximizing the likelihood that the intent of each question had similar
meaning to all respondents and the answers would correspond to what they were intended to measure.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The researcher collected data through the use of a survey, qualitative observation notes, interviews and documentation (see Table 3). The first qualitative phase of the data collection consisted of collecting survey data electronically via a web-based software program. The researcher informed all respondents that the completion and electronic submission of their institutional survey would serve as their passive and implied consent. In addition, the researcher checked the reliability and validity of the survey instrument with the dissertation committee and the referenced ACE expert on internationalization. One of the primary reasons the researcher chose to begin this study with a quantitative phase was to determine the best institutional participants for the second qualitative phase of the study.

The researcher received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at both institutions for the second qualitative phase of data collection. The respective IRBs approved all data collected through interviews, observations and documentation prior to research implementation.

The following summarizes the data collection procedures used for data collection during the qualitative phase of this study:

1. The researcher received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at each institution to conduct interviews.
Table 3

*Data Collection Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>UNCF-member institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Internationalization committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Provost, Chief International Officer &amp; Director of Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Internationalization related documents, mission/vision statements, institutional leader speeches, reports, applicable QEP Documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following summarizes the data collection procedures used for data collection during the qualitative phase of this study:

2. The researcher received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at each institution to conduct interviews.

3. The researcher identified and called the offices of each participant to be interviewed to set up an interview date and time. (There were three interviews completed per campus, for a total of six interviews for this study.)

4. The researcher described the interview protocol to each participant prior to the interview.

5. The researcher received signed copies of consent forms from each interview participant.

6. The researcher hired a professional to transcribe all interviews conducted.

7. The researcher completed the data analysis to compile the results of the study.
After the data collection phase was completed, the researcher began preparing the data for analysis. This step was especially critical to the process of analyzing the qualitative data collected. According to Creswell (2007), qualitative data preparation includes the following three major steps: (a) organizing data, (b) transcribing data, and (c) deciding whether to analyze data by hand or computer.

First, the researcher developed a system of data organization that was comprised of organizing the diverse data into specific categories (e.g. documents, interview transcripts and observational notes) and by institution. The researcher maintained duplicate copies of all data in electronic format (saved on hard drive and USB drive) and hard copy. Next, the researcher hired a transcriptionist to covert the audiotape interview recordings into text data (Microsoft Word format). Finally, the researcher used a manual (hand) process for the coding of the qualitative data to identify common patterns.

After the transcription of interviews was completed, the researcher analyzed the transcripts using the qualitative analysis approach suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). The researcher created a data set with the responses to questions that related directly the eight referenced independent variables. Next, the researcher examined the full interview transcript and coded the responses according to the broad, thematic areas of the interview questions related to each independent variable. The researcher then reviewed each transcript to identify any additional thematic areas not yet specified and to make certain that all pertinent themes were identified.
Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis: As part of the first quantitative phase of the sequential explanatory strategy, the data collected from the survey were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). This application provided a systematic way to identify and evaluate the responses taken from the survey. The SPSS program was used to examine the frequency and percentage response rate for each survey item. With the data collected from the twelve private HBCUs, the researcher was able to quantitatively define institutional levels of internationalization in each of the eight dimensions (independent variables). In addition, the researcher was able to rate their overall levels of internationalization. The use of the frequency tables enabled the researcher to develop a scoring mechanism for internationalization that was subsequently used to create an Internationalization Index, which resulted in categorizations of Highly Active and Less Active overall and by dimension.

Qualitative Analysis: The second qualitative phase of the study’s sequential explanatory strategy involved the constant comparative method (CCM), which served as the primary analytical method used to take information from data collection and compare it to emerging categories (Creswell, 2007).

Within-case analysis is the process of examining the data of each individual case. According to Creswell (2007), when multiple cases are chosen:

A typical format is to first provide a detailed description of each case and themes within the case, called within-case analysis, followed by a thematic analysis
across the cases, called a cross-case analysis, as well as assertions or an interpretation of the meaning of the case. (p. 75)

Coding data, determining internal homogeneity, displaying data, drafting analytical text and integrating data were the within-case analysis procedures followed in this study. After the completing the data coding process, the researcher displayed the data in a systematic format. This critical step enabled the researcher to draw conclusions and compare and contrast from subsequent themes that emerge from participant responses and documentation data.

After the two cases of this study were analyzed individually, the researcher began a process of cross-case analysis. Cross-case analysis is the process of building abstractions across cases, in order to generate a theory that fits each case examined, although the cases will vary in individual details (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). With this in mind, the researcher first trusted the process of data collection and organization. Next, the researcher carefully examined the emergent within-case themes, and compared and contrasted data across the two cases. As a result, the researcher was able to reflect cross-case analysis through analytic text that described emerging themes across cases.

Finally, the researcher employed data triangulation strategies to increase the level of credibility and dependability of the study. The researcher’s selection of a mixed methods research design helped to eliminate any preexisting biases of the researcher about the phenomenon. The mixed method form of data collection “involves the intentional collection of both quantitative and qualitative data and the combination of the strength of each to answer the research questions” (Creswell, Klassen, Plano, Clark, &
Smith, 2010, p. 5). Through the use of multiple sources of information and multiple methods of data collection and analysis, the biases of the individual sources were minimized, if not neutralized (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003).

The credibility and dependability of this study was especially important to the researcher. The use of multiple methods of data collection and analysis assisted the researcher in developing multiple perspectives, and as complete of an understanding as possible of the state of internationalization at private HBCUs. Triangulation in the data collection and analysis were critical to the researcher’s ability to enhance the outcomes and meanings that derived from the independent quantitative or qualitative phases. The quasi-quantitative survey used in this study, for example, provided a macro picture of internationalization at private HBCUs. On the other hand, the qualitative data added contextual information, which provided a more complete understanding of the referenced phenomenon. Data collection triangulation involved the accumulation of evidence through surveys, interviews, qualitative observation notes and documentation, as detailed in previous sections.

**Working with Human Subjects**

This study relied on the collection of data from and about human subjects. The data collected remained confidential. By following the human subjects’ procedures outlined by Clark Atlanta University’s IRB for ethical considerations, the researcher notified all participants of the confidentiality of their participation when they received the email and/or hard copy of the consent form. The identities of the faculty and administrators participating in this study remained concealed. Each institution’s chief
international officers (CIO), who completed a survey, participated in a telephone
conversation with the researcher regarding confidentiality, anonymity and conditions for
participation.

The following summarizes the ethical considerations the researcher addressed
related to conducting research with human subjects:

1. The researcher secured permission from Clark Atlanta University’s
   Institutional Review Board in order to conduct this investigation (see
   Appendix H: IRB Approval Clark Atlanta University).

2. The researcher obtained permission from the Institutional Review Board of
   the two select institutions for the qualitative phase of the study before
   beginning the data collection process, in order to ensure informed consent.

3. The researcher respected the decisions of institutions and individuals who
   declined participation in the study.

4. Fourth, in order to protect the anonymity of institutions and senior
   administrative leaders who participated in this study, they are given
   pseudonyms, such as HBCU#1, HBCU#2, Provost#1, Provost#2, CIO#1,
   CIO#2, Director#1, and Director#2 in the presentation of the data in Chapter
   Five.

Summary

Chapter Four presented the philosophical worldview, research design, the
population and sample, site selection, instrumentation, data collection and preparation
strategies, data analysis methods, internationalization index, data presentation and overall summary.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the stage of readiness of private black colleges as it relates to select benchmarks for comprehensive internationalization. The problem of practice explored by this study was that despite the rhetoric in American higher education for comprehensive internationalization, unique conditions exist, which impact comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. The problem of research addressed by this study was that although the literature indicates a wide array of approaches to internationalization in higher education, currently it does not to date include a study that specifically addresses the unique challenges internationalization present to private HBCUs, or any applicable internationalization strategies given their unique institutional missions, cultures, histories, and priorities. This study is one of the first attempts to do so.

This mixed methods multiple case study employed Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle to examine how select benchmarks affected internationalization at private HBCUs. The study also employed a sequential explanatory research strategy to handle the data collection and analysis of the study’s two phases (quantitative and qualitative research methods). In the first phase (quantitative), the researcher created and distributed a survey to the chief international officers at 37 of the
39 UNCF-member institutions. Questions on the surveys were developed based on the independent and dependent variables of this study. The survey was the result of the researcher’s modifications to a previous ACE Internationalization Survey.

Based upon the literature review undertaken for this study, the survey questions were grouped into eight dimensions that reflect the following select independent variables of the study: Articulated Institutional Commitment, Assessment of Global Learning, Foreign Students, Institutional Infrastructure, Institutional Leadership, Internationalization Review, Internationalized Curriculum, and Study Abroad. The 43-item survey instrument contained three types of questions, including yes/no, ranking, and open-ended questions. Respondents had the opportunity to add comments in yes/no and ranking questions.

One significant result of the quantitative data collection and analysis was the subsequent creation of an Internationalization Index. The institutional survey was designed to measure internationalization specifically at private HBCUs, and the resulting Internationalization Index was used to assign a level of internationalization for each of the responding institutions. This allowed for categorization as Highly Active or Less Active in internationalization. Such data analysis enabled the researcher to select one Highly Active institution and one Less Active institution in internationalization to examine in-depth throughout the second qualitative phase of this mixed methods multiple case study.

The second qualitative phase of this study examined, through a multiple case study research design, two United Negro College Fund (UNCF) member institutions.
HBCU#1 (*Less Active*) and HBCU#2 (*Highly Active*) each demonstrated evidence of articulated institutional commitments to internationalization, supportive institutional leadership, and internationalization taskforces/committees. This chapter presents the data collected to understand the state of internationalization at private black colleges; and the specific challenges and unique opportunities regarding comprehensive internationalization at two UNCF-member institutions. The data were obtained by collection methods including surveys, qualitative observation, interviews and documentation, as set forth in Chapter Four.

This chapter begins by presenting the quantitative data analysis from the *Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions*, composite quantitative descriptive results, and the types and numbers of the interview participants from the two UNCF-member institutions investigated in this study—HBCU#1 and HBCU#2. Finally, an analysis of the individual case studies is provided, followed by a presentation of cross-case findings, analysis and summary.

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

Chapter Five analyzes and presents data collected at 12 UNCF-member institutions. In order to examine the extent of institutional commitment to internationalization at private HBCUs and the strategies these particular institutions use to promote internationalization, the researcher distributed a survey to 37 of the 39 member institutions of UNCF. The following details the survey response rate, composite quantitative descriptive results, the eight dimensions into which the survey questions were categorized, Internationalization Index and statistical analysis.
A typical baccalaureate college is private, residential, very small (enrolls fewer than 3,000 students), and emphasizes teaching before research. In the United States, baccalaureate colleges enroll about 1.1 million students (6% of all students). They compose 13% of all degree-granting institutions in the United States (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). In 2007, the total enrollment (all degree levels) at 4-year, public and private not-for-profit colleges and universities was close to 11 million students. Approximately 3% of those students attended historically black colleges and universities, and less than 1% (approximately 54,205 total enrollment) attended private UNCF-member institutions (UNCF, 2010).

Research on internationalization in U. S. higher education (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; Siaya & Hayward, 2003) has described students at private liberal arts institutions as more likely than students at other types of institutions to study abroad and have international interests. The same studies have also suggested that private liberal arts institutions are typically more highly active in internationalization. Yet, none of the referenced studies included a representative number of private HBCUs in their sample population. As a result, the problem of research becomes immediately apparent, and one begins to wonder whether private HBCUs accurately fit into the image private liberal arts institutions have garnered as highly active in internationalization.

The primary question that framed the data collection and analysis of the study include: What are the driving and restraining forces of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs? This main research question was investigated
through eight research questions, which further examined the following independent variables (a) articulated institutional commitment, (b) assessment of global learning, (c) foreign students, (d) institutional infrastructure, (e) institutional leadership, (f) internationalization review, (g) internationalized curriculum, and (h) Study Abroad.

**Composite Results**

Examining the scale of internationalization at private HBCUs was central to this study. Investigating the common strategies employed by the private HBCUs that have pursued any form of internationalization was another critical aspect of this study. This dissertation addresses both scale and strategies by examining the responses given by 12 of 37 UNCF-member institutions to an institutional survey conducted in fall 2011 by the researcher. Table 4 provides a brief composite description of the 12 responding institutions. The table shows the spring 2008 number of degrees awarded (3,424) to students at the twelve responding institutions account for 40% of the total number of degrees awarded at all 39 UNCF-member institutions. In addition, the total number of foreign students (484) enrolled at the 12 respondent institutions for 2007 represents 51.4% of the total number of foreign students enrolled at all UNCF-member institutions.

**Quantitative Descriptive Results of Survey Dimensions**

The sample for the *Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions* was drawn from the population of regionally accredited member institutions of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF).
Table 4

**Institutions’ Composite Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>Respondent UNCF-Members (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td>Private Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Endowment</td>
<td>$742.91 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate Student Enrollment</td>
<td>20,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate Foreign Student Enrollment</td>
<td>484 (51.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>3,424 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected during the 2011 fall semester, from surveys emailed to the researcher from the chief international officers (CIOs) of the sample institutions in September 2011. Based upon the literature review and consultation with internationalization experts, the researcher grouped the survey questions into eight dimensions (independent variables): Articulated Institutional Commitment, Assessment of Global Learning, Foreign Students, Institutional Infrastructure, Institutional Leadership, Internationalization Review, Internationalized Curriculum, and Study Abroad.

Chapter Five provides descriptive data results of the responses given by 12 UNCF-member institutions that completed the *Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions*. With data collected from the 12 institutions, the researcher was able to quantitatively define institutional levels of internationalization within each dimension, and subsequently rate the institutions’ overall level of internationalization.

**Articulated Institutional Commitment:** Articulated institutional commitment is defined as the extent to which an institution has written statements or established policies...
supporting internationalization; and the extent that internationalization is an integral part of an institution’s identity and vision (mission and goals). The researcher examined key criteria that assessed institutional commitment to internationalization through questions about the institution’s mission statement, strategic plan, and recruitment literature (see Appendix A for a complete list of questions). Figure 5 illustrates the percentage responses of the institutions in the dimension of Articulated Institutional Commitment.

![Figure 5. Composite of Articulated Institutional Commitment](image)

The data show 66.7% responded in the affirmative that their institution’s mission statement specifically refers to international or global education, compared to the 33.3% whose institutional mission statements did not. Regarding whether or not their student recruitment literature highlighted global education, 63.6% of the respondent institutions replied in the affirmative. Finally, internationalization proved to be one of the top five institutional priorities at 83.3% of the 12 sample institutions, compared to 16.7% who do not list internationalization as a high institutional priority. The researcher endeavored to discover whether activity in the other seven dimensions underscored the stated international mission of the institution.
**Assessment of Global Learning:** The second survey dimension examined the assessment of global learning outcomes. This was assessed through questions related to whether or not the sample institutions formally assessed the impact or progress of its internationalization efforts and developed specific student global learning outcomes. Although significant literature exists on determining and assessing student learning outcomes, a gap exists in understanding how to effectively apply the assessment of learning outcomes to internationalization, and combining that approach with one that focuses on institutional internationalization strategies (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005).

Figure 6 illustrates the percentage responses of the institutions in the dimension of Assessment of Global Learning. Only 41.7% of the UNCF-member institutions surveyed had formally assessed the impact of its internationalization efforts in the most recent past five years. A mere 33.3% had developed specific student global learning outcomes for all of their students, while another 25% had made an attempt to develop global learning outcomes within certain schools, departments or programs.

*Figure 6. Composite of Assessment of Global Learning*
Foreign Students: Foreign students can have a tremendous effect on the learning of U. S. students. However, ACE's decade of research on internationalization in U. S. higher education has revealed that the strategy least likely to be used to increase internationalization on campus is the effective use of foreign students. This third dimension aimed to measure institutional support for foreign students through international student recruitment plans, funding for recruitment and international student support services. Only 33.3% of the UNCF-member institutions had a strategic international student recruitment plan that included specific targets for undergraduate students.

The data collected from this dimension was especially interesting to the researcher, as the 12 responding institutions collectively contribute to over half the total number of foreign students (non-resident status) enrolled at all 39 UNCF-member institutions. In addition to foreign student enrollment questions, the survey asked institutions about the nature of their international student support services operation. The data showed the majority of institutions offered orientations to the institution (83.3%), orientation to the U. S./local community (75%), and assistance with housing (58.3%). Figure 7 provides greater detail of the varying levels of support the UNCF-member institutions offered to their international students.
Institutional Infrastructure: Major strengths and weakness in internationalization are determined by the nature and level of programs, personnel and financing in place to support it. Regarding internationalization at private HBCUs, the lack of an administrative arrangement may restrain effective leadership from evolving. Weak infrastructure has been the perennial reason more HBCUs have not been more successful in accomplishing comprehensive internationalization.

This dimension reflects on some level the resources institutions provide to support and promote internationalization on campus. Fifty-eight percent of the institutions have a campus-wide committee or taskforce that works specifically on advancing internationalization. Additionally, 66.7% have a full-time administrator who oversees/coordinates multiple internationalization activities/programs. However, the survey also revealed that 25% of the institutions reported that their institution did not provide any specific funding for internationalization.
Institutional Leadership: As discussed in the literature review of Chapter Three, the challenges of globalization underscores even more the urgency for college leaders to move quickly and decisively beyond mere rhetoric about internationalization and an articulated mission to produce globally competent graduates, toward establishing formal internationalization guidelines that position their institutions to be successful in an ever-changing global landscape. The surveys examined how seriously institutional leaders gave legitimacy and focus to internationalization, and oversaw the development of an action plan in this regard. The responses to this dimension were critical to the researcher’s ability to compare these responses with the data collected related to infrastructure, curriculum, learning outcomes and study abroad dimensions. The researcher attempted to understand how institutional outcomes reflected on an institution’s internationalization rhetoric.

Over half of the institutions (66%) reported that their leadership gave legitimacy to internationalization, and oversaw the development of action plans. Institutional leaders at 75% of the schools reportedly ensured that processes were in place to support internationalization, while only 50% reported that their chief academic officers held deans and department chairs accountable for outlining and achieving their internationalization objectives.

Internationalization Review: This study’s literature review suggests that an internationalization review should address two basic questions (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005):
1. What would this institution look like if it were comprehensively internationalized? What is our vision for internationalization?

2. What is the current state of internationalization? How do we know?

A major consideration of such a review should be the faculty. On most campuses it is the faculty that performs the bulk of the heavy lifting to get internationalization underway. Consequently, this particular survey dimension investigated institutional support for faculty participation in internationalization, as evidence by such factors as funding, tenure and promotion policies, among other factors.

The data shows the majority (70%) of UNCF-member institutions did not have guidelines that specify international work or experience as a consideration in faculty promotion and tenure decisions. Only a very small number (10%) did have referenced guidelines for faculty in some schools, departments or programs. However, as shown in Figure 8, institutions did provide funding to support faculty development workshops to internationalize the curriculum (58.3%), increase foreign language skills (33.3%), use of technology to infuse international dimensions in courses (16.7%), and assess global learning (16.7%).

![Figure 8. Composite of Internationalization Review](image_url)
**Internationalized Curriculum:** The research on the administration and supervision of instructional programs reminds us that all instruction is really about is *initiating, expanding, and reinforcing.* "What we want our students to know" should be at the heart of any internationalization process/strategy. Among the many elements of internationalizing a campus, the curriculum stands out as the essential component of any internationalization effort if all students are to experience global learning in college.

The survey examined several critical elements that show institutional support for an internationalized curriculum in the form of foreign language requirements, international/global courses, and general education requirements, among others. The survey found that most of the UNCF-member institutions (75%) had a foreign language graduation requirement for undergraduates. Another 25% had a foreign language graduation requirement in place for only some degree programs.

In addition, only 40% of the UNCF-member institutions required undergraduates to take courses, as part of the general education curriculum that primarily featured international content in the course. Of those that did, there was a wide variance related to the number of required courses—a single course (30%), two courses (10%) and three or more courses (10%). In terms of languages offered, all of the UNCF-member institutions offered Spanish and French. While the next highest percentages of foreign language offerings were found in Chinese (41.7%) and Japanese (33.3%). See Figure 9 for other languages taught at UNCF-member institutions.
Study Abroad: Of the types of education abroad programs, UNCF-member institutions mostly offered study abroad (75%) for credit. In the majority of those cases, the institutions allowed their undergraduates to use their institutionally awarded financial aid to participate in study abroad opportunities administered by other institutions (83.3%). In addition, much smaller percentages were reported from those UNCF-member institutions that administered for credit—research abroad (41.7%), international internships (16.7%), international service opportunities (16.7%), and field study abroad (8.3%).

On one level, this dimension showed that UNCF-member institutions demonstrate a commitment to education abroad. However, as depicted in Figure 10, relatively small numbers of students from private HBCUs are in fact studying abroad (with only 8.3% of responding institutions reporting that 11% to 20% of their students have had a study abroad experience by the time they graduate).
The researcher collected a total of 12 institutional surveys issued to 37 UNCF-member institutions for a return rate of 32.4% for private HBCUs. The survey instrument consisted of 43 questions. Each received survey was coded from UNCF-1 to UNCF-12 in Microsoft Excel. The researcher used the SPSS program to examine the frequency distribution (Muijs, 2004) of the variables (frequency and percentage response rate for select survey items under each of this study’s eight dimensions of internationalization).

The data collected from the twelve private HBCUs enabled the researcher to quantitatively define institutional levels of internationalization in each of the eight dimensions (independent variables). The researcher was subsequently able to rate their overall level of internationalization. The development and use of frequency tables enabled the researcher to develop an Internationalization Index, which served as a scoring mechanism for internationalization.

The development of the Internationalization Index aided the researcher in the examination of the quantitative data to measure internationalization along eight critical dimensions (independent variables), distinguishing Highly Active UNCF-member institutions from their Less Active counterparts.

Figure 10. Composite of Study Abroad Participation
Table 5 shows the select survey questions the researcher chose from each of the eight survey dimensions to develop the frequency tables (For a complete list of survey questions, see Appendix A). In addition, Table 5 provides a composite of the internationalization strategies used by the *Highly Active* and *Less Active* private UNCF-member institutions in this study.

Table 5

**Strategies of Highly Active and Less Active Private HBCUs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight Dimensions &amp; Select Index Questions</th>
<th>Highly UNCF Institutions (%)</th>
<th>Less Active UNCF Institutions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulated Institutional Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had internationalization as top 5 institutional priority</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highlighted international education in recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Global Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formally assessed student global learning in last 5 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earmarked funds for international student recruitment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had a campus-wide taskforce specifically for Internationalization</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had a full-time administrator for international education</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight Dimensions &amp; Select Index Questions</th>
<th>Highly UNCF Institutions (%)</th>
<th>Less Active UNCF Institutions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• President &amp; CAO gave legitimacy and focus to Internationalization</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• President &amp; CAO ensured campus processes support Internationalization</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAO held deans, chairs and others accountable for Internationalization</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internationalization Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had guidelines that consider international experience in Faculty hiring, promotion and tenure decisions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earmarked funds for faculty development in Internationalization</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internationalized Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had a foreign language graduation requirement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had multiple courses with international dimensions in general education curriculum</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required the completion of courses that featured countries/regions other than Australia, Canada and Western Europe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight Dimensions &amp; Select Index Questions</th>
<th>Highly UNCF Institutions (%)</th>
<th>Less Active UNCF Institutions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permitted institutional aid to underwrite study abroad</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administered for credit proprietary institutional education abroad programs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had guidelines to ensure study abroad students do not delay graduation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of analyzing the frequency distribution of the eight dimensions (independent variables), and the frequency tables of each institution, the researcher could rank and categorize the UNCF-member institutions. See Table 6 for ranking and categorization results. Exactly half of the UNCF-member institutions surveyed fell into the Less Active category, but all met the following three minimum internationalization criteria determined by criterion-based sampling: an articulated institutional commitment, supportive institutional leadership, and an institution-wide internationalization taskforce/committee.

Frequency analysis on each index dimension was conducted to illustrate certain trends among private HBCUs, and compares and contrasts these institutions. The index distinguishes the internationalization strategies of Highly Active UNCF-member institutions.
The criterion-based sampling method aided the researcher in using data collection results to identify two research sites for further in depth qualitative investigation of the state of internationalization at private HBCUs. In order to create the index, specific questions from the 43-question survey were selected within each of the eight dimensions (for a total of 17 questions). Each dimension had one to three questions. An institution could potentially earn either a +1 (highly active), or -1 (less active) point for each of the eight dimensions, so that each dimension had the same relative weight in the index. Response values were coded so the possible value range was from one to zero for each dimension. Dimensions with three questions (institutional leadership, internationalized curriculum and study abroad) were coded so that each of the three responses was of equal value. Each of the three questions within that dimension was valued at 0.33 points. Dimensions with two questions were coded at 0.50 per question. Finally, dimensions with only one yes/no response were coded as either one or zero respectively. Although

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Active</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Less Active</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNCF-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UNCF-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNCF-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNCF-5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNCF-8</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNCF-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNCF-11</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the above referenced dimensions had one, two or three questions, no one dimension was weighted more than another. Finally, the dimension scores were totaled and used to calculate the overall internationalization scores referenced in Table 6.

**Data Integration**

In mixed methods studies, researchers intentionally integrate or combine quantitative and qualitative data rather than keeping them separate (Creswell, Klassen, Plano Clark & Smith, 2011). In particular, the literature (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) discusses the *merging data* approach. The researcher achieves this form of integration by reporting results together in a discussion section of a study (Creswell, Klassen, Plano Clark & Smith, 2011). Deciding when to begin the process of integration was a critical step for this researcher. As a result, the researcher decided to use the subsequent section, qualitative data analysis, as the initial point of data integration in this study. By first reporting the study’s quantitative statistical results, the researcher was able to use the emergent qualitative themes and interview quotes to support or challenge the quantitative results.

In addition, initially analyzing the quantitative survey was critical to the researcher’s development of a baseline understanding of internationalization at private HBCUs, which he then used to inform the next qualitative data collection. In this way the integration occurs by connecting the analysis of results from the initial phase with the data collection of second phase of research (Creswell, Klassen, Plano Clark & Smith, 2011).
Qualitative Data Analysis

Types and Numbers of Interview Participants

For the qualitative phase of this study, UNCF-11 was selected as the Less Active institution in internationalization (UNCF-11 will hereupon be referred to as HBCU#1). UNCF-10 was selected as the Highly Active institution, and will hereupon be referred to as HBCU#2. Both institutions were selected because they are UNCF-member institutions and demonstrated evidence of an articulated institutional commitment to internationalization, supportive institutional leadership, and an internationalization taskforce/committee. The participants in the second qualitative phase of the study included each institution’s provost/vice president of academic affairs, chief international officer and director of study abroad. Types and numbers of participants in the qualitative phase of the study are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>HBCU#1</th>
<th>HBCU#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Study Abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study of HBCU#1

This section presents data collected on internationalization strategies used at the selected Less Active institution (HBCU#1). The case study of HBCU#1 begins with
background information, including the institution composition and descriptive demographics. A brief historical account of the institution's engagement with internationalization is also provided. Finally, the case study of HBCU#1 will conclude with a summary of the contextual findings that have been either driving or restraining forces for comprehensive internationalization at HBCU#1.

In addition to conducting interviews with participants, data were collected through documentation. Table 8 lists the types of HBCU#1 documents analyzed for this study.

Table 8

*Types and Numbers of Documents Analyzed at HBCU#1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type (HBCU#1)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: <em>Internationalization Retreat</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes: <em>Global Leadership Curriculum Committee</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Organization Chart for International Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Curriculum-International Studies Minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Committee Charge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leader’s Speeches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution’s Website Pages (# of pages reviewed)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Programs (Hosted by HBCU#1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Documents Analyzed</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HBCU#1 is a private historically black four-year liberal arts, church related, but not church controlled institution. It sits on an estimated 500 acres of land in Mississippi, a result of a purchase (in the mid 1800s) of the American Missionary Association of New York to establish a school for the training of young people. The Mississippi State Legislature later granted the institution a charter, and in 1901, the first Bachelor of Arts degree was awarded. In 1916, the name of the institution was changed to HBCU#1.

HBCU#1 has gained national respect for its high academic standards and level of social responsibility. The institution reached the ultimate demonstration of its social commitment during the turbulent years of the 1960s. According to the institution’s website, during that period HBCU#1 was:

In the forefront of the Civil Rights Movement in Mississippi, serving as the safe haven for those who fought for freedom, equality and justice and the sanctuary within which the strategies were devised and implemented to end segregation and improve race relations. HBCU #1’s leadership, courage in opening its campus to the Freedom Riders and other Civil Rights workers and leaders, and its bravery in supporting a movement whose time had come, helped to change the economic, political and social fabric of the state of Mississippi and the nation. (HBCU#1 website, 2011)

Aside from its social commitment, HBCU#1 has continued to strive to create an environment of academic excellence and a campus of engaged learners. The administration and faculty continue to challenge students to be prepared to take advantage of opportunities available in a global economy and to become leaders who will
Effect change (HBCU#1 website, 2011). The faculty has grown in quality and size, diversity has been enhanced and the physical landscape and campus infrastructure is evolving. New curricula have been added and partnerships/networking relationships established with many research and Ivy League institutions, not to mention with several other international connections over the years.

HBCU#1 has moved forward on many different fronts. Its graduates are distinguished and engaged in meaningful work throughout the world. As the institution navigates through the 21st century, student success remains its highest aim—ensuring that students are prepared to meet the global challenges of a changing world. In 2002, the College welcomed its thirteenth president and first female to the distinguished list of leaders who have served HBCU#1.

Descriptive Demographics: Table 9 highlights select descriptive and demographic information about HBCU#1. The main question that framed the data collection and analysis include: What are the driving and restraining forces of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs? This main research question is investigated through eight research questions, which further examine the independent variables (a) articulated institutional commitment, (b) assessment of global learning, (c) foreign students, (d) institutional infrastructure, (e) institutional leadership, (f) internationalization review, (g) internationalized curriculum and (h) Study Abroad. This section is organized by the eight research questions, which further examine the referenced independent variables.
Table 9

**HBCU#1 Descriptive and Demographic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>HBCU#1 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Education, Humanities, Natural Science, Social Science, Continuing Education and Professional Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td>Private Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Attendance*</td>
<td>$19,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>$8.017 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Enrollment</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Foreign Student Enrollment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who Study Abroad</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 Degree Producer (Among UNCF Members)</td>
<td>Human Sciences and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ1:** How did an articulated institutional commitment impact Comprehensive internationalization?

This section begins with a brief overview of the historical context for internationalization at HBCU#1. The institution’s first official and strategic foray into international education began in 1989, with their membership into a consortium of higher education institutions in the southwest. Funded by a grant from the U. S. Department of Education, the grant called upon consortium members to internationalized courses. In response, HBCU#1 created two new courses, which are still currently taught at the
institutions, *Seminar in International Studies* and *Seminar on Politics in Developing Countries*.

The institution’s chief international officer (CIO), who has taught political science at HBCU#1 for nearly 40 years, remembers well those early starts at internationalization, Back then, I don’t know of any HBCUs, private or otherwise, that were articulating, in a formal way, their commitment to internationalization. However, what many of these institutions lacked in strategic commitment was partially made up for by our understanding of our responsibility to provide an education that equipped students with the skill sets and competence to be competitive in an increasingly global world. By 1989, HBCU#1’s alumni roster had clearly demonstrated its capacity to do just that. (CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Even in the absence of formal institutional documents and actions to define their internationalization ideals for students, faculty and the public, HBCU#1’s trajectory toward internationalization began. Shortly after their four-year participation in the consortium, in 1994 they received a grant to build on their interest in internationalizing the curriculum. This time they set about establishing an international studies concentration (HBCU#1 did not have minors at the time), which was successfully realized in 1996. Requirements for the 21-credit hour concentration included a study abroad requirement, coursework in international development, and new program collaborations with other area universities. However, the project was terminated when the funding ended.
The late 1990s found the institution participating in, yet, another consortium with two Midwest research institutions and one other private HBCU. The objective of this consortium was to create a Global Issues Honors Consortium that highlighted the following programmatic features:

- Common syllabus between the four participating institutions
- Focus on African colonialism and U. S. discrimination
- Rotating honors symposium (between the four institutions)
- Research methodology course, and
- Two successive summer study abroad experiences in South Africa

Like the previous two referenced cases, the Global Issues Honors Consortium was initiated with "soft money." In all three situations, once the grant funding ended, so did the impetus to continue with the programs. "All three projects were wonderful examples of faculty innovation in internationalization. But, there was never total buy-in from the top administrative levels, and over time interest began to taper off" (CIO#1, personal communication, November 4, 2011). Ironically, as HBCU#1 considers its future internationalization trajectory, it currently finds itself in a predicament reminiscent of the past. Recently, HBCU#1 was awarded an 18-month planning grant (from a major foundation) to look at internationalization through a curricular and co-curricular lens.

Data analysis revealed that faculty and administrators who have been around long enough to remember the abrupt end to the last three grant-funded initiatives are skeptical of the outcomes related to this new grant. As long as the funding lasted, the previous international projects had garnered marginal support from the leadership. But, once the
support had ceased, so, too, did the rhetoric that underscored those efforts. In the past, HBCU#1 had never embarked on the all important consensus building strategies, critical to initiating any innovation. An articulated institutional commitment to internationalization should represent a shared and compelling rationale for the ideal. Hudzik (2011) writes about the requisite mindset for action beginning with a campus-wide discussion and understanding of the rationale, motivations and options to engage internationalization. Such action should result in formal statements, policies and/or strategic plans for internationalization that reflect a process of shared decision making.

Yet, as the skeptics whisper about the prospects related to HBCU#1’s latest internationalization grant, the researcher encountered several encouraging signs of a departure from business of the past. One positive sign was the relative recent change in senior leadership at HBCU#1. In her first State of the College Address (May 18, 2002), the institution’s 13th and first female president not only described in proud detail the “mystique, spirit, endurance and triumphs” of HBCU#1, but she purposefully mentioned the importance of internationalization and the need to have organizational infrastructure in place “to support a high quality academic environment” (President#1, State of College Address, 2002).

In August 2011, a new chief academic officer assumed the provost position. Participants expressed that the new provost has been aggressive in her attempts to reimagine the academic enterprise at HBCU#1, making internationalization of the curriculum and co-curriculum high priorities. After only a month into her tenure as provost, she had rounded up anyone who had anything to do with the new foundation
planning grant. She was not about to let the interests of the authors of the grant taper off. For example, Provost#1, like the president is a graduate of HBCU#1, stated:

This is my third time coming back here, by the way, and my second as Provost. But, when I got here in August 2011 and began to examine the kinds of interests that a college has to have to advance, since I was here the last time, I was convinced that international studies has to be a major part of both the thinking and action of the institution. We are not currently at the level that I want us to be, but at least it seems to be on everybody’s mind. In fact, the internationalization taskforce that wrote the grant was actually already underway with a meeting when I walked into their first formal meeting. I remember walking down to the Chapel, and thought how appropriate it was that they would hold their meeting about internationalization in the Chapel, which is the most spiritual and recently renovated building on the campus. I thought, this is the group that will renovate internationalization on this campus as well. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Overall, it appears that HBCU#1 is readying itself for a new internationalization trajectory; one in which the new leadership is prepared to provide the financial resources and send a much stronger signal that they support internationalization. The first order of business for the provost it seems is formulating a strategic articulation for internationalization. In order to realize this type of articulated commitment, she has charged the internationalization taskforce with examining the institution’s unique mission and history, among other things, and with making recommendations for integrating
internationalization into other institutional priorities. At the end of this process, the leadership expects to have a draft of the institution's first ever strategic plan for comprehensive internationalization, which will detail specific goals beyond curriculum and a road map for overall implementation. To assist them in this regard, in November 2011, HBCU#1 contracted an external consultant to work with the internationalization taskforce in the development of their strategic plan for internationalization.

In the process of integrating the results of the quantitative and qualitative data of this study, the researcher discovered several key factors specifically related to the articulated institutional commitment dimension. HBCU#1 was among the 83% that responded in the affirmative that internationalization was a top five institutional priority. However, they were also among the 33% that did not highlight international education in their recruitment literature. As a result of his discussions with participants, the researcher was confident that this contradiction would correct itself very soon, as the leadership seemed keen on reimagining HBCU#1's academic enterprise, with messaging (internal and external) as a critical component of their transformation.

Regarding her engagements with skeptics at the college, Provost#1 had this to say:

I simply haven't heard them. I think I have heard just about everything they don't like and internationalization is not one of them. And, I need to say to you one of the reasons for that is probably because HBCU#1 has always had an international factor as far back as I can remember. It just has never been formalized in a way that we are attempting now. But, we've always had it. So, I haven't heard a
single whisper about anybody who feels that we are doing something wrong. This is just what it looks like when an institution is trying to figure out which way to go. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Provost#1 might not have heard from skeptics, but she has been listening to the on-going dialogue of the internationalization taskforce. As part of HBCU#1’s recent planning grant award for internationalization, the taskforce proposed a new Center for International Studies, along with an International Studies minor. In October 2011 the taskforce had submitted the following draft of the mission statement for the proposed Center:

The HBCU#1 Center for International Studies is an academic center designed to provide an interdisciplinary studies curriculum which enhances our liberal arts education for the 21st century and integrates study abroad, technology, international studies, community service and service learning. Since the College prepares students to be imaginative, self-directed, lifelong learners and mindful thinkers who are committed to leadership and services in a global society, the Center envisions a global learning community, which instills awareness and sensitivity for becoming globally competent citizens. (Draft Mission Statement for Proposed Center for International Studies, October 2011).

RQ2: How did an assessment of global learning impact comprehensive internationalization?

In this section HBCU#1’s experience with the assessment of student global learning outcomes is presented. Assessing student learning outcomes in general has
gained tremendous momentum over the last twenty years. According to Kinzie (2010), the challenge for most institutions in the assessment of student learning is figuring out an effective way to use an enormous amount of data to improve student learning. If that was not challenging enough, in Chapter Two, this study reported on the change in accreditation standards that have motivated institutions to design curricular and co-curricular programs that address intended student learning outcomes.

Global learning, however, is representative of those ineffable traits hard to evaluate or assess (Suskie, 2009). On the other hand, aligning global learning outcomes to other internationalization strategies is a formal way to guide efforts to review and assess institutional programs. While they all agreed that assessing global learning outcomes was probably the most critical aspect of internationalization, study participants at HBCU#1 readily admitted that they have done little to date in this regard. CIO#1 explained that assessing global learning outcomes:

Is absolutely essential! Too often what we’ve done here is create this great paper trail, but ignored the essence of assessment. Just because outcomes are listed on a syllabus, does not ensure that those outcomes have been achieved, or more importantly what the effects are. Honestly, our faculty has not had much training in assessing global learning outcomes. Until this provost, no one has ever asked us to think about the ways to internationalize the curriculum across the board. Sure it’s done in little pockets by faculty here and there, but there has not been much overall buy-in among faculty for two reasons: (a) previous administrations
didn’t give it a high priority and, (b) a lot of faculty probably were confused about what it was. (CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Director#1, who besides directing study abroad at HBCU# is also a professor of Modern Foreign Languages, emphatically agreed with his colleague in political science: Assessing global learning outcomes is definitely something we need to work on. Some professors literally cringe at the thought of being asked to tinker with the learning outcomes of their courses in general. But, you throw in global learning outcomes and some have a hard time understanding how to go about not only developing these types of outcomes, but assessing them as well. As faculty, we live in our disciplines, so professional development in this area would naturally make our lives easier. (Director#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Provost#1 took a more holistic approach in formulating her response to the questions regarding assessment of global learning as a strategy of internationalization:

It’s exceptionally important. You know, the majority of our students still come from the State of Mississippi. And I know, in this new class right now for example, the average GPA is 3.0, and average ACT score is 18. But, they come from schools, particularly in this district that are not the best. To be frank, we don’t really know what they know until they get here. So what we think we know about them when they get to us, just by looking at their transcript, is that they have had some exposure to a few courses with international content. Our students come to us looking forward to a wonderful experience. They heard about it. They
know, for instance, that HBCU#1 was a major Civil Rights Movement site. They also come to us inclined to allow us to assess where they are in their global awareness, and then help them grow that awareness into competence. We have not been doing that; but trust me we will get there very soon. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

The advent of HBCU#1’s recent award of a planning grant for internationalization may very well be a timely and appropriate next step in the direction of more robust assessment of global learning outcomes. Two major internationalization priorities that the internationalization taskforce addressed in their grant application was the establishment of a Center for International Studies and an International Studies minor. Along with specific program objectives (to be discussed in subsequent sections of this study), the taskforce drafted the following three student learning outcomes for HBCU#1 students:

1. Students will demonstrate recognition and understanding of the diversity of peoples and cultures around the world.
2. Students will demonstrate development of critical thinking and analytical reasoning skills exhibiting an international or global perspective.
3. Students will demonstrate a knowledge base and applied research skills through the use of information technology in order to analyze the effects of issues, trends, and events to work effectively and harmoniously in an ever changing complex global society. (Proposal, Center for International Studies/International Studies minor, October 2011)
Although the proposal does not describe how HBCU#1 plans to assess the above referenced learning outcomes, the overall proposal is nonetheless a major step in the right direction and already captures the rich campus-wide dialogue regarding internationalization. Another noteworthy aspect of the proposal is the fact that it was written by the internationalization taskforce, which is comprised of the following cross-section of faculty leaders at HBCU#1:

- CIO#1 (Chair, Internationalization Taskforce)
- Director, Center for Civic Engagement and Social Responsibility
- Dean of Humanities
- Dean of Education
- Chair, Biology Department
- Director, First-Year Programs
- Director, Study Abroad

HBCU#1 is not alone in its quest to improve in the assessment of global learning outcomes. As reported in this study’s Review of Literature, a 2006 Mellon Foundation-funded study of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), found that “there is little evidence that students are provided with multiple, robust, interdisciplinary learning opportunities at increasing levels of intellectual challenge to ensure that students acquire the global learning professed in the mission statement” (Hovland, 2006, p. 15).

Likewise, the composite results of responses to the questions under the dimension devoted to the assessment of global learning illustrated a very low percentage (33.3%) of
private HBCUs that had attempted to develop specific global learning outcomes.

HBCU#1 was not among this group, as their referenced proposal has not been accepted by its institutional leadership. In addition, only 41.7% of responding institutions had formally assessed their internationalization efforts in the most recent past five years.

RQ3: How did foreign students impact comprehensive internationalization?

In this section, foreign student enrollment trends that emerged from the data collection process, which affected internationalization at HBCU#1, are presented. Foreign student matriculation on a campus enriches the educational experience for every student. College and university leaders have quickly realized the impact that foreign student matriculation could have on their capacity to actually become the kind of global institution they want to promote.

In addition, increasingly U. S. higher education has also come to value foreign students for economic reasons: the tuition fees paid by foreign students can be an important source of income, particularly at times of economic difficulty when other income sources are threatened (Macready & Tucker, 2011). At HBCU#1, like most of their UNCF-member institution counterparts, foreign student recruitment has been the least used strategy for internationalization. No strategic international recruitment plans have ever been formulated at the institution.

Foreign student recruitment at HBCU#1 has always been an ad hoc endeavor. Without articulated institutional commitments to internationalization, which included foreign students as an important aspect of the institution's priorities, no real progress has
been made in this area. Director#1 attempted to explain HBCU#1’s experience with foreign students:

We have really been all over the place on the issue of foreign students. We have tried our hand at ESL programming, largely because I wrote a grant back in 2009 that got funded for one year. The grant allowed us to purchase computers, textbooks and hire an ESL coordinator. In one summer, we recruited nine Korean students. The students completed the ESL program and thoroughly enjoyed the program, our campus and Mississippi. Unfortunately, the grant was only a one-year grant and though the administration thought it was a great initiative, it did not support it past the grant period . . . Can you imagine how sad that was for those of us who worked hard to get that program off the ground? . . . Regarding foreign student recruitment, there are simply no funds to support the traditional approach of sending recruiters to certain countries to recruit . . . certainly no funds to offer scholarships. Lately, though, we have started to engage in some interesting conversations around how we can get more foreign students here; and ESL has snuck back on the discussion table as well. (Director#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

To add a historical context to the discussion of foreign student trends at the institution, CIO#1 remembered:

We have always been up and down in this regard. When I arrived 40 years ago, I recall two or three Nigerian students . . . excellent students . . . and, because of sporadic relationships with contacts in Japan, we have probably had about ten or
eleven Japanese student matriculate here over the years, and I have taught some of
them as well . . . And when we had a track team, students from Trinidad were
coming quite regularly at one point . . . But basically there has never been a
concerted effort to recruit internationally. We have really been missing the boat
on foreign student recruitment. (CIO#1, personal communication, interview,
November 4, 2011)

An analysis of the quantitative data underscores the marginal attempts at foreign
student recruitment at HBCU#1. The data showed that only 33.3% of private HBCUs
had a strategic plan for foreign student recruitment that included specific targets for
undergraduate students. The data also showed that even with the absence of strategic
recruitment initiatives, the 12 private HBCUs of this study remarkably enrolled over half
(51.4%) of the total number of foreign students at all UNCF-member institutions. As if
to emphasize the warm reception the Korean ESL-students received during their 2009
summer at HBCU#1, the quantitative data showed that private HBCUs did invest in,
significant ways, in the acculturation process of the foreign students that did enroll at
their institutions. Figure 7, for instance, showed that 75% of the private HBCUs
provided some type of orientation to the U. S. and local community. Finally, HBCU#1’s
brief foray into ESL programming could be in some way representative of the overall
lack of programming in this area, as suggested by the data which revealed that only 8.3%
of private HBCUs offered ESL programs for foreign students.
RQ4: How did institutional infrastructure impact comprehensive internationalization?

In this section, an analysis of institutional infrastructure to support internationalization at HBCU#1 is presented. Institutional infrastructure refers to the extent to which a dedicated staff, office, taskforce and an established communication system is in place to support internationalization. Regarding internationalization at HBCUs, the lack of an administrative arrangement which permits effective leadership to evolve towards accomplishing comprehensive internationalization has been the perennial reason more HBCUs have not been more successful in this regard.

The lack of institutional infrastructure to support internationalization at HBCU#1 emerged as a critical restraining force that has hindered the institution from making any significant progress in international education throughout the years. Internationalization Retreat minutes (2011) cited the “immediate need for a centralized organizing unit to facilitate internationalization” (p. 6). In further illustration of this point, CIO#1 indicated:

Increased infrastructure to support internationalization at HBCU#1 is especially critical at this point. Given this new momentum and positive energy this provost has ignited, a serious assessment of our infrastructure needs is a natural progression... a must really. People are interested across distinct lines, we’re working together and camaraderie is starting to develop... We’ve already reflected on what went on or didn’t before, so most of us are quite clear about what we need from the top levels. We need institutionalized infrastructure, so
that the international programs we conceive can become sustaining. The Provost just appointed a new CIO, who previously held the position for a short time a few years ago, and I will move on to directing the international studies minor. But the new CIO has got to figure out who he needs to work with him and on what basis . . . you know, deciding on the right infrastructure. But more importantly, the senior leadership needs to realize that internationalization needs to have a home at this institution, an office with staff and expertise HBCU#1 will benefit from.

(CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Ironically, the newly appointed CIO is the current director of study abroad interviewed for this study. A professor of Modern Foreign Languages, he came to HBCU#1 in 2004 and in 2006 was asked to establish an Office of International Programs. He ended up serving in that role for three and half years. Admittedly, his previous experience in the position was very challenging. The lack of coordination and apathy across administrative and academic lines were major obstacles. The expectation that one person would do it all, without support, was another. Director#1 remembered his previous stint as CIO:

From the very beginning it just was not well conceived. Some people felt like I was moving in on their territory and taking over. Another small few were unable to view internationalization as a benefit to the institution, and only saw benefits being accrued to the international programs office . . . that was pretty tough. Centralization of internationalization did not work for a number of reason back then. But the primary restraint was inherent in the position itself. There were just
certain things as CIO I was not allowed to do. On the other hand, I was new to
the campus and to my colleagues. Gosh, I had a lot to learn about everything.
But, please understand, there were a lot of people helping me, who wanted to see
us be successful. (Director#1, personal communication, interview, November 4,
2011)

Director#1’s sentiments underscore the research literature in this regard, as
internationalization scholar, Jane Knight, was quoted at a 2011 NAFSA Symposium on
Leadership:

If internationalization is seen as the purview of the international office or some
other structure/position which has the responsibility to design, operationalize and
monitor the internationalization strategy and faculty/staff are not involved and
rewarded there will be limited engagement and support for the international
dimension and it will continue to be a marginalized issue. (West, 2011, p. 6.)

The centralization of HBCU#1’s internationalization programs in a single office
emerged as a pervasive need from the data collection. Institutions that have been
successful in internationalization have most often appointed administrators or faculty
members to lead these centralized offices that have credibility among faculty, if not
faculty status. In order to facilitate widespread faculty engagement in
internationalization, the CIO can very often use their own scholarship as a starting point
to intellectually engage colleagues.

When asked what about this second appointment as CIO makes him hopeful for a
more successful outcome in the position, Director#1 added:
This administration is serious about internationalization. The new provost comes to us with a demonstrated background in building a successful international program at another HBCU—one that centralized all the key areas of internationalization under a strategic framework that was measurable. All of us can learn and benefit from that. In only three months her actions have been decisive and swift, and her leadership emanates from a fierce commitment to HBCU#1. She cares about all of our development, and I don’t know too many folks who wouldn’t want to collaborate with a leader like that. You know, the excitement swirling around this place right now is contagious. I know there is a lot I have to learn to do, but it’s exciting because for the first time I can visualize our success. With this kind of support, it’s really easy to forget the past.

(Director#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

The data collection at HBCU#1 showed that the decisions regarding the administrative structure to support internationalization and its eventual “home” is a task the provost has, for the moment, reached out to the academic deans for recommendations. Three of the deans (Education, Humanities and Social Sciences respectively) have made aggressive pleas to house the Office of International Programs, which Provost#1 finds encouraging and “somewhat amusing that you’ve got these deans vying for international programs. So, I am just going to sit back and wait to see what develops” (Provost #1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011).

However, the biggest barrier, according to Provost#1, to building institutional infrastructure to support and sustain internationalization will be financial resources.
While establishing effective administrative structures is key to the overall coordination of the program, limited financial resources emerged as a pervasive restraint to infrastructure development. Provost#1 explained:

HBCU#1 has never had money. We’ve got land and lots of art, but we have never had the kind of budget it takes to compensate running the type of institution we aspire to be. But that has never stopped us. We have produced some of the finest intellectuals in this country. So, we have always found a way. And, as we work through this internationalization project, I have the taskforce meeting with the team in institutional advancement to look at funding possibilities. I mean that’s the only way we are going to do it. I know there is funding out there we can opt for and I am looking forward to finding it . . . You know, we’re small, we’re driven, we’ve got 2000 students, and a low endowment. So without some external funding, none of the internationalization projects I’d like to see us through can be realized. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Again the analysis of the composite quantitative data mirrors the current movement of HBCU#1. The data showed that 58% of private HBCUs had a campus-wide internationalization taskforce/committee. In addition, 66.7% had a full-time administrator who coordinates multiple internationalization activities/programs, but HBCU#1 was not included in this percentage at the time of data collection from the survey. Yet, the qualitative data revealed that even the appointment of one administrator to coordinate multiple internationalization activities was woefully insufficient to effectively manage credible internationalization programs/activities. With admitted
RQ5: How did institutional leadership impact comprehensive internationalization?

Institutional leadership is defined as senior institutional leaders (presidents, chief academic officer, and/or chief international officer) with the authority and resources to coordinate or oversee an institution’s internationalization. The data collection revealed dramatic and swift change at HBCU#1 in this regard. At HBCU#1 the institutional leadership, in the form of Provost#1, encouraged campus engagement in internationalization, by providing needed communication mechanisms to support academic leaders’ exploration of defining internationalization on HBCU#1’s own terms. Such leadership included the facilitation of broad base dialogue (and input) about the direction internationalization should take at the institution.

Secondly, the immediate appointment of a CIO led to the centralization of internationalization at HBCU#1. This action was another prompt and strong signal that the institutional leadership was committed to internationalization. Thirdly, Provost#1’s particular interest in internationalizing the curriculum was consistent with past

stretched resources, HBCU#1 resembles many of their private HBCU counterparts in equating infrastructure with financial resources. The data did reveal, however, the strategic planning attempts of HBCU#1, and the positive caucusing of the internationalization taskforce and institutional advancement personnel early in the planning process. This latter point is a significant one when considering HBCU#1 was among the relatively low percentage (25%) that reported their institution did not provide any specific funding for internationalization.

Institutional leadership is defined as senior institutional leaders (presidents, chief academic officer, and/or chief international officer) with the authority and resources to coordinate or oversee an institution’s internationalization. The data collection revealed dramatic and swift change at HBCU#1 in this regard. At HBCU#1 the institutional leadership, in the form of Provost#1, encouraged campus engagement in internationalization, by providing needed communication mechanisms to support academic leaders’ exploration of defining internationalization on HBCU#1’s own terms. Such leadership included the facilitation of broad base dialogue (and input) about the direction internationalization should take at the institution.

Secondly, the immediate appointment of a CIO led to the centralization of internationalization at HBCU#1. This action was another prompt and strong signal that the institutional leadership was committed to internationalization. Thirdly, Provost#1’s particular interest in internationalizing the curriculum was consistent with past
internationalization efforts at HBCU#1, and sent a clear message that the heavy lifting of internationalization would rest with faculty.

However, the lack of immediate funding to support new innovations in internationalization, such as an international studies minor, new international center, and an internationalized curriculum emerged as an obstacle that continues to hinder the establishment a comprehensive internationalization program at HBCU#1. On many levels the data collection revealed that HBCU#1 was headed in the right direction to resolving the funding challenge.

Nevertheless, HBCU#1’s past experience with internationalization projects revealed a number of compelling factors. On one level, its history with international programs may suggest a lack of strategic planning in preparation for the institutionalization of programs built on “soft funds.” The relatively minimal promotion senior leadership lent to previous internationalization projects contributed to internationalization in general not ranking higher on the list of institutional priorities. On the other hand, the fact that HBCU#1 has demonstrated success in writing compelling and fundable grants for internationalization is a strength and valuable experience lacking at other private HBCUs.

In this way institutional leadership plays a tremendous role. The individual histories of private HBCUs are rooted in their perseverance, courage and the facilitation of their institutional leadership to anticipate change and shape the trends of the institution to be consistent with tomorrow. Internationalization of U. S. higher education is such a change. Data collection revealed that Provost#1 is acutely aware that the academic
enterprise over which she presides has to quickly mature in its internationalization efforts, if HBCU#1 is to remain a viable educational option in the delivery of U.S. higher education. For this maturation to occur, Provost#1 seems most concerned with holding people accountable for achieving the internationalization goals developed as a result of the internationalization review process:

I can create the mechanisms that lead to the building of structures with appropriate staff and centers that support the kind of internationalization programs this faculty thinks is best for us. I think I have been clear that this is a priority. What I’m learning is that there is no one best organizational way to approach embedding internationalization into the ethos of an institution. But, considering HBCU#1’s historical mission and who we think we are, I’m very interested in figuring out a way to embed internationalization in all of our strategic priorities. That means holding people accountable for what they come up with in terms of recommendations. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

This latter point regarding accountability is a critical one. Analysis of the quantitative data showed that 50% of the chief academic officers at private HBCUs hold deans, department chairs, and other administrators accountable for outlining and achieving their internationalization objectives. What the data did not reveal, however, was whether accountability included comprehensive internationalization strategies, or merely disparate international activities on the campus. The quantitative data also revealed that institutional leadership (president and chief academic officer) at 70% of the
private HBCUs in this study ensured that campus processes support internationalization. Though HBCU#1 was not included in that percentage, the qualitative data revealed that they are currently making swift attempts to correct this particular infrastructure barrier.

RQ6: How did an internationalization review impact comprehensive internationalization?

In this section, an analysis of the process of an internationalization review to support internationalization at HBCU#1 will be presented. An internationalization review is defined as the process of taking stock of the various international/global initiatives and programs on campus, evaluating the extent to which these activities achieve the institution’s goals for internationalization, and form the basis for an internationalization plan.

In order to address this critical dimension of internationalization, an internationalization taskforce at HBCU#1, which included faculty and administrators, was created in late July of 2011. The taskforce was organized into subcommittees to examine in depth the resources, stakeholders and programs necessary to advance HBCU#1’s internationalization.

The formation of the taskforce preceded the arrival of Provost#1, but the real momentum of this particular group began with the provost’s charge in August 2011 to create a mission and vision for internationalization, environmental scan/ SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats). In addition, the taskforce was charged with developing goals and objectives to support the proposed mission and vision. In August 2011, the Internationalization Taskforce held a retreat, which in addition to the
above referenced steering committee, included other faculty and student affairs stakeholders. The basis for the work of the taskforce was the development of a draft of a Strategic Plan for Internationalization to be submitted to the provost in August 2012.

Retreat minutes capture the following initial recommendations, suggested by steering committee and subcommittee members, related to a comprehensive approach to internationalization:

The creation of a centralized Office of International Programs to facilitate and coordinate diverse activities (advising, compliance, support, etc.) associated with campus internationalization, and move beyond the fragmented approach. Plus, we need to take a serious look at developing measureable global learning outcomes for all HBCU#1 students. (Subcommittee member#1, Retreat minutes, August 1, 2011)

Hit freshmen early on, expose them...bait them to increase global awareness from their very first day on campus through freshmen seminars and hire two full time faculty to teach these global components. (Subcommittee member #2, Retreat minutes, August 1, 2011)

Curriculum is the key, though. We need to look at internationalization of the general education curriculum and in the disciplines. And if we go down the curriculum road, we have to be prepared to support faculty development... training our faculty on internationalizing the curriculum will be huge. (Subcommittee member #3, Retreat minutes, August 1, 2011).
HBCU#1 needs to develop strategic partnerships with other area institutions and institutions abroad. These types of collaborations yield research opportunities for both students and faculty. (Subcommittee member #4, Retreat minutes, August 1, 2011)

Whatever way we go with internationalization, we can not lose sight of who we (HBCU#1) are . . . and why we exist. Our take on internationalization needs to represent who we are as an institution. (Subcommittee member #5, Retreat minutes, August 1, 2011)

The retreat served as HBCU#1’s initial planning phase of the internationalization review process. Early recommendations led to the formation of subcommittees to look deeper into aligning internationalization goals with institutional strategic priorities, assessing student global learning, foreign student enrollment, infrastructure, curriculum (general education core, disciplines and co-curricular) and study abroad.

At HBCU#1, the internationalization review process is encouraging faculty and staff engagement in internationalization, by empowering steering and subcommittee members to start addressing what they want HBCU#1 to become. Provost#1 pointed out:

Transparency is essential to any kind of review, and I suspect no different with an internationalization review either. There are some in the HBCU community, who would rather not see comparative data, but I’m really not afraid of knowing how our institution compares to other similar institutions. In fact, I want to know where the gaps are . . . In my experience, the gaps helped me reaffirm the gifts,
strengths and opportunities for success. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

The nexus of transparency and an internationalization review is inherent in the above referenced statement by Provost#1. The survey created for this study, *Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions*, considered the prevailing questions that typically guide an internationalization review, as defined by the research literature (Green & Olson, 2003). Data collection and analysis revealed that almost from day-one of her arrival on campus, Provost#1 began engaging people in discourse about internationalization. People need a reason to get behind an ideal, and she has been very successful in creating a socialization process for her faculty and staff at HBCU#1. This process has already begun to shape a shared and compelling rationale for internationalization. This ability to convene people is a critical organizing feature of the internationalization review process and for garnering broad-base support for internationalization.

Although only in the very early stages of their review process, HBCU#1 has discovered that their review has enabled them to focus on a broad range of areas, including the environment for internationalization, the curriculum, student life, study abroad, foreign students, infrastructure, and faculty development opportunities (Olson, Green & Hill, 2005). One of the ways in which HBCU#1 has sought to approach the internationalization review process is to charge the steering committee of the newly appointed internationalization taskforce to make certain that engagement in the review process is broad, deep and inclusive.
At the time of the researcher’s site visit to HBCU#1, such broad-based engagement had yet to happen. This was seemingly due to the fact that the steering and subcommittees were still reaching consensus regarding their reasons for internationalizing and the ways in which to use the results of what the review would uncover. There was, however, widespread agreement from the steering committee that review results would yield a clearer picture of the gaps in internationalization, suggest synergies and outline a future direction.

To highlight the review function, CIO#1 explained the next steps for the internationalization taskforce:

I’m not sure some of my colleagues fully understand how much work we have ahead of us. The review alone will take months to complete, if we aim to do it right. We’ve got to conduct interviews with faculty, staff and students, hold campus wide forums and really talk about what HBCU#1’s vision is for internationalization . . . you know give people a chance to consider what a completely internationalized HBCU#1 could look like. Then somebody’s got to synthesize all that data and make meaning out of it. I’m telling you, this could be a powerfully informative exercise for us. (CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

When asked if he felt the 15-member taskforce had been given any real power to make any sustaining improvements related to internationalization CIO#1 added:

Well, I didn’t have high expectations when conversations around internationalization first began to resurface. Our track record has been a bit
episodic over the years, but now, a few months into this project and we have made some real progress. We certainly have the right people on the taskforce ... I mean to have two deans (Education and Humanities) on the taskforce, who wield enormous influence on this campus, excited about this project should translate into change. We meet monthly specifically to discuss internationalization. This is a big deal for HBCU#1, considering our sporadic background with internationalization. Not to mention having an external consultant working with us, finalizing an organizational chart for the reimagined international office.

(CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Overall, a comprehensive internationalization review emerged as an urgent priority for HBCU#1. The results of such an examination of their articulated commitments and current practices should reveal inconsistencies, gaps and opportunities to enhance campus internationalization (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Consequently, the collection and analysis of the quantitative data revealed that private HBCUs, for the most part, had not engaged in extensive self-reflection of campus internationalization.

This particular survey dimension investigated institutional support for faculty participation in internationalization, as evidence by such factors as funding, tenure and promotion policies, among other factors. While private HBCUs are providing limited funding to support faculty development workshops, to internationalize the curriculum (58.3%), increase foreign language skills (33.3%), use of technology to infuse international dimensions in courses (16.7%), and assess global learning (16.7%), faculty
development would be more productive if training were aligned with a strategic plan for internationalization.

Finally, one priority of the internationalization review process at HBCU#1 is to end with a strategic plan for internationalization that is aligned with the institutional mission, goals and priorities. The gaps identified by the internationalization review should also reveal any misalignment between HBCU#1’s articulated institutional commitments to internationalization and their actual practices in this regard.

RQ7: How did an internationalized curriculum impact comprehensive internationalization?

In this section an analysis of an internationalized curriculum’s impact on comprehensive internationalization at HBCU#1 is presented. An internationalized curriculum refers to the extent to which international learning is infused throughout the curriculum and is an integral part of the academic offering of the institution; the elements of the curriculum and co-curriculum that foster international learning. At HBCU#1, internationalizing the curriculum and co-curriculum emerged as the driving force to accomplishing comprehensive internationalization. The academic leadership and the internationalization taskforce viewed an internationalized curriculum as the portal to increased faculty engagement in internationalization.

At HBCU#1, faculty buy-in was critical to successfully implementing an internationalization strategy. Since the curriculum is where faculty live (teaching, research, co-curricular programming), HBCU#1 approached the launch of their internationalization review with the notion that the curriculum will be the centerpiece of
any strategic plan that later develops. This curricular focus is inherent in the names of the proposed *Center for International Studies* and minor in *International Studies*. In its proposal, HBCU#1’s Center for International Studies would house the minor. In particular the proposal for the International Studies minor articulated the following three goals:

**Goal 1:** Provide interdisciplinary courses that satisfy global awareness and global competencies, promote service learning, and integrate study abroad, diplomacy and technology.

**Goal 2:** Provide an interdisciplinary contextual discourse for understanding socio-economic sustainable concerns and cultural structures, with historical and geographical influences at the local, state, national and international levels.

**Goal 3:** Organize living and learning communities which support developing an understanding of globalization issues and events; global communication skills; and experiential learning in order to enhance critical thinking and analytical reasoning across the various disciplines. (HBCU#1 Global Leadership Curriculum Committee, October 2011, p. 1)

This focus on an internationalized curriculum is illuminated through the following comments:

All I want is strong disciplines. Internationalizing the curriculum can be tricky, because some faculty can get carried away with external influences and crowd a discipline. But, on the other hand, I simply love the direction our conversations
are taking . . . like this minor in International Studies the taskforce has brought to me. I want something that's clean, crisp and creative in terms of how students gain international experience. As long as we develop curriculum that allows that to happen, I think I would support it. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

The goal is to finalize the packaging of the proposal for the International Studies minor and submit it through the appropriate faculty and administrative approval channels and be in position to offer the minor by fall 2012. The minor will really help us move on other internationalization initiatives like study abroad, because that will be a signature feature of the minor. And, because both the Center and minor have an interdisciplinary focus, faculty will be encouraged to infuse international dimensions into their courses. (CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

Internationalizing the General Education and Freshmen Seminar curriculum is another crucial step for HBCU#1. Quite possibly this step could meet some resistance, but if we are serious about this, we have to review our entire curriculum. (Subcommittee member#1, Retreat minutes, August 1, 2011)

The research literature (Green & Shoenberg, 2006) on internationalizing the disciplines has changed the general conversation about curriculum. A shift has been made from what faculty teaches to what students learn. Data analysis revealed that HBCU#1 is taking the global learning of their students very seriously, and is committed to producing students dedicated to public service throughout the world.
Internationalizing the curriculum is viewed as a strategic measure to ensure HBCU#1 continues its solid reputation of producing scholars that will transfer their knowledge to other people, set goals that contribute to the well being of the global community, and recognize and then solve problems.

Despite the prominence of an internationalized curriculum, the international studies minor also serves as an avenue through which HBCU#1 is addressing the internationalization of its curriculum. The interdisciplinary approach to developing the curriculum of the minor emerged as an unexpected accomplishment of HBCU#1’s internationalization taskforce. As a result, faculty across disciplines are starting to inquire about the minor and how they can become more engaged with this initiative. Off and on over the years, HBCU#1 has received external funding to support the internationalization of the curriculum (CIO#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011). The data revealed that previous external grants to internationalize the curriculum never generated campus-wide faculty support for three reasons, which include:

1. Faculty authors of those grants, in some instances, worked too independently developing the international initiative, and broad-base faculty input was not fully explored;

2. Academic leadership did not overtly promote the initiative, by ensuring the infrastructure and communication mechanisms were in place to support the referenced curriculum initiatives.
3. The support of academic leadership did not include the removal of barriers that restrain internationalizing of the curriculum.

The research literature (Green & Shoenberg, 2006) states that the third reason was a prevailing barrier to the internationalization of the curriculum across the Academy. Institutions’ general response to internationalizing the curriculum seems to be, We feel a real obligation to do something and we’ll do what we can within the limits of our funding, the circumstances of our students, and the abilities and the tolerance of our personnel on hand. Departments do not want to give up curricular space to international and foreign language requirements. Foreign language departments cannot expand fast or far enough to introduce a serious language requirement. And more and more college students are in no position economically or in terms of family obligations to travel and study abroad. (p. 3)

The data analysis revealed how real and difficult this challenge was at HBCU#1. But HBCU#1 has at a minimum arrived at consensus that global learning for all of their students is a compelling goal that requires increased faculty participation. In fact, the International Studies major was proposed by an interdisciplinary group of faculty from a cross-section of disciplines. HBCU#1’s past attempts at internationalizing the curriculum proved that without campus-wide faculty engagement a retooling of the curriculum was not likely to be sustaining. The current belief that an International Studies minor (with a major in the future) and a Center for International Studies, at a minimum, will provide infrastructure support for faculty to integrate their international interests and disciplinary expertise.
The quantitative data collection and analysis was less encouraging. Regarding an internationalized curriculum, the data showed that over 60% of the private HBCUs did not require their undergraduate students to take courses that primarily feature international dimensions in the course content to satisfy a general education requirement. Of that percentage 50% of the responding institutions had no courses with international dimensions that they required of undergraduates as part of the general education curriculum. Lastly, only 16.7% offered international studies tracks (majors/minors/certificates/concentrations).

Finally, the data also revealed that HBCU#1 looks to chart a new path in the internationalization of the curriculum for private HBCUs, as they consider the international implications of their nearly fifty year history of producing scholarly research pertaining to slavery and its legacy. One significant outgrowth of this impressive track record is HBCU#1’s cooperative agreement with one of the nation’s Ivy League institutions.

In 1964, the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court’s landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision, the two institutions, with the Civil Rights Movement as a backdrop... the two institutions entered into a commitment that continued as a unique collaborative venture, engaging the culture, academia and histories of these distinctive institutions. (HBCU#1 National Conference Brochure, 2011, p. 9)

The following passage from the program brochure of a national conference on slavery, hosted by HBCU#1 further highlights this unique institutional partnership:
Ivy League institution, as a former beneficiary of the slave system, and HBCU#1, as the inheritor of land that housed a slave plantation, with a study body composed of composed of descendents of former slaves, have had a long-standing relationship as sister institutions, with on-going faculty and student exchange programs. As they are approaching the 50th anniversary of their partnership in 2014, they are co-sponsoring this conference to discuss the nature of slavery . . . traditional and modern . . . focus on slavery [in their respective locations] . . . describe slave society culture and resistance movements, compare racial slavery with today’s forms of slavery and reflect on the legacy slavery has left in its wake.

(HBCU#1 National Conference Brochure, 2011, p. 9)

Analysis of the data reveals that HBCU#1 is keenly aware of the potential to develop opportunities for internationalization with their Ivy League institutional partner. Also not lost to HBCU#1 is the realization that they are positioned rather nicely in their pursuit of new institutional partners around the world, interested in slavery, its legacy and the Civil Rights Movement. Such innovative strategies to develop global partnerships excites Provost#1:

Depending on where in the world HBCU#1 looks for strategic partnerships, I am confident that the importance of our slavery legacy would be well received. The kind of campus we have and our reputation for producing physicians, attorneys and humanities (social sciences) scholars comes directly out of such a legacy. I am very interested in creating intellectual pathways for scholars around the world to come to HBCU#1 to review our collection of Civil Rights papers of
Mississippi, for example . . . and creating bi-directional exchanges of faculty and students researching this rich legacy via study abroad, collaborative research, and other projects. The sound of that is just so wonderful. (Provost#1, personal communication, interview, November 4, 2011)

RQ8: How did study abroad impact comprehensive internationalization?

At HBCU#1, significantly increasing their number of students studying abroad was a major priority of their internationalization strategic plan. However, there was an admitted lack of both infrastructure and expertise in place to expand their study abroad numbers at this time. The institution’s strategy to establish an International Studies minor, with a built-in study abroad requirement is one innovation they hope will simultaneously increase their study abroad number and warrant the hiring of additional administrative study abroad staff.

Case Study of HBCU#2

This section presents data collected on internationalization strategies used at HBCU#2. The case study of HBCU#2 begins with background information, school composition and demographics. A brief historical account of the institution’s engagement with internationalization is also provided. Finally, the case study of HBCU#2 will conclude with a summary of the contextual findings that have been either driving or restraining forces for comprehensive internationalization at HBCU#2.

In addition to conducting interviews with participants, data were collected through documentation. Table 10 lists the types of HBCU#2 documents analyzed for this study.
Table 10

*Types and Numbers of Documents Analyzed at HBCU#2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type (HBCU#2)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 SACS/Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Committee Charge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leader’s Speeches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution’s Website (# of pages reviewed)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Documents Analyzed</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HBCU#2 is a private historically black four-year liberal arts institution, and the campus consists of more than 32 acres and 23 buildings. HBCU#2 was established in the basement of a Baptist church in Georgia. During the first 10 years, the school flourished with 800 pupils, 30 teachers, and property valued at $90,000. HBCU#2 conferred its first college degrees in 1901. Throughout the late 1950s and 1960s, HBCU#2 began to emphasized the achievement of excellence in all aspects of life. Students were encouraged to enter the fields of medicine, law, international affairs, engineering, business, and industry. They were prepared and encouraged to enter the best graduate and professional schools in the country.

Although the decade of the 1960s severely tested all institutions of higher learning and threatened the continuity and purposes of the predominantly black colleges, HBCU#2's strong emergence from those challenges attests to the quality of its leadership
and the fiber of the whole college community. It was during this period that HBCU#2’s administration created opportunities for students to travel and study abroad, encouraged leadership training, developed an effective student government association, and strengthened the tradition of excellence in the fine arts. In 1987, at the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees, HBCU#2 selected its first black woman president.

Descriptive Demographics:

Table 11 highlights select descriptive and demographic information about HBCU#2.

Table 11

**HBCU#2 Descriptive and Demographic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>HBCU#2 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Education, Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td>Private Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Attendance*</td>
<td>$33,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>$340.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Enrollment</td>
<td>2,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Foreign Student Enrollment</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who Study Abroad</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>HBCU#2 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 Degree Producer (Among UNCF Members)</td>
<td>Cultural/Gender Studies, Biology, Engineering, English, Foreign Languages/ Linguistics, History, Mathematics, Natural Resources, Philosophy/Religion, Physical Sciences, Psychology, Social Sciences, Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary question that framed the data collection and analysis include: What are the driving and restraining forces of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs? This primary question is investigated through eight research questions, which further examine the independent variables (a) articulated institutional commitment, (b) assessment of global learning, (c) foreign students, (d) institutional infrastructure, (e) institutional leadership, (f) internationalization review, (g) internationalized curriculum, and (h) Study Abroad. This section is organized by the eight research questions, which further examine the referenced independent variables:

RQ1: How did an articulated institutional commitment impact comprehensive internationalization?

This section begins with a brief overview of the historical context for internationalization at HBCU#2. The institution has a long history of providing study abroad opportunities and hosting foreign students. Beginning with the first student from

In 2007-2008, 159 of the 2,343 HBCU#2 students participated in study abroad for academic credit. A total of 224 students engaged in study-travel programs overall during the same academic year. Study Abroad at HBCU#2 has increased over the years under the direction of the Office of Study Abroad, individual departments and programs. In 2008, for example, 6.8% of its students participated in international curricular and co-curricular experiences prior to graduation.

The institution’s strategic plan, *Strengthening the Core: the [HBCU#2] Strategic Plan for 2015*, challenges that, “We must expand our campus reach to embrace the wider world, modeling for our students the importance of thinking globally—understanding the world through more intentional connections—a challenge reflected in the major strategic goals to improve the student learning experience” (HBCU#2, SACS/QEP Document, August 2010, p. 1). An extension of the strategic plan was the development of HBCU#2’s SACS/Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), *[HBCU#2] Going Global*. The 2010 QEP Initiative set forth the following three major elements:

1. Introducing required curricular components to global travel programs;
2. Identifying and assessing shared student learning outcomes across global travel experiences to develop intercultural competencies; and
3. Enhancing and making cohesive the infrastructure for global programs and initiatives (HBCU#2, SACS/QEP Document, August 2010, p.1).
Data analysis revealed that the QEP document addresses four of the internationalization dimensions (independent variables) introduced in this study: *assessment of global learning, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, and study abroad*. In addition, the QEP document was HBCU#2’s first independent strategic plan dealing with any aspect of internationalization. However, leading up to the identification of the QEP topic was the consistent emphasis HBCU#2’s presidents have placed on internationalization. When asked what has kept internationalization as a major thread in the vision and mission of the institution, Director#2 explained:

Quite simply, we have had presidents who have also been anxious to have it. When I came to HBCU#2 in 1981, the president was very ‘pro-internationalizing’ the curriculum, the faculty and the students—and he put money into it. Varied resources were also put into other aspects of internationalization. For instance, I received course release time to do study abroad advising and develop programs. You know, given the study abroad numbers we’ve had . . . we think we’re now at somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 students who’ve gone abroad since the late 1950s—most of whom have gone in the last 15 years. That’s why we have this unique core of alumni that we can approach about giving specifically to study abroad. And we’ve gotten some very nice gifts in, that are very exciting, from former students. But it has been the presidents, right up to our current one, who have supported [internationalization] and made it central to the institution.

(Director#2, personal communication, interview, December 22, 2011)
The research literature (Davies, 1992) on articulated institutional commitment states that institutional leadership should have explicit positions on the scope of its internationalization plans, since mission is as much about declaring what is not to be done, as what is to be done. Data collection at HBCU#2 revealed that the current president has been extremely aggressive in advancing the internationalization efforts of the institution. Her position has caught the ear of national audiences whose expertise is the internationalization of U.S. higher education. For example, in a 2008 speech to attendees at a national conference sponsored by the Institute of International Education (IIE), HBCU#2's president opened her remarks with this reference to Martin Luther King, Jr.:

> It is a common misconception that Martin Luther King, Jr. led [the Civil Rights Activity] in Atlanta, but in fact the students initiated it. Dr. King himself wrote, 'A generation of young people has come out of decades of shadows to face naked state power; it has lost its fears, and experienced the majestic dignity of a direct struggle with their own history—the slave revolts, the incomplete revolution of the Civil War, the brotherhood of colonial colored men in Africa and Asia. They are an integral part of the history which is reshaping the world, replacing a dying order with a modern democracy.' We might ask: How did that generation lose its fear? One answer could be: They studied abroad. HBCU#2 students left the segregated South behind in their junior year and experienced their first taste of real freedom in France... empowered by that experience of freedom [they]
returned to the States ready to stand up for change. (President HBCU#2, IIE Conference address, March 13, 2008)

The move toward comprehensive internationalization is an aggressive agenda for any institution, and especially for the often resource-strapped private HBCU. Yet, one critical factor that emerged from the data analysis was the process by which HBCU#2’s current leadership conceptualized internationalization in order to put their unique imprint on internationalization in U. S. higher education. Given its long and successful track record with study abroad, HBCU#2 used its success in sending impressive numbers of its students abroad to encourage/influence the integration of internationalization into other institutional priorities. As a result, HBCU#2 emerged as a Highly Active institution in the quantitative phase of this study. Successful institutions in the dimension of articulated institutional commitment were those institutions whose commitment to internationalization was not only represented in mission/vision statements, or policies/procedures to support internationalization, but reflected a shared compelling rationale for it. Reflecting on the connection between HBCU#2’s mission and history, Provost#2 added:

Internationalization has been a part of our mission from the beginning. Our most serious obstacle has been funding . . . Internationalization is a natural for our institution for, as stated in our mission statement, we are global leader in the education of people of African descent and have one of our major goals (and expressed in the mission statement) to prepare students to engage the many cultures of the world and commit to social change . . . We identify international
experiences and intellectual interest in our students beginning with the address they hear from the provost during orientation, through the First Year Experience, etc. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

RQ2: How did an assessment of global learning impact comprehensive internationalization?

HBCU#2 has made substantial investments to support the assessment of global learning. The assessment of global learning emerged as having a major impact on comprehensive internationalization, and this is evidenced by HBCU#2’s selection of developing intercultural competence as a SACS/QEP topic. “Assessment is of paramount importance. To know if we are significantly impacting student learning—why and how, why not and how not; as well as being important for potential funding opportunities” (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012).

HBCU#2 has responded well to the revised institutional and program accreditation standards, and data analysis demonstrates its motivation to design curricular and co-curricular programs that address intended global learning outcomes. The QEP gives institutions the opportunity to describe a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning (Commission on Colleges/SACS, 2004). As far back as 2007, HBCU#2 began exploring the improvement of student learning outcomes for assessment purposes. By fall 2008, international and global themes were identified as being significant by HBCU#2 faculty. The Executive Summary of HBCU#2’s SACS/QEP document states:
In August 2007... in developing student learning outcomes for the [HBCU#2] academic experience, it became apparent that HBCU#2 does not have shared learning outcomes for [education abroad] learning experiences and that our infrastructure providing and overseeing these experiences is neither well-organized nor cohesive... Therefore, the QEP is designed to enhance student learning in study-travel experiences. (HBCU#2, SACS/QEP Document, August 2010, p. 1)

By January 2009, as a result of a Faculty Institute (January 2007), SWOT Analysis (December 2007), Faculty Affairs/Board Committee Discussions (January 2008), and Faculty Institute (January 2009), the following topics surfaced as possible QEP topics to improve the quality of the student experience (HBCU#2, SACS/QEP Document, August 2010, p. 8):

- Undergraduate research and internships for all students
- Global learning
- Literacies across the curriculum (e.g., writing, speaking, qualitative)
- Expanding the Individualized Education Experience (IIE) goals

The student learning outcomes for HBCU#2 are knowledge-based, skill-based, value-based, and shared across study-travel experiences. As a result of [their] study-travel experience, HBCU#2 students will reach competency in the following two learning outcomes:
1. Identify differences and commonalities of two world societies based on political, economical, social and/or cultural values during each study-travel experience [Knowledge and skill dimensions].

2. Develop a personal definition of cultural engagement that reflects openness to cultural difference [Value dimension]. (HBCU#2, SACS/QEP Document, August 2010, p. 2)

Through more thoughtful participation in study-travel experience, HBCU#2 students will reach competency in the learning outcomes, as demonstrated through reflective essays written after the international experience (HBCU#2, SACS/QEP Document, August 2010, p. 14).

The results of the quantitative data collection and analysis revealed, under the assessment of global learning dimension, that HBCU#2 was one of the few private HBCUs that answered in the affirmative to both survey questions. HBCU#2 had not only formally assessed their internationalization efforts in the last five years, but had also developed specific international or global student learning outcomes for all students. Only 33.3% of private HBCUs had attempted to develop specific global learning outcomes for all students, another 41.7% had not developed any global learning outcomes.

RQ3: How did foreign students impact comprehensive internationalization?

Researchers Macready and Tucker (2010) examined how foreign students decide which country to go to over another, which the researchers refer to as the twelve pull
factors. Data analysis revealed that the strategic recruitment of foreign students was HBCU#2's weakest dimension in internationalization. Admittedly, Provost#2 stated:

This [foreign student recruitment] is something we have not developed sufficiently and is a goal of our newly appointed Chief International Officer . . . A requirement of a very generous anonymous gift we received is to increase our foreign student population, specifically from Africa. We are very clear on the fact that we need to do better in this area. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

Director#2 elaborated:

We’ve never really had money to recruit overseas. So, it’s people who find us more than anything else. And we hope to increase the number of foreign students who came to HBCU#2 . . . The anonymous gift wants us to recruit in Africa. Plus, we are also a part of the Clinton Rwanda Initiative, which is another recruitment mechanism for us. (Director#2, personal communication, interview, December 22, 2011)

The infusion of substantial funding emerged as the critical boost to the institution's ability to reimagine is recruitment strategy for foreign students. The following key elements emerged as possible pull factors for HBCU#2, as they plan to expand their global reach and improve foreign student matriculation: high-quality study opportunities, specialized study opportunities, traditional links to the diasporas, internationally recognized qualifications, good prospects of high returns on education, good prospects of successful graduation within a predictable time, effective marketing by
institution, and helpful visa arrangements, for study and for work while studying (Macready & Tucker, 2010, pp. 45-46).

HBCUs, for any number of reasons, have not strategically sought to count foreign student mobility and their subsequent enrollment as significant dimensions of their internationalization strategy and/or their strategic plan for enrollment. But, foreign student recruitment is another opportunity to link institutional mission and capacity to comprehensive internationalization. Researcher suggests that both the mission and institutional capacity should drive the foreign student recruitment goal for enrollment management.

An analysis of the composite quantitative data mirrors the need to improve foreign student matriculation at HBCU#2. The institution was among the 33.3 % of private HBCUs that had a strategic plan for foreign student recruitment. Albeit, not fully implemented, HBCU#2’s recruitment plan is supported with scholarship dollars for international students.

RQ4: How did institutional infrastructure impact comprehensive internationalization?

Institutional infrastructure refers to the extent to which a dedicated staff, office, task force and/or an established communication system is in place to support internationalization. At HBCU#2, infrastructure to support internationalization emerged as major factor in the institution’s categorization as an institution Highly Active in internationalization. The nature and coordination of international programs and the personnel and financing in place to support internationalization are critical components of
this dimension, and underscored the significance of HBCU#2's approach to centralizing international initiatives.

Coordination of internationalization emerged from HBCU#2's SACS/QEP documentation as a critical driver of internationalization. And leading the effort is Provost#2 who explained how facilitating the complex nature of internationalization fit into role as Provost/Vice president of Academic Affairs:

I oversee the [new] Global Education Center, the Dean of which sits on the Provost Council. I integrate the goals of internationalization into every appropriate aspect of my job so that the curriculum and faculty efforts incorporate it . . . It is also a major responsibility for me to encourage and support various efforts to include internationalization in service learning, undergraduate research and internship opportunities . . . Since we have had a strong study abroad program and significant success with student Fulbright appointments, support of the faculty, administration, and board was there to be built upon. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

An outgrowth of this supportive stance was the recent appointment of the Dean of Global Education. The arrival of the charter dean of Global Education (CIO#2) has stimulated coordination of all international campus activities. The enormity of his role at HBCU#2 is readily apparent to CIO#2, as he explained his charge:

One of which is to implement the QEP, which is the centerpiece of our internationalization strategy. We are attempting to seriously ensure that HBCU#2 students have the opportunity to travel abroad, experience an encounter with
different cultures and be able to develop cultural competence. I also provide leadership for the assessment of our [global] learning outcomes. In addition, I work with faculty to secure grants that will promote students’ international research travel, and faculty travel to various countries to enhance the teaching of classes that have international flavors . . . Primarily, though, my role is to bring coherence and structure to the random acts of internationalization that has existed on the campus in order to streamline them, so our initiatives can be measured appropriately and HBCU#2 can push forward in our global pursuits. (CIO#2, personal communication, interview, January 10, 2012)

Director#2 views the new approach to centralizing internationalization at HBCU#2 as a good thing. With nearly 31 years teaching and directing study abroad at HBCU#2, Director#2 believes:

The new dean helps to centralize internationalization. Now, reporting to him are the International Affairs Center, Japan Studies, Study Abroad, as well as foreign student support services . . . I think it will definitely be an improvement. I mean, he’s only been here a semester, but he’s already gotten us grants to help support our summer Brazil Program . . . I think the Brazil grant was something like $70,000. (Director#2, personal communication, interview, December 22, 2011)

In earlier sections, the lack of an administrative arrangement, which permits effective leadership to evolve in order to accomplish comprehensive internationalization has been the downfall of a lot of HBCUs regarding internationalization.
Again an analysis of the composite quantitative data enabled the researcher to make certain comparisons between HBCU#2 and the other private HBCUs. As a result, the *institutional infrastructure* dimension emerged as another major strength of HBCU#2 versus the rest of their counterparts. Data showed that though 66.7% of the private HBCUs reported having a full-time administrator who coordinated multiple internationalization activities/programs, HBCU#2 lead the rest in having one or more dedicated full-time administrator(s) for each of the following activities: study abroad, international student services, internationalizing the curriculum, assessing global learning and the development of international partnerships.

RQ5: How did *institutional leadership* impact comprehensive internationalization?

Scholars and practitioners have found that institutions that tie their internationalization strategies to core institutional strengths will have greater success in the long run. Earlier sections of this study recall how the individual histories of private HBCUs have proven over time that the perseverance, courage and facilitation of their leaders have kept these private black colleges central to the delivery of U. S. higher education. The data revealed that HBCU#2's institutional leadership has not only found success in giving legitimacy to internationalization for internal constituents, but has managed to craft a compelling rationale for it to external donors who are currently funding internationalization efforts at HBCU#2 through especially generous donations.
The rationale for making the case for internationalization is no different whether Provost#2 is engaging a skeptical faculty member or potential donor. Here, Provost#2 describes her approach to both audiences:

The world has become increasingly global. Therefore, facility in more than one language, awareness of sociocultural and political realities, and of cultural differences that one must engage are key among the characteristics graduates need to be successful in any field of study, profession or career . . . Our faculty identified global and intercultural competence as our QEP, so there was a smooth transition from the strategic planning process to the QEP process that brought on board the entire community—students, faculty, and staff . . . The fundraising strategy for internationalization is aligned with the overall institutional fundraising strategy. In this regard endowed funding is part of the operational budget and that is a [direct] result of our annual campaign and utilization of grant funding. But, providing more funding in the operational budget is our goal. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

The new CIO was quick to point out that:

You have to look at the history of this institution. At HBCU#2, Internationalization is predicated back to the 1880s, with the first [foreign student] from the Congo arriving to HBCU#2 to study . . . It is a very pragmatic attempt, on the part of the leadership, to deliberately and intentionally, focus on internationalization initiative as strategies to prepare our students interactive
functions effectively and adequately for the changing global society. (CIO#2, personal communication, interview, January 10, 2012)

Director#2 highlighted the connections between the historical legacy of internationalization at HBCU#2, the leadership’s validation of it and alumni:

Seriously, I think the major driving force behind internationalization here has been the succession of presidents, since the early 1980s, who gave internationalization legitimacy. International travel is truly part of the institutional DNA. SO much so that we now have more alumni putting in money to support Study Abroad. We have one in DC, for example, who raises money every year, and I’m talking $16,000 - $17,000 a year. Some of it goes to endow her scholarship and some of it goes to current operating funds. To me, this type of alumni engagement speaks volumes about how collaborative the effort to internationalize is at HBCU#2. (Director#2, personal communication, interview, December 22, 2011)

The quantitative data collection and analysis examined how seriously institutional leaders gave legitimacy and focus to internationalization, and oversaw the development of an action plan in this regard. HBCU#2’s successful track record in this regard was largely facilitated by their QEP initiative, and again placed them in the Highly Active category within the institutional leadership dimension. In essence, the rhetoric of HBCU# 2’s leadership in support of internationalization emerged as a critical stimulant for the operationalization of internationalization on the campus, while only 50% reported
that their chief academic officers held deans and department chairs accountable for outlining and achieving their internationalization objectives.

RQ6: How did an internationalization review impact comprehensive internationalization?

The review focuses on a broad range of internationalization strategies, including institutional commitment, global learning outcomes, foreign students, institutional infrastructure, institutional leadership, curriculum and study abroad. A carefully composed team, with broad representation from faculty and administration, is critical for conducting a productive review of current international programs and policies and crafting an action plan (Green & Olson, 2003).

The SACS reaccreditation process emerged as invaluable to HBCU#2’s ability to successfully complete a thorough internationalization review. Provost#2 highlighted the process of internationalization review:

As Provost, I led the internationalization taskforce, which in this instance was the QEP committee . . . Major responsibilities of setting up the infrastructure have already ended. However, ongoing assistance to the new Dean in implementing the QEP involves bringing together, for coherence, all international initiative and having students who go abroad participate in a seminar with specific learning outcomes. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

HBCU#2’s QEP committee consisted of 24 members, representing all academic divisions, academic affairs, student affairs, enrollment management, undergraduate studies, international programs, institutional research, and the faculty council. In addition
to the QEP committee, the CIO#2 is in the process of assembling a new internationalization taskforce to assist with the implementation his multifaceted operation.

RQ7: How did an internationalized curriculum impact comprehensive internationalization?

Internationalizing the curriculum is the central mechanism that institutions can use to shape student learning. The internationalization of the curriculum requires an ongoing, collaborative, and interdisciplinary approach, which combines the support, knowledge, efforts, and skills of cross-culturally sensitive and globally oriented faculty, students, and administrators. In its simplest description, the internationalization of the curriculum is another form of curriculum reform. Director#1, who is a full-professor and former chair of the History department at HBCU#2, provided a historical summary of this dimension at HBCU#2:

Well, over a period of time, HBCU#2 has internationalized both its curriculum and experiences for students—starting with the president when I arrived in 1981. At that time we were trying to internationalize education overall by having two courses, *World Civilization* and *World Literature* respectively, required of all students. Those were core courses that everyone took. Originally, the requirement was a year (two courses) for each discipline, then it was dwindled down to a semester requirement, and finally they were replaced by other requirements. *World Literature* is still an elective course, but *World Civilization* was replaced by a course on the *African Diaspora*. The *African Diaspora* course
is currently 15 years old. (Director#2, personal communication, interview, December 22, 2011)

With a deep history of internationalizing the curriculum, the data revealed that HBCU#2 has been successful in handling the usually arduous task of reforming its curriculum. In addition to the general education curriculum HBCU#2 offers a major in International Studies, which requires a study abroad experience. Director#2 added, “Spanish majors are also required to do study abroad, but French majors yet, as that is a much smaller group. However, International Studies majors are supposed to do either a major research paper while they are overseas or an internship” (Director#2, personal communication, interview, December 22, 2011).

Provost#2 was explicit in explaining internationalization’s connection to the curriculum:

Internationalization is significant in the general education curriculum transformation we are implementing as part of our strategic plan to strengthen the core of the institution, academic affairs, and is significant in the hiring of faculty and providing co-curricular activities that support internationalization. So much that global perspectives is one of our core requirements and is contained in our curriculum map. To complement the global content in the core, academic departments engage in an ongoing process to internationalize majors. But this takes place in the interdisciplinary initiatives in the Teaching Resource and Research Center. And by the way, HBCU#2 has a two year foreign language
requirement for all our students. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

When whether she has met with any skepticism from faculty regarding curricular reform, Provost#2 stated:

We really have not had to deal with skeptics. We approach the topic holistically, and internationalization was agreed upon by the faculty to be a major part of the general education and major/minor experiences of students. While all faculty may not participate, there has been no open resistance or skepticism expressed, largely because we have had numerous conversations, involving numerous stakeholders over the past six years about enhancing internationalization as part of the process of improving general education. I am pleased with the determination, innovation and ingenuity that faculty have demonstrated in planning, supporting and finding support for our international initiatives. (Provost #2, written response to interview protocol, February 7, 2012)

In the dimension of an internationalized curriculum, HBCU#2 again achieved the rank of Highly Active. This categorization was supported by HBCU#2’s demonstrated track record with internationalizing the general education curriculum, its interdisciplinary approach to internationalizing the majors, the International Studies major and the added study abroad requirement for certain internationally oriented majors. On the contrary, the quantitative data collection and analysis showed that over 60% of the private HBCUs did not require their undergraduate students to take courses that primarily feature international dimensions in the course content to satisfy a general education requirement.
Of that percentage 50% of the responding institutions had no courses with international dimensions that they required of undergraduates as part of the general education curriculum. Lastly, only 16.7% offered international studies tracks (majors/minors/certificates/concentrations).

RQ8: How did study abroad impact comprehensive internationalization?

Study abroad was the centerpiece of HBCU#2’s internationalization strategic plan. Study abroad was seen as one of the most important international opportunities for their students. HBCU#2 has the highest number of students studying abroad than any other HBCU (private of public). Their success in this regard has led to their building their SACS/QEP initiative around study abroad.

Cross-Case Analysis

This section presents a comparison and analysis across the two individual cases (HBCU#1-Less Active and HBCU#2-Highly Active). This section is organized by the following subheadings: (a) context, (b) stakeholders, (c) alignment, (d) assessment of global learning, (e) foreign students, (f) internationalization review, and (g) an internationalized curriculum.

Context

Data collection and analysis revealed certain contextual similarities and differences that illuminate HBCU#1 and HBCU#2’s unique institutional missions, history and student clientele, as private HBCUs. Both institutions are UNCF-member institutions and were founded in the time after the emancipation of slaves in the U. S. For these institutions, their histories are as important as their future. In the time before
the 1950s, African Americans persisted under intense and relentless oppression. The fact that private black colleges, like HBCU#1 and HBCU#2, managed to not only prevail, but thrive in realizing their mission to produce literate, humane individuals, and help motivate less prepared students overcome earlier educational deficits is an enormous accomplishment for U. S. higher education. By virtue of this shared historical fact, both the institutions in this study represent an accomplishment of determination and resilience, which mirror the success of many private HBCUs. Such resilience is encouraging, as private HBCUs face the challenge of determining the best strategy for navigating the new globally marked course through the 21st century. This study's illumination of select dimensions for internationalization could provide answers to the questions regarding the relevance and sustainability of private HBCUs.

Contextual differences also emerged, in terms of how these two private HBCUs have fared over the past fifty years. As a result, they are now more different than they are the same. "Several colleges [private HBCUs], favored by location, leadership, and good fortune, have grown in size, attractiveness and financial strength. Others with different locations and circumstances and with less adaptability, by comparison, still appear to be struggling" (Drewry & Doermann, 2001, p. 10). No two private HBCUs represent more such a dichotomy than HBCU#1 and HBCU#2.

Though both institutions have a sporadic history with internationalizing their campus, the data revealed that HBCU#2 (Highly Active) managed to successfully utilize their historical internationalization efforts in the creation of a compelling rationale for its current internationalization initiatives. Possessing a track record in international student
mobility (in and out of Africa) that dates back as early as the 1880s, is an impressive background for any institution. Strategically choosing to incorporate such background into their case statements for internationalization is not only novel, but instructional for other private HBCUs. On the other hand, as HBCU#1 wrestles with deciding on the best strategic approach for internationalization, they are also considering how to leverage their unique legacy to slavery and the Civil Rights Movement into an opportunity to build a reputable internationalization operation. Finally, institutional endowments emerged as another critical contextual difference, as institutionalizing international innovations cannot always be sustain through external contributions.

**Stakeholders**

At HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 senior institutional leaders provided support for internationalization. At both institutions, provosts led the development of committee formation, internationalization reviews (SWOT analysis), and assumed the role of principal champion of the internationalization cause on their campus. For example, at HBCU#1, the new provost arrived on campus, after successfully building (also as provost) an impressive international program at her previous institution. Inheriting a newly appointed internationalization taskforce provided an opportunity to empower the academic leadership (deans, chairs, and faculty leaders, etc.) to develop an innovative internationalization strategic plan that integrated international dimensions into the other institutional priorities.

At both institutions, the faculty was cast as a primary stakeholder, as both institutions have situated the curriculum at the centerpiece of their internationalization
efforts. Faculty members were empowered to make decisions regarding their project's future direction, interdisciplinary approaches to internationalizing the curriculum and the development of global learning objectives. Senior leadership's ability to create effective communication channels and shared-decision making structures emerged as favorable tactics for implementing internationalization at both institutions. For example, at HBCU#1, where they are just getting underway with their internationalization review, Provost#1 was especially concerned with ensuring that faculty had a basic intellectual understanding of what internationalization in higher education proposes, so they will also understand how they could be impacted by the resulting change.

Data analysis also revealed the subtle brilliance of HBCU#2, who engaged their alumni and other external stakeholders in the development of their international initiatives. The result of this extended internationalization dialogue has been the significant financial contributions received to support internationalization at HBCU#2. HBCU#2 recently received the largest (double-digit million dollar gift) anonymous gift for internationalization of any HBCU.

Alignment

Comprehensive internationalization is an aggressive agenda for any institution, and especially for the resource-strapped HBCU#1 (Less Active). With the institution's recent change in the academic leadership, a process of reimagining the academic enterprise is currently underway. The primary focus of Provost#1 is to create an environment that works for everyone, improve the quality of the academic programs, grow enrollment and enhance HBCU#1's capacity to produce globally competent
graduates. Moreover, the challenge of aligning internationalization plans with the other strategic priorities of the institution emerged as another challenge of Provost#1. Essentially, HBCU#1 is in the planning stages of designing their strategy for making internationalization core to the institutional mission.

Another factor that emerged from the data analysis was the process by which HBCU#2’s (Highly Active) current leadership conceptualized internationalization on its own terms. HBCU#2 used its success in sending impressive numbers of its students abroad to encourage/influence the alignment of internationalization plans with the institutional strategic plan. The data showed that HBCU#2 was successful in this dimension because their commitment to internationalization was reflected in the alignment of the internationalization plan with institutional mission/vision statements, policies/procedures, and the senior leadership’s demonstrated support for internationalization. The data showed that this type of alignment results in smoother implementation of internationalization and compelling rationale to potential donors.

**Assessment**

This study revealed how important assessing student global learning outcomes were to accomplishing internationalization goals at both institutions. In particular, the creation of new international studies centers, international studies minors, reforming general education curriculum, requiring study abroad for certain disciplines all provided significant opportunities for faculty to explore, then develop, student learning objectives to assess the impact of international programs on students.
Analysis of the data and revealed that using the student as the focus of analysis changes the conversation about internationalization completely. This study introduced assessment scholar, Linda Suskie (2009), whose research examines what decisions our assessment results will inform. As revealed in this study, this is an especially critical consideration for educational leaders either introducing internationalization for the first time or enhancing an existing international initiative. For example, Suskie’s *Assessment as a Continuous Four-Step Cycle* indicates that institutions proceed through the following four steps to assess student learning (a) establish student learning outcomes, (b) provide learning opportunities, (c) assess student learning, and (d) use the results to modify and improve student programs.

By comparing both institutions’ approach to student learning outcomes associated with their internationalization initiatives, Suskie’s (2009) cycle seems to be an applicable and effective process. Suskie’s model provides a continuous process for outcomes assessment and refinement for each institution. Similarities in the types of student learning outcomes emerged in this study, and revealed that both institutions chose knowledge, skill and values-based outcomes. A difference that emerged was the fact that HBCU#1 developed their global learning outcomes based on a campus-based curriculum, whereas, HBCU#2 developed their outcomes to assess the impact study abroad had on the intercultural competence of students.

**Foreign Students**

This study affirmed the findings of previous research that HBCUs, for any number of reasons, have not strategically sought to count foreign student mobility and
their subsequent enrollment as significant dimensions of their internationalization strategy and/or their strategic plan for enrollment. Data analysis showed that without an articulated institutional commitment to internationalization, which includes foreign students, as an important aspect of institutional priorities, no real progress in this regard is expected to be made. HBCU#1 has just begun their internationalization review, and arriving at the answers to how many foreign students do they want and how many can they support, will take some time. However, one promising element that emerged was HBCU#1’s realization that foreign student matriculation will play a significant role in the comprehensive internationalization of its campus.

The infusion of substantial funding emerged as the critical boost to HBCU#2’s ability to reimagine its foreign student recruitment strategy. Data analysis revealed that HBCU#2 is fully aware of their key pull factors (Macready & Tucker, 2010, pp. 45-46). for increased foreign student matriculation. Of the twelve possible pull factors, HBCU#2 identified the following nine factors to inform their future foreign recruitment efforts: high-quality study opportunities, specialized study opportunities, traditional links to the diasporas, internationally recognized qualifications, good prospects of high returns on education, good prospects of successful graduation within a predictable time, effective marketing by institution, and helpful visa arrangements, for study and for work while studying

Internationalization Review

HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 both initiated their internationalization projects with a comprehensive internationalization review (SWOT Analysis). The data did reveal,
however, that the impetus for the review differed between the two institutions. HBCU#2 used the occasion of the SACS/QEP reaffirmation of accreditation process to provide the momentum for the completion of the internationalization review. On the other hand, HBCU#1 incorporated internationalization into its new theme of reimagining the academic enterprise of HBCU#1. As the new chief academic officer, Provost#1 has strategically endeavored to capitalize on being “fresh arms and legs” at HBCU#1, so colleagues immediately see her willingness to lift the institution towards a brighter future. A gifted and persuasive orator, Provost#1 will rely on her transformative leadership style to align internationalization with the institutional plan. Yet, the results of the internationalization review are key to ability to do so.

A result of two very different approaches, the internationalization review process at both institutions reflects the innovation of senior level leadership. Whether through an accreditation prism or effusive public statements about the impact of internationalization on U. S. higher education, both provosts understand the need to make internationalization integral to reimagining their institution’s vision of purpose. Finally, the internationalization review emerged as a significant strategy for creating broad-base buy-in and a shared decision making structure central to the continuous refinement of an institution’s vision of purpose. In Stand and Prosper, scholars Drewry and Doermann (2001) underscore the efforts of the chief academic officers of this study:

If their leaders can maintain vision and focus, the private black colleges will remain significant and also will carry forward a distinctive history that is
important to the institutional diversity of American higher education and to the

Curriculum

New minors with international themes, internationalizing the general education
core, faculty-led study abroad programs and faculty professional development, emerged
as opportunities, at both institutions, for increased faculty engagement in
internationalization. This study demonstrated that these opportunities stimulated campus-
wide disciplinary and interdisciplinary discussions. An interdisciplinary approach to the
development of the International Studies minor at HBCU#1 forms the foundation of the
major and has been vital to student learning outcome development. Finally, HBCU#2’s
inclusion of study abroad experience as an academic program requirement changed the
focus from what a professor teaches, to what a student learns. Again, the juxtaposition of
teaching, learning and assessment is realized. Most promising is the fact that both
institutions are engaged in transparent dialogue regarding how they are impacting student
learning.

Analysis of Knight’s Internationalization Cycle

Jane Knight’s (1994) Internationalization cycle has become the most highly used
theoretical or conceptual perspective to explain the process of internationalization
through which institutions should proceed to achieve their internationalization goals.
Knight’s internationalization cycle suggests six major phases of internationalization,
which include (a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization,
(e) review, and (f) reinforcement (see Figure 2).
Knight (1994) suggested that through this model, universities can translate their commitment for internationalization into an operational plan that integrates and institutionalizes the international dimension into university systems, practices, and values. The current dissertation analyzed the applicability of Knight’s internationalization cycle at two private HBCUs, who represent opposite ends of the readiness spectrum for internationalization.

In particular, Knight (1994) suggests that internationalization is the process for integrating international/intercultural content into the teaching, learning, research and service functions of the institution. The six elements and checkpoints of her model serve as a continuous cycle for how institutions transition from their initial awareness of internationalization to the implementation of a plan and subsequently to the refinement of their strategic plan for internationalization. The eight select independent variables (dimensions) of this study, serve as components of comprehensive internationalization. As an institution could conceivably select any one (or all) of the referenced dimensions as the centerpiece of its plan for internationalization, the researcher used the data analysis process to examine the viability of Knight’s cycle on each dimension at private HBCUs.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter Six presents the findings, conclusions, implications, limitations of the study, and recommendations that emerged from this study. This chapter begins by restating the purpose and significance of the study. Next, the primary and eight research questions that guided this study are restated. The major findings of this research study are presented and identified as either driving or restraining forces for internationalization. Conclusions drawn from this study summarize the important features of this research study. Implications are determined for the field of higher education, educational leadership, HBCUs and the ability of African-American students to compete globally. Recommendations are made for practice, policy, and further research will be offered. Finally, a chapter summary concludes this research study.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the state of internationalization at the private Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs), and to identify select factors that drive or restrain the internationalization process at these particular institutions. By first broadly reviewing the state of internationalization activity at the 39-member institutions of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) and, next, by
examining select strategies, used at two UNCF member institutions, to establish a comprehensive internationalization plan, the researcher endeavored to identify and highlight selected factors that drive or restrain comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs.

**Significance of the Study**

Comprehensive internationalization within U.S. higher education depends upon the convergence of a number of internationalization strategies on a college campus. During the past decade, numerous presidents and provosts have expressed their intent to internationalize their institutions to equip students with the broad intellectual skills necessary to succeed in the global 21st century. Yet, no comparative or empirical studies have been completed explaining any trends, barriers, or unique conditions that impact comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs.

This study fills the gaps in the literature through an in-depth examination of two private HBCUs and their process of internationalization to determine what private HBCUs have done to overcome endogenous challenges to conceive and subsequently implement comprehensive plans for internationalization. In addition, this study analyzes cross-case findings and implications. Second, this study adds to the literature on the internationalization of higher education in several overarching ways. Since Knight's 1994 study of the *Internationalization Cycle*, it has since been cited in three studies (Knight, 2001; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Qiang, 2003), but has never been analyzed in the context of private HBCUs. Thus, this study provides empirical data on internationalization at private HBCUs, which will aid U.S. higher education scholars and
internationalization practitioners in understanding how private HBCUs proceed from articulating their commitment to internationalization to the impact their strategies have on comprehensive internationalization.

Third, this study should encourage discussions among HBCU senior administrators and chief international officers about the best strategies to include in their strategic plans for internationalization. These unique institutions' ability to expand knowledge about the people of the world (and their challenges) and produce graduates who will advance equity and justice both at home and abroad is predicated on the success of private HBCU's internationalization efforts. The research to date has yet to explore the organizational practices and principles of successful internationalization at private HBCUs.

**Research Questions**

With regard to the statement of the problem, and in accordance with the purpose of the study, the primary question that framed the data collection and analysis include: What are the *driving* and *restraining* forces of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs? This primary question was investigated through eight research questions, which further examined this study's eight independent variables. The following research questions were formulated to guide this study:

**RQ1:** How did an *articulated institutional commitment* impact comprehensive internationalization?

**RQ2:** How did an *assessment of global learning* impact comprehensive internationalization?
RQ3: How did foreign students impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ4: How did institutional infrastructure impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ5: How did institutional leadership impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ6: How did an internationalization review impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ7: How did an internationalized curriculum impact comprehensive internationalization?

RQ8: How did study abroad impact comprehensive internationalization?

Findings

Given the quantitative and qualitative nature of this study, the findings in this section indicate exactly what this study uncovered, and represent the outcomes of this study’s data analysis. In addition, the findings provide support for themes found in internationalization research literature that assessment of global learning, foreign students, internationalization reviews and an internationalized curriculum advances the internationalization of higher education institutions.

This section restricts the findings and analysis to the original questions that guided this study. As explained throughout the chapters, this study’s design included one primary question, which was further examined by eight research questions that represent the independent variables of this study.
Primary Question

What are the driving and restraining forces of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs? Findings from the data analysis concluded that four of the eight dimensions of internationalization introduced in this study were the least utilized strategies for achieving comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs. The study revealed that the absence of assessment of global learning outcomes, foreign students, an internationalization review and an internationalized curriculum severely restrained the ability of the private HBCUs of this study to successfully achieve comprehensive internationalization. The study also revealed that the institutional leadership’s alignment of internationalization plans with intuitional strategic priorities was a critical driving for comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs.

This study indicates that for HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 to avoid internationalization being marginalized to disparate and random acts of international activity, it was critical to integrate the goals of all eight dimensions (internationalization strategies) into one comprehensive strategic plan to achieve sustainable internationalization. Both institutions in the case studies elected to approach the planning process with the development of student global learning outcomes as a primary objective. In contrast, over half of the private HBCUs surveyed had not formerly assessed global learning outcomes in the last five years. Analysis of the data revealed that using the student as the focus of analysis changed the conversation about internationalization completely.

The lack of a strategic foreign student recruitment plan at HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 mirrored the dearth of these plans across the board at private HBCUs. Data collection
revealed that 66.7% of the private HBCUs did not have a strategic foreign student recruitment plan that included specific targets for foreign undergraduates. This fact emerged as a major contributor to foreign student enrollment only accounting for less than 5% at 81.8% at private HBCUs.

Both HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 found the process of an internationalization review central to their ability to (a) take stock of the current international initiatives on their campus, (b) collect and analyze information as a basis for an internationalization plan, (c) identify strengths, weaknesses, gaps and possibilities for new strategic activities, and (d) engage people across the institution in a discussion about internationalization (ACE, 2007). The study also concluded that the internationalization review complemented Knight’s Internationalization Cycle in several overarching ways.

First, as step six, the act of reviewing is explicit in Knight’s model. Second, the study concluded that the internationalization review serves as a gap-analysis function, which is critical to charting how far an institution is willing to go with their internationalization. Third, the results of the review help determine what is feasible to pursue in the form of next steps in the planning and implementation of internationalization.

Finally, the study concluded that an interdisciplinary approach to internationalizing the curriculum stimulated campus-wide disciplinary and interdisciplinary discussions. An interdisciplinary approach facilitated the juxtaposition of teaching, learning and assessment.
Research Questions

RQ1: How did an articulated institutional commitment impact comprehensive internationalization?

The strategic alignment of the resulting strategic plan for internationalization, the institutional mission and long-term institutional plans, emerged as a major finding in sustaining comprehensive internationalization at HBCU#1 and HBCU#2.

The leadership's ability to develop compelling rationales for internationalization to both internal and external constituents emerged as another key finding in the study. Once the campus communities at HBCu#1 and HBCU#2 were given an opportunity to weigh in on how internationalizing the campus would impact them, and broad-base acceptance was obtained, the accountability of successfully implementing it became everyone's responsibility.

An unexpected finding emerged from the HBCU#1 case study. As a result of the quantitative analysis and the Internationalization Index score, HBCU#1 was categorized as a Less Active institution in internationalization. The researcher's original assumption was HBCU#1 would not be in a position to provide rich and contextual feedback regarding their efforts to internationalize their campus. However, the efforts and experience of HBCU#1 emerged as a stellar example of an institution coming to grips with the fact that their academic offerings has lost pace with the sweeping changes of globalization.

HBCU's honesty regarding their urgency to improve on a rather episodic experience with internationalization lent a valuable perspective to this research. Their
transparency and willingness to embrace their Less Active categorization as a mechanism for improvement emerged as a significant finding and immediately validated the purpose and significance of this research.

RQ2: How did an assessment of global learning impact comprehensive internationalization?

Both case studies revealed that the assessment of global learning offered institutions a guide for the alignment of their curriculum and other international activities with desired goals for students. The continuous assessment process model, introduced by Linda Suskie (2004), can help private HBCUs prioritize the activities of their strategic plans for comprehensive internationalization.

The provosts at HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 were most concern with their institutions’ ability to effectively assess the impact of international programs on students. A major finding of the study in this area was the use of the student as the focus of analysis. At HBCU#2, this focus was immediately apparent as the centerpiece of their internationalization plan was internationalizing the curriculum and cocurriculum, as well including study abroad requirements for certain majors. At HBCU#2, a good percentage of their internationalization initiatives are facilitated by the reaffirmation of accreditation process. With the QEP as a backdrop to internationalization planning, HBCU#2 was able to accelerate encourage the campus to adopt a culture of quality improvement, while also satisfying their accreditation agency.

Finally, the study found that both institutions have already begun developing student global learning outcomes that address the assessment of students’ knowledge,
skills and attitudes. Each institution was actively engaged in comprehensively examining the following questions: (a) what do we want our students to know and be able to do? (knowledge, skills, and attitudes), (b) Where would students acquire this knowledge and these skills and attitudes?, (c) What is our evidence that students are actually achieving these outcomes?

RQ3: How did foreign students impact comprehensive internationalization?

The study revealed that both HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 have strategic interest in capitalizing on the untapped foreign student recruitment market in countries throughout the African Diaspora. HBCU#2 emerged as the more strategic of the two cases, primarily because of the large multimillion dollar gift to look specifically at recruiting in Africa. Foreign student recruitment was another opportunity to link institutional mission and capacity to comprehensive internationalization for both institutions.

RQ4: How did institutional infrastructure impact comprehensive internationalization?

Both institutions in the study were concerned with the infusion of internationalization into the culture and ethos of the campus. Each sought the research of Knight’s (1994) Internationalization cycle as a model for their planning. The internationalization at HBCU#2, for example, created the rationale for the recruitment of the institution’s first chief international officer. The review, for both institutions, illustrated identified critical gaps in infrastructure, policies/procedures and levels of intellectual understanding about internationalization in general.
RQ5: How did institutional leadership impact comprehensive internationalization?

At both institutions institutional leadership was the principal drivers for comprehensive internationalization. Both provosts facilitated pivotal shifts in their institution’s orientation and focus towards internationalization. In both cases, their ability to convene people and create compelling rationale for internationalization were critical to moving the project from general discussion to planning and implementation (in the case of HBCU#2).

RQ6: How did an internationalization review impact comprehensive internationalization?

This study revealed that the internationalization review identified critical feedback regarding the vision for Internationalization, strategic goals, performance indicators (outcomes and evidence of Success), specific action steps and timeline, responsible agents, funding and a plan for monitoring implementation.

RQ7: How did an internationalized curriculum impact comprehensive internationalization?

Both HBCU#1 and HBCU#2 are in the early stages of planning their curricular reform. However, already each institution seeks to impact comprehensive internationalization by enhancing faculty acumen in the internationalization of their courses, enhancing the research agenda of faculty and students, strengthening engagement that promotes the application of knowledge.
RQ8: How did study abroad impact comprehensive internationalization?

Study abroad at both case institutions was overemphasized, as a major priority of their internationalization strategic plan. HBCU#1 is nearly nonexistent and plans are underway to make this activity more robust in years to come. On the contrary, HBCU#2 outpaces any HBCU (public or private) in this regard and ranks in the top 20 institutions in the nation for Fulbright Scholar production. For HBCU#2, the impact of study abroad was so significant that it nearly single-handedly made the case for internationalization’s selection as the QEP. Ways in which it has impacted comprehensive internationalization at HBCU#2 are as follows:

- Increased the development of “credit-bearing” opportunities for education abroad in each school without loss of time-to-degree.
- Increase the number of “faculty-led” study abroad programs; and the creation of interdisciplinary approaches to faculty-led study abroad programming.
- Established “credit-bearing” language immersion programs and international internships.
- Increased HBCU#2 students’ competitiveness for international study scholarships.
- Increased the funding available for student abroad scholarships and faculty international travel grants.
- Established policies and procedures that promote and support internationally focused faculty research.
• Created faculty development/training initiatives related to all aspects of study abroad program development/management.

• Through the QEP, strengthened infrastructure in the Center for Global Education.

Conclusions

Overall, with increasing attention on the internationalization of higher education, the importance of private HBCUs developing a compelling rationale for comprehensive internationalization on their campuses is critical to their remaining relevant in the delivery of U. S. higher education. In essence, it is critical to their survival. In order to remain relevant to their clientele, private HBCUs have to move beyond the archaic perceptions of the global role of higher education. It is imperative for these institutions to translate mission statements that profess the student acquisition of global competence, into academic enterprises that demonstrate evidence of internationalization practices.

The world is undergoing dramatic changes politically, economically and socially, and it is the responsibility of private HBCUs to adequately prepare their students to not only compete, but make an impact on the world. In Stand and Prosper (2001), a brilliant, comprehensive and unedited study on private HBCUs, the researchers Drewry and Doerrmann write about the importance of the leadership of private HBCUs sustaining a relevant vision and focus, in order for these institutions to remain significant. This is true now more than ever.

Merely counting the numbers of students who study abroad on a campus does not constitute internationalization, but assessing the impact of their international experience
upon their return does. Emerging 21st century realities of internationalization are
impacting the way U. S. higher education defines and fulfills its global role. The
inevitable population boom has begun to challenge normal trajectories of education all
over the world. Like Asia and Latin America, Africa’s burgeoning middle class is
currently looking for global location to educate their young people. Our African sisters
and brothers with the financial means and resources are quickly finding out what African
Americans have always known, that they will not all get into Harvard whether they can
afford it or not. So, they look for other educational alternatives.

This one small fact should create huge opportunities for the black college. This
study revealed that several countries throughout the African Diaspora, like Brazil, Kenya,
Nigeria, Venezuela and South Africa are among the top twenty sending nations of
undergraduates to the U. S., yet private HBCUs have not developed strategic foreign
student recruitment plans that include specific targets for these countries. If they did they
could dramatically enhance their revenue generation, as their foreign students
simultaneously partner in the internationalization of their campuses.

What this study reveals is that private HBCUs have not kept pace with the
sweeping changes of globalization. While other institutions have long developed
international profiles, HBCUs for many compelling reasons have not. This study
highlights the internationalization strategies used at two private HBCUs. Their
significance to this study is anchored in their differences, rather than their similarities.
They have weathered in very different fashions the years since the Brown decision
(1954), Civil Rights Act (1964) and the Higher Education Act (1965). Yet, thankfully
they arrived, in 2010 and 2011 respectively, to the realization that reimagining their academic enterprises means aligning and situating internationalization at the core of their institutions’ priorities.

Implications

The results of this study led to the development of the following implications for higher education, educational leadership, and HBCUs:

**Higher Education:** The results of this study revealed several important implications for higher education. Based on the review of literature conducted for this study, the field of higher education has clearly taken note of the fact that global learning is critical, as there are many indicators across the Academy that underscore this fact. However, the results of this study infer that U. S. higher education must do more to ensure that global orientations become central to the core missions of our institutions.

At the same time it has become clear that internationalization is not achieve with one single formula, but requires a reimagination of purpose, deep and lasting commitment and a wide array of specific actions. Accreditation agencies and state boards of higher education may welcome internationalization, but have done nothing to date to require it. This inference is made with caution, as to require internationalization might result in institutions’ less imaginative attempts to internationalize in order to check a box.

U. S. higher education has an obligation to keep pace with the range and innovation in internationalization currently on display at counterpart institutions around the world. The acceleration of globalization itself has instigated a shift in the global
educational paradigm, yet many of our U. S. institutions still deliver education through a local-parochial prism. Higher Educational leaders, who fail to plan and address the needs of globalization, will find themselves left behind.

**Educational Leadership:** The results of this study infer two critical implications for the Educational Leadership field. First, the lack of an international thrust in the curriculum of graduate degree programs in educational leadership is extremely problematic. The field is in the business of training future educational leaders, yet the students (and faculty) that populate these programs do not engage in discussions regarding the design and internationalization of curriculum in an organic way. Central to this implication is faculty members' belief that global learning is a compelling goal.

Second, Internationalization is not a part of the institutional DNA of the majority of private HBCUs. Since leaders throughout an institution (boards of trustees, presidents, chief academic officers, chief student affairs officers, deans, chairs, etc.) possess enormous power to influence change and innovation, these educational leaders must be actively engaged in crafting the institution's articulated institutional commitment to internationalization, and held accountable for implementing it.

**HBCUs:** The results of this study revealed several critical implications for HBCUs. Contemporary thinking about the curriculum has shifted the discussion from what faculty teaches to what students know (Green & Shoenberg, 2006). However, this study revealed that many of our HBCUs have yet to achieve a global, integrative and personal learning environment for their students. For example, the research literature on
internationalizing the curriculum highlights new curricular structures that feature enhanced flexibility and a blurring of traditional academic boundaries.

This study helped to illuminate that in the reality of HBCUs today, there is stark variations among them. Institutions like HBCU#2 are starting to realize certain levels of success in internationalization, while others like HBCU#1, are charting new and uneasy paths in this regard. Still, others are so nearly incapacitated by accreditation warnings, low retention rates and financial challenges that it’s challenging for them to entertain another priority like internationalization. Yet, this study has highlighted the legacy of resilient HBCU leaders, whose charge, some could argue given the backdrop of racial oppression, was far more daunting.

How private HBCU leaders begin to strategically reposition their institutions by integrating serious internationalization plans with other strategic priorities will not be the same on each campus. Both HBCU#1 and HBCU#2, though at different stages in their internationalization work, have determined that to internationalize does not mean losing site of their historical mission. On the contrary, internationalization, as they have found, can be a viable mechanism for revitalizing their history, enhancing their institutional capacity, while at the same time addressing the nagging question of relevance.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are drawn from the data analysis of this study and are related to the findings described in this chapter. The following recommendations are organized by recommendations for practice, policy and future research:
Recommendations for Practice

1. It is recommended that private HBCUs ensure that their articulated institutional commitment to internationalization is aligned with (and evidenced by) their institutional practices.

2. It is recommended that the academic leadership (chief academic officers) at private HBCUs examine Suskie’s *Assessment as a Continuous Four-Step Cycle* in their discussion of developing global learning outcomes for their students. Suskie’s model indicates that institutions proceed through the following four steps to assess student learning: (a) establish student learning outcomes, (b) provide learning opportunities, (c) assess student learning, and (d) use the results to modify and improve student [international ] programs (Suskie, 2009).

3. It is recommended that private HBCUs pursue the alignment of their institutional missions, strategic plans for internationalization and student recruitment/enrollment goals (which include foreign students).

4. It is recommended that HBCUs retool the curriculum to meet the growing demands of internationalization and global learning outcomes.

5. It is recommended that HBCUs, in considering the internationalization of their curriculum, examines strategies for internationalizing both the disciplines and the general education core.
6. It is recommended that private HBCUs establish majors/minors in international studies, which are disciplinary in nature, and that have foreign language and study abroad requirements built into the degree requirements.

7. It is recommended that leaders of private HBCUs become active members of the leading professional associations for international education (ACE, AIEA, NAFSA) in order to remain engaged in the national and international dialogue surrounding the internationalization of higher education.

8. It is recommended that leaders of private HBCUs support internationalization in the following overarching ways: establish an institutional culture that encourages shared-decision making/responsibility, overtly make the case for internationalization (over-and-over), and create the administrative/bureaucratic structures (policies/procedures), which provide order and orientation for internationalization.

9. It is recommended that private HBCUs create appropriate institutional infrastructure to support comprehensive internationalization.

10. It is recommended that private HBCUs develop a fundraising strategy for internationalization. In addition, it is recommended that private HBCU examine how well institutional resources align with institutional goals.

11. It is recommended that private HBCUs explore the latest innovations in technology to enhance international programs, internationalize the curriculum and to communicate their internationalization goals with internal and external stakeholders.
12. It is recommended that Schools of Education look closely at interdisciplinary approaches to delivering the curriculum of educational leadership programs. Such training will ensure that future educational leaders are equipped with the skill to either enhance or create international education imperatives.

Recommendations for Policy

1. It is recommended that UNCF establish an Office of Internationalization to work with the private HBCUs in internationalization and curriculum and faculty enhancement.

2. It is recommended that more leadership (in the form of facilitating policies) from the governing agents of U. S. higher education be implemented, if our system of education is to successfully combat deficiencies in knowledge of international affairs and foreign languages specifically, and keep U. S. higher education in step with global change in general.

3. It is recommended that HBCUs receive more specific earmarked federal funding to support internationalization efforts such as, internationalizing the curriculum, strategic partnerships with institutions throughout the African Diaspora, international studies majors, expansion in foreign language instruction and overseas faculty development seminars/workshops.

4. It is recommended that U. S. higher education examine and develop more strategic programming to assist HBCUs produce globally competent graduates with much needed skills in intelligence, comparative politics and foreign language.
Recommendations for Future Research

1. It is recommended that future research be conducted at both private and public HBCUs to investigate the state of internationalization.

2. It is recommended that future research on internationalizing black college be conducted to include both graduate and undergraduate students.

3. It is recommended that future research be conducted on expanding study abroad at private HBCUs.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the state of internationalization at the private Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs), and to identify select factors that drive or restrain the internationalization process at these particular institutions.

Chapter One provides the introduction, background of the problem, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, and the significance of the study. Chapter Two contains an overview of internationalization and the review of literature on the research topic in relation to the selected independent variables. Chapter Three explains the theoretical framework of the study, and the definition of all variables and other operational terms. The relationship among the variables is also explained. Chapter Four establishes the research methodology employed for this study. This chapter includes the philosophical worldview, research design, description of the setting and sampling procedures. In addition, the instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis, and an explanation for working with human subjects are included as well.

Chapter Five discussed the analysis of data collected from the research. As this study was
a multiple method case study, both quantitative and qualitative data are included.

Quantitative analysis includes composite results from the data collection quantitative
descriptive results of the survey and a description of the internationalization index created
for this study. Qualitative analysis includes a description of both case studies, descriptive
demographics, cross case analysis and an analysis of the application of the theoretical
framework model to the study.
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Survey on Internationalization of UNCF-Member Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Climate</th>
<th>Internationalizing the Black College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>ANTHONY L. PERDIER, DOCTORAL CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP 
Survey on Internationalization at UNCF-Member

1. PERSONAL DATA

1.1 Name

1.2 Institution

1.3 Job Title

1.4 Telephone & Email Address

2. ARTICULATED INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

2.1 Does your institution's mission statement specifically value international or global education? (Select one)
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes

2.2 Is international or global education listed as one of the top five priorities in your institution's current strategic plan?
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes

2.3 Does your institution have a separate written plan that addresses institution-wide internationalization? (Select one)
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes

2.4 Does your institution's student recruitment literature highlight international or global education programs, activities, and opportunities? (Select one)
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes

3. ASSESSMENT OF GLOBAL LEARNING

3.1 Has your institution formally assessed the impact or progress of its internationalization efforts in the last five years? (Select one)
   - [ ] Yes

3.2 Has your institution developed specific international or global student learning outcomes? (Select one)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   - [ ] Yes, for students in some schools
   - [ ] Yes, for all students, departments, or programs

4. FOREIGN STUDENTS

4.1 Did your institution provide specific funding for any of the following activities to promote recruitment of full-time, degree-seeking international students at the undergraduate level last year? (Select all that apply)
   - [ ] Travel for recruitment officers
   - [ ] Scholarships for international students
   - [ ] Other (Please specify)

   - [ ] No specific institutional funding provided
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Class Climate

Internationalizing the Black College

1. FOREIGN STUDENTS (Continued)

4.2 Specify other funding sources for foreign students here:

4.3 What percentage of all-time undergraduate students at your institution are international students? **Note**: For the purpose of this survey, an international student is not a U.S. citizen, an immigrant (permanent resident), or a refugee. International students may be holders of F (student) visas, J (exchange visitor) visas, or (foreign educational exchange student) visas. (Select one)

- [ ] None
- [ ] 10 percent to 25 percent
- [ ] More than 25 percent
- [ ] 5 percent to 10 percent

4.4 Does your institution have a strategic international student recruitment plan that includes specific targets for undergraduate students? (Select one)

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

4.5 Does your institution offer any of the following programs or support services for international students? (Select all that apply)

- [ ] International academic support services
- [ ] Orientation to the U.S. and local community
- [ ] Institutional advisory committee of international students
- [ ] Host-family program for international students
- [ ] English as a Second Language (ESL) program
- [ ] Language partner program that pairs U.S. and international students
- [ ] International festsivals or campus events (on-going)
- [ ] Other

4.6 Did your institution offer any of the following programs or activities for undergraduate students last year? (Select all that apply)

- [ ] Buddy Program that pairs U.S. and international students
- [ ] Language partner program that pairs U.S. and international students
- [ ] Internationally oriented curricula
- [ ] International festsivals or campus events (on-going)
- [ ] Other

4.7 If you offered an 'other' program or activity, specify here:

INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

5.1 Does your institution have a campus-wide committee or taskforce that works solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus? (Select one)

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

5.2 Please select the response that most closely resembles the administrative structure of the internationalization activities, and programs at your institution. (Select one)

- [ ] No office oversees internationalization activities and programs
- [ ] A single office oversees internationalization activities and programs
- [ ] Multiple offices oversee internationalization activities and programs
## 6. INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE (Cont.)

### 6.3 Does your institution have or more professional staff or faculty members dedicated at least half-time to any of the following aspects of internationalization? (Select all that apply)

- International student recruitment/admissions
- International/Student Services
- Education/Study Abroad
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Development of International Partnerships
- Other: _______________________________

### 6.4 If your institution has staff or faculty dedicated to another aspect of internationalization, specify that here:

### 6.5 Does your institution have a full-time administrator who oversees/coordinates multiple internationalization activities programs? (Select one)

- Yes
- No

### 6.6 If you responded "yes" to the previous question, to who does the individual report? (Select all that apply)

- Chief Academic Officer
- Other administrative in academic affairs
- Other: _______________________________

### 6.7 If you marked "other," identify the office responsible for an internationalization report here:

### 6.8 Has your institution received external funding specifically earmarked for internationalization programs/activities from any of the following sources in the last three years? (Select all that apply)

- Federal Government
- Private Donors
- Other: _______________________________

### 6.9 If you marked "other," identify those external funding source(s) here:

### 6.10 Did your institution provide specific funding for any of the following internationalization programs/activities last year? (Select all that apply)

- Faculty-led study abroad programs
- Faculty development seminars abroad
- Other: _______________________________

### 6.11 If you marked "other," identify programs/activities here:

---

## 6. INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP

---
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6. [INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP (Continued)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1 Does your institution's leadership (president and chief academic officer) give legitimacy and focus to internationalization, and ensure the development of an action plan? (Select one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes, for faculty in some schools, departments or programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes, for all faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Does your institutional leadership (president and chief academic officer) ensure that campus processes support internationalization? (Select one) |

| □ No |
| □ Yes |

6.3 Does your chief academic officer hold courses, department chairs, and other administrative associates for outlining and achieving their internationalization objectives? (Select one) |

| □ No |
| □ Yes, for some schools, departments or programs |
| □ Yes, for all schools, departments or programs |

7. INTERNATIONALIZATION REVIEW

7.1 Does your institution have guidelines that specify international work or experience as a consideration in faculty promotion and tenure decisions? (Select one) |

| □ No |
| □ Yes, for faculty in some schools, departments or programs |
| □ Yes, for all faculty |

7.2 Does your institution offer any of the following opportunities to faculty members in the last three years? (Select all that apply) |

| Workshops: Internationalizing the Curriculum |
| Workshops: Using Technology to Integrate International Dimensions into Courses |
| Opportunities to Increase their Design Language Skills |
| Recognition awards specifically for international activity |

7.3 When hiring faculty in fields that are not explicitly international/global, does your institution give preference to candidates with international background, expertise or interests? (Select one) |

| □ No |
| □ Yes, rarely |
| □ Yes, frequently |

7.4 Does your institution use technology in any of the following ways to enhance internationalization? (Select all that apply) |

| □ Email or video conferencing |
| □ Course sponsored study abroad blogs |
| □ Direct links from your institution's homepage to international program websites |
| □ Courses conducted in collaboration with institutions abroad using web-based technology |
| □ Other (Please list) |

7.5 If you marked "Other", identify the technology used here

7.6 Does your institution offer programs outside of the U.S. for non-U.S. students leading to a degree from your institution only, and delivered entirely or in part through face-to-face instruction? (Select one) |

| □ No |
| □ Abroad, but we are currently working on developing such programs |
| □ Yes |

7.7 If you responded "yes" to the previous question, please indicate in what countries or regions your institution offers such programs, and whether you have partnered with higher education institutions in those countries or regions. (Note: A partner institution is defined as a higher education institution in the target country that in collaborating with your institution in the design and/or delivery of the program specified)

7.8 If you responded "yes" to the previous question, please indicate in what countries or regions your institution offers such programs, and whether you have partnered with higher education institutions in those countries or regions. (Note: A partner institution is defined as a higher education institution in the target country that in collaborating with your institution in the design and/or delivery of the program specified)
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7. INTERNATIONALIZATION REVIEW (Continued)

7.8 Please indicate all the fields, if any, in which you offer undergraduate degree programs for non-U.S. students outside of the United States.

7.9 Please indicate whether you are receiving direct and/or indirect financial support, if any, from the home country government for your institution's program in the referenced country (or countries).

7.10 Has your institution established a branch campus in another country for any of the degree programs you have indicated? (Select one)
   □ No  □ Yes, for some programs  □ Yes, for all programs

8. INTERNATIONALIZED CURRICULUM

8.1 Does your institution have a foreign language admissions requirement for incoming undergraduates? (Select one)
   □ No  □ Yes, for some degree programs  □ Yes, for all programs

8.2 Does your institution have a foreign language graduation requirement for undergraduates? (Select one)
   □ No  □ Yes, for some degree programs  □ Yes, for all degree programs

8.3 What is the foreign language requirement, if any, for graduation at your institution? NOTE: If your institution has different requirements for different students, please indicate the requirement as it applies to the largest school/collegiate program. (Select one)
   □ One semester or equivalent  □ One year or equivalent  □ More than one year, but less than two years
   □ Two years or equivalent  □ More than two years or equivalent

8.4 Can undergraduate students satisfy their foreign language requirement for graduation by passing a proficiency exam? (Select one)
   □ No  □ Yes

8.5 Please select all foreign languages that were taught at the undergraduate level during the 2010-2011 academic year. Do not include ESL, or American Sign Language (ASL). (Select all that apply)
   □ Arabic  □ Chinese  □ French  □ German  □ Hindi  □ Italian  □ Japanese  □ Portuguese  □ Russian  □ Spanish  □ Other (Please specify):

8.6 If you marked 'Other', identify languages taught here:

8.7 To satisfy a general education requirement, are undergraduates required to take courses that primarily feature international dimensions in the course content? NOTE: Do not include foreign language courses. (Select one)
   □ No  □ Yes

8.8 How many courses, if any, with international dimensions are undergraduates required to complete to satisfy their general education requirement? (Select one)
   □ None  □ One course  □ Two courses  □ Three or more courses
Appendix A (continued)
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8. INTERNATIONALIZED CURRICULUM (Continued)

8.6 Are students required to complete courses that primarily feature countries or geographic areas other than Canada, Australia or Western Europe? (Select one)
- No
- Yes

8.10 To satisfy a general education requirement, are undergraduates required to take courses that feature global issues or topics, e.g., global health issues, peace studies, etc.? (Select one)
- No
- Yes

8.11 Does your institution offer International/Global minors, concentrations, or certificates for undergraduates in any of the following fields? (Select all that apply)
- International/Global Certificates (regardless of major)
- Business/Management
- Education
- Health/Medicine
- Humanities
- Social/Behavioral Sciences/Economics
- Science/Technology/Engineering/Math
- Technical/Professional
- Tourism/Hotel Management
- Other: (Please specify)

8.12 If you marked 'Other', specify the option here

8.13 Does your institution offer any joint degree programs with institutions in other countries? (Select one)
- No
- Yes

9. STUDY ABROAD

9.1 Can undergraduate students use their institution’s awarded financial aid to participate in study abroad opportunities administered by other institutions? (Select one)
- No
- Yes

9.2 Does your institution, or any schools or departments within your institution, provide specific institutional funds for education abroad, in addition to all other sources of financial aid? (Select one)
- No
- Yes

9.3 Did your institution administer credit any of the following undergraduate education abroad programs last year? (Select all that apply)
- Study abroad
- International internships
- International service opportunities
- Field study abroad
- Research abroad
- Work abroad

9.4 If your institution administers education abroad programs for credit, does it have guidelines to ensure that undergraduate students who participate in approved education abroad programs without delaying graduation? (Select all that apply)
- No
- Yes

9.5 Please estimate the percentage of undergraduate students at your institution who graduated between 2007-2010 who engaged in education abroad for credit at some point during their academic careers. (Select one)
- Less than 5 percent
- 6 percent to 10 percent
- 11 percent to 20 percent
- 21 percent to 30 percent
- 31 percent to 60 percent
- More than 60 percent

YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE SURVEY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!
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ACE Survey Request

Zimbra

Re: ACE Survey Request

From: Christa Olson <C Olson@ACENET.EDU>  Wed, Apr 06, 2011 07:28 AM
Subject: Re: ACE Survey Request
To: 'spinder@ggc.edu' <spinder@ggc.edu>
Cc: Lindsay Mathers <L Mathers@ACENET.EDU>, Barbara Hill <BHill@ACENET.EDU>, Milkyung Ryu <MRyu@ACENET.EDU>

Tony,
Sorry I missed your call. I have been out of the office extensively over the past month. Glad to learn of your timeline. We would of course welcome your help in encouraging strong response rates next fall and will be in touch with you about that.
Best wishes,
Christa
Christa Olson
Associate Director
International Initiatives
American Council on Education
One DuPont Circle NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 839-3739
Fax: (202) 785-8036
christa_olson@acenet.edu
acenet.edu

---

From: Anthony L. Pinder <mailto:spinder@ggc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 01:23 PM
To: Olson, Christa
Cc: Mathers, Lindsay; Hill, Barbara; Ryu, Milkyung; Anthony L. Pinder <mailto:spinder@ggc.edu>
Subject: Re: ACE Survey Request

Greetings Christa,

I left you a voice message yesterday and I hope this finds you doing well.

I greatly appreciate you and your ACE colleagues for granting me permission to use aspects (including the general format) of the ACE Internationalization survey instrument. As I move one more step towards the completion of my dissertation process, I am delighted to know

https://hermes.ggc.edu/zimbra/uu/printmessage?id=12331&xn=1

4/7/2011
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that I have ACE's support.

Regarding your one concern, I plan on sending out my survey this spring. I think that should be sufficient enough time between the two surveys. In addition, in an effort to be of some assistance to your fall initiative, I can alert the international officers at the UNCF-member schools (during my follow-up calls) about the forthcoming Fall ACE Mapping Survey (If you think this is appropriate-- As a former SCO at two UNCF-member institutions, a good number of the UNCF senior international officers I either already know or feel very comfortable cold calling directly). But, please advise regarding this latter point.

Again, I sincerely thank ACE for its support! Best Regards!

Anthony L. Pinder

---

From: "Christa Olson" <COlson@ACENET.EDU>
To: "aplinder@ggc.edu" <aplinder@ggc.edu>
Cc: "Lindsey Mathers" <LMathers@ACENET.EDU>, "Barbara Hill" <BHill@ACENET.EDU>, "Minyoung Ryu" <MRyu@ACENET.EDU>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2011 5:35:43 AM
Subject: ACE Survey Request

Hello Anthony,

Barbara has reminded me that I need to be in touch with you about your research. It sounds so exciting and I hope the dissertation defense goes well on April 15th. We definitely want to be supportive of your work and grant permission for you to heavily draw upon the survey instrument. We just have one concern I was hoping to check in with you about. When were you planning on sending out your survey? This spring by chance? I ask because ACE is planning to conduct the Mapping study again this Fall and would hope that the private HBCUs would respond to the fielding of that survey. If there is enough time between the two, hopefully this would not be an issue.

All my best,
Christa
Christa Olson
Associate Director
International Initiatives
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 999-9739
Fax: (202) 785-8056
christa_olson@acncche.edu
acncche.edu

### 2010 Member Institutions: United Negro College Fund (UNCF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College/University</th>
<th>Name of College/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allen University, Columbia, SC</td>
<td>21. Oakwood College, Huntsville, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bennett College for Women, Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>23. Paul Quinn College, Dallas, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bethune-Cookman University, Daytona Beach, FL</td>
<td>24. Philander Smith College, Little Rock, AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Claflin University, Orangeburg, SC</td>
<td>25. Rust College, Holy Springs, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>26. Saint Augustine’s College, Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dillard University, New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>27. Saint Paul’s College, Lawrenceville, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>28. Shaw University, Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fisk University, Nashville, TN</td>
<td>29. Spelman College, Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Florida Memorial University, Miami, FL</td>
<td>30. Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Huston-Tillotson University, Austin, TX</td>
<td>31. Talladega College, Talladega, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>32. Texas College, Tyler, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, TX</td>
<td>33. Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>34. Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lane College, Jackson, TN</td>
<td>35. Virginia Union University, Richmond, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. LeMoyne-Owen College, Memphis, TN</td>
<td>36. Voorhees College, Denmark, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Livingstone College, Salisbury, NC</td>
<td>37. Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Miles College, Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>38. Wiley College, Marshall, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>39. Xavier University, New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Morris College, Sumter, SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNCF and UNCF ICB Mission Statements

UNCF envisions a nation where all Americans have equal access to a college education that prepares them for rich intellectual lives, competitive and fulfilling careers, engaged citizenship and service to our nation.

UNCF's mission is to build a robust and nationally-recognized pipeline of under-represented students who, because of UNCF support, become highly-qualified college graduates and to ensure that our network of member institutions is a respected model of best practice in moving students to and through college.

UNCF launched the Institute for Capacity Building (ICB) in 2006. Its primary objective is to support strengthening the 39 UNCF member private historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in various areas. The ICB helps HBCUs draw on their foundations of existing institutional strength and potential. Various ICB programs offer four strategies:

1. Institutional funding such as planning and implementation grants.

2. Consultative and technical assistance provided by ICB program directors and external experts.

3. Professional development opportunities for stakeholders.

4. Communities of practice that provide opportunities for idea exchange and interaction.

Colleges and universities that build their capacity and undergo the rigorous discipline needed to uncover, remediate, implement and assess every aspect of institutional life and behavior will build institutions with sustainable futures.
APPENDIX E

Invitation to UNCF-Member Institutions to Participate in Quantitative Survey (via Email)

September 15, 2011

To Chief International Officer:

As you are well aware, internationalization has become an increasingly important trend in American higher education. Research on the internationalization of higher education has suggested that institutional leadership, institutional infrastructure, campus-wide internationalization taskforces, and assessing students' global learning outcomes are critical elements of comprehensive internationalization. Yet, no studies have investigated the connections among these four factors and the stage of readiness of private Black colleges for comprehensive internationalization.

Consequently, with the support of the Institute for Capacity Building at the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), my dissertation research examines the stage of readiness of private Black colleges/universities, as it relates to comprehensive internationalization. The initial phase of the research study is comprised of a quantitative survey that is being distributed among the 39-UNCF member institutions, to understand how institutional strategies impact the creation of comprehensive internationalization plans. The findings will assist higher education scholars and practitioners in better understanding strategies used to advance internationalization at private Black Colleges. As the former chief international officer at two HBCUs (Morehouse College and Dillard University respectively), this research holds particular importance for me.

The purpose of this email is to ask whether you would be willing to complete an on-line survey on Internationalization. A version of this survey was originally created and used by the American Council on Education (ACE) to map the state of internationalization of undergraduate education at U.S. colleges and universities. With permission, this version of the ACE survey has been modified based on the selected independent variables for this particular study mapping internationalization at UNCF-member institutions. Your responses will not be included in any national pools, and all data collected in this survey will be kept confidential. This survey asks about your efforts at the undergraduate level only, and primarily from the academic year 2010-11. If current data is not available, please leave the question blank. If exact totals or percentages are not available when requested, please provide your best estimate. You may need to consult with other individuals and offices at your institution, in order to answer some of the questions. If you do not know an answer or cannot answer a question for any reason, please leave the question blank. The survey should only take approximately 25 minutes to complete. If you are willing to participate in this study, please click the link below and use the following PIN number (PINCAU) to begin the on-line survey. Your completion of this on-line survey will serve as your passive...
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and implied consent. If you wish to continue with this survey, it would be greatly appreciated if your submissions could be completed on/before October 7, 2011. The link is as follows:

http://megatron.ggc.usg.edu/classclimate/online

Once again, the following PIN number (PINCAU) should be entered using all capital letters. If you would like additional information about this study, please feel free to contact me directly by telephone at (678) 612-3675. In advance, thank you for your time and attention to this important matter. I will follow up this initial email with a subsequent telephone call and/or email. I look forward to receiving your survey.

Best Regards,

Anthony L. Pinder
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership
APPENDIX F

Interview Protocol with Institutions’ Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs

Leadership of Internationalization at Institution X
- Why is internationalization an important issue for Institution X?
- Where does internationalization fit into the complex role of your job?
- How do you make the case for internationalization at Institution X?
- How do you identify and/or create supporters of internationalization and understand their goals?
- How do you engage with skeptics of internationalization at Institution X?
- How does Institution X’s internationalization plan take into account the institution’s mission, history, and nature of the student body?

Institution X’s Institutional Infrastructure for Internationalization
- Where does the primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?
- What are the staffing arrangements and reporting lines? How well are they working?
- To what extent does the institution reward or penalize faculty for international activities and internationalization of their courses, especially in the hiring, promotion and tenure process?
- To what extent is study abroad integrated into the academic major, minor and general education requirements at Institution X?
- What financial resources does Institution X provide for Internationalization: curriculum development, faculty international travel/research, student education abroad, and co-curricular programs?
- Does Institution X have a fundraising strategy for internationalization? If so, how is it aligned with the overall institutional fundraising strategy?

Institution X’s Foreign Students
- What are the enrollment trends of international students at Institution X?
- What strategies are in place to help domestic students learn from international students?
- To what extent does pedagogy take advantage of the differing perspectives that domestic and foreign students bring to the campus?

Institution X’s Campus-wide Internationalization Taskforce
- What has your involvement been, if any, with this taskforce or its initiatives?
- What are the major responsibilities of the internationalization taskforce at Institution X?
- How does the internationalization taskforce assess its progress in achieving its goals?
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Assessing Global Learning Outcomes at Institution X
- From your perspective, how important is assessing the global learning outcomes of students in order to accomplish Institution X’s internationalization goals?
- Is global learning articulated as part of Institution X’s vision, mission, or goals? If so, where (mission statement, strategic plan or recruiting materials)?

Internationalizing the Curriculum at Institution X
- To what extent does Institution X’s general education curriculum include international or global content, perspectives, and different ways of knowing? What is the evidence?
- To what extent do academic departments attempt to internationalize majors? What is the evidence?
- Does Institution X have a foreign language requirement (for some or all students)? Why or why not?
- Has there been anything that surprised you or that you didn’t expect that impacted the involvement of faculty in the internationalization of the curriculum?
APPENDIX G

Interview Protocol with Chief International Officer & Director of Study Abroad

Leadership of Internationalization at Institution X

- In your opinion, what does internationalization mean at Institution X?
- Why is internationalization an important issue for Institution X?
- How has the internationalization of Institution X developed?
- What role do you play in leading internationalization?
- How do you engage with skeptics of internationalization at Institution X?
- How have you been involved in the development/implementation of the internationalization plan at Institution X?

Institution X’s Institutional Infrastructure for Internationalization

- Where does the primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?
- What are the staffing arrangements and reporting lines? How well are they working?
- What governance structures support internationalization? How well are they working?
- What are the barriers to internationalization? To what extent is Institution X succeeding in removing these barriers? What is the evidence?
- Does Institution X have an overall strategy for international partnerships? If so, how well is it working?
- What financial resources does Institution X provide for Internationalization: curriculum development, faculty international travel/research, student education abroad, and co-curricular programs?
- To what extent does synergy exist among the various international activities and programs at Institution X? What communication channels exist, and how well are they working?
- Could you provide an example of a success Institution X has had in integrating international activities.

Institution X’s Foreign Students

- What are the enrollment trends of international students at Institution X?
- How are international students distributed among schools/colleges? How are they integrated into campus life?
- What strategies are in place to help domestic students learn from international students?
- To what extent does pedagogy take advantage of the differing perspectives that domestic and foreign students bring to the campus?
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Study Abroad at Institution X
- What opportunities exist for education abroad at Institution X?
- What are the distribution of students studying abroad by discipline and gender?
- To what extent is study abroad integrated into the academic major, minor and general education requirements at Institution X?
- How are students prepared for education abroad experiences—a pre-departure orientation? A specific orientation course?

Institution X’s Campus-wide Internationalization Taskforce
- What has your involvement been, if any, with the internationalization taskforce or its initiatives?
- How does the internationalization taskforce assess its progress in achieving its goals?
- When and why did Institution X develop a campus-wide internationalization taskforce?
- Who developed the charge for the taskforce and what was the charge?
- Are there any particular communication channels the taskforce uses to communicate the goals of the internationalization plan to non-taskforce faculty members throughout the institution?
- Could you provide a specific example of a time when the taskforce faced a significant challenge or setback in developing faculty engagement in the implementation of the internationalization plan?

Assessing Global Learning Outcomes
- From your perspective, how important is assessing the global learning outcomes of students in order to accomplish Institution X’s internationalization goals?
- Is global learning articulated as part of Institution X’s vision, mission, or goals? If so, where (mission statement, strategic plan or recruiting materials)?
- From your perspective, are there any particular academic activities, organizational practices, or organizational principles that have affected the participation of faculty in assessing the global learning outcomes of students at Institution X?
- Has there been anything that surprised you or that you didn’t expect that impacted the involvement of faculty in internationalization initiatives?
- Does Institution X collect information on the international interests, experiences and attitudes of students? If so, how is this information used?
- Is there anything else you would like to share about what has supported or hindered faculty to engage in the assessment of student global learning outcomes at Institution X?

Internationalization Review at Institution X
- How would you describe the process of internationalization review, in terms of its components, rationales and goals?
- Have the goals of the internationalization review been communicated to faculty, staff and students throughout the institution?
- Has Institution X used particular strategies to engage faculty throughout the institution, including non-taskforce faculty members, in the implementation of Institution X’s internationalization review?
- Have there been any particular academic activities, organizational practices, or organizational principles that affected faculty involvement in initiatives that support the implementation of the internationalization review?
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- Has there been anything that surprised you or that you didn’t expect that impacted the involvement of your office/department/unit in internationalization at Institution X?
- Is there anything else you would like to share about what has supported or hindered internationalization at Institution X?
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Clark Atlanta University IRB Approval

CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
Institutional Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs

June 27, 2011

Mr. Anthony L. Pinder <AnthonyPinder1025@yahoo.com>
Educational Leadership,
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, GA 30314

RE: Internationalizing the Black College: An Investigation of the Stage of Readiness of Private Black Colleges as it Relates to Select Benchmarks for Comprehensive Internationalization.

Principal Investigator(s): Anthony L. Pinder
Human Subjects Code Number: HR2011-6-385-1

Dear Mr. Pinder:

The Human Subjects Committee of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your protocol and approved of it as exempt in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Your Protocol Approval Code is HR2011-6-385-1/A

This permit will expire on June 26, 2012. Thereafter, continued approval is contingent upon the annual submission of a renewal form to this office.

The CAU IRB acknowledges your timely completion of the CITI IRB Training in Protection of Human Subjects – "Social and Behavioral Sciences Track". Your certification is valid for two years.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Georgianna Bolden at the Office of Sponsored Programs (404) 880-6979 or Dr. Paul L. Musey, (404) 880-6829.

Sincerely:

Paul L. Musey, Ph.D.
Chair
IRB: Human Subjects Committee

cc. Office of Sponsored Programs, "Dr. Georgianna Bolden" <gbolden@cau.edu>
    Dr. Shelia Gregory <sgregory@cau.edu>
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Research Consent Form

President, Provost, Chief International Officer, and Director of Study Abroad

“Internationalizing the Black College: An Investigation of the Stage of Readiness of Private Black Colleges as it Relates to Select Benchmarks for Comprehensive Internationalization”

CONSENT FORM

CAU IRB Reference Number: HR2011-6-385-1
Principal Investigator (PI): Anthony Louis Pinder
Telephone number: (678) 612-3675
Dissertation Chair: Sheila T. Gregory, Ph.D
Chair Telephone number: (404) 880-6015

You are invited to participate in a research study under the direction of Dr. Sheila T. Gregory in the Department of Educational Leadership at Clark Atlanta University (CAU). We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Research on the internationalization of higher education has suggested that institutional leadership, institutional infrastructure, campus-wide internationalization taskforces, and assessing students’ global learning outcomes are critical elements of comprehensive internationalization. Yet, no studies have investigated the connections among these four factors and the stage of readiness of private Black colleges for comprehensive internationalization.

Background Information:

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the state of internationalization at the private Historically Black Colleges/Universities (HBCUs), and to identify selected factors that support or impede the internationalization process at these particular institutions. By first broadly reviewing the state of internationalization activity at the 39-member institutions of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) and, next, by examining select strategies, used at two UNCF member institutions, to establish a comprehensive internationalization plan, the researcher endeavors to identify and highlight selected factors that support or impede comprehensive internationalization at HBCUs.
Consequently, the findings will assist higher education scholars and internationalization practitioners in better understanding strategies used to advance internationalization at Black Colleges.

Although the researcher will travel to various campuses for interviews, the analysis of the data collected will be conducted at Clark Atlanta University. A total of 6 participants at two institutions will be asked to take part in this study. You will be one of 3 participants at your institution asked to participate.

Procedures:

If you agree to participate in this study, you should expect the following to occur:

1. You will be asked to send this form, along with a letter stating your interest in participating in this study, to the principal investigator (Anthony L. Pinder).

2. The principal investigator will:
   (a) Call your office to set up an interview date and time;
   (b) Send you a confirmation letter to solidify the agreed upon date and time;
   (c) Send you a copy of the interview questions and a list of documents requested to aid in gaining insight into the strategies of internationalization at your institution; and
   (d) Interview you on the designated day for approximately one hour. The interview will be audio taped.

3. The interview will be transcribed and the transcripts, along with the documents collected will be analyzed in light of the research questions posed.

4. One week after the interview, the principal investigator will contact you via email to (a) share with you a memorandum that contains my preliminary findings and analysis for your review, and (b) schedule a follow-up telephone interview for the following week to learn about your perceptions of my preliminary findings and analysis.

5. Final analysis will be conducted and the results will be formally written into the dissertation.

6. The principal investigator will send you a copy of the results and findings after the final analysis have been conducted and the conclusions have been written into the dissertation.

The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is approximately one hour over the next two months. One hour would be spent in an interview at a location most convenient for you. There will be no payment or other compensation for your participation in this study.
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Risk and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Risks: This dissertation research invites minimal risk. The only possible risks and discomforts participants could experience during this study could potentially include having others read about the challenges participants have encountered in the development of comprehensive internationalization at their institutions. However, participants may refuse to answer any of the questions and may take a break at any time during the study. They can also stop their participation in this study at any time. This dissertation research invites minimal risks because of the following considerations:

A. The dissertation research topic is not a sensitive one, and the researcher is committed to minimizing the risk of exposure of the participating institutions.

B. The researcher will not share with anyone the information collected from participating institutions.

C. The researcher will maintain a secured storage practice of data collection:

   1. Phase I: Survey results will be kept in a secured database on a secure server and powered by a protected account only accessible by the principal investigator (researcher) on a protected computer.

   2. Phase II: Audio files from the interviews will be transcribed within one week. Audio files will be destroyed within one week of dissertation defense.

Benefits: The benefits of participation in this dissertation research study are:

A. The internationalization survey, interviews and preliminary document analysis will aid survey respondents and institutional participants to organize and better strategize about the actual state of internationalization on their own campuses.

B. As a result of their participation in the study, the transparency of participating institutions will help American higher education in general, and the field of international education in particular, gain a better understanding of not only the barriers to comprehensive and sustainable internationalization, but the set of circumstances and/or opportunities that facilitate the path to comprehensive internationalization at HBCUs.

C. In addition, the benefit to the internationalization of higher education research and practice that might result from this study are the increased understanding of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs through this study’s provision of empirical data and insights into (a) why institutional leadership, institutional infrastructure, campus-wide internationalization taskforces and assessing students’ global learning outcomes are critical elements of comprehensive internationalization at private HBCUs, and (b) how the
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connection among these four components of internationalization can be maximized to help HBCUs achieve their internationalization goals.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a locked file; only the researcher will have access to the records. The researcher and his dissertation committee will be the only ones with access to the audio taped interviews. Audio taped interviews will be retained for a five year period and then erased.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the researcher, Clark Atlanta University, or with the United Negro College Fund, Inc. (UNCF).

The principal investigator can decide to withdraw you from the study at any time. In addition, your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the freedom to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships previously identified. Further, you may elect not to answer any specific question posed to you by the interviewer while continuing your participation in the overall study.

Contacts and Questions:

Anthony Louis Pinder (Principal Investigator), doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership and Administration in the School of Education at Clark Atlanta University is conducting this study. Mr. Pinder’s contact information is as follows: (678) 612-3675 or apinder@ggc.edu. Dr. Sheila T. Gregory is the dissertation committee chair supervising this study. Dr. Gregory can be reached at (404) 6880-6015, or sgregory@cau.edu.

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions in the future about the research, you may contact the researcher or the dissertation committee chair at the above referenced contact information. If you have any questions now, or later, related to the integrity of the research (the rights of research subjects, etc.) you are encouraged to contact Dr. Georgianna Bolden at (404) 880-6979, or Dr. Paul I. Musey at (404) 880-6829 in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Clark Atlanta University.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.
STATEMENT OF CONSENT: I have read the above information. I have discussed this study, its risks and potential benefits, and my other choices with the principal investigator, Anthony L. Pinder. I have asked questions and received the answers to my satisfaction. My signature below indicates that I consent to participate in the study. It is my understanding that I can withdraw at any time.

Participant’s Name (Signature) .......................................................... Date

Participant’s Name (Printed) .......................................................... Date

CONSENT FOR AUDIO RECORDING: I understand that my interview will be audiotaped and transcribed. I understand that the audio recordings will be transcribed by a professional and are both delivered to and retrieved from the transcriber by the interviewer. During transcription, the transcriber stores recordings in a locked file cabinet. After transcription and prior to being destroyed, recordings are stored in a locked file cabinet to which only the interviewer has access. I understand that the recordings are maintained securely at all times.

Participant’s Name (Signature) .......................................................... Date

Participant’s Name (Printed) .......................................................... Date

Principal Investigator’s Name (Signature) ............................................ Date

Principal Investigator’s Name (Printed) ............................................. Date

Please consider the attainment of informed consent as a process within the research design that requires your attention. The consent/assent forms that are approved by the IRB committee will be stamped as such and returned to the researcher and must be utilized throughout the research study.
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