The drive to internationalize the higher education curriculum has a long history (see Chapter 3, this volume). Students in medieval Europe crossed political and geographical borders to learn from scholars elsewhere. Then, students internationalized their studies themselves, while more recently, globalization has made it imperative that colleges and universities internationalize both themselves and their curricula. A process increasing the interconnections between nations and peoples of the world, globalization has transformed higher education throughout the world, engaging local institutions, their staff, students, and their graduates with the wider world (Marginson, 2003, p. 2). As those who were once far away are now our neighbors (Featherstone, 1990, p. 11), the need to build “bridges of tolerance and respect for other cultures” (Kramsch, 2002, p. 272) is more evident than ever before. Furthermore, “making higher education [more] responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets” has become urgent (Van der Wende, 1997, p. 19). This chapter provides a discussion of the key issues inherent in an internationalized curriculum, which is key in this process of increasing global interconnections and deepening engagement in the wider world.

The Context for Internationalization of the Curriculum Within Higher Education

Internationalizing the curriculum is a response to the historical as well as contemporary contexts of universities and their local and global situatedness. Driven by both institutional and national agendas, motivations to internationalize the curriculum have included promoting national political and economic competitiveness, preserving linguistic and cultural heritage, and facilitating critical and comparative thinking for life in multicultural environments (Yershova, De Jaegbere, & Mestenhauser, 2000, p. 67) as well as intercultural competency for “personal, professional, and citizenship development” (Knight, 2004, p. 22; see also Green & Shoenberg, 2006). Key foci of an internationalized curriculum are encouraging deep learning and new ways of thinking. Indeed, given the small percentage of students who study abroad,
an internationalized curriculum is the primary means by which all undergraduate students can be encouraged to expand their horizons beyond traditional, nationally focused boundaries and concerns.

While there is no single agreed definition of an internationalized curriculum, the one offered by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1994) has been widely used:

A curriculum with an international orientation in content and/or form, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/socially) in an international and multicultural context and designed for domestic and/or foreign students.

(p. 9)

Curriculum internationalization is associated with a process of constant transformation (Foucault, 1981) and is represented in ways that are both similar and different in different parts of the world:

- The development of “a sophisticated degree of global awareness as an integral part of [students’] liberal arts education” that prepares them “for the highly interdependent and multicultural world in which they live and have to function in the future” (Harari, 1992, p. 52 & p. 53) (United States)

- “A means for Canadian students to develop global perspectives and skills at home . . . (that) . . . makes the teaching/learning process more relevant for international students on campus” and develops the “breadth and depth of knowledge, skills and attitudes that graduates need to work effectively in a more global environment” (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2009, p. 5) (Canada)

- “Content (that) does not arise out of a single cultural base but engages with global plurality in terms of sources of knowledge . . . encourages students to explore how knowledge is produced, distributed and utilized globally . . . helps students to develop an understanding of the global nature of scientific, economic, political, and cultural exchange” (Webb 2005, p. 111) and “develop[s] graduates who can call on a range of international perspectives in their lives as professionals and as citizens” (Leask, 2005, p. 119) (Australia)

- “It is actually the combination of international content, the international classroom setting and a strong emphasis on interactive and collaborative learning processes, which optimally enables the acquisitions of a wide range of skills, which are essential for work and life in an international and multicultural context” (Van der Wende 2000, p. 36) (Europe)

These examples speak to the connections between internationalization and globalization; the importance of integration (as opposed to adding on); and the need to focus on teaching and learning in addition to content. However, interpretations of internationalization have depended largely on local settings, so that “what may at first appear to be similar policies may end up being quite different practices” (Lee, 2000, p. 329). Indeed, in the last 20 years in the United States, internationalization of the curriculum largely has focused on the development of intercultural skills through the outbound mobility of students (study abroad). Many European countries have focused on outbound mobility within Europe (see, e.g., Teichler 2004, p. 7), while in Australia, Japan, and the United Kingdom, international student recruitment has been both a driver and a resource for internationalization of the curriculum. Much can be learned about the internationalization of the curriculum, therefore, by studying examples from across the world, with the caveat that first-world representations of the subject in journal articles and conference papers tell only part of the story.

In 1997, Knight observed that “internationalization means different things to different people, and as a result there is a great diversity of interpretations attributed to the concept” (p. 5). The same can be said for internationalization of the curriculum. The discussion in this chapter takes place within this context. Internationalizing the curriculum is both a concept and a process and will continue to be dynamic and challenging.

Critiques

Internationalization of the curriculum has not been without its critics. One area of critique has focused on the hegemony of Western perspectives and the export/import of Western conceptions of...
of higher education and internationalization. Goodman (1984) argued that the dominance of Western educational models defines “what is knowledge and who is qualified to understand and apply that knowledge” (p. 13), who is expert in what, and who can claim privilege, prestige, and elite status. Ashwill (2011) has written that using international exchange to remake “other societie\h the United States’ image is not only technically and misguided; it is also delusional,” while feminist scholars in the United States have warned against reproducing colonial relationships when incorporating non-U.S. materials into comparative Women’s Studies courses, arguing that “the use of truly international perspectives in women’s studies courses should fundamentally reframe the classroom” (McDermott, 1998, p. 90). Mok (2007), writing on the internationalization of universities in Asia, cautioned against simply copying Western policies and practices, lest Asian states “fall into traps of internationalization” (p. 438). African scholars have voiced similar concerns: Having been disconnected from their earlier African identities by colonization and structural adjustment policies, universities in Africa need to respond to globalization and internationalization by changing internally so that they can both meet African needs and contribute to world knowledge (Mthembu, 2004; Teshuhani & Kishun, 2004). Soudien (2005) suggests that this requires that Africans make critical decisions about how much or how little of that which we imagine to be distinctly ours, whatever that might be, we wish to have at the core of the education our children ought to receive; or, alternately, how strongly we wish them to be assimilated into that which has become the dominant culture. (p. 502)

These comments highlight the tensions between the local and the global, and the less developed South and the more developed North, in today’s world. These tensions are frequently overlooked but extremely important, in the process of internationalizing the curriculum. There is also an underlying ethical question for developed countries: how to ensure that, while pursuing their own internationalization agendas, others are given the opportunity to make critical decisions about what internationalization means for them, both in the short and long term. For example, countries in Latin America and the Caribbean will need to seek a balance between exchanges with higher education institutions in the developed world and “ties to Latin American and Caribbean neighbors” (Gazzola & Didriksson, 2008, p. 182) in their internationalization efforts. Other criticisms of internationalization of the curriculum have focused on reach and impact. Mestenhauser (1998) argued that internationalization of the curriculum in the United States had been narrowly focused on projects and programs designed to train a few students as future international affairs specialists, completely ignoring the need to prepare all graduates to work in an interconnected world no matter their profession. He also argued that those involved in internationalization of the curriculum had not sufficiently challenged the nature of the curriculum or the paradigms on which it is based (p. 21). Harari (1992) pointed out that where international studies programs did exist, their impact was “often limited to a rather small number of students with limited repercussions on the much larger pool of students attending the institution involved” (p. 57). Furthermore, despite some successful efforts to internationalize curricula in the United States, “at a national level [the U.S. remains] somewhat parochial, and monolingual, if not monocultural” (p. 56). Mestenhauser (1998) also criticized student mobility as a vehicle for internationalizing the curriculum, arguing that this does not impact faculty practice and, therefore, fails to impact teaching and learning. Indeed, in 1991, Goodwin and Nacht reported that internationalizing the curriculum was less a priority in internationalization efforts than different kinds of mobility (see also Van der Wende, 1997, p. 54). These arguments, as discussed later in this chapter, have led to calls for a more comprehensive approach to internationalization (see Chapter 4, this volume, for further discussion of this approach).

It has also been argued that the use of English as the main language of instruction in international education today contributes to the continued dominance of Western knowledge, has resulted in a decline in the status of national languages, and works against internationalization of the curriculum (Pennycook, 1994). Critics of approaches in the United Kingdom and Australia have focused on an overemphasis on the recruitment of fee-paying international
students as a strategy for internationalization of
the curriculum, while comparatively small num-
bers of UK and Australian students develop
international perspectives by learning foreign
languages and studying abroad. The uneven
flow of students between the South and the
North is also criticized as a major contributor to
brain drain from the very countries that can
least afford it, especially if students remain in
the receiving country as migrants. Thus, poorer
sending countries lose, while wealthier receiving
countries benefit from both the home-country
government or aid agency funding that has sup-
ported the students and the subsequent intel-
lectual and economic contributions the students
make as graduates.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND
CURRICULUM CHANGE

A variety of approaches and strategies to creat-
ing less parochial and more international curri-
cula have emerged both across and within
nations and regions. The drivers for change have
varied, as have the responses. Both practical and
ethical issues have been raised.

In the United States after World War II, an
emergency to add elements to the curriculum that
would assure greater knowledge of the world
was felt at national and institutional levels
(Larsen & Dutschke, 2010). The specter of
Soviet domination in science and technology led
to the National Defense Education Act of 1958,
which in addition to providing funding for
improvements in these areas in higher educa-
tion, also led to the establishment of area studies
centers at universities and to graduate student
fellows for language and area studies. Subsequently, in 1972, an undergraduate interna-
tional studies program provided support for
area studies and language study at this level. The
area studies approach to curriculum interna-
tionalization has been criticized. Area studies
have been associated with cold war ideologies
and the use of knowledge to gain advantage and
domination over other countries. Many area
studies programs lack the theoretical underpinn-
ings associated with the social sciences, and
cultural differences are looked at objectively and
scientifically (Kulacki, 2000). Thematic studies
are given preference over interdisciplinary
approaches to problems and issues, and, with
globalization, the increasing emergence of trans-
national issues call into question conventional
conceptions of “areas.” In addition, U.S. gradu-
ates of area studies programs have more often
joined the professoriate than business and gov-
ernment. As Szanton (2004) points out, how-
ever, “the context of area studies has changed
dramatically since the 1940s and 1950s” (p. 30).
In dialogue with scholars in the regions of study,
area studies have become more critical and
much less prone to serving national interests
and in at least some cases, allow for a “deeper
comparative understandings of U.S. society and
culture” (Szanton, 2004, p. 30).

In other nations and regions, World War II
also resulted in a broadening of the curriculum
to develop open mindsets, international and
cross-cultural skills, and understanding in the
next generation of leaders and citizens of the
world. By the 1990s, however, it was clear that
the strategies were reaching only a small portion
of students. Organizations such as the American
Council on Education (ACE) called for the
extension of internationalization to subject
areas not traditionally associated with interna-
tionalization (ACE, 1995). However, a 2002 ACE
report showed that only 8% of American under-
graduates had studied a foreign language, and
only 14% had taken four or more credit hours of
instruction with significant international con-
tent (Engberg & Green, 2002). Furthermore,
although in 2008 more U.S. college and univer-
sity mission statements referred to international
or global education and faculty enjoyed more
opportunities to gain international experience,
curricular evidence for internationalization
appeared to decline (ACE, 2008).

Since the turn of the 21st century, there has
been a growing recognition across global higher
education that significant changes in the way
the curriculum is conceived and delivered are
required if all students are to develop interna-
tional and intercultural perspectives. Leak
(2008) argues that internationalization of the
curriculum requires innovation based on

an understanding of the way in which discipline
knowledge and professional practice are
culturally constructed... active engagement with
the diversity of cultures existing within
classrooms, countries, communities and
institutions... the development of intercultural
understanding in all students and all staff, the
ability to see professional issues from a variety of national and cultural perspectives and... new curriculum content and teaching and learning processes. (p. 23)

Increasing the volume of student mobility, inbound or outbound, will not significantly influence learning outcomes for the majority of students. In response, some have argued that "internationalised curricula are the only way to equip all students for their roles in this world" (Beelen, 2007, p. 4). However, faculty members are not equally equipped to help with this work, nor equally willing.

Internationalization at home (IaH) emerged as a concept in a 2001 position paper published by the European Association of International Educators (Crowther et al., 2001) in recognition of the limitations of student mobility as a vehicle for internationalization. This led to formation of a special interest group and a 2003 edition of the Journal of Studies in International Education devoted to the topic. IaH asks that all students develop international competences through internationalized curricula and opportunities for learning beyond the campus, including through student mobility (Wächter, 2003; see also Knight, 2004). In the same period, the importance of the curriculum to Australian higher education internationalization efforts was recognized, resulting in 2005 in the formation of a special interest group on internationalization of the curriculum (IoC) within the newly formed International Education Association of Australia. In the United States, educational associations such as the ACE began a push toward comprehensive internationalization; more recently, NAFAE: Association of International Educators also championed the movement.

A key objective in IaH, IoC, and comprehensive internationalization is to increase the management of faculty members in its conceptualization and implementation, as faculty members are key to internationalizing the curriculum and student learning (Laska & Beelen, 2009). We need to focus on faculty development, awards, and recognition to internationalize the curriculum is a recurring theme (Brewer & Cunningham, 2010, pp. 209–221; Peterson, 2006; Stohl, 2007).

The most cited definitions of internationalization link the development of intercultural skills and attitudes to internationalization of the curriculum (see, for example, Knight, 2004). A recent literature review on educators’ preparation to internationalize the curriculum looks at educators’ ability to prepare students “for life in plural societies” by teaching for intercultural competence and world-mindedness (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2007, p. 181). Drawing on studies undertaken in a number of countries, the review concludes that there is little evidence that educators’ own intercultural competence and world-mindedness translates into classroom practice; it suggests that targeted interventions to help educators do so may be productive. This resonates with the ACE’s At Home in the World Initiative: Educating for Global Connections and Local Commitments (2007), which asks higher education in the United States to consider issues and commonalities around domestic diversity and internationalization. (See also Chapter 17, this volume.) The Shared Futures project of the American Association of College and Universities (AAC&U) similarly focuses on building a network of educators to facilitate “curricular change and faculty development” so that graduates will be able to both thrive in an “interdependent but unequal world” and “remedy its inequities” (AAC&U, n.d.).

The 1990s also saw institutions across the world focusing on the concept of “graduate attributes or qualities” (learning outcomes in the United States). Hough (1991) proposed that a concern for the common good be one of the criteria for educational excellence. To this end, he argued that universities needed to become more outward looking and community-focused and to foster interdisciplinary discourse that might transcend “individualism, nationalism, and anthropocentrism” as the “the larger issues of the common good are transnational” (p. 117). Such views resonate with approaches to internationalization focused on the development of intercultural and international perspectives as elements of graduate attributes. Those listed on university websites in Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States include the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for the exercise of citizenship in a globalized world. Considerations around political and economic integration on both a regional and a global scale have often motivated efforts to internationalize the curriculum.
Strategies for Internationalizing the Curriculum

Efforts by higher educational institutions to internationalize the curriculum take place at system-wide, institutional, departmental, and individual course levels. Governments, educational associations, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) also seek to help internationalize higher education. The varied approaches are highly context-dependent and involve challenges such as building faculty capacity to design and deliver an internationalized curriculum, providing access to an internationalized curriculum to all students, ensuring that students’ international experiences (study abroad, internships, service learning) result in internationalized learning outcomes and are integrated back into the classroom, and linking institutional mission and policy to the curriculum. This section discusses specific strategies, related issues, and challenges.

International Faculty

The recruitment of faculty from diverse national, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds is one strategy to internationalize the curriculum. However, recruitment on its own is unlikely to be sufficient. Whitsed and Volet (2011) and Whitsed and Wright (2011) examined the role and place of adjunct foreign English-language teachers in the Japanese higher education sector in the context of internationalization or kokusai. They found that while such teachers may seem ideally placed to encourage the development of domestic Japanese students’ intercultural and global competencies, at the institutional level, the teachers are marginalized and face a “culture of indifference.” Moreover, receiving no professional development and guidance, the teachers’ understanding of the internationalization to which they are meant to contribute is limited and highly subjective. Their impact on the university and its curriculum is thus limited at best. These studies make clear that importing faculty will help internationalize the curriculum only if expectations for the faculty are clear, they are integrated into the work of the larger institution, and they have professional development opportunities. The strategy must also be monitored and evaluated.

Faculty Development

Faculty are central to internationalizing the curriculum, yet engaging faculty in this work can be challenging (Childress, 2010; Clifford, 2009; Leask, 2003, 2008; Leask & Beelen, 2009; Sanderson, 2008; Webb, 2005). The range of skills, knowledge, and attitudes required to internationalize the curriculum are many and varied (Deardorff, 2011; Farkas-Teekens, 1997; Sanderson, 2008). Furthermore, the educational reform involved in internationalizing the curriculum requires thinking differently about the universality of knowledge (Mestenhauser, 1998, p. 21) as well as recognizing—and, ideally, critically analyzing—the connections between culture, knowledge, and professional practice. The beliefs and perceptions of faculty are culturally influenced, and the process of change can, therefore, be personally and professionally challenging.

Faculty development is critical to enabling faculty members to do this work. To start, they need the opportunity to engage in activities that will stimulate reflection on their own cultural identity, provide them with examples of curricular internationalization, and encourage them to experiment in their teaching. Eventually, they will need to undertake a meta-analysis of the curriculum and to view it from an interdisciplinary and integrative stance. Ultimately, to be effective, faculty development must be based on “faculty ownership, choice, and support,” integrated with “other internationalization strategies,” and it must reach an ever-expanding “circle of engaged faculty” (Green & Olson, 2003, p. 78). (See Chapter 15, this volume, for further discussion on the internationalization of teaching.)

One approach to faculty development around curriculum internationalization is to assume that faculty will learn from the experiences of international and returned study abroad students (Pickert & Turlington, 1992). Another is to allow faculty to study abroad themselves by traveling abroad individually or in groups (Peterson, 2000, pp. 3–4). Faculty development may also take place in seminars or workshops aimed at enabling faculty to “re-vision” what they know (Winston, 2001, p. 69), gain new content knowledge, and “test new pedagogical approaches encouraging experiential and intercultural learning” (Brewer & Cunningham, 2010, p. 215). International teaching collaborations;
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residencies at a university or other institution abroad for the purposes of teaching, research, or collaboration; and travel abroad with students as part of a course or study abroad program are also commonly cited development activities. Ultimately, however, the success of faculty development in support of curriculum internationalization rests on its being an assessed part of a broader strategy, rather than a series of isolated and ad hoc activities with unmeasured outcomes. Box 14.1 discusses a conceptual framework for faculty development for internationalization of the business curriculum in Australia.

**BOX 14.1 A Conceptual Framework to Help Faculty Internationalize the Business Curriculum.**

*Mark Freeman, Lesley Treleaven, and Chris Sykes*

Project Team, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Sydney (Australia)

*Lyn Simpson and Simon Ridings*

Project Team, Faculty of Business, Queensland University of Technology (Australia)

*Betty Leask*

University of South Australia (Australia)

*Prem Ramburuth*

Project Team, Australian School of Business, University of New South Wales (Australia)

There are three core components of this framework: communities of practice; curriculum, policies, and procedures; and resources and tools. The identification of relevant communities of practice and work within and by them is central to the framework and provides a useful alternative to customary approaches to supporting curriculum internationalization. The latter tend to provide tips and tricks and workshops for managing cultural diversity or internationalizing one aspect of a program in isolation. Such approaches encourage a view of internationalization of the curriculum as a disconnected set of activities.

Communities of practice (see Lave & Wenger, 1991) are groups of faculty and other staff who have a shared commitment to and understanding of internationalization. They are the champions who collectively are motivated, committed, and ready to take action to encourage and enact change. Sharing reflective practice and generating new knowledge open up and support possibilities for change. The communities may include individuals responsible for academic content across degree programs, course teams, student reference groups, and peer mentoring facilitators.

Policies, procedures, and curriculum can initiate or further systematic change. For example, a university or faculty policy may require the development of a graduate attribute such as intercultural competence. If embedded in procedures for approving new courses or programs, intercultural competence will be given attention in intended learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment, and assessment criteria. Alignment of these components is as important as the policy that drives it and the curriculum content that surrounds and supports it. This alignment includes the development of specific assessment criteria for self-assessment and tutor marking of each assessment task. Curriculum-mapping graduate attributes across a program facilitates the

(Continued)
embedding of these attributes throughout the degree. The informal curriculum is also integral to supporting the development of intercultural competence as a part of the student experience, for example, in training to be a cultural peer mentor or mentee.

Resources and tools provide new materials for embedding into learning and teaching new ways of using materials, both in a system-wide approach and in particular curricula. These might include resources faculty can use to assist students to work in multicultural teams or to design, manage, and assess multicultural group work. Tools might include mapping the integration of internationalized learning outcomes across a program using a taxonomy of intercultural competence.

This framework connects faculty with the core activity of curriculum internationalization and focuses that activity on embedding internationalized learning outcomes for all students within the context of the complete program of study.


International Student Enrollments

Recruiting degree-seeking or exchange students to increase the cultural diversity of the campus student body has been a strategy to internationalize the curriculum in a number of European countries as well as in Japan, Australia, and the United States. However, there is little evidence to suggest that cultural diversity on campus results in, or even contributes positively toward, the development of intercultural or international perspectives in either faculty or home-campus students (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Leask, 2005; Wächter, 2003). Two examples illustrate the challenges.

Huang (2006) reports that Japanese higher education internationalization reforms focused mainly on the importation of "Western ideas and practices" (p. 104) until the 1980s, when policies shifted to the importation of students from other countries in response to globalization and the declining number of university-age Japanese. In addition, in the 1990s, Japanese students were given greater push to learn foreign languages and study abroad. By 2003, Japan had surpassed its 2002 goal of enrolling 100,000 international students. University curricula included Japanese language programs as well as courses in English specifically designed for international students, but these were eventually opened to Japanese students. The curriculum for Japanese students included more international perspectives (p. 113), with private universities particularly creative in their approach (p. 114). Nonetheless, Japan has had difficulty creating educational programs attractive to both domestic and foreign students (p. 116), and the impact of international students on the international education of Japanese students has been weaker than desired.

In Australia, for many years, the recruitment of fee-paying international students was seen as a strategy to increase contact and positive intercultural experiences for domestic students and their international peers. This was rarely the case (Leask & Carroll, 2011), however, and institutions then tried to improve the international learning outcomes of domestic students. Leask (2001, 2009) describes strategies within both the formal and the informal curriculum, which have improved the international learning outcomes of all students at one Australian university. By internationalizing the informal or co-curriculum, universities can ensure that international students and domestic students, including those from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, learn from each other as part of the experience outside the classroom. International and domestic students beyond the first year of study work in pairs as mentors to mixed culture groups of first-year students. Longitudinal program evaluation has demonstrated increased levels of intercultural engagement on campus, and those involved report greater willingness to be involved in intercultural activities in class (Leask, 2010, p. 13).
Even slight, but strategic modifications made to an existing scheme resulted in significant benefits.

Ultimately, international students can help internationalize the curriculum. This requires, however, an intentional approach to incorporating their perspectives and experiences into the classroom as well as in the life of students outside the classroom. Box 14.2 contains such an example.

**BOX 14.2 An International Experience "At Home" for Education Students in Amsterdam**

*Ios Beelen*

Consultant, Center for Applied Research on Economics and Management, University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands)

The School of Education at Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences, hosts an annual student conference as part of its Internationalisation at Home strategy.

"Teacher in Europe is a 3-day conference for students in teacher education. The event is attended by about 50 Dutch and international students, all of whom are studying to be teachers at home or in the Netherlands. The participating students, all of whom are studying in the Netherlands, typically come from more than 10 European countries. One third to one half are Dutch. The language of communication is English.

All come to the conference with the same background information. Students and coaches participate in preparatory online training, including orientation to internationalization and globalization, European educational programs (such as Comenius), and project management. The training also introduces educational and project terminology in (international) English, necessary because most participants have English as a second (or third) language.

The conference starts with a keynote talk, followed by an ice-breaker activity. Students then work in multicountry groups to develop a proposal for an international project for a secondary school. They explore different European educational systems as part of this process while being coached by former participants as well as Dutch and other European educators, who find the activity contributes to the development of their international perspectives. The dinner for coaches and speakers has become a popular tradition.

Short plenary instruction lectures focus on handling project management, budgeting, and making a convincing PowerPoint presentation. Halfway through the conference, the groups present their preliminary proposal to the coaches. At the end, they give PowerPoint presentations and receive feedback from coaches, other specialists, and the students.

The conference is a pressure cooker. The students meet for the first time at the conference and start working together almost immediately. Many students are unfamiliar with project-based work or the task of distinguishing aims, goals, and objectives. In addition, they have to use a second language to communicate with students from quite diverse educational traditions.

Financing by the European Platform for Dutch Education supports good quality catering, facilities, and hotel rooms. Students appreciate this professional atmosphere and feel challenged to perform well.

After the conference, they upload a personal evaluation report to a Moodle-based platform, which they can also use to stay in touch. Teacher in Europe is an intensive international experience for both students and coaches.
Study Abroad

The term *study abroad* is generally understood as credit-bearing undergraduate study in another country incorporated into degree studies at the home university. The form of study abroad varies and includes enrollment in universities abroad as fee-paying or exchange students, courses taught by a faculty member from the home institution who accompanies the students abroad, courses designed for study abroad students by educational organizations, and combinations of these. Exchanges are the dominant form of study abroad in many parts of the world, although in the United States, study abroad has increasingly taken the form of programs designed specifically for study abroad students. These programs may not have any connection to universities in the countries in which they take place. With long historical antecedents, formal study abroad is generally said to have emerged in the United States in the early 20th century, when eight students from Delaware College spent their junior year in France.

Engle and Engle (2003) distinguish between "culture-based" study abroad and "knowledge-transfer" (p. 4) study abroad, the latter often involving science and information exchange. Knowledge transfer may have been a goal from the beginning of modern study abroad (Gore, 2005). However, into the 1980s, students could find it difficult to earn credit toward the major in disciplines outside those traditionally associated with study abroad such as language, literature, history, and area studies (see Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Pickert & Burlington, 1992). Nevertheless, the potential of study abroad to internationalize the curriculum was being acknowledged. In the 1990s, President Peter McPherson of Michigan State University made a bold move to massively increase study abroad to reshape the university's curriculum.

Within the European Higher Education Area, the Bologna Process has aimed to "ensure more comparable, compatible, and coherent systems of higher education in Europe" (The Official Bologna Process website, http://www.chea.info). Forty-seven countries are participating in the process, and the model has been made available to other countries and world regions. The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System has greatly increased study abroad on the part of European students by easing recognition of credit earned at other European universities. Offering curricula in a major European language has also been a strategy to overcome barriers to mobility when the host-country language is less commonly known. Credit transfer has also been vital to increasing study abroad enrollments in the United States, as well as providing access across the disciplines, although the decentralization of U.S. education makes this an institutional and organizational effort rather than governmental. In the 1990s, the University of Minnesota embarked on an initiative to assure that study abroad would be possible across the institution. Academic departments were asked to identify study abroad courses that could earn credit toward their majors (see Paige, 2003; University of Minnesota, 2011). Other U.S. institutions have since adapted the Minnesota model to their needs, resources, and institutional cultures (Van Deusen, 2007). ACE and NAFSA have also promoted study abroad integration. Articulation agreements allowing students to earn dual degrees at two different institutions are increasing; the partner universities identify courses of study that will integrate well with each other. (See Chapter 10, this volume, for more on this topic.)

Earning credit for study abroad is one way for students to integrate study abroad into their education. However, knowledge transfer is no longer the only goal of study abroad; another goal is cultural learning as preparation for living and working in today's globalized world. Yet simply studying in another country may not advance intercultural learning. Furthermore, knowledge transfer rests on the ability of students to successfully negotiate the host institutions' educational systems. Two different, but not incompatible approaches to yielding more robust learning outcomes are to provide interventions before, during, and after the study abroad experience for participating students (see, e.g., Deardorff, 2008; Engle & Engle, 2002; Savicki, 2008; Vande Berg, 2007), and to modify the home-campus curriculum to better equip students for study abroad as well as integrate it into their ongoing studies upon return (see Brewer & Cunningham, 2010). Research on intercultural development suggests that gains are greater during study abroad when interventions (experiential learning, structured reflection, opportunities to engage with host nationals) are provided (Paige & Goode, 2009; Vande Berg, 2007).
Study-abroad students frequently report that most of their learning takes place outside the classroom; scholarship supports this view. Increasingly, therefore, higher education is aiming to teach students how to learn both in and outside the classroom. The Bologna Process, to take one example, is now focusing on “the teaching mission of higher education institutions and the necessity for ongoing curricular reform geared toward the development of learning outcomes” and asking “higher education institutions to pay particular attention to improving the teaching quality of their study programmes at all levels” (European Higher Education Area, n.d.; Labi, 2011). Hong Kong has recently moved from a 3-year university education model to a 4-year model, in part to make study abroad possible for more students but also to introduce general education and encourage more service learning; these can lead to lifelong learning and contributions to society. This supports the notion that for study abroad to help internationalize the curriculum, students must be prepared and assisted to take advantage of the learning opportunities both in and outside the classroom.

Other efforts to use study abroad to internationalize the curriculum focus on the role of faculty. Faculty members who accompany students abroad to teach them on-site claim that this helps them incorporate content from other places into their teaching while also giving them insight into the cultural dimensions involved in locating teaching and learning abroad. Professional schools are creating opportunities for students to spend a portion of their studies abroad; nursing and medical students, for example, are undertaking rotations in other countries. Yet another possibility is for the faculty to remain at home but supervise students’ work abroad (see, e.g., Brown University, 2010; Youd, 2010). Technology can bring study abroad students into the classroom on the home campus; Skype and blogging enable study abroad students to report from their host sites on topics under discussion on the home campus (Ellett, 2010). Electronic course management systems and video conferencing enable faculty members in different countries to collaborate in their teaching by connecting their classrooms (Ellett, Kiuwu, & Roberts, 2009). However, these activities can be difficult to undertake if institutions are unable or unwilling to invest in the technology to support them, or if they do not value this kind activity as part of faculty members’ responsibilities. Another challenge is that faculty may not feel comfortable taking on the role of integrating study abroad into their teaching, or that study abroad may be seen as falling under the responsibility of an administrative unit, not the faculty (Brewer & Cunningham, 2010, p. xv). Nevertheless, examples of faculty engagement with study abroad are emerging and have been fostered by engagement with such initiatives as the ACE’s Internationalization Collaborative (see Brewer & Cunningham, 2010). Foundations such as the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation as well as disciplinary organizations are seeking to support such efforts.

What is the evidence that study abroad impacts the curriculum? Credit transfer is one measure used to analyze the impact on a variety of levels, ranging from an individual student’s studies to departmental, institutional, system, and national levels. However, credit transfer does not get at the larger questions of learning outcomes, and therefore, increasingly there are attempts to set learning goals for study abroad and to measure their outcomes (see Chapters 10 and 16, this volume, for further discussion). More than 100 different assessment tools have been developed to assess aspects of intercultural and global learning (Deardorff, 2009). Beyond pre-post measures, assessment efforts include gathering information about students’ activities post-study abroad, such as changes in grade point average, senior theses related to the study abroad experience, presentations, civic engagement, and post-undergraduate study and careers. Another method is to embed assessment into course assignments as well as post-study abroad reflection essays. The outcomes of study abroad are also being made visible to wider audiences: Student writing about study abroad is sometimes attached to college and university websites, as are digital films about the study abroad experience. Other forms of visible assessment include public presentations, exhibits, and symposia devoted to learning that takes place abroad (Berzon, n.d.).

Ultimately, study abroad can serve as a vehicle for internationalizing the curriculum, but only if study abroad is approached intentionally and faculty are prepared to facilitate the integration of the study abroad experience into the curriculum. Furthermore, action is necessary
not only at the individual student and faculty member level, but also at departmental and institutional levels, and, where educational systems permit, governmental levels.

**Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Approaches**

Examples of curriculum internationalization could be drawn from most if not all disciplinary and interdisciplinary fields of study. This section focuses on examples of initiatives in mathematics, political science, science, and nursing rather than the fields traditionally associated with internationalization (modern languages, area studies, and international studies/relations). However, all fields of study will benefit from continuing innovation as internationalization evolves.

Applebaum, Friedler, Ortiz, and Wolff (2009) argue that as mathematics is shaped by culture, the mathematics curriculum should be internationalized, especially cultural aspects of mathematics, mathematical modeling, and math history. Furthermore, mathematics students should study abroad to gain the cultural knowledge they will need to collaborate successfully and internationally, and capstones should incorporate cultural issues. At Arcadia University, the authors are internationalizing mathematics course by course, with the goal of ultimately internationalizing them all.

Carter (2008) argues that it is critical to develop a new science curriculum that includes content focused on the way in which globalization has resulted in the uneven distribution of science while privileging Western scientists, science, and technology. In addition, the curriculum should acknowledge that commercial interests and the privatization of knowledge have virtually eliminated purely curiosity-driven science. One of the unintended consequences of globalization has been “fewer nations, and fewer individuals, working on more narrowly defined problems of Western science, controlled by a limited number of economically related interests” (p. 625), and this has had a negative impact on many peoples of the world and the environment. Thus, an internationalized curriculum in science would be suited to the needs of socially, culturally, and ethnically diverse learners and would employ problem-based methodologies that prepare students to be flexible, adaptive, and reflexive problem solvers who can conduct community-based as well as industry-based investigations and who “respect the great diversity, both natural and cultural of our planet” (p. 629).

Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER), initiated by the National Science Foundation in the United States in 2001, seeks to “improve STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) education by connecting learning to critical civic questions” (http://www.sencer.net/). SENCER is now the signature program of the National Center for Science and Civic Education at Harrisburg University of Science and Technology, Pennsylvania, and focuses on faculty development and education reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. SENCER model courses focus on civic issues important to students’ futures and draw on research about how people learn. A number of the model courses posted on the SENCER website (http://www.sencer.net/) have explicit global themes or address social justice issues relevant to both local and international contexts. Another approach to internationalizing science curricula comes from the University of Saskatchewan in Canada, where transformative pedagogies were used in the internationalization of two global health courses with the aim of increasing the “potential for social transformation” (Hanson, 2010).

Sandstrom (1998) looks at the internationalization of the nursing curriculum in Sweden. She argues that education can and should create the conditions necessary for health, peace and harmony, and human rights in every society and that nurses and midwives can make a valuable contribution to the promotion, preservation, and maintenance of these conditions (Sandstrom 1998, p. 146). Thus, the learning outcomes of an internationalized curriculum in nursing should include:

- The ability to cooperate and collaborate in joint efforts across national and cultural boundaries
- Intercultural communicative competence required for provision of professional health care to patients from diverse cultural backgrounds
- The ability to obtain and utilize ideas and experiences from different parts of the world
- The ability to function within the healthcare organizations of the future
The achievement of such outcomes requires systematic, sustained efforts across the entire curriculum, rather than isolated, uncoordinated, and ad hoc efforts. These discipline-specific examples highlight the diversity of approaches to internationalization of the curriculum. Common features include a focus on ethics to secure the future of the world and its peoples, with the approach varying by discipline. However, instrumental approaches also exist, where the intention may be to develop international perspectives and intercultural competencies to achieve benefit for the individual rather than the larger society.

**Challenges: Enacting Institutional Policy or Mission Through the Curriculum**

College and university mission statements around the world include internationalization, international learning outcomes, and preparation of graduates for work and citizenship. However, mission does not always result in curriculum planning and enactment, even though “internationalization is ideally completely integrated in the regular curriculum” (van Gaalen, 2010, p. 36). The European Association of International Education provides seven questions to ensure that mission translates into curriculum internationalization, for example: To what extent do curricular goals explicitly mention international knowledge and skills? How much does the curriculum improve the international competencies of all students? How is the curriculum aligned with workplaces outside of the home country? And What supports are available for faculty to internationalize their teaching (van Gaalen, 2010, p. 37)?

Internationalization of the curriculum can also be “front-loaded” by requiring faculty to indicate in course planning and approval documents how course objectives, teaching, and learning will be internationalized and assessed. This approach is often linked with the development of a set of graduate attributes related to internationalization and “soft” skills such as cross-cultural communication and the ability to work in multicultural teams (see Leask, 2001).

Despite these examples, powerful deterrents to internationalizing the curriculum also exist (see e.g., Childress, 2010; Clifford, 2009). Childress (2010) provides detailed case studies of how two very different U.S. universities, Duke University and the University of Richmond, have worked to address the blockers they faced by working strategically to engage faculty with curricular change (see Box 14.3). Box 14.4 gives an example from Australia.

---

**BOX 14.3 The Faculty Role in Internationalizing the Curriculum: Findings from a Cross-Case Study**

Lisa Childress
LKC Consulting (USA)

To develop global competencies for students, internationalization of the curriculum has become a priority for many higher education institutions. This is increasingly important as the majority of college students do not study abroad (Siaya & Hayward, 2003), although study abroad is a common vehicle for developing global competencies. A strategy to ensure that the majority of students are exposed to cross-cultural vantage points is therefore to provide faculty with the time and financial resources to internationalize their pedagogies and syllabi. At Duke University and the University of Richmond (Childress, 2010), supports such as faculty seminars, differential investments, strategic use of electronic communication channels, and the customization of internationalization
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goals to unique disciplines have encouraged faculty to internationalize their curricula and thus expose students to international vantage points.

**Faculty Seminars**

Seminars enhance the international expertise and experiences of faculty so that students can develop global competencies. At Duke, interdisciplinary, semester-long, on-campus seminars have provided teaching release time for faculty to discuss particular international topics with colleagues. Richmond's nationally recognized faculty seminar-abroad program allows faculty to gain interdisciplinary knowledge about a country for 3 weeks during the summer. In both cases, faculty have developed critical knowledge, networks, and motivation to internationalize their pedagogies and syllabi.

**Differential Investment**

Differential investment is the process of allocating special funds at various institutional levels for initiatives that promote strategic priorities. At Duke and Richmond, curriculum internationalization grants have encouraged faculty to develop new courses with international content and to infuse international perspectives into existing courses. For example, at Richmond, such grants allowed a law school professor to create an international intellectual property course and a psychology professor a cross-cultural psychopathology course. The proposal writing proved a productive way for applicants to engage with curriculum internationalization, even for those who did not receive funding.

**Strategic Use of Electronic Communication Channels**

Both Duke and Richmond have central international offices that take advantage of faculty members' frequent use of electronic media to (a) share international teaching resources with faculty and (b) collect information about faculty members' areas of international expertise and interests. At Duke, these include an international faculty database and international faculty blogs, while at Richmond, they include examples of internationalized syllabi and a faculty internationalization survey.

**Customizing Internationalization Goals to the Disciplines**

Customization emphasizes the importance of adapting an institution's internationalization goals to unique disciplinary priorities. With internationalization a priority in Duke's university-wide strategic plan, internationalization was also prioritized in schoolwide strategic plans. Customizing the plans to each school made connections between disciplinary priorities and internationalization explicit, thereby prompting faculty involvement.

**Recommendations**

Higher education leaders seeking to internationalize their curricula must ensure infrastructural supports enable the faculty to do the work. In addition to the points discussed above, the following may be useful:

1. Incorporation of global perspectives into tenure and promotion policies' definition of "excellence in teaching" can promote faculty engagement in curriculum internationalization.

2. Incorporation of deliverables, that is, internationalized syllabi, as requirements of participation in international faculty seminars and programs, builds in a structural mechanism to ensure that participation results in internationalized teaching.
Universities and colleges can strategically engage faculty to internationalize the curriculum using intentionality, investments, infrastructure, institutional networks, and individual support (Childress, 2010). That is, to internationalize the curriculum, higher education institutions should (a) intentionally articulate their goals for faculty involvement, (b) make long-term investments to provide resources to support faculty in these endeavors, (c) develop infrastructure to create foundational programmatic support, (d) streamline institutional networks so faculty are aware of international teaching opportunities and resources, and (e) provide support for individual faculty to connect international issues with their unique scholarly agendas.

**BOX 14.4 Identifying Gaps and Synergies to Achieve Institutional Vision in Relation to Internationalization at an Australian University**

Kay Salehi  
Academic development adviser, Swinburne University (Australia)

The Swinburne University 2015 Vision Statement states that university staff and students will be international in their outlook. This is connected to internationalization of the curriculum across the university and the preparation of all students for "performing professionally/socially in an international and multicultural context" (OECD, 1996). Achievement of the vision is thus related to the application of teaching and learning and support strategies that assist staff and students to develop these skills and attitudes. Many universities' vision statements claim similar intentions. Deceptively simple, the vision statements mask a range of complex interactions between individuals and departments, their conceptualization of the rationale behind the vision, and their responsibilities and accountabilities in relation to the vision's achievement.

A literature review undertaken in conjunction with a project to evaluate progress toward achievement of the Swinburne vision suggested that within the institution, there might be different rationales for internationalization as well as differing perspectives on how to approach the task and achieve the vision. As well, despite the possibility that synergies, groups and individuals might work separately, unaware of each other's efforts. For example, some staff might focus on the international marketing of programs and the university's international standing and reputation; others on locating alliances and new partnerships to increase study abroad, exchanges, and research linkages; and others on the quality of teaching and student learning outcomes. A challenge for institutional leaders, therefore, is to ensure that the efforts of various groups and individuals contribute efficiently to the achievement of institutional vision.

To identify the gaps and synergies between the international vision of the university and the perspectives of relevant staff, the project used Knight's 2004 five institutional rationales for internationalization (profile and reputation, student and staff development, income generation, strategic alliances, and knowledge generation) and combined these with Leask's 2003 five layers of internationalization (policy, program, course, teacher/academic, and student). A conceptual matrix was developed and provided a valuable prompt and framework for discussion with institutional leaders.
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Institutional leaders shared their thoughts and perspectives in relation to each of Leask’s layers and Knight’s rationales. This provided them with new ways to both conceptualize their role within the university’s internationalization agenda and to think about how their work might relate to and impact the work done by colleagues working in other areas. Informal discussions provided opportunities for leaders in different areas of the university to both confirm and reconceptualize their own and others’ roles and identify synergies and possible areas of contradiction. Potential gaps and opportunities were also identified.

For example, the research and knowledge area was expected to promote international research linkages, while the marketing/reputation area was concerned with promoting the university’s reputation to attract high-caliber scholars and staff. However, the staff and student development area was expected to help staff and students take advantage of international research opportunities. While such overlaps can be useful, they can also be wasteful and counterproductive. Knowing that they exist is the first step in being able to use the opportunities and reduce duplication of effort. Ultimately, research linkages can benefit (a) faculty seeking to internationalize the curriculum, (b) students hoping to add an international dimension to their studies and prepare for future employment, and (c) institutional leaders charged with supporting the institution in achieving its international mission and goals.

This process and the matrix that guided it may help other institutions determine how best to employ resources to internationalize the curriculum.

---

**Future Issues and Concluding Questions**

A number of practical, philosophical, and ethical considerations emerge from the discussion in this chapter:

- How can the experiential and intercultural learning outcomes considered crucial to the development of all students’ ability to live and work in a globalized world be developed and assessed within the context of a program of study?

- How can faculty members be engaged to internationalize the curriculum in their disciplines and in institutions and contexts where academic teaching and learning continue to be conceived of as separate from the development of students’ intercultural and international perspectives?

- How can universities ensure that the intersection of the international and intercultural in the curriculum will lead to “increased understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity and fusion” rather than “cultural homogenization”? (Knight, 2004, p. 28).

  - How can teaching within higher education become flexible so as to include different cultural perspectives on, and constructions of, knowledge to reflect the diversity within and beyond the educational institution? Also, how can knowledge from outside the academy help to internationalize the curriculum?

  - How can strategic, planned transformative encounters maximize the benefits of international education as well as ensure that we “become something more than we presently are” at the individual and institutional level (Sanderson, 2004, p. 9)?

  - Transformative encounters will result from internationalization only if difference is valued, if there is a genuine desire and willingness to engage with cultural others, and if support for faculty, staff, and students is adequate and appropriate (Thom, 2010). How can we best support faculty, staff, and students to acquire this value so that they adjust the way they think and act?
• **Productive diversity** treats diversity as a resource rather than an annoying problem to be overcome, thereby creating “new and diverse paths of learning” (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000, p.42). How will faculty engage with and learn from other cultures so that they can become intercultural educators and avoid the colonization of the mind and the non-negotiable domination of Western ways of doing and knowing described by Goodman (1984)?

• New technologies have made it far easier than in the past to access information from around the world as well as facilitate communication, and educators have been experimenting with ways to take advantage of these to internationalize the curriculum. Yet, access to new technologies is uneven, as is the ability of educators and students to use them effectively for teaching and learning. How will the use of technology to internationalize the curriculum evolve, both on the traditional campus and in distance learning? Will its use act as a mechanism to create greater equality between nations, or will it exacerbate disadvantage?

These and other questions highlight the complexity and rich potential of internationalization of the curriculum as both an established and an evolving concept and set of processes. Thus, this chapter concludes with lessons for those seeking to internationalize the curriculum in their institutions.

**CONCLUSION: EIGHT LESSONS**

Internationalization of college and university curricula is challenging but also imperative as a response to globalization; it must involve many actors. This chapter, therefore, concludes with eight lessons that have emerged from experience.

First, it is critical that institutions work to develop an internal understanding of what it means to internationalize the curriculum. The literature can help institutions develop definitions that respond to their missions in processes that will likely be iterative and should involve students, faculty, administrators, and institutional leaders. This is not the work of an individual or a single office or group.

Second, inventories of courses with international content can be a starting point for measuring the internationalization of the curriculum, but the lists need to be supplemented by information on degree requirements for specific courses of study (foreign language study, courses with international content, as well as data on study abroad participation). In addition, other kinds of courses may also be developing the knowledge and skills students need to succeed in an internationalized and globalized world. Thus, it is important to develop learning goals around internationalization, assessment tasks, and graduate attributes.

Third, collaborative effort within and beyond the institution is needed to advance internationalization of the curriculum. Within institutions, partnerships can be between and among individuals, academic departments, administrative offices, and student groups. Beyond the institution, productive partnerships can be built with local organizations, other institutions of higher education (within or beyond the country in which the institution is located), organizations working to help internationalize the curriculum, government agencies, and professional associations.

Fourth, faculty members are central, and their role must be recognized and valued, as they control the curriculum and must, therefore, take the lead in its internationalization. Thus, they must be given opportunities for reflection on what internationalization of the curriculum means for them personally as well as for their disciplines, their departments, their own teaching and scholarship, their students’ learning, and the institution. Financial resources can be helpful, but even in the absence of dedicated funding, much can be accomplished if faculty members are given the space in which to think about internationalization of the curriculum and take action. Curriculum internationalization must also be embedded in the institutional mission, curricular structure, and faculty responsibilities and compensation.

Fifth, the learning outcomes of an internationalized curriculum must be assessable and assessed. This provides evidence that the internationalization is taking place and that the institution is producing graduates able to succeed personally and professionally in an internationalized and globalized world. Faculty and institutional researchers can assist with this work; external organizations and researchers can also provide models.

Sixth, students have an important role to play in shaping as well as receiving an internationalized
education. They need to both understand their institutions’ goals in internationalizing the curriculum and identify their own goals within these. Developing meta-cognition will allow them to understand what they are learning and how, as well as identify and address the gaps in their knowledge and skills.

Seventh, while institutions and their leaders may want to justify internationalizing the curriculum as a means to compete nationally and internationally, they may want to balance that with recognition that internationalization can also lead to greater cooperation.

Finally, eighth, none of this will happen without adequate resourcing. What is clear from the past is that without adequate funding, employed strategically, we can claim much but achieve little.

Internationalization of the curriculum is a complex, multidimensional and iterative process. With learning and teaching at its heart, it requires collaboration and reflective practice. The past can provide valuable lessons, as can the experience of others working in other places toward similar goals.
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