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**Internationalizing Teacher Education: A Systemic Initiative**

The preparation of teachers in the U.S. has traditionally focused almost exclusively on developing understandings, skills, and attitudes appropriate for teaching in local schools. Yet, in no other time has the importance of global competence and intercultural understanding been greater. As Reimers (2009) asserted, “the educational paradox of the beginning of the twenty-first century lies in the disconnect between the superb institutional capacity of schools and their underperformance in preparing students to invent a future that appropriately addresses the global challenges and opportunities shared with fellow world citizens.” While the tremendous influence of globalization, the interconnectedness of economies, and the importance of intercultural communication have been clear for some time, too little attention has been given to the question of how to make curriculum more reflective of international dimensions and – concomitantly – how to insure that we have more internationally competent teachers.

 At the University of Maryland, we have had a commitment to enhance the international dimensions in our teacher education programs for several years. Supported by a new University of Maryland Strategic Plan (2008) that included both the recognition that internationalization/global education in general was vital to the future success of the University and the mandate for all programs to increase their emphasis in reaching internationalization goals through transformed courses, opportunities for study abroad, and other formal and informal experiences, our College of Education identified “Enhancing International Perspectives” as one of its four strategic priorities for the next decade.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the systemic approach to internationalization taken by the University of Maryland College of Education and to argue that this type of approach to internationalizing teacher education is necessary for the success of internationalization of education across the p-16 continuum. In this paper we describe how a modest initial experience, the GATE (Global Awareness in Teacher Education) Fellows program, which began in 2007 with grant support from the Longview Foundation (Koziol, Greenberg, and Imig, 2009), became the seed for a set of curricular, policy, and professional development experiences and an internal operating infrastructure to support this systemic approach to the internationalization of teacher education at the University of Maryland.

**Background and Review of the Literature**

The problems and challenges that we face today – global warming, religious and ethnic conflict, the maldistribution of wealth and opportunity, the decline of citizen interest and engagement in the political process, the increasing ineffectiveness of government, and the shift from an industrial to a knowledge-based society and from a national to a global economy – call for adaptive, creative solutions that will require a new kind of leadership… Future leaders will not only need to possess new knowledge and skills, but will also be called upon to display a high level of emotional and spiritual wisdom and maturity. (p. 1)

Although Astin and Astin’s (2000) words are more than a decade old, they accurately describe the need to educate a new generation of globally competent citizens. The events of the past eleven years have only heightened this need. In the United States, the terrorist attacks of September 11th brought the issue of internationalization to the forefront in American education. Comparing September 11 to the launching of Sputnik in 1957, the American Council on Education (ACE, 2002) stated that “the attacks of September 11 have brought America’s international preparedness to a crossroads. The global transformations of the last decade have created an unparalleled need in the United States for expanded international knowledge and skills” (p. 7).

**What is global competence?**

While it is clear that global competence must be a core educational goal in the 21st century, it is less clear what exactly global competence *is*. The recent report, *Educating for Global Competence: Preparing our Youth to Engage the World,* sponsored by the Asia Society and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), argued that to be globally competent, all students should be able to:

1. Investigate the world beyond their immediate environment, framing significant problems and conducting well-crafted and age-appropriate research.
2. Recognize perspectives, others’ and their own, articulating and explaining such perspectives thoughtfully and respectfully.
3. Communicate ideas effectively with diverse audiences, bridging geographic, linguistic, ideological, and cultural barriers.
4. Take action to improve conditions, viewing themselves as players in the world and participating reflectively.

(Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p.11)

Silimarly, Fernando Reimers, the Ford Foundation Professor of International Education at Harvard University Graduate School of Education, defined “global competency” as:

the knowledge and skills people need to understand today’s flat world and to integrate across disciplines so that they can comprehend global events and create possibilities to address them. Global competencies are also the attitudinal and ethical dispositions that make it possible to interact peacefully, respectfully, and productively with fellow human beings from diverse geographies. (Reimers 2009, p. 184)

Merry Merryfield (2008) likewise argued that students cannot be educated world citizens without learning about children, women, religious and ethnic minorities, immigrants and those with the least access to power. Merryfield pushed educators to strive for not just globally informed students but for what she calls “worldminded” students. According to Merryfield, in many societies people wear “blinders of ethnocentrism,” but to become worldminded, students need to overcome this singular perspective and develop an acceptance of different cultures, a concern with the world, an understanding of interconnectedness, and a value of world citizenship (Merryfield et al., 2008). Worldmindedness grows as individuals experience and appreciate views of others different than themselves; it becomes a habit when thinking about the effect of a decision on others – outside local or national boundaries – is routine (Merryfield et al., 2008).

 Similar to Merryfield, Reimers (2009) argued that good education has “clarity of purpose” and prepares students for life as citizens of their communities and of the world (p. 1). Good educators appreciate that the world is increasingly interconnected, so students require global skills, including knowledge of world geography, complex cultural literacy and world language skills, to understand these interdependencies (Green & Olson, 2006; Johnston & Spalding, 1997; Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Most educators understand that developing global competency is important and, at the same time, know that this development is not happening in many—probably most—schools (Reimers, 2009; Hicks, 2007).

**The role of schools in developing global competence**

Unfortunately, despite this clear need for education to focus on international and global competence, the U.S. education system has not responded accordingly. According to the Longview Foundation (2008):

Our education system is not preparing young people for this new reality. Recent education reform efforts have focused heavily on improving reading, math, and science education. These efforts, while important, cannot ensure that students will develop the knowledge of world regions and global issues, languages and cross-cultural skills, and values of citizenship and collaboration that are so important to living and working in an increasingly interdependent world. (p. 4)

While organizations such as the American Council on Education, the Longview Foundation, and even the U.S. Federal Government (e.g., The Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship, 2005) have all recognized the need for global competence, schools are not fostering this competence in students.

Despite good intentions, schools do not integrate global competency skills into the curriculum for a number of reasons, including lack of resources and an obsolete mindset (Reimers, 2009; Stearns, 2009). First, while individuals and schools may value developing global competency, when resources are tight money may first be allocated to more traditional priorities. Similarly, schools are more familiar with developing programs for traditional skills such as reading and math that are reflected in standards and assessment. Schools rely on what is comfortable and what they feel they have the skills to accomplish rather than on tackling new competencies, resulting in uneven change (Reimers, 2009; Stearns, 2009).

**A lack of globally competent teachers**

If schools are to become more global, teachers within those schools must have the knowledge and skills to engage in globally-oriented education. The role of teachers in fostering global competence is critical, and yet many teachers are not developing this competence themselves. Schneider (2003) conducted extensive research to determine both the existing international content and program practices for teacher education and the perceived needs for improvement. Among the 24 universities and colleges she studied, including 19 public universities and five private liberal arts and comprehensive colleges, she found that teacher education programs were generally very weak on international dimensions. While there has been some uneven starts to internationalizing teacher preparation programs, teacher preparation programs are often the least international programs on U.S. colleges and universities (Longview, 2008).

There are many reasons for the failure of teacher education programs to foster global competence in their students. The culture of teacher education has tended to be local, rooted in neighborhood schools, rather than global because teacher education programs focus on local and/or state requirements for certification. Additionally, course requirements and student teaching fill so much of a pre-service teacher’s undergraduate schedule that there is typically little to no room left for study abroad, language study or internationally-focused electives (Longview, 2008).

Unfortunately, the failure of our schools to respond to this growing international emphasis is a cyclical process. Students who do not develop global competence throughout their education grow up to be teachers who are not equipped to foster global competence in a new generation of students. As the Longview Foundation (2008) described, “The critical role of teachers in internationalizing P-12 education has never been clearer, yet today’s educators rarely begin their careers with the deep knowledge and robust skills necessary to bring the world into their classrooms” (p. 3).

**Internationalizing teacher education**

 Based on her research on international dimensions of teacher preparation, Schneider (2003) proposed a number of recommendations that cut across many aspects of pre-service teachers’ academic experience, including:

* reviewing and assessing the full range of campus resources for international exposure, and their accessibility, particularly for students in teacher education programs;
* providing training on international needs and students’ options for both faculty and professional advisors;
* fostering development of internationally oriented curriculum, through individual faculty grants, through workshops for both Arts and Sciences and Education faculty (together), and through the hiring of internationally-trained faculty; and
* reviewing policy and practice for the integration of study abroad in the curriculum, with respect to both general education and major field requirements.

Similarly, the American Council on Education (ACE) has argued for a comprehensive approach to internationalization, which involves “infusing an international or intercultural dimension into the teaching, learning, research, and service functions of higher education” (Olsen, Green & Hill, 2005, p. v). Olsen (2008) summarized recommendations from the range of studies and programs ACE has conducted, including:

* Combinations of well-crafted and supported faculty development options
* Faculty ownership, choice and support
* Faculty activities integrated with other internationalization strategies
* Strong sustained leadership combined with a constantly widening circle of engaged faculty
* Workshops on methods for infusing international content into the curriculum

While these recommendations can be implemented to a limited degree in pieces – i.e., as an additional course or as an added international experience, true internationalization is systematic and requires holistic curriculum transformation (Green & Schoenberg, 2006; Green & Olson, 2008; Johnson & Spalding, 1997; Stearns, 2009; Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Longview, 2008). True internationalization is not as easy as creating a new major or inserting readings or assignments into existing courses (Green & Olson, 2008). True internationalization requires new pedagogies, which could include experiential, service and collaborative learning (Green & Olson, 2008). Internationalizing teacher education is most effectively done when global awareness and developing international understanding and perspectives are built into the full fabric of educator preparation.

Internationalizing teacher preparation calls for a model of systemic change (Reigeluth, 1994; Duffy, 2009), an approach that emphasizes the necessity to envision reform as a system-wide priority. While traditional models of reform have often focused on piecemeal change that entailed modifying and studying parts of the whole system in isolation, systemic reform entails engaging in change that impacts the whole of the enterprise. It is comprehensive rather than fragmented. In teacher preparation program design, a systemic approach that fosters global competence requires taking into account the contributions and impact of the full set of studies and experiences in which prospective teachers engage as part of their overall curriculum. These experiences range from the general education requirements for their degrees and academic emphasis courses they take to fulfill subject area concentrations or majors, to the curriculum and pedagogy courses they take to learn about teaching and the focused clinical experiences they take to develop the skills and understandings they need to qualify for licensure as a teacher.

**Developing a Systemic Initiative for Internationalization**

What is called for is a far more systemic approach to organizational change, one that couples attention to leadership, vision, resources, and commitment with a strategy that eventually incorporates studies and experiences across the full range of academic, professional, and clinical experiences in a teacher preparation program. It is that understanding of organizational change that has stimulated and guided our efforts at the University of Maryland. The remainder of this paper builds on the above arguments for a systemic approach to internationalization by describing the ways in which the University of Maryland College of Education has implemented such an approach. While no program is a perfect example of internationalization, it is our hope that sharing our approach can illustrate how a university or college might move toward internationalization in a systemic fashion.

In line with the recommendations and guidelines for systemic change outlined by Adelman and Taylor (2007), the examples noted here reflect recommendations repeated in reviews, studies, and handbooks, which tell us that strong institutional leadership and expectations, faculty buy-in and development, and curriculum transformation are key ingredients of any effort to internationalize the teacher education program and any other component of a campus’ comprehensive offerings. Moreover, common in these recommendations is the understanding that isolated initiatives, no matter how good they may be, are unlikely to accomplish significant change or be sustainable.

**Stage 1: Leadership, Vision and Infrastructure Support**

 The first stage in internationalizing the teacher education program at the University of Maryland was the leadership, vision, and infrastructure support provided by the university-wide leadership (president, provost, and senate). This made global connections and international work a top priority for the whole campus. Increasing support for and recognition of international initiatives, especially through the University’s Office of International Programs, over the past five years sent a broad message to the university community that the campus leadership was raising expectations for international involvement. That vision and commitment became even clearer in the emphasis placed on global awareness and engagement in the University of Maryland Strategic Plan (2008). This Strategic Plan made a commitment that the “University of Maryland will be the public institution of choice for students, faculty, and staff committed to engagement in the global community.” Moreover, the University “will produce informed global citizens and skilled professionals prepared to engage in a global community in which the important issues of our times are international ones.” Among broad strategies for achieving that vision were commitments to: increase study abroad opportunities and expectations for students and international exchange opportunities for faculty, create additional or revise current courses to reflect a “global focus,” make revisions in the General Education requirements to support the development of cross-cultural competencies, and support academic programs in incorporating an international focus at the program level. In unequivocal ways, the campus leadership directed all units on campus to increase the international dimensions of research, curriculum, and student experiences in their programs.

 The policy changes at the University level created a supportive platform for the College of Education to focus more systematically on internationalization. A new College of Education leadership team strongly supported enhancement of international work highlighted in the campus plan and guided the College Senate and faculty in the reformulation of the College’s Strategic Plan (2009), which made internationalization one of four priorities. For at least the previous five years, the college had an ad hoc “Committee on International Education” which included a number of faculty with interests in international work but no clear agenda or leadership. To coordinate and stimulate efforts at internationalization, the Dean authorized the creation of a new College-wide Office of International Initiatives, with an experienced and respected director, formally designated space, and a small but formal line budget. The purpose of this new office was to coordinate and expand existing international initiatives (e.g. faculty international research and collaborations, study abroad, visiting scholars and international students), and to create new initiatives with a focus on internationalization. While the overall attention to global perspectives at the University level was important, creating the Office of International Initiatives and giving it the respect and authority that comes with a formal director, an office, and a budget was crucial in establishing a foundation of coherent leadership and infrastructure support for the professional development and curriculum change needed to realize the goals of internationalization.

**Stage 2: Strategic Steps in Implementing the Internationalization Agenda**

With support from both the University and College leadership, the Office of International Initiatives moved forward in implementing strategic steps towards internationalizing the College. Although the College’s Strategic Plan outlines a vision for activity across all levels of research, teaching, and service for faculty and students, initial internationalization efforts targeted our teacher education programs. The focus was on curriculum transformation that supported the development of global competence in future teachers and provided them with the skills to teach in ways that would enable their own students to become global thinkers. Our first step in launching the internationalizing of our teacher education programs, the Global Awareness in Teacher Education (GATE) Fellows Program, began in 2007 and was aimed at developing a core of teacher education faculty who would serve as models and leaders in exploring ways to enhance internationalization in our teacher preparation program by transforming a variety of courses to help provide our teacher education students with greater global competence.

In 2010-11, we launched additional initiatives intended to institutionalize the commitment to and capacity for internationalization throughout our teacher education programs. These new initiatives included: (1) a multipronged approach to create an international track in our elementary teacher preparation program, (2) a program to support principals from Professional Development Schools (PDS) in internationalizing experiences for teachers, children, and our teacher preparation candidates, (3) a state-wide Summit on Internationalization in Education to address developing sustainable policy foundation for internationalization, and (4) a program to host teachers from k-12 schools across the globe through the Distinguished Fulbright Awards in Teaching program. Together with the continuing GATE fellows program these initiatives represented a systemic approach to the internationalization of teacher education that aimed to impact the coursework, pedagogical experiences of student teachers, policies that frame the context of schools, and schools themselves. In this section of the paper, we summarize the nature and specifics of these initiatives, provide details of outcomes and results to date, and outline what we see as the next steps in the institutionalizing the changes.

**The GATE Fellows Program.**

The idea for the GATE Fellows program came from two recurrent themes in the recommendations for internationalizing: faculty development and curriculum transformation. First, we agreed that a buy-in and commitment by the faculty was essential and wanted to support the development of a core of faculty leaders who would be both advocates for and models of the kind of internationalization commitment and change envisioned. Of equal importance was the need to support curriculum transformation aimed at enhancing the global knowledge of current and future teachers. The design of the program was influenced by successful models created for other purposes on our campus, such as the long-standing and very successful Lilly-CTE Teaching Fellows Program, which emphasizes building a cross-disciplinary professional community devoted to mutual learning and sharing related to common interests and problems in teaching and learning. A second model was the Curriculum Transformation program, which brings selected faculty together across disciplinary lines to learn about current scholarship on gender, race and equity and the impact of this scholarship on curriculum in various disciplines. In this program, faculty participants commit to modifying their courses to include more aspects reflective of gender and race diversity.

Many innovations depend on external funding for the “seed” capital to initiate new ideas. In our case, the proposal to establish a faculty development and curriculum transformation program devoted to internationalization of teacher education was supported by the Longview Foundation. Faculty were invited to submit applications to become part of a new faculty Fellowship, the GATE Fellows, and to make three commitments:

* 1. Participate in a monthly seminar, as part of this special professional community, focused on international education and the internationalization of curriculum;
	2. Complete an individual project in which they would modify an existing course they taught in the teacher education program to reflect enhanced international dimensions and content; and
	3. Help to organize a culminating statewide colloquium in which Fellows would showcase their work for colleagues in our own university, other colleges and universities, and in partner school systems and state agencies.

To support faculty participation, we offered a small monetary stipend (funded by the Longview Foundation grant) and the prestige of being part of a valued new select group promoting a major goal of the College and the University. Recruitment began in 2007. The seven faculty members in the initial cohort represented a variety of specializations: elementary science education, early childhood special education, early literacy, reading, language arts, foreign language/ESL education, and education policy. These faculty met monthly during the 2007-2008 academic year, sharing ideas and resources and providing peer feedback on their course transformations. A second cohort of seven, also with support from the Longview Foundation, participated in the program for the 2008-2009 academic year. After the initial two years of grant funding, the program is now funded by the College. In addition, starting with the 2009-2010 cohort the program has been opened to other graduate program areas outside of teacher education, thereby furthering the goals to internationalize the whole College.

***Outcomes.***

 The GATE program has been a great success, especially in building community, promoting visibility, and developing capacity. Faculty members involved have developed a dynamic peer community – something that is rare and precious in a large research university – and have been effective voices for the internationalization process in the college. Former GATE fellows have voluntarily served as “mentors” for faculty in the new cohorts. The Statewide Colloquium on International Education, featuring the previous year’s GATE fellows and a presentation by a state leader or national scholar in international education, has brought together over 100 participants each year with representation from the Maryland State Department of Education, other universities from across the state, regional school system leaders, and faculty and administrators from among units across campus. For full details of the projects and individuals involved during the first three years, see: <http://www.education.umd.edu/international/CurrentInitiatives/GATE.html>

 The success of the program and its impact on our College and on our teacher education (undergraduate and graduate) programs has been notable in other ways as well. In addition to the building of critical faculty commitment and a body of “internationalized” courses, the program brought recognition within the College, the University, the state and at the national level. Many GATE fellows began to develop networks with educators at other institutions also trying to promote internationalization goals. Building reputation and initial capacity have been keys to our subsequent efforts.

 Although getting the commitment of key faculty and changes in the content of specific courses taught by those faculty was an essential beginning, change that relies on a selected set of individuals is fragile, no matter how committed they are. Simply changing experiences in a sampling of individual professional courses in the elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs without building supporting experiences in other components of the program was at best the illusion of success. Our candidates needed to have expanded content knowledge and experiences in order to know what international content, resources, and perspectives to incorporate in the lessons and units they planned for children. They also needed to understand how to make the pedagogical content decisions about how and when to integrate that content in the curriculum and what to do with it to support students’ learning. Finally, they needed to have opportunities to practice that implementation in school settings with informed and supportive mentors and administrators. In 2010-11, we began four funded initiatives underway that moved us forward systemically toward these goals.

 **Elementary Education Internationalization Project.**

 The GATE fellows program produced several internationalized courses within the teacher education program; however, a systemic approach necessitated finding ways to connect the various components of the teacher education programs. The Elementary Education Internationalization project, funded for two years by the U.S. Department of Education’s Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL) program, is an effort to internationalize an entire teacher education program that would impact the academic and clinical components and find ways to connect them. Already mentioned were the reasons for the initial focus on faculty development through the GATE program. Beginning our internationalization efforts with a focus on faculty development and curriculum transformation resulted in a model for curriculum transformation as well as cadre of faculty whose expertise could be a resource as we deepened and broadened the internationalization work of the College. The Elementary Education Internationalization project built on the foundation of the GATE fellows program.

The Elementary Education degree program requires candidates to complete University General Education requirements, specific course requirements in mathematics, science, history, and literature as pre-professional academic courses, an 18 credit area of emphasis in one of six subject matters, a set of courses and practicum experiences that address general issues in teaching and learning, a set of subject matter focused “methods” courses (mathematics, science, reading, language arts, and social studies), and a full time 16 week student teaching internship as a culminating experience. The Elementary Education Internationalization project aimed to touch all aspects of the program through four different strands.

***Strands 1 and 2.***

Modeled after the GATE Fellows program, these first two strands brought together key faculty from the History Department, the English Department, the Spanish Department and the Center for Latin American Studies with College of Education Elementary Education faculty specialists in English Language Arts, Social Studies and Foreign Language education to: (a) revise the content of 3-4 key courses in each of the academic areas that are part of the required Academic Area of Emphasis for Elementary Teachers with enhanced attention to international dimensions and global awareness; (b) as appropriate, focus revision on courses that are also available to all undergraduates and could be usable to meet University-wide General Education requirements, and (c) design a new specialization/minor in Latin American Studies that would be an option for elementary education teacher preparation students. The intent of these two strands was to have a direct impact on the way prospective teachers learn and understand the disciplinary content they study and use in their teaching.

***Strands 3 and 4.***

The second two strands of this effort brought together faculty within the College of Education to revise the core education courses taken by students majoring in Elementary Education. Strand 3 has focused on courses such as Social Foundations and Diversity, Learning and Human Development, Assessment, Introduction to Teaching, and Inclusion. Strand 4 has focused on engaging a core of former GATE Fellows in Elementary Education, each representing one of the five core “methods block” areas (mathematics, science, reading, language arts, and social studies), who are collaborating in integrating their approaches to internationalization across the courses of the program for one cohort of elementary education candidates. This will include making connections between the on-campus components of these courses and the required school-based experiences through designing placements at internationally-focused Professional Development Schools.

***Outcomes.***

 There is tangible progress across the four strands in the redesign work and we appear to be on schedule for getting the revisions done that will be piloted in year 2 (2011/2012). In addition, the discussions in Strands 1 and 2 have led to conversations about other changes or initiatives – for example, ideas to revise the secondary English requirements to better reflect an international emphasis and exploring a career-exploration course for 1st and 2nd year undergraduates as a joint offering between History and Education.

**Principals’ Academy.**

 Both the GATE fellows program and the Elementary Education Internationalization project focused specifically on internationalization of the elements of teacher education that occur within the walls of the College. However, systemic change in teacher education requires that there be a focus on the P-12 schools in which education majors will not only have their student teaching experiences, but will also eventually work as classroom teachers. Changing their college courses was therefore a necessary but insufficient step in our internationalization plans. If our teacher preparation candidates are to have opportunities to explore enhancing internationalization in their teaching during practicum and internship experiences, and throughout their careers, they would need to be in schools that encouraged that exploration and preferably already had capacity and experience in international education. The College partners with a number of school systems that have designated schools as Professional Development Schools (PDS) that serve, among other things, as sites for student teaching experiences. Building on these existing relationships, we sought to encourage the internationalization of schools through the Principal’s Academy initiative.

Principals play an essential role in shaping the culture, instructional expectations and types of experiences and initiatives supported in their schools, and as such our attempts to foster internationalization in schools focused on the principals. With funding Longview Foundation, along with additional funding from the College, we brought together twelve principals from our PDS schools for a year-long professional development experience focused on internationalizing curriculum, professional development, and informal experiences in the principals’ schools. We recruited principals of elementary, middle, and secondary schools that were major partners with the College in our teacher preparation program. These principals agreed to participate in a two-day summer academy and then meet monthly during the year; each principal committed to initiating or extending an internationalizing project during the year and to report on their projects at an end-of-year colloquium. Principals received a small project budget to help support their work.

 During the summer academy, principals had an opportunity to read and discuss background pieces on the importance of global awareness and developing global competence in today’s youth and they heard presentations about curriculum resources (e.g., International Digital Children’s Library (IDCL), Peace Corp World Wise Schools, and the National Foreign Language Center), resources for teacher professional development (e.g., UM’s Crossing Borders and Seminar for Teachers), and new policy initiatives (e.g., Maryland State Department’s Reform “From National to World Class”). The principals were able to share examples of initiatives already underway or being planned in their schools to enhance global education. During the monthly meetings, principals shared progress on their projects and heard about additional opportunities, including the Asia Society programs (e.g., International Focus Schools Network), federally sponsored teacher and student exchange options, and study abroad opportunities for teachers and for students.

***Outcomes.***

 The responses from principals on the summer academy were very positive. Principals’ projects include incorporating IDCL in the library/media center with monthly international emphasis areas, significantly expanding Chinese language and culture experiences for children in the upper elementary grades, and becoming a “sister school” with a high school in Italy. [Projects are still underway but will be completed by June; we will be able to elaborate on selected examples in the final paper and at the conference]. One of the difficulties has been maintaining regular attendance at the monthly meetings. We are also exploring with our principals how they can take a leadership role in future academies with principals from other schools.

**Summit on International Education.**

 Teacher education programs and the schools they ultimately serve operate within a policy context that, in large measure, determines the possibilities for and direction of teaching and learning. As such, systemic change in teacher education is not possible without policy recognition and support. In undertaking a systemic approach to internationalizing the College of education, it was important to take steps to deepen the institutionalization of the efforts at internationalization, not only within our institution but also throughout the state. Thus far, the efforts described sought to build capacity first, with the College through faculty development and curriculum transformation, and then within the schools through Principal’s Academy. The International Summit attempted to impact the possibilities for the successful internationalization of teacher education in the policy arena at the state level.

In collaboration with the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), we obtained a small grant (from the Longview Foundation) to sponsor a state-wide summit meeting of education, government, and business leaders, on the importance of international global perspectives in the P-12 curriculum and in teacher education. The invitational Summit meeting held in November 2010 included over 130 participants representing county school system superintendents and administrators (including our Principals’ Academy participants), deans and senior faculty from colleges and universities across the state, representatives from MDSE, federal and state government representatives, and members of the Maryland Business Roundtable. In addition to plenary sessions on the status and importance of global education for students and teachers, participants met in three discussion groups to share information and produce recommendations for policy and action steps in three areas: P-12 Curriculum Reform, especially in Learning Standards; teacher preparation certification and program requirements; and leadership development priorities and state policy revision.

To Rec-up on the November Summit, a representative task force met the following February to take the notes and recommendations from the Summit discussion, along with information from state summit meetings held earlier in other states, to produce a set of recommendations for internationalizing p-12 education throughout the state of Maryland.

***Outcomes.***

 The feedback from participants at the Summit meeting was very positive for both content and importance. The task force meeting in February led to the creation of a white paper report, which captures the process and recommendations for policy. Recommendations were made in three categories: Teacher Preparation and Professional Development, Curriculum and Instruction, and Assessment. In each case, the recommendations contain action steps which would lead to enhanced professional knowledge and global competence, internationalization of curriculum and pedagogy, and assessment of baseline and gain factors relevant to the internationalization goals. A summary of the recommendations follows:

* Candidates for certification should provide evidence of global competency and this recommendation should be the basis for requiring documentation of this important qualification at the initial as well as advanced stages of professional certification, and assessments need to be designed to assure attainment of these competencies;
* Teacher preparation programs should work toward curriculum transformation and enhancement of field experiences so that global competencies are embedded in content and professional components of preservice programs, and Professional Development Schools are identified with characteristics that reflect commitment to internationalization and have school populations that are culturally diverse;
* Faculty development and reward systems in IHE’s should help support faculty in efforts to modify their programs, course content, and personal growth in areas of internationalization and global competency;
* School systems and school curricula need to support internationalization goals by beginning world language teaching in elementary schools and supporting curriculum development in general that seeks to infuse international content and pedagogy in subject matter at all levels;
* All levels should insure that assessment is integrated into all aspects of the internationalization process and that baseline data collection and analysis initiatives are implemented in order to determine current thinking and program implementation by principals and other school-based educators as well as teacher education personnel.

**Distinguished Fulbright Awards in Teaching Program.**

 Efforts to internationalize programs, curricula, and classroom instruction rely on the global knowledge of individual faculty and teachers, which is strengthened by sustained interactions with persons from different countries and cultures. In the fall of 2010, the College of Education and the Office of International Initiatives were fortunate to be selected to host 17 Distinguished Fulbright Teacher Fellows (DFT’s) from six different countries – Finland, South Africa, Argentina, Mexico, India and Singapore. These elementary and secondary teachers were outstanding educators in k-12 schools and selected through a rigorous process by the U.S. Department of State and the Academy for Educational Development. As part of their program, DFT’s had opportunities to study in graduate courses addressing areas of their special interest, take a joint seminar on American education and educational policy, work with a mentor to produce a “capstone project paper” regarding a special area of their research or professional development, and work 1-2 days per week with host teachers in k-12 schools. We made an explicit effort to pair DFT’s with faculty mentors who were also faculty in our teacher preparation program and engage them in classes being taken by our teacher education candidates; we focused school placements in our network of Professional Development Schools, with an emphasis on assignments in schools being guided by principals in our Principal’s Academy. In this way, we sought to connect this very special international program with our broader efforts to internationalize our curriculum and programs – e.g., by bringing their experiences and perspectives into teacher preparation courses and graduate courses and by connecting them with our candidates and principals and mentor teachers in schools that serve as primary internship sites for our candidates.

***Outcomes.***

 It is difficult to measure the full extent of the benefits that we have experienced from this program. All involved – faculty, graduate students, teacher education candidates, university administrators, school administrators, host teachers, school students as well as the DFT’s themselves have indicated the very positive impact of this program on their perspectives about teaching and learning. In addition, new partnerships have already begun to emerge. A DFT physics teacher and his host teacher are designing a professional development institute for physics teachers world-wide and seeking preliminary funding to help launch this in the summer of 2011; at least four DFT’s and their host teachers have created virtual classroom exchanges for their students; another DFT has begun conversations about support for English teachers in her middle and secondary schools being able to come to Maryland during the summer to participate in the Maryland Writing Project.

**Outcomes of the Systemic Initiative**

 Although it is difficult to isolate individual impact, there are other outcomes that unquestionably have occurred because of the influence of the initiatives described above. For example, we have an increasing number of faculty and graduate students applying for partial support for presentations at international conferences. We have seen a significant increase in the number of study abroad proposals from faculty across the college – from 2-3 such proposals per year in 2006-7 to initiatives today in South Africa, India, the Netherlands, Uganda, El Salvador, Qatar, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, and Italy. We have a pilot “co-teaching” course on English as a Foreign Language Pedagogy with a university in Taiwan. We also have an increasing number of faculty at least exploring the opportunities for international exchanges.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

 As discussed at the beginning of this paper, as a country we are facing a critical disconnect between the realities of an increasingly globalized world and the school systems that are failing to prepare students to succeed in such a world. While teacher education alone cannot bridge this gap, the systemic initiative described above can provide a foundation for tackling this problem. Through taking steps to internationalize individual courses and entire academic majors, expose students to teachers from around the world, foster international developments in individual schools through the work of principals, and affect state-level policy, the University of Maryland College of Education has made significant progress in fostering global competence not only in our College’s graduates, but also in the hundreds of thousands of students those future teachers will influence.

 Despite this great progress, implementing systemic change is neither quick nor easy, and there is still much work to be done to improve the College’s existing efforts and to continue to expand. One significant challenge we face moving forward is in securing the funding to continue these efforts after grant funding runs out. We also must find ways to continue to build programs, such as the GATE Fellows program. After four cohorts of Fellows we have come to a point where it is no longer easy to recruit new participants. Moving forward we must find ways to engage those faculty who are not already interested in international education, and to continue to help previous GATE Fellows develop their own global competence and commitment to international education. Keeping with the systemic approach to internationalization, we also must find more ways to connect various efforts. While there are key connections between the projects described above, there is still room to get more out of these interconnections. For example, in the next academic year we are exploring new ways to integrate the Distinguished Fulbright Teachers into the College to better capitalize on their cultural knowledge. Additionally, in progress are plans to further extend the study abroad opportunities for our students, to build into the admissions process a priority and eventually a requirement for international experience and background, and to design an assessment of knowledge, abilities, and dispositions on international dimensions that we can use to assess our teacher preparation candidates at entry and exit from the program.

 While the actual implementation of any change effort must be specific to the particular institutional context, we hope that the programs described above can serve as inspiration for other Colleges of Education to undergo similar systemic initiatives to internationalize teacher education. Only through truly systemic efforts can true internationalization take place, and teacher education is a particularly important field for internationalization. This century has already been a time of great change and globalization, and all indications are that this trend will continue. Our schools must be educating globally competent citizens, and teacher education students today will play a critical role in whether or not that happens.
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