

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Faculty Publications in Educational Administration

Educational Administration, Department of

---

2016

# Faculty Transformation in Curriculum Transformation: The Role of Faculty Development in Campus Internationalization

Elizabeth K. Niehaus

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, [eniehaus@unl.edu](mailto:eniehaus@unl.edu)

Letitia Williams

*University of Trinidad and Tobago*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub>

---

Niehaus, Elizabeth K. and Williams, Letitia, "Faculty Transformation in Curriculum Transformation: The Role of Faculty Development in Campus Internationalization" (2016). *Faculty Publications in Educational Administration*. 26.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub/26>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications in Educational Administration by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# Faculty Transformation in Curriculum Transformation: The Role of Faculty Development in Campus Internationalization

Elizabeth Niehaus and Letitia Williams

**Elizabeth Niehaus** is Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln. She received a Ph.D. in College Student Personnel from the University of Maryland—College Park, an M.A. in American Culture Studies from Washington University in St. Louis, and a B.A. in Linguistics from the University of Virginia.

**Letitia Williams** is the Assistant Vice President for Student Support Services at the University of Trinidad and Tobago. She received a Ph.D. in Education Policy and an M.A. in Education Policy and Leadership from the University of Maryland—College Park, and a B.A. in History from the University of the West Indies.

*Corresponding author* — Elizabeth Niehaus, Department of Educational Administration, University of Nebraska—Lincoln, 133 Teachers College Hall, Lincoln, NE 68588-0360, USA; email eniehaus@unl.edu

## Abstract

Curriculum transformation is often cited as one of the key strategies for internationalizing higher education in the United States, and faculty members play a central role in this process. The purpose of the study we report here was to explore the potential for professional development initiatives to foster the transformation in perspectives necessary for faculty members to engage in curriculum internationalization. Findings suggest key program components that help faculty members overcome barriers to international work and transform their perspectives about course content, pedagogy, and internationalization, as well as the limitations of professional development initiatives focused on teaching.

**Keywords:** Faculty development, Internationalization, Curriculum transformation

Universities around the world have long been international spaces—research has been published in the *lingua franca* of the time, whether that be Latin, French, German, or English; students and faculty members have travelled abroad; and university models have been borrowed and adapted from other cultures (de Wit 2002). The social, political, and economic changes of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, however, have made higher education

institutions even more central to the processes of globalization, which, in turn, has made internationalization even more central to the work of the university (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Although there are many definitions and understandings of the term *internationalization* in higher education (Kreber, 2009), in this study we draw from Van derWende's definition of internationalization as "any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets" (as cited in Kreber, 2009, p. 2). Over the past decade, the call for internationalization has come from many fronts—professional associations, government commissions, university mission statements, and even students themselves (e.g. American Council on Education, 2002).

Although universities and colleges have engaged in a number of internationalization strategies, curriculum transformation is often heralded as central to these efforts (e.g. Green & Schoenberg, 2006; Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). According to a recent report from the American Council on Education, "internationalizing the curriculum is the most important strategy institutions can use to ensure that *all* students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they will need as citizens and workers in a rapidly changing and globalized world" (Green & Schoenberg 2006, p. iii). Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, Van Gyn & Preece (2007) defined curricular internationalization as "a process by which international elements are infused into course content, international resources are used in course readings and assignments, and instructional methodologies appropriate to a culturally diverse student population are implemented" (p. 70). This definition places the faculty in the role of central actor in curriculum transformation, suggesting that an internationalized curriculum will have much to do with faculty members' perspectives and values (Badley, 2000). Internationalizing curriculum/a is therefore also an exercise in transforming faculty members' perspectives and increasing their global competence.

Despite the central role of curriculum transformation to the internationalization of higher education and the central role of the faculty in curriculum transformation, little is known about the curriculum transformers themselves. The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which one faculty development initiative influenced participants' perspectives on internationalization and how those perspectives have in turn played a role in faculty members' engagement in international curriculum transformation.

## Review of the Literature

Curriculum transformation in the United States is a term that grew out of the Women's and Ethnic Studies movements in the 1970s within the larger context of the educational equity movement of the 1950s and 1960s (Rosenfelt, 1994). Since that time, curriculum transformation has been used to describe efforts to increase the inclusion of women's perspectives and contributions in the curriculum (e.g., Hedges, 1996); integrate perspectives from a variety of sociocultural identity groups (e.g., Allan & Estler, 2005; Clark, 2002); and create more inclusive environments for students with disabilities (e.g., Ouellet, 2004).

Regardless of the specific context or the curriculum being transformed, there is wide agreement in the literature that faculty involvement is key to any curriculum transformation effort (e.g., Allan & Estler, 2005; Green, 2007; Raby, 2007; Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007). While at its core curriculum transformation is about changing the content of courses (Hedges, 1996), true transformation also involves rethinking pedagogy, the evaluation of student learning, the

relationship between student and teacher, and even the physical classroom environment (Clark, 2002). As Raby (2007) described, faculty members “are the institutional actors who teach the internationalized curriculum, serve on international committees, and lead education abroad programs” (p. 58); she also noted the importance of internationalization spread throughout the faculty so that efforts do not hinge on the interest of one faculty member who might go on sabbatical or leave the university.

Unfortunately, despite faculty members’ importance in curriculum transformation in general and international curriculum transformation in specific, there are several barriers that prevent faculty members from engaging in international curriculum transformation. Some of these barriers are external—for example, lack of consideration of international contributions in the institution’s tenure and promotion structure (Andreasen, 2003; Kelsey & Dormody, 1995), financial constraints (Andreasen, 2003; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Green, 2007; Kelsey & Dormody, 1995), institutional policies and procedures that deter international work (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Green, 2007), and the many competing demands on faculty members’ time and attention (Andreasen, 2003; Kelsey & Dormody, 1995). Other barriers have more to do with an individual faculty member’s own interests and experience. For example, researchers have noted barriers to internationalization such as lack of personal experience and cross-cultural competence (Green, 2007), biases or fear of different cultures (Andreasen, 2003), and a lack of personal interest in international affairs (Green, 2007).

Despite such barriers, there *are* faculty members who engage in international curriculum transformation. As Allan and Estler (2005) described,

... in a real world characterized by loose coupling, faculty autonomy, diverse goals, and values, it is nothing short of remarkable to find all members of a faculty group choosing to invest in a cooperative endeavor to explore curricular change around a set of issues demanding personal engagement. (p. 213)

Structured professional development programs for faculty members are one way to encourage them to engage in this type of work. Research on professional development programs to encourage curriculum transformation in the fields of multicultural education and Women’s Studies has shown that these programs can result in integrating new content into courses, such as new readings, discussion topics, assignments, and class activities (Allan & Estler, 2005; Hedges, 1996). This same research has also identified a number of personal outcomes for faculty participants including changing their pedagogical approaches, coming to accept students as active agents in their own learning, gaining confidence in their teaching abilities, becoming more comfortable discussing potentially controversial issues in the classroom, and coming to understand diversity or other focus issues as fundamental to the core content of their courses rather than treating them as special topics (Allan & Estler, 2005; Hedges, 1996; Major & Palmer, 2006).

## Theoretical Framework

One way to help make sense of the outcomes of professional development programs for curriculum transformation is through Mezirow’s (1991) theory of transformative learning. As King (2002) described, adult learning theories like transformative learning are particularly useful in understanding professional development initiatives because they help us understand faculty members as learners. Transformative learning theory describes the ways in which adult

learning can be not only instrumental (i.e., learning facts and figures) but can also change the way that people look at the world. Mezirow (2000) referred to these ways of viewing the world as frames of references—"the structure of assumptions and expectations through which we filter sense impressions ... [which] provides the context for making meaning within which we choose what and how a sensory experience is to be construed and/or appropriated" (p. 16).

Several scholars have pointed to the utility of transformative learning in considering how people develop global awareness and competence. For example, transformative learning has been shown to play an important role in cross-cultural training (Garson, 2007) and intercultural communication (Taylor, 1994). Transformative experiences can be instrumental in helping faculty members develop global awareness and competence, and also in helping them understand why international curriculum transformation is necessary. As Green and Schoenberg (2006) stated:

Even if faculty members are ready and willing to act on the internationalizing imperative, aspects of academic culture and certain unspoken assumptions about the nature and purpose of the curriculum get in the way of deep curricular change.... Those mind-sets that prevent individuals from seeing beyond the limits of their assumptions must be addressed before cogent curriculum discussions can proceed. (p. 5)

A few researchers have applied transformative learning theory to curriculum transformation efforts. Within the context of K-12 education, King (2002), for example, explored the transformative learning potential of a program to introduce technology into classroom teaching. She found a number of transformative outcomes, both in terms of how teachers thought of themselves as teachers and in their view of education. Teachers in the program developed a new understanding of the relationship between teacher and student and shifted to a more student-centered approach. As a result, they developed new approaches to teaching involving different learning activities, self-directed learning, and an increased focus on developing critical thinking skills.

Specific to the topic of international curriculum transformation in higher education, Schuerholz-Lehr et al. (2007) used transformative learning theory as a framework for understanding professional development for internationalization. They found that participants in a faculty development program came to think critically and creatively about the role of international students in their classrooms, recognized the need to infuse international content throughout the curriculum (rather than as a one-day special topic class), and thought more carefully about how their use of language in the classroom was or was not accessible to all students. Like the teachers in King's (2002) study, these faculty members became more student-centered, recognizing that they needed to consider the background and needs of students in addition to the content of the class. They also came to a broader and deeper understanding of internationalization as a process and learned to recognize both the connections and distinctions between internationalism and multiculturalism.

## **The Study**

### ***Purpose and Research Questions***

Considering the centrality of faculty and curriculum in campus internationalization efforts, there is a need to understand how best to engage faculty members in international curriculum

transformation. Building on the work of Schuerholz-Lehr and colleagues (2007) and using transformative learning theory as a framework, the purpose of this study was to explore the potential for a professional development program to transform faculty perspectives and to facilitate curriculum transformation. Specifically, we were interested in exploring how a professional development program that was *not* intentionally focused on transformative learning (unlike the program in Schuerholz-Lehr and colleagues' study) might still lead to the transformative outcomes necessary to internationalize the curriculum.

### ***Methodology***

In order to explore the influences of a professional development initiative, this study used case study methodology, which focuses on "a specific, unique, bounded system" (Stake 2000, p. 436) and is "characterized as being particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic" (Merriam 1998, p. 29). More specifically, this study is an instrumental case study as it seeks to shed light on a larger phenomenon, i.e., the relationship between transformative learning for faculty members and curriculum transformation for internationalization, through illustrating one particular case (Stake, 2000). Researchers also employed a constructivist epistemological framework in order to focus on the co-creation of meaning between researcher and participant (Guba & Lincoln, 2001).

### ***The Case***

According to Merriam (1998), the defining feature of a case study is the bounded nature of the case itself. In this study, the case in question is a Global Faculty Development Program<sup>1</sup> (GFDP) in the College of Education ("the College") at a large public research university. This case was selected because of its direct relevance to the importance of professional development for faculty in curriculum transformation and because the program had been in place in the College for four years, providing a relatively large group of participants (22 total).

The first two years of the GFDP were funded by a grant with the purpose of internationalizing courses in the teacher education program of the College; the second two years were funded by the College directly, and the program was open to faculty members throughout the College who were interested in exploring international dimensions of their courses. The program was positioned within a larger comprehensive internationalization plan within the College, and the goal was to internationalize specific courses and to create a critical mass of faculty members who would be champions for further internationalization efforts. The GFDP included three main components: bi-weekly readings and group discussions, an individual curriculum transformation project, and presentations of those projects at a statewide international education colloquium.

### ***Participants and Data Collection***

Consistent with case study methodology, this study utilized multiple sources of data including interviews, participant observations, and document analysis (Merriam, 1998). After receiving human subjects approval from the institutional review board, the researchers invited all twenty-two faculty members who had participated in the GFDP over the four years of the program to

1. The name of the program and all participants have been changed to protect participant confidentiality.

participate in the study. Fifteen agreed to participate in in-depth, semi-structured interviews, where they were asked to discuss their experiences in the GFDP; their curriculum transformation projects; and their perceptions of the influences of the GFDP on students, the College as a whole, and their own personal and professional learning. Participants were asked to describe both positive aspects (e.g., "What do you think you learned from the overall GFDP experience?) and negative aspects of the program (e.g., "What was the least useful part of the experience for you?").

As the initial focus of the program was on teacher education, it is not surprising that ten of the fifteen participants were in disciplines related to teacher education. Eleven participants identified as women and four as men; eight identified as White, three as African American, three as Asian or Asian American, and one as Hispanic. At the time of the interviews, four were full professors, one was an associate professor, six were assistant professors, and four had non-tenure-track appointments.

In order to triangulate interview data and provide a deeper understanding of the GFDP itself, the researchers also employed participant observations and document analysis. One of the co-facilitators of the program served as a researcher on this study and provided her observations and insights into the program and participants, although she was not formally interviewed for the study; the researchers also interviewed the director and primary facilitator of the program for more information about the process and content of the program. Finally, the researchers collected documents related to the program including the initial program grant application and announcement, meeting agenda and notes, readings provided to participants, descriptions of final projects, and copies of posters from the final colloquium.

### ***Data Analysis***

While the primary unit of analysis for this study is the case of the GFDP, data analysis began with individual faculty members' experiences in the program. Each interview was transcribed verbatim, and the researchers then met to develop a preliminary list of codes based on their notes from the interviews (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Each transcript was coded by the researcher who had not initially conducted that particular interview. The preliminary list of codes and categories were used as a starting point to ensure consistency, but as the coding progressed these categories were expanded and other emergent codes and categories were identified. After an initial round of coding, the researchers met and agreed on a final list of codes, combining the preliminary and emergent codes, and examined each coded data segment to ensure that it fit the description of the coding category. Each transcript was then re-coded by the other researcher to ensure consistency and thoroughness of coding.

After two rounds of coding, the researchers met to discuss the themes that had emerged from the coding process. Based on the constant comparative method of data analysis (Merriam, 1998), researchers identified increasingly more abstract themes in the data. Researchers also examined themes both within and across individual faculty participants in order to understand the influence of the GFDP on each individual participant as well as the themes that cut across many participants (Stake, 2000).

### ***Trustworthiness***

The trustworthiness of this study was established through triangulation of multiple sources of data and member checks (Stake, 2000). By triangulating data from interviews with multiple

participants, the researcher ensured that the themes found within and across cases were clear. Participant observations, the interview with the program director, and document analysis served to triangulate the findings further and provide greater context for the findings from the interviews. Consistent with a constructivist framework, asking participants to review findings allowed the researchers to verify their interpretation of those findings and added more data to the study as the participants reacted to, agreed with, or corrected findings.

### ***Limitations***

It is important to note a few key limitations of this study. First, although all 22 GFDP participants were invited to participate in the study, only fifteen agreed to do so. It is unclear why the remaining seven declined to participate; a few noted scheduling conflicts or lack of time, but it is also possible that the seven faculty members who did not participate had different experiences with the program than the fifteen who did participate. Similarly, the fact that one of the researchers served as a facilitator for the GFDP itself added another level of triangulation of data, but it also meant that participants may have been less likely to share negative experiences or opinions about the program. One factor that may have countered this dynamic, however, was the fact that at the time of the study in the spring of 2011 both researchers were graduate students. Despite the potential social desirability of positive feedback about the GFDP program, participants did share a number of negative opinions and areas where they thought the program had fallen short; they may have felt comfortable doing so because of the status difference between researchers and participants in this particular study. Finally, this study focuses on *what* participants learned, rather than the specific process for *how* that learning occurred. Although our findings were broadly consistent with transformative learning as a type of learning, we did not examine the extent to which participants' experiences reflect the complexity of Mezirow's (2000) ten-stage process of transformative learning. Future research in this area might look more specifically at the process of faculty learning to better inform the development of similar programs.

### ***Description of the GFDP***

Before moving on to the key findings, it is important to provide more information about the GFDP itself as a context for understanding faculty participants' experiences. Approximately 4–6 participants were chosen through an application process each year and received a small stipend to incentivize participation and to help create time to focus on the program. In applying for the program, faculty members had to describe why they wanted to participate and detail a specific idea for internationalizing an existing course or creating a new course with an international theme. As the goal was to be as inclusive as possible, every effort was made to accept qualified applicants, even if this meant finding additional monetary support from within the College to do so. Applications were open to all teaching faculty in the College, including those in part-time and non-tenure-track positions.

Applications for the program were processed in the fall semester, and then during the following spring semester participants were expected to work on their individual projects and attend bi-weekly meetings with the other participants and two facilitators. These meetings and discussions were key to developing a cohort of faculty members with shared interests who could support one another in their internationalization efforts. Readings for each meeting focused

on providing a broader perspective on internationalization (e.g., reports from the American Council on Education, the Longview Foundation, the Asia Society, and other organizations writing about comprehensive internationalization and curriculum transformation) to help faculty members situate their own work within this broader context. Meetings also frequently included guest speakers who could speak to this broader context, such as the campus-wide director of international programs and representatives from the state department of education. Facilitators and guest speakers also provided faculty participants with a wealth of resources that they could use in their courses, such as the Peace Corps World Wise Schools Program and the International Digital Children's Library, and also provided information about internal and external funding opportunities to support international teaching and research. In years two, three, and four of the program, former GFDP participants were also invited to meetings to discuss the process and progress of their own curriculum transformation projects.

Perhaps the most important component of the bi-weekly meetings, however, was the opportunity that participants had to share information about their own individual projects and seek feedback and advice from their colleagues. In creating the GFDP, the facilitators intentionally did not provide guidelines for the curriculum transformation projects, believing that faculty members themselves were the best people to guide those efforts. The only requirements were that projects had to be concrete, to be focused on teaching (defined broadly), and to somehow internationalize the content or pedagogy of a course. As a result, there was a wide range of projects over the four years of the program, including creating new study abroad courses led by faculty members, internationalizing course reading lists, developing new internationally-focused modules within existing courses, and creating new experiential learning courses and opportunities with local immigrant communities. After the end of the program in the spring semester, participants then presented their completed projects at a state-wide international education colloquium the following fall.

## Findings

The findings from this case study fall into two categories, consistent with the theory of transformative learning—instrumental outcomes (those that are practical and concrete in nature, such as new topics to include in courses, publications, and presentations) and transformative outcomes (those that involve shifts in participants' perspectives). The main findings are summarized in Table 1 and are described in more detail below.

### *Instrumental Outcomes*

Faculty participants reported a number of outcomes of the GFDP that had practical significance for their teaching, research, and professional lives. They were able to expand the content of their courses, present and publish based on their experiences, and expand professional networks within the College and across the campus.

**Teaching** As the focus of the GFDP was on curriculum transformation, it is not surprising that most of the outcomes participants identified were in terms of their own teaching. They felt encouraged to include new international topics and materials with an international comparative perspective to examine topics formerly taught from a purely U.S. perspective. For example,

**Table 1.** Summary of Findings

Domain	Instrumental Outcomes	Transformative Outcomes
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New international and comparative topics</li> <li>• Broadened existing content to include international and comparative perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflective pedagogical practices</li> <li>• Authenticity of sources</li> <li>• Integration of international themes in courses</li> </ul>
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference presentations</li> <li>• Research with students</li> <li>• Publications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views on research in one's field</li> <li>• Perspective on one's own research</li> </ul>
Personal and professional benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanded professional networks</li> <li>• Enhanced reputation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perspective on culture and difference</li> <li>• Understanding of internationalization</li> </ul>

Donald described how he introduced the topic of global warming in his course on science education, “I decided that it would be helpful to pick a significant global issue that has scientific implications and show my interns how they could engage with it” in their own future teaching.

For Donald the topic of global warming was completely new, but other participants found new ideas that built on what they were already doing in class. For example, Melody, who already included discussions of illegal immigration and migrant farm workers in her course, broadened that topic to include international comparisons, such as illegal immigration in Europe and the challenges faced by the Roma people in France. Andy and Julie introduced an international focus by incorporating comparative perspectives on teaching and pedagogy to help students understand the culturally situated nature of their instructional practice. As evidenced by these examples, some of the new topics brought into class were broadly global in nature (e.g., global warming), others were international and comparative (e.g., immigration in the U.S. and Europe), and others were more focused on the specific content area of the course (e.g., content and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics).

**Research** The instrumental effect of the GFDP on participants’ research at the time of the study was limited; but six participants did cite effects on their research, including conference presentations, work with students, and publications. For example, Andy and Laura were both invited to participate in international conferences based on their internationally-focused work. Both Donald and Beatrice worked with graduate students to put together presentations based on their projects for a variety of different conferences, and Mei gave a presentation on her project at a large education research conference. Although several participants indicated their intention to incorporate international perspectives into their research, they also noted the challenges of time and the restrictions of the tenure process as obstacles to following through on these intentions.

**Professional benefits** Outside of the influence of the program on their teaching and research, participants discussed a number of professional benefits arising from their participation in the GFDP. The most commonly cited benefit was the opportunity to expand their professional community through their interactions and relationships with other faculty members in their

cohort, but also extending to others on and off campus that they met through the program. One of the benefits of this professional network was simply knowing more about what others were doing around campus and having the opportunity to connect with others interested in the same issues who could provide support in this work. Faculty members often work in isolation, and for many of these participants, being the only one in their program or department working on international issues was even more isolating. Having the opportunity to be with a group where, as Christina described, “we were all speaking the same language” gave participants a sense that they were part of a larger community of internationally-oriented scholars who could provide support, encouragement, and serve as resources to one another as they pursued international work.

A final, very practical benefit of this professional network was that for some participants, particularly junior faculty members and those not on the tenure track, this was an opportunity to enhance their reputation within the College by connecting to senior faculty members and administrators. For example, as David described his relationship with others in his cohort:

... some of them are full professors who ... can be seen as allies as I go forward through the tenure process...and know that they now understand me in a different capacity than just being eventually a box that they might see on the [promotion and tenure] committee.

Similarly, Melody described how her participation in the program made her feel like she was being taken seriously as a faculty member, and Stephanie and Emily gained status in their department when they were asked to present their project at a department-wide faculty meeting.

### ***Transformative Outcomes***

In addition to the practical benefits of participating in the GFDP program, participants also described the ways in which they transformed their perspectives through the experience. Participating in the GFDP helped many participants change the way they approached the content and pedagogy of teaching and to incorporate international perspectives in their current and future research. The program also gave participants new perspectives on international issues in general, and on international education specifically.

**Teaching** As described above, many participants described the various international topics that they added to their courses. For a few faculty members, participation in the GFDP also transformed the way they thought about the content of their courses and the outcomes for their students. Participation in the GFDP led to the adoption of reflective pedagogical practices including recognizing students as learners, reflecting on pedagogical decisions, and focusing on the use of authentic sources in the classroom.

A number of participants commented on new ways that they thought about student learning that resulted from the GFDP. Stephanie came to realize the value of first-hand experiences for student learning. As she described, “I think that really had a big impact on me on how to ... allow students to have some sort of life changing experience that comes from within them and is not just me telling them things.” Mei approached her pedagogical learning in a different way. Although she herself was from a different country, she felt that the GFDP experience had helped her think differently about how she is teaching international students in her courses: “I feel after the [GFDP], I’m better in dealing with students, especially those international students who

may have difficulty to—maybe ... either to learn the statistics or maybe somewhat like adjust themselves to the new learning environment.”

The process of transforming curriculum during the GFDP also reframed the thinking of some participants about the power they have in shaping the story told in the curriculum. For example, Laura came to realize the importance of authenticity in the sources she used. Referring to a book about apartheid that she added to her course, she explained:

I would have thought, “Oh, I can just read a book written by a U.S. author on South Africa or apartheid.” But for me, getting that international perspective was much more of an importance. ... For me the idea of authenticity became much more important. And I was thinking, “Boy, I really would like to make sure that I’m getting books that represent a particular group but from that particular group’s perspective.”

Andy also described his new perspectives related to sources. For him, it was a realization that his own personal experience was a valid source that should explicitly be brought into his teaching. As he described, “fortunately, I’ve been able to travel and see different places. And I need to bring that stuff to my classroom.... I do have a lot that I can show these students, just of my personal experience.” Reflection on the messages conveyed in the curriculum during the GFDP changed these participants’ perspectives on how to bring authentic sources from the world outside the United States into their courses.

In addition to thinking about source selection, participation in the GFDP led some participants to reconsider how international topics were incorporated into the curriculum. Laura critiqued her formerly additive approach to international topics, recalling that she used to have one class that was a special international topics week. After her GFDP experience she worked to make sure that international topics were “interwoven and integrated into the other themes.” The experience led participants to consider ways to make international topics central to their courses.

**Research** In addition to instrumental outcomes like presenting at conferences and writing papers about their GFDP projects, participants also described how the experience had influenced their perspectives on their own research and inspired new research questions. Donald, for example, was surprised to find a gap in the literature on the internationalization of science education, his field of expertise, and outlined his current attempts to address this limitation. As he described, a “graduate student and I are working on another article having to do with the notion of internationalizing Science Ed courses, not necessarily though just content like I mentioned before, the module, but just the whole notion of it.” Mei was inspired by her GFDP experience in a different way. Being from another country herself, the experience encouraged her to think about how she could develop international research collaborations with her home country, something she had not previously considered.

For other participants, the GFDP experience helped them think more broadly about their research. For example, Howard, who had studied bias against African American students, developed a new interest in studying bias in different contexts, particularly targeting Muslim-American students. Julie came to a broader understanding of the complexity of school students’ diverse cultural backgrounds, particularly those who are non-native English speakers:

I think maybe putting it in an international framework helps me better understand the complexity of that work, because these kids...they have different life experiences,

different cultural backgrounds, different—and they themselves have different lenses in which they understand their own experiences. And so maybe if my research really focused on the student side of things, I would have understood that earlier, but because I focus on the teacher end of things, sometimes that gets masked in terms of just labels.

For both Howard and Julie, learning the international dimensions of their work helped them to think more broadly about their own research.

While several participants expressed new perspectives on their research, at the time of the study only a few had been able to actually incorporate those perspectives into their research activities. One faculty member expressed a need to delay her comparative research because of the structure of academia and the challenges associated with deviating from her research agenda. Referring to her place in the tenure process, Julie said, “You get on track and you’re told that you can’t get off.” Senior faculty also expressed the challenge of integrating international research into their established research agenda. For Beth the challenge came in getting familiar with new bodies of research, and she admitted to “still struggling with and working on how to incorporate that [international perspective] into a personal research agenda.”

**Personal growth** Outside of their own teaching and research, all fifteen participants commented on the ways in which their participation in the GFDP influenced them personally. For many of these participants, the program helped them broaden their own perspectives on culture and difference in ways that helped them shift their frames of reference. For example, Stephanie learned from others in her cohort that pedagogy is culturally situated. Referring to Julie’s GFDP project in math education that compared the way math ability and math learning is conceptualized in many Asian countries and in the United States, Stephanie said, “I think I’ve learned a lot about that whole idea [of] how kids think are [sic] taught differently to think about different subject matters in different countries.” Exposure to these ideas in the GFDP led her to reflect on the idea outside of the program. She explained, “It hadn’t occurred to me that different kids in different countries learned reading and writing and math and everything in different ways.”

For Laura, the GFDP changed her view of herself in the world and led her to reflect on her upbringing. She said, “I definitely had that mentality that where you are and where you make your little home, that’s sort of where you are. I think that framed how I saw travel, how I saw interacting with people.” Describing the influence of the GFDP on her outlook she said:

I never thought of the world as being so big but yet so close and so personal that I could touch it and that I should want to go visit and see something else. ... Now I can see myself really saying to my boys, “Get out there. Sure you can travel here in the United States, but there’s also a whole wide world there that you can travel to.” And that’s not a perspective I think I would have taken before.

Participation in the GFDP not only affected participants academically but also resulted in personal growth and change.

**Perspectives on internationalization** The final theme from participants’ discussion of their own perspective shifts was in terms of their perspectives on internationalization. Participants had come to the program with various international experiences and perspectives on international education. As a result, the meaning that they made of internationalization through the

GFDP experience varied. Emily, for example, had very limited exposure to international education before applying for the GFDP, so her major perspective shift came from realizing that there was such a thing as internationalization and that it actually connected directly to her own educational values and priorities. Stephanie noted a similar experience in realizing that broader conversations about internationalization were relevant to teaching and education.

For participants who came to the GFDP with more international experience the program often helped them broaden their understanding of internationalization or think about it in new ways. For example, Mei had always thought about internationalization from her own perspective, being an Asian immigrant to the United States. After learning about other internationalization efforts through the GFDP, however, she explained, “Now I feel international is not only related to Asian people, it’s to European people, and other countries as well.” Donald similarly came to a more expansive understanding of internationalization through learning about the role that immigration plays in ideas of international education:

In our conversations of the other method instructors, I found it so interesting how they kept focusing on the immigrant experience. ... And so that helped me grow to see where I could put my emphasis on other new things in Science Ed for internationalizing.

The GFDP helped both of these participants expand their concepts of internationalization to be more inclusive.

For other participants, a deepening perspective on internationalization came in the form of exploring one’s personal connection to it. For example, Julie’s deepening perspective had to do with her reflecting on how her personal experience as a Korean American influenced her role in internationalization. She concluded, “I better understand now how I am—it’s weird to say it this way, because I haven’t really thought about it—but I am an actor and agent in the on-going internationalization.” David similarly expressed how his exploration of internationalization led to a deeper personal connection to and critical perspective on the topic. As he explained, “doing a little bit more reading has made me move away from the rhetoric [and say] let’s make sure that we’re doing good work as opposed to assuming that we’re doing good work and leaving damage in our path.” The GFDP’s explicit focus on internationalization influenced participants’ understandings of the process, its potential impact, and their place in the process.

## **Discussion and Implications**

In light of the importance of curriculum transformation to broaden efforts to internationalize higher education in the United States and the central role that faculty members play in the curriculum, the purpose of this study was to explore the potential for a professional development program for faculty members to promote the perspective transformation necessary to internationalize the curriculum. The findings from the study point to the potential for professional development initiatives like the GFDP to foster both instrumental and transformative outcomes to promote curriculum transformation and broader college or campus internationalization.

Some of the instrumental outcomes reflected in this study were not surprising—they were the very content of the curriculum transformation projects that were the centerpiece of the GFDP. From global warming to comparative perspectives on immigration to understanding how children learn math around the world, faculty members discovered and integrated a variety

of international topics in the courses they taught—one of the key components of curriculum transformation (Allan & Estler, 2005; Hedges, 1996; Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007). Importantly, though, participants went beyond just adding additional “special topics” to their courses through individual modules or course sessions and actually saw ways to infuse and integrate international content throughout their courses (Allan & Estler, 2005; Hedges, 1996; Major & Palmer, 2006; Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007).

Truly transforming/internationalizing the curriculum needs to go beyond what faculty members *do*, however, and actually transform what and how they *think* (Badley, 2000; Green, 2007). Prior research on faculty engagement in internationalization has identified the important role that lack of experience, interest, and cross-cultural competence plays in preventing faculty members from engaging in internationalization efforts (Andreasen, 2003; Green, 2007); the results of this study point to the potential for intentional professional development efforts like the GFDP to help faculty members overcome these barriers. Participants reported a wide range of transformative outcomes—they transformed their views on pedagogy and the use of authentic source materials, developed new and expanded research ideas, came to a better understanding of cultural differences, and developed more personal connections to international issues. Often these new ideas and perspectives came as a result of the structure and content of the program, both by providing readings and discussion on the broader context of internationalization and by providing opportunities for faculty members to learn from one another. Although it may be obvious that faculty members without substantial international experience can benefit from a program like the GFDP, a particularly important finding from this study is that even those participants *with* a great deal of prior international experience reported broadening and deepening their understanding of internationalization as well.

In addition to transforming participants’ international perspectives, the findings from this study point to additional ways in which programs like the GFDP can help overcome the barriers to internationalization (Andreasen, 2003; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Green, 2007; Kelsey & Dormody, 1995). By providing a modest stipend, the GFDP was able to create a small but important incentive for faculty members to make time to internationalize their courses; many participants noted this as a key motivation for participating in the program. Because the GFDP was institutionalized and coordinated through the Dean’s office, it also gave legitimacy to and increased the recognition of participants’ international work within their departments and across the College. Although these intentional elements of the program were vital to the success of the program, it is also important to note that the simple act of getting faculty members together on a regular basis had incidental benefits in helping participants build their professional networks to support their international work specifically and their career advancement more generally.

Although the findings of this study point to the potential for programs like the GFDP to contribute to larger internationalization goals of a college or university, the study also uncovered a number of limitations of this type of program. First, participants reported limited effect of the program on their research. This is perhaps not surprising as research was not the primary focus of the program, but as faculty members at research universities are primarily rewarded for research productivity, a program that better connects to faculty members’ research agendas will have a better chance of sustaining interest over time. The international dimensions of teaching are also more likely to be implemented and sustained if they connect to faculty members’ research. This finding points to the need to consider ways to support the internationalization of research more directly, in addition to supporting the internationalization of teaching.

A second limitation identified through this study is the relatively small effect of the GFDP that participants reported seeing on their departments or the College as a whole. Although faculty participants were successful at revising their own courses and saw broader personal impact, with few exceptions those effects were limited to the individual faculty members. If those individuals left the College, the effects of the program would likely leave with them. In many ways this may be connected to the issues raised by some of the findings of motivation—it is easy to reach faculty members who are already engaged or interested in international work, but much harder to reach those who are not. The majority of the faculty members in the College were not involved in the internationalization effort, so it is no surprise that revising a few courses in each department would not have a broader impact. However, this reality does raise an important question about the institutionalization of internationalization efforts, particularly in the area of curriculum transformation. Curriculum transformation can clearly not be successful in a vacuum; rather it should be part of a broader internationalization strategy that provides a foundation for expanding individual faculty members' internationalization work.

## Conclusion

International curriculum transformation is often heralded as one of the most important and promising strategies to internationalize higher education (e.g. Green & Schoenberg, 2006; Mansilla & Jackson, 2011), but faculty members cannot be expected to engage in the work necessary to transform the curriculum without adequate support to do so. As the findings of this study indicate, faculty development programs like the GFDP, when paired with a broader internationalizing strategy, have the potential to help faculty members develop the knowledge, perspectives, and motivation to engage in the difficult and important work of curriculum transformation. Institutions looking to support faculty efforts to internationalize the curriculum can learn from both the strengths and the limitations of the GFDP in creating similar programs on their own campuses.

## References

- Allan, E. J., & Estler, S. E. (2005). Diversity, privilege, and us: Collaborative curriculum transformation among educational leadership faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 29*, 209–232.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motives and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 290–305.
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Andreasen, R. J. (2003). Barriers to international involvement. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education, 10*, 65–69.
- Badley, G. (2000). Developing globally-competent university teachers. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 37*, 244–253.
- Clark, C. (2002). Effective multicultural curriculum transformation across disciplines. *Multicultural Perspectives, 4*(3), 37–46.
- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education, 58*, 491–504.
- Garson, K.D. (2007). *Applying transformative learning theory to cross-cultural training endeavors*. Unpublished masters thesis. Saint Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.
- Green, M. F. (2007). Internationalizing community colleges: Barriers and strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 138*, 15–24.
- Green, M. F., & Schoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2001). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In C. F. Conrad, J. G. Haworth, & L. R. Latucca (Eds.), *Qualitative research in higher education: ASHE reader series* (2nd ed., pp. 57–72). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Hedges, E. (1996). Curriculum transformation: A brief overview. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 24*(3/4), 16–22.
- Kelsey, K. D., & Dormody, T. J. (1995). College faculty motives and barriers for participating in international activities. *Journal of Agricultural and Extension Education, 2*, 49–56.
- King, K. P. (2002). Educational technology professional development as transformative learning opportunities. *Computers & Education, 39*, 283–297.
- Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 118*, 1–14. doi 10.1002/tl.348
- Major, C. H., & Palmer, B. (2006). Reshaping teaching and learning: The transformation of faculty pedagogical content knowledge. *Higher Education, 51*, 619–647.
- Mansilla, V. B., & Jackson, A. (2011). *Educating for global competence: Preparing our youth to engage the world*. New York, NY: Asia Society.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformative theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation* (pp. 3–33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ouellet, M. L. (2004). Faculty development and universal instructional design. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*, 135–144.
- Raby, R. L. (2007). Internationalizing the curriculum: On- and off-campus strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 138*, 57–66.
- Rosenfelt, D. S. (1994). Definitive issues: Women's studies, multicultural education, and curriculum transformation in policy and practice in the United States. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 22*(3/4), 26–41.
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Van Gyn, G., & Preece, A. (2007). Internationalizing the higher education curriculum: An emerging model for transforming faculty perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 37*(1), 67–94.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435–454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, E. W. (1994). Intercultural competence: A transformative learning process. *Adult Education Quarterly, 44*, 154–174.