

**Moving Beyond Marketing Study Abroad: Comparative Case Studies of the
Implementation of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration**

**A Five College Report
(2006-2007)**

**Brenda Gayl Van Deusen
Department of Educational Policy & Administration
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities**

**A Plan B Colloquium Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts in Comparative and International Development
Education**

Spring 2007

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Acknowledgements..... | 4 |
| Abbreviations..... | 5 |
| 1.) Introduction..... | 6 |
| 2.) Review of Literature..... | 9 |
| 3.) The Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration..... | 12 |
| 4.) 2006 Report (University of Minnesota): Oregon State University, The University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire, & Skidmore College.... | 15 |
| Description of the Research Process..... | 15 |
| Research Findings..... | 16 |
| 5.) Case Study #1 (University of Minnesota, 2006): Oregon State University | |
| 1a.) Impetus & Goals for CI | 16 |
| 2a.) Initial Barriers..... | 17 |
| 3a.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI..... | 18 |
| 4a.) Beginning the CI Process..... | 18 |
| 5a.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model..... | 19 |
| 6a.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model..... | 19 |
| 7a.) Refining the Minnesota Model..... | 20 |
| 6.) Case Study #2 (University of Minnesota, 2006): The University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire | |
| 1b.) Impetus & Goals for CI..... | 21 |
| 2b.) Initial Barriers..... | 21 |
| 3b.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI..... | 22 |
| 4b.) Beginning the CI Process..... | 22 |
| 5b.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model..... | 23 |
| 6b.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model..... | 23 |
| 7b.) Refining the Minnesota Model..... | 24 |
| 7.) Case Study #3 (University of Minnesota, 2006): Skidmore College | |
| 1c.) Impetus & Goals for CI..... | 25 |
| 2c.) Initial Barriers..... | 27 |
| 3c.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI..... | 27 |
| 4c.) Beginning the CI Process..... | 27 |
| 5c.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model..... | 28 |
| 6c.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model..... | 28 |
| 7c.) Refining the Minnesota Model..... | 29 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 8.) 2007 Report (Van Deusen): The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and Michigan State University (MSU) | |
| Description of the Research Process..... | 30 |
| Research Findings..... | 31 |
| 9.) Case Study #4 (Van Deusen, 2007): The University of California, San Diego | |
| 1d.) Learning About CI..... | 31 |
| 2d.) Learning About the Minnesota Model..... | 32 |
| 3d.) Impetus & Goals for CI..... | 32 |
| 4d.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI..... | 33 |
| 5d.) Beginning the CI Process..... | 33 |
| 6d.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model..... | 34 |
| 7d.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model..... | 35 |
| 8d.) Adapting CI for Institutional Needs..... | 36 |
| 9d.) CI Advice for Other Institutions..... | 36 |
| 10d.) Developing New Models of CI..... | 37 |
| 10.) Case Study #5 (Van Deusen, 2007): Michigan State University | |
| 1e.) Learning About CI..... | 37 |
| 2e.) Learning About the Minnesota Model..... | 38 |
| 3e.) Impetus & Goals for CI..... | 38 |
| 4e.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI..... | 39 |
| 5e.) Beginning the CI Process..... | 49 |
| 6e.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model..... | 40 |
| 7e.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model..... | 40 |
| 8e.) Adapting CI for Institutional Needs..... | 41 |
| 9e.) CI Advice for Other Institutions..... | 41 |
| 10e.) Developing New Models of CI..... | 42 |
| 11.) Conclusion..... | 42 |
| References..... | 46 |
| Appendix I..... | 48 |
| Survey Instrument (University of Minnesota, 2006) | |
| Appendix II..... | 49 |
| Survey Instrument (Van Deusen, 2007) | |
| Appendix III..... | 50 |
| Curriculum Integration Bibliography Project: Internationalizing the Campus (Van Deusen, 2007) | |

Acknowledgments

I would like to begin by extending my deepest appreciation to the Curriculum Integration team at the Learning Abroad Center, who instilled in me a passion for making learning abroad experiences accessible to all students. My supervisor and CIDE colleague, Gayle Woodruff, has been instrumental in guiding me through the nuances of the intricate and complex process that is internationalizing the campus. Her case study interviews formed the basis of this project, and I am grateful to have the opportunity to expand upon her research. Without her support as well as that of Lynn Anderson, Sophie Gladding, Molly McCoy, and Laurel Johnson, I would not have been fortunate enough to work as the Graduate Intern in Curriculum Integration during the 2006-2007 academic year.

I am extremely grateful for the support of my advisor, Dr. David Chapman, and my committee members, Dr. Arthur Harkins and Dr. Michelle Everson, for their attention and feedback. I would like to thank my interview participants for taking the time to share with me their expertise and best practices via telephone and email interviews. Without the support of Oregon State University, the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire, Skidmore College, University of California at San Diego, and Michigan State University, this project would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the Institutional Review Board at the University of Minnesota for its assistance in the development of this interview study.

I wish to thank my CIDE family at the University of Minnesota for a wonderful and productive year of learning and sharing knowledge and experiences. Finally, I would like to thank my family for their support.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------|--|
| AI | <i>Academic Integration</i> |
| CI | <i>Curriculum Integration</i> |
| CIC | <i>Committee on Institutional Cooperation</i> |
| EAP | <i>Education Abroad Program</i> |
| FIPSE | <i>Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education</i> |
| IT | <i>Institute of Technology</i> |
| MAP | <i>Major Advising Page(s) (See SAMAS)</i> |
| MSAG | <i>Multicultural Study Abroad Group</i> |
| MSU | <i>Michigan State University</i> |
| NAFSA | <i>Association of International Educators</i> |
| OIP | <i>Office of International Programs</i> |
| OSU | <i>Oregon State University</i> |
| SAAP | <i>Study Abroad Articulation Project</i> |
| SAMAS | <i>Study Abroad Major Advising Sheet(s) (See MAP)</i> |
| UC | <i>The University of California</i> |
| UCSD | <i>The University of California at San Diego</i> |
| UMN | <i>The University of Minnesota</i> |
| UOEAP | <i>Universitywide Office of the Education Abroad Program</i> |
| UWEC | <i>The University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire</i> |

Introduction

The Learning Abroad Center at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities is leading the nation in the development of meaningful and academically relevant study abroad options for undergraduate students by enabling them to fulfill major and/or liberal studies requirements overseas. The Curriculum Integration initiative, which is accomplished through extensive program research and collaboration with individual academic departments, provides opportunities for undergraduate students to study abroad without extending the length of the degree plan. This innovative approach to study abroad administration is transforming the ways in which international education professionals at the University of Minnesota and beyond approach the complex process of study abroad advising. The goal is no longer to simply recruit as many students as possible for study abroad opportunities through creative marketing; instead, study abroad advisers at the University of Minnesota are seeking to tailor international education experiences to meet the academic requirements and goals of each department and to achieve specific learning outcomes. This paradigm shift from destination-focused to discipline-focused advising has proven particularly beneficial for students enrolled in underrepresented disciplines such as engineering, natural sciences, and information technology.

The University of Minnesota has put forth its own framework, The Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration, to assist other institutions attempting the process of incorporating study abroad as an integral aspect of the undergraduate experience. This model was presented at the April 2004 Curriculum Integration Conference in Minneapolis and was enthusiastically received by 400 participants from 120 higher

education institutions in the United States, Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Australia, Denmark, France, and Spain (Anderson 2005, p. ii).

Since 2004, the Curriculum Integration team has continued to offer workshops to provide training to University of Minnesota departments, faculty, academic advisers, and study abroad administrators, in addition to presenting the evolving model at national conferences such as NAFSA and The Forum. Many colleges and university systems across the United States have published statements of intent on their websites stating their commitment to incorporating Curriculum Integration into study abroad administration; of those institutions, a significant number specifically cite the Minnesota Model as the impetus and inspiration for this paradigm shift. However, the commitment to effect institutional change presents a tremendous undertaking that can be arduous, costly, time-consuming, and even overwhelming. In order for the University of Minnesota to continue to develop, modify, and streamline the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration for ease of implementation across institutions, maintaining close contact with the first group of institutions that have opted to attempt this innovation is essential.

As only three years have passed since the first international Curriculum Integration conference in Minneapolis, we know relatively little about the outcomes of the implementation of the Minnesota Model at other institutions and, ultimately, the duplicability and transportability of the model itself. Michael Vande Berg (2005) stated in his closing plenary comments at the 2004 Curriculum Integration conference in Minneapolis that he was optimistic about the transportability of the Minnesota Model despite the fact that other institutions may lack the outside funding that the University of Minnesota has secured through the FIPSE and Bush grants (p. 38). However, the

transportability of this model must be further examined through case study research. Many questions remain unanswered. How have other colleges and universities used the Minnesota Model to integrate study abroad into the curriculum? What challenges have they faced? Is the Minnesota Model flexible enough to adapt to a wide variety of institutional cultures? What can be learned from these early experiences?

This interview case study project is an effort to gauge the perceptions and responses of professional study abroad administrators to the complexities of Curriculum Integration and the utilization of the Minnesota Model as an effective means of creating academically relevant study abroad experiences for undergraduate students. It is an extension of the unpublished Minnesota Model case study project conducted by the Director of Curriculum Integration at the University of Minnesota in 2006, which included interviews with study abroad administrators from three higher education institutions that were in the process of implementing their own Curriculum Integration efforts. These institutions included Oregon State University (OSU), the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire (UWEC), and Skidmore College.

Until this extension project, the results of those interviews were available only in the form of the researcher's notes. I have expanded the findings into a narrative format as per the researcher's request, and have extended the study to include interviews with three study abroad administrators from two other institutions applying the Minnesota Model in 2007: Michigan State University (MSU) and the University of California at San Diego (UCSD). The purpose of this extension of the 2006 University of Minnesota interview study is twofold. First, I have attempted to expand the knowledge base that the University of Minnesota Curriculum Integration team has constructed with regard to the

transportability of the Minnesota Model to other institutional contexts. The second purpose is to provide the Curriculum Integration team with a case study framework that can be further expanded and built upon on a yearly basis as more higher education institutions adopt and adapt various aspects of the Minnesota Model. Maintaining close contact with practitioners at participating institutions will prove invaluable in terms of developing and refining the Minnesota Model in the years to come.

Review of Literature

The American higher education system has begun to recognize the need to equip students with the skills necessary to navigate the complexities of an increasingly globalized and interconnected world (Barker, 2000; Pickert, 1992; Wood, 2005). Posey's (2003) study of the differences of educational achievement between study abroad participants and non-participants moves beyond the commonly cited outcomes of personal development, language acquisition, and intercultural competence to demonstrate the impact of study abroad on skill building and human capital. Despite the well-documented academic and personal benefits of study abroad, international education professionals recognize that simply transporting students overseas is not necessarily sufficient for achieving learning outcomes required by a particular discipline or concentration (Balkcum, 2005). As a result, creating academically relevant and meaningful study abroad experiences for undergraduate students has presented a longstanding challenge for international education professionals in the United States.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, many American higher education institutions began searching for ways to increase enrollment in study abroad programs in an effort to internationalize the undergraduate experience. In an extensive report on the Study Abroad

Articulation Project (SAAP), Burn (1991) presents case studies of eight universities that formed a collaborative partnership to increase student participation in study abroad. Participating universities included the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Earlham College, Georgetown University, the University of California at Riverside, the University of Colorado at Boulder, Kalamazoo College, Pomona College, and Smith College. The SAAP study culminated in a compilation of best practices from each of these universities ranging from garnering faculty support to establishing a concentration in International Affairs. The issue of shifting the perception of study abroad from that of a supplementary educational experience to an integral aspect of the overall undergraduate curriculum was present, but remained in the periphery in favor of internationalizing the campus as a whole. Much of the available literature to this effect is focused solely on the institutional perspective rather than that of the practitioner and/or student (Barrows, 2000; Bok, 1995; Bonfiglio, 1999).

The efforts of higher education institutions nationwide to increase enrollment in study abroad through programs such as SAAP doubled the number of participating undergraduates over the course of a decade from 48,400 in 1987-1988 to 99,500 students in 1997-1998 (Balkcum, 2005, p. 5). However, this increase in participation was far from significant as it represented only 1% of the total undergraduate student population in the United States. Of that small fraction, only 22% of study abroad participants were enrolled in degree programs outside of the humanities and social sciences (Balkcum, p. 5). Clearly, a marketing strategy for recruitment was not meeting the academic needs of students enrolled in these disciplines.

The new millennium brought forth a discursive shift in the literature; the need to integrate study abroad into the curriculum was acknowledged by educators and administrators alike, and researchers began analyzing the curriculum integration process at the institutional level. During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Forum on Education Abroad conducted a study entitled *A Baseline Survey of Curriculum Integration in Education Abroad* (Woodruff et al., 2005). The objectives of this survey were to “identify the broadly varied conceptualizations and definitions of curriculum integration, describe the methods used to implement the model(s), and describe challenges that have been encountered with the models and integration methods” (p. 4).

Forty-six U.S. higher education institutions responded to the survey, which asked them to describe their understanding of curriculum integration, transfer of credit for study abroad, the use of study abroad as a requirement, institutional culture, the role of faculty in study abroad, and institutional obstacles to study abroad. The results of the data analysis showed that while the participating institutions were attempting to integrate study abroad experience into the curriculum in many creative and innovative ways, a consensus on the meaning of Curriculum Integration in the form of a cohesive cross-disciplinary model separate from the Minnesota Model had not emerged (p. 19).

It is evident from the aforementioned studies that institutions internationalize in different ways and often collaborate to share resources and best practices. The individualized internationalization efforts of higher education institutions have been well-documented, and advice for how to achieve individual institutional goals is abundant (Bartell, 2003; Burr, 2004; Kerrigan, 2005). Keillor and Emore (2003), for example, have put forth a Curriculum Integration model specifically for International Business

departments designed to be transportable across institutions. However, there is little discussion in the relevant literature regarding the implementation of a specific model of Curriculum Integration (such as the Minnesota Model) that extends not only across institutions, but also across disciplines. Furthermore, the studies previously discussed have not directly incorporated the perspectives of individual practitioners or study abroad administrators working to implement such a multifaceted model of institutional change. As more institutions are adopting the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration to meet their internationalization goals, understanding the practitioner perspective will be essential for the development and sustainability of this innovative framework.

The Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration

The Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration traces its roots to the late 1990s, when the Learning Abroad Center at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities created a partnership with the Institute of Technology (IT) as a pilot initiative to increase undergraduate access to international education opportunities within typically underrepresented disciplines such as engineering and the sciences (University of Minnesota Learning Abroad Center, 2006). This goal was to be accomplished through a paradigm shift in study abroad advising from a focus on the destination to a focus on fulfilling academic requirements and achieving departmental learning outcomes. The initial work increased the number engineering students studying abroad, and the success of the pilot project enabled the Curriculum Integration team at the University of Minnesota to apply for grant funding for expansion across the disciplines.

The Minnesota Model is conceptually straightforward but logistically complex. I will attempt to provide a brief summary of its core conceptual components. The goals of the Minnesota Model of CI are as follows:

- 1.) Increase integration of study abroad into all undergraduate majors and minors
- 2.) Provide additional scholarships for study abroad
- 3.) Enhance faculty/adviser awareness of the contributions that study abroad makes toward creating global citizens and well-educated students
- 4.) Develop innovative practices, materials, partnerships, and professional alliances
- 5.) 50% of each graduating class will have studied abroad
- 6.) Create long-term institutional change: a more "internationalized undergraduate experience" (University of Minnesota Learning Abroad Center, 2006a)

The five guiding principles of the Minnesota Model of CI include:

- 1.) Partnerships
- 2.) All participants are teachers and learners
- 3.) Ownership outside study abroad offices
- 4.) Work within existing structures
- 5.) Long-term impact (Anderson, 2005a, p. 9)

These goals and guiding principles are set into action through a process that is described as "Assess-Match-Motivate", a three-tiered component that strives to provide students in every discipline with opportunities to fulfill requirements through study abroad. Gladding and Shirley (2005) describe the process: 1.) Assessing the curriculum and determining how study abroad can fit with each major's curriculum. 2.) Determining

how study abroad can help students achieve their desired learning outcomes. 3.) Finding specific study abroad programs that will meet these goals. 4.) Motivating students (especially through advising relationships) (p. 14).

A liaison is assigned to meet with members of each academic department or discipline and is responsible for informing them about the goals, boundaries, and outcomes of Curriculum Integration. According to Gladding and Shirley (2005) the first stage of this partnership with departments involves “assessing the curriculum and finding program matches to develop a study abroad major advising sheet [SAMAS],” an informational publication designed to inform students of the study abroad options within their particular discipline (p. 14). Special consideration is given to issues of course sequence, major requirements, electives, curricular expectations, internship experiences, and courses within the discipline that cannot be taken abroad (p. 15). After a department has selected and approved a list of study abroad programs for its students and an appropriate SAMAS has been published, the second stage of the partnership “train[s] advisers on the use of the major advising sheets and evaluating their effectiveness” (p.15). The third and final stage is described as the “feedback loop” in which study abroad participants of programs approved by their academic department evaluate their experiences. This stage promotes further revision of the major advising sheets (p. 15).

The Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration also systematically addresses five major barriers to study abroad for undergraduate students. These barriers are referred to as Vande Berg’s “5 F’s”:

- 1.) Finance: This barrier is addressed by increasing funding for scholarships, applying financial aid to study abroad programs, and reframing the concept of study abroad as an investment.
- 2.) Fit: The Minnesota Model empowers study abroad administrators to work directly with departments in order to match degree requirements to study abroad coursework. By addressing this issue, time spent abroad translates into time spent meeting degree requirements.
- 3.) Faculty/Advisers: This barrier is addressed by educating faculty members about study abroad and dispelling myths as well as empowering them to explore and select appropriate study abroad options for their students.
- 4.) Fear: This barrier is addressed by uncovering the root causes of students' fear as it relates to study abroad and by "making study abroad a natural part of academic conversations".
- 5.) Family & Friends: This barrier is addressed by creating publications and materials related to study abroad that students can share with their families and friends and also by reminding them of the new relationships that they can explore abroad with host families and fellow students (Anderson, 2005a, p. 9).

2006 Report (University of Minnesota): Oregon State University (OSU), The University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire (UWEC) & Skidmore College

Description of the Research Process

In April 2006, the Director of Curriculum Integration at the Learning Abroad Center at the University of Minnesota conducted telephone interviews with study abroad administrators at three universities that were at different stages of adapting the Minnesota

Model of Curriculum Integration to their own institutional contexts. Participants included the Director of the Office of International Education and Outreach at Oregon State University, a coordinator at the Center for International Education at the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, and the Director of the Office of International Programs at Skidmore College. The respondents provided answers to the following questions:

1. What was the impetus for you/your unit/your institution to begin CI? What are your goals?
2. What were some of the initial barriers?
3. What were some of the initial perceived benefits that the institution would gain from CI?
4. How did you begin the process? (Who did you speak with initially? How did your leadership view the initiative? Which disciplines did you choose and why? Etc.)
5. What from the Minnesota model did you initially use?
6. What from the Minnesota model worked/did not work?
7. How have you refined curriculum integration for your own institution? (University of Minnesota, 2006)

Case Study #1 (University of Minnesota, 2006): Oregon State University

1a.) Impetus & Goals for CI

OSU has traditionally shared study abroad programs with the University of Oregon System and other consortia, but these programs have tended to be focused primarily upon language, culture, and liberal arts. The impetus for OSU to begin implementing CI into study abroad administration was driven not only by the need to address increasing enrollment in study abroad programs, but also by the institution's emphasis on professional degree programs in fields such as engineering, forestry, and

agriculture. The international education needs of professional students at OSU were not being adequately addressed by traditional study abroad options.

The prior Director of International Programs became aware of the University of Minnesota's Curriculum Integration initiative and hired the respondent (the current Director), in part, to begin the implementation process at OSU. As his unit was responsible for the development of faculty projects overseas, he was also appointed as "college liaison" because of his connected status with OSU faculty. The ultimate goal of CI implementation was to improve study abroad statistics in the long term. Despite increasing enrollment levels, only 438 students out of 19,000 (approximately 2.3%) were studying abroad at the time. OSU recognized that a paradigm shift needed to occur; a shift in study abroad recruitment strategies was needed in order for OSU to focus on curricular content of programs rather than simply marketing programs to students by geographic location alone.

2a.) Initial Barriers

Before OSU made the decision to implement CI into its study abroad administration practices, the university lacked a formal system for addressing the curricular aspect of study abroad. OSU had depended solely upon marketing study abroad programs to students based upon the geographic locations of the programs rather than curricular content. Therefore, the paradigm shift from marketing to CI presented a significant undertaking. The Director also identified the following barriers that OSU encountered when first approaching CI as an alternative:

- Garnering support from the rest of the study abroad staff
- Practical concerns regarding which process to use to reach enrollment goals

- Practical concerns regarding how to move study abroad from the study abroad office and into the curriculum; increasing visibility on campus.
- While academic advisors were supportive of CI as a concept, they expressed that it would be difficult for them to take on the extra work involved in the initiative.

3a.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI

The Office of International Education at OSU is focused on the learning outcomes of study abroad and included five learning outcomes for studying abroad from the University of Minnesota CI initiative on their website in 2004. These outcomes include discipline-specific learning, placement of a discipline in its international context, country/region-specific learning, language acquisition, and student (personal) development (Oregon State University Office of International Education, 2004).

4a.) Beginning the CI Process

The Curriculum Integration process at OSU began with a retreat within the study abroad office to discuss the importance of advising and to devise effective ways to collaborate with college advisers. The study abroad office began to contact individual departments to discuss the curricular benefits of study abroad through CI. These interactions began with an informal meeting with the Biology department to discuss degree audit and how study abroad fits (or would fit) into students' degree programs. Shortly afterwards, other departments began to request that the study abroad advisers come to them to discuss the CI initiative. The Study Abroad Major Advising Sheets (SAMAS) were particularly instrumental in communicating the principles and value of CI to the colleges.

5a.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model

The Minnesota Model of CI is important to OSU in part because of the role of study abroad in the university's strategic plan and, ultimately, as a core outcome in accreditation. The Director described the Minnesota Model as easy to articulate, which eases the process of replicating it to meet the international education needs of OSU. While the SAMAS publications are useful for communicating the process and value of CI to departments, faculty, and advisers, he explained that their primary purpose at OSU has been to serve as a foundation for conversation, and finally collaboration, with faculty.

When OSU began the CI process, degree audit reviews were critical in terms of determining how credits earned abroad could be applicable to a specific major. Determining the best timing for students to study abroad according to their majors also became an important issue. Assessing the curriculum has been the most important aspect of the Minnesota Model for OSU, and encouraging faculty to think about learning outcomes has also proven critical.

6a.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model

Expected outcomes of study abroad and CI for OSU students include intercultural competencies, increased understanding of cultural pluralism, and greater commitment to social responsibility. As of 2006, the OSU has made progress in the following areas:

- Formed an International Advisory Council (faculty, associate deans)
- Compiled a study abroad outcomes document created specifically for the OSU curricula
- Established a mini MSAG (Multicultural Study Abroad Group)
- Developed a taxonomy that can be used in the accreditation process

- Mentored graduate students
- Sought out volunteer interns from the College Student Personnel and Psychology programs to work on CI and advising from curricular perspectives.
- Began a partnership with the Center for Teaching & Learning Services to focus on student-centered learning
- Began working with the international degree program track, which is an option for any student within their undergraduate degree (similar to the University of Minnesota's foreign studies minor)
- Received a request from the College of Health and Human Sciences to measure the impact of study abroad on students in these disciplines

The Director expressed that study abroad professionals need to be able to concretely state how study abroad impacts learning outcomes through data collection and research. He stated that it is also important to be able to assess learning outcomes according to program structure. For example, what learning outcomes can be expected from a direct enrollment experience as opposed to another program structure? What can be measured? He considers the assessment of learning outcomes as important to the international education field as a whole.

7a.) Refining the Minnesota Model

The Director expressed interest in further collaboration with the University of Minnesota's CI team, indicating that he would be willing to attend a summer workshop related to one or more of the following themes:

- Staffing models
- More specific work with particular majors (such as Engineering and Forestry)

- Scripts to articulate importance of study abroad and counter resistance
- Presentations related to CI research, study abroad outcomes, statistics, and data collection

Case Study #2 (University of Minnesota, 2006): The University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

1b.) Impetus & Goals for CI

Administrators in positions of leadership expressed that study abroad should not constitute a mere supplement to the educational experiences of UWEC students, but rather should be fully integrated into the curriculum. Involvement in CI was a natural progression of this leadership for UWEC.

2b.) Initial Barriers

The coordinator observed that a major administrative barrier to the implementation of CI at UWEC has been that although faculty members and advisers demonstrate enthusiasm about the CI initiative, they are often reluctant to take action. As a result, knowing when and how forcefully to push the CI initiative has become a challenge for the staff members. In terms of academic barriers, she finds that it often takes a considerable amount of time to communicate with partner institutions about curricular information such as course details and laboratory hours. This information is essential to the facilitation of transfer credit for UWEC students. For the students themselves, the cost of study abroad constitutes a major perceived barrier. As many students are first generation college students, they often face unique challenges that can make participation in a study abroad experience difficult.

3b.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI

The administration at UWEC publicly acknowledged the value that study abroad has as part of a college education. The CI initiative is designed to increase study abroad opportunities for students regardless of discipline.

4b.) Beginning the CI Process

Initially, the coordinator traveled to Minnesota to consult with CI team about beginning the process of utilizing the Minnesota Model at UWEC. When she returned, she presented the CI initiative to the department chair of the Department of Economics, who is directly responsible for course articulations. They discussed appropriate timelines for students to study abroad within the Economics degree program and worked collaboratively to create the first SAMAS for the department. She then presented the SAMAS to the department and the academic adviser and discussed communicating with students about their study abroad options and publishing international education opportunities for Economics students on the department website. Following this meeting, she introduced the CI initiative to the Management and Marketing departments.

At first, the School of Business faculty wanted to develop new study abroad programs for their curriculum, but the CI team at UWEC was able to show that many existing programs could be utilized to effectively meet curricular needs of the department. The School of Business came to the realization that it did not need to run its own programs; it could make use of CI to offer study abroad opportunities to Business students, which would save time, money, and resources. As a result of this realization, The School of

Business became the most receptive academic unit to the implementation of the CI process.

5b.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model

To expand the CI initiative across the disciplines, the coordinator worked with the Registrar's office to gain access to information about courses that students have previously taken abroad. She indicated that gaining an understanding of previously approved courses would help departments to save time when beginning the CI implementation process.

6b.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model

The coordinator explained that the Teacher/Learner Principle has been the most important aspect of the Minnesota Model for UWEC. Specifically, carefully defining the role of the faculty (curricular experts) and the CI team (study abroad experts) has helped to open the lines of communication between study abroad administrators and departments. Another particularly effective aspect of the Minnesota Model for UWEC has been the SAMAS publications. They inform both students and faculty about the possible learning outcomes of study abroad within a specific discipline. Feedback from academic advisers about the SAMAS has been extremely favorable.

She noted that the SAMAS reframes the discussion about study abroad from destination to discipline. The study abroad office discusses this transition often, even during Parent Orientation sessions. In this respect, the SAMAS concept has changed the way that study abroad is approached by advisers, students, and even parents at UWEC. The study abroad office has also developed a Global Adviser newsletter for faculty,

advisers, and staff, which has also proven an effective means of communication. As a result, the demand for CI is growing; the College of Arts & Sciences has requested that three to four departments per year utilize the CI initiative for its study abroad options. Some departments also appear to be responding to “peer pressure” as well; they are requesting to work with the CI team after having seen the SAMAS publications of other departments.

7b.) Refining the Minnesota Model

The CI team at UWEC has invited faculty and advisers visit their study abroad office for formal tours and refreshments. They have also arranged for visits with new faculty during the second month of employment to discuss the role of study abroad in academic advising. The study abroad office also strives to be flexible and sensitive to the needs of individual departments. For instance, when the Department of Nursing was unable to locate semester programs that were both cost-effective and academically appropriate for its students, the study abroad office created summer programs to meet this need.

UWEC has also focused on staffing in order to meet the needs of the institution. The full-time study abroad staff works for 1-2 hours per week on average with the CI initiative. They are assisted by graduate students employed for credit-bearing internships, who spend 5 hours per week on CI. The graduate interns also work with individual departments. All other interns have also begun to work on CI as well, researching potential study abroad program options for individual departments and compiling SAMAS publications.

Case Study #3 (University of Minnesota, 2006): Skidmore College**1c.) Impetus & Goals for CI**

The impetus for CI at Skidmore College developed through student experiences. Study abroad returnees reported that their experiences abroad were an extremely valuable aspect of their undergraduate education, but were not always able to articulate how their study abroad experiences were connected to their academic plan at Skidmore. The faculty also lacked confidence in the academic rigor of study abroad and questioned its curricular legitimacy. In the 2001-2001 academic year, there was a campus-wide conversation about creating an academic vision for Skidmore (a portal to the world) and the potential of study abroad experiences to assist the college in reaching its goals. The following question was collectively examined: what are the academic goals of study abroad? The Office of International Programs (OIP) wanted the input of the faculty about this issue, but preferred not to require the faculty to take on more responsibility than necessary for study abroad programming.

The Director began strategic conversations with department chairs to discover what learning outcomes they wanted for students who choose to participate in study abroad programs. Out of these conversations, an idea emerged; the OIP could collaborate with the departments to create an approved list of study abroad programs targeted by discipline. While this idea was still in the planning stages, she learned about the Minnesota Model and decided to attend the CI conference in Minneapolis. Until that time, she did not have a name to describe her efforts. CI made sense to her as a term and as a concept that could help Skidmore achieve its international education goals.

The first CI goal for Skidmore was to create and maintain list of 125 approved programs that would be evaluated on a 4-year cycle. This list would be created by following normal procedures at Skidmore, which has a process-focused institutional culture designed to encourage discussion. Faculty input would become an integral aspect of the selection and evaluation process for study abroad programs. Each program must demonstrate academic soundness, and the OIP would need to provide faculty with enough information about the structure and curricula of the programs to aid in the approval process.

The following questions were posed to participating departments prior to the initial CI meeting:

- 1.) What are your goals for study abroad?
- 2.) What feedback do you get from students?
- 3.) What coursework is appropriate for study abroad?

The faculty response indicated that finding the right program for their students was the primary goal for study abroad, and they expressed appreciation to the OIP for taking an active interest in their students and curricula. The conversations between the OIP and the participating departments became focused on meeting this goal as opposed to simply marketing study abroad in general.

Ultimately, it took the OIP two years to get the CI project approved and one year to implement it, although the Director stated that she would not recommend such a short implementation timeline to other institutions. She indicated that she would have preferred a two year implementation process; however, the process inadvertently coincided with a new direct billing system, which proved helpful.

2c.) Initial Barriers

Time constraints presented a major barrier for study abroad administrators at Skidmore, as did encouraging department chairs to make CI a priority. Many conversations were required between the study abroad office and individual departments before changes could be made. Although the study abroad office staff tried to communicate that CI would benefit the departments in the long run by saving time and enhancing the quality of Skidmore students' academic experiences, they found that the faculty were not always immediately receptive to their ideas.

3c.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI

According to the new strategic plan put forth by the president of the college, Skidmore is seeking 60% student participation in study abroad by 2015. While Skidmore's institutional culture is not always amenable to top-down goals, the CI initiative resonated with the study abroad office. Not only would it help to increase enrollment in study abroad, but it would also provide a framework for realizing this shared goal.

4c.) Beginning the CI Process

The process at Skidmore began with the CI conference that the Director attended with her dean at the University of Minnesota. The conference reinforced that the concept of CI was a real movement that was also taking place at other institutions. This solidified the vision that she had for CI at Skidmore and gave her a support network from which to draw resources and ideas. She made a presentation to Committee of Educational Policy and Planning with her dean present at the meeting.

A new faculty subcommittee on International Study was formed with each discipline selecting a representative. From this subcommittee, she was able to form close cooperative relationships with others who were committed to the CI initiative. The proposal for CI went to the faculty floor and was approved by a voting process. After the approval, the dean allowed her to discuss it with the department chairs.

5c.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model

The Director “started with the low-hanging fruit”. When departments that were particularly enthusiastic about the CI initiative approached her and offered their support, she arranged meetings with them to discuss the process. She prepared pre-meeting questions for those departments and came to the meetings with syllabi from potential study abroad providers collected from OIP research. For example, the OIP offered the Department of Anthropology twenty prospective study abroad programs and asked them to choose twelve for their department, keeping in mind diversity of experience. Once the department officially approved a selection of programs, the subcommittee made final recommendations. The Committee of Educational Policy and Planning gave the final approval, and the entire list was brought before the faculty floor.

6c.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model

The Director reported significant changes in study abroad at Skidmore as a result of the implementation of the Minnesota Model. Prior to taking part in the CI initiative, there were four full-time employees in the Office of International Programs including the director, two program coordinators, and a clerical staff member. The OIP reported to the Dean of Studies, who in turn reported to the Dean of Faculty. While Skidmore operated

ten of its own study abroad programs and utilized a wide range of providers, the academic advising system for study abroad was disjoined and lacked focus. Typically, students would approach advisers to discuss program options that they had found on their own. The students were much more focused on the destination than integrating study abroad into their chosen discipline.

Following the implementation of the Minnesota Model of CI, two full-time employees (an assistant director and a finance coordinator) were added to the OIP staff as per the CI proposal. The transition from study abroad advising from a destination-focused perspective to one emphasizing academic goals presented a major paradigm shift for advisers and students alike. Skidmore now uses a list of faculty-approved programs, which are directly tied to academic units. The approval of a given study abroad program is now contingent upon the appropriateness of its curricular content. Study abroad participation has seen a substantial increase following the implementation of the Minnesota Model. During the 2001-2002 academic year, 289 students studied abroad. During the 2005-2006 academic year, which was the first year of full implementation, 453 students participated in a study abroad experience.

7c.) Refining the Minnesota Model

In terms of adapting the Minnesota Model to meet the specific needs of Skidmore College, the Director discussed the importance of connecting CI to the institutional culture. She stated that affecting successful curricular change was dependent on faculty involvement, and she was able to accomplish this by utilizing the Teacher/Learner Principle. This concept was especially important to the success of CI at Skidmore because it established the nature of the relationship between faculty (academic experts)

and the OIP staff (study abroad experts). Establishing roles helped to break down communication barriers, fostered a collaborative partnership between the two groups, and increased faculty engagement, enthusiasm, and participation. The OIP staff also began to adapt their discussions about study abroad to meet the needs of individual departments and disciplines. Although the implementation of the Minnesota Model proved extremely time-consuming at Skidmore, she feels that it was also very rewarding. The CI system is in place and is functioning well. Faculty engagement and the academic advising process have also shown improvement. Skidmore was planning to begin the SAMAS writing process in the summer following this interview.

2007 Report (Van Deusen): The University of California at San Diego & Michigan State University

Description of the Research Process

In March and April of 2007, while working as the Graduate Intern in Curriculum Integration at the Learning Abroad Center at the University of Minnesota, I conducted telephone and email interviews with study abroad administrators at two other universities that were beginning the process of adapting the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration to their own institutional contexts. Participants included the Dean of International Education and Director of the International Center and the Academic Integration Coordinator at the University of California at San Diego, and the Assistant Director of the Office of Study Abroad at Michigan State University. The respondents provided responses to the following questions:

- 1.) How did you / your office first learn about Curriculum Integration?

- 2.) How did you / your office first learn about the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration?
- 3.) What was the impetus for your office / institution to begin Curriculum Integration? What were the goals of this initiative?
- 4.) What were some of the perceived benefits that the institution would gain from the use of Curriculum Integration?
- 5.) How did your office/institution begin the process?
- 6.) What aspects of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration did your office / institution include / exclude, and why?
- 7.) What aspects of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration worked? Which did not? Why?
- 8.) How has your office adapted Curriculum Integration to meet the specific needs of your institution?
- 9.) What advice would you give to other study abroad offices / institutions interested in using Curriculum Integration?
- 10.) Has your institution / office developed its own model of Curriculum Integration? If so, please describe it and discuss how it has been implemented at your institution and/or other institutions.

As two representatives from UCSD were interviewed, their responses are separately labeled. It should be noted that the University of California system refers to Curriculum Integration as Academic Integration, or AI.

Case Study #4 (Van Deusen, 2007): The University of California, San Diego

1d.) Learning About CI

Dean of International Education: Curriculum Integration is referred to as Academic Integration at UCSD. It became an integral aspect of the University of California system's international education initiative several years ago.

AI Coordinator: “I first learned about Curriculum Integration when I was hired to coordinate the Academic Integration Project at UCSD. It is my understanding that several of my colleagues from UCSD and also from other campuses in the UC System, as well as from UOEAP (University-wide Office of EAP—all UC) attended the Conference on CI in Minnesota in the spring of 2004. I’m not sure how long UOEAP had been talking about Academic Integration, but I’d say for probably a year before I was hired in the fall of 2004.”

2d.) Learning About the Minnesota Model

The Dean of International Education learned about the Minnesota Model of CI at NAFSA Conferences prior to 2004 and at the April 2004 conference in Minnesota.

AI Coordinator: “I learned about it at the same time I learned about the concept of CI, as discussed above. I didn’t know any other campuses were doing anything similar when I first heard about the Minnesota model.”

3d.) Impetus & Goals for CI

Dean of International Education: The goal of AI is to increase enrollment in study abroad without extending the length of students’ degree programs and delaying graduation.

AI Coordinator: “There was a woman at UC Davis who had started implementing some of the outreach activities (I suppose that she learned at the UMN conference in spring 2004?) at her campus and she presented on her efforts at the UOEAP annual conference in Santa Barbara in June 2004. Apparently her presentation was so well

received that either the President of UOEAP or one of the deans decided to ante up some money (\$20,000 per campus) as part of a matching fund program to try to get academic integration started at each of the (then) 8 UC campuses. Taken from the UOEAP AI web site: ‘The two primary goals of AI are to (1) further engage and invest academic units in EAP, and (2) demonstrate the feasibility of, and reduce academic barriers to, participation in EAP for students in all disciplines’” (University of California Education Abroad Program, 2007).

4d.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI

AI Coordinator: “Again, from the AI web site: ‘In addition, AI initiatives may: increase enrollment in EAP; streamline and automate work processes; highlight opportunities for underrepresented student cohorts; or help internationalize the University of California’” (University of California Education Abroad Program, 2007).

5d.) Beginning the CI Process

Dean of International Education: The CI process at UCSD has included the following.

- First step meetings (informational meetings for students)
- Major Advising Page(s) (MAP – see SAMAS)
- Meetings with departments
- Outreach to colleges and advisors and working with them to ensure that they have a baseline understanding of the CI process
- Meetings / conferences
- Orientation presentations for parents, families, and students
- 10 student interns / student organization liaisons

- Presentations to student organizations
- Class presentations (50 minute units have not been included yet)

The AI team hasn't yet convened with all the provosts or sought out broader buy-in, but that is just beginning to get underway through her leadership.

AI Coordinator: "UCSD seized upon the opportunity to take advantage of the matching funds program; they were looking for someone who had relationships with the department and college advisors and when they found me, the process began!"

6d.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model

Dean of International Education: Every aspect of the Minnesota Model that USCD has utilized has been working, especially the First Step Meetings and MAP (SAMAS) publications. The AI team completed the MAP publications without departmental consultations; instead, they accounted for what has already been done and presented the departments with the completed MAPs for their approval. As of 2007, they have not yet consulted with the departments with respect to what they would like the students to be able to do overseas, nor have they discussed learning outcomes with the departments.

AI Coordinator: "Initially, we had only the notes from the person at UC Davis who had been making some strides in the AI process and the UMN CI web site to use as guidance. I followed some of the Minnesota methodology in creating a 'What is AI?' press sheet to release to the UCSD community, and then used the Minnesota SAMAS Development Guide to create a template for our own Major Advising Pages. When the monograph came out in August 2005, I read through it cover to cover to try to further grasp what the project I was working on might entail in the future. You have to

understand that this project has been very organic from the start—the matching funds program came with no strings attached, and no guidance initially, from UOEAP on how to proceed with the project. I sat down with the faculty director of our office to come up with some phases of our project, and the initial phase (which has brought us really into this 3rd year) included outreach efforts to the colleges and departments (workshops and presentations to advisors and faculty), development of Major Advising Pages (MAPs) for departments (we currently have approx 18 fully developed and another 12 in development, out of a total of approx 50 to develop) and development of a database to obtain and track approved courses from abroad. I also adapted an adviser and faculty survey from Minnesota to use at one of our large workshops for advisers.

There are so many aspects of the Minnesota Model that we have not been able to include as part of our efforts due to a lack of funding. Our AI project is funded at approximately \$20,000 annually, whereas Minnesota had the FIPSE and Bush Foundation grants totaling more than \$3 million, I believe. Also, in the UC system we are still in the very early stages of AI. I think we'll be able to include other aspects of Minnesota's model as we develop the project further on each campus and in the UC system as a whole." Author's note: While the University of Minnesota's total funding for CI was over three million dollars, only one third of that amount was grant funding. The other two thirds was a result of institutional cost sharing.

7d.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model

Dean of International Education: All of the UC systems have been working with EAP, which is a set of programs that the UC system runs. There is an office and a rotating faculty director every two years. What hasn't been working well is that not all of

the languages or geographic destinations that students are interested in are available. AI had to ask EAP to relinquish some of their control because some students wanted to go on Opportunities Abroad Programs (OAP).

AI Coordinator: “So far, I’d say the outreach methodology has worked for our needs, although we haven’t had the top-down support or leadership at the campus or system-wide level that Minnesota had to essentially mandate the internationalization of the campuses.”

8d.) Adapting CI for Institutional Needs

The Dean of International Education’s advice for other institutions is to adapt and adopt as much as possible from the Minnesota Model. There is no need to reinvent the wheel; look at a needs assessment for the institution (including goals and objectives) and adapt the Minnesota Model accordingly.

AI Coordinator: “In addition to the things I’ve mentioned above, we’ve used some of the evaluation and assessment processes Minnesota used, and have formed a system-wide workgroup to begin the assessment of the AI project.”

9d.) CI Advice for Other Institutions

AI Coordinator: “There are fantastic guidelines, processes, examples, and methodologies to be learned and borrowed from Minnesota’s model! However, Minnesota had funding and administrative support that is rare, I think, among other similar institutions, at least to date. I am excited by the prospect of someday being as “integrated” as the four UMN campuses, but things here are moving as slow as molasses

(with just a handful of people working on the project system-wide), so I'd caution other offices/institutions to be realistic about goals and support before launching in. It can be frustrating holding yourself up to the goals which Minnesota set and accomplished in such a relatively short amount of time!"

10d.) Developing New Models of CI

The Dean of International Education plans to integrate the Minnesota Model into the existing UC AI model. She will be helping with development of materials for UC-wide. In terms of how her leadership will shape the CI initiative: "To a great extent. It will enrich what's happening and shape it at UCSD and UC-wide. The UCSD staff is very amenable to Assess-Match-Motivate."

Case Study #5 (Van Deusen, 2007): Michigan State University

1e.) Learning About CI

The Assistant Director of the Office of Study Abroad at Michigan State University spent nine years at the University of Minnesota while working on her graduate degrees and is familiar with the Minnesota's international education history. She explained that in order to determine the relationship between MSU and Curriculum Integration, one must distinguish between when the phenomenon itself was labeled and elements of its existence before it was labeled. MSU began looking into the CI initiative in response to the University of Minnesota's success. MSU was interested in CI as a strategy for encouraging underrepresented majors to study abroad.

Initially, many people at MSU were skeptical of the Minnesota Model because it represented a radical departure from the dominant institutional culture. Since the 1950s,

MSU has taken great pride in their trademark short-term, faculty led programs. These programs simply take existing MSU courses overseas; the Assistant Director explained, “This is the ultimate curriculum integration.” Because of the mindset that study abroad can only be properly executed by faculty members teaching MSU courses overseas, it was very difficult to convince administrators and faculty members that direct enrollment programs in which MSU faculty members do not lead the course(s) could be as academically legitimate as the faculty-led programs.

In 2003, a new staff member took the initiative to follow the Minnesota Model insofar as the production of study abroad publications. They are currently working on assisting students to earn MSU grades and credits in direct enrollment programs through cosponsoring. Certain programs have begun to approve these opportunities for students, which constitutes a significant step forward.

2e.) Learning About the Minnesota Model

The Assistant Director learned about the Minnesota Model informally through her contacts at the University of Minnesota and through the Committee for Institutional Cooperation (CIC), a consortium of twelve major research universities in the Midwest. She recognized CI as a strategy to pool resources, exchange best practices and to avoid “reinventing the wheel”.

3e.) Impetus & Goals for CI

The Assistant Director described the goal of CI at MSU as twofold: the first goal was to increase options for majors that are typically underrepresented in study abroad (sciences, engineering, technology, etc). The second goal was to increase participation in

semester-long direct enrollment programs as an alternative to the traditional short-term faculty-led programs.

4e.) Initial Perceived Benefits of CI

MSU has held a longstanding commitment to campus internationalization since the Dean for International Programs was established in 1956, and is united in its efforts to produce “Global Ready Graduates”. The Assistant Director stated that the benefits of CI must be viewed in the larger context of internationalizing the student experience. Gaining international experience of any kind should be made easy and accessible to all students; a student wishing to study abroad should be able to do so irrespective of his or her major.

In order for MSU to reach this goal, it is essential to create meaningful study abroad opportunities that are fully integrated into the existing curriculum. Students should understand that “You come to MSU for your degree and you will study abroad”. CI enables students to take part in an international experience while simultaneously fulfilling degree requirements at MSU.

5e.) Beginning the CI Process

When the CI process began, “nobody talked about it because it was a non-issue”. It was a top-down process; the dean informed the study abroad office that they had to start with the college of natural science because there a large number of majors that were not being served.

There was a half-day retreat where individuals from the department (the dean, advisers, etc) met and the idea of CI was presented to them. They participated in roundtable discussions about meaningful ways to proceed. From those discussions

emerged early adopters who believed in the benefits of study abroad and shared the vision of CI. The Assistant Director opted to “pick the low-hanging fruit first” and work with the professors who were most motivated to help. While she has received some support from the social sciences, there has been a relatively low level of success with college of business, including some instances of total opposition. It is not clear why this is the case.

6e.) Initial Use of Minnesota Model

The colleges at MSU are very independent, and the CI initiative met with some initial resistance. It was then decided that the CI team would work with individual majors instead of whole departments. The departments resisted the idea of the “staff infiltrating the system” but did adopt the CI publications such as academic interest sheets (SAMAS).

7e.) Outcomes of Minnesota Model

One of the outcomes for MSU has been increased contact with academic advisers. Working with people from different areas in the college has proven very valuable. The idea of sending faculty / advisers on site visits has also been a very positive experience. Even if they were initially doubtful, they return as “complete converts”. MSU is starting a new college in 2007: a residential college in arts and humanities with a global focus. This new global liberal arts college is very interested in making CI happen from the start; they want immediately to show the students how they can fulfill requirements through study abroad and are finding ways to cosponsor programs. MSU is building this college from the ground floor with CI in mind.

8e.) Adapting CI for Institutional Needs

MSU developed a CI team internally “using personal connections to avoid resistance by building on existing human relationships and expertise”.

9e.) CI Advice for Other Institutions

Depending on the culture of the institution, the Assistant Director would advise to reexamine the term “Curriculum Integration” because her experience is that her office is not viewed as an “academic unit” at MSU. When MSU faculty, departments, and colleges perceive a non-academic person as trying to interfere with the curriculum, there is a communication breakdown. In the case of MSU, the CI team was told by some faculty members that they “have no right to mess with our curriculum” and that they “have no right to even use the word curriculum.”

She advises completing an environmental scan to discover the “trigger words” at a particular university, and to avoid using those terms if possible. She would also argue not to choose the top-down approach; if the provost’s office had made it a priority in conjunction with the bottom-up approach, she feels that there might have been more success. It is important to “do it from both ends” (top-down and bottom-up). For MSU, implementing CI is still an uphill battle despite the fact that it has been included in strategic planning documents.

Institutionalization is important: “Relying on all these volunteers is great, but if they leave, then what happens?” The Assistant Director also advises against understaffing. When the CI team raises expectations but is unable to deliver services as promised when approached by departments and/or individuals, this creates problems. “Be staffed at the level at which you are making promises and offering services.”

10e.) Developing New Models of CI

The Assistant Director explained that she would prefer to rely less on publications than the University of Minnesota; success at MSU is dependent upon on making CI a part of the institutional culture through a paradigm shift. Support from advisers is also a crucial element for success. There is a tendency for advisers to only discuss a limited range of program options with students and to favor faculty-led programs over direct enrollment programs. Students are sometimes unaware that by participating in a direct enrollment program, they might also be able to complete requirements for their degree; for example, a student might be able to complete all his or her electives in one summer through a direct enrollment program.

She encourages advisers to utilize the study abroad online search function and not to focus solely on the SAMAS publications. This search function is already in place (Michigan State University Office of Study Abroad, 2007). She also encourages advisers to think outside the major when considering a student's study abroad options and to focus on the wide range of program options offered at MSU. This approach will enable students to complete elective requirements (as opposed to only major requirements) abroad. She plans to introduce this into the discussion about CI.

Conclusion

These practitioner interviews provide us with an inside look into the early stages of the implementation of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration into five higher education institutions between 2006 and 2007. A limitation of this study was the restriction of the use of quantitative data and/or a lack of quantitative data to report at several institutions. However, the qualitative data is promising. Each of the five

institutions reported that their international education offices have been successful in implementing some or all of the components of the Minnesota Model despite having faced challenges in areas such as funding and/or leadership. These findings lend credibility to early optimism about the transportability of this model to other institutional contexts. Several themes and salient points emerge from these case studies:

- The role of institutional culture in the interpretation and implementation of CI
- Cooperative partnerships with faculty
- Efficient utilization of existing resources and structures
- Setting realistic goals for institutional change

First and foremost, the interview responses showed how critical a thorough understanding of institutional culture and leadership is to the success of Curriculum Integration. As the Assistant Director of the Office of Study Abroad at Michigan State University explained, international education professionals must be familiar with “trigger words” and potentially sensitive issues at their institution in order to effectively communicate the benefits of Curriculum Integration to stakeholders. Institutions seeking to adopt the Minnesota Model should consider conducting environmental scans and/or faculty focus groups to assess potential institutional traditions, procedures, and misconceptions that could present future challenges for the implementation of the CI initiative. Just as international education professionals must work to understand and remove student barriers to study abroad, they must also identify potential administrative barriers to the implementation of Curriculum Integration and plan accordingly.

Learning to set the tone for a close, cooperative relationship with faculty emerged as another primary factor for successful implementation of the Minnesota Model. As this framework is highly dependent upon departmental participation and support, international education professionals must develop the skills and strategies necessary to build trust and credibility among the faculty. Oregon State University noted that appointing liaisons with existing faculty connections proved advantageous in terms of garnering wider support. Both Skidmore College and Michigan State University reported that the success of departments that emerged as early adopters of the Minnesota Model encouraged other departments to follow suit. The University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire also reported success in building relationships with faculty members by inviting them to the Center for International Education for formal tours. Institutions in the initial stages of adopting the Minnesota Model should assess the level of interaction between the study abroad office and the faculty and develop strategies to strengthen these connections early in the process.

Another issue that emerged from these findings was the need for institutions that are in the process of implementing the Minnesota Model to set realistic goals and to work with as many existing resources as possible, particularly in the absence of substantial outside funding. Michigan State University, for example, made use of its existing online presence to develop a study abroad program search engine to streamline the advising process. Skidmore College's one-year implementation timeline, while ultimately successful, was challenging. Allowing ample time not only to locate funding and identify resources but also to complete each stage of the implementation process is a crucial element of setting realistic goals for success.

As more institutions begin to utilize the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration to transition toward discipline-focused study abroad administration and advising, institutional case studies and practitioner interviews will become an increasingly important method of gathering information about the transportability and sustainability of the model. Building cross-institutional relationships will enable international education professionals to share best practices and to develop strategies for overcoming challenges within each stage of the implementation process. Continued case study research is recommended for the future in order to maximize the effectiveness of the Minnesota Model.

References

- Anderson, L. (2005). From the editor. In L. Anderson (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (pp. i). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Anderson, L. (2005a). Overview of the curriculum integration initiative. In L. Anderson (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (p. 8). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Balkcum, A. (2005). Background and context: An emerging interest in study abroad. In L. Anderson (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (p. 5). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Barker, C. (2000). *Education for international understanding and global competence*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Barrows, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective*. Bucharest: European Center for Higher Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45, 43.
- Bok, P. (Ed.). (1995). *Policy and policy implementation in internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Bonfiglio, O. (1999). The difficulties of internationalizing the American undergraduate curriculum. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(2), 3.
- Burn, B. (Ed.). (1991). *Integrating study abroad into the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum: Eight institutional case studies* Greenwood Press.
- Burr, P. (2004). *Internationalizing your campus: Fifteen steps and fifty federal grants to success*. Information Age Publishing.
- Gladding, S. & Shirley, S. (2005). Assess-match-motivate: The University of Minnesota's curriculum integration methodology. In L. Anderson (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (p. 14). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Keillor, B., & Emore, J. (2003). The structure and process of curriculum integration in study abroad programs: The university of Akron international business model. In S.

- Cavusgil, G. Hult & E. Lashbrooke (Eds.), *Study abroad: Perspectives and experiences from business schools* (pp. 227) Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Kerrigan, P. (2005). *Twenty ways to strengthen international education on the campus*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=39510>
- Michigan State University Office of Study Abroad. (2007). *MSU Office of Study Abroad Program Search*. Retrieved March 26, 2007, from http://ntweb11.ais.msu.edu/osa_db/search.asp
- Pickert, S. (1992). Preparing for a global community: Achieving an international perspective in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 2*
- Posey, J (2003). *Study abroad: Educational and employment outcomes of participants versus non participants*. Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University. Retrieved March 18, 2007, from <http://etd.lib.fsu.edu/theses/available/etd-11142003-213320/>
- Oregon State University Office of International Education. (2004). *Learning outcomes for study abroad*. Retrieved March 18, 2007, from <http://www.oregonstate.edu/international/>
- University of Minnesota Learning Abroad Center. (2006). *Curriculum integration history*. Retrieved March 14, 2007, from <http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/whatisCI/history.html>
- University of Minnesota Learning Abroad Center. (2006a). *University of Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration*. Retrieved March 14, 2007, from <http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/whatisCI/model.html>
- Vande Berg, M. (2005). An outsider's inside perspective: The transportability of the University of Minnesota's Curriculum Integration Initiative. In L. Anderson (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (p. 38). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Wood, V. (2005). *Globalization and higher education: Eight common perceptions from university leaders*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/page/84658/>
- Woodruff, G., Gladding, S., Knutson, M. & Stallman, E. (2005). *The forum on education abroad: A baseline survey of curriculum integration in education abroad*. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from <http://www.forumea.org/documents/SurveyFinal.pdf>
- University of California Education Abroad Program. (2007). *What is academic integration (AI)?* Retrieved March 28, 2007, from <http://eap.ucop.edu/ai/>

Appendix I: Curriculum Integration Interview Questions (April 2006)

University of Minnesota

1. What was the impetus for you/your unit/your institution to begin CI? What are your goals?
2. What were some of the initial barriers?
3. What were some of the initial perceived benefits that the institution would gain from CI?
4. How did you begin the process? (Who did you speak with initially? How did your leadership view the initiative? Which disciplines did you choose and why? Etc.)
5. What from the Minnesota model did you initially use?
6. What from the Minnesota model worked/did not work?
7. How have you refined curriculum integration for your own institution?

Appendix II: Curriculum Integration Interview Questions (March / April 2007)

Brenda Van Deusen (adapted from University of Minnesota, Appendix I)

- 1.) How did you / your office first learn about Curriculum Integration?
- 2.) How did you / your office first learn about the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration?
- 3.) What was the impetus for your office / institution to begin Curriculum Integration? What were the goals of this initiative?
- 4.) What were some of the perceived benefits that the institution would gain from the use of Curriculum Integration?
- 5.) How did your office/institution begin the process?
- 6.) What aspects of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration did your office / institution include / exclude, and why?
- 7.) What aspects of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration worked? Which did not? Why?
- 8.) How has your office adapted Curriculum Integration to meet the specific needs of your institution?
- 9.) What advice would you give to other study abroad offices / institutions interested in using Curriculum Integration?
- 10.) Has your institution / office developed its own model of Curriculum Integration? If so, please describe it and discuss how it has been implemented at your institution and/or other institutions.

Appendix III: Curriculum Integration Bibliography Project

Brenda Van Deusen, Graduate Intern in Curriculum Integration

Compiled for the 2007 Curriculum Integration Sustainability Retreat (Duluth, MN) and the 2007 NAFSA Conference (Minneapolis, MN)

- Aigner, J., Nelson, P., & Stimpfl, J. (1992). *Internationalizing the university: Making it work*. Springfield: CBIS Federal.
- Albright, R. (1992). Americans, an international people in need of internationalizing. *International Educator*, 2(1)
- Alsup, R., & Egginton, E. (2001). *Major obstacles and best practices in international educational exchanges*. Washington DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- American Council on Education. (1995). *Educating Americans for a world in flux: Ten ground rules for internationalizing higher education*. Washington DC: American Council on Education
- American Council on Education. (1997). *Educating for global competence: America's passport to the future*. Washington DC: American Council on Education
- American Council on Education. (1997). *Guidelines for college and university linkages abroad*. Washington DC: American Council on Education
- American Council on Education. (2001). *Public experience, attitudes, and knowledge: A report on two national surveys about international education*. Washington DC: American Council on Education
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. Washington DC: American Council on Education
- American Council on Education. (2005). *Internationalization in U.S. higher education: The student perspective*. Washington DC: American Council on Education
- Anderson, L. (Ed.). (2005). *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum*. Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Arum, S. (1993). Innovations. *International Education Forum*, 13, 53.
- Barker, C. (2000). *Education for international understanding and global competence*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

- Barrows, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective*. Bucharest: European Center for Higher Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45, 43.
- Bok, P. (Ed.). (1995). *Policy and policy implementation in internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Bonfiglio, O. (1999). The difficulties of internationalizing the American undergraduate curriculum. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(2), 3.
- Bowen, R. (2000). Realizing global education: An immodest proposal. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4(2), 69.
- Bowman, K. (1990). A strategy for internationalization: The University of Oregon. *International Education Forum*, (Spring), 9.
- Brockington, J. (2005). *Bringing the international home: Rethinking the role of study abroad in institutional internationalization*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=47441>
- Burn, B. (Ed.). (1991). *Integrating study abroad into the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum: Eight institutional case studies* Greenwood Press.
- Burr, P. (2004). *Internationalizing your campus: Fifteen steps and fifty federal grants to success*. Information Age Publishing.
- Burr, P. (2005). *Promising practices for internationalizing the campus*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=79992>
- Carmical, B. (2002). Internationalizing the campus: What do you need to know? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2002(117), 79.
- Christenson, G. (1988). An overview of one university's efforts to make 'international' central to its mission. *Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators*, 69.
- Connell, C. (2005). Home on the prairie and abroad. *International Educator*, 14(6)
- Connell, C. (2005). Realizing 'outrageous ambitions'. *International Educator*, 14(4)
- Connell, C. (2005). Thinking big on a small campus. *International Educator*, 14(5)
- Connell, C. (2006). Engineering for internationalization. *International Educator*, 15(6)

- Connell, C. (2006). *Pathways to internationalization: 2005 Simon award winners*. Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Dalichow, F., & Adelman, A. (1995). Credit transfer schemes build mutual trust and confidence in multilateral student exchange. *International Educator*, 4(2)
- Davies, J. (1995). University strategies for internationalisation in different institutional and cultural settings. In P. Bok (Ed.), *Policy and policy implementation in the internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- De Wit, H. (Ed.). (1995). *Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Deardorff, D. (2005). A matter of logic. *International Educator*, 14(3), 26.
- Dessoff, A. (2006). Who's not going abroad? *International Educator*, 15(2), 20.
- Dunstan, P. (2001). Internationalizing the student experience: How serious are we? *International Educator*, 10(1)
- Ellingboe, B. (1996). *Divisional strategies on internationalizing the curriculum: A comparative five-college case study of deans' and faculty perspectives at the University of Minnesota*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.
- Engberg, D., & Green, M. (2002). *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Flourney, M. (1990). State strategies for international education: The Ohio case. *International Education Forum*, 10(2), 86.
- Francis, A. (1993). *Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia*. Vancouver: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Green, M. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at community colleges*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at comprehensive universities*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at liberal arts colleges*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.

- Green, M. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at research universities*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M., & Barblan, A. (2004). *Higher education in a pluralist world: A transatlantic view*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M., & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M., & Purser, L. (2000). *Faculty of the future: A transatlantic dialogue*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Harari, M. (1989). *Internationalization of higher education: Effecting institutional change in the curriculum and campus*. Long Beach, CA: Center for International Education of the California State University.
- Harari, M., & Reiff, R. (1993). Halfway there: A view from the bridge. A model for internationalizing the campus. *International Educator*, 3(1)
- Hayward, F. (2000). *Internationalization of U.S. higher education: Preliminary status report*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Hoemeke, T. (1990). Education for international competence and competitiveness: The Texas response. *International Education Forum*, 10(2), 74.
- Holterman, S. (1996). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: A case study - the Nordic centre at Fudan University, Shanghai, China. *Higher Education Policy*, 9, 329.
- Horie, M. (2002). The internationalization of higher education in Japan in the 1990s: A reconsideration. *Higher Education*, 43, 65.
- Hulstrand, J. (2006). Education abroad on the fast track. *International Educator*, 15(3), 46.
- Institute of International Education. (2005). *Andrew Heiskell awards for innovation in international education category: Internationalizing the campus. Winner 2005: Santa Fe community college*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=55112>
- Institute of International Education. (2005). *The Andrew Heiskell awards for innovation in international education winner 2003: Chatham college global focus program*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=27459>

- Institute of International Education. (2005). *Andrew Heiskell awards for innovation in international education winner 2004: Internationalization of northeastern Illinois university* Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=39498>
- Institute of International Education. (2006). *Andrew Heiskell awards for innovation in international education category: Internationalizing the campus. Winner 2006: George mason university*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=72318>
- Kalvemark, T., & van der Wende, M. (Eds.). (1997). *National policies for the internationalization of higher education in Europe*. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.
- Katz, E. (2007). Creating leaders for tomorrow. *International Educator*, 16(1), 44.
- Kawaguchi, A., & Lander, D. (1997). Internationalization in practice at Japanese universities. *Higher Education Policy*, 10(2), 103.
- Keillor, B., & Emore, J. (2003). The structure and process of curriculum integration in study abroad programs: The university of Akron international business model. In S. Cavusgil, G. Hult & E. Lashbrooke (Eds.), *Study abroad: Perspectives and experiences from business schools* (pp. 227)Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Kerrigan, P. (2005). *Twenty ways to strengthen international education on the campus*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=39510>
- Klahr, S., & Umberto, R. (2000). Increasing engineering student participation in study abroad: A study of US and European programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4(1), 79.
- Klasek, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- Knight, J. (1993). Internationalization: Management strategies and issues. *International Education Magazine*, 9, 6.
- Knight, J. (1994). *The internationalization of Canadian universities*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Knight, J. (1996). *Internationalization of higher education: A shared vision*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J., & De Wit, H. (Eds.). (1997). *Internationalization of higher education in Asia pacific countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

- Kopp, W. (1987). Developing the international dimension on campus: A case study of the Pennsylvania State University. *Journal of the Association of International Education Administrators, Spring*, 249.
- Kwok, C., & Arpan, J. (2002). Internationalizing the business school: A global survey in 2000. *Journal of International Business Studies, 33*(3), 571.
- Lambert, R. (1989). *International studies and the undergraduate*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Lim, G. (1995). *Strategy for a global university: A model international department experiment*. Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Marcum, J. (2001). Eliminate the roadblocks. *Chronicle of Higher Education, The Chronicle Review*, B7.
- Marlin, N. (2005). *Should we be institutionalized?* Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/page/84659/>
- Marsella, A. (2001). Essay: Internationalizing the psychology curriculum. *Psychology International, 12*(2), 7.
- Matherly, C., & Diane, R. (2000). *Get ready for the global workplace*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://www.blackcollegian.com/career/wsj/getready902.shtml>
- McBurnie, G. (2000). Pursuing internationalization as a means to advance the academic mission of the university: An Australian case study. *Higher Education in Europe, 25*, 63.
- McBurnie, G., & Ziguras, C. (2005). *The international branch campus*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/page/84656/>
- McCoy, C., Plagwitz, E. & Tupper, S. (2005). *The international language and culture floor at Michigan State University*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=79996>
- Merkur'ev, S. (1991). Implications of internationalization for the university. *American Behavioral Scientist, 35*(43)
- Mestenhauser, J., & Ellingboe, B. (2005). Leadership knowledge and international education. *International Educator, 14*(6), 36.
- Miller, B. (1999). Literacy of professionals in transnational contexts of practice: The case of the regulated globalized professions in the USA. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 3*(1), 83.

- Min, W. (1999). *Improving the effectiveness of higher education institutions through inter-university cooperation: The case study of Peking University*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning & UNESCO.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus report 2003*. Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2004). *Internationalizing the campus report 2004*. Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2005). *Internationalizing the campus report 2005*. Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2006). *Internationalizing the campus report 2006*. Washington DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- National Intelligence Council. (2000). *Global trends 2015: A dialogue about the future with nongovernmental experts*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://www.loyola.edu/dept/politics/intel/globaltrends2015.pdf>
- Oberst, B. (1999). A decade of experience: Data from the council on international educational exchange's international faculty development seminars. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(2), 73.
- Olson, C., Green, M., & Hill, B. (2005). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Olson, C., Green, M., & Hill, B. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Paige, R. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 52.
- Pickert, S., & Turlington, B. (1992). *Internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum: A handbook for campus leaders*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248.
- Rea, L. (2003). Responses and outcomes to international curricula offered off and on campus: Two case studies at Hiram College. *International Education*, 32(2), 40.
- Robinson, G. (2000). A guide to internationalizing the urban non-residential campus. *The Phi Beta Delta International Review*, 10, 49.

- Roochnik, D. (2001). What direction for study abroad? First, look homeward. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://chronicle.com/free/v47/i36/36b00901.htm>
- Rudzki, R. (1995). The application of a strategic management model to the internationalization of higher education institutions. *Higher Education*, 29, 421.
- Rudzki, R. (2000). Implementing internationalisation: The practical application of the fractal process model. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4(2), 77.
- Sandgren, D., Nick, E., Hovde, P., Krejci, M., & Rice, M. (1999). How international experience affects teaching: Understanding the impact of faculty study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(1), 33.
- Schoorman, D. (1999). The pedagogical implications of diverse conceptualizations of internationalization: A US-based case study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 3(2), 19.
- Scott, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The globalization of higher education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Scott, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The globalization of higher education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Scott, R. (1992). Campus developments in response to the challenges of internationalization: The case of Ramapo College of New Jersey (USA). *General Conference, Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development*, Paris, France.
- Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: Final report*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Sideli, K., Rubin, D., Sutton, R., & Vande Berg, M. (2001). Assessing student learning outcomes from study abroad. *International Educator*, 10(2), 30.
- Skolnikoff, E. (1994). Knowledge without borders? Internationalization of the research universities. In J. Cole, E. Barber & S. Graubard (Eds.), *The research university in a time of discontent* (pp. 337). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sternberger, L. Partnering for success. *International Educator*, 14(4), 12.
- Turlington, B., Collins, N., & Porcelli, M. (2002). *Where credit is due: Approaches to course and credit recognition across borders in U.S. higher education institutions*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.

- Van Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 41*, 415.
- Van de Water, J. (1997). Gaps in the bridge to the twenty-first century: The customer is always right. *International Educator, 6*(3), 10.
- Van der Wende, M. (1999). An innovation perspective on internationalisation of higher education: The critical phase. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 3*(1), 3.
- Van der Wende, M. (2001). Internationalization policies: About new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy, 14*, 249.
- Wallraff, B. (2000). What global language? *The Atlantic Monthly, 286*(5), 52.
- Warner, G. (1992). Internationalization models and the role of the university. *International Education Magazine, 1992*, 21.
- Wertsch, J. (2005). *A global response to global issues: Partnering with universities worldwide to build cooperation and train future leaders*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=79997>
- Wood, V. (2005). *Globalization and higher education: Eight common perceptions from university leaders*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/page/84658/>
- Woodruff, G., Gladding, S., Knutson, M. & Stallman, E. (2005). *The forum on education abroad: A baseline survey of curriculum integration in education abroad*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.forumea.org/documents/SurveyFinal.pdf>
- Young, A. (2005). *Internationalizing the campus at centenary college: an innovative approach to international cultural exchange*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=79999>
- Zamastil-Vondrova, K. (2005). Good faith or hard data? justifying short-term programs. *International Educator, 14*(1), 44.
- Zeimis, N. (2006). *The intersection of academic advising, study abroad, and career development at the University of MN*. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/docs/resources/zeimis.pdf>