

## **Plenary Paper 2**

# **Continuing and Emerging National Needs for the Internationalization of Undergraduate Education**

JoAnn S. McCarthy

Old Dominion University

### **Abstract**

This paper surveys future global trends as well as current trends in higher education and looks at their combined implications for U.S. undergraduate education. A redefinition of global security in terms of economic, political, social, cultural, and environmental changes requires, in addition to language and area specialists, a whole new cadre of scientists, engineers, business leaders, teachers, and public servants who can function effectively in this increasingly interdependent global environment. The author outlines a broad framework for a more globally oriented undergraduate curriculum to develop the skills suggested by the international business community and others as essential for a globally competitive workforce. The ability of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays to address these needs is then examined. Results of a survey of 200 Title VI projects funded between 1990 and 1995 are also presented. The nature of the projects and their perceived high level of success in achieving goals indicate that Title VI has had significant impact and is well designed to provide further support for continued curriculum reform. The survey also rendered information about areas most in need of future attention. Finally, ten recommendations are offered in an effort to further strengthen Title VI as a primary instrument of renewed federal commitment to the internationalization of undergraduate education.

### **Anticipating the Future**

An editorial in the *Atlantic Journal* complained,

The world is too big for us. Too much going on, too many crimes, too much violence and excitement. Try as you will, you get behind in the race, in spite of yourself. It's an incessant strain, to keep pace.... And still, you lose ground. Science empties its discoveries on you so fast that you stagger beneath them in hopeless bewilderment. The political world is news seen so rapidly you're out of breath trying to keep pace with who's in and who's out. Everything is high pressure. Human nature can't endure much more!

This editorial speaks for many of us today. However, it actually appeared on June 16, 1833!

Cyrus McCormick was revolutionizing agriculture and ushering in the Industrial Age with the invention of the reaping machine; Faraday had just discovered the principle of electromagnetic induction; Indian wars were flaring from Florida to Wisconsin; germ theory was as yet unproven; the antislavery movement was gathering steam; and Andrew Jackson was president. Not much is different today. We, too, are reeling from rapid changes in technology, widespread ethnic conflict, the global spread of disease, and abuses of human rights. As always,

change remains the greatest threat to the security of mankind.

As we anticipate the dawn of a new millennium, we are naturally inclined to speculate on what the future holds. Indeed, futurists around the world are offering their prognostications of what the twenty-first century has in store, most of them looking at current trends as indicators of future directions. One attempt to predict the essential nature of the next twenty-five years or so was provided by Robert Kohls (1996) in a recent edition of the *International Educator*.

Like many futurists, Kohls forecasts a continued increase in the number of nation-states, which will further fractionalize the globe into cultural, linguistic, and ethnic subsets. With no effective system of world government, small regional conflicts will continue to erupt all over the globe. As the likelihood of nuclear proliferation increases, even small regional wars will become less acceptable as a means of settling conflict, and negotiation, mediation, and arbitration skills will be more valued (pp. 31–32).

There will be continued movement toward the surrender of some sovereignty by nation-states, exemplified by the regional trading blocs of Europe and North America along with those emerging in the Pacific Rim and Latin America (p. 32). Other futurists point to the rise of TSMOs (“tizmoes”) or transnational social movement organizations, most of which have been established since 1945 (Lopez, Smith, and Pagnucco 1996). Now numbering around 600, TSMOs can be powerful change agents in the tradition of Physicians for Peace and transnational citizen groups that aligned themselves against missile deployment in Europe or advocated divestment to end South African apartheid. Kohls (1996) also predicts a gradual reform of the United Nations and a strengthening of its power as a byproduct of the erosion of sovereign rights. The worldwide shift to democracy and slow but steady progress in the realm of human rights will continue (pp. 32–33).

Robert Kohls also emphasizes the revolutionary effects of the Internet. Ease of communication and the free flow of information will have a profoundly integrating effect on the world’s people with the most far-reaching implications felt in countries where access to information is controlled (p. 33). The Internet will further solidify the primacy of English as a world language. However, Kohls cautions us that “universal English” will likely consist of a basic vocabulary

of approximately 2,000 words, which will be useful in practical application but hardly sufficient to effectively conduct business or diplomacy (p. 33). Therefore, one could assume that the development of a high level of second language skills will remain very important to successful global interaction. Meeting in cyberspace will not replace actual travel, either. Kohls notes that increased face-to-face communication between and among the world’s leaders will have a “pacifying” effect (p. 30).

The most dramatic changes, however, will take place in the shifting economic powers of the world. The list of G7 countries already misrepresents the leading economic powers since neither the United Kingdom nor Canada currently rank among the top seven. At present, the seven leading powers (in rank order) are: the United States, Japan, China, Germany, France, India, and Italy. By 2020, the seven will most likely be (in order): China, the United States, Japan, India, Indonesia, Germany, and South Korea (Kohls 1996, 32–33). The Department of Commerce is predicting a major shift in U.S. exports away from our traditional trading partners in Japan and Europe to ten developing nations known as the Big Emerging Markets (BEMs). These countries are: China (including Hong Kong and Taiwan), India, Indonesia, South Korea, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, South Africa, Poland, and Turkey (International Trade Commission 1994, 1).

Professor Kohls goes on to warn us that various “wild cards” could have catastrophic impact on his predominantly optimistic predictions. These include threats of rapid environmental destruction, overpopulation (at current rates, the world’s population will nearly double by 2030), nuclear annihilation, worldwide economic collapse, and the menace of drug cartels and organized crime (p. 33).

Many futurists agree that, regardless of where such threats are able to establish a foothold, all of mankind is ultimately at risk because our destinies are now so intertwined. Worldwide attention must be focused on fostering economic security for all people, reversing environmental degradation, controlling infectious disease, limiting nuclear proliferation, and eradicating terrorism, crime, hunger, and the abuse of human rights wherever it exists. These are the *new* measures of global security and constitute the American agenda for the twenty-first century (“Redefining Security,” 1995).

## Trends in Higher Education

Higher education must continue to adapt itself to this changing environment in an effort to serve client needs. The American Council on Education (ACE) report *Campus Trends 1996* underscores six defining characteristics that will continue to shape the evolution of postsecondary education in the United States. First, there will be an emphasis on *undergraduate* learning and improving the quality of teaching. Second, fiscal constraints and expanding student needs will force institutions to make hard decisions about priorities. Sustainable programs “consistent with funding prospects and long-term priorities” stand the best chance of survival (p. 27). Third, institutions will be expected to be increasingly more active in their communities and regions. Collaboration with other institutions (especially with regard to technology) and with the private sector (often involving economic development initiatives) will continue to expand. The fourth trend concerns the rising costs of higher education and the burden students are assuming to finance their education. More students are working, and for longer hours, to meet these increased costs. There are increased numbers of students from low income backgrounds “who may be especially disadvantaged by needing to work during the school year and having limited time for their studies” (p. 28). Fifth, computer-based instruction will become increasingly important and “will pose serious problems of funding and capacity-building” (p. 28). Finally, the ACE report notes that the fiscally constrained environment will increase competition for scarce resources, possibly resulting in divisiveness and a widening gap between “have” and “have not” institutions (p. 29).

## Implications for Undergraduate Education

As the undisputed economic and political leader of the modern world, the United States boasts a system of higher education that also produces more of the world’s educated leaders than any other nation. We must remember that higher education in the U.S. serves a much wider population than just the American public. We also provide education, often at premium prices, for

nearly 450,000 international students each year from every corner of the globe. The \$6.2 billion in revenue from these students and the estimated 100,000 jobs it generates makes it an important service export ranked fifth in volume by the Department of Commerce (International Trade Commission 1994, 110). Overall, foreign students now constitute 4.9 percent of the total enrollment in U.S. four-year institutions and 2.9 percent when community colleges are included (p. 2). Nevertheless, the number of foreign students in U.S. higher education is expected to grow as global economic integration increases, and U.S. citizens will need to become more knowledgeable about foreign cultures, languages, and lifestyles (Davis 1995, 117). Thus, higher education finds itself already heavily engaged in educating a *multinational* workforce in virtually every conceivable field of endeavor. These graduates, both foreign and American, will confront the range of global problems just cited as they begin launching their careers in the United States and elsewhere around the world. One would hope that undergraduate education is preparing them to meet these challenges.

In *America 2000* (U.S. Department of Education 1991), the national blueprint for education reform, leaders call for education that will “ensure that every American adult ... has the skills necessary to compete in a global economy”(p. 39). It also points out that

serious efforts at education improvement are under way by most of our international partners. Yet, while we spend as much per student as almost any country in the world, American students are at or near the back of the pack in international comparisons. If we don’t make radical changes, that is where we are going to stay. (P. 9)

*Goals 2000* (U.S. Department of Education 1994), the subsequent programmatic response to the challenges presented in *America 2000*, developed national standards for most content areas, including foreign languages, but it does not address the important need to internationalize the broader general curriculum. Without clear performance goals, it is unlikely that the necessary global competencies will be developed among American students.

When combined with demographic realities that bring more and more reluctant and poorly prepared learners into our undergraduate programs, we ignore the needs of the global work-

place at our peril. A recent study by the Rand Corporation and the College Placement Council (CPC) Foundation (1994) looked at the challenges and responsibilities of both the corporate world and higher education. In *Developing the Global Workforce* they found that higher education was turning out graduates with high levels of mastery of the subject matter, but lacking in important cross-cultural skills. According to the study, U.S. students were

unlikely to understand the international dimensions of their major academic field, and they probably have not had a general education background that includes world history, geography, comparative political science, and the like. Moreover, they may have had no exposure to other cultures and languages. Compared to students of other nations—and particularly to those who have studied in the United States—American students are believed to be at a serious competitive disadvantage in the global labor market. (P. 80)

Indeed, many globally active U.S. companies are hiring foreign nationals with U.S. college degrees because they are bilingual, culturally aware, and well-grounded in the knowledge base of their fields (Huebner 1994, 71).

In order to create a more globally competitive workforce, the Rand/CPC study (1994) urges corporations and higher education to work more closely together in defining human resource needs, developing cooperative models of training and education, and coordinating policies wherever feasible. It also urges universities to do a better job of creating opportunities for diversity training on campus to develop much-needed cross-cultural skills. Finally, it asks undergraduate curricula to pay attention to developing not only academic knowledge, but *generic skills* of communication, problem solving, socializing, negotiating, presentation skills, and group skills, particularly within a multicultural context, since these are key components to successful completion of nearly any assignment in the global workplace (pp. 83-85).

While other countries have long been honing global skills as the necessary tools for their economic and political survival, simply *defining* the concept of global competence has monopolized much of the related discussion in the United States in recent years. Humphrey Tonkin (1994, 179) suggests Robert Hanvey's landmark essay, *An Attainable Global Perspective* (1976), as a

fundamental, process-oriented framework for educating American citizens with a global outlook. Hanvey's approach to global learning would emphasize the following components:

1. *Perspective consciousness* (recognition that the individual has a view of the world that is not universally shared);
2. *State-of-the planet awareness* (awareness of prevailing world conditions and global trends);
3. *Cross-cultural awareness* (awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world and how one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points);
4. *Knowledge of global dynamics* (comprehension of key traits and mechanisms of the world system and consciousness of global change);
5. *Awareness of human choices* (problems of choice confronting individuals, nations, and the human species). (Tonkin 1994, 179)

As a starting point, Hanvey's system allows for a wide range of curricular options for education at various levels that could potentially involve nearly any field of inquiry. Tonkin then adds,

I would argue that three great issues have emerged to dominate our thinking about global affairs today: the management of technology, the management of diversity, and the management of global resources. An awareness of these issues must be included in any curriculum design that we put in place for general education. (P. 180)

Tonkin also sees global technology transforming the education process as the Internet and teleconferencing literally bring the world into the classroom, revolutionizing educational delivery systems. The distinction between global and domestic knowledge will blur as we move inexorably toward the internationalization and globalization of the curriculum. Tonkin is wary of one-size-fits-all minimal global competencies or a prescribed list of courses to be used by the many different types of institutions engaged in teaching a very diverse learner population. "Increasingly such competence comes not through courses labeled as international, but through an international approach to issues and concerns" (p. 182). In the end, he contends, "the

desired outcome will not be so much knowledge as process, not so much data as understanding” (p. 185).

Unfortunately, confronting these issues at the undergraduate level will require “a degree of cross-disciplinary cooperation that most of our institutions of higher education are ill-equipped to provide,” cautions Tonkin (p. 184 ). Richard Lambert agrees that an internationalized curriculum requires “pan-institutional planning and programming” which, unfortunately, must be carried out in an environment that emphasizes “autonomy, diversity, and productive chaos” (Lambert 1989, 150). Lambert reduces the problem to one central issue: “How do we accomplish our integrative goals in a system in which disaggregation of educational decisions is the dominant characteristic?” (p. 150).

The situation is further complicated by fiscal constraints now facing nearly every institution of higher education. Profound curricular changes are labor-intensive and, therefore, expensive. Furthermore, the Rand/CPC Foundation study (1994) points out, “Exacerbating this problem is the general lack of effective mechanisms for reallocating existing resources within and across institutions” (p. 81). In a study of 183 universities (with enrollments of 5,000 or more), researchers examined the undergraduate curriculum.

It appeared...that changing the undergraduate curriculum to incorporate more international content and materials has not proceeded to a very large degree at most institutions. In some instances, it appears that smaller institutions have been able to incorporate international content into the curriculum more readily than larger universities. (Henson, Noel, Gillard-Byers, and Ingle 1991, 14)

On the other hand, a more recent study by the American Association of Community Colleges showed 40 percent of the responding 624 colleges were involved in internationalization of the curriculum (Chase and Mahoney 1996, 6). This is perhaps an indication of increasing recognition of the importance of incorporating a global perspective in undergraduate education.

## The Role of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays in Undergraduate Education

The international education programs of the Higher Education Act, Title VI, have been the primary response of the federal government to meeting the nation’s need for international expertise. The strategic use of Title VI funds since its inception in 1958 established a foundation of knowledge and expertise that was the primary source of the United States’ international competence during the cold war period. In the 1980s it was expanded to respond to our need to become more economically competitive in the global marketplace, and today, in the post-cold war era, global security has been even further redefined. Title VI remains a vital force to help focus undergraduate education on developing citizens with the skills to address new political, cultural, economic, social, and environmental challenges that demand our attention.

Within Title VI, there are three sections that deal with undergraduate education: Section 602, Undergraduate and Graduate Language and Area Studies Centers; Section 604, Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs; and Section 613, International Business Education and Training. This paper will focus almost exclusively on the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program (604) and the International Business Education and Training Program (613) as those with the broadest implications for undergraduate education. Section 604 addresses the strengthening of undergraduate curricula by fostering new programs in area studies, foreign languages, and other international fields. Section 613 is designed to promote linkages between institutions of higher education and the American business community engaged in international economic activities. The goal of these projects is to enhance international academic programs, and to provide appropriate services to the business community to develop its capacity to engage in commerce abroad. The purpose of these programs is threefold:

1. To provide a “feeder” system of qualified candidates for graduate programs in foreign language and international studies;
2. To serve those students for whom the bachelor’s degree would be the terminal degree (i.e. engineering, business, education, etc.);

3. To encourage collaboration and outreach between and among higher education, government, K-12 education, business, and the community (particularly Section 613).

Programs sponsored by Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) are those affecting undergraduate education through the training of faculty and teachers overseas. These programs include Group Projects Abroad and Seminars Abroad. As opposed to Fulbright lecturing and research awards for individual faculty members, Group Projects and Seminars Abroad are designed as short-term group activities. Group Projects are proposals funded for the training of faculty from a particular institution or consortium to conduct curriculum development activities in a specific country or region. Seminars Abroad are short-term overseas summer programs designed to provide faculty development opportunities for a broad range of K-12 teachers and undergraduate faculty responsible for teaching social sciences, humanities, foreign languages, and international affairs.

### **Evaluative Data: Attempting to Fill the Void**

Although many of us are convinced that Title VI undergraduate programs have played a pivotal role in the internationalization of many institutions, our impressions are based largely on anecdotal evidence and/or direct experience with a limited number of programs. In an effort to establish more reliable data in anticipation of this conference, the directors of nearly 200 Title VI undergraduate projects funded between 1990 and 1995 were contacted last fall and asked to provide an assessment of their respective projects' performance and impact to date. These projects spanned 46 states as well as Puerto Rico and Washington, DC, and involved a wide range of institutions—community colleges and four-year institutions, urban and rural, large and small, public and private. To encourage responses from this population, the survey instrument was purposely kept brief and simple to complete. The survey is clearly no substitute for an objective research project specifically designed to determine how well these programs are performing, and such a proposal is currently underway to launch a long-overdue study. In the

meantime, however, this preliminary inquiry has provided some potentially useful insights and points for discussion as we consider future directions.

### **Summary of Survey Responses**

In total, 86 of the 195 project directors responded to the survey for an overall response rate of 44 percent. Significantly, among these directors, there was a high degree of satisfaction with the outcome of their respective Title VI projects. On a scale of 1 to 6, they were asked to rate the level of impact of the project on their institutions (with 1 signifying no impact and 6 signifying high impact). The average response was 5, with 66 percent of directors responding 5 or 6. In addition, all but two directors felt that they had been successful in maintaining gains made during the course of their projects. In general, their collective responses support the following additional observations:

### **Project Design and Performance**

The vast majority of the projects focused on four areas of development:

1. Development of skills and knowledge of the faculty;
2. Acquiring library and teaching materials to support curriculum development;
3. Revision of *existing* courses;
4. Revision or expansion of the foreign language curriculum.

This was the first of many indicators of the perceived critical role of faculty development in changing the curriculum. It is also consistent with fiscal trends in higher education that generally preclude the hiring of new faculty or the addition of new courses and major fields in an attempt to "solve the problem." External funding also augmented scarce library and teaching resources in support of curriculum revisions. The predominance of an infusion approach to internationalizing the curriculum is actually *good* news with regard to sustaining an international perspective over the long term. However, the conservative approach might also indicate that few institutions are really ready to experiment with the traditional undergraduate curriculum and prefer (or are compelled) to work

within the established disciplines. Perhaps the emphasis on traditional approaches also indicates the basic nature of the task at hand. Many of these institutions may find themselves at the very beginning stages of internationalization with no identified faculty core of expertise on which to build more ambitious programs. Indeed, while many indicated a need to continue with faculty development and course revision in the future, they appeared to be ready to take on more complex projects in a subsequent stage that would entail interdisciplinary approaches and the development of new courses.

While fewer programs attempted overseas activities such as the development of linkages, the development of study abroad programs, or the development of internships (possibly because these activities were considered less urgent or cost effective than those cited above), those who *did* attempt them reported a high rate of success. Likewise, fewer projects attempted collaborative alliances with other institutions or local businesses, nor did many attempt community outreach activities. However, these endeavors rose significantly on the scale of importance for anticipated future projects.

While nearly all projects acquired new library and teaching resources, less than half used funds to acquire new equipment and technology. Although major acquisitions of hardware would be cost-prohibitive with current levels of Title VI funding, lack of activity in this realm could also indicate an insufficient understanding of how quickly our educational delivery systems are changing. The Internet is the evolving source of information for the future, and the purchase of quickly outdated library materials to support instruction may not be the best use of funding in the long run.

Also, while nearly all projects enhanced their foreign language programs, the survey instrument did not ascertain whether these gains were made in the traditional language offerings of French, Spanish, German (and possibly Italian, Portuguese, Russian, and Japanese), or in the less-commonly taught languages. Given the conservative nature of the projects' emphases and the problems associated with hiring qualified instructors, one could probably assume that few programs added Arabic, Hindi, Mandarin, or Malay-Indonesian to the curriculum. Indeed, when queried about future plans, few expressed interest in developing additional language tracks at their institutions beyond those cur-

rently taught. In any case, the United States capacity to deal effectively with the Big Emerging Markets is seriously compromised when related languages are essentially left out of the curriculum.

### Multiplier Effect

Former directors enthusiastically pointed out unanticipated "multiplier effects" of their projects, including the following:

1. New courses of study were established (20);
2. Additional grants were obtained to support further international activities (10);
3. Permanent administrative or academic positions were established to support international education (6);
4. Number of students participating in study abroad increased (6);
5. Collaboration across disciplines increased (6).

### Obstacles to Future Growth

The former project directors were asked to indicate factors that were obstacles to future internationalization of their respective campuses, and the results revealed a wide range of problems, none of which appeared universal. The most consensus was seen in

1. Lack of financial support for students who wish to study abroad;
2. Faculty who lack international experience;
3. Lack of financial support for faculty to develop international expertise.

One of the multiplier effects frequently noted in the Title VI project evaluations was an increase in interest in study abroad programs. However, the rising cost of higher education, the influx of economically disadvantaged students, and the likelihood of students attending part-time or working while in college all legislate against students being able to take advantage of these opportunities. The frustration of students and faculty with this paradox is widespread and deeply felt. Likewise, faculty interest and commitment is high, yet the resources to help them develop needed expertise are sadly lacking in most institutions. This is especially true for international travel. In both cases (for students

and faculty), it is generally felt that there can be no substitute for actual experience abroad, yet for many it is cost-prohibitive without institutional or external support. This point of view was shared by college and university presidents in a 1987 ACE survey in which they signaled faculty development funds as the most needed resource for internationalizing their campuses, followed by funds to expand study abroad opportunities for students (Lambert 1989, 154). While Title VI has not been a vehicle for study abroad scholarships, and Fulbright-Hays has assumed primary responsibility for the overseas training of faculty, Title VI *has* raised expectations among faculty and students that overseas experience is an important component of international education. It is important to consider what Title VI and Fulbright-Hays can do, not just to raise expectations and demand, but to position an institution to make such experiences available to larger numbers of faculty and students.

Surprisingly, disincentives in the faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure system ranked a distant fourth as a perceived obstacle. Perhaps this was not an issue on many campuses because the Title VI grant provided needed incentives to involve faculty. However, this is a widely acknowledged problem in many institutions, especially when the academic job market is tight, and rewards go to those who publish. Teaching loads continue to escalate, committee assignments consume precious time, and performance is evaluated in terms of published books, monographs, and articles. Who has time to professionally retool to revamp or create courses? Who can afford to stray from clearly discipline-based courses to participate in interdisciplinary offerings that might dilute the department's funding base (read "faculty lines")? Who can take time out to lead a study abroad program or participate in a faculty exchange when the tenure clock is ticking? Craufurd Goodwin and Michael Nacht (1991) catalog a long list of institutional disincentives that discourage and often preclude faculty from participating in critical international experiences. Henson et al. reported that, while 80% of the universities surveyed supported the concept of internationalization, only 16% had any annual review policies or promotion and tenure criteria that incorporated international activities (p. 8). The Rand/CPC Foundation report shares this concern and points out that "until more weight is given in

tenure and promotion decisions to activities other than research and publication—activities such as curriculum development and industrial participation—it is unlikely that faculty will embrace the challenge to do things differently" (p. 81).

## Summary

Current and anticipated global trends suggest that mere tinkering with the existing undergraduate curriculum is tantamount to rearranging the proverbial deck chairs on the Titanic. Revolutionary changes in society demand bold, creative responses from higher education. In broad parameters, an undergraduate curriculum that prepares *all* students for global effectiveness, regardless of their chosen field, will require a major departure from the cafeteria-style requirements that are typical of most institutions. A global curriculum might contain various combinations of elements that foster the development of:

1. Basic knowledge of global systems (economic, political, cultural, environmental);
2. Skill in the language and knowledge of the culture, history, politics, and geography of at least one of the world's areas (Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, Africa, Eastern Europe/Russia);
3. Ancillary skills (developed in a multicultural environment) including leadership, negotiation, conflict resolution, group dynamics, oral and written presentations, technology, and management of change;
4. Opportunities to explore interdisciplinary issues of global significance.

Such a curriculum, based on future needs instead of long-held tradition, requires a fundamental shift away from lock-step, discipline-based curricula to a more integrated, performance-based undergraduate education. It must be supported by appropriate resources and materials as well as the technology through which the world of knowledge and human interaction can be accessed on a regular basis.

Ties with overseas institutions must be established to support student and faculty interaction on a global scale. The actual movement of students and faculty internationally will facilitate

the establishment of global microcosms on campuses, a crucial learning environment in which to practice global skills. Furthermore, strong ties with business, government, and nongovernmental agencies must be implemented in order to ensure the responsiveness of the curriculum to the needs of the real world. These closer ties may also lead to the development of other local and regional sources of external funding for mutually beneficial international initiatives. Internationally active businesses and organizations could also be the source of future internships abroad, a potentially viable means of making overseas experiences economically feasible for more students.

The central driving force of such curriculum reform is predicated on the existence of a skilled, knowledgeable faculty supported by a committed administration. The faculty of the next century must be encouraged to explore beyond the confines of their respective disciplines to discover how they interface with and impact upon other fields. *Undergraduate* faculty must accept the challenge to develop *breadth* of knowledge, along with *depth* of knowledge, in order to contribute to this new curriculum. This will require that faculty have access to development opportunities to expand their knowledge and skills, the time and resources to incorporate them into classroom content and activities, a system of rewards (usually promotion and tenure-related) that allow them to devote valuable time to these endeavors, and institutional flexibility to accommodate substantive changes in the organization of the curriculum and delivery of instruction.

Rarely, however, do such profound curricular changes take place spontaneously, especially in today's fiscal climate of shrinking budgets and competing campus priorities. Even the first step toward such change is almost always a response to some sort of external stimulus, the most effective one being funding. For nearly forty years, Title VI funding has served the purpose of instigating change and has accommodated, with a high degree of success, virtually every element of faculty, curriculum, and outreach development previously described. Thus, the scope and direction of Title VI remains valid for extension into the next century.

## Recommendations

Title VI A(604), IV B(613), and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) all withstand scrutiny as sound federal programs that address the continuing and emerging needs of undergraduate education. Title VI speaks directly to current efforts in higher education to improve the undergraduate curriculum and the quality of teaching. It allows a wide range of institutions to access crucial funding to address curriculum revision and reform. It has supported collaborative efforts between higher education and the private sector to improve our global economic competitiveness and establish a new paradigm for future cooperation. Finally, the goals and objectives of Title VI funding converge with identified trends for the future that require new skills and knowledge for effective leadership and citizenship in the next century.

In an effort to maximize the effectiveness of Title VI and Fulbright Hays in their impact on the transformation of United States *undergraduate* education, the following measures might be considered:

1. Expand the dissemination of successful program models by showcasing "best practices" at national conferences and workshops and by publishing teaching materials and descriptive abstracts on the Internet.
2. Consider making longer commitments to support some projects of a more ambitious nature.
3. Encourage the development of interdisciplinary curricula, instruction in the less commonly taught languages, and non-European studies.
4. Encourage more applications of technology to international and foreign language curriculum development.
5. Foster the development of partnerships with the private sector, government, and other stakeholders in the strengthening of international education at the undergraduate level. This collaboration could be especially productive in the sharing of technology, joint economic development projects, and internship programs.
6. Recognize the centrality of faculty development to the success and sustainability of an internationalized curriculum and facilitate their participation in appropriate develop-

ment activities.

7. Reward institutions with promotion and tenure policies that encourage applied research, curriculum development, and community outreach with bonus points in proposal competition (in the same way that institutions are currently rewarded with extra points for strong foreign language requirements).
8. Continue to support second-stage grants that move institutions beyond the basic course revision approaches to more creative and sophisticated responses to curriculum reform.
9. Require institutional cost sharing in order to promote institutional commitment and increase the likelihood of a residual “established” funding base for continuance after the grant funds expire. Encouraging *private sector* cost-sharing can foster more widespread and long-term participation of local business and other organizations as primary stakeholders in the outcome of these important initiatives.
10. Expand the Fulbright-Hays programs to accommodate increased demand. As the complementary overseas program to Title VI, Fulbright-Hays is essential to enhancing faculty expertise.

## Conclusion

The approaching dawn of a new millennium is significant if only for the opportunity it presents to step back and consider the larger picture of how our global civilization evolved and where we are headed. Janus, the Roman god of portals and patron of beginnings and endings, reminds us of the importance of recognizing the past and looking to the future. Statues and pictures of Janus portray him as having eyes, nose, and mouth on both the front and back of his head, symbolizing that a doorway or portal can be simultaneously an entrance and an exit. As Janus stands in a doorway (the present), he can look forward and backward at the same time. On this January day, a month named for Janus, we have gathered here to consider the past record of two important federal programs that serve our national interests. At the same time, we look forward to the potential roles Title VI and Fulbright-Hays can play in shaping the future. Poised at the threshold of the twenty-first century, we can be proud

of nearly four decades of accomplishment in foreign language and international studies development. Hopefully, this threshold also marks the beginning of a newly energized federal commitment to developing global leadership at the undergraduate level.

## References

- American Council on Education. 1996. *Campus Trends 1996*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Davis, Todd M., ed. 1995. *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute for International Education.
- Chase, Audree M., and James R. Mahoney, eds. 1996. *Global Awareness in Community Colleges: A Report of a National Survey*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- College Placement Council Foundation and Rand Corporation. 1994. *Developing the Global Workforce: Insights for Colleges and Corporations*. Bethlehem, PA: College Placement Council Foundation and Rand Corporation.
- Goodwin, Craufurd, and Michael Nacht. 1991. *Missing the Boat: The Failure to Internationalize American Higher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanvey, Robert G. 1976. *An Attainable Global Perspective*. New York: The American Forum.
- Henson, James B., Jan C. Noel, Thomas E. Gillard-Byers, and Marcus D. Ingle. 1991. *Internationalizing U.S. Universities: A Preliminary Summary of a National Study* (Occasional Paper No. 7). Pullman, WA: Washington State University, International Program Development Office.
- Huebner, Lee W. 1994. “Thriving on a Sense of Dislocation: Global Competence among International Journalists and Corporate Leaders.” In *Educational Exchange and Global Competence*, edited by Richard D. Lambert, 67–76. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.
- International Trade Commission. 1994. *A Vest Pocket Guide to the Big Emerging Markets*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Kohls, Robert. 1996. “A New World Order.” *International Educator* 5 (4): 31–33.
- Lambert, Richard D. 1989. *International Studies and the Undergraduate*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Lopez, George A., Jackie G. Smith, and Ron Pagnucco. 1996. “The Global Tide.” In *Global Issues*, edited by Robert M. Jackson, 33–39. Guilford, CT: Brown and Benchmark. Reprinted from *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, July-August 1995, 33–39.
- “Redefining Security: The Human Dimension.” 1996.

- In *Global Issues* edited by Robert M. Jackson, 25–32. Guilford, CT: Brown and Benchmark. (Reprinted from *Current History* [May 1995]: 229–36.)
- Tonkin, Humphrey. 1994. “Higher Education and Global Competence: Diversity, Technology, and Global Resources.” In *Educational Exchange and Global Competence*, edited by Richard D. Lambert, 179–85. New York: Council for International Education and Exchange.
- U.S. Department of Education. 1991. *America 2000: An Education Strategy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- . 1994. *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.