INTERNATIONALIZATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING THE ROLE OF A STATE CONSORTIUM

A Dissertation
by
CHRISTY LYNN FORREST

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

December 2012
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

INTERNATIONALIZATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING THE ROLE OF A STATE CONSORTIUM

A Dissertation
by
CHRISTY LYNN FORREST
December 2012

APPROVED BY:

_____
Jim Killacky, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee
Director, Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

_____
Les Bolt, Ph.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

_____
Vachel Miller, Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

_____
Edelma D. Huntley, Ph.D.
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

INTERNATIONALIZATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING THE ROLE OF A STATE CONSORTIUM

Christy Lynn Forrest, B.S., University of North Alabama

M.Z.S., Auburn University

Ed.D., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Jim Killacky

Community colleges currently serve almost half of the undergraduate students in

the United States and in an effort to prepare students for interactions in an increasingly

globalized world many offer international education experiences.   A review of the

literature presents a call for higher education to engage in international education along

with a strong rationale for doing so.   However, despite support from national

organizations and indications from employers regarding the value of a global perspective,

there are barriers to internationalization for community colleges. One often cited

potential solution is the utilization of consortia to assist with managing resources and cost

effectiveness.

This study uses a case study approach to explore the role of a state consortium in

informing international education among colleges in a state system.   Interviews and

examination of consortium documents were used to establish perceptions regarding the

foundational beliefs and roles of the consortium. Primary components of the

foundational beliefs focused on importance of outcomes for student function in an

interconnected world and the accomplishment of those outcomes through curriculum

internationalization and travel/study abroad opportunities. Another foundational aspect

of international education for the consortium was the importance of support from

leadership.   Primary roles and functions of the consortium in informing international

education included function as a clearinghouse for information, a facilitator of

communication, and a builder of awareness and support. In addition, the impact of

barriers to the work of the consortium emerged as an important theme.   Barriers to

carrying out the roles and functions of the consortium were associated with support,

communication, and competing interests.   Implications from the findings and

suggestions for further research are presented.

Lastly I would like to thank my family for sharing the joys and frustrations throughout this process.   Your understanding has been invaluable and your encouragement has helped me keep everything in perspective. The final and most critical thank you goes to my husband Kelly.   You have made this sometimes difficult journey with me and I am absolutely blessed because of your faith and belief in me.   Thank you for giving time and energy so that I might pursue my dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

The mission of the community college has long maintained a local focus. The very name "community" implies a commitment to the needs of a service area. However, as the world has become increasingly globalized, local needs have changed and more frequent interaction with employees, employers, customers, and neighbors from cultures very different from our own becomes necessary (Hudzik, 2011; Romano, 2002). Community colleges educate 44% of all United States undergraduates (American Association of Community Colleges, 2011) and in order to prepare students for global interactions, some community colleges make international experiences a part of education for students. Madeleine Green (2007), Vice-president of International Initiatives for the American Council on Education (ACE), summarized the need saying, "An educational system that pretends the world ends at our national borders cannot be excellent; a quality education must equip students to live and work in a globalized and multicultural world" (p. 15). While not always an easy task, as Green indicates, community colleges must commit to make international experiences a part of the education students receive if that education is to be complete.

Context

Engagement in international education is not new for higher education. The Cold War prompted the federal government to enact the 1958 National Education Defense Act

aimed at boosting available expertise in area studies and foreign languages. A few years

later, Title VI evolved to continue this development along with the Fulbright-Hays

Mutual Education Act. Following the end of the Cold War the National Security

Education Program was created to support study abroad, language study, and other

projects emphasizing languages and areas of the world critical to United States security.

In 1999 President Bill Clinton issued a memorandum which pledged the support of the

federal government for international education. Among the recommendations were

those targeting increases in international students studying in the U.S., study abroad,

faculty, student and citizen exchanges, expansion of foreign language learning, building

of programs to form international partnerships and expertise, and support for educators

who can interpret other countries and cultures. The impact of the recommendations was

limited since no funding accompanied the memorandum (Green 2002; Genelin, 2005).

Globalization and the Community College Mission. There is little doubt that

globalization, defined as the trend toward increasing amounts of economic, social,

political, and cultural exchanges around the world (Suarez-Orozco & Sattin, 2007), has

impacted the world. Certainly higher education, including community colleges, has not

escaped the impact as these forces of globalization have altered the environment in which

educational institutions operate. Raby and Valeau (2007) summarized the response of

education to globalization stating, "In essence, globalization is the phenomenon that

exists and that we cannot control, while internationalization is the response that education

is making" (p. 5). Community colleges have always been institutions dedicated to

serving the needs of the local community and have not been recognized as global

institutions (Levin, 2001). As community colleges attempt to meet local needs they do

so within the context of an increasingly interconnected world which has created "a highly turbulent operating environment for community colleges and similar institutions with a historically local orientation" (Frost, 2009, p. 1012).   Increasingly, higher education entities attempting to meet local economic development challenges must be at the forefront of knowledge and discovery in order to keep pace with global expansion (Hudzik, 2011).

A focus group of community college trustees, administrators, and faculty assembled in 2009 clearly identified globalization as a critical issue for community colleges both presently and in 2019.   Globalization was cited by the group as an important opportunity for instructional programs and services in 2009 and they predicted not only that it would still be viable in 2019 but would require much more focus.   A similar trend came from the group in discussing top issues for workforce development and they agreed that in the future the pace of change related to globalization would continue to increase.   The group identified globalization as a factor influencing the future of community colleges mission and values (Mendoza et al., 2009).

Frost (2009) found in his study of academic leaders at community colleges in Illinois that leaders often were faced with trustees and taxpayers focused on local needs as they tried to consider external influences on the organization.   The academic leaders interviewed recognized the influence of globalization on long range plans and evidence indicated an attempt to move in a direction to address globalization but at a slow pace. Cardwell (2006) noted in his account of Southeastern Community College's journey toward a more global campus that colleges are now viewing education as more global and

holistic in scope. One recommendation for Southeastern from their internationalization team was to add a global perspective to the mission statement and long range plans. An extensive case study during the late 1990's involving seven community colleges in the United States and Canada produced evidence that community colleges were responding to the force of globalization and shifting their mission away from community social involvement and individual development and more toward economic needs of the community (Levin, 2001). The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the primary advocate for American community colleges, has also responded to globalization by calling on community colleges to consider their role in global education (AACC, 2006a).

Call to Action

The current move to increase international education on community college campuses began with two meetings sponsored by the American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE) and the Stanley Foundation and a subsequent project undertaken by ACIIE, the Stanley Foundation, and Community Colleges for International Development (CCID). The first conference held in 1994 was entitled Building the Global Community: The Next Step. The second conference, Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges, followed two years later. The subsequent project, undertaken in 1998 sought to focus increased attention on community colleges and global education, and resulted in a report entitled Charting the Future of Global Education in Community Colleges. The additional reports resulting from these undertakings are often cited as foundational for the move to internationalize community

college education (Dellow, 2007; Floyd, Walker, & Farnsworth, 2003; Frost, 2008; Korbel, 2007).

The first two conferences involved educators, government leaders, and nongovernment participants. There was recognition at both events of the need for clarity for community colleges regarding issues surrounding international education including goals, strategies, and implementation. Participants also sought to define and characterize a globally competent learner and what community colleges could do to produce such learners.

A theme which appeared in both conferences was the importance of forming collaborations and partnerships. Coordination of community college efforts in the form of collaborations was viewed as one means by which obstacles to internationalization might be overcome. Consortia relationships were also viewed as an important way for colleges to access existing programs and tap into funds which could help with costs related to internationalization efforts (ACIIE, 1994; ACIIE, 1996).

Information from the two conferences along with results from a survey and testimony from a hearing regarding community colleges and international education were parlayed into a document which addressed the impact of global education on various aspects of community colleges. Faculty was identified as an important component of international education success and recognition of challenges related to changing faculty roles was a focus. The importance of leadership was also recognized as was the need for inclusion of international education in the mission and values of an institution (AACC, 2000).

National education organizations. National educational organizations such as the ACE and the AACC also encourage institutions of higher education to engage in international education. The AACC approved five strategic action areas for 2007-2012, one of which speaks to the importance of international education for community college students. That action area, entitled Global and Intercultural Education, contained the following two goals: 1) AACC assists community colleges in promoting global awareness, and responsibility, intercultural understanding, and engagement among students, faculty, staff, and decision makers and 2) AACC raises the recognition of the community college role in global education among key constituencies, nationally and internationally (AACC, 2006a). Also in 2006, the AACC and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) issued a joint statement in support of international education at community colleges (AACC, 2006b). Additionally, resources for guiding and supporting internationalization on campuses can be found on the AACC website including recruitment of international students, study abroad, and grant opportunities. The AACC also maintains a website for international students interested in studying at community colleges.

A look at the ACE website reveals their Center for International Initiatives and many associated programs surrounding international education. The ACE conducted a project entitled Promising Practices beginning in 2000 which was designed to "contribute to and advance the national dialogue on internationalization on U.S. campuses, specifically as it relates to undergraduate learning" (Engberg & Green, 2002, p. 6). From among the applicants, eight institutions were selected for participation and the resulting case studies provide valuable insight into strategies of schools leading

internationalization. Along with this and other resources providing guidance for internationalization, the ACE has also conducted two significant survey projects designed to provide insight into the state of international education in United States higher education.

      North Carolina. In addition to encouragement and support from national organizations, community colleges in North Carolina also enjoy support from the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS).   The mission of the system includes a commitment to "develop a globally and multiculturally competent workforce" (North Carolina Community College System [NCCCS], 2011b).   The system offers the Global Learner Consortium (GLC) to support the community colleges in their internationalization efforts. Formed in 2001, the GLC has as its purpose to "support the member colleges of the consortium as they seek to promote the economic survival and well-being of their constituent communities through the education of a globally competent citizenry and workforce" (Global Learner Consortium [GLC], 2007).

      All 58 colleges in the NCCCS are members of the GLC but not all are active. Approximately 20% of the colleges are active, 60% are marginally active and the remaining 20% are inactive.   The group hosts a statewide conference during the fall of each year with the location alternating between the eastern and western halves of the state. Conference participants gather to share information, opportunities, and strategies related to international education in community colleges.   The average attendance at the annual conference is around 50 participants. In addition to the state conference, one day regional meetings are held during the spring of each year to present an opportunity for

attendees to engage with others from colleges near their own (T. Ivey, personal communication, November 1, 2012).

In 2010 the NCCCS surveyed colleges regarding their global education initiatives and 39 colleges responded to questions addressing international students, student/faculty exchanges, business/community activities promoting global awareness, internationalization of curriculum, and future funding opportunities. Among the responding colleges a wide range of engagement in international education was evident with some colleges engaging heavily in some or all activities and other colleges that participated on a very limited scale and not at all in some categories. The survey revealed that international students were very unevenly distributed according to numbers reported by individual colleges. Over 5,000 of the more than 7,000 reported international students were from one college. Among the student and faculty exchange activities reported were study abroad, faculty exchanges, and sister-college exchanges. The most commonly reported activities to engage communities were film festivals and lecture series. Several colleges also reported working with local business and civic organizations to promote global awareness. All respondents submitted examples of curriculum internationalization in general education courses and many also had examples involving technical or applied science courses. Many of the ideas for future funding focused on support for student and faculty travel and professional development aimed at enhancing understanding of global issues (Morrissey, 2010).

External stakeholders. It is not only educators who recognize the value of global knowledge but employers and citizens as well. A survey conducted by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) in 2006 provided

information about what companies believe are important components of undergraduate education. Several international themes emerged such as knowledge of global issues and human cultures and the importance of that knowledge for success in the global economy (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 2006). The ACE conducted a survey in 2000 of U.S. residents over the age of 18 that suggested the general public sees knowledge of international issues as very important for careers of future generations and that higher education institutions play an integral role in developing that knowledge (Hayward & Siaya, 2001).

Due to increasing globalization, community colleges face challenges and also enjoy tremendous opportunities. Because of the number of students impacted, community colleges can positively influence citizens of the United States through programs and activities which foster global and cultural awareness and literacy and thus enhance their ability to function in a global society (Romano & Dellow, 2009). Community colleges can help shape students into citizens who are capable of making well informed decisions; however, making this happen requires commitment from both leadership and faculty to face the challenge of delivering education which goes beyond the borders of the institution service area and the United States.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore perceptions regarding the role of a state level consortium in informing internationalization at community colleges from the perspective of the consortium and the system with which it is associated. The examination of perceptions was conducted within the framework created by broad categories of measurement of internationalization utilized in previous national surveys

(Blair, Phinney, & Phillippe, 2001; Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, Luu & Burris, 2008). Those categories include institutional support, academic requirements, programs and extracurricular activities, faculty policies and opportunities, and international students. Participants include officers in the consortium as well as an individual from the community college system office with which the consortium is associated.

Research Questions

This study seeks to address the following primary research question: How does a consortium inform internationalization at community colleges? Secondary questions which inform this research question include the following:

- How does the consortium understand internationalization?

- How does the consortium describe its role in internationalization?

- How does the community college system office understand the role of the consortium?

- How does the future role of the consortium as envisioned by participants differ from the present role with regard to internationalization?

This study utilizes a case study approach employing interviews of consortia officers and others associated with a state level international education consortium.   Through interviews the study develops a rich description of the perceived role of the consortium in informing internationalization in community colleges and how the role might appear in the future.

An understanding of how the participants see the current and future role of the consortium compared and contrasted with commonly accepted indicators of internationalization contributes to a better understanding of how the consortium might

inform key aspects of internationalization.   This information could be of use to colleges trying to build international education programs and looking for assistance from a consortium, those working with consortia, and those considering formation of a consortium. This information could also be of use to those trying to build or strengthen international education programs at community colleges and support the mission of community colleges as outlined by the AACC.   Finally, other consortia might find value in the information as they continue development and work toward assisting their constituents with internationalization.

Significance of the Study

A review of the literature reveals that most research about international education in higher education has focused on four year schools, the traditional home of international initiatives (Valeau & Raby, 2007).   Little work has been done with community colleges and in fact an examination by Chen (2008) of the 368,039 dissertations completed in the United States between 2002 and 2007 found only 30 which focused on international education in community colleges.   Of those 30, the majority focused on international students studying in the United States.   Among the other topics were experiences of faculty and administrators, policy implications, and benefits of international education. Chen's research revealed no studies focused on the role of consortia and yet the consortium model is heralded as one solution to address some of the challenges faced by community colleges trying to internationalize (Korbel, 2007; McLean, 1990; Raby, 2008; Smith, Opp, Armstrong, Stewart, & Isaacson, 1999; Sternberger, 2005; Zhang, 2011).

Despite support from state and national entities, there are barriers to successful international education programs at community colleges.   Some colleges struggle with

institutional barriers focused on policy, mission, and strategies. Such struggles often involve leadership which places little value on international education, leaving policies and practices which support international initiatives at a low priority level. Barriers also exist in the form of individual barriers associated with faculty and students. Community college students often have challenging circumstances which prevent their participation in activities outside the classroom. Due to their command of curriculum, faculty and the integration of international themes into curriculum becomes a critical piece for successful internationalization at community colleges and faculty resistance can severely limit integration.

The following literature review clearly demonstrates that additional depth and breadth of knowledge regarding international education at community colleges are needed to guide institutions to overcoming barriers and implementing successful internationalization efforts.   In addition to contributing to the body of knowledge related to internationalization and community colleges, this study could be beneficial to administrators and faculty in their efforts to build international education at their institutions.   Knowledge regarding the role consortia play in informing internationalization could be of benefit to those seeking to build international education programs.   As mentioned above, the mission of community colleges as represented by the AACC includes a focus on the importance of global literacy for community college students and so findings from this study may also help advance the mission of the community college.

Definition of Terms

  Academic administrator in this study includes individuals who function in a leadership or administrative role within the academic division of an institution. Such individuals commonly carry the title of department chair, assistant/associate dean, dean, or vice president.

  Consortium is "a formal association of institutions in a state or region choosing to pool their human and financial resources to offer collaborative programs for all member institutions" (Korbel, 2007, p. 48).

  Faculty are those individuals whose primary responsibility is to provide classroom or laboratory instruction.

  Globalization is defined as the trend toward increasing amount of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges around the world (Suarez-Orozco & Sattin, 2007).

  International/global education are used interchangeably in this study and according to AACC can be defined as "programs and activities designed to increase global awareness in the college community and to support the process by which students prepare for successful integration into a multicultural and interdependent world" (Blair, et al., 2001, p. 1).

  Internationalization for the purposes of this study is defined as the ACE did for their 2006 survey of internationalization of higher education. According to the ACE internationalization is "…institutional efforts to integrate an international, global, and/or intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, or services functions of an institution" (Green, et al., 2008, p. 7).

North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) consists of 58 public, two-year institutions under the governance of the State Board of Community Colleges (North Carolina Community College System, 2011a).

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

This literature review focuses on international education with a particular emphasis on community colleges. The review begins with the importance of international education for community colleges. Next, the review considers the current status of international education including barriers, role of leadership and faculty, trends arising out of national surveys measuring internationalization, and involvement of consortia. Finally the review addresses the conceptual framework which guides this study.

Importance of International Education for Community Colleges

Some might question why community college students should be equipped for global functioning. The ACE conducted two surveys in 2000 aimed at gauging public expectations regarding international education, the results of which indicated that the public places value on international education. One survey polled people 18 and older and the other focused on college-bound high school seniors. A great majority of adult respondents (93%) indicated that they believe international knowledge will be important for careers of future generations. The same percentage expressed the belief that knowledge of other cultures and customs would be necessary to function in the global context. There was also strong agreement among respondents that courses addressing international topics should be required for students (Hayward & Siaya, 2001). College-bound high school seniors polled also supported international education. Eighty-three

percent of the seniors responded that international education options were an important

factor in selection of a college or university. Students cited interaction with

foreign students and foreign languages as especially important. Adding to the survey,

90% of students indicated that experience with another culture was the reason for their

interest in international education opportunities (Hayward & Siaya, 2001). Employers

have also indicated the need for global knowledge among future employees. As

mentioned above a survey conducted by the AACU in 2006 revealed themes such as

knowledge of global issues and human cultures identified by employers as important for

success in a global economy (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 2006).

Rationale for International Education

The literature reveals four rationales regarding the importance of international

education: political, economic, social/cultural, and academic (Childress, 2010; Dolby &

Rahman, 2008; Knight, 2004; Kreber, 2009; Raby & Valeau, 2007). These rationales

provide a good basis for discussion of the importance of international education to

various stakeholders.

Political. The political rationale emphasizes the importance of international

knowledge for functioning in a global society and the importance of international

knowledge to government agencies. Many authors cite matters of national security and

foreign policy as key drivers for international education (ACE, 2002; Childress, 2010;

Green & Olson, 2008) and this is validated by the continuous presence of stories

regarding diplomatic issues, military involvement, and national security in the headlines.

Government agencies rely on institutions of higher education to provide experts with

skills in languages, cultures, and global knowledge to support the role of the U.S. in

global affairs.   The bombing of the Twin Towers in New York City on September 11, 2011 created a greater awareness of shortfalls in government personnel with expertise in key regions and languages (ACE, 2002; Green & Olson, 2008).

A report from the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued in 2010 examined efforts to evaluate foreign language needs and identify gaps at the Departments of Homeland Security (DHS), Defense (DOD), and State.   The reason cited for conducting the study was that

> Foreign language skills are an increasingly key element to the success of diplomatic efforts; military, counterterrorism, law enforcement and intelligence missions; and to ensure access to federal programs and services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) populations within the United States (Maurer, 2010, p. 1)

Additionally a 2009 GAO report identified persistent foreign language and staffing gaps in the Department of State which put diplomatic readiness at risk (Ford, 2009).   In a report which specifically addresses needs of the military to improve language skills and regional proficiency, the GAO recognized the necessity of the military to work with partners from various nations in numerous localities and the importance of language and regional knowledge for success (Pickup, 2010).

Economic.   International business and the ever expanding global market place lie at the center of the economic rationale.   Few truly local companies exist as many have offices or operations in other areas of the world and even those who have not physically expanded outside the country now use the Internet and do business at any time and in any place. According to Boggs and Irwin (2007), this expansion occurred because companies

realized the potential of the markets lying outside the United States; a business trend which promises to continue. When considering the huge export and import business conducted by United States companies, the importance of global literacy skills for students interacting in the economy becomes obvious. The international nature of labor markets puts increasing pressure on higher education to produce graduates who have skills to be competitive not just in their local job market but internationally (Byers-Pevitts, 2008; Dellow, 2007; Qiang, 2003).   Larsen (2004), instrumental in building Arcadia University's nationally known global education program, said "The U.S. economy is integrally linked to those of other, both developed and developing countries. We buy from and we sell to everyone. One U.S. job in four is directly linked to international trade, with more evolving interdependence every year" (p. 54).

The impact of communication technologies and the increased mobility and diversity of the labor market have ensured that even those students whose careers do not take them abroad need a higher level of understanding and knowledge to work and live in a global society (ACE, 2002; Knight, 2004; Wood, 2010).   Respondents to a recent survey regarding talent management administered to 334 executives and talent managers from companies around the globe indicated that 28% of the companies will be focused on expanding into global markets (Deloitte Development LLC, 2010).   Many believe that international education holds the key to preparing a workforce which will be competitive in the future.   Childress (2010) indicates that literature on internationalization is filled with studies which stress the importance of preparing students for global careers and to contribute to economic development and competitiveness.

The survey of talent managers mentioned above also provided evidence that employers are increasingly looking globally for employees. Forty-one percent of those surveyed responded that competing for talent on a global level was one of their most pressing concerns, indicating that students will be increasingly competing against a global pool for jobs. When asked how talent development would change over the next year, 52% of respondents replied they would increasingly look to offshore hires. Additional priorities identified by those surveyed for the next year which reflect a global emphasis include a focus on global diversity management (65%) and global mobility strategies (64%) (Deloitte Development LLC, 2010).

A survey conducted for the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) in 2006 of employers and recent college graduates reveals that employers are supportive of more emphasis by educational institutions in several areas related to global understanding. One of those relates to student knowledge of cultures, global issues and developments, and the United States in the larger world. A second major area which overlapped the one mentioned above was personal and social responsibility. According to the survey, 73% of employers believe that higher education institutions play a very important role in the ability of United States to compete in a global economy. Graduates polled in the survey ranked global issues among the top areas on which institutions should place more emphasis (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 2006).

Social/Cultural The third rationale, social/cultural, promotes international education as a way in which students can better understand and appreciate the various peoples and cultures of the world (ACE, 2002; Kreber, 2009). Exposure to the citizens of the world increases daily due to advancements in technology and the increasing ease of

travel. Even local travel and daily interactions bring encounters with people from other cultures and countries and as the United States becomes increasingly diverse this will be even more true (Green & Olson, 2008; Hudzik, 2011).   With the increasing popularity of distance learning, students taking classes via the World Wide Web might find themselves with classmates from other parts of the world or opportunities for cyber visits to exotic locales (Garrett & MacDonald, 1997; Hudzik, 2011; Qiang, 2003).

Feeding into the social/cultural rationale we find attention to global issues of health and environment including environmental degradation, overpopulation, disease, and hunger.   Increasingly there is recognition that these issues are related to the well-being of the United States and will require work with other nations and cultures if they are to be addressed (Goodman, 2010; Hugonnier, 2007). Appreciation and understanding of differences in order to create a better world requires exposure and experience such as that provided by international education opportunities (ACE, 2002; Green & Olson, 2008; Hudzik, 2011).   Preservation of cultures and diversity in the wake of globalization has also been cited as contributing to the need for a greater level of global understanding (Kreber, 2009).   Raby and Valeau (2007) say that the global citizen benefits society by "maintaining cohesive relationships, working with different types of people, and forming a valuable foundation by which a thriving community exists" (p. 9). Others insist that being a good citizen extends beyond contributing to the wealth of a community and development of individuals with such citizenship attributes is important for understanding and communication (Knight, 1999).

Academic.   Finally, academic refers to the idea that in order to maintain and strengthen the quality of education there should be an international component

(Childress, 2010; Green & Olson, 2008; Knight, 1999; Raby & Valeau, 2007).   Including

such a component in courses constitutes a key mechanism by which educators can

influence students to think about the political, economic, and social/cultural rationales

and develop knowledge and skills to function in a global environment (Childress, 2010;

Green & Olson, 2008). For this reason many educators believe internationalization is an

ethical imperative (Byers-Pevitts, 2008; Kahane, 2009) and higher education has a

responsibility to provide an education that readies students to function in a more

interconnected global environment (Floyd, et al., 2003; Green and Olson, 2008).

In their joint statement regarding the role of community colleges in international

education, the AACC and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT)

indicated that community college educators had an obligation to engage in international

education for the sake of their students and communities (AACC, 2006b).   In other areas

of the literature, an overarching theme surrounding international education is the

responsibility of higher education to provide an educational experience which produces

students who are citizens of the world (AACC 2000; Floyd, et al., 2003; Hudzik, 2011;

Raby & Valeau, 2007).   In many ways the academic pathway via internationalization of

the curriculum is the key to accomplishing the goal of producing global citizens since

many community college students cannot engage in study abroad or even extracurricular

activities (Green & Olson, 2008).

Each rationale impacts the lives of community college students.   According to the

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), 44% of all undergraduate

students attend community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges,

2011).   For many students who complete applied science and technical programs in

preparation to enter the job market, community college represents their only higher education experience. Those individuals, therefore, may never find themselves on the campus of a four-year school and so if the community colleges neglect to address global literacy needs, they will likely remain unaddressed for that population (Childress, 2010; Raby & Valeau, 2007). In fact, Dellow (2007) recommended that community colleges be diligent in watching changes on a global level related to occupational and technical programs. He indicated such attention would be important in adjusting programs to provide skills necessary for community college students to be successful in a multinational workforce.

Barriers to International Education

Despite compelling reasons and numbers, successful implementation of international education programs requires overcoming obstacles. Many of the barriers cited by community colleges resemble those encountered by other educational entities and commonly include: lack of support, insufficient resources, and inability of students to participate (Boggs & Irwin, 2007). One useful scheme for looking at barriers places them into two categories: institutional and individual (Green, 2007; Childress, 2010). These same barriers are also found in the measures of internationalization utilized in several national surveys. One survey done by the AACC in 2000 and two by the ACE (one in 2001 and the other in 2006) give some insight into the current state of international education in community colleges.

Institutional barriers. Institutional barriers center mostly on policy, mission, and strategies and therefore on leadership due to the role leaders play in crafting these aspects of an institution (DeFleur, 2008). Because of the traditionally local focus of

community colleges, institution leaders and trustees sometimes place minimal value on international education; the resulting low prioritization leads to little effort to implement policies and strategies to support international education.   Trustees are often focused on support and development of the local economy (Green & Olson, 2008) and the idea of community defined geographically presents obstacles to advancement of international education. In many instances a definition of community bound by geographic location to a college leads to the view that international education efforts are in direct competition with local efforts and interests.   In this same spirit international students are perceived to take seats and resources away from local students (Raby & Valeau, 2007; Stohl, 2007). This tendency was recognized by the Institute of International Education as they addressed trustees regarding international education as an institutional priority.   Among the points in the document was the imperative for trustees to realize that the local workforce needs to think globally and that institutions are benefitting from international students (Goodman, 2010).

Wood's (2010) examination of international education at universities found a trend in that a lack of leadership from the top resulted in international education initiatives that were undervalued. Studies designed to measure levels of internationalization and identify successful international education programs include in their criteria an evaluation of support from leadership (Blair, Phinney, & Phillippe, 2001; Green & Olson, 2008; Green & Siaya, 2005).   NAFSA: Association of International Educators also lists leadership as one of the prerequisites for successful internationalization (Hudzik, 2011).

Related to leadership is inclusion of international education as part of the mission and/or strategic planning of an institution, a process spearheaded by leadership (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). Childress (2009) examined internationalization plans at 31 institutions and found that among those that had internationalization plans leadership from the top was critical in the development of those plans. She also found that at institutions that did not have a plan lack of support from leadership was a deterrent to the creation of plans, the high prioritization of internationalization, and the implementation of plans. Linda Korbel, former Executive Director of the American Council on International Intercultural Education, states that though funding is often cited as the biggest obstacle, "The most important ingredients are strong leadership combined with faculty enthusiasm and commitment. Where those elements exist, any obstacles can be overcome" (Frost, 2008, p. 70).

In the areas of policy and direction of institutions several barriers exist. First, establishing international education as a priority is accomplished through inclusion in the mission and strategic planning of an institution. Green and Siaya (2005) found that only 40% of institutions included a reference to internationalization in their mission and that figure dropped to 27% among community colleges. Establishment of policies and priorities that are general enough to stimulate development of campus initiatives can lead to building of an international culture that pervades the campus (Wood, 2010). Another area related to policy, and which also impacts faculty engagement, centers on the value placed on international activity with respect to hiring, tenure, and promotion (Stohl, 2007). Few colleges and universities include international education efforts in expectations for faculty and so there is little incentive for faculty participation (Childress,

2010).   In fact, Dewey and Duff (2009) found that some university policies worked as financial disincentives to faculty engaging in international research grants.   Ninety-two percent of institutions surveyed by Green and Siaya in 2006 responded that they had no specific guidelines for consideration of international activity or experience with regard to faculty promotion or hiring.   Again community colleges followed this trend with only three percent reporting consideration of international experience in promotion or tenure and only 16% generated awards to recognize international activity.

Two final noteworthy elements of success for internationalization and the role of leadership are organizational infrastructure and external funding. Successful colleges have sought and received external funding to support internationalization efforts (Engberg & Green, 2002; Green & Olson, 2008).   According to the ACE surveys, the majority of community colleges do not receive external funding in support of international education.   In a similar manner community colleges ranked low with regard to infrastructure.   The majority does not have dedicated office space and personnel for international education and yet authors indicated that highly active institutions operate an office which administers programs (Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, et al., 2008).   As a result of the 2006 survey, the ACE recommended several areas of attention for community colleges including administrative infrastructure and investment in faculty; areas that go back to leadership and the prioritization of international initiatives (Green, et al., 2008).

Case study examples. In 1999 the ACE launched the Promising Practices project involving eight institutions each of which demonstrated commitment to internationalization in alignment with their unique campuses.   Despite differences, a

number of common elements contributed to the successful efforts on each campus including strong leadership from the top, leadership throughout the institution, and widespread faculty engagement. Among the criteria applicants responded to was "Strong support, including commitment of significant institutional funds and human resources to the internationalization process, from the president, chief academic officer, and other essential policy makers on campus" (Engberg & Green, 2002, p. 6). The presidents and chief academic officers of the eight schools fervently supported international education and that support and leadership was disseminated throughout the institution. Each of the schools provided opportunities for faculty travel and development which helped build the faculty support necessary for success (Green, 2002).

Another example of the importance of leadership is provided by Ng (2007) as he describes the challenges faced by the International Education program of the Peralta Community College District in California when the district underwent a leadership change. The chancellor and governing board members began to travel to promote the International Education program and work to develop partnerships. However, when a new chancellor came on board, he ordered an end to the travel. Others in leadership positions who did not support international travel amplified the divide by taking criticism of the program to the press. Peralta's experience illustrates how initiatives derail without support from leadership.

According to Richards and Franco (2007), strong and committed leadership help facilitate international education at Kapi'olani Community College (KCC) in Hawaii, one of the Promising Practices institutions.

The chancellor's office imparts substantial vision, leadership, and funding for a number of international initiatives. The vice-chancellor for academic affairs, who oversees international education and international institutional partnerships, brings financial support to the faculty who lead the international education programs (p. 91).

The support from leadership at KCC is further evident in strategic planning as objectives are focused on intercultural curriculum and diversity. Administrative leadership has also been critical in securing external resources and developing partnerships to advance the international mission (Richards & Franco, 2002).

Support for overcoming institutional barriers relies on those in top positions responsible for policy making and the shaping of mission and vision for a school. Without their support, international education has little hope of becoming an integral part of a campus. Even with support of leadership, some colleges fail to truly institutionalize international education efforts and create a culture as seen at the Promising Practices institutions "where internationalization is lived rather than merely spoken about" (Green, 2002, p. 19). Disconnects result when institutions do not have well thought out plans connecting activities and programs with learning outcomes and when international education is not a part of the strategic planning for the institution. In instances where strategies, programs, and activities do exist, they are often minimal and have little visibility. For example, two different departments might have initiatives which would mesh nicely, but they remain separate because the campus lacks a connecting framework. Green (2007) summarizes the need for connectivity saying, "In other words, the international linkages among institutional goals, student learning outcomes, and

institutional programs and activities must be the core of an institutional strategy for international education" (p. 19).

Individual barriers. In addition to struggles against institutional barriers such as those mentioned above, colleges must also deal with individual barriers: those which focus on faculty and students.   Community college students often have family and work priorities which make participation in some aspects of international education difficult (Childress, 2010; Guerin, 2009; Korbel, 2007; Raby & Valeau, 2007). For example, only three percent of students who study abroad are community college students (Asheford, 2011). According to AACC (2011), the average age of the community college student is 28 years old and likely works as 80% of full time and 87% of part time students work at least part time.   Related to study abroad is the idea that internationalization is equivalent to academic mobility, something possible only for a few students. In some instances this creates a sense of elitism arising from the perception that study abroad is only possible for the top notch student who can garner scholarship money or those who have financial means to fund a study abroad experience (Knight, 1999).   Elitism resulting from this equilibration of internationalization and academic mobility then leads to a negative perception of the value of internationalization for a larger portion of students and this creates yet another barrier.

Since many community college students can not commit to travel or other activities outside of the classroom, educators must bring the world to them through the curriculum (Childress, 2010).   Faculty, then, must be interested in internationalizing curriculum and be provided with the necessary tools to do so.   Green (2007) indicates that, "To participate in this work, faculty must have the expertise and inclination.

Unfortunately, not all faculty have both.   As a result, faculty development is vital" (p. 20). Some argue that engagement of faculty is so critical that the impact of international initiatives will be greatly lessened if faculty is not involved on a sustained basis (Larsen, 2004; Stohl, 2007).

Faculty.   Four levels of faculty engagement are identified in the literature. Faculty members who have extensive knowledge of international education and cross-cultural communication skills are champions.   Champions are most likely to participate in international initiatives and exhibit the greatest level of commitment. Advocates are especially passionate about a particular aspect of international initiatives and can often be called upon to help with implementation of that aspect of the international program.   The third group of faculty is the skeptics.   Doubtful of the relevance of international perspectives to their curriculum, skeptics are often reluctant to engage in international initiatives. Finally, opponents are faculty who openly oppose internationalization and in some cases actively attempt to disrupt efforts to introduce international education initiatives (Childress, 2010; Green & Olson, 2008).

Faculty might give a myriad of reasons to avoid internationalization of courses or curriculum.   One factor which has been cited as an impediment to implementation of internationalization plans is the autonomous operation of some faculty which precludes them from participating in campus-wide initiatives (Childress, 2009).   In many cases faculty place greater emphasis on the demands and needs of their individual disciplines as opposed to those of the institution and may envision incorporation of international components as a threat to their area of expertise.   Schoorman (1999) found faculty engagement in international education was influenced by discipline.   The case study

revealed that faculty in the business department saw international content as more relevant to their field than those from the sciences. In addition, faculty who lack international experience and knowledge may have difficulty seeing how an international agenda fits with their discipline and the particular courses they teach. A related barrier arose out of internationalization efforts at the University of Oregon. Faculty there noted that with full curricula within their programs, adding courses with an international focus would necessitate removing other courses (Dewey & Duff, 2009). Since internationalization is in essence a change process and many faculty are resistant to change, many avoid or oppose engagement in international efforts (Childress, 2010).

The personal international experiences, or lack thereof, of individual faculty members can heavily shape their attitude toward international education. This is often dependent on whether their discipline has an international focus as they experience their academic training in the field (Childress, 2010). If international viewpoints are not a part of a discipline, then it is unlikely that faculty will incorporate aspects of international education into their curriculum. In many cases those faculty who do not have international experience exhibit concern and even opposition to internationalization due to doubts about their personal capacity to contribute to the agenda (Green & Olson, 2008). Grabove (2009) indicated that lack of diversity among faculty at Niagara College precipitated a lack of awareness regarding international education. Professional development which gives faculty opportunity for international experiences can often build support and enthusiasm and those faculty members in turn generate enthusiasm among their students, and translate that enthusiasm into the classroom (Green, 2007).

Faculty engagement influences success since they are responsible for carrying out the internationalization of the curriculum (Hudzik, 2011). In fact, Wood (2010) found that among the universities in his study "it was a motivated, entrepreneurial faculty, more so than any other component, which drove international success" (p. 3). Childress (2009) indicated that of the institutions in her study that had internationalization plans, widespread faculty engagement was seen as an essential element for successful implementation of those plans. Since a small number of community college students study abroad, the curriculum becomes a key element of international experiences and the impact reaches beyond faculty who teach the traditionally globally focused courses (Green & Siaya, 2005). Academic experiences with an international focus are not a strong point for community colleges according to ACE survey data. The 2001 survey revealed that few colleges had courses with an international focus and there was decline in this area in the 2006 survey. Colleges were also weak with regard to foreign language requirements. Two areas exhibiting growth between 2001 and 2006 were availability of study abroad and on campus events with an international focus (Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, et al., 2008).

Faculty Development

As mentioned above faculty development is a key to successful internationalization and as such there are several themes related to effective faculty development presented in the literature. Workshops which focus on teaching and incorporation of international content can help faculty picture relevance and role of international education in their courses (Green & Olson, 2008). Niagara College incorporates activities into professional development for all new faculty designed to

increase awareness of international education, globalization, and diversity. Faculty

participants not only gain a better understanding of the importance of those topics but

also of how to incorporate them into their classroom (Grabove, 2009).   A similar

suggestion arose from case studies completed by Childress (2010) where her

recommendation was to conduct seminars for faculty to promote increased awareness and

transformation which would build support.   Such opportunities give faculty a forum to

share their expertise and techniques as well as provide an opportunity to interact among

the different disciplines which can often promote collaboration in the name of

international initiatives.   Many of the Promising Practices institutions utilized workshops

to assist faculty in finding their way to incorporating international content and to be

mindful of pedagogy which supported international perspectives (Engberg & Green,

2002).

Providing travel abroad opportunities for faculty has also been cited as a critical

element of expanding faculty horizons and generating excitement regarding international

education. Faculty who have experience with other countries and cultures often return

transformed and filled with enthusiasm that can be shared with colleagues and leveraged

to build commitment to furthering international education (Childress, 2010; Green &

Oslon, 2008).   All eight of the Promising Practices institutions provided opportunities for

faculty to travel abroad and interact with colleagues and cultures outside their normal

realm.   Kapi'olani Community College sponsored summer travel opportunities for

faculty from across the U.S. led by one of their faculty members (Richards & Franco,

2002).   Arcadia University has supported a number of faculty in travel abroad to pursue

research interests, attend conferences, and research potential sites for future partnerships.

These relatively small investments resulted in creation of contributions to the campus international initiatives and renewed enthusiasm upon their return (Engberg & Green, 2002).

Incentives and rewards have proven to be a positive factor in enticing faculty to join internationalization efforts. Recognition in the form of value placed on international experiences for promotion, tenure, and hiring can influence faculty to be more involved. Funding and release time to allow faculty to internationalize a course, develop an idea, or travel abroad also send a message of support for faculty involvement and engagement. In many instances incentives can be as simple as technical or grant writing support to assist a faculty member's effort (Childress, 2010; Engberg & Green, 2002; Green & Olson, 2008; Hudzik, 2011). Many successful institutions, such as the Promising Practice schools, utilize a combination of internal and external funding to offer monetary incentives and support their efforts (Engberg & Green, 2002).

Faculty buy-in and participation resulting from proper development can lead to a strong international education program. Kapi'olani Community College (KCC) offers a good example of how faculty can drive integration of international and global concepts. KCC began a focused curriculum internationalization effort with an emphasis on Hawaii's connections to Asia, the Pacific, and the Americas (Richards & Franco, 2002). Faculty chose the direction of internationalization at KCC from the onset and one of the core principles of international education at KCC is its faculty driven nature. Kapi'olani faculty coordinates activities including International Education Week and the International Festival and contributes to creating a campus environment which embraces an international and global mindset (Richards & Franco, 2007).

Tidewater Community College, another Promising Practices Institution, also demonstrates a high level of faculty engagement. The international program was founded by faculty in the 1980's and many of those same faculty members helped grow the program. A faculty led International Education Committee sets priorities for international education, oversees professional development for faculty, and awards study abroad scholarships for students. The program has remained strong and faculty driven through various administrative changes (Natali, Johnson, Dever, & Jones, 2002).

Partnerships.

The value of partnerships and collaboration for advancing international education has long been established. McLean (1990) outlined the benefits of using consortia for promoting study abroad. Among the benefits he cited were consistency, quality, and variety of programming as well as low cost, and efficiency. He acknowledged that the consortial approach was especially attractive for smaller colleges where budget and resources were often a challenge.

The work of the ACIIE and Stanley Foundation during the mid to late 1990's, which many claim laid the foundation for the current move to internationalize community college education, espoused the value of partnerships in helping colleges promote international education. The first conference sponsored in the foundational series emphasized organization partnerships as one of six strategies important for colleges to advance international initiatives. Participants cited several benefits to forming collaborations including sharing of costs and expertise, advancement of advocacy, development and coordination of programs, and acquisition of funding (ACIIE, 1994). During the second conference in 1996 engagement in consortia or other partnerships as a

way to access existing programs related to international education was among the strategies recommended for colleges looking to begin or expand international education efforts (ACIIE, 1996). Sternberger (2005) indicated that formation of international higher education consortia has been prompted by several factors including pressure to internationalize higher education, advances in technology which promote instant connection, shrinking resources, desire to collaborate with colleagues worldwide, increased demand for study abroad and exchange opportunities, and growing recognition of global interdependence.

Publications outlining strategies for successful internationalization have offered consortia and other partnerships as a viable option for institutions. In recent calls to expand study abroad for community colleges consortia have been offered as a possibility (Raby, 2008; Zhang, 2011). Green and Olson (2008) included partnerships as one of the keys to successful internationalization and cited a variety of ways in which partnerships could assist institutions in advancing international education. In addition to making study abroad more manageable, Green and Olson suggest partnerships can provide resources for faculty engagement and development, sharing of difficult to acquire resources such as foreign language expertise and visiting scholars, and encourage sharing of resources and best practices. Korbel (2007) noted the viability of state and regional consortia as an option for colleges that cannot join national organizations due to budget restrictions.

There are also disadvantages and challenges to involvement in consortia and other partnerships. Authors cite accreditation issues, revenue and financial aid sharing, conflicts over ownership of programs, and funding for consortial activities (Korbel, 2007; Raby, 2008; Zhang, 2011). Retirement of community college faculty and leaders who

championed international education and did much of the work related to running state
and regional consortia is an ongoing challenge as is justification of international
education for community college students.

Conceptual Framework

The purpose of this study is to examine perceptions regarding the role of a state
level consortium in informing internationalization at community colleges.   The measures
of internationalization found in recent major surveys form the conceptual framework for
this study.   The ACE established four broad indicators of internationalization including
institutional support, academic requirements, programs, and extracurricular activities,
faculty policies and opportunities, and international students for their 2006 survey.

Institutional support measures evidence of commitment, staffing, and funding for
international education initiatives.   Academic requirements looks at course requirements
related to foreign language, study abroad, campus activities and other academic related
international activities.   The third indicator examines an institutions faculty opportunities
for international engagement and hiring and promotion policies for evidence of emphasis
on international education. Finally, recruitment, enrollment, support, and programs
focused on international students form the basis for the fourth measure of
internationalization (Green, et al., 2008).

These same qualities have been shown as pivotal to successful
internationalization at a number of colleges as well as implicated in discussions of
barriers to successful internationalization.   Interview questions are framed around these
four indicators in an effort to create a rich description of how a state level consortium

focused on international education is informing internationalization currently and what opportunities might lie in the future for the consortium.

Summary

The literature reveals several themes related to international education and community colleges. Sources indicate that global literacy is critical for community college students' ability to function effectively in an increasingly globalized and interdependent world. While community colleges are making strides toward providing international education for their students, there is still much work to do and challenges to overcome. Among the barriers to international education cited in the literature are institutional support/commitment, administration and faculty attitude and activity, and funding. Suggested categories of international education initiatives for successful programs include institutional support, internationalizing the curriculum, activities to increase awareness, and individual international experiences. Consortia, though not widely researched, are touted as one way in which community colleges might overcome some barriers to international education and gain access for more faculty, staff, and students to global education opportunities.

Common elements of internationalization found in national surveys examined in the literature are used to frame this study. Participants were asked questions founded in those common elements as a way to determine their perceptions regarding how a state level consortium informs internationalization currently and what opportunities might exist in the future.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter describes the research design including the methods and processes used for data collection, selection of participants, and data analysis.   This study seeks to address the following primary research question: How does a consortium inform internationalization at community colleges?   Secondary questions answered and which inform this research question include the following:

- How does the consortium understand internationalization?

- How does the consortium describe its role in internationalization?

- How does the community college system office understand the role of the consortium?

- How does the future role of the consortium as envisioned by participants differ from the present role with regard to internationalization?

Research Design

This study employs a case study approach to explore these questions. Merriam (1988) suggests that case studies work particularly well in education since they are founded in real life situations and can subsequently impact practice.   She also indicates that case study research is good for exploring practice and adding to the knowledge base in an effort to improve practice since it focuses on understanding and insight from the perspective of those being studied.   Case study methodology allows for development and

exploration of multiple realities characteristic of qualitative research assumptions since it explores the topic from the perspectives of those involved.

Creswell (2009) describes a case study as a "qualitative strategy in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals" (p. 227). Case studies work well for the study of bounded systems and lead to understanding of context and process as opposed to seeking to uncover cause and effect relationships. They are characterized as particularistic in that they focus on some specific phenomenon and what that particular case reveals about a practice or problem. Case studies are also descriptive as they provide a rich and detailed description of the phenomenon being studied and the heuristic nature of case studies allow for the discovery of meaning and understanding of the phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). In the instance of this study, a case study approach allows for exploration of the role of a consortium model in internationalization and provide an in depth description of how such a model might inform the process of internationalization.

In an effort to develop the researcher's understanding of the case, interviews were conducted with key active members of the consortium as well as an academic officer for the community college system to which the consortium is connected. Interviews allow for collection of data that cannot be observed, to solicit knowledge regarding how people understand the topic at hand, and give the researcher a certain level of control over the data being collected since they determine the questions being asked. An awareness of the potential disadvantages of interviews is also important to note. Data collected via interviews is filtered through the lens of the interviewee and in some cases could be the perspective the interviewee believes the researcher wants to hear. There is

also the possibility that response of the interviewee is influenced by the presence of the researcher (Creswell, 2005).

Interview questions explore the role of a consortium in internationalization in community colleges especially as related to the primary indicators of internationalization. Information from GLC meeting minutes and bylaws were used to provide triangulation. Permission to conduct the research was granted from the Appalachian State University Institutional Research Board and from appropriate community college and system office personnel.

The Study Population

The North Carolina Community College system is the base of the study population.   There are 58 community colleges in the North Carolina Community College System.   The move to create community colleges in North Carolina began in 1950 when the need for post-high school education for those who did not want or need a bachelor's degree was recognized.   Legislation resulted in the creation of junior colleges and industrial education centers which later were brought together under the community college system. Originally control of the system rested with the State Board of Education but later a separate State Board of Community Colleges was created which assumed control of the system.   Today the system is the third largest community college network in the United States (North Carolina Community College System [NCCCS], 2011a). During the 2009-2010 academic year one in eight North Carolina citizens age 18 or older enrolled in classes at a community college (North Carolina Community College System [NCCCS], 2011b). International students also enroll in North Carolina community colleges. Between the 2007-08 and 2010-11 academic years 9,793 international students

enrolled in credit offerings with the majority holding foreign student VISAs (K. Corbell, personal communication, September 13, 2011).

The NCCCS ventured into global education in 2001 with two statewide meetings aimed at development of global education plans at the colleges.   Increasing engagement and interest resulted in the formation of the Global Learner Consortium (Morrissey, 2010).   The Global Learner Consortium (GLC) is divided into four regional subgroups including northeastern, southeastern, central, and western.   Each region has a representative nominated by a nominating committee and voted on by the colleges. Representatives sit on the larger steering committee of the consortium consisting of seventeen members of the GLC including representatives from colleges, the system office, and other community partners.   The committee represents the membership as it carries out activities, business, and decision making processes which promote the purpose and goal of the GLC (GLC, 2007).

Interviews include the current regional representatives, two former regional representatives, one other GLC member, and a NCCCS academic officer.   Regional representatives and the current GLC members possess the most detailed understanding of the GLC and its potential influence on internationalization.   The system academic officer provides a different perspective related to the intention and possibility of the GLC for influencing internationalization.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted one-on-one at the interviewee's institution or other mutually agreed upon site or by phone after obtaining permission from appropriate personnel. See Appendix A for the Interview Consent Form. Creswell (2005) indicates

that one-on-one interviews work well when interviewees are comfortable speaking about the topic and can easily communicate thoughts and ideas.   An audio recording was made of each interview and the researcher took notes to supplement transcripts of recorded material.   Once transcribed, a copy of the interview transcript was shared with each interviewee via email in order to confirm the accuracy of the transcript. Selection of interviewees was purposeful which, according to Creswell (2009), helps the researcher gather information from individuals who are most likely to provide in depth understanding of the research questions.   In the case of this study, the selected individuals were deemed likely to be most cognizant of the activity of the consortium and best able to contribute to a deeper understanding of how the consortium informs internationalization among members.   This led to development of a detailed description of how the consortium and associated system office understand the role of the consortium in informing internationalization among community colleges.

Interview questions were be open-ended and conducted within the framework of a consistent interview protocol which allows for probes during the questioning if the opportunity or need presents itself to acquire more detail.   Open-ended questions allow participants to answer questions based on their perceptions and experiences and not be influenced by the researcher's perspective or pre-defined response categories. The interview protocol was developed based on recommendations of Creswell (2009) and included an icebreaker question followed by major questions. Each major question had possible probes developed during a pilot process and additional probes were added as required during the interviews to gain deeper understanding or solicit clarification.

Glesne (2006) describes interviewing as "the process of getting words to fly" (p. 79). She emphasizes the importance of remaining open to change and considering questions tentative so that modifications might be made and early interviewees revisited if necessary. To that end, interviews were conducted in a semi-structured format which allows the researcher to make adjustments in wording and order of questions as the interview develops. This permits the interview to capture the unique way in which each interviewee views the research topic as the natural flow of the interview allows. See Appendix B for the interview protocol.

Allowing time for review and practice with interview questions and protocol is critical to obtaining the necessary data (Glesne, 2006; Merriam, 1998). The interchange between interviewer and interviewee along with the skill of the interviewer in asking questions are critical elements in conducting a successful interview (Merriam, 1988). A pilot to assess the interview questions effectiveness in practice was conducted with peers at the researcher's institution. Feedback about clarity and relationship to the topic was solicited and revisions made accordingly. Practice interviews were conducted prior to data collection to further refine interview protocol and questions, anticipate probing questions, and allow the researcher to sharpen interviewing skills. In addition, practice sessions allow the researcher to develop shorthand note taking skills to aid in the interview process (Creswell, 2005).

Role of the Researcher and Ethical Considerations

The researcher in qualitative methods is the primary instrument for data collection (Merriam, 1998; Creswell, 2009). This creates a situation where data are related to context and subject through ongoing analysis as it is collected. As a data collection

instrument the researcher lends a certain fluidity that allows for adaption to circumstances as data is collected that is not available when using inanimate instruments. The researcher conducted all interviews in person at the institution of the interviewee or other mutually agreed upon site or by phone and transcribed, coded, and analyzed interview transcripts.

Since the data are collected by the researcher it is also subject to the filters and biases' of the researcher (Merriam, 1998). The researcher brings one interpretation of reality to the study while each subject brings another and the combination of these interpretations produces the final product which is yet another reality. The researcher must be aware of the many potential shaping forces, the interactions of those forces, and be able to account for those as the study develops (Merriam, 1998). Potential sources of researcher bias in this study include pre-existing experience with the consortium being studied, the community college system associated with the consortium, and with some individuals slated for interview as well as personal thoughts and opinions regarding international education in community colleges. The researcher took care during interviews to avoid language during questioning that might lead or influence the answer of interviewees. The researcher also made every effort to prevent introduction of her personal views regarding international education into the interview process. An additional ethical consideration is confidentiality of participants was be addressed by giving each a pseudonym to offset easy identification and promote open and honest discussion over interview questions. Additionally, participant contributions were used to arrive at an overall description of perceptions as opposed to individually identifiable perceptions.

Data Analysis

Interview recordings were transcribed verbatim and reviewed along with interview notes to identify emerging themes and provide a general idea of what respondents said during interviews. Creswell (2005) suggests that examination of data for general ideas and themes is an important first step in data analysis. Initial data analysis was conducted as data was collected and the researcher wrote memos in conjunction with each interview to preserve perspectives and potential linkages which become apparent during data collection (Glesne, 2006; Merriam, 1998). Since each interview can potentially inform the next, it is critical to review each transcript for missed opportunities which might become part of the next interview. Analysis in this manner also allows for development of tentative themes and emerging answers to research questions.

Using the general process outlined by Creswell (2005), detailed analysis of transcripts and notes were used to develop a coding system for the data which brought related information together into meaningful categories and identify data that is not relevant to the research questions. Initially major codes were developed that identify central ideas of the data and then grouping of related codes and elimination of redundant codes will help reduce the number of codes. Once the codes were identified, the data were revisited to identify specific quotes which support the codes and look for any new codes. Finally, similar codes were grouped to form the themes which clearly delineate the major ideas of the study and help answer the research question.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter introduces the interviewees and explores the themes and subthemes arising from interviews. Themes and subthemes are presented in an effort to create a picture of how members of the Global Learner Consortium perceive the organization informs international education currently and what they perceive that role might look like in the future. The research questions are addressed in the presentation of the themes and subthemes and in addition the final section of the chapter relates research questions to themes and subthemes.

This study sought to address the following primary research question: How does a consortium inform internationalization at community colleges? Secondary questions which were also answered and which informed this research question included the following:

- How does the consortium understand internationalization?

- How does the consortium describe its role in internationalization?

- How does the community college system office understand the role of the consortium?

- How does the future role of the consortium as envisioned by participants differ from the present role with regard to internationalization?

Interviews were conducted with eight individuals seven of whom are currently serving or have served in a leadership capacity in the Global Learner Consortium and all are still active supporters of international education and the GLC. The seven individuals

are from seven North Carolina Community College campuses and the names of individual and institutions are not included to ensure confidentiality. Interviews were conducted with current regional representatives, two former regional representatives, and an individual serving in a chair position within the consortium. A summary of interviewees is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Summary of Interviewees

Name	Role	Years in Current Role
Steve	Instructor	16
Ron	Academic Administrator	9
Linda	Student Services Staff	9
Lisa	Academic Support	8
Mary	System Office-Academics	2.5
Missy	Academic Administrator	1.5
Bob	Student Services Staff	12
Janet	Academic Support	5

Missy and Ron both hold positions in academic leadership while Steve serves as an instructor and Janet works in academic support. Bob, Linda, and Lisa have student support services as their primary responsibility at their respective institutions and all view their role in the GLC as volunteer work which falls outside the lines of their day to day duties. The other interviewee, Mary, currently serves in the academic area of the North

Carolina Community College System Office.   One additional interview was requested

with a member of the NCCCS State Board but that individual declined to be interviewed.

Early in spring 2012 I conducted interviews with Lisa and Linda on the same day

beginning with Lisa on the campus at which she works.   She is housed in the main

instructional building on a satellite campus housing four buildings.   I met Lisa in the

room in which she does her work but she suggested we conduct the interview in a shared

office space which also functioned as a workroom for employees.   We talked at an empty

workstation but were surrounded by a good deal of activity.   Lisa shared that her

involvement in international education began when she was community college student

and had the opportunity to participate in a work study program that took her abroad.   She

became involved with the Global Diversity Committee at her college and eventually the

GLC.

Linda requested to be interviewed on her home campus which is the main campus

of the community college at which she works.   She and I shared lunch and general

conversation about community college work and international education prior to the

interview.   Upon our return to campus we retreated to her office to carry out the

interview.   Linda's global outlook was reflected by the books and pictures in her office

as well as her description of how she became involved in global education during

elementary school while taking foreign languages.   She also shared that her mother was

very much a global thinker and influenced the early development of her global

perspective.

Steve resides near my home institution so we decided my office would be the

quieter location of our possibilities at which to meet. I conducted the interview over

coffee at the side table in my office. Steve shared that his entry into international education began when he was asked to lead a group of students on a trip abroad for his institution. He felt that his having lived in another country for several years prior while working in private industry had been one factor leading to his being asked to lead the trip. He later became involved with the global education committee work on his campus and eventually with the GLC. Ron works at a community college near my home and so a short drive brought me to his office on the campus on which he is employed. He noted that his entry into international education was through a last minute teaching opportunity for an international marketing course. Following that experience, he continued to cultivate an interest in international marketing and business. Due to his interest his involvement in international education continued to grow at his college and he became involved with the GLC after attending a session at the North Carolina Community College System conference.

During mid spring 2012 I conducted interviews with Missy and Janet on the same day and followed with Bob the next morning. I met Janet in her office which was a new space to which she had been recently relocated and was shared with someone who was not in at the time of the interview. The area was quiet as the campus was on spring break. Janet shared that her first international education venture was working in the international office at the university where she attended college. Her interest and knowledge were broadened by working and living abroad for several years after college and once she joined her current institution she was contacted by a GLC member about getting involved with the group.

I also met with Missy in her office where she shared that her involvement began in a formal way through working with the global education committee at her campus. She became involved with the GLC after being contacted by someone associated with the group who knew of her interest in international education. Missy's office was filled with items related to her teaching discipline which lends itself very naturally to global education. The following morning I conducted the interview with Bob in his office which was located within the area dedicated to his duties at the college. He began his international education experience in a way similar to Missy, through work on a campus committee, but shared that his interest stemmed from experience in the military. His first experience with the GLC was at a system office conference meeting where the discussion focused on forming the GLC. He did not actually become formally involved until later when he was contacted about getting involved by an active member who knew he was interested in international education. The final interview was conducted with Mary by phone. Her involvement in international education began as part of her administrative roles in academics in community colleges. She indicated that she has not been involved with the GLC in a direct way.

I conducted seven interviews in person and completed the eighth by telephone during the spring of 2012. Each interview was recorded and transcribed in full by the researcher. After reviewing the transcript, one respondent requested to clarify some points in writing. I responded by sending the interview questions via email and those clarifying points were returned electronically. Analysis of transcripts resulted in identification of three major themes: foundational beliefs, roles, and barriers. The subthemes identified for each theme are illustrated in Table 2. The initial questioning

probed for details of how the consortium defines international education, how widely that
definition is shared, and what the consortium identifies as the key elements of
international education.   As interviewees discussed both current and future roles, the
third theme of barriers to fulfilling those roles began to emerge.

Table 2

Summary of Themes and Subthemes

Themes	Subthemes
Foundational Beliefs	Defining International Education Key Elements
Roles	Clearinghouse for Information Facilitator of Communication Builder of Awareness/Support
Barriers	Support Competing Interests Communication

Foundational Beliefs

In order to establish context and foundation participants were asked about how the
consortium might define international education and what the group perceives to be the
key elements.   Initial interview questions sought to gather insights about how the
consortium defined international education as well as how widely members perceived
that definition to be shared among colleges and whether it matched their personal
definition. The discussion of how the consortium defines international education was
followed with a question about what the consortium considers the key elements of
international education.

Defining International Education. When asked about the consortium definition of international education, the descriptions were primarily in terms of outcomes for students. Four participants in their discussion included a reference to preparation of students for a 21st century or global economy. Ron used the phrase "focus global awareness" to describe the broad nature of the definition he feels the consortium aims to uphold. Another of the seven GLC interviewees, Linda, described the definition only in terms of the function of the GLC itself. She indicated when asked how the consortium defines international education that "it is a clearinghouse through which the 58 community colleges can share with each other what they are doing in the global arena." Three of the seven also displayed some uncertainty regarding a definition shared by the consortium. Bob began his answer to the question regarding how the consortium defines international education with "I don't know that we actually do define it" and Linda began with "I should be able to answer that easily but I can't." This suggests a lack of certainty on the part of some members and Janet, who indicated she did not recall the group discussing how they define international education, stated of the group "but I think our biggest problem is that we are not cohesive and we are not working together."

With regard to the breadth with which the definition was shared among the colleges six felt that colleges who were active in international education shared it at least in part. A small number felt that individual colleges in some ways personalize the broader definition of the GLC to match their students and communities. Ron stated that each college manifests the definition "based on the culture and their service area and the direction of the president." Only one person, Bob, indicated that their personal definition differed in some significant way from the definition he had given for the

consortium. He shared that the definition should include not only a statement of commitment but also have a plan for how to bring the vision to fruition.

Key Elements of International Education. When asked to identify the keys to international education six of eight participants identified curriculum internationalization and five of eight identified taking students, faculty, and staff off campus.   Both of these were also mentioned as opportunities the GLC should consider moving forward. Mentioned but less frequently was the importance of support from leadership as a key.   It is noteworthy that these elements are also included in the keys to successful internationalization used in the framework for this study (Blair, e al., 2001; Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, et al., 2008).

Curriculum internationalization. Several interviewees commented about course level incorporation of global themes and content as a way to promote change and emphasized the need for internationalization in all courses.   An examination of available minutes from GLC Executive Committee meetings revealed several references to internationalization of curriculum and teaching.   Steve emphasized the importance of curriculum internationalization saying strong colleges would have "global education across the campus and especially in the classroom since everyone can't travel abroad." Lisa shared a similar sentiment relating to the importance of global content in the curriculum to those who cannot travel.   Bob discussed more of the detail of curriculum internationalization saying global education should be considered when courses and syllabi were being designed. In addition to being cited as a key to international education by interviewees, curriculum internationalization has also been a topic of frequent discussion at GLC meetings. Janet shared that the members had discussed the topic at

many meetings and most specifically she referred to examination of models to follow. Throughout the interviews participants mentioned work at East Carolina University and especially a global awareness course being taught there as a possible model to follow. In addition, there was frequent mention of the relationship with World View and utilization of their resources to assist colleges in curriculum internationalization. World View is a public service of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and functions to provide resources to public schools, community colleges and universities interested in international education.

Travel. Travel/study abroad was also emphasized by interviewees as a key component of successful international education. Janet indicated that the group had discussed linking courses with study abroad opportunities as a way to move beyond "surface activities" that support internationalization. Ron was adamant about the value of study abroad and recognized it as one of the most important things for the consortium to consider moving forward. In talking about study abroad he said, "That is the key. Study abroad, whether it is ten days or three months, get students out of this culture and forces them into another culture."

One concept developing out of the discussion of travel and exchange was the idea of virtual exchanges. Among those citing travel/exchanges as a key were three individuals who included virtual exchange. Bob indicated that the GLC members often talk about "how we can take the student off of campus even if it is just via Skype or some other electronic means and take them to the larger world." Lisa mentioned the potential of technology being used to connect with other schools internationally. Mary discussed at length the benefit of exchange and travel abroad and also included an example of

virtual exchange she had encountered at East Carolina University. The example she described included a class at the university paired with the same course at a university in India. The students from each course communicated in a variety of ways including asynchronously via email as well as synchronously through video. She also remarked that she was uncertain about how many community colleges were engaging in similar exercises.

Support from leadership. Ron and Steve identified support from leadership as a key indicating that without it you would likely get fragmentation across campus or see international efforts pushed down the priority list. Ron shared his view that "There has to be a sense of administrative support for it. Otherwise you are going to end up with pockets of it fragmented throughout the college." He also specifically referred to support from system office personnel and local support from college presidents as critical. Though not as strongly as Ron and Steve, other interviewees also referenced the importance of leadership. Janet in talking about curriculum internationalization suggested that colleges would like to move to more substantial activity with regard to international education but "they do what they can given the support they get in their institution." Missy discussed the necessity for grassroots support from faculty as well as support from leadership. With respect to the role leadership support plays she shared that "To create an atmosphere that you want to promote international education it has to be top down."

Roles

Several interview questions probed participants about their perceptions regarding the roles and functions of the consortium in advancing international education.

Responses led to subthemes of general roles as a clearinghouse for information, a facilitator of communication, and a builder of awareness and support.   In addition to general questions about the roles of the consortium, interviewees were asked to give their perspectives on the roles the GLC plays with regard to specific indicators of international education as set forth by nationally recognized higher education groups such as the AACC and the ACE (Blair, et al., 2001; Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, Luu & Burris, 2008).

General Role of the GLC.   All interviewees used similar language to describe both the current and future role of the GLC and in fact there was significant movement back and forth by most between current and future roles during the interviews.   Steve described the role in a very straightforward way saying,

> I think the GLC should have a function of knowing who is doing what and who has what interest and then putting all this together and helping schools to collaborate. So they should be like a clearinghouse and information bureau, making connections between the community colleges.

An examination of the constitution and by-laws of the consortium reveals information within the stated goals that supports the most frequently cited perceptions of interviewees regarding roles and functions.   Included in the goals are "to act as a resource and clearinghouse" and "to promote cooperation and collaboration."   Several goals also mention promotion of awareness of diversity and global education among institutions and their communities.

Clearinghouse.   One predominant idea of the GLC role focused on the group functioning as a clearinghouse for general information.   This concept was mentioned at

some point throughout the interviews by all participants. Participants described the consortium as a collection point for information and resources associated with international education in general as well as information regarding specific global education activities of colleges. When questioned about what they considered the most critical role the concept of functioning as a resource center came up again from four participants. Missy stated this succinctly saying, "We've got to band together and use our resources very wisely and that is what the consortium ultimately was designed to do." Lisa referenced bringing resources together and sharing information and Janet mentioned a central location to search for information regarding successful projects and models. One of the commonly cited ways in which the GLC could assist with resource utilization focused on travel abroad opportunities. Ron suggested an opportunity for the GLC to act as a "clearinghouse to consolidate trips" so participants would have one good trip rather than three or four marginal trips. This role in facilitating collaboration is not currently very strong.

The notion of functioning as a clearinghouse is also supported in the constitution and by-laws of the consortium. The following statement can be found within the stated goals of the constitution of the GLC: "To act as a resource and clearing house for those colleges and programs seeking to institute various components of diversity and global education and awareness throughout their institutions and communities." A review of minutes from the GLC Executive Committee meeting in October 2005 revealed a discussion regarding the direction of the group which included emphasis on becoming a clearinghouse of information for the colleges. Comments from Mary seem to indicate that the system office shares this vision of the role of the GLC. In talking about the

current role of the GLC she said, "I think the Global Learner Consortium plays a pretty significant role in that they are a facilitator of information, they are a convener, they produce workshops…"

Communication/Connection. One of the goals presented in the constitution and by-laws of group supports their role as vehicle for connection and collaboration. The goal reads as follows: "To promote cooperation and collaboration among the member colleges of the consortium as they seek to incorporate the concepts of multiculturalism and global diversity throughout their individual college communities." The idea of connection emerged strongly from discussion of GLC roles with the notion of the GLC working to create an avenue through which participants could connect with each other in order to share ideas and resources and collaborate on projects.

Lisa referenced creating connection and linkages among members to support initiatives and programs. Janet referenced consortium members having some success partnering on grants and study abroad opportunities though she also emphasized the room for growth in that area. Steve felt bringing people together to share ideas should be the GLC's most significant function. Bob spoke of the importance of helping make connections in light of the decentralized nature of the system and the accompanying limited impact of decrees on college activity. He said, "The networking becomes much more important than the directive and we are becoming really successful at that." Speaking of the GLC potential to make connections he said, "If one college does something that was really successful, make sure others hear about it, offer them assistance and offer to connect them to the college that has the successful program." Steve also shared an example of two colleges that both needed an immersion experience

for students in a particular program.   Neither had enough students but he suggested that

had they collaborated on a joint travel experience there would have easily been enough

students.   He cited this as an example of how the GLC could function to bring about

collaboration and wise use of resources.   Lisa shared a very similar hypothetical

example indicating her idea that regions of the GLC could work together to collaborate

on travel/study abroad opportunities in order to have a strong contingent.

   Building awareness and support.   Also mentioned in the discussion of roles was

building awareness and support, especially from the top levels.   Support from leadership

was mentioned frequently throughout the interviews as being important for advancing the

mission of the GLC and international education.   Bob shared that he felt the most critical

role was for the GLC to "identify key administrators at each college and bring them on

board" and that the group's greatest success had been raising awareness of international

education. He also talked about the role of the consortium in creating ambassadors who

could help promote international education and the GLC at their colleges. Ron

mentioned building awareness as the critical role of the GLC and most especially he

emphasized the need to make leadership aware that interest in international education is

"growing in the ranks."   In a related note, Ron saw opportunity for the GLC to help

overcome local barriers through providing faculty champions help with information and

rationales to present to presidents.   He also described the consortium as a "lobbying

group" trying to create awareness with people in leadership positions.   Janet suggested

that the original goal of the GLC was to generate top down support and that at present the

ambition is to communicate to the system office that there is interest in international

education. Steve mentioned building awareness as well and referenced more specifically

building awareness among students of the need for global education and getting them interested.

   Future. All agreed that in the future the idea of functioning as a clearinghouse and a facilitator of collaboration and communication among colleges should be expanded and improved. There were differences in perceptions of how well or how much the consortium is carrying out that function at present with four of the seven GLC participants indicating they saw little or very limited activity.   When asked about the current role, Janet commented, "I don't see it playing much of a role unfortunately." Linda echoed that sentiment saying, "I see the GLC having as its function the clearinghouse. I don't see it playing that role…except in a very limited way."   Linda also described the role of the consortium as a clearinghouse "on paper" and indicated that function to be one of the "great potential strengths" of the GLC.

   It is evident from interview comments that the participants feel that in the future the GLC should be the go to group for colleges when they are looking for international education resources. Bob expressed this saying, "What I'd like to see us become is the "go-to" people rather than the people who go out and search."   Especially prominent in the examples given by interviewees were those illustrating sharing of curriculum internationalization knowledge and opportunities for working together on travel abroad programs.   An important part of the sharing for many participants was the idea of learning from experiences of others within the consortium as opposed to starting at the beginning.   Lisa summarized this saying,

Wanting to be the one place where people can go get ideas and get a contact for what they want to do in the future and not have to do all the legwork. To get experience from those who have been there.

Mary noted that a 2010 survey of colleges completed by the system office revealed that colleges were looking for ideas and information about how to do things related to international education from those who might have gained experience already.

Role of GLC in Informing Specific Indicators of International Education. The idea of the consortium functioning as a clearinghouse and facilitator of communication was continued in the discussion of the role of the GLC with regard to the specific indicators of internationalization. The indicators used in the questioning were those identified by national higher education organizations as prevalent among internationalized educational programs and included: academic programs and activities, support and buy in from faculty, support from leadership, and international students (Blair, et al., 2001; Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, et al., 2008). As mentioned in the previous section, there was some question regarding the extent to which the GLC currently performs the functions mentioned.

Academic programs and activities. With regard to the first indicator, support of international education in academic programs and services, most felt that the best way the GLC could provide support was to act as a clearinghouse for information and as a vehicle for connecting people so that information and resources could be shared. Lisa articulated this idea saying, "I think it all goes back to communication and sharing, I really do. I really see that as a major role of the consortium." Three interviewees felt that currently the main avenue for the GLC to accomplish this was through the annual and regional

conferences. At the time of the interviews the GLC did not have a functioning website

and a website or other similar means was viewed as a necessity moving forward to reach

a larger number of people and have information more readily available. Janet indicated

she had been charged with creating a Facebook page for the group but there had been

very limited participation.

Six participants were able to provide examples of the type of information or

resources related to academic programs and services that could be shared at conferences

or via a website.   Steve gave a hypothetical example of a college that had a successful

international festival using the conference and website to share the details of the festival

for others who might be interested in hosting a similar event.   Linda shared an example

from a conference in which instructors presented about a service learning travel abroad

they conducted with a group of students. Several participants cited the difficulty

encountered by colleges in recruiting enough students to have a meaningful and cost

effective travel abroad opportunity as an example of how the GLC could help in

facilitating sharing of opportunities for several colleges to pool students for those trips.

Others recognized a role for advancing curriculum internationalization by

functioning as a resource for faculty to share their experiences and materials.

Curriculum internationalization was one of the key elements identified by the group and

seemed to be especially important as throughout the interviews it was mentioned

frequently with the understanding that not all students would be able to engage in travel

opportunities and their interaction with courses and faculty was the way to impact

significant change.   In referencing the different ways to internationalize academic

programs and activities Missy stressed the importance of change at the course level.   In

fact she offered as a possible example of information that could be shared through the GLC the idea of an instructor at one college internationalizing an introductory sociology course, posting the details on the GLC website, and an instructor at another college accessing that information.

Faculty support and buy-in.   Related in many ways to support of academic programs and activities is the second indicator concerning support and buy in from faculty. The importance of faculty involvement is threaded throughout the interviews in the form of emphasis by all interviewees on internationalization of the curriculum.   Janet stated the importance of faculty more explicitly saying, "Once you start getting faculty on board that is key because they are really the frontline with the students." This sentiment was echoed by Missy as she discussed the importance of change at the course level.   She said, "Ultimately it comes down to the instructor in the classroom."

Three of the GLC members shared that they do not see the group making any real impact on faculty involvement. This idea was captured by Linda who said simply "I don't see that there is any coordinated impact of the GLC on faculty at all."   Several cited the annual conference and regional meetings as a way in which the GLC currently provides some tools and information but recognized the scope is limited largely to grass roots faculty. Another indicated the role of the regional representatives was to distribute information to faculty.   Again a viable website was viewed as an essential tool to complement these other means of distributing information and connecting individuals. A small number of interviewees recognized a tie to advancement of this indicator and the indicator dealing with support from leadership.   This was evidenced by comments about garnering support from leadership as being a key to involving more faculty members.

Steve in talking about why faculty might not be involved and supportive stated,

"Sometimes they don't get behind it because they don't have any push, any driving force

like a president who is really in favor of this."   Among ideas for the future role of the

GLC were to share research with administrators that demonstrate the benefits of

international education and to hold workshops for administrators with the intended result

that those administrators would then be more likely to encourage involvement from

faculty at their respective colleges.

   Support from leadership.   As questioning turned to the third indicator, support

from leadership, participants indicated that the current role played by the GLC consists

largely of sharing information regarding GLC activity and international education with

presidents and other upper level administrators such as chief academic officers.   One

example given by a regional representative concerned information regarding the

upcoming regional conference which was sent to presidents, academic vice presidents,

and the global education contact person at each college in the region.   Another factor

cited as important by several participants is the presence of a presidential liaison on the

GLC board who can then report about GLC activity to the presidents' association. This

person was seen as a vital linkage to the other presidents and even potentially the system

office though there was uncertainty among the GLC members how much the liaison

shared with the other presidents. All interviewees at some point during our conversations

recognized the importance of support from leadership in advancing international

education.   Missy talked specifically about the necessity of the president seeing the value

in internationalization.   Steve discussed the importance of leadership support as he talked

about the key elements of international education. He remarked that a commonly heard

conversation at the GLC conference includes remarks from an attendee indicating an interest in doing a specific initiative followed by a comment about a lack of support from the institution leadership.

Interviewees shared ideas about the future role of the GLC with regard to support from leadership that centered on more contact with leadership and provision of assistance to schools that lack support. Suggestions included providing workshops for leadership, visits to colleges from regional representatives, and arming interested faculty with data and other information that might help convince administration of the need for international education. Two interviewees suggested that the GLC would need to strengthen in order to gain support and interest from administration. Linda suggested "the GLC has to become stronger in order to get the presidents interested across the board." This idea is explored further in the barriers section.

International students. The final, and seemingly weakest, indicator for the GLC is international students. Four of the participants indicated that the GLC does very little to support colleges that have international students or that might be interested in support related to international students. There was some feeling that this was more specific to urban institutions more likely to have international students living in their service area than the other indicators and so more difficult for the GLC to support. Ron mentioned a loose support structure of informal referrals to experienced colleagues for colleges looking for information about international students. Rather than the GLC having specific resources it was more likely that someone searching for information regarding international students would be referred by word of mouth to the individual with experience. Another participant mentioned opportunities for partnering with four year

institutions to host international students for their first two years before transferring.

She indicated that no colleges had been willing to take advantage of the partnership

opportunity yet. Possible future roles echoed prior thinking of functioning as a

clearinghouse and resource center. Janet mentioned the GLC could possibly provide

information related to cultural and legal issues for colleges interested in hosting

international students.   However, fewer interviewees were able to give concrete

examples of how the GLC might support this aspect of international education when

compared to other indicators.   As discussed in more detail later in the section on barriers,

hosting international students is seen by some as a conflict with the traditional mission of

the community college.

Barriers

As the discussion of roles for the GLC progressed an additional theme focused on

barriers to carrying out those roles began to emerge. Analysis of the barriers mentioned

by interviewees led to identification of three subthemes including support,

communication, and competing interests. Most barriers mentioned by interviewees were

direct barriers to the work of the GLC.   Others were barriers to international education in

general but from the perspective of the participants still represented obstacles to the work

of the GLC.   For the purpose of this study barriers which most obviously impact the

work of the GLC are termed "direct barriers" while those that are more removed but are

still likely to impact the consortium work are term "indirect barriers".   The volunteer

nature of the GLC participants was emphasized by all interviewees and was especially

prevalent with respect to barriers to fulfillment of the GLC role. Interviewees put a great

deal of emphasis on the volunteer nature of the GLC and the fact that their roles in

promoting the consortium and the work it does come after the demands of the regular job are met and the volunteer nature of the consortium thus presents a significant obstacle.

Support.   Lack of support was cited by every participant and for most there were several instances where lack of support was mentioned as related to function of the GLC as a group and to carrying out their individual roles in the GLC.   In addition, there were multiple sources of lack of support identified by interviewees.

Direct barriers related to support.   Several participants identified lack of support from local leadership as a critical barrier to the work of the GLC and to the individual's role in the GLC.   Ron mentioned support at the local level from college presidents as necessary for the GLC to reach its potential and Bob echoed the same idea in speaking about GLC members saying "presidents and their administration have to realize 10-20% of their workload may be doing this and it may not be clear how it's going to benefit that college at that particular time but in the long run it will."   This comment ties in support on a local basis with the volunteer nature of the organization at present.

A significant amount of discussion about barriers involved a perceived lack of support from the system office.   In fact one interviewee termed the system office a "hurdle" to the GLC with respect to having a website. Historically, the GLC was formed as a result of a system office decision to support international education and to encourage individual colleges to become active with regard to global education.   It was noted by interviewees that the system office at the time of the formation of the GLC was very supportive of international education, in almost direct contrast to the view of the current system office administration.   One participant even indicated that she had sensed not only disinterest but almost discouragement from the current system office.   Another

interviewee in describing the history as opposed to the current status stated, "Interestingly enough, it started as a top down because the system office created it, now they've kicked us to the curb." Bob indicated a need from his perspective for the system office to have a greater level of commitment to international education. Additionally, some interviewees recognized that there is system office personnel listed as members of the GLC Steering Committee but they do not attend meetings and are not active otherwise. There does seem to be some disparity in how the GLC members viewed their relationship or potential relationship with the system office and how the system office views the relationship. Mary giving the system office perspective indicated

> I think when the GLC first started it was a fledgling association in the North Carolina Community College System and we have 30 or 40 different associations-instructional administrators association, student development administrators association, and business officers association. I think initially the system office provided some support to the GLC while they were getting off the ground but they are now a standalone association that is affiliated with the NCCCS.

This disparity could explain some of the perceived lack of support from the system office on the part of the GLC members.

Both budget and personnel were commonly cited barriers throughout the interviews and in many cases they were linked back to the system office. Bob noted with regard to budget from the system office "The state doesn't give us money for anything and they don't have a budget line item for global education at all." Not only was the lack of specific budget support from the system office noted, several interviewees noted that most colleges do not have any local budget designated for international education.

Half of the interviewees recognized budget constraints currently in place as one likely stumbling block for system support. Linda perhaps summarized this best in saying, "The fact that there is not strong support from the system office, I understand the budget situations are such that anything that is viewed as luxury takes a back seat." Some felt that having paid personnel, perhaps at the system office level, would help the GLC carry out their role by providing support for the communication and planning that is currently the responsibility of a few volunteers. The most commonly cited benefits of having personnel focused on maintaining a website and planning for conferences and meetings with the result being better and more consistent communication.

In describing the role of the system office in international education Mary indicated that budget cuts had forced them to downsize and focus on core mission. Minutes from the October 2008 meeting confirmed the lack of budgetary support from the system office for the GLC. It was reported in those minutes that a former system office administrator present at that meeting indicated that in order to secure a budget the GLC would have to be more active. Minutes from the October 2005 meeting in which the current structure of the GLC was being discussed described a role for the system office that focused on "resources, information, and support such as funding sources, legislative actions, and State Board action."

Four of the seven GLC interviewees raised the question of another potential barrier in questioning whether the GLC has established a level of credibility sufficient to gain interest from leadership. Janet raised the question in talking about how the consortium might be more involved at the system level. She said, "I don't know if we are seen as the group with the knowledge to go to. Have we proven ourselves to be worthy

of sharing in those discussions? What qualifies us to share in those discussions?"   Linda

shared a similar idea in discussing the role of the GLC in building support from

leadership. She stated, "The GLC has to become stronger in order to get the presidents

interested across the board."   As part of that same discussion she raised the question of

whether the GLC message is strong enough to garner interest from leadership.   When

asked about what opportunities the GLC should consider moving forward, Bob suggested

that the GLC needed to be recognized by the system office as more than an "ad hoc

group."   Steve tied the perceived lack of credibility to lack of involvement from some

colleges questioning whether presidents would push attendance at the conferences if the

GLC wasn't seen to be an active group. He also suggested that the credibility of the

group could be boosted significantly if they could have some successful projects.   A note

in the minutes from the October 2008 meeting of the GLC Executive Committee

indicated that perhaps the issue of visibility and credibility had arisen previously.   One of

the items discussed was the need to have more visibility with the presidents and the need

to improve on information distribution.

   Indirect barriers related to support. Lisa, in talking about the key elements of

international education, described a local barrier to curriculum internationalization she

had witnessed in the form of department chairs.   As she discussed the difference seen

sometimes when teaching shared courses that others are also teaching and that are offered

in a more prescribed manner it became apparent that she recognized that lack of local

support could be an impediment to the work of the GLC.   She said "You know one

barrier possibly could be who is your department head, are they going to allow you to do

that? I call it owned courses, owned courses versus shared courses where a lot of people

teach the same section."   She was aware of an example of a department chair disallowing the internationalization of a shared course that produced a direct barrier to international education at the local level but that could also be considered an indirect barrier to the work of the GLC.

One question posed to participants asked what they perceived the role of the GLC to be in system office decision making with regard to international education questions. Most interviewees indicated a belief that international education was not currently a high priority in the system office with the result that decisions are not being made about international education thus leaving the GLC with only a minimal role at best.   Janet shared her perspective saying, "I don't know how frequently global education issues are discussed on that level. I would hope we would be aware if they were. So it is sort of my thinking that those are not priorities that are being discussed." Mary confirmed this saying about the system office "To be honest with you right now we don't have at the system level any initiative that we are calling an international education initiative."   The mission of the North Carolina Community College System includes a reference to developing "a globally and multi-culturally competent workforce" (North Carolina Community College System [NCCCS], 2011b).   The most recent strategic plan available on the NCCCS website was 2007-2009 and it does not reference international education or any related plans (North Carolina Community College System, n.d.).

When asked in what ways the consortium should be involved with the system office participants spoke generally about a role in which the existing infrastructure of the GLC could assist the system office in improving international education among the colleges, help direct the path of international education, and identify those colleges who

are active in global education.   Bob remarked that the system office could use help from the GLC in deciding what "role the system office is going to play with global education" as well as "what things should be happening in each college."   Ron shared that the GLC could help the system office identify the people involved at the colleges and which colleges are among the leaders.

Competing Interests. A second aspect of barriers that emerged was the idea of competing interests both at the local level and the system office level.

Direct barriers related to competing interests.   A local barrier that received a great deal of attention from participants was the demands of the volunteers' day-to-day jobs at their respective colleges and periodic strains on time and energy such as work related to reaccreditation. Ron in talking about the GLC annual conference expressed the reality of day-to-day barriers saying, "You bring in people to talk about it and everybody jumps on the band wagon and they go back and all of a sudden SACS is knocking on our door, now I got to do my budgets.   Suddenly the day job rears its ugly head and gets in the way."   As previously stated there was a great deal of emphasis on the volunteer status as an impediment to the GLC moving forward and fulfilling the role members believe is was intended to play in advancing and informing international education.   This is consistent with results of the 2006 ACE survey which indicated that community colleges ranked low with regard to infrastructure including dedicated personnel (Green, et al., 2008).

Indirect barriers related to competing interests.   There was recognition by some participants that each system office administration has particular priorities and if international education does not rise to the top for a particular administration there will be

other priorities that receive more attention. This notion ties back to the perceived lack of support from the system office discussed previously.   Similarly, there was also recognition that individual colleges have priorities set forth by presidents and boards of trustees that can also move international education down or even off the list of important aspects of a college.

There were several references to the tension between the traditional local mission of the community college and international education.   Most participants recognized that the local autonomy of the colleges meant that in some cases advancement of international education would not proceed despite interested faculty and personnel. Missy recognized this in her discussion of the system office indicating that the system office could push international education but with the local autonomy afforded the colleges the local board of trustees could resist allocating resources or otherwise supporting global education if they saw a conflict with the mission.   The idea of the local board as a potential stumbling block to international education was also commented on by Mary who talked about ways to build support from leadership.   She talked about engaging boards in a fundamental way but recognized boards sometimes "have the wrong impression of what global education is and sometimes they even, depending on the generation of the board member, see global education as a huge threat."

Steve suggested a similar issue in the misperception that associates international education only with travel.   He remarked that those involved with the GLC understand the broader nature of the organization but people who are not active "perceive it has something to do with travel."   Lisa recognized that in some cases faculty and staff also struggle with the traditional focus of community colleges and international education.   In

talking about faculty and staff travel she referenced encountering the attitude that travel is "not even considered in the realm of community college thinking." One historical piece of information indicates that local resistance is not a recent development. In an attachment to the October 2005 Executive Committee meeting minutes outlining points of emphasis for the group, one of the items mentioned was "Local Board and Commissioner's Acceptance of Globalization."

The local mission seemed to be more prevalent in the discussion of international students. Ron recognized the traditional mission as a stumbling block in discussing laws that prevent community colleges from participating in tuition exchange programs. He felt that the law was obsolete when considering the global nature of the world but also said, "I can understand because the mission of the community college is workforce development within the local service area." Bob also recognized the tension when talking about bringing international students to community colleges. He stated "We are supposed to be building the workforce of our state and our own economy. So I am not against it but I don't think that is really part of what we should be doing." A small number of interviewees pondered a related question in considering how service area is currently defined and what globalization and most specifically advances in technology have done to change the concept of service area and what is considered local. Linda illustrated this strongly saying,

> With the internet, with the world the way that it is, the degree to which we limit ourselves to service area, and this may truly be heresy, you know we are working in a pre-internet era and our students are not. I mean it is one thing if our students are working in a pre-internet era but our students are not.

Another aspect of redefining service area mentioned by a small number of participants was the realization that many students would not enter the workforce in the same place they were born and raised. An increasingly mobile workforce was cited by Ron as one a potential catalyst for redefining service area. Mobility within the workforce is an idea which also appears in the literature most especially associated with the economic rationale for international education (ACE, 2002; Knight, 2004; Wood, 2010).

    Communication. The final subtheme related to barriers centered on communication. All barriers cited by interviewees related to communication are direct barriers. One of the focal points of this barrier was the ability to communicate with member colleges and the need for a viable means to do so. When talking about the future role of the consortium, Janet remarked, "Well I think one of our biggest problems right now is just communication overall." Communication has been problematic for a while as is illustrated by minutes from the October 2005 Executive Committee meeting that contain references to difficulty with communication in the form of a listserv and website. Several interviewees mentioned the GLC website and the history that surrounding that tool. Prior to removal of the original website it was hosted and maintained by one of the colleges and again volunteers found it difficult to keep the site up to date. The organization has struggled to find effective ways to communicate and several participants cited lack of a tool by which current active members as well as potential active members can share information and resources as a significant barrier to moving international education forward among the colleges. Linda mentioned the struggle encountered by the group in maintaining a website and indicated that as a result the information flow vital to letting participants know what the GLC was doing was greatly impaired. Much of what

participants described as the role of the GLC in informing international education is dependent on communication. As she talked with urgency about the need for a website Missy said, "We've got to have a place for people to know to go to get to us, besides word of mouth." The GLC has a new website but it contains limited information and is still being maintained by volunteers. In addition, the website is not currently linked to the system office website and so is difficult to find.

There were also hints from interviewees regarding difficulty with internal communication and questions about continuity within the GLC. As mentioned previously in the section regarding the GLC definition of international education Janet felt a certain lack of cohesiveness in the group. Later in talking about discussions within the GLC about difficulty recruiting new members Janet expressed frustration that she had not seen information about who had been contacted about the GLC and she posed the question of how the group was being promoted. One interviewee shared that they had not been given any guidance regarding their role in the GLC and there was a feeling of people struggling with their roles. Another participant who had been asked to pull together a group expressed frustration about not really understanding the purpose of the group saying, "I will be honest, I have not done that because I don't really know what they would do." Steve suggested an infrequent meeting schedule contributes to a lack of continuity in the group and makes it difficult to maintain activity. Lisa suggested the group needs to be better organized and cited the difficulty of doing so with the work being done by volunteers. Along those lines, Janet suggested the group might benefit from a discussion of what the priorities should be for the consortium and that would give some direction she felt is missing as they move forward. Another participant shared the

need for creating a "unified front within the consortium" in discussing how the GLC might help build support from leadership.

Summary of Findings Related to Research Questions

The following primary research question guided the conduction of this study: How does a consortium inform internationalization at community colleges? A number of secondary questions were also utilized to inform this question. Following is a brief summary of the findings related to each secondary question and an overall summary of findings which respond to the primary question.

How does the consortium understand internationalization? Questioning focused on the definition of international education and key elements was intended to establish a sense of how the GLC understands international education and establish the foundation for the resources, initiatives, and roles of the consortium.   The foundation provides structure and context for how the GLC informs colleges and colleagues within the system with which it works.

Responses to the request for interviewees to talk about how the consortium defines international education primarily resulted in a focus not on a definition but on purpose mostly related to student outcomes. A notable part of some answers framed a lack of certainty about a definition which in turn leads to questions regarding how uniform the foundation might be that guides the GLC's understanding of international education. Interviewees were more consistent regarding key elements of international education with curriculum internationalization and travel/study abroad being cited most frequently and support from leadership being mentioned as well.

As with questions regarding the definition, the expectation would be that key elements identified by participants would play significantly in establishing how the consortium understands international education and in turn would be reflected in efforts of the group to inform others. Questions regarding the definition and key elements of international education helped establish that the GLC focuses understanding of international education around the outcome of students being better prepared for the twenty-first century and the activities, primarily curriculum internationalization and travel/study abroad, which promote the accomplishment of student outcomes.

How does the consortium describe its role in internationalization?

Participants were asked to describe the roles the GLC plays in international education with the intent of establishing perceived roles to illustrate what part the GLC plays in informing constituents about international education. Current roles consistently cited were those of clearinghouse for information, vehicle for communication and connection among members, and builder of support and awareness.   Examples of how the roles play out were often focused on the key elements identified by interviewees prior to discussion of the roles.   This served to indicate a connection between what the group sees as the critical elements to successful international education and the roles they envision the GLC playing in their efforts to inform international education. When asked to consider the consortium role with respect to four nationally recognized indicators of internationalization, the theme of clearinghouse and facilitator continued to dominate thinking.

There were considerable differences among participants with respect to the extent to which the consortium currently carries out the roles they identified. Accompanying

the comments regarding effectiveness was considerable discussion of barriers which currently impede the consortium in efforts to fully play the role members would like to see. Subthemes within those barriers were categorized as related to support, communication, and competing interests. In some instances the barriers were related more directly to GLC activity while in others they were more focused on international education. Regardless of the direct or indirect nature of the barrier, participants perceived the barriers as disruptive to the GLC with regard to informing international education.

How does the system office understand the role of the consortium? The system office views the consortium as one of several associations affiliated with the system but whose work is not funded by the system. The GLC is seen to function as a standalone association that plays the role of facilitator for colleges and system employees who have an interest in international education. While the function of the GLC is similar as viewed by the system office and the GLC membership, the relationship between the system office and the GLC is viewed differently by the two entities with the GLC perceiving that it should be more integrated into the system office as opposed to being affiliated.

How does the future role of the consortium as envisioned by participants differ from the present role? Most interviewees cited the need to improve on the role of clearinghouse and facilitator and most expressed the idea of the GLC becoming the go to group in the state with respect to international education in the community colleges. With regard to informing the specific indicators of internationalization, members generated ideas about academic programs and activities, support from leadership, and

faculty buy in but seemed less sure about how to support and inform the indicator related to international students. Members also recognized the barriers to improving and potentially being seen as the best source for internationalization would need to be cleared. The urgency to have a viable communication tool in the form of a website was perceived to be a high priority to move forward for the future of the GLC.   There was also indication from some GLC members that the consortium needs to increase its visibility and credibility to improve their perceived role.

How does a consortium inform internationalization at community colleges?
There are two aspects of the way in which the GLC informs international education that arise out of this study. First is the sense of the intended role the group has in informing internationalization in North Carolina community colleges. Secondly is the limited capability of the GLC to carry out the intended activities and functions and thus to inform internationalization. Efforts of the group to inform international education are founded in the idea of preparing students for work and life in an increasingly globalized world and recognition that key ideas such as curriculum internationalization, travel/study abroad, and support from various levels of leadership are critical to successful international education advancement.

The current role envisioned by interviewees involves the group functioning as a clearinghouse for information, a vehicle to facilitate communication and connection, and a builder of awareness and support. Interviewees see the group as informing international education through offering supportive structures and collective knowledge to advance the foundational items reported above. Examples of how the group supports key indicators of internationalization were focused on three of the four indicators including academic

programs and activities, support and buy in from faculty, and support from leadership. Not surprising since the interviewees indicated key elements from these three as important during the questioning to establish the foundational beliefs of the group. The primary ways in which the group currently acts to inform international education is through an annual conference and regional meetings. Less obvious was the place of the fourth indicator, international students, in the efforts of the group to advance international education. Interviewees struggled with providing examples of how the group supports colleges with international students or how that might be part of future work of the GLC.

Contrasting with the role described above is the question of how well the group is presently carrying out the functions and roles. Some participants question whether the group is informing international education at all in the community colleges of North Carolina. As the themes emerged around the roles of the consortium, themes situated on barriers to fulfilling the roles emerged equally strongly. Barriers, whether directly impacting the work of the GLC or being more closely associated with international education in general, were perceived to have significant impact on the work of the group's efforts to inform international education in North Carolina.

There was general agreement among the interviewees that the group informs international education but not to the extent it would like at the state level. The presence of significant barriers, some at the state level and others within the group itself, is recognized as an impediment to functioning of the GLC as is necessary to create significant impact in the arena of international education in North Carolina community colleges.

   The following chapter will relate the findings discussed here to the literature and outline how this study contributes to the body of literature. The framework will also be revisited and limitations of the study defined. Finally, implications and recommendations arising from examination of the data will be reviewed and suggestions for future research presented.

Chapter 5: Analysis and Implications

This chapter will relate the findings of this study to the literature both where the findings bear out the literature and where there is divergence. A review of the conceptual framework will be followed by presentation of limitations of the study as well as implications for practice and recommendations. Finally, recommendations for further research will be offered.

This study sought to address the following primary research question: How does a consortium inform internationalization at community colleges?   The study was conducted using case study methodology to examine this question and the Global Learner Consortium (GLC) associated with the North Carolina Community College System served as the study population.   Interviews were conducted with individuals currently serving in leadership roles in the GLC, individuals who formerly served in leadership roles, and one individual working in academics within the system office. Themes developed in three categories including foundational beliefs, roles, and barriers.

Foundational Beliefs

Foundational beliefs of the interviewees focused on defining international education primarily in terms of outcomes for the student. Half of the participants referred to the importance of preparing students to function in a 21st century workplace which according to the literature is one of the rationales for incorporating international education into community college education (ACE, 2002; Byers-Pevitts, 2008; Dellow, 2007; Knight, 2004; Qiang, 2003; Wood, 2010).   The economic rationale for

international education recognizes the impact of globalization and technological advance on the growing interdependence of world markets (ACE, 2002; Byers-Pevitts, 2008; Dellow, 2007; Knight, 2004; Qiang, 2003). This notion is supported by surveys that have suggested employers see the need for students to be prepared to function in a global work place including the skills and knowledge needed to compete against international applicants (Deloitte Development LLC, 2010; Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 2006).

Curriculum internationalization and travel/study abroad were the two most commonly identified key elements of internationalization by consortium members. Both elements are considered important parts of academic programs and activities necessary to promote successful internationalization by national higher education groups such as the AACC and the ACE (Blair, et al., 2001; Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, et al., 2008). Interviewees recognized that many community college students are unable to travel abroad due to work and family obligations, an idea which is also noted in the literature (Childress, 2010; Guerin, 2009; Korbel, 2007; Raby & Valeau, 2007). This in turn elevates the importance of curriculum internationalization and other campus based activities. Study participants shared this outlook as is evidenced by the frequent mention of curriculum internationalization throughout the interviews as well as the importance of faculty participation as part of successful internationalization. The literature is supportive of this finding since it also reveals a good deal of focus on faculty engagement and development as an important part of successful international education (Childress, 2010; Green, 2007; Larsen, 2004; Stohl, 2007).

Study abroad was viewed by participants as one of the most important pieces of international education but also perhaps the most challenging. The low rate of study

abroad among community colleges is well documented in the literature.   According to

Asheford (2011) only three percent of students studying abroad are community college

students.   One noteworthy idea that emerged from the interviews and that related to the

challenges of getting community college students abroad was the use of virtual exchange

to take students, faculty, and staff off campus and facilitate synchronous interactions.

The virtual exchange mentioned by some participants focused on utilization of the same

technology which has advanced the interdependence of the globe to provide some global

interaction for students and others who cannot travel.   Noted in the literature is the fact

that distance learning opens opportunity for students to interact with anyone, anywhere

through online classrooms (Garrett & Macdonald, 1997; Hudzik, 2011; Qiang, 2003).

Less evident in the literature is the deliberate development and offering of those

opportunities as suggested by interviewees for virtual exchange.

Roles

Interviewees' perceptions of the roles and functions of the GLC led to

development of three subthemes identifying the GLC as a clearinghouse for information,

a facilitator of communication, and a builder of awareness and support.   These three

roles continued to be emphasized in perceptions of how the GLC could inform and

support specific key indicators of successful international education. Prominent ideas in

the discussion included sharing resources and information regarding curriculum

internationalization and global activities as well as promotion of collaboration among

colleges to promote and provide travel/study abroad opportunities.   These focal points

are consistent with the advantages cited in the literature with regard to partnerships and

consortia related to global education (ACIIE, 1994; ACIIE, 1996; Green & Olson, 2008).

In fact, consortia have been identified as possible options for expanding and advancing international education, especially for small institutions or those colleges where budget restricts access to joining national organizations (MacLean, 1990), a situation representative of North Carolina community colleges.

Barriers

Interviewees also identified barriers to GLC fulfillment of the states roles related to lack of support, competing interests, and communication. Obstacles to advancement of international education related to support also feature prominently in the literature and are often associated with leadership (Childress, 2009; DeFleur, 2008; Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Woods, 2010), though that focus is primarily on individual institutional leadership as opposed to state level leadership. Participants focused on the volunteer nature of their work for the GLC and stressed the difficulty of devoting appropriate time considering the duties of their regular job for their college. One of the elements of successful internationalization noted by the ACE is administrative infrastructure which includes office space and personnel dedicated to administering programs (Green & Siaya, 2005; Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). As with support from leadership, the literature focus is on institutional infrastructure rather than state or system level. Several interviewees recognized the need for infrastructure mentioning the possibility of a dedicated position at the system office.

Another notable competing interest cited by participants was the tension that can arise between the traditional local mission of the community college and international initiatives. Interviewees recognized that the work of the GLC and supportive faculty and staff might be interrupted by local autonomy of colleges and most especially

unsupportive boards of trustees. The literature cites local boards as having

geographically limited perspectives on support of the local economy and as a result they

view international education initiatives as competition for local economic activity and

support (Green & Olson, 2008). This potential barrier is reflected in the literature as well

(Green & Olson, 2008; Raby & Valeau, 2007; Stohl, 2007) despite encouragement by the

American Association of Community College Trustees and the AACC regarding the

importance of international education (AACC, 2006b; Goodman, 2010).

　　While the idea of community colleges serving local needs is still legitimate,

faculty, staff, and boards of trustees must consider the impact of globalization on their

service area. The meaning of local in today's world is very different from that used to

frame the mission of community colleges when many were founded. There is an

opportunity to explore the community college mission and reframe the understanding in

the context of the globalized world.   In many ways the increasing interdependence of the

world is making the concept of local service area obsolete as well as altering the world in

which students will be living and working.

　　Barriers mentioned in the literature specific to involvement in consortia included

accreditation, sharing of revenue and financial aid, program ownership conflicts, and

funding (Korbel, 2007; Raby, 2008; Zhang, 2011).   Interestingly, of these only issues

related to funding of consortia activities was mentioned by interviewees.   Most barriers

cited by participants related to function of the consortium appear in the literature as

barriers to international education in general.   There seems to be little in the literature

exploring interplay between barriers to international education and barriers to the work of

consortia attempting to advance international education. Also there seems to be little in

the literature offering guidance to consortia seeking to function at the state level but which lack high level support.

Insight gained from this study and the literature suggests that in order for a consortium to encounter the barriers mentioned above, there has to be international education activity involving institutional collaboration. A predecessor then to having barriers to consortium activity would be a climate in which international education is broadly accepted and considered a priority so that colleges are engaging in collaborative activities. In North Carolina there is little evidence to indicate that is the case.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was based in the broad indicators of internationalization put forth by the American Council on Education. Those indicators include institutional support, academic requirements, programs, and extracurricular activities, faculty policies and opportunities, and international students (Green, et al., 2008). These broad indicators were used to frame interview questions aimed at creating a description of how GLC members perceive the organization is informing international education among community colleges.

Use of the conceptual framework described above helped focus participants on what are considered important pieces for colleges to have successful international education programs as well as delineating the roles and functions of the GLC. Interview questions designed to establish the foundational beliefs of the consortium revealed keys mentioned by the participants that are located in the broad categories outlined by the ACE and forming the framework. The framework was also successful in opening the

dialogue to barriers to advancing international education encountered by the GLC as an organization as well as individuals.

Going forward studies exploring the work of consortia might benefit from expanding the framework used for this study to include elements related to commonly cited barriers. This would introduce structures to guide exploration of each of the key indicators forming the framework utilized in this study. Barriers proved to be a point of emphasis during the interviews and specific questioning framed by the most commonly cited barriers might generate a deeper discussion of how barriers to the work of the consortium and barriers to international education intersect.

Limitations

This study only includes perceptions and perspectives of individuals who currently hold or have held leadership roles and are most active within the Global Learner Consortium associated with the North Carolina Community College System. Those members of the consortium who have not been in leadership roles might have different perceptions regarding how the GLC informs international education. An additional perspective might also be added by those within the colleges who are actively engaged in international education efforts but are not active in the GLC for whatever reason. In addition, the study includes a single representative of the North Carolina Community College System office personnel and others within the system office might express different perceptions regarding the GLC and international education.

Implications and Recommendations

The literature makes a strong argument for community college student engagement in international education. Considering the increasingly interconnected

world and the large number of students being prepared for that world by community colleges it seems international education should be an increasingly important focus for community colleges. To that end, implications and recommendations will be considered in two phases with the first being focused on the GLC and North Carolina and the second looking at the broader community college picture.

The GLC and North Carolina. This study and the literature recognize that support of international education opportunities from those in leadership roles is critical if commitment to internationalization is to be wide spread on campuses and throughout systems. Findings of this study can serve as a starting point for fostering engagement among faculty and staff at colleges as well as across the system in North Carolina beginning with recognition of the foundation that has been laid in the state and the scaffolding in the form of a consortium that is available to build upon. It is recommended that GLC members identify those colleges where support from leadership already exists and strengthen those relationships. This in turn would create a core group of committed leaders and institutions that could complement the committed individuals in the GLC and contribute to a critical mass of dedicated supporters needed to draw attention to internationalization and the work of the consortium.

As is evident from this study there is currently a lack of emphasis on international education from the North Carolina Community College System office. If international education is to become an imperative in North Carolina community colleges, an increased amount of support and emphasis is necessary from the highest levels of the system office. It is recommended that the NCCCS explore a renewed commitment to encouraging and guiding member institutions in the pursuit of internationalization on

their campuses. As part of the commitment it is recommended that a position be created within the system office to function as a liaison for international education between the system, the GLC, and the colleges. This would demonstrate that international education is important for North Carolina community colleges and create linkages among the scaffolding already in existence.

The results of this study can be offered as encouragement to the Global Learner Consortium to explore strengths and weaknesses. There is obvious passion and interest in international education among the leadership of the organization but a sense that there is a lack of cohesion within the consortium. Based on this finding, it is recommended that the group engage in a process to illuminate those areas where frustration and confusion exist and promote a more cohesive approach going forward. An example from this study is the lack of certainty among GLC members regarding a shared definition of international education for the consortium. The group would benefit from working through a process to define international education as endorsed by the GLC. Not only would this alleviate frustration, it would create consistency in messaging and provide a guiding framework for those carrying out the work of the consortium.

There was general agreement among participants that the roles and functions of the consortium are primarily that of a clearinghouse for information and a facilitator of communication and connection among members. There was discrepancy regarding how well the group is carrying out that function. It is recommended that the group analyze how and where resources are spent fulfilling the roles and functions in an effort to generate a complete picture of where the consortium is currently. When combined with the exploration of strengths and weaknesses suggested above, information from such

analysis could in turn assist in the development of a three year plan designed to focus on critical goals as well as development of a communication plan. This organizational analysis could be carried out by the group through utilizing of a process akin to a Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis.

Another goal of most members was to be seen as the primary group for international education in North Carolina community colleges. However, members expressed that the consortium needed to boost visibility and credibility to move into that position. A critical examination of things negatively impacting credibility and visibility and formulation of a plan to remedy those when possible is recommended. A number of barriers to advancement of international education and the work of the GLC were identified in the study. One of the most significant cited was the volunteer nature of the consortium. The recommendation mentioned above regarding a plan to increase visibility and credibility could result in a larger pool of volunteers to assist with advancing the work of the GLC. A second recommendation presented previously for a dedicated system office position could unify the network of volunteers and assist in limiting to a manageable level the functions required of volunteers.

Community Colleges in General. The service area of a college no longer extends only to the city limit or county line just as students are no longer assured of jobs in the immediate area or that competition for jobs will come from nearby. The traditional locally focused mission of the community college would benefit from a retooling to account for the increasingly global nature of local communities. The conversation was introduced by the focus group gathered by Mendoza, et al. (2009) with their recognition of the importance of globalization for community colleges. Thus one recommendation

arising from this study is for community colleges to engage in a discussion about service area and mission and how those might need to be redefined in light of the increasingly globalized world in which we live and in which students are educated, living, and working. This could help remove a barrier to international education cited in both the literature and by participants in this study.

Taking into consideration the nature of the world and the population being served by community colleges, opportunities to promote international education among colleges, such as the one offered by a consortium approach, should be a significant priority for forward thinking institutions. The results of this study can encourage new and renewed interest among colleges in supporting consortia and the potential benefits related to sharing resources and information as well as collaborating to bring about international education opportunities. Individuals or groups considering joining or forming a consortium will find the results of this study useful in identifying potential benefits as well as pitfalls. It might also provide some idea regarding organizational structure of one model and insight into the mechanics of how that model has functioned.

A second recommendation is for community colleges to examine or reexamine the potential of consortia relationships as a way to overcome obstacles facing community colleges with regard to international education. Included in the examination is the imperative to look at how barriers to international education in general interact and intersect with barriers to work of a consortium. Interviewees cited various barriers to the work of the consortium many of which impact not only the work of the consortium but advancement of international education as well. Barriers which can be overcome on a

local basis through strong leadership and development are multiplied when considered at the level of a system.

Recommendations for Further Research

While the study presents the perspectives of those most closely involved with the work of the Global Learner Consortium, adding the perspective of other members of the GLC as well as others engaged in international education would enhance the picture of how the consortium informs international education.   The additional perspectives might also examine whether the roles and functions of the GLC as perceived by participants matches the needs of the constituents and assist in determining the level of awareness of the GLC. This would be useful to the consortium in future planning and focusing of limited resources to maximize impact.   Additionally, studies of how other state consortia such as the Tennessee Consortium for International Studies and California Colleges for International Education inform international education would be beneficial in identifying best practices as well as common barriers.   This information would be helpful in constructing a model for building and sustaining successful consortia.

The literature has much to offer regarding challenges faced by institutions as well as activities and strategies proven in overcoming barriers within successful institutions. There is much less is available related to the dynamics and challenges faced by systems and consortiums.   More study of how the challenges institutions face intersect with challenges faced on a larger scale such as would be the case for systems would be helpful for groups attempting to navigate larger systemic change.

Two emerging ideas from the study could benefit from further examination. An examination of the current use and potential for incorporation of virtual exchange for the

purpose of global education could benefit community colleges. Further research would help illuminate possible ways in which technology might be used to circumvent barriers to travel and study abroad for community college students. A second area worthy of exploration is examination of the idea of an expansion or reframing of the traditional community mission and service area in light of the globalized world in which those institutions now operate.

Conclusion

There is strong support and rationale in the literature for provision of international education experiences for all levels of higher education including community colleges. Community colleges serve a large portion of undergraduate students and as a result the imperative to provide students with a foundation for living and working in an increasingly interconnected world should extend to the population served by the nation's two year colleges. Consortium involvement has been touted as a way in which community colleges might overcome the challenges of resources, nontraditional student populations, and other factors that possibly present obstacles to engagement in international education.

The case study method was utilized in this instance to examine the perceptions of those involved in a state level consortium about how they see the consortium informing international education in the North Carolina community colleges. As a result of interviews with individuals involved with the consortium a picture of the consortium emerged which indicates that strategies and actions of the group are founded primarily in the recognized and accepted keys to successful internationalization espoused by national groups. However, also evident is the limited capacity with which the group is able to

advance and inform internationalization in North Carolina community colleges due to numerous barriers.   In order to move forward with support for colleges and thus inform international education as the consortium was envisioned to do, work must be done to mediate or remove the barriers.

A first step in removing the barriers is to make international education a priority of the community colleges.   If indeed the goal of the community colleges is to produce citizens who are capable of working and living in the globalized world, support in various forms for international education is a necessity.   Assistance with advancing international education is available through the use of consortium models but successful internationalization at a systemic level cannot be accomplished by a consortium alone. Systemic transformation requires commitment and expectation from system and institutional leadership as well as those faculty and staff who most directly impact the students.   If broad based support is not available internationalization will exist only in pockets within an institution and at a few institutions within a system.

From my perspective as a community college leader international education is a matter of obligation to quality for community colleges.   As educational practitioners we should strive to give students the necessary skills and knowledge for function in a globalized and interconnected world. This is critical since we, as educators, touch the lives of almost half of the undergraduate population of the United States and for many will represent their only higher education experience. This study demonstrates there are champions for international education but there are also many barriers to international education becoming a priority for community colleges.   Resources and tools represented by the likes of consortia will only be useful in advancing international education if

educators recognize and embrace international education as part of the foundation of a quality education. The mission of the community college to meet the needs of the local service area is still very viable but we must reframe what local means in light of the globalized world in which we live and work. We can no longer assume that educating students under the premise of what local meant 50 years ago will lead to their success as an employee and a citizen.

References

American Association of Community Colleges. (2000). Charting the future of global education in community colleges. *New Expeditions: Charting the Second Century of Community Colleges*, *Issues Paper 12*, Annapolis, MD: Community College Press.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2006a) *Strategic action areas* (08/04/2006) [Board Policy] Washington DC. Retrieved April 23, 2010 from the World Wide Web: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/About/Documents/ boardpolicies08072009.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2006b). Building the global community: Joint statement on the role of community colleges in international education. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/international/ Documents/aaccacct_jointstatement.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2011). *2011 community college fast facts* Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/ FactSheet2011.pdf

American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education.* Washington DC: American Council on Education.

American Council on International Intercultural Education. (1994). *Building the global community: The next step*. Retrieved from http://www.ccid.cc/resources/airlie/ PDF/Airlie_1994.pdf

American Council on International Intercultural Education. (1996). *Education for the global community: A framework for community colleges*. Retrieved from http://www.ccid.cc/resources/airlie/PDF/Airlie_1996.pdf

Asheford, E. (2011). Colleges urged to take advantage of study abroad. *Community College Times*. Retrieved from http://www.communitycollegetimes.com/Pages/ Campus-Issues/Colleges-urged-to-take-advantage-of-study-abroad.aspx

Blair, D., Phinney, L. & Phillippe, K. (2001). *International programs at community colleges* (Research Brief No. AACC-R8-01-1). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Boggs, G.R. & Irwin, J. (2007). What every community college leader needs to know: Building leadership for international education. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 138, 25-45.

Byers-Pevitts, B. (2008). Innovative education for an interconnected world. *The Presidency*, 11(3), 24.

Cardwell, T. (2006). Globalization: Getting started. *Community College Journal,* 76(7), 14-17.

Chen, D. (2008). International education at community colleges. *The Community College Enterprise,* 14(1), 83-94.

Childress, L.K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 13(3), 289-309. doi: 10.1177/1028315308329804

Childress, L.K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.

DeFleur, L.B. (2008). A visible commitment to global education. *The Presidency*, 11(3), 20-21.

Dellow, D.A. (2007). The role of globalization in technical and occupational programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 138, 39-45.

Deloitte Development LLC. (2010). *Talent edge 2020: Blueprints for the new normal.* Retrieved from http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-UnitedStates/ Local%20 Assets/Documents/ IMOs/Talent/ us_talentedge2020_121710.pdf

Dewey, P. & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education,* 58(4), 491-504.

Dolby, R. & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 676-726.

Engberg, D. & Green M.F. (Eds). (2002*). Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization.* Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

Floyd, D.L., Walker, D.A., & Farnsworth, K. (2003). Global education: An emerging imperative for community colleges. *International Education,* 33(1), 5-21.

Ford, J.T. (2009). *Persistent staffing and foreign language gaps compromise diplomatic readiness* (GAO-09-1046T). Retrieved from U.S. Government Accountability Office website: www.gao.gov/new.items/d091046t.pdf

Fowler, F.J., Jr. (2009). *Survey research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Frost, R.A. (2008). An interview with Linda Korbel on globalizing the community college. *The Community College Enterprise*, 14(2), 63-72.

Frost, R.A. (2009). Globalization conceptualized: An organization-environment case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 33(12), 1009-1024.

Garrett, R.L. & Macdonald, D.P. (1997). A technical college's response to the need for internationalizing education programs and services. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 21(7), 627-636.

Genelin, N.L. (2005). *Technical college administrator and faculty perceived levels of importance of global education initiatives* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Education, Inc.

Global Learning Consortium. (2007). Constitution and bylaws of the North Carolina community college Global Learner Consortium. Retrieved August 12, 2010 from http://www. roanokechowan.edu/ncglobal/

Goodman, A.E. (2010). International education as an institutional priority: What every college and university trustee should know. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports /IIE-Bookstore/International-Education-as-an-Institutional-Priority

Grabove, V. (2009). Reflections on trends and challenges in internationalizing an Ontario community college. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 15-23.

Green, M., Luu, D. & Burris, B. (Eds.). (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 Edition*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, M.F. (2002). Joining the world: The challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education. *Change,* 34, 12-21.

Green, M. F. (2007). Internationalizing community colleges: Barriers and strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 138, 31-38.

Green, M.F. & Olson, C. (2008). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Green, M.F. & Siaya, L. (Eds.). (2005). *Measuring internationalization at community colleges.* Washington, DC; American Council on Education.

Guerin, S.H. (2009). Internationalizing the curriculum: Improving learning through international education: Preparing students for success in a global society. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(8), 611-614.

Hayward, F.M. & Siaya, L.M. (2001). *Public experience, attitudes, and knowledge: A report on two national surveys about international education*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

Hudzik, J.K. (2011). C*omprehensive internationalization: From concept to action.* Washington D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators

Huggonier, B. (2007). Globalization and education: Can the world meet the challenge?. In M.M. Suarez-Orozco (Ed.), *Learning in the global era: International perspectives on globalization and education* (pp. 137-157). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Kahane, D. (2009). Learning about obligation, compassion, and global justice: The place of contemplative pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 49-60. doi: 10.1002/tl.348

Knight, J. (1999). Issues and trends in internationalization: A comparative perspective. In S.C. Bond & J.P. Lemasson (Eds.), *New World of Knowledge: Canadian Universities and Globalization* (pp. 201-238). Retrieved from http://www. idrc.ca/openebooks/893-7/

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31. doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832.

Korbel, L. A. (2007). In union there is strength: The role of state global education consortia in expanding community college involvement in global education. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 138, 47-55.

Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 118, 1-14. doi: 10.1002/tl.348.

Larsen, D.C. (2004). The future of international education: What will it take?. *International Education*, 34(1), 51-56.

Levin, J.S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century.* New York: Palgrave.

Maurer, D.C. (2010). *Departments of Homeland Security, Defense, and State could better assess their foreign language needs and capabilities and address shortfalls* (GAO-10-715T). Retrieved from U.S. Government Accountability Agency website: www.gao.gov/new.items/d10751t.pdf

McLean, J.J. (1990). *Consortial approaches to international education*, 1990(70), 47-56.

Mendoza, P., Basham, M.J., Campbell, D.F., O'Daniels, T.M., Malcolm, Z., Felton, S., … Douma, D. (2009). *Missions, values, and "flying monkeys": Critical issues for community colleges today and in 2019.* Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33(11), 866-882. doi: 10.1080/10668920903149715

Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Morrissey, S. (2010). *NCCCS global education report.* Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Community College System.

Natali, J., Johnson, B., Dever, J.T., & Jones, T.L. (2002). Tidewater Community College. In D. Engberg & M.F. Green (Eds.), *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization* (pp. 88-95). Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

North Carolina Community College System. (2011a). Get the facts. Retrieved from www.nccommunitycolleges.edu/pr/Get_The_Facts/

North Carolina Community College System. (2011b). System mission-history. Retrieved from www.nccommunitycolleges.edu/pr/MissionHistory/mission-history.htm

North Carolina Community College System. (n.d.). 2007-2009 NCCCS strategic plan. Retrieved from www.nccommunitycolleges.edu/Planning/docs/ strategic_plan_docs/2007_09_draft_NCCCSplan.pdf

Ng, J. (2007). Campus politics and the challenges of international education in an urban community college district. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 138, 83-88.

Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. (2006). *How should colleges prepare students to succeed in today's global economy?* Retrieved from The American Association of Colleges and Universities website: www.aacu.org/leap/documents/ Re8097abcombined.pdf

Pickup, S.L. (2010). *Continued actions needed to guide DOD's efforts to improve language skills and regional proficiency.* (GAO-10-879T). Retrieved from U.S. Government Accountability Office website: www.gao.gov/new.items/d10879t.pdf

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248-270.

Raby, R.L. (2008). *Expanding education abroad at U.S. community colleges* (Issue Number 3). Retrieved from Institute of International Education website: http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/~/media/Files/Corporate/Membership/StudyAbroad_WhitePaper3.ashx

Raby, R.L. & Valeau, E.J. (2007). Community college international education: Looking back to forecast the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 138, 5-14.

Richards, L. & Franco, R.W. (2002). Kapi'olani Community College. In D. Engberg & M.F. Green (Eds.), *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization* (pp. 71-78). Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

Richards, L. & Franco, R.W. (2007). Island roots, global reach: A case study in internationalizing Kapi'olani Community College. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 138, 89-96.

Romano, R.M. (2002). *Internationalizing the community college.* Washington D.C.: Community College Press.

Romano, R.M. & Dellow, D.A. (2009). Technological change, globalization, and the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 146, 11-19.

Schoorman, D. (1999). The pedagogical implications of diverse conceptualizations of internationalization: A U.S. based case study. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 3(2) 19-46. doi: 10.1177/102831539900300203

Smith, A.B., Opp, R.D., Armstrong, R.L., Stewart, G.A., & Isaacson, R.J. (1999). Community college consortia: An overview. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 23, 371-385.

Sternberger, L. (2005). Partnering for success. *International Educator*, 14(4), 12-21.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 359-372. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303923.

Suarez-Orozco, M.M. & Sattin, C. (2007). Introduction. In M.M. Suarez-Orozco (Ed.), *Learning in the global era: International perspectives on globalization and education* (pp. 1-43). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Valeau, E.J. & Raby, R.L. (2007). Editor's notes. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 138, 1-3.

Wood, V.R. (2010). *Globalization and higher education: Eight common perceptions from university leaders*. Retrieved from http://www.iienetwork.org/page/84658/

Zhang, Y.L. (2011). CSCC review series essay: Education abroad in the U.S. community colleges. *Community College Review*, 39(2), 181-200.

Appendix A

Interviewee Consent Form

I agree to participate as an interviewee in this research project conducted during spring 2012 entitled Internationalization in Community Colleges: Perceptions Regarding the Role of a State Consortium aimed at better understanding how a state international education consortium informs international education. I understand that my comments will be audio recorded and transcribed used for a dissertation to be conducted by Christy Forrest as part of the Educational Leadership Program. The interview(s) will be scheduled at a time and place convenient for you and will last approximately one hour. I understand that there are no foreseeable risks associated with my participation. I also know that this study may help me better understand the work of the Global Learner Consortium presently and possible direction for the future. This will in turn help community colleges understand how to better to prepare students for an increasingly interconnected world.

I give Christy Forrest ownership of the tapes, transcripts, and notes from the interview(s) she conducts with me and understand that tapes, transcripts and notes will be kept in the researcher's possession. I understand that verbatim transcripts will be submitted for my review for accuracy and that information and quotations from those transcripts will be used in the dissertation but will not be attributed to me specifically to protect confidentiality. I understand I will receive no compensation for the interview.

I understand that the interview is voluntary and I can end it at any time without consequence. I also understand that if I have questions about this research project, I can call Christy Forrest at (336) 245-3536 or contact Appalachian State University's Office of Research Protections at (828) 262-7981 or irb@appstate.edu.

☐   I request that my name **not** be used in connection with tapes, transcripts, or publications resulting from this interview.

☐   I request that my name **be used** in connection with tapes, transcripts, or publications resulting from this interview.

_____   _____
Name of Interviewer (printed)   Name of Interviewee
(printed)

_____   _____
Signature of Interviewer   Signature of Interviewee

_____
Date(s) of Interview (s)

Appendix B

Proposed Interview Protocol

Icebreaker: Describe how you came to be involved in international education and the

GLC.

1. Describe how the consortium defines international education.
   - How widely do you think this definition is shared among the colleges?
   - How closely does this match your personal definition of international education?
2. What does the consortium consider to be the key elements of internationalization and international education?
3. What role does the consortium currently play in internationalization?
   - What elements of this role do you feel are most critical and why?
   - What other activities do you think the consortium should consider and why are those important?   OR
   - Describe the role you see the consortium playing in the future.
4. In what ways does the consortium support international education in academic programs and activities at colleges?
   - What other areas of academic programs and activities would you like to see the consortium become involved in?
5. Describe the role of the consortium in supporting colleges related to international students.
   - What opportunities exist for the consortium to provide support for colleges with international students or those seeking to attract international students?
6. Faculty involvement and buy in are cited by the experts as important for internationalization. In what ways does the consortium currently support faculty involvement?
   - In what other ways could the consortium become involved in the faculty involvement piece?
7. Describe the role of the consortium in system office decision-making regarding international education.
   - Are there additional ways in which the consortium should be involved at the system level?
8. What opportunities do you think are important for the consortium to consider moving forward?

Biography

Christy Forrest holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Biology from the University of North Alabama, a Master of Zoological Studies from Auburn University, and a Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Appalachian State University. Forrest began her community college career as a faculty member teaching anatomy and physiology.   After joining the faculty at Davidson County Community College in Lexington, North Carolina in 1999 Forrest redesigned the anatomy and physiology courses and was the first to use a course management system to supplement a traditional classroom setting.   Her first leadership role was as Department Chair for Science and Physical Education.   She was nominated by her supervisor and was awarded an Exemplary Leader award by the International Chair Academy in 2005.   Forrest moved to the role of Associate Dean of Academic Programs at the Davie Campus in 2007 where she also served as the college liaison for one of DCCC's early college high school partnerships.

Forrest currently serves as the Dean for the School of Foundational Studies and Academic Support at DCCC. She is involved in several initiatives focused within the school including redesign of developmental math, reading, and English as well as planning and implementation of centralized academic support services. Her involvement in campus wide initiatives includes serving as lead for DCCC's Achieving the Dream work as well as serving on the Implementation Committee for Completion by Design.