Who Assists the Faculty? The Need for Mentorship Programs for Faculty Undertaking Global
Education Initiatives

Yasmin Dean, Chad London, Cathy Carston, Vincent Salyers

Mount Royal University, Alberta, Canada

This study explored the expectations, motivations, and experiences of Canadian faculty members undertaking development and implementation of global education initiatives (GEI) for students in the form of exchange and study abroad programs, supervised practical coursework, and experiential learning in international settings. Findings revealed that the faculty members leading these initiatives for the first time were surprised by the amount of work required for planning and implementing them. This was in contrast to the perceptions of more experienced faculty who spoke with certainty about the workload and associated demands of organizing these initiatives. Further, more experienced faculty members implied that their personal desire to continue to lead international initiatives diminished each year. Attrition was explained by the increasing work demands of these projects. Experienced faculty also raised concerns about underprepared faculty who participate in global experiences with students. Findings suggest a need for faculty development, mentorship, and preparation programs as a means for improving the overall experience for students and faculty.

Keywords: international education, field schools, internationalization, faculty preparation, faculty selection

In Canadian universities and colleges, there has been growth and emphasis placed on the education of students in global contexts. These opportunities to live and study overseas are perceived to offer students the chance to become culturally competent and therefore able to work within globalized economies (Brown, Lauder, & Ashton, 2008). As a result, higher education is recognized as an important medium for facilitating cross-border flows of knowledge and people (Brookes & Becket, 2011). A common approach to providing students with global learning experiences is through initiatives such as exchange and study abroad programs, supervised practical coursework, and experiential learning in international settings. However, although there is a significant body of research focused on internationalization efforts by institutions (Sanderson, 2008) there is still limited information on who plans these activities for students and how they are organized and led.

Access to global travel, particularly for those individuals with financial and travel resources, has accelerated the pace of internationalization in higher education. According to Smith, 2012, "Gribble and Ziguras (2003) reported limited pre-departure support for offshore teachers" (p. 10). Today, it is still rare to question about how much preparation is required of faculty when planning and organizing international education programs (Dunn & Wallace, 2008; Gribble & Ziguras, 2003; Smith, 2012). Moreover, many faculty training programs fail to address expectations and motivations of seasoned and new faculty members undertaking these types of international activities. The institution where this study occurred noticed similar gaps and challenges with faculty leading global initiatives.

This paper reports on a study undertaken to identify the needs of faculty members who develop and implement global education initiatives (GEI) for students. The study found that

faculty mentorship programs are one possible mechanism for addressing challenges associated with leading GEI.

BRIEF REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Preparing Faculty

As international education activities continue to grow across the globe, so has the body of knowledge related to study abroad (Stroud, 2010). Current literature tends to focus more on the student experience and less so on that of the faculty one (Hackney, Boggs & Borozan, 2012; Matthews & Lawley, 2011). Despite a relative plethora of information about the student experience, there has been little research done that evaluates the preparation, mentorship, and selection of faculty who lead international student learning experiences. Lough (2009) asserted international placements enable students to better understand global poverty and strengthen commitments to social justice. However, he cautioned that the development of deep student insight is contingent upon the crafting of an effective curriculum and consistent guidance of field faculty.

In comparison, Niehaus and Williams (2012) evaluated the impact of a faculty development program as a means for supporting internationalization strategies. They found that faculty development programs increased faculty motivation to participate in international activities, as well as increased their desire to embed international concepts into their course and program curricula. Niehaus and Williams' findings support the need to explore faculty development programs in a more comprehensive way and suggest future areas of research that explore faculty involvement in international curriculum transformation.

Further, there is a growing body of literature pertaining to international education and "divergent views relating to curriculum and pedagogy in the transnational context" (Dunn & Wallace, 2004, p. 359). Dunn and Wallace proposed that internationally mobile faculty need formal academic professional development and cultural induction prior to departure. In contrast to this recommendation, others suggest that the actual experience of offshore teaching is a valuable learning experience for instructors, and more informal means of preparation and mentoring is recommended (Gribble & Ziguras, 2003). Despite an institutional mandate for transnational teaching, there has been "less institutional interest in ensuring that lecturers are prepared for the specific rigors of teaching overseas" (Gribble & Ziguras, p. 213). For the purposes of this paper, transnational is defined as a faculty's work of taking students to places beyond usual national borders (Dunn & Wallace, 2006).

In a study on the experience of international faculty, Smith (2012) defined "flying faculty" as "short term sojourners living and working (albeit temporarily) within environments that are culturally different to their own" (p. 2). Similar to Dunn and Wallace (2006) and Gribble and Ziguras (2003), Smith reported that her participants embarked on their overseas work with limited pre-departure support. Smith's respondents identified they would have benefitted from pre-departure information about their host culture and students, so as to better understand the culture and context of students. Overall, the literature suggests that with all GEI projects, it is important that faculty and students are mindful of the imposition their stay may place on the host culture and to express respect and embrace the perspectives of their hosts.

Dehaan and Sherry (2012) concluded that "a more micro level of engagement … has

been neglected along the way (p. 25)" noting that internationalization of higher education

requires more detailed exploration of the ways that classroom actions make a difference in the

student experience. Further, Brookes and Becket (2011) asserted that in order to internationalize

a curriculum faculty and student experiences must be considered. However, these explorations,

particularly those of faculty, are still missing from much of the current research related to

internationalization in higher education.

While there is a reasonable amount of literature that mentions preparing students for

educational opportunities in global settings, there is little that specifically identifies how best to

prepare faculty to support these experiences. The notion of mentoring faculty in the leading of

GEI is brief in the literature. This could be due to the fact that academia "has been slower to

formalize its faculty mentoring practices in response to the changing organizational dynamics

and demographics of higher education" (Zellers, Howard & Barcis, 2008, p.553), suggesting the

need for further development in this area of practice. "Mentoring was once viewed as a dyadic

relationship in which knowledge and expertise were to be gained by a younger and more junior

colleague from an older and more experienced mentor. However, mentoring is now understood

as potentially beneficial to both the mentors and mentees" (Loue & Luff, 2008, p.52). Group

mentorship and peer mentorship are also rising in popularity as mechanisms to provide faculty

with support and resources" (Zambrana, Ray, Espino, Castro, Cohen, & Eliason, 2015, p.40).

These mentoring approaches require further exploration to understand how they can support

faculty who lead GEI.

Trying to Define Internationalization

Although internationalization has been declared a major priority area for higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Codina, Nicolas, Lopez, & Hernan, 2013; de Wit, 2011; Mack & Kennedy, 2012), a clear definition of what internationalization refers to is lacking (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011; Delgado-Marquez, Hurtado-Torres, & Bondar, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Green, 2012; Knight, 2008; Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisberg, 2012). Knight (2004; 2008) argued that the internationalization of higher education has been interpreted rather widely by different countries and stakeholders. Leask (2003) holds a similar view noting that even within one institution internationalization is viewed differently by the various stakeholders. Frequently internationalization is defined by institutional mandates, vision, and resources as well as by the type of activity undertaken (e.g. exchanges, immersion and language development, etc.), the competencies to be achieved (e.g. increased cultural awareness), and processes (e.g. integration of internationalization concepts into teaching, research and service activities) (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Delgado-Marquez, Hurtado-Torres, & Bondar, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2004; Knight, 2008).

With multiple definitions and perspectives described in the literature, it is clear that each university will approach internationalization from a slightly different perspective. From the philosophical perspectives of the authors of this paper, internationalization can and should be understood as the crossing of borders by students, academics, and staff in a two-way flow between home and host countries. The authors are quite committed to the notion of mutual exchange between our university and host countries and this guides how we define and implement internationalization at our institution. Moreover, by strengthening and expanding our partnerships with similar institutions in strategically selected regions of the world, we provide international opportunities for our students, faculty and staff and we create interest for

international students and faculty in accessing programs and services at the campus where this study was conducted.

Background & Need

This study was carried out at a mid-sized Canadian post-secondary institution of approximately 12,000 full-time students. The researchers are from one Faculty (an academic unit) within the institution. During the time data was collected the Faculty consisted of 5 departments and one school. The researchers come from the disciplines of Social Work, Child & Youth Studies, Nursing, and Physical Education and share common philosophical and interprofessional perspectives related to GEI. These shared philosophical and interprofessional perspectives include: 1) a direct alignment between the curriculum and the global education experience, 2) careful consideration of the needs of host agencies and where there are mutually beneficial outcomes from the GEI, 3) experiences that provide students with opportunities to learn about other cultures and practices, and 4) GEI that are sustainable.

Because of the discipline-specific and professional nature of many programs within the Faculty, there are a number of GEI for students in the form of exchanges, supervised practical coursework, and experiential courses undertaken in international settings. Courses are generally four to six weeks in duration, although they may be carried out over an entire semester if the student is participating in an international exchange. Two examples of this include an experiential learning course taught in Peru as part of the Ecotourism and Outdoor Leadership program and a field course taught in India as part of the Social Work program. For supervised practical coursework and experiential courses, faculty to student ratios may be mandated by

professional organizations and regulatory bodies. In most instances the faculty to student ratios range between 1:10; when more than one faculty participates the ratio may be 2:25.

Research Aims & Question

The purpose of this study was to inform GEI teaching practices at the university with the overall goal of gaining an understanding of ways to improve GEI. A second important goal was to create global experiences that are sensitive to and respectful of the needs of host organizations and communities that accept students from the institution.

To guide the study, the following research question was posed.

1, What are the motivations, expectations, and experiences of faculty who engage in global education initiatives with students?

Methods and Theoretical Approach

This study used an exploratory qualitative research approach to gain a greater understanding of the motivation, expectations, and experiences of faculty who planned and participated in the development of global experiences. The data collection method used for the study was the active interview (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). The central questions of the research addressed the participants' experience and interpretations of their involvement with global initiatives in the form of exchanges, field schools, study tours, and/or practica in international settings.

The active interviewing method supported the research questions because this qualitative approach suited the narrative of participants whose stories were complex and full of substance (Janesick, 1994). Narratives make up a substantial part of research and it is through the participant's telling of a personal story that details of the teaching experience can be understood. This also supported Kvale and Brinkmann's (2009) idea about the "inter-view" as an exchange whereby the participant and interviewer gain insights into each other's perspective and experiences. Kvale (1996) included the traveler metaphor in this relationship that understands the interviewer as a traveler who journeys to other lands before returning home to tell the story. The traveler metaphor offered an opportunity to move toward new ways of self-understanding as well as the possibility of uncovering previously taken-for granted values and customs. This research required a reflexive approach that included an ability to reflect on opinions and to then offer discussion on how our experiences may have impacted the research process (Vickers, 2007). This approach explicitly positioned the research as a collaborative process rather than an isolated experience (O'Connor & O'Neil, 2004).

Participants

Approval to conduct research with human subjects was obtained. Participants were full-time faculty members who were planning (at the time of data collection) or had previously (within five years) led one or more GEI. Faculty members (n=13) from various disciplines and programmatic areas were invited to participate in interviews. Originally two interview groups were proposed; one for experienced faculty (those who had prior experience in leading international experiences) and one for new faculty (those who were leading a GEI for the first

time). Table 1 provides an overview of the participants r and their level of experience in leading

a GEI. Scheduling common meeting times proved to be difficult, and therefore a variety of group

and individual interviews were conducted in order to hear these participants' perspectives. The

group interviews offered a chance for greater dialogue as participants built upon each other's

experience. All of the sessions were digitally recorded and transcribed.

Table 1. Participant Overview

New Faculty (in process of planning first GEI)	3
Experienced Faculty (had led one or more GEI in the past five years)	10
Group Interviews	5
Individual Interviews	2

Procedures

Two individual interviews and five group interviews were held between March and

October 2012. These groups consisted of 4 -two person interviews and 1 -group interview.

Personal interviews lasted between 60-90 minutes and group interviews lasted between 90-140

minutes. The complete data set of interviews contained over 15 hours of recorded information.

This data was fully transcribed. Participants led or were planning to lead international learning

experiences in the following countries: Australia, England, India, Malaysia, Mexico, New

Zealand, Peru, Qatar, and Sri Lanka. Digital technology was used to record interviews. All

requests were sent by a research assistant and interviews were conducted by a faculty researcher

and not by administrators.

Data Analysis

Each researcher reviewed transcripts independently. Utilizing a thematic process

outlined by Miles & Huberman (1994) and described by Carter, Horrigan & Hudyma (2010),

the data were analyzed using a three step approach: (1) data reduction, whereby participant

responses were sorted into clusters of varying main themes; (2) data display, whereby

participant responses were organized, compressed, and assembled into various tables and

figures, which permitted conclusions to be readily visible and easily drawn; and (3) conclusion

drawing/consistency, whereby conclusions were deemed credible through the use of repeated

group readings of participant responses, multiple group discussions, and debate. Following this

process, the data were sent to an independent coder for trustworthiness. Findings were

consistent with our earlier phase of individual and group analysis.

Due to time limitations of the participants, formal member checking was not undertaken

in this study. However, questions arising from the interviews were collected and shared with

participants as part of a poster presentation authored by three of the four researchers.

FINDINGS: THEMES

Findings from this study are presented below in response to the research question, "What

are the motivations, expectations, and experiences of faculty who engage in global teaching

experiences with students?"

Faculty Motivations

The findings revealed that faculty who led a GEI typically became involved out of a desire to help students understand alternate worldviews. One participant summed this up stating,

> Yeah, I think our expectations are also that our students will come away having learned things both that are formative, so look at the sort of outcomes that we have put in place, but more than that they can – I don't like the word 'global citizens' but I will use it here – you know, that they can develop as adults and responsible citizens meaning that they will take greater interest in the world and they can understand things from more than one perspective and so that they can understand there is a difference between sort of cultural relevance and cultural sensitivity.

Participants reported seeing limitations in current curriculum content and noted that students rarely understand the global perspective. Curricular limitations that fail to capture diverse issues of global concern have been explored within disciplines such as journalism, social work, and nursing. Participants in this study explained that regardless of their discipline, Canadian university students can expect to work in transcultural situations and needed to have opportunity to experience some form of cultural immersion within their education.

Research agendas and tenure and promotion requirements were discussed by the faculty members as being an important consideration for whether or not they would undertake the

development and delivery of global education. Participants reported being strategic when aligning their personal interests with teaching, research, and service commitments and the challenges this might create. Many faculty members agreed that there is a wonderful opportunity to carry out their own research and engage students in the research process while in international settings. One individual indicated that "increasingly my expectations are to be able to do more research and I would like to develop it to the point where we have a supported, associated research program" with the global context central to the research process.

A common feeling expressed by faculty participants was that they were judged negatively by non-mobile, non-internationally minded colleagues for participating in and leading global initiatives. One participant described this feeling by indicating: "I think…a number of people that I have talked to naively think it is pretty easy and this is a glorified holiday for me." Faculty believed this viewpoint influenced or limited the amount of support they could expect from colleagues and administration. As one individual indicated, "I feel that sometimes ideas are just somehow looked at as ideas that are going to benefit me the individual, rather than maybe it is an idea that is worthy of consideration."

The factors that motivated faculty to become involved with and deliver GEI course varied. Several faculty members expressed an earnest desire to provide students with a rich cultural immersion experience that was aligned with course goals and objectives. Frequently, however, they struggled with how these motivations directly impacted their ability to meet their teaching, research & scholarship, and service requirements within the university context. While motivations were quite high for faculty who led GEI for the first time, these motivations varied over time.

Faculty Expectations & Experiences

When institutions are ambiguous about what it means to be internationally minded, this can lead to mixed messages and a lack of criteria about how to effectively structure international programs. The notion of crossing borders with innovative and enriching international experiences for students is highly desirable in the competitive world of higher education. The data revealed that most GEI occurred as a direct result of a faculty member's interests. While the faculty may require tacit peer and departmental approval to proceed with developing an international program of study, proposals that meet generalized institutional criteria can generally be moved forward in an expeditious way. Experienced faculty members made efforts to distinguish what makes an effective learning experience. One participant indicated:

A good international learning experience is really well planned. What does that mean? It means that the prof has really good ground experience as opposed to just sort of showing up and saying we are all going to learn about this together….So to know that the prof has spent time on their own in that area getting to know people and things and customs and culture, that is important.

A common statement made by faculty participants was that little or no institutional support in the form of travel organization or course planning was provided to them. Similar responses have been seen in the literature related to 'flying faculty' (Dunn & Wallace, 2006; Gribble & Ziguras, 2003; Smith, 2012). As one faculty member indicated, "I have spent six months doing the logistics and the administrative piece and I could get a job now as a tour

operator".

New faculty participants in the process of planning GEI reported frustration with the type

of tasks they were expected to undertake. They also expressed some confusion regarding what

the administrative side of the university is responsible for. They frequently cited increased

frustration over roles and responsibilities. As one participant described their preparation for

delivering a course in a global setting, they indicated that "I am not really sure what the role of

the International Office is….there is duplication and redundancies in what we do." This caused

confusion on the part of students and undermined the credibility of the Office and the faculty

member. Faculty participants were unanimous in stating that there was a lack of clarity regarding

roles and responsibilities throughout the process.   Moreover, they believed that much of the

planning, student recruitment, and orientation were the responsibility of other departments within

the institution. When much of this fell to them, they felt unsupported by these departments and

this created a great deal of angst and frustration.

Respondents were unanimous in their recommendations for a user-friendly template that

would clarify faculty responsibilities. This recommendation was directly linked to concerns

about the additional workload that necessarily accompanied GEI projects. More experienced

faculty also identified feelings of frustration and fatigue regarding planning and implementation

of on-going annual or biannual courses in global settings and pointed to some missed

opportunities at home as a result of leading such projects.

Some participants discussed the need for a mentoring program for faculty who have

participated in leading GEI and those who may be interested in leading an experience in the

future. This relationship would support both the mentor and the mentee. The mentee would

receive increased content knowledge and facilitation skills, assistance in trip planning and

organization, and connections with the mentor's international network. The mentor may also

"derive new insights from the mentee, as well as assistance with his or her research.

Additionally, the mentoring relationship may evolve over time into a professional collaboration

between colleagues and/or a friendship that both the mentor and the mentee may enjoy." (Loue

& Loff, 2013, p. 52)

Experienced faculty members also reported a desire for greater institutional

acknowledgement of their 'sacrifices'. At our university, there have been ongoing discussions

of how faculty might "count" this work towards as part of their tenure and promotion processes.

Some faculty members believe this is part of their teaching requirement while others suggest

that this meets research, scholarship or service criteria. To further complicate the discussion,

there is not agreement between departments within our area or across the institution about this.

As one faculty participant suggested,

> You never get any feedback which is frustrating, I mean at least in classes you
>
> eventually get an evaluation but here you don't ever seem to get any kind of feedback
>
> …. you get the present that the students always seem to buy you." Personal stories of
>
> missing family experiences and managing the logistics of being away from home were
>
> also illuminating: "I was away from my wife and family, right? And everyone thinks,
>
> 'Aren't you lucky.' Right? But it was hard and after a number of years my wife keeps
>
> going, 'You are not going to do this again are you?

There were also comments from more seasoned faculty members who said they might

not lead future trips due to personal health, aging issues, increased family responsibilities, and

disillusionment over the purpose and logistics of international education projects. "I may not

ever do this again if I can't find more money to offset my expense and I am not going to pay out

of my own pocket."

Faculty participants leading GEI for the first time commented that they looked to

more experienced faculty for guidance and mentorship related to the process. One of the

faculty members that planned inaugural GEI course for the first time indicated that "this

process of working with someone that is more seasoned than I am in international student

driven projects has been wonderful and I think it has kind of turned into an educational

mentoring kind of project where I have learned a lot."

DISCUSSION

The data revealed some emergent themes that have the potential to inform the future of

GEI within higher education. In particular, faculty selection, preparation and motivation,

research agendas, and clarification of workload responsibilities were identified as important

elements for successful global educational experiences for students.

There were gaps that quickly surfaced in this study. It is unclear who is ultimately

responsible for designing and developing the GEI and this confusion led to unmet expectations.

Frequently faculty participants described observable tensions regarding responsibility and

accountability for global initiatives across the institution. Furthermore, faculty members felt that

some logistical planning such as travel booking, language preparation, and home stay

accommodation were not clearly accounted for by faculty or staff. Participants suggested that

students with minimal travel experience look to faculty and the institution for a leadership that

they may not have the current capacity to provide. Faculty participants also noticed frustration

from student groups about the confusion over responsibilities of trip planning. As a faculty

member stated, "the students need to know from you what you are doing … or what they need to

do and what are their expectations." Faculty members who want to lead a global initiative

typically initiate the planning process. These individuals may not always have the transcultural

acumen to effectively manage the planning or lead the initiative.

The GEI examined in this study have potential to offer students in health and human service

programs the chance to experience and understand life in another culture. In the context of

current forces of globalization, these types of activities provide students with the opportunity to

learn and practice in culturally relevant ways. Among other learning, they are understood to

enhance cross-cultural skills, improve personal self-esteem, develop leadership skills, and

enhance communication skills (Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen, 2009; Ingraham &

Peterson, 2004; Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Williams, 2005). However, student learning might be

compromised when faculty who lead such initiatives are not provided adequate administrative

support, training, and mentorship to facilitate the educational process for their students.

Data from this study revealed that some of the faculty participants felt their peers were

under-prepared and lacked experience to successfully lead global initiatives. Interestingly, none

of the participants expressed the perspective that they themselves were under-prepared. This

perspective of faculty feeling their peers were under-prepared needs to be further explored in the

literature. It seemed that a combination of the immense demands of a 24-7 work schedule, combined with the ways teaching has to occur outside of typical classrooms, and compounded by the amount of logistics, finances, and emergencies that were faculty responsibilities offer a few indicators for how future initiatives might be better prepared.

A future study that draws comparisons between insights of faculty, students, and host agencies would facilitate better understanding of what is needed in preparing faculty for leading GEI. The existing literature tends to focus on screening of students (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; (Pettys, Panos, Cox, & Oosthuysen, 2005; Sutton & Rubin, 2004) and there continues to be a lack of emphasis on the micro level of engagement required for teaching and learning (deHaan & Sherry, 2012). Insights gleaned from the participants in this study revealed that they feel the need for greater preparation, which may aid in more detailed pre-screening of faculty who lead global opportunities for students.

Mention was made of the sustainability of global initiatives when attrition of seasoned faculty occurs. Out of these discussions, recommendations to coach and mentor new faculty members are offered as an essential requirement for undertaking GEI. Universities should consider establishing formalized mentoring programs that pair experienced faculty with those that are new to teaching within global contexts, from the initial conceptions of planning new experiences, through to implementation and evaluation of the programs. Mentorship programs can reinforce the important skills and strategies for implementing global initiatives, including communication strategies with students, host-agencies in international locations and with on-campus administrators that support planning of them. Most universities provide faculty with a handbook or policy and procedure manual, but mentors can help mentees hone in on the most important elements within manuals and provide context for reasons that certain policies and

procedures are in place.

Mentors can share wisdom such as aligning program-specific orientation programs with those delivered by the centralized office of international education and the benefits to be gained by including language and cultural preparation in orientation programs. Additionally, formal mentoring venues such as committees and workshops can be used to foster sharing of "lessons learned" about global learning initiatives. A beginning strategy for bringing interested faculty together might be to establish a formal learning community dedicated to GEI, where mentoring relationships can be developed. As faculty participants in this study indicated, the learning curve for those leading global initiatives is extremely steep, even with support from their department chairs, dean's offices and central offices of international education. Without one-on-one support from a faculty colleague that has "been through it", the successful implementation of an initial global offering may be in jeopardy. Mentoring programs can also be used as "succession plans" to ensure that faculty are available to lead courses in global contexts when colleagues step in and out of them as workload and interests vary over time.

One of the central points of discussion within our faculty participants related to the need to create sustainable GEI and this is often quite challenging for a number of reasons. First, there is a need to mentor inexperienced faculty in how to lead a global initiative and frequently resource and other institutional supports may not provide for this type of faculty development. This is imperative for sustaining the international learning experience into the future. Second, experienced faculty often suggest that mentoring new faculty in how to plan and lead educational opportunities in global settings can actually require more time and energy than leading the experience alone. This was clearly the case with one participant who described co-leading a GEI

with another colleague who was unable to manage the experience: "I had a faculty member who

if I could have sent him home, I would have sent him home. It was a very stressful tour". In the

case of the faculty member who made this comment, a mechanism to address concerns about a

colleague that might be safely shared without fear of reprisal was a strong recommendation.The

experience of this particular faculty members also makes evident the need to better prepare

faculty to lead GEI.

Recommendations for Sustaining Faculty-Led GEI

This study helped to frame some important recommendations for global education at

one Canadian university. Based on the themes that emerged from the data, the following

recommendations are proposed.

1. Create mentorship programs designed for faculty who have never led a GEI. Ensure that
   inexperienced faculty work together with experienced faculty to develop a strong
   network of relationships (contacts), knowledge, expertise, and skills for leading GEI.
2. Establish clear roles and responsibilities for faculty and staff who develop, support, or
   implement GEI.
3. Develop and utilize a clear and concise "checklist" for faculty of the tasks they must
   complete as part of the process.
4. Ensure sufficient resources including infrastructure support and funding are in place to
   develop new global initiatives and refresh existing ones.
5. Identify GEI at the program, department, and institutional levels and clearly articulate
   these to all stakeholder groups.

6. Ensure that there is an alignment between the international experience, the curriculum, and the needs of host agencies.

7. Establish clear lines of communication, accountability, and standardized roles and responsibilities to be operationalized across the institution offering GEI.

8. Create institutional strategies that profile and recognize the time, effort, and commitment required for the development and sustainability of GEI.

Limitations

The small sample size makes findings not generalizable beyond the postsecondary institution where the study was conducted. Further, given the researchers' relationships with participants as colleagues and administrators, it is not known whether responses were guarded or offered in order to be socially desirable. Participant availability was another limitation of this study. Wisniewski (2001) found that academics rarely study themselves. Others (Acker & Armenti, 2001) experienced that the demands of academic life may also make it difficult to schedule meeting times with academic participants. We found this to be the case in our study and therefore made the decision to undertake individual as well as group interviews. This decision was based solely on the availability of time so as to avoid further schedule conflicts.

Follow up or formal second interviews were not done in this study. Second interviews might have enhanced this study and allowed for increased probing regarding the ways in which participants understood the findings and recommendations. However, finding academics willing and able to make time for further interviews may have presented a further challenge.

The small sample size and case study approach facilitated identification of participants. As a result, identifying information such as gender, age, professional disciplines was deliberately left out of the sample description. This is unfortunate because interesting insights could be gained when comparing the training needs of faculty who lead more travel-oriented tours than those who lead more service oriented or professional skill building international learning experiences.

The perspectives of host agencies and/or partner institutions for GEI between the Global North and Global South [1] were not explored in study. Since much of the existing literature tends to focus more on the flow of students into international settings with little attention given to the host organizations, it is recommended that future studies examine the question posed by Heron (2011) as to whether it is right for the North to pursue international educational experiences given the burden that falls upon Southern organizations to host and educate potential "global citizens".   In spite of these limitations, there was richness to this data that point to the need for more exploratory research within the area of faculty preparation.

Conclusion

---

[1] [1] Global South and Global North: Like much terminology, the terms "Global North" and "Global South" obscure and neglect as much as they explain and illuminate. We therefore use them reluctantly, even though they are prevalent in development literatures, and are meant to replace earlier (and perhaps even more troubling) nomenclature such as developing/developed, and (from the Cold War) First, Second, and Third Worlds. By Global North, we mean those advanced industrialized countries, many (but not all) of which are in the Northern hemisphere, including the United States, Canada, and Northern Europe; by Global South, we mean those countries in Asia, Africa, Central and South America, and elsewhere, that tend to be less industrialized and economically wealthy, and are more likely to be in the Southern than Northern hemisphere" (Al-Krenawi & Graham, 2009, p.225).

This study was a response to the calls of other researchers who have noted the paucity of faculty voices within the current dialogue on internationalization in higher education (deHaan & Sherry, 2012). The purpose of gaining a greater understanding of the motivations, perceptions, and experiences of faculty leading educational experiences for students in global settings was achieved through this study. Findings from the present study suggest that faculty undertaking GEI require greater institutional support, more orientation and preparation prior to departure, and mentoring of faculty members who have never been involved in teaching a course in an international context. Although careful selection and preparation of students is necessary for successful GEI (Pettys et al., 2005), we learned it is equally important that a similar process be required for faculty wanting to lead a global initiative such as those described in this paper. The creation of a well- designed mentorship program will support faculty development, create sustained relationships amongst faculty members and host agencies and aid in need for succession planning.

Recommendations arising from study include: the creation of faculty mentorship opportunities that support sustainable and effective learning experiences for students in global settings; ensure and maintaingarnered institutional commitment and strategic direction for GEI; and a strong emphasiemphasis ze the importance ofthe alignment ofing curricular outcomes at the course and program levels with global learning experiences.; and develop mentorship programs that ensure sustainable, efficient and effective learning experiences for students in global settings. The findings suggest that even with institutional commitment and well-developed global educational learning opportunities, there may still be barriers to successful, sustainable and satisfying experiences for students and faculty. Implementation and strategic considerations are equally important for global initiatives to be of high quality. The authors

speculate that faculty mentoring provides another ingredient for ensuring success.

REFERENCES

Abye, T. & Butterfield, A. (2012). Can Africa learn from the world? Can the world learn

from Africa? *Journal of Community Practice, 20*(1-2), 3-11.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2012.653733

Acker, S. & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender & Education 16*(1), 3-24.

Retrieved from: http://www.ualberta.ca/~lgotell/OB_Articles/acker.pdf

Altbach, P. (2001). Academic freedom: International realities and challenges. *Higher

Education, 41*, 205-219.

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal

world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*, 3–25.

Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: motivations

and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 290-305.

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009). Trends in global higher education. A report

prepared for the UNESCO 2009 world conference on higher education. Retrieved on

10-01-13 from: http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/trends-global-

higher-education-2009-world-conference-en.pdf

Al-Krenawi, A., & Graham, J. R. (2009). Localizing social work: Bedouin-Arab of the Negev. In

G. James, R. Ramsay, & G. Drover (Eds.), *International social work: Canadian

perspectives* (pp. 224-240). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Brookes, M. & Becket, N. (2011). Developing global perspectives through international

management degrees. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(4), 374-394.

Brown, P., Lauder, H., & Ashton, D. (2008). Education, globalization and the future of the

knowledge economy. *European Educational Research Journal, 7* (2). 131-56.

Carter, L., Horrigan, J., & Hudyma, S. (2010). Investigating the educational needs of nurses in

telepractice: A descriptive exploratory study. *Canadian Journal of University*

Continuing Education, 36(1), 1-20.

Clarke, III, I., Flaherty, T., Wright, N., & McMillen, R. (2009). Student intercultural

proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education, 31*(2),

173-181.

Clifford, V., & Montgomery, C. (2011). Internationalizing the curriculum for global citizenship

in higher education. In V. Clifford and C. Montgomery (Eds.) *Moving towards*

internationalisation of the curriculum for global citizenship in higher education (pp. 13-

24). Oxford, UK: Oxford Brookes University.

Codina, B., Nicolas, J., Lopez, L., & Hernan, R. (2013). The importance of student mobility,

academic exchange and internationalization of higher education for college students in a

globalized world: The Mexican and Latin American case. *International Journal of Good*

Conscience. 8(2)48-63. Retrieved on 03-14-15 from: http://www.spentamexico.org/v8-

n2/A3.8(2)48-63.pdf

deHaan, D., & Sherry, E. (2012). Internationalisation of the sport management curriculum:

academic and student reflections. *Journal of International Education, 16*(1), 24-39.

http://dx.doi.org/10. 1177/1028315311403487

De Wit, H. (2011). Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. In *Globalisation*

and internationalisationof higher education [online monograph]. *Revista de*

Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC), 8(2), 241-48. Retrieved on 03-14-15

from: http://rusc.uoc.edu/index.php/rusc/issue/view/v8n2

Delgado-Marquez, B., Hurtado-Torres, N., & Bondar, Y. (2011). Internationalization

of higher education: Theoretical and empirical investigation of its influence on university

institution rankings. In *Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education* [online

monograph]. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC) 8*(2), 265-84.

Retrieved on 03-14-15 from: http://rusc.uoc.edu/index.php/rusc/issue/view/v8n2

Dunn, L., & Wallace, M. (2004). Australian academics teaching in Singapore: Striving for

cultural empathy. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 41*(3), 291-304.

http://dx.doi.org/10. 1080/14703290410001733285

Dunn, L., & M. Wallace. (2006). Australian academics and transnational teaching: An

exploratory study of their preparedness and experiences. *Higher Education Research

and Development, 25*(4), 357-369. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1080/07294360600947343

Elkin, G., Farnsworth, J., & Templer, A. (2008). Strategy and the internationalisation of

universities. *International Journal of Educational Management, 22*(3), 239

250.

Gogia, N. (2006). Unpacking corporeal mobilities: The global voyages of labor and leisure.

Environmental Planning A, 38, 359-375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/a37274

Green, M. (2012). *Measuring and assessing internationalization*. Washington, DC:

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Retrieved on 03-15-15 from:

http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/downloads/measuring_assessing.pdf

Gribble, K. & C. Ziguras. (2003). Learning to teach offshore: Pre-departure training for

lecturers in transnational programs. *Higher Education Research and Development,

22*(2), 205-216.

Hackney, K., Boggs, D., & Borozan, A. (2012). An empirical study of student willingness to

study abroad. *Journal of Teaching in International Business, 23*(2), 123-144

Hamza, A. (2010). International experience: An opportunity for professional

development in higher education. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education, 14*(1), 50-69.

Hellsten, M. (2008), Meeting new challenges in multicultural provisions for international students: Implications for first year university transition engagements. *Proceedings of the 4th International Barcelona Conference on Higher Education, Vol. 6. Higher education for intercultural dialogue and multiculturalism*. Barcelona: GUNI. Available at http://www.guni-rmies.net.

Heron, B. (2006). Critically considering international social work practica, *Critical Social Work, 7*(2). Retrieved on 5-16-13 from: http://www.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/critically-consideringinternational-social-work-practica

Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for development: whiteness, gender, and the helping imperative*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier Press.

Heron, B. (2011). Challenging indifference to extreme poverty: Considering southern perspectives on global citizenship and change. *Ethics and Economics, 8*(1). Retrieved on 5-16-13 from: https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/jspui/bitstream/1866/4584/1/Heron.pdf

Huzik, J. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Retrieved on 03-15-15 from: http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf

Hussein, A. (2009). The use of triangulation in social sciences research: Can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined? *Journal of Comparative Social Work, 1,* 1-12.

Retrieved on 10-01-13 from:

http://jcsw.no/local/media/jcsw/docs/jcsw_issue_2009_1_8_article.pdf

Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ingraham, E., & Peterson, D. (2004). Assessing the impact of study abroad on student learning

at Michigan State University. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,*

10, 83–100.

Janesick, V. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and

meaning. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp.

209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, W. B. & Ridley, C. (2004). *The elements of mentoring*. New York: Palgrave

Macmillan.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales.

Journal of Studies in International Education, 8(5), 5-31.

doi:10.1177/1028315303260832

Knight, Jane (2008). *Higher education in turmoil. The changing world of*

internationalization. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers. Retrieved on 03-

14-15 from:

https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/475-higher-education-in-turmoil.pdf

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research*

interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lough, B. (2009). Principles of effective practice in international social work field

placements*, Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(3), 467-480.

Lough, B. J. (2009). Curricular blueprinting: The relevance of American social work

    education for international students. *Social Work Education, 28*(7), 792-802.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02615470802478212

Matthews, J., & Lawley, M. (2011). Student satisfaction, teacher internships, and the case for a

    critical approach to international education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics*

    of Education, 32(5), 687-698. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.620752

Mak, A.S., Kennedy, M. (2012). Internationalising the student experience: Preparing

    instructors to embed intercultural skills in the curriculum. *Innovative Higher*

    Education, 37(4), 323-334. doi: 10.1007/s10755-012-9213-4.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Niehaus, E., & Williams, L. (2012, April). The role of faculty development in curricular

    transformation for internationalization. Paper presented at the American Educational

    Research Association Conference. Vancouver, BC. Retrieved 5-15-13 from:

    http://www.education.umd.edu/international/CurrentInitiatives/GATE_Y2/

    The%20Role%20of%20Faculty%20Development%20in%20Curricular%20

    Transformation%20for%20Internationalization.pdf

Rumbley, L., Altbach, P., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education

    context. In D. Deardorff, H. Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of*

    international higher education. (pp. 3-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

    doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452218397.n1

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self. *Journal of*

    Studies in International Education, 12, 276-307.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315307299420

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks,

    CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, K. (2012). Exploring flying faculty teaching experiences: Motivations,

    challenges, and opportunities. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(1), 117-34. doi:

    10.1080/03075079.2011.646259

Sutton, R. C., & Rubin, D. L. (2004). The GLOSSARI Project: Initial findings from a

    system-wide research initiative on study abroad learning outcomes. *Frontiers: The*

    Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10, 65-82.

Tiessen, R. (2008, June). *What motivates Canadian youth to go abroad? (An experience of a*

    lifetime: Examining Canadian youth motivations for participation in learning/volunteer

    abroad programs), Canadian Association for Studies in International Development

    Annual Conference, Thinking Beyond Borders – Global Ideas, Global Values,

    Vancouver, BC.

Tiessen, R., & Heron, B. (2012). Volunteering in the developing world: the perceived impacts

    of Canadian youth. *Development in Practice, 22*(1), (np). Retrieved on 04-23-14 from:

    http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09614524.2012.630982

Williams, T. R. (2005). Exploring the impact of study abroad on students' intercultural

    communications skills: Adaptability and sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International*

    Education, 9, 356-371.

Wisniewski, R. (2000). The averted gaze. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 31*(5) 5–23.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2000.31.1.5

Zambrana, R., Ray, R., Espino, M., Castro, C., Cohen, B., & Eliason, J. (2015). Don't leave us

    behind: The importance of mentoring for underrepresented minority faculty. *American*

    Educational Research Journal. 52(1), 40-72. doi: 10.3102/0002831214563063

Zellers, D., Howard, V., & Varcic, M. (2008). Faculty mentoring programs: Re-envisioning

rather than reinventing the wheel. *Review of Educational Research , 78(3),* 552-588. doi:

10.3102/0034654308320966