A Field of Dreams?
Overseas Student Teaching as a Catalyst towards Internationalizing Teacher Education

By Jennifer Mahon

In asking questions about the internationalization of teacher education, there are numerous variables to consider. We may examine the appropriate skill base for candidates, as well as for faculty. We may investigate hiring practices. We may consider the curricula, both within our colleges and campus-wide. We may expand the opportunities for intercultural interaction. No matter which direction we consider, we must carry out our work within a system of higher education, and acknowledge that institutional change can be a formidable opponent. Numerous researchers (Gollnick, 1992; Melnick & Zeichner,1998; Nieto, 1996) discuss the administrative and programmatic obstacles which arise via the political nature of multicultural and global initiatives, as well as the culture and power structures of higher education. Despite the dreams and passion one has for a particular effort, navigating bureaucratic channels may challenge even the staunchest supporters'

Jennifer Mahon is an assistant professor in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, Nevada.

energies, thus affecting the creation of the new program and the hopes of those involved. Therefore, wisdom dictates giving thought to both the personal aspects and the administrative structures involved in realizing our dreams of internationalizing teacher education. This article offers a place to begin reflecting on these concerns.

I have worked in international educational exchange programs in a wide variety of capacities for 15

years, and with each new and changing role, I have deepened my commitment to the belief that a philosophy of global/multicultural education must be central to a college of education's mission. Beginning in 1991, as a Rotary International Scholar, I was a participant in one of the largest and longest-running study abroad programs in the world. I learned what it was like to be an international student, to be a visitor, and to be hosted by people who had different perspectives on my country, and on the world. That experience led me to be a teacher in an international school, and finally to work in a U.S. school where I began taking students abroad. I have seen firsthand the benefits gained by students who travel outside their comfort zones. Reflection on these experiences continually reminds me that practicing K-12 teachers also need support in centralizing international and multicultural education.

Nowhere, however, has my experience been as profound as working with student teachers who choose to complete the culmination of their studies overseas. In our research, (Mahon & Cushner, 2002; Cushner & Mahon, 2002) we discuss the personal, professional, and global competencies that we consistently found in returning students. In my personal interactions preparing students to leave, and corresponding with them both while abroad and after returning home (in the case of five students nearly two years later), I continue to see the effects of this program. Numerous studies, discussed in the following section, exist which support these positive outcomes (Baker, 2000; Mahan & Stachowski, 1990; Stachowski & Visconti, 1998; Stachowski & Brantmeier, 2002; Calhoon et al, 2003).

Because of the powerful results which may result from these experiences, I believe that an overseas student teaching program can be the "field of dreams" which enables us to start the conversations that can bring internationalization of teacher education from the margins to the center. This task, however, is not easy. The following article offers the opportunity to consider elements necessary to create an overseas student teaching program (OST) beginning with the research into effectiveness of such initiatives and the literature on institutional change. In the second part of the article, engaging the compatibility and commitment necessary to institutional change is considered from a critical perspective as related to the options and objections encountered in setting up an OST program. These include context, program quality and requirements, as well as supervision and evaluation. Finally, the remainder of the article briefly discusses the elements necessary to bear in mind when developing an initial OST proposal.

Research on International Teacher Education

The Administrative Perspective

Merryfield, Jarchow, and Pickert (1997) authored a comprehensive work on a variety of aspects of overseas training for teachers. Within this volume are three articles applicable to program administration. Kissock (1997) provides an overview of overseas student teaching. Case and Werner (1997) discuss the need to build

faculty commitment while Jarchow (1997) discusses the dean's role. McFadden, Merryfield, and Barron (1997) discuss both global and multicultural education in a guideline document available from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). Pike (2000) details setting up a major in International Education, of which overseas student teaching is a part, in the Canadian context. Landerholm, Gehrie and Yao (2004) discuss the comprehensive facets included in globalizing an elementary education program, including overseas study, made possible through a large Teacher Quality Education grant.

Partnerships, Program Effectiveness and Outcome Research
Partnership issues are considered by Merryfield (1995) in setting up global professional development schools, while Kiely and Nelson (2003) consider a wider number of disciplines in their discussion. Baker and Giacchino-Baker (2000) discuss not only a U.S. Mexico partnership, but one that was undertaken by three U.S. universities working together. Specific guidelines are included for organizing field experiences and documenting program effectiveness. Stachwoski and Chlebo (1998) give voice to the overseas partners in discussing host-faculty's suggestions for improving program effectiveness.

Finding the Center:
Engaging Compatibility, Commitment and Conversation
In 2001, I spent a year overseas at a host institution as a high school teacher where I also worked with two incoming student teachers from the U.S., quickly becoming familiar with supervision issues around communication, curriculum, and adjustment. In 2002, in the first year of a tenure-track appointment, I completed an agreement for my university to join an overseas student teaching consortium. In this position, I handled all facets of the program within the college and as part of my service commitment. In the following year, I was asked to take on an interim (one semester) administrative role for the university where I would be responsible for more than 30 faculty-led global programs. Though given extra compensation, I was expected to maintain a four-course load. During the second semester, no replacement had been hired, so I agreed to stay with a three-course load. After the replacement was found, and I returned to my college permanently, the university began slowly centralizing all international study efforts, and soon the international student teaching program fell under the auspices of the campus office. I left that institution after my 3rd year to take up a position in a larger university in the west where I have begun the process of completing a program from inception.

I detail this history for two reasons. First, it is evidence of the energy, resources, and commitment required in the internationalization of teacher education. Secondly, each of these experiences falls within one of three possible overarching frameworks for an OST program—consortium, campus-based, or college-level,

which will be explored later in this article. Detailing the possible logistics of an overseas program so it is useful to many is not an easy task, as there are as many different systems of organization at work in higher education. Common sense tells us that this is logical to acknowledge; however, institutional change research (Kezar & Eckel, 2000; Levine, 1980; Simsek & Louis, 1994) shows that crafting the right match is crucial to effective transformation.

Kezar and Eckel (2000) note the importance of determining the degree of fit between a proposed change and the organizational culture itself. According to Levine (1980) this is known as compatibility. Simsek and Louis (1994) in a model of institutional change for higher education, argue that aspects of the old culture or paradigm must be maintained to enhance congruence. Thus in the present question of internationalizing colleges of education, it would be helpful to consider the institution's international philosophy as a whole. Levine (1980) adds another major element to compatibility as an obstacle to institutional transformation, and that is profitability. Profitability is defined as, "the measure of the effectiveness of an innovation in satisfying the adopter's needs" (p. 19). Naturally at the university level, issues of tenure and promotion come to mind as do abilities to function within and augment a budget perhaps designated by the state legislative body.

Finally, we must contemplate commitment. Merryfield's work (2000) describes educators committed to global and multicultural education. Calling on Van Manen's (1990) notion of lived experience, she uses elements of these educators' histories to show ways to improve practice, in this case, to increase the effectiveness of teacher education programs at preparing students for a global/multicultural world. She also notes work by Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1992) which recommends that to transcend imperialism we must engage in "moving the centre" in order to realign worldviews. In this way, we can be inclusive of multiple cultures, rather than marginalizing them, thus shifting power relationships. As Merryfield (2000) notes, U.S. colleges of education need to complete this move if teachers are to be successful in preparing future teachers. She advocates, for example, that programs such as women's studies or African American studies be brought to the center.

Bringing international study abroad programs to the center of colleges of education can be a "profitable" and compatible approach to beginning the internationalization of colleges of teacher education. Individuals can begin to see how teaching and research can be augmented, and even how grants or other assets may develop as a result. Therefore much of the following work centers around lessons I have learned as a program administrator and researcher (Mahon & Cushner, 2002; Cushner & Mahon, 2002) of overseas student teaching. These recommendations are culled of relevant lived experience rather than a formal program assessment; they should not be construed as definitive. Rather, they are offered as a point of departure to begin discussion and applicability for compatibility to individual contexts.

Engaging Compatibility:
Choosing a Framework that Fits

Each framework in which an overseas study program can be developed obviously has associated benefits and costs. The options to consider include (1) a consortium of universities which pool together to combine resources; (2) a university-led effort centralized through a main and well-established international study office; and (3) a program housed within a school or college of education itself. In general, a consortium provides placement opportunities that one university cannot, however, serious issues around institutional commitment, rules of operation for members, and resources become a concern, especially as the program grows. In a smaller institution, with relatively few, if any international partnerships, such a leap to membership in a large consortium may add an unnecessary obstacle for program compatibility. In the case of a centralized university program, exact procedures and requirements may exist for the nature of a study abroad program. This can be helpful because it offers structure and support, but it may also create limitations—including regulations on supervision, payments, and site locations.

Given a particular school of education culture, this imposition of rules from the outside may be seen as neither profitable nor compatible. Finally, a program housed within a school or college generally offers the most flexibility and autonomy. However, as all programmatic responsibilities may fall on one or two people (who generally have other responsibilities as well), resources and staffing are a concern. This may not then be seen as a profitable option as it may interfere with tenure and promotion responsibilities.

Engaging Commitment:
Critical Questions for Navigating Change

In making the decision as to which of the aforementioned approaches is best, it is important to anticipate the aspects of an international program which may bring about concerns on the part of other members of the organization in order to ensure their commitment. Clearly there are legitimate concerns to consider in adopting any program, yet to facilitate change, it is also often necessary to ask critical questions when obstacles arise. One of the most challenging aspects of starting an overseas student teaching program may be to demonstrate how the international context will not compromise programmatic integrity, departmental mission, particular philosophies of teacher education, and concerns born of external pressures such as state certification, legislative mandates, and accreditation. Following is a discussion of some of these issues including context, quality, program requirements, supervision and assessment.

One common objection raised is that to be a well-prepared U.S. public school teacher, one must student-teach in a U.S. school. It may be difficult for individuals to construe the possibility of transference of pedagogical skills practiced in an

overseas school to the problems and parameters of the U.S. Further, critics argue that the majority of these teachers will return to seek jobs in the U.S., consequently, lack of domestic student teaching experience may harm their employment potential. This objection may also arise in places where accountability for colleges of education has risen to the level of showing data that their graduates are finding jobs. (In my experience, I have yet to find a U.S. administrator that has found the overseas experience to be anything but an asset, but of course it is not wise to suggest that those administrators do not exist.)

Merryfield (2000) argues that internationalizing schools of education requires that lack of faculty diversity, global knowledge, and significant cross-cultural experience are salient obstacles which must be confronted. Thus, where lack of international experience exists, if we are to be critical questioners, we must, unfortunately, consider that such objections over the suitability of the international context may on occasion, be construed as evidence of ethnocentric beliefs. In previous research (Mahon, 2003), using the Intercultural Development Inventory, (Intercultural Communication Institute, 1999) a valid and reliable scale measuring understanding of intercultural difference, a large majority of teachers (90% in one case) had ethnocentric understandings of culture. This research took place on both the east and west coasts with teachers with a variety of experience, background, grade levels and school types. While this is clearly not generalizable to colleges of teacher education, it does raise some disturbing possibilities considering the number of former teachers in higher education. I would like to stress, however, that based on my experiences, objections do have roots in other much less judgmental concerns, especially those which come from the aforementioned external pressures.

Questions of context lead to quality concerns. Individuals who have invested much time into crafting a teacher preparation program may believe that the international context simply does not offer the same quality. From what might this concern grow? Clearly it is wise to assess a host-institution, and to assume quality differences may exist. However, the institutional change literature adds another perspective by explaining the anatomy of resistance. According to Clark (1984), resistance is created by sub-cultures, based on things such as disciplinary affiliation or roles within the system, which present a set of beliefs or practices likely to be incompatible with change efforts. Adds Kashner (1990) subcultures may be the genesis of "spheres of ownership" which become especially problematic because a change is perceived as a threat to their rights of possession. Where issues of quality arise then, it would be necessary to consider what elements of quality must be demonstrated by an overseas institution, and how that will be assessed.

It should now be obvious that when examining these various ideas on change, from compatibility and profitability to employability, ownership, and possession, that an economical discourse emerges. Peter Evans, the Marjorie Meyer Eliaser Chair of International Studies at the University of California, Berkley coined the term monocropping (2004) to describe "the imposition of blueprints based on

idealized versions of Anglo-American institutions, the applicability of which is presumed to transcend national circumstances and cultures" (p. 30). Further it is assumed that since the U.S. is a developed nation, bringing our ideas to others would promote their development. He explains,

> Questions of power and distributive conflict further complicate the problem. Any set of institutions entails a distribution of gains and losses. The institutional winners are likely to gain political power along with economic benefits and, as Bardhan (2001: 28-9) points out, they are unlikely to support intuitional changes that diminish their gains relative to other participants, even if the change would result in greater productivity that would increase their returns in absolute terms. Vested interests in the distributive results of "bad" institutions make them harder to change and help keep poverty traps firmly in place. (p. 31)

While an internationalization of schools of education is not addressing poverty in the same direct way as Evans indicates, the reality is that teachers who are prepared to ready their students for 21st century global realities are addressing the prevention of poverty—not only the economic poverty that comes from a lack of skills for such an arena, but the poverty of cultural understanding that leads to domestic and international conflict. Those who object to an overseas student teaching program are not engaging in monocropping per se when they cite the necessity to fulfill programmatic requirements. However, the inability to allow students to learn from other cultures' ways of educating (and to bring them back to our schools to educate us) can suggest an assumption of either superiority or aforementioned issues of ownership. The two areas of an overseas student teaching program most relevant to this issue are supervision, assessment and evaluation.

Of all questions fellow faculty or administrators may ask, supervision is most likely. Initially, questions arise about supervisor qualifications. What backgrounds will overseas supervisors have? What is the frequency and type of evaluation, and what differences exist in significance of numerical values on assessments? Will they use home-country forms, or will the university accept the host's format? State or university regulations may require that the institution's faculty members complete direct evaluations of the student. In other cases, individuals may believe that, given the nature of the institution's training for supervisors, that the process is so highly specialized that it cannot be replicated by others. If proponents of this supervision approach remain unwavering, it may signal the death knell for the program.

Another issue surrounds documentation. In order to ensure that students complete the same program requirements, faculty may require students to make up seminar or clinical experiences overseas or to complete frequent written assignments documenting certain required competencies. The reality of the student teaching experience is that it is a busy, stressful time where weekends and evenings are spent preparing lessons, correcting papers, and preparing university portfolios rather than getting to know the local community. This flies in the face of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994) which emphasizes the absolute neces-

sity of knowing and using community to ensure successful student outcomes. In addition, the overseas experience also requires adjusting to and learning about the culture. Faculty should be aware that requiring students to send home large assignments presents a challenge to the host cooperating teacher and supervisor, as they may be concerned with their lack of familiarity with the assignment assist the student, or of having the student's focus taken away from the student-teaching day. This may signal a lack of distrust of the model of teacher education the host-country has in place.

Engaging Conversation:
Democratic Discourse on Internationalization

There is no doubt that the necessities of a U.S. teacher education program require that certain requirements are fulfilled, but this should not be rationale for reproducing a student teaching program overseas, or worse, not establishing one at all. Rather, arriving at some commonality, coming to the center for the student's benefit, requires conversations on many levels. Citing Ferguson (1994), Evans notes that until institutions begin to understand development as more than a "technical" problem, real change will not occur. I believe that by continuing to relegate programs such as international/global/multicultural programs to the periphery, and engaging in monocropping of institutional requirements, schools of education treat internationalization as a technicality.

International issues, though are not necessarily always marginalized—at least in one area of educational discourse—the failure of public schools. Attention is called to global issues in schools of education because they are continually brought before us as evidence of school failure by groups such as legislators. One such case in point is the National Governor's Association initiative entitled An Action Agenda for Improving America's High Schools (Achieve & The National Governor's Association, 2005). A simple word search of this document reveals the far more frequent use of the words competitive or competition than other ideas which underlie the purpose of public schooling such as citizenship.

These realities may be a very real part of conversations around centralizing the internationalization of teacher education programs. However focusing on the negatives, will not likely be productive. (Faculty may be even further dismayed if they receive reports from overseas faculty, as I have, who comment that U.S. student teachers appear much less prepared with the pedagogical and management skills to take full control of the classroom than the host-country students.)

As the literature shows, many confounding elements of institutional change have to do with tacit elements of culture, Keup et al. (2001) ask a crucial question. "How can we talk about that which is unspoken?" In examining the research on organizational change, they note three important factors. Kashner (1990) empha-sizes the necessity of a contextual study. Farmer (1990) underscores the importance

of trust. And a related necessity (Farmer, 1990; Rowley, Lujan & Dolence, 1997) is the open participative change process. Evans (2004) proposes closer consideration of the work of economic scholars Rodrik (1999) and Sen (1999) who advocate "thickly democratic" decision-making built around a process of deliberation to enhance development. (The irony may be obvious here. In a place where the competitive rationale is used to point out school failures detrimental to our development as a nation, the very field of economic development is advocating issues which have been alive in education for ages. John Dewey comes to mind.)

Thus as educators we should be able to bring this deliberation and participative discussions to help us in our quest to internationalize schools of education. While clearly not exhaustive, the following discussion offers points around which that deliberation may begin for some of the more pressing issues in beginning this type of program.

Considerations for Initial Program Development

State Licensing Requirements

Perhaps the place where any discussion of program development must begin is examining state requirements. Some states mandate that student teaching must be completed in the state, thus seemingly ending any opportunities for the program. Unfortunately if this is the case, discussion of the internationalization of the program must take place at a legislative level (undoubtedly an article in itself). In other states, requirements may be described in terms of weeks to be completed, days or even hours of contact. Given that a host site may be on a very different academic calendar, for example in the southern hemisphere, this can mean some sites are simply unworkable. Additional requirements may exist for time spent in different levels or content areas, for example eight weeks in upper elementary, and another 8 in lower elementary. The varieties in regard to secondary majors and minors also become an issue if a particular host country cannot accommodate such needs. Special education is characteristically difficult to place due to the variety of differences in state requirements and host programs. Fingerprinting and background checks have added an entire new level of complexity. Host countries may also require an international police fingerprint for security purposes.

Objectives and Adjustment

Once state requirements are understood, objectives should be discussed. Clearly the main objective of the student teaching semester is for students to be fully immersed in the process of teaching and learning so they may acquire and demonstrate a readiness to join the profession. But in the overseas student teaching experience, there are other objectives clearly tied to broadening the knowledge and skills necessary to not only interact in a global society, but to lead K-12 students towards acquiring those same skills. A great deal of literature discusses character-

istics of culturally competent individuals (Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989; Hammer, 1987; Bhawuk & Triandis, 1996), of the effects of general study abroad programs (Kaufmann et al., 1992), of culturally relevant teachers (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995) and of globally competent teachers (Merryfield, Jarchow & Pickert, 1997). Some commonalities in these characteristics include: language and communication skills, flexibility or open-mindedness, an ability to empathize or understand the position of the other, and a recognition of other value systems and ways of behaving.

Therefore, primary considerations in designing an overseas student teaching experience must be given to structures which facilitate these outcomes. For students to adequately adjust to a culture, learn the context, and get to know the school program, the number of weeks required should be substantial. This recommendation is grounded in research which continues to show the value of long-term intercultural interactions (Kauffmann et al., 1994; Koester, 1987; Sikkema & Niyekawa, 1987). Secondly, the experience should be considered a process. According to LaBrack (1993) pre-departure orientation and return debriefing is crucial to a successful experience. Finally, notes Weaver (1993) when individuals cut off all contact from home, it is likely to make adjustment more difficult than less. Therefore, in the student teaching context, home-country supervision (generally via email) that provides not only support in handling the requirements of student teaching, but also that enables students to dialogue, reflect, and vent or worry about the intercultural experience itself should be available.

Institutional Policies, Fit, and Commitment

Every university has a different approach to formalized partnerships—international or not. For some, this may mean specific language in agreements, for example whether the partnership in question is an affiliation, consortium (defined by a certain number of cooperating institutions) exchange or international program. These designations may require different forms of documentation, for example, an official memorandum of agreement may be required with presidential or other chief officers' signatures. This can be a time-consuming process. In preparing agreements, it is highly advised to examine the institution's mission statement, strategic plan and relationship to the involved personnel's role statements so that administrators can clearly see how expanding into this particular international effort is congruent with stated institutional goals. Finally, consideration needs to be given to the physical location of offices, as well as available administrative funds. While a program remains small, one committed faculty member may agree to take on the workload. However as the program grows, this will definitely interfere with research and teaching commitments. Thus, institutional commitment is necessary.

Determining Host Institutions

Given the age of increasingly tight university budgets, institutional commit-

ment may not occur until university officials are confident that a program does not duplicate efforts of other departments or programs on campus. In general, the fact that students will be completing specialized work pertaining to their degrees usually answers this query. However, some universities may hold to policies that programs may not be offered in the same locations. This may also have to do with the conditions of pre-existing international partnership arrangements. Therefore, the first place to begin in determining a host institution is to understand existing study abroad options.

Next, program coordinators should investigate the personal/professional contacts various faculty, the college or university have overseas. This is the best way to investigate host institution interest and to reduce the amount of rapport-building necessary to establish a partnership. Other options are to visit international schools or schools of education while presenting at overseas conferences. Finally, the university's international admissions office may have well-established links at international high schools.

Health and Safety Concerns

In general, thought should be given to safety and health concerns which may arise in particular host countries. As a general rule it is necessary to examine the advisories issued such as those by the U.S. and Canadian State Departments, as well as the Center for Disease control. These lists will enable universities to exclude countries where there may be a clear and present dangers to students. On occasion, concerned individuals will mention safety concerned raised via the media regarding certain countries not on any warning list. It is helpful to find ways to tactfully remind people that when opening a U.S. paper, one regularly sees national reports of murder, child abuse, rape, natural disaster, gang violence, institutional corruption, and unfortunately now, terrorist alerts. Safety concerns are applicable to any country in the world. If care is taken to pay close attention to various sources of warning, and if proper pre-departure orientation is conducted, these risks can be minimized.

Types of Placements

Though many types of placements exist, there are three basic structures to begin examining. These placements are generally secured through either the partner university abroad or directly with the school. These include: (1) Instruction in English with a U.S. based curriculum; (2) Instruction in English with a non-U.S. curriculum; and (3) Non-English instruction.

Instruction in English with a U.S. based curriculum at International American schools is a popular option. These schools, which often cater to U.S. expatriates, have similar standards and graduation requirements as U.S. schools. Department of Defense schools which serve military personnel are also in this category. (Individuals should carefully investigate this option as issues regarding military clearance, security concerns or university vs. military policies may exist).

The second option that exists is instruction in English with a non-U.S. curriculum. In this case, student teachers are placed at public or private schools in English speaking countries. In non-English speaking countries, this may include international schools such as Canadian, British, South African or Australian which cater to their expatriates abroad.

Finally there is non-English instruction. In cases where a student may have a second language fluency, or be working towards modern language certification, two options are possible—placement in public schools in non-English speaking countries (requiring excellent levels of fluency) or in international schools with foreign language or bilingual programs. (Complications may arise in countries where the student is being certified in the native language, but a large number of native language speakers attend the school, for example in some Spanish-speaking nations. In this case, a Spanish as a Foreign Language program must exist).

Types of Supervision

In order to finalize decisions about placements, the type of supervision desired and available must be considered. We have already discussed the unfortunate issue of monocropping that arises when we assume our students must be evaluated by our own university personnel. In this case a compromise must be worked. In all cases, it is assumed that a university contact (regular supervisor or OST program coordinator) serves as a regular contact/communication point, and that the supervision of the cooperating teacher is assumed by one (or more) of the following: (1) Host university education faculty; (2) Administrators, for example, in locations where no formal university partnership exists, such as American international or DODD schools; (3) Non-English instruction. Home-country evaluators, for example, when sabbaticals, research studies or other funds allow for travel or stay to the host country.

Finally, a further complication in supervision may arise. As accountability and accreditation pressures have mounted in recent years, it may be common for a college to have students complete a data-driven assignment documenting their ability to effectively plan for, carry-out, assess, and differentiate instruction. Such documents may be unknown in the host-country, and though not impossible, would require more communication with the U.S. based instructor/supervisor, and necessitate consideration of local laws regarding collection of student work.

The Numbers: Credits, Tuition, and Fees

No discussion of setting up an overseas program is complete without considering tuition and fees. How much will students pay during this semester? Clearly they pay the associated costs of travel, room and board, but is their tuition affected? Whether a student travels for the entire semester or a part, demands on home-faculty resources are lessened, but this fact may not satisfy a university administrator counting on tuition dollars. This brings us back to the issue of supervision. If an overseas evaluator is acceptable, the necessity of contact with home-faculty still

remains, creating the need for two supervisory stipends usually drawn from student tuition. Unless the student's tuition and the U.S. supervisor salary is being completely altered to reflect a removal of the international student teacher from rosters, the fact remains that students are paying tuition for services from the university. This is often a point not lost on parents or others footing the semester tuition bill. On the other hand, assuming the student is still assigned, the supervisor will need to maintain regular contact with the student via email. However, a question of remuneration may arise in cases where students may actually be overseas longer than faculty are required to be on campus, that is, longer than they are being paid. Some faculty will accommodate this extra work without pay, others will not. In addition, some programs may try to rely on pro-bono supervision overseas. Clearly in both cases, individuals should be expected to be compensated for their expertise. If funds cannot be secured, a final option may be to consider assigning the supervision to an administrator not on a nine-month contract.

Paying full university tuition, all traveling and housing expenses, plus supervisory stipends or host institution costs becomes cost prohibitive for many students. Therefore, it is necessary to consider ways the institution might release a portion of the tuition dollars back to the college or consortium to pay associated fees. Options to consider include varieties of enrollment options such as distance education, enrolling per credit or through a continuing education unit.

It may be necessary to consider whether or not the traditional course credits for U.S. student teaching will be given for overseas student teaching. In some cases, a university may choose to make the overseas practicum an elective required above and beyond the regular semester. This has the advantage of attracting students who might not want to leave for a longer period of time, or given the fees, simply might not be able to afford a 12 or 15 credit overseas experience. Unfortunately, as many students have a desire to simply finish their program, an additional elective may not seem attractive, or they may not have any electives at all. This brings us to decisions regarding the options for length of stay such as: (1) Full semester; (2) Students complete one half of required weeks in the U.S. and the remainder in-country; for example, 8 weeks overseas; 8 in-country (with adjustments made as necessary for cultural adjustment/quality of experience as previously discussed); (3) A short term elective is designed to be completed prior to or after the culminating U.S. semester, for example as part of a pre-student teaching semester.

Additionally there is the issue of co-requisite credits. Depending on the particular program, students may be required to attend concurrent seminars, clinicals, state-mandated sessions on ethics or praxis testing. Though less common, some students may have remaining degree requirements in their major. In the case of the latter, it would be necessary to find an equivalent course offered by the host university, or determine if the course is offered in semesters after the student returns assuming it will either not affect or be completed in time to secure state licensure.

Conclusions

This article has overviewed the considerations necessary in establishing an overseas student teaching program. But beyond adding a program, we must recognize that we are seeking to transform institutions. Evans (2004) offers an analogy, "If biologically diverse ecologies are more robust in the face of environmental change and diversified investment portfolios are superior in the face of risk, shouldn't institutional diversity have adaptive value for the global political economy as a whole?" (p. 34) Overseas student teaching is just one "stock" to include in the diversification of teacher education for a global society. Overseas studies add a dimension to the education of pre-service and practicing teachers that is simply profound. Noted one returnee, "I reflect from my experience every day of my life. I am a different person today because of it." By democratically creating a program with the potential for such rich results, and sharing those successes, it may be the catalyst which enables us, as educators, to engage in the conversations which can bring internationalization from the margins to the center. It can perhaps be our "field of dreams." Build it and the rest will come.

References

Achieve, Inc., & The National Governor's Association (2005). *An action agenda for improving America's high schools*. Washington, DC: Author.

Baker, F.J., & Giacchino-Baker, R. (2000). *Building an international student teaching program: A California/Mexico experience*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No: ED449143)

Baker, B.R. (2000). Moving beyond our education community: Student teaching abroad. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Childhood Education International (Baltimore, MD, April, 17-20, 2000). (ERIC Document Reproduction No: ED455238)

Beach, R. (1995). *Multicultural learning at home and abroad*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No: ED415791)

Bhawuk, D., & Triandis, H. (1996). The role of culture theory in the study of culture and intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. Bhaghat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 17-34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Briscoe, K. (1991). Broadening horizons: Institutionalizing an international perspective. *Educational Record, 72*, 62-64.

Calhoon, J., Wildcat, D., Annett, C., Pierotti, R., & Griswold, W. (2003). Creating meaningful study abroad programs for American Indian postsecondary students. *Journal of American Indian Education, 42*, 46-57.

Campion, W.J., & Bostic, D. (1993). *Manual for building an international education program in the community college*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No: ED361013)

Case, R., & Werner, W. (1997). Building faculty commitment for global education. In M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow & S. Pickert (Eds.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Clark, B.R. (1984). Academic culture. Yale Higher Education Working Group Paper.

Cushner, K., & Mahon, J. (2002). Overseas student teaching: Affecting personal, professional and global competencies in an age of globalization. *Journal of International Studies in*

Education, 6(2), 44-58.

Evans, P. (2004). Development as institutional change: The pitfalls of monocropping and the potentials of deliberation. *Studies in Comparative International Development, 38*(4), 30-53.

Farmer, D.W. (1990). Strategies for change. In D.W. Steeples (Ed.), *Managing change in higher education: Vol. 71. New directions for higher education* (pp. 7-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ferguson, J. (1994). *The anti-politics machine: Development, depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Fung, S., & Filippo, J. (2002). What kinds of professional international opportunities may be secured for faculty? *New Directions for Higher Education, 117*, 57-62.

Gollnick, D. (1992). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education* (pp. 218-239). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Hammer, M. (1987). Behavioral dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: A replication and extension. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 11*, 65-88.

Hammer, M., Gudykunst, W., & Wiseman, R. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2*, 382-392.

Hatton, M.J. (1995). Internationalizing the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 19*(5), 453-70.

Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1996). Patterns in prospective teachers: Guides for designing preservice programs. In F. Murray (Ed.), *Teacher educators' handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 465-505). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Intercultural Communication Institute. (1999). *Intercultural Development Inventory*. Portland, OR: Author.

Jarchow, E. (1997). The dean's role in infusing global perspectives throughout a college of education. In M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow & S. Pickert, (Eds.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kappler, B., & Nokken, K. (1999). *Making the most of your time abroad*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, International Student and Scholar Services.

Kashner, J.B. (1990). Changing the corporate culture. In D.W. Steeples (Ed.), *Managing change in higher education: Vol. 71. New directions for higher education* (pp. 7-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kauffman, N.L., Martin, J.N., Weaver, H.D. & Weaver, J. (1992). *Students abroad, strangers at home: Education for a global society*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Keup, J.R., Walker, A., Astin, H., & Lindholm, J. (2001). *Organizational culture and institutional transformation*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED464521)

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2000). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principals or culturally responsive concepts? Manuscript submitted for publication.

Kiely, R., & Nelson, D. (2003). International service learning: The importance of partnerships. *Community College Journal*, Jan., 39-41.

Kissock, C. (1997). Overseas student teaching. In M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow & S. Pickert, (Eds.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators* (pp.104-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Koester, J. (1987). *A profile of the U.S. student abroad—1984 and 1985*. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.

LaBrack, B. (1993). The missing linkage: The process of integrating orientation and reentry. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp.241-280). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Landerholm, E., Gehrie, C., & Hao, Y. (2004). Educating early childhood teachers for the global world. *Early Child Development and Care, 174*(7-8), 593-606.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159-165.

Levine, A. (1980). *Why innovation fails*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mahan, J.M., & Stachowski, L.L. (1990). New horizons: Student teaching abroad to enrich understanding of diversity. *Action in Teacher Education, 12*(3), 13-21.

Mahon, J. (2003). *Intercultural sensitivity development among practicing teachers: Life history perspectives*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (07), 2352. (UMI No. 3097199)

Mahon, J., & Cushner, K. (2002). The overseas student teaching experience: Creating optimal culture learning. *Multicultural Perspectives, 4*(3), 3-8

McFadden, J., Merryfield, M. M., & Barron, K.R. (1997). *Multicultural and global/international education: Guidelines for programs in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Merryfield, M.M. (1995). Institutionalizing cross-cultural experiences and international expertise in teacher education: The development and potential of a global education PDS network. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*, 1-9.

Merryfield, M., Jarchow, E., & Pickert, S. (Eds.). (1997). *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Merryfield, M.M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*, 429-43.

McFadden, J., Merryfield, M., & Barron, K. (1997). *Multicultural and global/international education: Guidelines for programs in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Melnick, S., & Zeichner, K. (1998). Teacher education's responsibility to address diversity issues: Enhancing institutional capacity. *Theory into Practice, 37*(2), 62-69.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (1992). *Moving the centre: The struggle for cultural freedom*. London, UK: James Curry.

Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Paige, R.M., Cohen, A.D., Kappler, B., Chi, J.C., & Lassegard, J.P. (2002). *Maximizing study abroad: A student's guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Pike, G. (2000). Preparing teachers for global citizenship: The impact of the specialization in international education. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 10*(1-2), 95-106.

Rodrick, D. (1999). *The new global economy and developing countries: Making openness work*. [Policy Essay no. 24] Washington, DC: Overseas Development Council, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D., & Dolence, M.G. (1997). *Strategic change in colleges and*

universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sevigny, J. (2001). *The AACRAO International Guide: A resource for international education professionals*. (AACRAO Professional Development & Education Series) American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, DC.

Sikkema, M., & Niyekawa, A. (1987). *Design for cross-cultural learning*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Simsek, H., & Louis, K.S. (1994). Organizational change as a paradigm shift: Analysis of the change process in a large, public university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 65*(6), 670-695.

Stachowski, L.L., & Brantmeier, E.J. (2002). Understanding self through the other: Changes in student teacher perceptions of home culture from immersion in Navajoland and overseas. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Denver, CO, February 2-6, 2002). (ERIC Document Reproduction No: ED465715)

Stachowski, L.L., & Visconti, V.A. (1998). Service learning in overseas nations: U.S. student teachers give, grow, and gain outside the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(3), 212-19.

Stachwoski, L.L., & Chlebo, J.A. (1998). Foreign educators provide feedback for the improvement of international student teaching experiences. *Action in Teacher Education, 19*(4),119-30.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.

Weaver, G. (1993). Understanding and coping with cross cultural adjustment stress. In R.M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 137-168). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Wiseman, R., Hammer, M., & Nishida, H. (1989). Predictors of intercultural communication competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13*, 349-370.