



CREATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

Challenges and Opportunities for
Internationalization at HBCUs



Gailda Pitre Davis

Associate Director

Inclusive Excellence Group

American Council on Education

This publication is made possible in part through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education.



ACE and the American Council on Education are registered marks of the American Council on Education and may not be used or reproduced without the express written permission of ACE.

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036

© 2014. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 1

INTRODUCTION 3

 Methodological Overview..... 3

PART I: COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION AND THE INTERNATIONALIZATION REVIEW 5

 The Internationalization Review..... 7

PART II: HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES..... 9

 HBCUs and Internationalization..... 9

PART III: MAJOR FINDINGS 10

Finding 1 11

 Fiscal Resources 11

 Human Resources..... 13

Finding 2..... 14

 Leadership Transitions..... 15

 Leadership from the Top..... 15

 Understanding Competing Demands on Senior Leaders..... 16

Finding 3..... 17

 Undocumented Practices..... 17

 Institutional Policies 18

Finding 4..... 19

 The Internationalization Rationale 19

 What Internationalization Means for HBCUs 20

Finding 5..... 21

 Alignment with the Institutional Strategic Plan 21

 Data-Informed Planning 22

 Collective Planning Process..... 23

Finding 6..... 23

CONCLUSION 24

REFERENCES..... 25

APPENDIX: INSTITUTIONAL TEAM LEADERS 28

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: ACE MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION 1

FIGURE 2: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONALIZATION REVIEW 5

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report draws from the work and insights of many institutions, organizations, and individuals. Their collective efforts helped us to ensure the success of the Creating Global Citizens initiative. First, we want to acknowledge the hard work of the institutional team leaders of the seven project institutions. Without their strong commitment to internationalization and the devoted, visionary leadership of the institutional project teams, this work could not have been completed. We are grateful for their candor, camaraderie, and willingness to support the broad goal of advancing internationalization at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Additionally, the institutions that engaged in this initiative provided the American Council on Education (ACE) project team with a unique opportunity to both observe their campuses and learn from their experiences. Thank you to the presidents, provosts, senior administrators, faculty, staff, and students with whom we interacted at each institution—your authentic engagement with our team had a significant impact on this work.

ACE is grateful to the U.S. Department of Education for its support of this initiative. Their funding enabled us to gain greater insights and assist in advancing the internationalization efforts at HBCUs. We are also grateful to the advisory group for its insights into, guidance of, and shared vision for this initiative. The advisory group included representatives from the following organizations:

- Council for Opportunity in Education
- Thurgood Marshall College Fund
- National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education
- United Negro College Fund (UNCF)
- UNCF Special Programs Corporation

In addition, we would like to thank the following HBCU leaders who helped us design and launch this initiative: James A. Anderson, chancellor, Fayetteville State University (NC); Charlie Nelms, former chancellor, North Carolina Central University; and Marvalene Hughes, former president, Dillard University (LA). We would like to thank Meldon Hollis, associate director of the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, for his perceptive contributions and overall commitment to internationalization at HBCUs. Finally, we would like to thank Anthony Pinder for his collegial support and candid feedback as we designed the latter stages of this initiative.

The author also would like to recognize several colleagues at ACE for their ongoing support, including the ACE project team, which over the life of the initiative included Delores Scott, Brad Farnsworth, Barbara Hill, Christa Olson, Jarred Butto, Linda Mabrey, and our external evaluator Cassie Bryant. This was truly a collaborative effort, and we are grateful for everything you each did in support of this project. The author would also like to thank Kim Bobby and Patti McGill Peterson, the leaders of the collaborating offices on this initiative—the Inclusive Excellence Group and the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement. Finally, the author thanks the many others at ACE who supported this effort, including the Shared Services group, Charlene Bowman, the Marketing team, Public Affairs, the Web Strategy and Operations team, and the Publishing department. To everyone who had a role in the success of this initiative, the author is grateful for your contributions, words of encouragement, and insights.

INTRODUCTION

The American Council on Education (ACE) launched *Creating Global Citizens: Exploring Internationalization at Historically Black Colleges and Universities* (HBCUs) in 2010 to learn how HBCUs are internationalizing their campuses. Conducted as an action-research study, the project's goals were to (1) identify factors that impede or enhance the internationalization process at HBCUs and (2) disseminate findings to the higher education community. The primary aim of the project was to build on HBCUs' successes in internationalization by assisting them in being more strategic in advancing initiatives, accelerating and deepening their efforts, and positioning them to pursue funding and partnering opportunities for internationalization.

Over an 18-month period, ACE worked closely with seven HBCUs to create internationalization teams, conduct a review and analysis of their current internationalization efforts, prepare a self-study report, and develop a strategic plan for advancing internationalization at their institutions. The institutions engaged in this project were Dillard University (LA), Howard University (DC), Lincoln University (MO), North Carolina Agricultural and Technical (A&T) State University, Savannah State University (GA), Tuskegee University (AL), and Virginia State University. Two team leaders (see Appendix) were designated by either the president or provost of each project institution to serve as the primary liaisons between the institution and ACE. These individuals also led the campus internationalization teams through the internationalization review process (see Part I).

Methodological Overview

The questions that guided this action research study were:

1. What strategies are HBCUs currently using to internationalize?
2. What factors impede or enhance the internationalization process at HBCUs?
3. To what extent does the ACE internationalization review and planning process assist HBCUs in building capacity for sustainable internationalization?

The ACE researchers utilized a cross-case analysis, which allowed them to explore similarities, differences, and broad themes across the seven project institutions (Yin 2009). This approach also allowed the project team to engage with the institutions while responding to the research questions in real time. Data sources included notes

The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, defines an HBCU as "any historically black college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of black Americans, and that is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary [of Education] to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation."

—*Higher Education Act of 1965, Section 322(a)*

Research Terms

Action research, also known as participatory action research, is a methodology with the purpose of bringing about “change at individual, organizational, and societal levels. The methodology consists of outsider researchers working as facilitators engaged with insider teams of practitioners in a process of collecting data and creating knowledge about local problems as seen from a local perspective” (*Bensimon, Polkinghorne, Bauman, and Vallejo 2004, 108*).

Cross-case analysis is a research method that enables the comparison of similarities and distinctions in the events, activities, and processes of interest within individual case studies (*Yin 2009*).

Data triangulation “involves checking information that has been collected from different sources or methods for consistency of evidence across sources of data” (*Mertens 2005, 255*).

Internationalization and Comprehensive Internationalization

Internationalization is “the process by which institutions foster global learning.”

Comprehensive internationalization is a “strategic and integrated approach to internationalization in which institutions articulate internationalization as an institutional goal (if not priority), develop an internationalization plan driven by sound analysis, and seek to bring together the usually disparate . . . aspects of internationalization” (vi).

(*Olson, Green, and Hill 2006*)

taken by the ACE project team during conference calls, virtual meetings with the institutional project team leaders, and campus site visits; institutions’ reports on the outcomes of their internationalization reviews; institutional documents, such as strategic plans, mission statements, and campus newsletters; and 36 institutional applications to participate in the Creating Global Citizens project. These data were analyzed by two members of the ACE project team and then triangulated to explore similarities in findings. The findings from each team member were compared for consistency to determine the major themes. Member checking was then done with several institutional team leaders to establish the credibility of the findings (*Mertens 2005*).

This publication presents project findings and highlights successful strategies used to further internationalization at these institutions. The major findings are presented in narrative format within this publication to promote greater dialogue about the most critical factors associated with internationalization at HBCUs based on this study. This publication will provide a brief overview of the unique characteristics of HBCUs and the identified need to internationalize these institutions. It begins, however, with an overview of ACE’s model of comprehensive internationalization and the internationalization review process.

PART I: COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION AND THE INTERNATIONALIZATION REVIEW

Comprehensive internationalization, a concept developed by ACE, is a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions (Olson, Green, and Hill 2006). This process requires a clear commitment by senior institutional leaders; meaningfully impacts the curriculum and broad range of people, policies, and programs; and results in deep and ongoing incorporation of international perspectives and activities throughout the institution. For institutions that perceive internationalization more comprehensively, internationalization pervades the institutions' teaching, learning, research, service, and extension agendas; affects a broad spectrum of people, policies, and programs; and leads to a deeper and potentially more lasting change in institutional focus and culture. Commitment to comprehensive internationalization is also a commitment to long-term, systemic change that can be transformative in nature for many institutions. It requires a significant investment of resources (human, fiscal, time, etc.), but can yield substantial, positive results for students and institutions alike.

The ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization consists of the following six interconnected target areas for institutional initiatives, policies, and programs (American Council on Education 2013). Each area is explored within this section.

Figure 1. ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization



Articulated Institutional Commitment

Institutional leaders should readily articulate the importance of internationalization in various ways. One indication of an institution's commitment to internationalization is whether or not it is prioritized within the mission statement and strategic plan. Another indicator of an articulated commitment to internationalization is an explicit internationalization plan for the campus. Whether at the institutional or divisional level, strategic planning involving key stakeholders articulates an institution's commitment to internationalization and provides a roadmap for implementation. Formal assessment mechanisms reinforce the commitment to internationalization by framing explicit goals and holding the institution accountable for accomplishing them.

Administrative Structure and Staffing

The involvement of senior leaders and appropriate administrative and reporting structures form an essential framework for internationalization. The president and other senior executives (e.g., chief academic officers and senior student affairs officers) must be committed to internationalization and engaged in the process of comprehensive internationalization from the start. Ideally, one or more offices are designated to coordinate campus-wide internationalization activities, with the individual primarily responsible for internationalization reporting to the chief academic officer or president.

Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes

As a core purpose of higher education, student learning is a critical element of internationalization. An internationalized curriculum and co-curriculum ensure that all students are exposed to international perspectives and build global competence. Globally focused student-learning outcomes articulate specific knowledge and skills to be addressed in courses and programs.

Faculty Policies and Practices

As the primary drivers of teaching and research, the faculty holds a pivotal role in campus internationalization. Institutional policies and support mechanisms ensure that faculty have opportunities to develop international competence and are able to maximize the impact of these experiences on student learning. Opportunities for faculty to engage in workshops, conduct research, and attend conferences that support international efforts are critical to faculty engagement.

Student Mobility

Student mobility, which refers both to the outward flow of domestic students to other countries and the inward flow of international students to study at U.S. campuses, is often a focus of internationalization efforts. Orientations, re-entry programs, and

other support structures and activities help facilitate student adjustment and maximize learning.

Collaboration and Partnerships

U.S. institutions are increasingly pursuing opportunities to expand their global reach through collaborations and partnerships, including student and faculty exchanges, joint and dual degrees, branch campuses, and other off-shore programs. Careful planning, ongoing support, and regular assessment are important to the success of such ventures.

The Internationalization Review

An internationalization review allows an institution to catalog and analyze current internationalization efforts. It involves taking stock of the international initiatives on campus by collecting and analyzing information as a basis for creating an internationalization plan. The internationalization review allows key stakeholders across the institution to engage in broad discussions on internationalization while identifying strengths, weaknesses, gaps, and opportunities.

An internationalization review looks across the dimensions of ACE's model of comprehensive internationalization to provide answers to critical questions for institutions. It is conducted with an analytic focus, rather than a descriptive focus, to learn more about the institution's internationalization efforts, professional development needs of faculty and staff, attitudes of stakeholders toward internationalization, and institutional needs as related to internationalization (resources, policies, curricular, programming, etc.), and to get a broad sense of the internationally related capacities of the institution (e.g., foreign-language expertise of faculty and staff, and student exposure to international cultures and languages). This review, in turn, assists an institution in developing student learning outcomes (as well as a method for assessing them) and a strategic internationalization plan to guide the institution in its efforts.

Figure 2. Guiding Questions for the Internationalization Review

Articulated institutional commitment

- Is global/international learning articulated as part of the vision, mission, or goals of the institution?
- What are the goals for internationalization and where (and how) are those goals articulated?

Administrative structure and staffing

- Where does primary responsibility for internationalization lie?
- What governance structures support internationalization?
- Is the necessary staffing in place to support and advance internationalization efforts?

Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes

- Does the institution have student learning goals associated with the global and international dimensions of undergraduate education?
- How are goals assessed?
- Is there coordination between curricular and co-curricular efforts to achieve the desired student learning outcomes?

Faculty policies and practices

- How does the institution promote faculty engagement in internationalization?
- How effective are administrative policies and procedures pertaining to faculty engagement in activities abroad?

Student mobility

- In what ways are students encouraged to or discouraged from pursuing international learning opportunities outside the United States?
- How effective are the administrative policies and procedures pertaining to education abroad (e.g., financial aid and credit transfer)?
- What are the enrollment trends of international students?
- How are international students integrated into campus life?
- What strategies are in place to help domestic students learn from international students and vice versa?

Collaboration and partnerships

- How many international partnerships exist at the institution? How is effectiveness of those partnerships gauged? How are the partnerships managed and by whom?
- What policies exist about developing and approving international partnerships?

Source: Hill, Barbara, and Madeleine Green. 2008. *A Guide to Internationalization for Chief Academic Officers*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

PART II: HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HBCUs are institutions established prior to 1964 for the purpose of educating African Americans. There are currently 100 accredited HBCUs, which make up less than 3 percent of all colleges and universities in the country (Gasman 2013). HBCUs enroll approximately 9 percent of all African American college students in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics 2013) and 2 percent of all college and university students in the United States (Peterson and Hamrick 2009). While historically the vast majority of students enrolled at these institutions were African American (Freeman and Thomas 2002), almost 40 percent of students enrolled at HBCUs now are non-black (Gasman 2013). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2013), HBCUs awarded 16 percent of baccalaureate degrees and 13 percent of doctoral degrees earned by African Americans in 2011. HBCUs are well known for alumni such as Martin Luther King Jr., W.E.B. DuBois, and Booker T. Washington, to name a few. Their alumni also include such international leaders as Nnamdi Azikiwe, who became Nigeria's first president in 1963, and Hastings Kamuzu Banda, Malawi's first president (Oguntoyinbo 2013). Since their humble beginnings, HBCUs have celebrated many successes but also face many challenges. Among these are resource constraints, pressures to increase enrollment and improve retention rates, and continuing questions of the current relevance of their historic mission (Allen and Jewell 2002; Brown 2013; Hall and Closson 2005).

HBCUs and Internationalization

In recent years, many U.S. campuses have come to recognize the increasing significance of the global nature of our society in ways that have prompted a closer look at how campuses are engaged in internationalization efforts and how they prepare students to be effective within the global society. This is no less true for HBCUs, yet these unique environments come with incomparable challenges to comprehensive internationalization. HBCUs have a critical role in preparing students as global citizens, even in the face of the challenges they endure. The remainder of this paper will focus on the major findings from ACE's 2010–13 Creating Global Citizens initiative.

PART III: MAJOR FINDINGS

This section presents the major findings of the Creating Global Citizens initiative. As mentioned in the introduction, these findings are presented in a narrative or descriptive format to promote greater dialogue around the most salient factors that were found to enhance or to impede internationalization at HBCUs. The section begins with an overview of the major themes and follows with a more detailed discussion of each, along with identified strategies to advance internationalization efforts at HBCUs.

The major findings of this project were that:

1. **Resource constraints are a significant inhibitor to internationalization efforts at HBCUs.** HBCUs have historically operated with considerably fewer resources than many of their peer institutions. Comprehensive internationalization requires an investment of resources (human, fiscal, etc.), without which internationalization efforts will likely remain stagnant or possibly decline.
2. **Senior leaders have a significant role in internationalizing a campus.** They must demonstrate their commitment consistently, both in word and in deed, throughout the campus to gain significant momentum for internationalization efforts. While the demands on senior leaders at HBCUs are many, their continual support of internationalization as an institutional priority can propel efforts in immeasurable ways.
3. **Clear policies and consistent practices to support internationalization can make an important difference in the success of such efforts.** Lack of written policies can lead to uncertainty and inconsistency in practice, which may be detrimental to the internationalization process.
4. **Institutional constituents need a shared understanding of the importance of internationalization, what it means to internationalize a campus, and what is required to successfully do so.** This includes a shared rationale for internationalizing the campus by administrators and faculty, along with a visible commitment to act upon this rationale. It also requires a shared sense of urgency about preparing globally competent students. While many understand that internationalization is significant to an institution and the students it serves, implications for processes, structures, resources, policies, and training to achieve this may not be as clear. Each institution has to develop its approach to internationalize in a manner that is consistent with its institutional mission and core identity (American Council on Education 2011) while considering all of the aforementioned requisites to achieve its internationalization goals.

5. **Institutions need a strategic approach to internationalization or efforts may be hindered.** This approach should be codified in a strategic plan or action plan which aligns with the larger institutional strategic plan, and should be agreed upon by institutional leaders and a core group of individuals charged with enacting the plan. Data-gathering proved to be essential for determining an effective internationalization strategy. Through the process of an internationalization review, institutions were able to take stock of their international activities, analyze the effectiveness of these activities, and assess the campus climate around internationalization. Several institutions were also able to assess attitudes of various campus constituents toward internationalization. Data obtained through the review process were essential in developing an effective action or strategic plan to advance internationalization efforts.
6. **Comprehensive internationalization takes place in phases, not all at once.** Internationalization, especially at a comprehensive level, can be viewed as a transformation for many institutions. As with any transformative process, the long-term vision of comprehensive internationalization cannot be achieved in a few short months or years. Often institutions have to begin with short-term, achievable goals that balance a strategic approach with the reality of institutional context as they move toward the end goal of comprehensive internationalization.

Finding 1: Resource constraints are a significant inhibitor to internationalization efforts at HBCUs.

As is the case for many institutions currently advancing internationalization efforts, all project institutions indicated a need for additional resources (primarily fiscal and human) to support internationalization efforts.

Fiscal Resources

Many institutions experience fiscal demands that are greater than existing resources. This demand, however, may be even more pronounced at HBCUs, according to Ezzell and Schexnider, 2010, given their history of operating with very “modest funding” (3). In addition to this, endowments at HBCUs tend to be smaller than those of many other institutions. According to Gasman (2013), private HBCUs had an average endowment of \$38.01 million in comparison to the national private-institution average of \$223 million; endowments at public HBCUs were \$49.34 million in comparison to the national public-institution average of \$87.7 million. HBCUs are also less likely to depend on alumni giving as a resource stream, as most students graduate from HBCUs with a debt of at least \$40,000 (Jennings 2013). In many cases, fiscal constraints place tremendous pressure on leaders at HBCUs to use available resources to

simply sustain the institution and often do not allow significant latitude to invest in internationalization efforts. The unfortunate reality is that internationalization efforts can remain stagnant or even decline when there is not an alignment of institutional resources with institutional goals (Green and Olson 2003).

As more HBCUs are seeking to prepare their students to be entrepreneurs (Baker 2012), so too will institutional leaders need to be entrepreneurial in their approach to funding internationalization efforts. Strategies that may be worth considering for funding internationalization efforts include:

- **Establish a modest student fee to support internationalization efforts.** Institutions such as Howard University and North Carolina A&T State University have used this model with some gains to support internationalization.
- **Engage directly with businesses that employ graduates or that would benefit from a globally competent workforce as external partners for funding internationalization efforts.** During the course of the Creating Global Citizens project, some of the project institutions began to explore this as a possible revenue source or for providing student internships with a global competence focus. Dillard University, for example, began to explore ways to connect with the shipping industry for student internships that might connect the local and the global.
- **Creatively reallocate existing funds.** An institution might, for example, designate a portion of the indirect costs (or overhead) from internationally related grants for use in advancing institutional internationalization efforts. While much of the overhead should be used to support the institutional operations necessary to administer the grant, a portion of this could serve as seed funding to advance internationalization efforts. Similarly, unexpended and unrestricted funding at the end of a fiscal year might be utilized as seed money to support professional development for faculty or staff charged with advancing internationalization or to fund faculty efforts to enhance existing courses with global learning.
- **Earnestly pursue grant funding.** While there are grant funds available to support internationalization efforts, institutions must take the time to understand what funders seek and how to determine the appropriate funding source for designated goals. This takes an earnest effort to educate and engage faculty and staff and time to develop relationships with potential funders and draft funding proposals.
- **Tap into available community resources that support internationalization.** Local institutions can partner to develop shared internationally related pro-

gramming. Savannah State University, for example, partners with local institutions to share costs for speakers on international topics. Additionally, in many communities, there are internationally related organizations, agencies, and businesses which can also provide educational opportunities to advance the global competence of students, faculty, and staff at minimal or no cost to the institution.

Human Resources

Institutional leaders and those tasked with advancing internationalization must identify and commit to realistic goals and the resources needed to achieve those goals in a way that does not overburden a select few faculty or staff members. It is critical that those in charge of advancing internationalization efforts have the regular opportunity to think strategically about their work, engage with stakeholders to assess the environment for internationalization readiness, and share the institutional rationale for advancing internationalization with key constituents. This is a challenge when senior international officers (SIOs) are mired in the minutiae of managing everyday operations and logistics or juggling two equally demanding positions at the institution under the guise of each being part time. Possible ways to alleviate this strain and provide additional support for leaders of internationalization include:

- **Enlisting student, faculty, or alumni ambassadors for assistance.** Tuskegee University, Virginia State University, and North Carolina A&T State University, for example, prepare students and other faculty members to facilitate information sessions on study abroad, provide feedback and insights for students considering study abroad, and assist with planning and implementing pre-departure orientations for study abroad participants. In most instances, these students and faculty have traveled abroad and are familiar with institutional policies, allowing them to speak from personal experience while providing necessary information to others. This, then, allows the senior international officer more time to focus on other aspects of his or her work. Similarly, some institutions with limited recruitment capacity have found it beneficial to enlist the support of alumni who reside in other countries to aid in international student recruitment. By engaging these alumni and providing them with the materials to tout the benefits of studying at their particular institution, the institution will employ the well-known marketing method of word-of-mouth.
- **Examine and adjust the institutional infrastructure where necessary to support coherence and efficiency.** While in many institutions there may be multiple individuals responsible for different aspects of campus internationalization (such as international student recruitment and admissions, internationalization of the curriculum, study abroad, faculty development, etc.), it is important

to review the infrastructure to ensure that there is a clear delineation of roles and no overlap in function. This may be enhanced by regular communication efforts between offices but also may require the melding of multiple units, in some instances, to maximize the human capital already available.

- **Hire entry-level or part-time staff to provide support for internationalization offices.** While this may require minimal institutional investment, it can free up time for the internationalization officers to strategize more effectively and engage in thought leadership at a higher level. Virginia State University, for example, hired a part-time employee for its Office for International Education. By having someone to respond to telephone and email inquiries, student process questions on study abroad, and complete institutional documents, the director of the office could then focus her attention on the strategic alignment of internationalization goals with institutional goals.

Finding 2: Senior leaders have a significant role in internationalizing a campus.

Leadership at the top is essential to successful internationalization. As leaders, they must consistently articulate the importance of internationalization, stay focused on the issue, secure and allocate adequate resources, provide symbolic support, engage external groups, and develop on-campus leadership and support.

—Green and Olson, 2003, p. 79

Presidents face a unique challenge at HBCUs, balancing their strategic vision with the unique culture, inadequate resources, limited financial support, shared governance structures, and board governance (Ezzell and Schexnider 2010).

Leadership for internationalization should be viewed as a shared responsibility across an institution (Hill and Green 2008). The president and chief academic officer, however, have critically important roles in ensuring that internationalization efforts are viewed in this shared manner, and that everyone at the institution understands the ways in which they contribute to the internationalization goals. Three significant

themes arose within this project that revolve around the role of senior leaders in internationalization: (1) transitions in leadership positions, particularly the president and chief academic officer, can inhibit internationalization efforts; (2) leadership from the top, including the president, provost or chief academic officer, and other senior executives, is critical to the success of internationalization; and (3) SIOs must be aware of the many competing demands that senior leaders face and understand how internationalization fits into the larger perspective of institutional needs. Each of these will be discussed in this section.

Leadership Transitions

Stability at the top was a significant factor for most institutions in the Creating Global Citizens project, as it has been the case at many HBCUs in recent years (Hayes 2014). Between the start of the project in January 2011 and the conclusion of the primary engagement with institutions in August 2012, five of seven project institutions experienced a senior leader transition (president, provost, or both). Of the two that did not experience such a transition, each had presidents who had been appointed within six months of the start of the project.

Senior leader transitions often bring about institutional changes in the strategic plan and vision for the institution. This in turn makes an alignment of strategic goals, both institutional and internationalization, a major challenge, as it may be unclear which goals of a previous administration will remain and which will be changed in accordance with the new leader's vision. However, such change can present opportunities for institutions if managed well. Below are two strategies employed by the project institutions that seemed to aid in maintaining momentum toward comprehensive internationalization during a leadership transition:

- **Provide new leaders with an executive summary of the status of internationalization at your institution.** SIOs should be able to provide senior leaders with a rationale for internationalization, an overview of the status of internationalization (including clear supporting data such as those obtained through an internationalization review), and a clear vision (grounded in short- and long-term goals) for advancing internationalization in a compelling manner. This assists new leaders as they begin to understand the institution and how internationalization fits within the priorities they are to manage.
- **Use the time between leaders to develop new institutional allies for internationalization.** New senior leaders often meet individually or in small groups with numerous key stakeholders upon entering the campus environment. SIOs can use the leadership transition phase, especially if there is an interim president or provost in place, to ensure that any number of campus stakeholders can speak to the internationalization imperative. A unified voice indicating the campus-wide commitment to internationalization will certainly send a clear message to new leaders about internationalization as an institutional priority.

Leadership from the Top

Leadership from the top, including the president, provost or chief academic officer, and other senior executives, is critical to the success of internationalization. These individuals set the direction of the institution, and their ability to articulate a vision for internationalization throughout the campus community can indeed propel efforts substantially. As Hill and Green (2008) state, "institutions that succeed in

internationalization have leaders who frame the agenda in positive ways and provide compelling reasons for undertaking internationalization. These leaders recognize that key constituents must see a real need for action before they willingly participate” (ix). In other words, campus stakeholders will follow the direction of senior leaders and are more inclined to willingly engage in internationalization efforts when there is clear commitment from the top to doing so.

Several project institutions had senior leaders who clearly understood the case for internationalization. This allowed the senior international officer the opportunity to actively seek out ways to deepen the institutional commitment to internationalization with full support of leadership while working proactively with senior leaders to ensure that a shared agenda was being communicated to all campus constituents directly from the top. The ability of all senior leaders, but particularly the president and chief academic officer, to articulate a vision around internationalization with clarity of perspective can greatly enhance internationalization efforts.

While it is important to make senior leaders aware of resource needs to support internationalization, it is important not to overwhelm new leaders with resource requests up front. They should have time to gain an understanding of the broad institutional needs as they begin their tenure, while having opportunities to contextualize the internationalization agenda. This is a delicate balance, which requires significant understanding of the broad institutional needs and how internationalization supports the broader agenda of the institution.

Understanding Competing Demands on Senior Leaders

The demands on senior leaders at any institution are great, but are possibly even more so at HBCUs, given the resource-constrained environment, unique institutional culture, and national attention placed on their current significance within higher education (Brown 2013; Hayes 2014). Given these challenges, HBCU senior leaders must use their political acumen, vision, and entrepreneurship to honor the past while embracing the present needs of students and the future direction of U.S. higher education. To address these challenges, senior leaders at HBCUs are often managing a significant number of competing priorities, all of which have merit. SIOs are well advised to be mindful of the fact that, while senior leaders may view internationalization as a priority for the institution, it is not the sole priority.

A critical suggestion for SIOs is to explore ways they can keep internationalization as an institutional priority without placing an overwhelming demand on senior leaders. Requests to double the staffing of an international office while the institution is facing a significant budget deficit, for example, are likely to be left unmet. However, SIOs can take into account some of the larger institutional needs and find ways that they can make appropriate requests to continue a strategic approach for internationalizing

the campus. For example, Pinder (2012) highlights the fact that it is critical for senior administrators to engage in regular dialogue with SIOs about internationalization strategies for the institution. SIOs can establish priorities for meetings with the president or provost to ensure that the larger internationalization plan for the institution remains consistent with the institutional strategic plan, and that they are guiding the institution toward its desired outcomes effectively. If leaders cannot commit to a regular meeting schedule, they may find an executive summary of the status of internationalization a useful way to stay abreast of institutional progress. Ultimately, understanding how internationalization fits within the larger perspective of institutional needs is important, both in assisting senior leaders as they manage competing priorities and in aligning internationalization goals and outcomes with the institutional context.

Finding 3: Clear policies and consistent practices to support internationalization can make an important difference in the success of such efforts.

Policies and practices that support internationalization are critical to its success. It is important that institutions think through the many processes that are associated with internationalization efforts, which range from those focused on students (e.g., financial aid, student mobility, and course credits) and faculty (e.g., tenure and promotion, faculty mobility, curriculum development, and research partnerships) to those at the institutional level (e.g., housing international students, recruitment of international students, and international partnerships). Most of the Creating Global Citizens project institutions had written policies regarding various aspects of internationalization. However, there were two particular areas related to policies that were found to be significant within this project: undocumented practices used as a strategy to support internationalization, and institutional policies that have implications for internationalization.

Undocumented Practices

Several institutions cited practices that lent themselves well to advancing internationalization efforts. These practices, though, were not documented in a way that would allow them to remain constant. For example, two institutions had no written policies on housing international students over holiday breaks or for early check-in for the fall semester. In each case there was a pre-established rapport between the

Sample Questions to Assess Policies and Practices in Internationalization

To what extent are policies and practices aligned with internationalization goals?

What policies and/or practices impede internationalization efforts at this institution?

How do policies and practices support or impede faculty engagement with internationalization?

To what extent do policies encourage students to take courses with international content? To study abroad?

How effective are the administrative policies and procedures pertaining to internationalization?

(Adapted from Hill and Green 2008)

international officer and the director of housing that allowed for arrangements to be made when necessary to house students. While this practice worked seamlessly in both instances, according to the institutional representatives, the lack of a written policy on this can pose a major challenge; if there is a staffing change in either partnering office, a new staff member could unknowingly jeopardize the smooth-flowing yet undocumented process. A recommendation, in such situations, is to document the practice in a memorandum to ensure that the agreement exists between the offices, not the individual leaders of the office.

Institutional Policies

Another challenge noted by some institutions that seemed to inhibit internationalization efforts involved institution-wide policies. Items such as reimbursement policies for faculty who travel abroad to support student study abroad trips or enhance international research partnerships, the inclusion of internationally related activities in the tenure and promotion process, the use of student financial aid to support study abroad opportunities, whether students received academic credit for courses that included a study abroad component, and even housing visiting international scholars came up at most project institutions. Several of the project institutions noted the need for a general increase in awareness of the policies that already existed and of which offices to consult for what issues.

It is important for institutions to assess policies and practices on a regular basis to minimize inefficiencies within structures and to ensure that the policies themselves are not creating significant impediments to internationalization efforts. During the Creating Global Citizens project, this was done formally through the internationalization review process, but many of the project institutions' team leaders could readily discuss at the onset of the project those policies or practices that had proven a challenge to or had successfully enhanced internationalization efforts.

In addition, while it is important to assess policies and practices, it is also critical to ensure that campus stakeholders have access to necessary policies related to international efforts. A strategy employed by some of the project institutions is to have policies related to internationalization accessible online for students, faculty, and staff. Savannah State University, for example, has posted online a procedure manual for establishing study abroad programs. The manual is designed "to provide Savannah State faculty with information and procedures that apply to the establishment and maintenance of a Study Abroad program" (Savannah State University International Education Center 2013). North Carolina A&T's Office of International Programs also places its policies and numerous institutional forms online under the stated purpose of ensuring "that study abroad and other international activities/programs using the name of North Carolina A&T State University (NCA&T) and

involving its students and/or faculty are properly identified and registered with the Office of International Programs” (North Carolina A&T State University 2013). Lincoln University’s Dr. Jabulani Beza International Student Center, which focuses on international students and scholars, also provides process, policies, and documents online to support this population. An important observation at these institutions is that they do not simply post policies and practice guides online; they also ensure that there is communication across the campus about the information available and where to access it.

Finding 4: Institutional constituents need a shared understanding of the importance of internationalization and what internationalization entails.

At almost every project institution, and as was affirmed by several representatives from other HBCUs who attended the Institute on Internationalization at HBCUs in August 2013, there was a notable need for raised consciousness on the internationalization imperative and what it really means for virtually all constituent groups. The project team noted this through two significant sub-themes: (1) lack of a shared rationale was related to slow progress toward internationalization goals and (2) misunderstandings of what internationalization means were related to concerns about whether internationalizing might negatively impact the unique institutional culture at HBCUs.

The Internationalization Rationale

A strong, compelling rationale can assist in designating resources for, garnering support for, and gaining interest in internationalization efforts. While most of the institutional team leaders for Creating Global Citizens could clearly articulate a rationale for internationalization efforts, it seemed that their institutions lacked a campus-wide, shared rationale. This then led to a sense of indifference toward internationalization and how it related to the various aspects of the campus. For example, at some institutions, faculty indicated that they did not see how internationalization related to their particular area. While in general the lack of a campus-wide shared rationale for internationalization is not unique to HBCUs, it is important to consider this in light of the previously mentioned challenge of clarifying the role of HBCUs in twenty-first-century education. Allen and Jewell (2002) point out that today’s HBCUs must determine the critical aspects of a twenty-first-century curriculum and how they can educate students in accordance with these curricular needs. There is little question that internationalization and preparing students to be effective citizens in our global society are critical aspects of the curriculum in higher education. However, HBCUs have to balance this awareness with the need to maintain their rich culture and heritage. Doing this requires a significant amount of consen-

sus building across the institution and a full commitment to a fundamental, historic aspect of many HBCUs' efforts to prepare students to be effective, contributing citizens to society.

What Internationalization Means for HBCUs

Knight (1994) defined internationalization as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.” While this definition seemed to underscore many of the discussions with team leaders at the project institutions, it did not seem to be understood among many other campus constituents. At some of the project institutions, for example, discussions of internationalization caused significant angst. It seemed that the essence of what makes an institution an HBCU—the “heart and soul of HBCUs” (Allen and Jewell 2002)—was called into question as the number of international students and

faculty increased. At one institution, faculty expressed concerns that the international faculty seemed to be “taking over” the institution, while at another campus students asked whether internationalizing would impact the institutional status as an HBCU. In creating a shared understanding of internationalization and what it entails, it is critical for institutional leaders and those charged with internationalizing the institution to ensure that campus constituents understand what internationalization actually means, how it enriches the educational experience, and the impact it might have on the institutional culture. Campus constituents will likely react with concern or even fear if they do not understand this, and this reaction can easily challenge or even halt efforts to advance an internationalization agenda. Understanding the concerns of campus

constituents as an institution begins to internationalize can be done through several mechanisms, including town hall meetings, surveys, and in-class discussions. It is important, however, to gain this understanding and to be able to address any misgivings about internationalization in an honest manner so that there is a greater sense of buy-in. Tuskegee University, for example, has worked to inform students, faculty, and staff of its historic global connections, and that this aspect of the institution's heritage is being amplified and honored through current internationalization efforts. Highlighting such aspects can help naysayers develop a greater understanding of and appreciation for the positive outcomes that internationalization may bring to the institution.

What's in an Internationalization Plan?

An internationalization plan will typically include:

- A vision and/or mission statement
- Goals and supporting objectives
- Strategies to achieve each stated objective
- Indication of the person or group responsible for each objective
- A timeline to achieve the objective
- Success indicators for each objective

(Green and Olson 2003)

Finding 5: Institutions need a strategic approach to internationalization or efforts may be hindered.

At each of the project institutions, the desire to internationalize was present at the onset of this initiative. What many of the institutions lacked, however, was a clear plan to garner the campus-wide buy-in necessary to strategically approach internationalization efforts. Developing an internationalization plan requires a significant time investment (see Finding 1) and also a dedicated group of campus constituents who can work collectively to create a cohesive plan. As Green and Olson (2003) note, a campus culture of planning and assessment is a significant factor in developing an internationalization plan as well. The project institutions differed in this aspect. One campus team noted that they believed many at the institution suffered from planning fatigue, as they had been so heavily involved in developing the institutional strategic plan. Another institution noted that while there was not necessarily a culture of planning and assessment at the institution, many were excited about working collaboratively to create an international plan. There were three elements that seemed to support the creation of a strategic approach to internationalization: (1) alignment with the institutional strategic plan; (2) data obtained through the review process; and (3) the collective planning process, which garnered support for the final plan.

Alignment with the Institutional Strategic Plan

The institutional strategic plan is the foundational document that articulates the direction of the institution and indicates the institutional priorities. It is a way to assess where resources will be allocated and the collective goals that faculty, staff, and administrators are working toward. Given the importance of the institutional strategic plan in guiding the general organizational focus, it is important that an internationalization plan aligns with its language and goals to signify its clear relationship to the larger direction of the institution. Institutional team leaders were encouraged to examine the institution's strategic plan to determine how internationalization fit into the larger direction of the university. The ability to make a connection between internationalization and the broad institutional strategic plan can help in framing the vision and mission for the internationalization plan while supporting the rationale to engage the entire campus in the internationalization process. Institutions were encouraged to look for language that related well with internationalization within their strategic plan and to explore how this language could provide support for advancing internationalization efforts.

Examples of Internationalization Connections Within Institutional Plans

North Carolina A&T State University

"Goal 5: Foster a more diverse and inclusive campus community by promoting cultural awareness and collegiality, and by cultivating respect for diverse people and cultures."

Source: A&T Preeminence 2020: Embracing Our Past, Creating Our Future, <http://www.ncat.edu/about/forms-pdf/strategicplan-preeminence2020.pdf>.

Dillard University

"Goal IV: Dillard University will infuse globalization into its curriculum to expand its reach to other cultures and countries."

"Goal VII: Dillard University will continue to attract, retain and graduate talented African-American students, while welcoming those from diverse backgrounds who can also benefit from the unique experience we offer."

Source: Strategic Pillars: Dillard University's Strategic Plan, http://www.dillard.edu/images/presidentsoffice/dillard_pillars_tm_110708_final.pdf.

Virginia State University

"Establish a Center for International Education to oversee Study Abroad and other programs."

Source: 20/20 Vision Plan, <http://www.vsu.edu/files/docs/instit-planning-effectiveness%20/2020VisionPlan.pdf>.

Data-Informed Planning

A critical step for developing an internationalization plan is to collect data. The internationalization review process allowed teams to understand what was already in place at the institution that might support internationalization goals, gauge the campus environment for internationalization, and garner the perspectives of campus constituents on internationalization. Each campus used different approaches to gather data, including focus groups, interviews, and surveys. These methods yielded significant evidence to inform the internationalization team in formulating a campus strategy for internationalization. It also supported their recommendations on where institutional resources might best be used to advance internationalization efforts.

Collective Planning Process

The internationalization planning process should include a number of participants. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators committed to advancing internationalization efforts served on the internationalization teams at each institution. Individuals who might be able to contribute expertise to the review process were also involved. For example, Dillard University's team included the director of assessment, who was instrumental in supporting the development of surveys to assess student and staff attitudes toward internationalization. However, the creation of an internationaliza-

tion plan that will have significant buy-in requires engaging a large swath of the campus community in the development process. This extends beyond the core team, and requires engagement with several key players, such as faculty who may wish to incorporate global learning into their courses, deans who may want to see increased global engagement by faculty within their respective colleges, and student affairs administrators who may support international students. These individuals might be engaged through meetings to discuss the preliminary findings of an internationalization review, for example. The ultimate goal is to use a collaborative process that will promote a shared understanding of, and agreement with, the final internationalization plan.

Finding 6: Comprehensive internationalization happens in phases, not all at once.

Comprehensive internationalization should be viewed as a transformative process that requires a significant time investment. Olson, Green, and Hill (2005) state that:

Comprehensive internationalization requires a process of continually broadening and deepening the international and global dimensions of an institution and each of its constituent units. It demands multiple interrelated changes—one program or policy change produces a cascading series of subsequent changes. . . . It is a long-term undertaking, involving many people, usually requiring five to 10 years to become embedded in the fabric of the institution, and even longer to work its way into every department, program, and campus office.

A significant finding of this project was that it is critical for team leaders and senior leaders to understand that internationalization, especially comprehensive internationalization, does not happen quickly. Institutions in the project were encouraged to set a long-term vision for internationalization through the internationalization plan, but to also focus on short-term goals and actions in the interim. This kept the ultimate goal from seeming overwhelming, while allowing the institutions to see a clear path forward in manageable portions for immediate action.

Many team leaders in this project indicated that there seemed to be a significant amount of work ahead of them. However, we encouraged these leaders to start with short-range, achievable targets in developing their plan toward comprehensive internationalization. For example, one institution sought to meet its president's goal of ensuring every student has a global experience while at the institution. The long-range goal was to incorporate global courses in the general education curriculum, which required significant consensus building and action at multiple levels by faculty, deans, the provost, and even the president. We encouraged the team to hold this long-range goal, but to also look at achievable objectives that would support

this goal in terms of what could be done within the immediate future (six months), the short term (one year), and the long term (more than two years). For example, they could look at the ways in which students were already being exposed to international or global learning at the institution and then determine how to reach those students who were not getting such exposure. They approached this through both curricular and co-curricular means, hosting student programs with an international focus and providing professional development sessions for faculty on internationalizing the curriculum. Ultimately, the goal is to move toward internationalization in a strategic manner that will not overwhelm the institution but rather slowly garner increasing support for the goals of the internationalization plan.

CONCLUSION

ACE launched the Creating Global Citizens initiative to explore the ways in which HBCUs internationalize their campuses. The related goals included identifying factors that impede or enhance the internationalization process, and strategies used by the selected HBCUs to internationalize. This publication focused on the major findings from the project and provided examples of strategies employed by the project institutions to advance internationalization efforts. The findings were presented in a narrative format with the goal of promoting increased dialogue within the HBCU and larger higher education community about internationalization. While many of the findings are not limited to HBCUs, there are unique aspects of the environment, culture, and structure of many HBCUs that brought a distinctive perspective to the findings. We hope that this resource provides useful strategies for other institutions and supports the deepening of discussions at HBCUs on internationalization.

REFERENCES

- American Council on Education. 2011. *Strength Through Global Leadership and Engagement: U.S. Higher Education in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- American Council on Education. 2013. "CIGE Model on Comprehensive Internationalization." <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>.
- Allen, Walter Recharde, and Joseph O. Jewell. 2002. "A Backward Glance Forward: Past, Present, and Future Perspectives on Historically Black Colleges and Universities." *The Review of Higher Education* 25 (3): 241–261.
- Baker, C. Daniel. 2012. "Entrepreneurial Studies Increasing at HBCUs." *Black Enterprise*. <http://www.blackenterprise.com/small-business/entrepreneurial-studies-increase-hbcu>.
- Bensimon, Estela Mara, Donald Polkinghorne, Georgia Bauman, and Edlyn Vallejo. 2004. "Doing Research That Makes a Difference." *The Journal of Higher Education* 75 (1): 104–126.
- Brown, M. Christopher, II. 2013. "Mission Metamorphosis: Organizational Life Cycles and the Future of Historically Black Colleges and Universities." *Experts Speak*. Southern Education Foundation. <http://www.southerneducation.org/News-and-Events/Experts-Speak/Op-Eds/Mission-Metamorphosis-Organizational-Life-Cycles-a.aspx>.
- Ezzell, Jack L., and Alvin J. Schexnider. 2010. "Leadership, Governance, and Sustainability of Black Colleges and Universities." *Trusteeship Magazine* 18 (3). <http://agb.org/trusteeship/2010/mayjune/leadership-governance-and-sustainability-black-colleges-and-universities>.
- Freeman, Kassie, and Gail E. Thomas. 2002. "Black Colleges and College Choice: Characteristics of Students Who Choose HBCUs." *The Review of Higher Education* 25 (3): 349–358.
- Gasman, Marybeth. 2013. *The Changing Face of Historically Black Colleges and Universities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.
- Green, Madeleine F., and Christa Olson. 2003. *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hall, Brenda, and Rosemary B. Closson. 2005. "When the Majority is the Minority: White Graduate Student Social Adjustment at an HBCU." *Journal of College Student Development* 46 (1): 28–41.

- Hayes, Dianne. 2014. "HBCU Presidents at a New Crossroads." *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*. <http://diverseeducation.com/article/57130>.
- Hill, Barbara, and Madeleine Green. 2008. *A Guide to Internationalization for Chief Academic Officers*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Jennings, Robert. 2013. "Sustaining the Future of HBCUs." *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, January 6. <http://diverseeducation.com/article/50503>.
- Knight, Jane. 1994. *Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Mertens, Donna M. 2005. *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 2013. "Historically Black Colleges and Universities." *Fast Facts*. <http://nces.ed.gov/FastFacts/display.asp?id=667>.
- North Carolina A&T State University. 2013. "Policy on International Activities." <http://ncat.abroadoffice.net/policy.html>.
- North Carolina A&T State University. 2013. "Policy on International Activities at North Carolina A&T State University." <http://www.ncat.edu/academics/oip/Policy%20.html>.
- Oguntoyinbo, Lekan. 2013. "HBCUs Produce Leaders Not Only Domestically, But Also Abroad." *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*. <http://diverseeducation.com/article/51530>.
- Olson, Christa L., Madeleine F. Green, and Barbara A. Hill. 2005. *Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Olson, Christa L., Madeleine F. Green, and Barbara A. Hill. 2006. *A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Peterson, R. Darrell, and Florence A. Hamrick. 2009. "White, Male, and 'Minority': Racial Consciousness Among White Male Undergraduates Attending a Historically Black University." *The Journal of Higher Education* 80 (1): 34-58.
- Pinder, Anthony Louis. 2012. "Internationalizing the Black College: An Investigation of the Stage of Readiness of Private Black Colleges as it Relates to Select Benchmarks for Comprehensive Internationalization." Doctoral dissertation. Atlanta: Clark Atlanta University.

- Savannah State University International Education Center. 2013. *Establishing and Maintaining a Study Abroad Program: A Procedure Manual*. Savannah, GA: Savannah State University. http://www.savannahstate.edu/academic-affairs/docs/IEC_Procedure_Manual.pdf.
- Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities. 2014. "What Is an HBCU?" <http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities>.
- Yin, Robert K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX: INSTITUTIONAL TEAM LEADERS

Institutional team leaders served as the primary liaisons between ACE and their campuses during the period of January 2011 through July 2013. They are listed with their titles during this phase.

DILLARD UNIVERSITY

Kimya Dawson-Smith

Director, Office of International Students and Study Abroad Programs

Dorothy Smith

Dean of the College of General Studies and Director of the General Education Program

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Narendra Rustagi

Professor and Director of the Global Business Center

Jeanne Maddox Toungara

Assistant Provost for International Programs

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY

Mary Beza

Director of International Student Affairs

Gabrielle Malfatti-Rachell

Department Head of English, Foreign Languages, and Journalism and Director of Study Abroad

NORTH CAROLINA A&T STATE UNIVERSITY

Wanda Lester

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Division of Academic Affairs

Minnie Battle Mayes

Director, International Programs

SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Terri Clay

Assistant Professor, Homeland Security Program

Emmanuel Naniuzeyi

Associate Professor, Political Science, and Director, International Education Center

TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

Eloise Carter

Director, Office of International Programs

Thierno Thiam

Assistant Professor of Political Science and Special Assistant to the President for Global Initiatives

VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Maxine Sample

Professor of English and Director of International Education

Adeyemi Adekoya

Professor of Management Information Systems

