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This study is a follow-up to a study completed by Dr. Thomas Barker in 1994 entitled The Status of the Implementation of International Education in Texas Four-year Colleges and Universities: A Comprehensive Study. A survey of 35 Texas universities and 6 out-of-state benchmark universities revealed information regarding the international programs at these universities in four areas. The four areas surveyed include: (a) administrative, (b) instructional, (c) international student support services, and (d) outreach. A summary of the survey results includes 34 tables detailing the university responses for the 2004 survey compared with the responses obtained from the original, Barker (1994). The results from the 2004 participating benchmark institutions were also reviewed. Texas universities continue to work toward the internationalization of the curriculum with increased numbers supporting an international focus in their mission statements and staffing patterns.

Benchmark institutions continue to lead Texas institutions in a majority of areas surveyed. Funding for international education continues to be an issue for both the benchmark and Texas institutions. Changes in attitudes and immigration policies continue to affect the implementation of international programs on the university level. While universities continue to provide support to community and businesses in the area of international education, the extent of this support has decreased in the ten years since the Barker (1994) survey.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Advances in technology, travel, and commerce continue to shrink our world and constantly remind us that the United States is but a small member of a large and intricately constructed global society. The realization that international awareness is essential to successful peaceful coexistence on this shrinking planet is paired with a growing understanding that our nation’s institutions of higher learning are uniquely situated to provide a major conduit for international education for citizens of this country as well as for citizens of the world.

The trend towards worldwide interdependence emerged during World War II. As the war drew to a close, the United States leaders began to see themselves as leaders of the free world and sounded the call for internationalization of the curriculum. In discussions concerning the nation’s role as a leader, the responsibility for helping move citizens towards a greater awareness of global affairs was placed on the doorstep of our nation’s institutions of higher learning (McGrath, 1951; deBury, 1964; Good, 1977; Smuckler & Summers, 1988; Holzner, 1988; Cooper, 1988; Jaschik, 1989, Jenkins, 2002). The picture of the American university curriculum painted by John Di Biaggio (1988) remains accurate in the new millennium:

Global interdependence is easy to demonstrate; picture the not atypical American with a German car, a Japanese camera, a shirt made in Hong Kong, Italian shoes, a television set assembled in Taiwan, drinking Colombian coffee, driving on Middle East oil-the inventory could go on and on. But the American university remains heavily parochial in teaching the social sciences within the
predominantly American context (p. 4).

In 1990, the rhetoric calling for the internationalization of education in the United States gained urgency. An editorial published in the Educational Record by Robert H. Atwell (1990) summarized the call by the American Council on Education (ACE) for the need for international education in the form of foreign language proficiency.

The world changed dramatically in 1989. Our notions of the superpower relationship, the Cold War, the fixed structure of Eastern Europe -- notions that formed Americans' actions and attitudes for over 40 years -- were no longer valid. ACE’s Commission on International Education recommended that by the year 2000 all baccalaureate graduates be required to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, a goal endorsed by the ACE Board of Directors.

Internationalizing the curriculum must become a priority for higher education leaders at all types of institutions. Our future depends on it (p. 6).

Most universities have, to a greater or lesser extent, recognized the need for the internationalization of the curriculum. Many university students in the United States have had some opportunity to learn about culture(s) other than their own either through the media or as a direct result of their higher-level studies. However, the coordination and prioritization of international programs available at the university level continue to be haphazard at best.

In 1958, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 calling for the establishment of university centers designed to teach foreign languages (Section 601). On October 29, 1966, President Lyndon Johnson signed the International Education Act (IEA) at Chilalongkorn University in Bangkok, Thailand. “What is most
revolutionary about this epoch-making International Education Act is the hoped for impact upon undergraduate education, which amounts to nothing less than including a world perspective with every college diploma” (Abrams & Arnold, 1967, p. 1). Section 2 of the International Act states:

The congress finds and declares that knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples and cultures; and that therefore it is both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing future programs of the Federal Government in international education, and to meet the requirements of world leadership (p. 1066).

Yet, there was no funding provided to carry out the international education mandate. In an article for International Studies Notes, Ann Imlah Schneider (1993) summarized the history of legislation and funding of legislation pertaining to international education at the undergraduate level:

The International Education Act of 1966 included undergraduate programs with generous authorizations; the appropriations for which never materialized, in part,
ironically, because of the Vietnam War. In 1972, with the unfunded IEA as background and under the broad umbrella of NDEA’s Title VI, the U.S. Office of Education initiated the Undergraduate International Studies Program to provide two-year seed money for institutions hitherto untouched by the NDEA programs. This program continues today, now under the Higher Education Act, and has so far involved nearly 500 programs at community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities (p. 21).

In 1989, the State Legislature of Texas enacted two pieces of legislation aimed at increasing the emphasis on international education at all institutions of public education in Texas. The two concurrent resolutions, H.C.R. 194 and H.C.R. 236, called for the development of programs of study for both languages and international education and guidelines and position statements concerning international education in the state of Texas.

A review of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Criteria for Accreditation (1998) revealed a singular general reference to international education in accredited institutions. This reference states that effective institutions “prepare students to function in an increasingly diverse, complex and global society...” (p.21).

The Problem

The problem of this study was to update a study completed in 1994 that was designed to “determine the extent to which international education has been implemented in Texas four-year colleges and universities” (Barker, 1994, p. 9). The current study sought to describe the current status of international education in Texas four-year colleges and universities in 2004.
Purposes of the Study

This study was intended to duplicate the study completed by Barker (1994). Thus its purposes were identical except this study focused on developments since 1994 and the current status of international education in Texas four-year colleges and universities in 2004. Barker’s original study examined the historical issues and legislation surrounding the development of international education in the United States with a concentration on post World War II activity. Barker’s study also reviewed the implementation of international education in colleges and universities in Texas by means of a survey. Barker then compared the implementation of international education in Texas schools with a set of selected benchmark institutions located in the United States. The purposes of this study will mirror those listed by Barker in his original research:

1. Determine the components of international education policies and programs as described in the literature.

2. Determine the emphasis given to international education by the government and other agencies.

3. Examine briefly the history of the development of international education concentrating on the post-WWII period and to determine the components that have developed.

4. Describe these components as implemented in Texas four-year institutions of higher education in the areas of administration, instructional activities, international exchange activities, support services, and outreach activities.

5. Compare the components of international education as implemented in Texas
four-year institutions to the implementation of the components in the selected benchmark institutions (pp. 9-10).

Research Questions

The research questions for this study parallel those utilized in the study conducted by Barker in 1994. Unlike the Barker study, the focus of this study was on developments since 1994 and the current status of international education in Texas four-year colleges and universities in 2004. The following research questions were addressed and are taken from page 10 of Barker’s study:

1. Based on the literature review, (a) what emphasis has been given to international education by governments and other agencies (e.g., accrediting agencies and private foundations), and (b) what are the components of international education described in relevant examples or models?

2. What elements of international education have been implemented in Texas four-year institutions of higher education in the area of administration, instructional activities, international student support, and outreach activities?

3. How does the current status of implementation of the components of international education by Texas four-year institutions compare to the implementation of components by selected benchmark institutions?

4. How does the current status of implementation of the components of international education by Texas four-year institutions in 2004 compare to the implementations reported in the 1994 Barker survey?
Significance of the Study

Dr. Tom Barker (1994) called for a continuation of his study on the implementation of international education in Texas four-year colleges and universities. He stated: “The baseline data developed in this study can be used for a longitudinal study 3 to 5 years hence to determine what progress Texas institutions have made in implementing international education” (p. 167). It is believed the current study will provide updated information on the status of international education in the state of Texas to members of the Texas state government, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and to the leadership of four-year institutions of higher education in the state of Texas as well as to other parties who had an interest in the original study. Because the study will be designed to extend Barker’s (1994) original work, it will also mirror his desire to further provide:

a) insight into the present status of international education and practices in Texas higher education institutions, b) current in-depth data for state-level officials, (c) data for use by state legislative policy makers, and (d) information for use by administrators in higher education to establish or modify their international programs (p. 12).

In 1938, United States Senator William J, Fulbright began working on financial support for international education at the university level. The year 1996 marked the 50th anniversary of the Fulbright scholarship program in the United States. Although it had been 58 years since U.S. Senator J. William Fulbright first dreamed of greater international understanding, his basic vision continued to be timely. His strong voice and support for international education continues to articulate the need for studies such as
the one detailed in this paper. A Web page summary containing information on the
Fulbright programs noted the following:

    The preservation of our free society in the years and decades to come will
depend ultimately on whether we succeed or fail in directing the enormous power
of human knowledge to the enrichment of our own lives and to the shaping of a
rational and civilized world order (p. 8).

    The Fulbright program consistently set the pace and called for support and
participation in programs for international education. In 1996, President Bill Clinton,
commenting on the Fulbright program's 50th anniversary, stated:

    When Senator Fulbright proposed his exchange program, the world was divided
and shattered by global war. We now live in a world linked economically and by
information technology undreamed of then. Yet Senator Fulbright's recognition of
the urgent need for the world's people to know each other and each other's
cultures is as relevant today as it was then. His legacy, the Fulbright Program,
remains a vibrant response to the diverse challenges of our changing world
(p. 1).

    In light of political instability in the world as a result of the September 11, 2001
tragedy, it was my belief that international education should be the main foundation for
all university programs regardless of the field of study a student chose to pursue. If
study and knowledge were not framed in a global context, then both would be
incomplete ultimately resulting in an incomplete and therefore inadequate education.
The United States, and more specifically the state of Texas, must move forward in the
21st century with an understanding that things currently referred to as foreign, i.e.,
countries, languages, and cultures, would not remain *foreign* much longer. In his address before the Subcommittee on International Relations, House of Representatives, 95th Congress, 2nd session, Representative Paul Simon (1990) defined the practical need for the internationalization of our nation’s thinking by noting: “When Chevrolet comes out with a car named Nova and it doesn’t sell in Latin America because Nova means ‘doesn’t go’ in Spanish, you know it is a simple, obvious lack of knowledge” (p. 3).

In spring 2002, the ACE conducted a survey to determine if Americans’ public opinion on international education had changed since September 11. The study concluded that the public’s support of international education remained strong and in some cases the support especially for foreign language requirements had increased in intensity (Siaya, Porcelli & Green, 2002).

**Definition of Terms**

In an attempt to enhance continuity with the previous study, the definitions as developed by Barker (1994) will be applied in this study as well.

*Administration of international education*. The activities and programs of an institution designed to internationalize the campus.

*Instructional activities of international education*. The activities and programs of an instructional nature designed to internationalize the campus.

*International education*. All activities and programs with an international perspective that affect campus administrators, faculty, U.S. students and foreign students on campus, and the local community and businesses, including the institution’s relations with out-of-country governments, agencies, institutions, and students.
International student support services. All activities and programs designed to aid and assist foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities.

International studies. International relations studies, foreign languages and cultures, comparative and international approaches to individual disciplines, and global studies examining issues affecting more than one nation.

Outreach. The activities and programs designed with an international content for local communities and businesses and out-of-country relations.

Study abroad. Any experience outside the United States for which U.S. college or university students can earn academic credit (p. 13).

Delimitation

As in Barker (1994), the population of this study was limited to the presidents or designees of Texas four-year institutions of higher education and selected out-of-state benchmark institutions.

Assumptions

The following assumption was made for the purposes of the Barker (1994) study and remained in place for this follow-up study as well: “the respondents will use their institutional knowledge of the experience with international education by accurately and honestly completing the questionnaire” (p. 14).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature summarizes the historical background, including the law and published articles, on international education covered by Barker in 1994. In addition, literature concerning international education published since 1994 has been reviewed in detail.

Early History

In the introduction to a volume of writings on the history of comparative and international education, Fraser and Brickman (1968) traced the beginnings of international education. They noted that international education was “as old as the custom of visiting of countries other than one’s own. This practice -- whether for purposes of commerce, religious conversion, war or even curiosity -- goes back to the early periods of human history” (p. 2). Travel and interest in the cultures of foreign countries continued to grow in educational circles. By the early 19th century, a new term, “internationalism,” began to gain meaning. By the end of the 19th century, “No self-respecting scholar, university president, or educational administrator from any European nation, the United States or British Empire could resist the urge to travel and make his own comparative analysis” (Fraser & Brickman, 1968, p.18).

Even as the first colleges were being founded in colonial America, the influence of a global perspective in American education was present. The puritans had a strong sense of the need for education and saw education as the foundation for their global religious influence. “Unable to set the world straight as Englishmen in England, the
Puritan settlers of Massachusetts intended to set it straight as Englishmen in the New World” (Rudolph, 1968, p. 5).

As America grew so did its colleges. When the American Revolution began there were nine colleges operating in the United States. As the Civil War began the number of established colleges had grown to 250. From the very beginning and even as colleges continued to be founded there was criticism of the relative value of a college education. A college education was often too expensive for the middle and lower classes and the lure of the adventure and fortune available on the western frontier drew many Americans away from established educational programs (Rudolph, 1962).

In an article entitled “The Changing Need for an International Perspective,” Groennings (1987) noted that almost a hundred years earlier Senator Justin Morrill of Vermont, author of the Morrill Act that created the unique American system of land grant colleges and universities, recognized the international relevance of the new public universities. Morrill, in support of the act, stated that in order to compete with the “skill and wealth of many nations” (p.64), America needed to have a basic secondary education system that offered students an international curriculum based on “the widest and best experiences of mankind” (p. 64). Morrill’s basic understanding that education must contain a global point of view continued to be relevant to students and their universities.

While interest in international education, international organizations, and international study had begun to grow prior to World War II, the war marked a significant turning point in America’s global perspective. Although World War II required many college educational programs to be placed on hold, the war itself created a new interest
in foreign culture and education. As described by Rudolph (1962), servicemen returning from World War II found their interest in foreign culture and language acquisition piqued. The war opened up a new world and created increased awareness in American’s of foreign cultures.

A Historical Look at Legislation and Implementation of International Education in the United States Post World War II

The Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944 encouraged returning servicemen to attend college and further their new interests in foreign language and foreign affairs (Barker, 1994). At the same time, congress began creating programs to assist countries recover from the war and also began providing a variety of services and monetary assistance to underdeveloped countries. These programs created job opportunities and increased the need for persons who could travel from the United States to various foreign countries to administer recovery efforts.

In his review of the literature, Barker (1994) concluded that two specific acts of congress could be credited with creating international education programs. The Fulbright Act of 1946 provided for financial assistance to Americans who studied abroad and the United States Information Educational Exchange Act of 1946 initiated the process of creating programs for students to study abroad and for students from other countries to study in the United States. In addition to the two specific acts mentioned above, Section 2 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 included the following declaration:

Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this Act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United
States and other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries (p. 6).

In the early 1950s, both the Carnegie Corporation and Ford Foundation began providing funds for international studies at the undergraduate level. While the Carnegie Corporation was the first to provide funds for international studies at the undergraduate level, it was the Ford Foundation that greatly expanded earlier funding programs. One of the most significant programs of the Ford Foundation has been the sponsorship of Foreign Area Fellowships. Created in 1952, the Ford fellowships have been awarded for graduate study to students who combine their major disciplinary study with study in a foreign country. Nearly 1500 of these fellowships were granted between 1952 and 1967 (Abrams & Arnold, 1967). On November 29, 2000 the Ford Foundation announced a 21st century commitment of $330 million of assistance for 3,500 fellows over the next decade. An article obtained from Ford Foundation Website noted that the $330 million represented “...a special appropriation above the Ford Foundation’s annual level of grant making. Last year the foundation made some 2,000 grants totaling close to $700 million” (2003 ¶ 9).

In 1957, the appearance of Sputnik, the Soviet satellite, became the inspiration for radical changes in American education at all levels. This satellite was significant proof that the Soviets intended to become a greater world power. In response to Sputnik, the National Defense Education Act was created by the 85th (1958) Congress of the United States. This act, also known as the NDEA, established four programs designed to create area language centers, provide fellowships for language study, support research and study on language acquisition and instruction, and created
language institutes to train teachers. The Title VI language centers and/or programs present on many college campuses today are a result of this legislation. Despite legislation designed to encourage international education, an article published by Charles Wilson in 1964 painted a picture of “the ugly American undergraduate” (p.351). Wilson lamented:

Politely stated, this is merely academic parlance for the abysmal ignorance of the typical American undergraduate on everything outside the golden circle of his own provincialism. A nationwide test on foreign affairs administered to nearly 2,000 seniors in 175 colleges and universities by the Educational Testing Service had produced an average grade of 55…. The root of the problem is that, in college after college, it is possible for students to graduate without ever having a course that even remotely concerns world affairs (p. 351).

In 1966, during an address to congress, then President Lyndon Johnson called for new initiatives in international education and proposed new legislation to provide assistance for international studies. The International Education Act of 1966 was adopted after an amended version bill passed both houses on October 21. Because this bill was passed at the close of the 89th session, no funds were appropriated for implementation. In January 1967, President Johnson asked congress for a supplementary appropriation of $350,000 to form a Center of Educational Cooperation (CEC) to create guidelines and administer funds for the International Education Act.

Abrams and Arnold (1967) noted:

This committee would set forth the guidelines according to which grants would be made by the CEC, and it would also make recommendations concerning funding
of this program in future years. The act itself had authorized appropriations of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending in 1969, with an increasing proportion being given to undergraduate programs in the second year. The actual budget request for 1967-68, however, was only for $20,000,000 (p. 57).

At the annual meeting of the International Studies Association in Washington, D.C., Rose L. Hayden (1975) stated:

More is spent on international programs in the United States than many other countries have in their entire education budgets. Even so, it is not enough... failure to fund the International Education Act of 1966 blunted the edge of a movement many educators accepted as worthy of their deepest professional support (p. 9).

During hearings before the House Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on International Relations, Representative Paul Simon (1978) of Illinois submitted a written statement summarizing the danger caused by American’s lack of knowledge of foreign language noting that it not only reflected a lack of education but also because he perceived it as a threat to our national security. Simon’s information at the time of the statement indicated that as we entered the Vietnam War, “there was not a single American-born specialist on Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos in an American university” (p. 5).

The Post Vietnam War Perspective

In her book *Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education*, Barbara Burn (1980) noted that, “With the Vietnam War and its aftermath came a general
disenchantment with international involvement, an apathy that was abruptly ended by
the energy crisis of 1973" (p. 2). In a series of background papers and studies for the
President’s Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, Bullard
(1979) and Harf and Burn (1979) provided information on international education in the
United States. Their reviews emphasized the importance of international education at all
levels of education, lamented the ability of students to move through their entire
educational careers with no exposure to an international perspective, and called on
universities to increase the emphasis on international exposure for future educators.

In a subsequently published review, Rahman and Kopp (1992) concluded that
although many of the recommendations of the President’s Commission were never put
into place, the commission did capture the attention of education leaders. Emphasis on
international education continued to be strengthened by the Fulbright programs.
Barbara Burn (1979) found that Fulbright alumni seemed to maintain a greater interest
in world affairs, travel, and foreign visitors and appeared to be “active in the
international community of scholarship” (p. 223).

In the 1980s, numerous scholarly articles were published criticizing our lack of
national emphasis on international education. Many criticized the red tape and
governmental involvement in international education and most strongly lamented the
lack of adequate funding and focus for international programs (Starr, 1980; Bonham,
1980; Cleveland, 1980; Posvar, 1980; Smuckler, 1980 and Hufstedler, 1980). As the
nation moved through the 1980s, the globalization of our economy and the tie to
increased emphasis on international education at the university level became more
apparent. Groennings (1987) noted that “internationalization has become one of the
most powerful substantive developments in the history of American Education… essentially the surging internationalism is weakly connected to the globalization of the economy” (p.67).

As we began the 21st century, the need for international exchange and understanding continued to grow. The global perspective of business, politics and education became more apparent as technology increased our capabilities in the area of global communication. In addition, the United States became an increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-lingual society. The states of Texas and California are predicted to become the first states where the majority ethnic group will be Hispanic. In the year 2000, Latinos accounted for one in eight people in the United States. California and Texas accounted for one of every two Latinos in the United States (R. Saenz, 2004, p. 1). While our technical capabilities to communicate continued to expand, our ability to create genuine understanding between cultures seemed unable to keep pace. The organizational structure and funding for international education programs continued to lag behind a growing need for both exposure and knowledge.

Major Developments

After 1994 in Both Texas and the Nation

International turmoil, on national and geographical levels, continues to suggest that education concerning international issues is critical. Gaudiani (1998) noted that our post cold war politics changed dramatically with the destruction of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the former Soviet Union. As turmoil in the world continued to intensify, the need for international diplomacy and basic understanding of cultural differences grew.
Lambert (1998) and Mestenhauser (1998) both noted that changes on the international scene, changes in our immigration laws, and increases in international economic competitiveness have caused international education to become part of all basic education programs. International education could no longer be treated as a separate field of study. Mestenhauser (1998) continued the discussion stating that although many universities claim to be providing educations focused internationally, the quality of the programs was suspect. He noted that most of the international education programming was created by faculty from other fields such as engineering. In conclusion, Mestenhauser also noted there was little evidence that international experience on the part of university faculty members was transferred to enhanced programming for university students.

As the justification for the need for international education continued to grow, the funding for such programs dwindled. According to both Chandler (1999) and Desruisseaux (1999), primary funding for international programs has shifted from governmental to philanthropic sources. While funding for higher education as a whole was almost 10% of total state expenditures on education in the 1970s, this figure had fallen to about 7% by the mid 1990s (Chandler, 1999). With education costs growing on all fronts and government support decreasing, growing competition for international education continued.

In 2000, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board issued a plan for improving higher education in Texas. This was a long range plan designed to guide Texas higher education through 2015 and titled *Closing the Gaps: The Texas Higher Education Plan*. This 18 page plan contained no references to international education. A
Summary of Significant Legislative Actions in Support of “Closing the Gaps” was also published by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board in August 2001. With the exception of HB 1403 allowing non-citizens to qualify for resident tuition, the legislation was silent on international education.

In 2001, a report entitled Globalizing Texas Higher Education for the New Century: A Response to “Closing the Gaps” was published by the Special Committee on Globalization and Higher Education (2001) at the request of Dr. Don W. Brown, Commissioner of Higher Education. This report was designed as a complement to the Closing the Gaps plan and contained a proposal that would “help achieve the desired level of quality among our higher education programs by ensuring that these programs are indeed relevant to the global context of the 21st century” (p. 1). The authors of the report encouraged a statewide effort to develop a policy on international education. They noted “the Federal Government issued an Executive Memorandum on April 19, 2000, proposing an international policy for the United States generally” (p. 2). The committee concluded there were four areas where all those concerned with higher education in Texas could work together to achieve globalization in higher education:

1. Send students abroad for a portion of their education.
2. Diversify higher education institutions through the enrollment of international students.
3. Globalize higher education research and development activities.
4. Globalize the curriculum and faculty. (p. 3)

More specific recommendations included increasing the current $1.00 per semester student fee to $4.00 in support of international scholarships as well as “providing staff
support to collect and track benchmarking data related to the globalization of the Texas higher education system...” (p. 8). In addition, the Special Committee on Globalization and Higher Education called for the appointment of a task force to work with the Texas Education Agency to establish a “seamless” (p. 8) foreign language program. In an article written for *The Daily Texan*, Angela Marcus (2001) summarized the efforts of the Special Committee on Globalization and Higher Education with a quote obtained from the current University of Texas Vice President of Student Affairs, James Vick, “The study abroad experience is the most broadening experience a student can have” (p. 1). Vick also noted “The office of the Registrar is currently working on a system that will allow students outside the University to audit their current records and determine what classes they will need to take at the University” (p. 2). The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board approved the report from the Special Committee on Globalization and Higher Education, as noted on page J-4 of their report on current activities dated June 2002.

The need to focus on international education at the national level was articulated by William Cummings (2001). “Because international education in the U.S. has essentially languished over the last decade, American colleges and universities are not well-prepared to help their students understand the events associated with September 11” (p.2).

In the spring of 2002, the American Council on Education conducted a survey to determine if public attitudes about international education had changed since a similar survey was conducted in 2000. An article reviewing the results of the survey by Siaya, Porcelli, and Green (2002) began as follows:
During the last year, the public has been frequently reminded that September 11, 2001, was a defining moment for the United States. It was also a defining moment for U.S. higher education. September 11 raised important questions about how colleges and universities educate students for global citizenship (p. 2).

Madeline Green (2002) compiled a summary analysis of the survey revealing the following three major conclusions. First, both university student and faculty support for international education remained strong with definite support for foreign language learning. Secondly, support for international course requirements remained strong. And finally, the intensity of support had increased. In general, those who initially indicated that they “somewhat” supported international education were more inclined to “strongly” support it now. The survey also revealed security concerns regarding study abroad and foreign students on campus. Green (2002) concluded, “Institutions should consider expanding their role in educating the public about international issues” (p. 1).

In Globalizing Texas Higher Education for the New Century, A Response to “Closing the Gaps” (2001), the Special Committee on Globalization and Higher Education recommended that the Coordinating Board “…provide staff support to collect and track benchmarking data related to globalization of the Texas higher education system….“ (p. 8).

Advocacy, the Current State of Affairs, and The University Perspective on International Education

While the preceding pages provided a review of history, as well as many fundamental arguments substantiating the need for international components in undergraduate and graduate programs at American colleges and universities, they did
not provide a picture of how these programs should be defined or are currently structured.

There are numerous definitions and models of international education in place at universities in the United States. In 1994, Barker reviewed studies and/or surveys completed by Kelleher & O'Brien (1991), Rabinowitch (1988), and Oster (1988) and found that universities utilized many methods for delivering a global perspective and international education in their undergraduate curriculum. It was noted there was no consistent or standardized model for delivering international curriculum. Kelleher & O'Brien (1991) and Aigner, Nelson, & Stimpfl (1992) detailed their research in the area of internationalization of the curriculum by noting the implementation of international education required basic involvement, support, and collaboration from the following areas or individuals on a university campus: (a) administration, (b) faculty and curriculum, (c) foreign study and international exchanges, (d) foreign students, and (e) public service. These aforementioned areas established a basic outline for the internationalization of education as proposed by Arum (1987). The Arum taxonomy was the basic model adopted for use in Barker’s (1994) study and was utilized in this follow-up study.

Barker’s (1994) definition of international education, as adopted for use in this paper, was as follows:

International education: all activities and programs with an international perspective that affect campus administrators, faculty, U.S. students, and foreign students. [These activities include programs presented] on campus, [by] the local community and businesses. [International education may also include] the
institutions’ relations with country governments, agencies, institutions and students (p. 13).

As noted earlier, Arum (1987) devised a basic taxonomy of international education. Stephen Arum summarized his observations of international education programs on college and university campuses:

What one ends up with in the most general terms are humanities and social science faculty members involved primarily in international studies programs....

Foreign student advisors, study abroad advisors, and admission professionals exist mostly in student services divisions (p. 20).

Barker’s survey was organized into the following parts: a) Administration, b) Instructional Activities, which included faculty development, curriculum, foreign language study, and study abroad, c) International Support Services, and d) Model Programs. A position paper published in 2000 by the United States Department of Education supported Barker’s (1994) definition of international education and the categories as utilized in construction of his survey (p. 2). In 2002, Jenkins’ list of criteria required for a credible international education program supported Barker’s (1994) components:

Any credible effort to put into effect a strategic plan’s commitment to internationalization should address five basic components: (1) teaching cross-cultural understanding, (2) promoting foreign language fluency, (3) encouraging faculty to develop international curricula, (4) supporting efforts to bring foreign students and faculty to U.S. campuses, and (5) creating study abroad programs for Americans (p. 5).
Research on Administrative Perspectives on International Education

Bullard (1979), Backman (1984), Beltsos (1988), Goodwin & Nacht (1991), Harari (1992), Overton (1992), and Kushigian (1998) concluded the responsibility of implementation of an international curriculum at universities should be placed on university administrators. All of these researchers noted that international education was often very low on the priority lists of both top and middle management administrators with financial concerns related to university problems here at home topping the list of concerns. Praetzel (1999) concluded the first thing needing to happen was “to create a desire at the top administrative level for international understanding that is as fundamental as developing writing and computer skills” (p.144).

Administration of international education programs could be difficult due to traditional university structure and rigid curricular requirements. Faculty and association concerns often worked against an affective and congruent internationalization of the curriculum (Arum, 1987; Burn, 1991; and Praetzel, 1999). Goodwin & Nacht (1991) found, in many cases, the internationalization efforts on college campuses were created either by students themselves or by alumni organizations. In addition, it was noted that universities rarely made an effort to integrate experiences students may have had while studying abroad into curriculum provided at their home university. It was generally accepted among faculty members to not support students completing work in their major areas overseas because the time spent overseas detracted (either in credit hours
or time spent enrolled locally) from the prescribed degree programs already in place. Some faculty members and/or administrators questioned the legitimacy of credit hours and/or degrees earned overseas stating it was difficult to transfer these experiences into the local university system requirements. Karen Jenkins (2002) noted “Even when an institution’s mission statement incorporates a global perspective, there often is little connection between the statement’s noble language and the practicalities of running an international program” (p. 4).

In an article directed at university board members, Jenkins (2002) listed 12 questions designed for application in review of current international programs. The initial question on the Jenkins (2002) list challenged college governance boards by asking if there was, “general enthusiasm on your campus for an international approach to higher education” (p.5). An executive summary located on the American Council on Education’s website summarized results of their 2000 survey on international education and questioned the commitment to international education by many institutions. “…as evidenced by a low percentage of institutions that included internationalization in their mission statements…” (p. viii). The summary concluded: “Institutions should make internationalization an institutional priority - include it in their mission statement, [and] make it visible in their strategic plan…” (p. x).

In his survey of Texas four-year colleges and universities, Barker (1994) found fewer than half of the respondents had mission statements addressing international education; the numbers were similar for private and public institutions. Regarding the question concerning institution-wide written policies, less than half of the institutions made mention of international education in their policies. Thirty-seven percent of the
institutions surveyed reported the existence of an administrative office with “international” contained in the title. Half of the Texas institutions responding had an international education office. The title of the administrator directly responsible for international education varied widely; the two most popular titles being director and/or coordinator. A little over half of the institutions responded positively to the question concerning the existence of either advisory or policy committees for international education in their administrative structure. Three fourths of the Texas institutions responding reported membership in an international association. The most common sources of funding for international education at the time of the Barker study were budgeted institutional funds.

In comparing Texas institutions with the benchmark group, Barker (1994) found the benchmark institutions appeared to have a “stronger commitment and are [were] more attuned to the importance of international education” (p.107) as evidenced by a 20 point difference in the percentages of those reporting the mention of international education in their mission statements. In his conclusion of survey results, Barker stated:

It would be expected that the recent signing of the NAFTA and the latest agreement from GATT…would cause Texas institutions to put more emphasis on international education. This could cause Texas institutions to add international education in their mission statements, establish institution-wide written policies…. (p. 115).

Research on Instructional Activities

Barker (1994) designed his survey to include a broad category entitled instructional activities. Questions in the category were then broken down into four sub-
categories including inquiries on faculty development, curriculum, foreign language acquisition and study abroad. In the policy paper, *Beyond September 11: A Comprehensive National Policy on International Education* published by the American Council on Education (2002), it is noted over the last 20 to 30 years the United States had developed a “…dangerous shortfall of individuals with global competence…. The responsibility to reverse this trend rests with the nation’s educational system…. ” (p. 7). The American Council on Education (2002) defined global competency as the ability to interpret information for international security, foreign language proficiency and an ability to function effectively in other cultural environments.

*Research on Instructional Activities-Faculty Development*

Faculty development was a critical component of internationalizing instruction. Harari (1981) noted faculty members were the key to internationalization of the curriculum. Smuckler & Sommers (1988), Kelleher (1991), Pacheco & Fernandez (1992), and Carter (1992) found international study for faculty members could provide major instructional changes leading to internationalization of the curriculum. Although many faculty members surveyed supported study abroad, they also placed numerous qualifications on the process. These qualifications included the following: a) the study should not be done on university time, b) the study should not interfere with the professor’s current teaching load and/or publishing schedule, and c) the professor’s time abroad should not require other instructors to take on additional teaching loads. In addition, Carter (1992) noted faculty members who did engage in “international initiatives” (p.40) often received little reward or recognition for their efforts and continued to function as a full-time administrator for the program with “only a one-course release
time to accomplish their responsibilities” (p. 40). Goodwin & Nacht (1991) also noted faculty members may oppose any program that might dictate their activities or constrain their freedom by requiring an international experience for faculty members. Jenkins (2002) discussed the need to encourage faculty members to become involved in internationalizing the curriculum through “…tangible rewards in salary, tenure and promotions” (p. 5). Jenkins (2002) also noted providing faculty members with the opportunity to share their work in internationalization with colleagues provided incentives for further work in the area of internationalization. The American Council on Education (2002) found education institutions of higher education currently face a shortage of “teachers with global competence” (p. 12). This lack of teachers included teachers of foreign language as well as “faculty in professional disciplines, such as business, public health, law and the environment need greater international expertise” (p. 12). With this concern for the lack of qualified instructors in the international curriculum field, the ACE (2002) called for expanding: “…the international knowledge of faculty and graduate students in professional and technical fields such as business, education, the environment, law, crime and terrorism, economics, finance, health, food and hunger, conflict resolution and information technology” (p. 15). In an article written for the Institute of International Education IIE Network, Ronda S. Collins and Linda Edwards (2003), the director and assistant director respectively of the International Center at Texas A&M University, published a list of the top ten best practices for encouraging faculty international involvement. These recommendations included encouraging faculty members to coordinate study abroad trips and providing financial incentives for hosting international scholars and visitors to campuses. Collins &
Edwards (2003) suggested opportunities to visit foreign countries, special recognition in university publications, the addition of “leveling” funds to supplement travel grants, incentives for development of international courses, salaries and incentives for travel abroad, and the opportunities to share expertise with others of similar interests would all be considered best practices resulting in increasing faculty involvement in the international arena.

Barker’s (1994) survey questions addressing faculty development revealed “slightly over one third of the Texas institutions maintained a database of faculty or staff expertise in international education” (p. 77). Barker (1994) noted few institutions provided incentives or rewards for faculty work in the area of internationalization. Most respondents to the survey felt faculty participation in international activities neither enhanced or had no effect on tenure, promotion and/or merit raises.

Research on Instructional Activities-Curriculum

“Preparing all citizens to become effective workers in an increasingly diverse and multicultural workplace requires that all students K-16 learn a foreign language, experience international content throughout the curriculum and enjoy relevant internship opportunities” (ACE, 2002, p. 16).

Ann Kelleher (1991) listed eight attributes that could be used by institutions “for planning or as yardsticks to determine relative progress. Cumulatively, they (the eight), produce a balanced international education program” (p. 7). The first item on her list dealt with curriculum.

A general-education curriculum systematically covers the data, concepts, and perspectives students need to explain, analyze, and evaluate contemporary
world issues. Courses in the core curriculum enable students to develop their knowledge and skills about world cultural, economic, ecological, and political diversity as well as interdependence. Graduation requirements include facility in a second language (p.7).

Groennings (1983 & 1987), Kelleher & O’Brian (1991), and Thompson (1998) noted the internationalization of curriculum has lagged behind the need for international perspective in both study and business. However, they also conceded there was no concise definition of what an international curriculum actually was. Thompson (1998) listed “core features” of international education, including exposure to others of differing cultures as well as a balanced formal curriculum.

Mestenhauser (1998) noted international education did not seem to fit into our current curricular system of categories and units because international education covers such wide territory. Mestenhauser called for a system of defining and packaging international education to enable students to determine which parts of the international piece were needed. Mestenhauser concluded “…the field of international education is so complex that it is virtually impossible for every student to be fully educated in it” (p.16). Spaulding, Mauch and Lin (2000) agreed there seems to be a general understanding university curriculum must be internationalized; however, this process was often haphazard and disconnected. They noted, “The international interests of professional schools are often concentrated on participation by the faculty in a variety of consulting and technical assistance projects which may little impact the curriculum if at all” (p. 204). Cummings (2001) discussed the imbalance found in many international study
programs with a greater emphasis often placed on European and Latin American studies and a virtual absence of focus on the Middle East, Asia and Africa.

In their response to *Closing the Gaps* (2001), the Special Committee on Globalizing and Higher Education (Texas) defined curriculum as the “heart of the academic enterprise” (p. 5). The committee recommended the entire university curriculum should be “infused” with global perspectives with the caveat “those engaged in the business of education must be just as globally oriented as those doing business in the private sector” (p. 5).

Barker’s (1994) survey questions dealing with curriculum development revealed a majority of institutions in Texas had some type of organized international global studies offered on campus. The most common response indicated global studies were integrated and/or infused into the regular curriculum. No institution awarded certificates in international education. However, the 12 institutions responding to the question regarding degrees in international education had together awarded 276 degrees in international studies.

*Research on Instructional Activities—Curriculum: Foreign Language Study*

In 1990, Senator Paul Simon from Illinois reminded us of the practical importance of foreign language study in a growing global economy. “The importance of foreign languages to our ability to compete in the global marketplace is reflected in a simple rule of business: If you want to buy, you can buy in any language; if you want to sell you have to speak the language of your customer” (p. 7).

In any discussion of international education, the subject of gaining proficiency in a foreign language is consistently supported as not only a basic foundation requirement
for graduation but also a minimum requirement for a program of international study (Burn, 1979; Cooper, 1988; DiBiaggio, 1988; Barker, 1994; and de Bary, 1994). Robert Atwell (1990), while president of the American Council on Education, called for a strong push for foreign language instruction on the undergraduate level, with all graduates from four-year institutions displaying proficiency in a foreign language by the year 2000. In its summary of recommendations for an international education policy published in 1999, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA) recommended every college graduate be proficient in a foreign language and have a basic understanding of another world region by the year 2015. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (2000) also targeted the year 2015 as the year when its recommendations articulated in Closing the Gaps should be in place. Jenkins’ (2002) article on international education included the following statistics on foreign language in the U.S.:

On April 6, 2001, nearly six months before the terrorist attack on America, The New York Times reported a serious shortage of linguists for key U.S. government security positions. For example, the 140 college students who graduated in 2000 with degrees in Chinese overshadowed the mere nine students who majored in Arabic (p. 4). The American Council on Education (2002) listed 80 federal agencies needing employees who were proficient in foreign languages. These positions were available in various federal agencies and offices and included work in areas of national security, defense and foreign policy. After September 11 the FBI openly recruited U.S. citizens who could speak Arabic, Persian or Pashto to assist in the probe into the terrorism attack (ACE, 2002).
Jenkins (2002) also stated "In the 1999-2000 academic year, only 8.2% of course enrollments in U.S. colleges and universities were in foreign language classes" (p. 5). She observed in Europe, citizens switch from one European language to another and then to English with little effort. Workers encountered throughout Europe were bilingual “drawing on English learned in primary school [while] across the African continent, people speak their mother tongue and at least one major European language” (p. 5).

Barbara Burn (2001) found an increase in study of foreign language by students in high schools and colleges and some evidence indicating the students were enjoying these studies. Burn further noted statistics on students from the U.S. studying abroad could be misleading due to the methods for reporting those statistics. She also pondered whether increased study of language by high school students might actually result in a decrease in the number college students studying abroad because they had already completed language study requirement(s). The study of language and study abroad were often linked in curricular planning with the general understanding that experiencing language study (emersion) in the country where the language is native continued as an efficient and effective curricular strategy. In summarization of the final goals designed to create renewed emphasis on improving international education, the ACE (2002) listed increasing the number of experts with “a high level foreign language proficiency” (p. 15) as their first priority.

In their review of the ACE public opinion poll dealing with public attitudes on international education after the September 11 tragedy, Siaya, Porcelli and Green
revealed post public support for international education remained unchanged; however, the intensity of support for foreign language requirements did increase. This increased support for foreign language instruction was further defined with positive responses to questions regarding the willingness of participants to back increased spending for increased language requirements and/or instruction at their local colleges and universities. Despite the obvious support for foreign language acquisition, the ACE in their *Beyond September 11* paper (2002) noted: “Overall foreign language enrollments in U.S. higher education fell from 16% of total student enrollment in 1960, to just 8% today. The number of four-year colleges with foreign language entrance and graduation requirements also declined during that period” (p. 27).

The need for residents of the state of Texas to become proficient in more than one language became apparent when one looked at the growing population shift in the state. In a brief reviewing the 2000 population census, Malone, Baluja, Costanza and Davis (2003) analyzed the statistics on the foreign born population currently residing in the United States. This analysis revealed the largest foreign born populations in the United States could be found in our four largest cities in the United States. These cities (New York, NY, Los Angeles, CA, Chicago IL, and Houston, TX) were placed in descending order according to foreign-born population ranging from 2.9 million in New York to 516,000 in Houston. In 2004, Roger Saenz, current head of the sociology department at Texas A&M University, reviewed the history of the Latino population in the United States. Saenz found over the last 100 years the Latino population in the United States grew from 500,000 to more than 35 million. From 1980 to 2000, the growth in the Latino population accounted for 40% of the growth in population in the
United States. The buying power and the political muscle of this group has begun to
have a definite impact “…especially with the group’s concentration in the most populous
states in the union” (p. 1). Saenz continued by noting that 10 states housed
approximately 80% of the Latino population in the United States. Of these 10 states,
Texas and California accounted for “…one of every two Latinos in the United States”
(p. 1). As early as 1997, Del Pinal and Singer had predicted Hispanic Americans would
become the nation’s largest ethnic minority “early in the 21st century.” Saenz (2004)
supported this prediction with the latest 2003 figures of the U.S. Census Bureau
designating Latinos as the nation’s largest minority group. Del Pinal and Singer (1997)
explained the common geographic location concentration in a few states and cities with
shared cultural heritage and a common Spanish language made this group an important
segment of the U.S. population. The projected growth of this population was significant.

While today one of every eight residents of the United States is Latino,
projections are that Latinos could account for one of every five residents by 2035, one
of every four by 2055, and one of every three by 2100. The continued flow of Latino
immigrants ensure the continuance and endurance of the Spanish language and the
diverse Latino culture in the United States (Saenz, 2004, p. 3). In conclusion, Saenz
(2004) explained colleges and universities increasingly find the need to work with
Latinos as both students and educators. Latinos are becoming an important political
force. Health care systems will be impacted by not only Latino recipients but by Latino
providers. Religious organizations and churches will find growing numbers of leaders
and members among the Latino community. As Texas became home to this growing
number of Latinos, the state’s universities needed to prepare to not only educate the
Latinos, but to educate non-Latinos with regard to the diversities in cultures. While it was clear the social and educational systems in Texas would be affected by this change in population, the state’s economic future would also be impacted by this influx. For example, the business community will increasingly rely on Latinos as entrepreneurs, employees, investors, and consumers. The bilingual and bicultural nature of the Latino population also makes Latinos a valuable resource as the U.S. business economy expands its consumer markets and business operations into Latin America (Saenz, 2004, p. 4).

Saenz also noted Spanish was increasingly becoming the most universal foreign language offered in colleges and universities in the U.S. Spanish became a part of mainstream culture in many areas of the United States with many everyday signs and business activities now presented in bilingual format.

In the Barker (1994) study, the most common foreign language offered by Texas universities was Spanish followed by French and then German. Only 14 respondents (26.4%) required courses with international content for undergraduate degrees (p. 90). “Twenty-three of the 50 Texas institutions responding (46.0%) required foreign language for graduation as compared to 4 of 6 (66.7%) benchmark institutions” (p.129). ESL courses were offered in approximately 65% of the Texas institutions responding. Fewer than 50% of the institutions gave academic credit for ESL courses (p. 89). All benchmark institutions responding to the Barker (1994) survey offered ESL classes with 66% of those institutions offering academic credit for the courses (p. 130).

Research on Instructional Activities—Curriculum: Study Abroad
Although it was widely assumed international education was essential, there appeared to be little agreement on the methods to be utilized for internationalizing the university curriculum. Many programs relied on international travel and/or study as the basic vehicle for exposure to and acquisition of knowledge of foreign languages and cultures. Studies indicated that international experiences can indeed enhance the education of not only the individuals who study abroad but those individuals who have the opportunity to learn from them upon their return. Barbara Burn (1985) wrote a short article entitled “Research in Progress: Does Study Abroad Make a Difference?” She stated:

…in the United States foreign study has often been regarded as an ornament to collegiate study-mainly for the affluent and for female students. Moreover, such study required specially created programs rather than the simple integration of American students into foreign universities, and involved cultural enrichment rather than preparation for such professional careers as medicine, law, science, and business (p. 48).

Study abroad was recommended as a tool for international study in a majority of the articles and papers calling for an increase in international education at the college level (Burn, 2001; Department of Education, 2001; ACE, 2002; Siaya, Porcelli and Green, 2002). Jenkins (2002) noted: “Programs that send U.S. students overseas provide the most visible and tangible evidence of institutions commitment to international education” (p. 7). While study abroad could be a strong component in the internationalization of any college curriculum, the costs of foreign study are often prohibitive. The transfer of credits acquired from foreign universities was not consistent among universities and
varied from program to program between universities. Financial aid for study abroad was a problem for many U.S. college students. More than 70% of students enrolled in U.S. colleges depended upon some sort of financial aid (Jenkins, 2002). Jenkins reported while governmental aid was portable and could be applied to study abroad, a majority of private aid and tuition discounting programs could not be utilized for study abroad.

Thomas Homeke (1990) published an article in the *International Education Forum* entitled “Education for International Competence and Competitiveness: The Texas Response.” Homeke chronicled developments in international education in the state of Texas by noting that in 1988, Dr. William Mobley, then Deputy Chancellor of Texas A&M University, called for Texas higher education to meet the challenge of preparing graduates for international competition. Mobley’s challenge led to the formation of the Texas Higher Education Commissioner’s Advisory Committee on International Issues. After two years of study, the committee issued a series of recommendations with regards to curriculum, study abroad, and exchange programs. The committee further declared the need for “…the State Coordinating Board to actively and aggressively promote and sustain an atmosphere in which public universities and colleges can meet the challenges of preparing an international aware citizenry” (pp. 75-76). The committee noted Texas had a very small percentage of students participating in international education programs and Texas institutions of higher education made it difficult for students to participate in international education opportunities. Homeke concluded the state’s economy would increasingly fall under a global influence, requiring business to respond with the need to compete in the world trade arena.
In 1994, Barker found Texas universities and colleges had a variety of arrangements to facilitate study abroad. The most popular were consortia arrangements with the second most popular programs being those sponsored by the universities themselves. Only five institutions reported no study abroad arrangements. Most institutions reported institutional agreements for exchange programs with multiple countries. Students attending public institutions in the state had more opportunities for study abroad than those attending private institutions. All of the benchmark institutions in the Barker (1994) study had a study abroad advisor while one third of the Texas institutions had an advisor.

All of the benchmark institutions reported having their own study abroad programs. The average number of study abroad agreements with other countries was eight times greater than for Texas institutions. Barker (1994) theorized the benchmark institutions “with their long involvement with international education, have had more time to formalize these agreements than have Texas institutions” (p. 134).

In November of 2003, Governor Rick Perry of Texas issued a proclamation declaring November 17 - 21, 2003 as International Education Week. In this proclamation the governor stated:

Study abroad programs are a time-honored way to introduce American students to other languages and global issues. Texas must make international education a priority to ensure that its students and leaders are prepared to face the challenges of a global society (p.1.)
In Jenkins’ (2002) report on the state of international education after September 11, she noted safety issues for students studying overseas have multiplied. She also cited “geographical distances and cultural communication gaps can magnify the perceived potential for physical danger, improper supervision or ill-advised frivolity” (p. 12). With the common border between Mexico and Texas and the growing understanding of the Latino culture, Texas colleges and universities would seem to have the ideal opportunity to create exchange programs for their students without some of the difficulties and expense other universities in the U.S. might incur.

Research on International Student Support Services

There were differing opinions with regards to whether the presence of international students supported or hindered international education on American campuses. While one might think the admission of foreign students into American institutions could only enhance the education of all students, there was criticism of these programs. McGrath (1983) found international students were often recruited for their athletic abilities alone and preference was given to foreign students when it came to admission as well as teaching or research assistantships. Additionally, in a climate of international competition, American businesses often objected to the exportation of ideas to other countries as foreign students returned home (Kaplan, 1987). McGrath (1993) explained how the federal government sought to restrict certain types of information and research on American campuses in an effort to prevent military and technological secrets from falling into foreign hands.

Quantifying the benefits of foreign student attendance at colleges and universities in the United States was difficult. In general, most students and faculty
members recanted positive benefits from the influence of international students on campus with regards to the internationalization of a university culture and academic systems. The internationalization of higher education provided, as many people claimed, “an opportunity to make higher education truly universal, with young people learning during their periods of formation that we are indeed one world…” (Spaulding, Mauch & Lin, 2001, p. 197). The American Council on Education’s 2002 survey on public attitudes revealed 80% of the respondents agreed the presence of international students on U.S. campuses “enriches the learning experiences of American students” (p. 7). While the presence of international students on campus was generally perceived as positive, some conditional attitudes have emerged since September 11. In response to a question on the ACE 1002 survey regarding support for international education, 25% of respondents said “in light of September 11” they would be more likely to support an increase in the number of international students on their campus, and 42% said they would be less likely to support this increase (p. 7). When responding to this same survey, students agreed (90%) that the international students on campus enriched their learning experience. Thirty percent of the students surveyed replied since September 11 they have been “more likely” to have a conversation with an international student or scholar on campus. However, on the same survey, 20% of students and 10% of faculty members reported they were less likely to support an increase in the number of international students and scholars on campus since September 11 (Siaya, Porcelli & Green, 2002, p. 7).

The complexity of admitting foreign students to U.S. campuses continued to increase. Financing opportunities, immigration laws, political attitudes, safety issues,
and numerous details and regulations regarding exchange student activities will need to continually be evaluated, legislated and applied in an attempt to strike a balance between safety, educational, and financial concerns. Lambert (2001) summarized some of the issues related to foreign students:

In spite of many determined efforts by international education administrators to utilize the presence of foreign students as a force for general internationalization of the campus, like other aspects of international studies, the management of foreign student flows is carried out by a separate tribe on the campus, one that has little relationship to other tribes. Indeed, foreign students have little or anything to do with other aspects of international studies on campus. There are a number of structural issues that have faced foreign student management in the past and seem likely to become more intense in the future (p. 42).

Lambert noted the numbers of international students on U.S. campuses continued to grow and with this growth, the financial dependence on international students grew. Lambert continued by discussing the growing competition and recruitment for foreign students from universities in countries. Graduate programs in science and engineering at many research universities were “heavily dependent on the influx of foreigners to provide a satisfactory level of bright, well-educated graduates” (Lambert, 2001, p. 44).

In 2002, Jenkins reviewed current public attitudes towards programs for foreign students in the United States and noted the following:

Tough talk and legislation from congress in the wake of September 11, along with embarrassing student-visa tracking delays by the Immigrations and Internationalization Service, have called into question long-standing efforts to
welcome foreign students and scholars to study in American colleges and universities (p.6).

Barker’s (1994) survey contained four questions on international student support services. Along with the number of foreign students enrolled in the university programs at the time of the survey, respondents reported on a variety of programs designed to integrate foreign students into university activities. Public institutions reported providing more services than did private schools. The four most popular services provided to foreign students were counseling (48%), immigration advising (45%), initial orientation (44%), and assistance with documentation (43%). Thirty-eight percent of the Texas universities responding to the survey also reported the existence of international clubs on campus. The benchmark institutions led the Texas institutions in all programs designed to integrate international students into college life.

In *A Comprehensive National Policy on International Education* published by the American Council on Education (2002), a final recommendation encouraged increasing the number of international students on campuses was articulated:

Promote increased numbers of international students in the United States by modernizing and streamlining visa, taxation, and employment policies and regulations, thus facilitating entry for bona fide short-term and degree students to maximize their exposure to American society and culture through internships and employment (p.18).

**Research on Community Outreach**

Kelleher (1991) concluded community outreach was part of a balanced international education program. Kelleher (1991) stated a fully developed international
education program included “relationships and programs that are well developed with community groups, such as world affairs councils, sister city networks, school districts, local business organizations, religious groups, media networks, and special interest groups” (p. 17). Pacheco and Fernandez (1992) included the establishment of satellite campuses as an important part of an international education program further noting “A major challenge remains: how to demonstrate to the average citizen the benefits of a public university’s involvement in world affairs” (p. 23). Student exchange programs have benefited community business development through Rotary Club exchanges as well as a variety of foreign student exchange programs sponsored by a number of business and educational organizations.

In a chapter entitled “International Outreach for the New Millennium” contained in the book *Changing Perspectives on Education*, John D. Metzler (2001) discussed outreach. “Outreach can and should be perceived as central to the scholarly enterprise, and not simply a peripheral activity which can be done in a haphazard manner by ‘para-professional’, ‘want-to-be’ scholars” (p.122). Metzler (2001) discussed the role of the federally funded Title VI centers housed on university and college campuses and noted these university programs supplied support for K-12 educators, teachers’ organizations, foreign language instruction, globalization programs for businesses, and a large number of collaborative programs between communities and universities designed to internationalize the community perspective. These centers were critical links in the outreach programs at many universities. Metzler (2001) concluded his research by stating the mandate of Title VI programs:
…re-connect with the public through the effective provision of outreach services which will assist individual Americans, as well as institutions in the private, civil, and public sectors, to develop the level of global competency necessary to realize international security and prosperity (p. 136).

In their review of public attitudes toward international education post Sept 11, Siaya, Porcelli and Green (2002) found there was a great deal of support, throughout all subgroups of survey respondents, for universities to provide internationalized outreach programs for the community. Results of the survey supported the idea the public believes institutions of higher education had a responsibility to “…help America gain knowledge about international events” (p. 8). They concluded “Expanding into the community and providing the public with increased knowledge about international events and issues could pay significant dividends to the institution, the local community, and society at large” (p. 8). Barker (1994) stated, “Based on the literature surveyed, it is apparent that many opportunities for outreach exist. Foresight, initiative, and imagination can give U.S. institutions the chance to take advantage of these opportunities” (p. 55).

The following areas were listed as opportunities for community outreach in Barker’s (1994) survey: a) host family programs, b) translating services, c) distance education courses, and d) technical assistance to foreign governments. With regards to the outreach questions, all of the benchmark and 90% of the Texas universities reported being active in at least one of three areas of outreach.

Questions concerning outreach to the business community in the Barker (1994) survey listed the following possible program offerings: a) short-term foreign language
[instruction], b) import/export training, c) training of foreign workers in the U.S., d) ESL training, e) tailored occupational programs, and f) international business seminars. There was also space provided for university respondents to elaborate on additional outreach programs not listed as possible responses. In general, the responses to the outreach questions reflected limited involvement in activities designed to provide services for local businesses. In Texas, the community services most often provided included English language training (45%), short term foreign language training (42%) and international business seminars (40%). A comparison of benchmark and Texas university responses revealed Texas institutions responded more favorably to areas of service provided to businesses whereas the benchmark institutions responded more often to areas in services for the community.

Research on Model Programs

While reviewing the research for the construction of his survey, Barker (1994) found information on two innovative programs not fitting the typical international education model. The first program was a rigorous two-year liberal arts program named the International Baccalaureate. This international baccalaureate program was initiated through a system called the International World Colleges created in 1962 “…with the Atlantic College in Wales and was followed by schools in Canada, Swaziland, Singapore, Italy and the United States” (p. 55). The second innovative program was a UNESCO project called the Stadium Integrate. This was a program designed to “complement studies in any academic field” (p. 56) and was found to be available at United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) associated universities.
Conclusion

This review of literature from 1994 to the present revealed there continues to be widespread support for international education both from the public and university population; however, the implementation of such programs continues to meet financial and political barriers. Texas appeared to be taking steps towards fulfilling the mandate for continued growth in the area of international education. As the country as a whole continued to grapple with foreign affairs and continued deployment of our troops, it only stands to reason the call for greater understanding of cultures other than our own will continue to grow. As concluded by Siaya, Porcelli and Green (2002), the ACE survey respondents placed a great deal of the responsibility for international education at the university’s doorstep.

The 2002 survey asked whether colleges and universities have a responsibility to educate the public about international issues, events, and cultures. Nearly three out of four respondents, regardless of race, age, income, or education level, agreed higher education has a responsibility to educate the public about international education (p. 3).

While underscoring the importance of international understanding, the events of and following the September 11 disaster have intensified scrutiny of America’s international education programs. The devastating terrorism sparked debate among policy-makers and forced colleges and universities to reevaluate the safety and effectiveness of programs sending American students and faculty abroad or bringing foreign students and faculty here. “What remains unaltered to those of us in the field is the value of and international approach to higher education in the 21st Century.
Colleges and universities will continue to have an important responsibility to enhance international understanding (Jenkins, 2002, p. 1).

Business continued to call for increased emphasis on global perspectives mandated by the realization that the United States is but one part of a global economy. Controversy continues regarding the universities' roles and responsibilities for enhancing global perspective in the educational, economic, and cultural literacy of our populace. Rich Karlgaard (2004), publisher of Forbes Magazine, laments the tightening immigration laws and the effect political activities will have on local/national business:

After September 11, 2001, congress capped foreign visas. The cap for 2004 was a puny 65,000 (versus the previous year's 195,000) and was exhausted on February 17, 2002. This is detrimental and very shortsighted. More than half of the Master and Ph.D. degrees granted in engineering and sciences at American universities go to foreign students. Through grants and scholarships, the U.S. taxpayer trains foreigners and then sends them packing. We invest; India gets the return (p. 47).

Debate continues over where international students will choose to live and work following their university years. While some in the United States lament the export of graduate level expertise, their native countries sometimes struggle to convince graduates to return home with their new knowledge and skills.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was a replication of a descriptive and historical study conducted by Dr. Thomas S. Barker (1994). Barker completed a review of literature dealing with the implementation of international education at the university level. He then developed a survey to be used in his study of the implementation of international education in Texas four-year colleges and universities. Barker constructed the survey utilizing “A Taxonomy of International Education in U.S. Universities”. The taxonomy was published as part of a paper on international education by Stephen Arum (1987).

Survey Instrument

After analyzing several specific survey instruments, reviewing numerous publications on the subject of international education, and seeking input from the State of Texas Commissioner’s Committee in International Issues, Barker (1994) determined that “the literature did not identify an instrument that met the needs of this [his] survey” (p. 61). Therefore, Barker developed a comprehensive questionnaire for utilization in his study. While creating the survey, Barker examined and utilized portions of the following documents: a) “International/Intercultural Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) Office of International Programs, Fall Survey 1980” (Harari,1981), b) “Taxonomy of International Education in U.S. Universities (Arum, 1987), c) “Institutional Survey of International Activity Within the State of Texas, 1988-89” (Commissioner’s Advisory Committee on International Issues,1990), and d) “International Education Institutional Audit” (Pickert & Turlington, 1992).
Additional input was solicited from the State of Texas Commissioner’s Committee on International Issues.

The survey instrument consisted of 33 yes/no questions with opportunities for specific detailed follow-up responses to questions completed in the affirmative. Utilizing Arum’s (1987) Taxonomy of International Education, Barker (1994) grouped the questions under the following headings: a) Administration of International Education Programs, b) Instructional Activities of International Education, c) International Student Support Services, and d) Outreach. Section 2 of the survey, Instructional Activities of International Education, was further delineated into the following sub-sections: a) Research on Instructional Activities - Faculty Development, b) Research on Instructional Activities – Curriculum, c) Research on Instructional Activities - Foreign Language Study, d) Research on Instructional Activities - Study Abroad, and e) Research on International Student Support Services. The final portion of the questionnaire requested comments concerning any model programs in the area of international education currently in place at the particular university being surveyed.

Population

The population consisted of current senior public and private universities in the state of Texas. Barker (1994) obtained a mailing list containing the names of presidents and/or chancellors of the 79 public and private four-year colleges and universities in the State of Texas from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. As with Barker in 1994, an updated list was acquired for this study. This updated list contained the names of chief academic officers for 79 senior public and private universities.
In order to create a benchmark for his study, Barker (1994) initially contacted 13 out-of-state institutions. The 13 benchmark institutions were: a) The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, b) The University of Massachusetts at Amherst, c) Western Kentucky University, d) Ohio University, e) Indiana University, f) Florida International University, g) The University of Nebraska at Omaha, h) Warren Wilson College, i) Linfield College, j) Earlham College, k) Utica College, l) Emory University, and m) Pacific Lutheran University. Barker selected these particular universities because they were featured in the book entitled *Approaches to International Education* by E. Beckman (Ed.), (1984). Beckman’s book consisted of chapters written by authors in 14 universities involved in international education. Barker selected only 13 of these universities because one of the universities was located in Texas. One of the 13 selected institutions communicated with Barker declining participation. These 12 out-of-state institutions were then contacted requesting their participation in the survey for this replication. Six of the 12 universities failed to respond to the survey. Of the six benchmark institutions responding, three were private universities and three were public universities.

**Instrument**

The instrument utilized in this study was a duplication of Barker’s (1994) survey. The wording of the questions was identical to the wording in Barker’s survey. However, the numbering of the questions had to be changed to allow the survey to be placed in an electronic form to allowing for on-line responses. References to questions from the duplicate study carried two numbers. The initial question reference number referred to Barker’s original numbering followed by a number or numbers in parenthesis which
corresponded to the numbers utilized in the electronic version of the survey.

Instrument Validity

Barker (1994) validated his instrument for content using eight "nationally known individuals with expertise in the field of international education" (p. 62) as well as members of the Committee on International Issues appointed by the Texas Commissioner of Higher Education. Barker reported: “All panelists responded with comments and suggestions, and some members of the committee offered specific comments and suggestions. All responses were considered in preparing the revised questionnaire” (p. 62). Because the question wording remained identical to Barker’s (1994) survey, no additional validation was sought.

Instrument Reliability

“Because this was a 100% survey limited to Texas institutions of higher education, the normal procedure of using two distinct populations to determine reliability was not possible” (Barker, 1994, p. 63). In order to test the reliability of the survey, Barker requested seven individuals in international education offices in Texas Universities complete the survey. The results of these surveys were then compared to the surveys later completed by the same seven universities as part of the study. In addition, the norms of the seven initial responses were compared to the norms of the completed survey. Barker noted “there were small differences between the responses from these individuals and the later responses from the questionnaire sent to the presidents and or chancellors of the same institutions. Thus, these indicators were used to imply reliability since the normal test-retest procedures could not be used” (p. 63). A copy of the survey is provided in Appendix C.
Administration of the Survey

In his recommendation for further study, Barker (1994) noted, “The baseline data developed in this study can be used for a longitudinal study 3-5 years hence to determine what progress Texas institutions have made in implementing international education” (p. 167). Because international education continued to be an important facet of education, this longitudinal study was conducted with the hope the information obtained from the duplicate study would be useful in an overall evaluation of current university programming.

The duplicate questionnaire for this study was sent via United States mail to the chief academic officers of the 13 benchmark institutions and the chief academic officers of the 79 universities and colleges on the current list obtained from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. A return envelope with postage was mailed with each survey. An on-line version of the survey was made available to all potential respondents. The Uniform Resource Locater (URL) for the on-line survey was provided in the cover letter included with the survey. In addition, an electronic solicitation for participation in the survey was generated and sent via the Internet to the same 79 university officers and 13 benchmark institutions. This e-mailed request provided participants with a copy of the cover letter and a direct link to the electronic survey. Two weeks after the original mailing and electronic request for participation was completed, a second e-mail request was sent to those institutions that had not responded to the survey. A third e-mail reminder was generated for those who still had not responded to the other two requests. The survey was placed on a commercial electronic survey site.
The electronic survey site provided detailed copies of each survey as well as a report of the number and percentage of responses obtained from five benchmark institutions and 35 Texas schools. In an attempt to obtain support for this follow-up study, a request for a letter of support was sent to the Commissioner of Higher Education for the State of Texas, Don Brown (2003). The Commissioner explained he could not draft a cover letter encouraging universities to participate in the current study:

Given the heavy demands on the time of presidents and their colleagues and the fact that we no longer have an International Education Advisory Committee that has reviewed the study or the instrument, I just do not feel that I can urge the presidents to complete the questionnaire (Appendix E).

This response would suggest that international education will continue to fight for a place of importance at the state level.

Reporting the Data

The results of the update survey were compiled utilizing the same percentage calculations applied by Barker in the original study. The data were then transferred to tables detailing frequency and percentages of responses. The tables were duplicated from those presented in Chapter 4 of Barker’s (1994) paper. Barker’s results were reported in a narrative fashion with charts and tables presenting the frequencies and percentages of responses to each of the questions. In addition, Barker included a list of comments, model programs, and references for these programs as reported by Texas Institutions. The data collected utilizing the replicated survey have been likewise reported mirroring Barker’s organizational system, charts, and tables.
In addition to the reporting of the 2004 results, a comparison between the current percentages and those reported by Barker (1994) for the Texas institutions was completed. Information regarding model programs was incomplete or insufficient for reporting.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Surveys were received from five benchmark and 42 Texas institutions. Results from seven of the Texas surveys were not included in the statistical calculations because they were either duplicate submissions or had less than 10% of the answers completed. Incomplete surveys resulted when a participant completed the required biographical portion of the on-line survey but then failed to complete the remaining sections. Duplicate submissions from the same university occurred as a result of one person responding to an on-line survey and another from the same university submitting a hard copy. When duplicate surveys were received from a university, the most complete survey was utilized. One survey was keyed-in twice. After these adjustments were made, a total of 35 surveys from Texas institutions were utilized in the compilation of Texas (2004) data. Surveys were received from five benchmark institutions, and all were utilized.

The response rate for the duplicate survey was lower than the original response percentage on the original Barker (1994) version. Barker’s response rate was 70.9% with 56 of 79 universities responding. The response rate for the duplicate survey was 46.5% (35 of 79 universities responded). The response from benchmark institutions on the Barker (1994) survey was 6 of 12 or 50% and on the duplicate 5 of 12 universities responded (41.7%). While the response rate decreased from the 1994 administration to the 2004 administration, a review of the institutions responding reveals a wide range of sizes and types responded to
both surveys leading to the speculation that the relative percentages utilized throughout the survey represented a diverse cross-section of Texas universities (see Appendix F).

Possible reasons for the lower response rate for the duplicate survey included length of the survey, decrease in staff available to respond to the survey and/or the decrease in the novelty of the subject matter over the last ten years resulting in a lessening of interest in information on international programs. In addition, the survey response rate may have been enhanced by the inclusion of a letter with Barker’s survey from the then-Texas Commissioner of Education of Texas, Kenneth Ashworth, encouraging universities to complete the 1994 survey. In 2003, Commissioner Don Brown declined the request for a similar cover letter to accompany the 2004 survey. (Appendix D and E).

The design of the data tables, method of calculation for each response, and the presentation of numbers and percentages were compiled following Barker’s (1994) model. “Not all institutions responded to all questions; therefore, percentages were calculated based on the number of responses to each question. Percentages in the tables have been rounded to the nearest tenth of a percent” (p. 67).

With regard to the tables presented below, please note that initial question numbers referred to question numbers in Barker’s survey. Question numbers in parentheses refer to question numbers in the Hodges electronic survey. Tables, numbers, and titles were identical in both reports.
Part 1 of the survey consisted of questions 1 through 7 (numbered 1-11 on the duplicate electronic version of the survey). These questions addressed the administration of international education. Tables containing the response numbers and percentages are displayed below.

1. (2) Does your institution’s mission statement address international education?
   (yes / no)

Table 1

Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark #</th>
<th>2004 Texas #</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (2) Mission statement addresses international education.</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>34:35</td>
<td>55:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 68% of the responding Texas institutions referenced international education in their mission statement in the 2004 survey as compared to approximately 44% in the 1994 survey. Four of the five benchmark institutions reported mission statements referencing international education. One of the benchmark institutions and one of the Texas institutions failed to respond to this question.

2. (3) Do your institution-wide policies address international education?
   (yes / no)
Table 2

*Institution-wide Written Policies*

Number of responses to this question: total survey participants and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark #</th>
<th>2004 Texas #</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (3) Institution-wide written policies addressing international education</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>34:35</td>
<td>55:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 79% of the Texas institutions responding to the 2004 survey had institution-wide policies addressing international education as compared to approximately 42% in the 1994 survey. Four of the five benchmark institutions reported having institution-wide policies addressing international education. One of the benchmark institutions and one of the Texas institutions failed to respond to this question.

3. (4) Does your institution have an international education administration office? (yes / no)

Table 3

*International Education Administrative Office*

Number of responses to this question: survey participants and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark #</th>
<th>2004 Texas #</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (4) International education administrative office</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>34:35</td>
<td>53:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 77% of the Texas institutions responding to the 2004 survey had an international education administration office. All but 1 of the 35 Texas institutions (2004) addressed this question. Approximately 51% of the Texas institutions reporting in 1994 had an international education administrative office. All of the benchmark institutions responded to this question, with 100% reporting the presence of an international education office.

3a. (5) International Education Office Name

Five of five benchmark institutions provided names of the administrative office; 100% of these institutions reported an office containing the word “International” in the title. Twenty-six of the 34 Texas 2004 institutions responding to this question provided names of administrative offices with 25 of the 26 institutions (96.15%) reported having an office with “International” in the title. One Texas 2004 institution reported an office title not containing “International.” Eight Texas (2004) institutions reported not having an administrative office. One Texas (2004) institution did not respond to this question.

Table 4

**Staffing of International Education Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average number staff per responding institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>2004 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Avg. # Staff</td>
<td>Avg. # Staff</td>
<td>Avg. # Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. (5) Full-time professional</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time support</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4 details the average number of staff members in each of the four categories provided, as reported by 26 of 35 Texas 2004 institutions and 4 of 5 benchmark institutions. The average number of staff members (12.4 in 2004 and 12.4 in 1994) in international education offices in the state of Texas remains stable over the last 10 years. Since 1994, there has been an increase in the average number of full-time support staff employees and a decrease in the average number of part-time support staff in the offices of the Texas institutions responding to this question. The benchmark 2004 institutions reported an average (17.3) number of full-time support staff members in comparison to the Texas 1994 and Texas 2004 figures which are three and one respectively. Twenty-six of the 35 (71.4%) institutions participating in the Texas 2004 survey reported staffing numbers in contrast to 20 of 56 (35.7%) institutions reporting in the Barker (1994) survey. Four out of five (80%) benchmark 2004 institutions reported staffing numbers.

4. (6) Is there a person at your institution with primary responsibility for international education?
   If yes, please list person’s title: ________________
   
   Among the 31 responses to this open ended question, 100% of the five benchmark institutions (5 of 5) responding answered yes and 74.3% (26 of 35) of the Texas institutions responded yes. There were 18 different titles listed for this position; the most popular response being “Director of International Programs” (or Education) with a total of five listings.

4a. (7) To whom does this person report within your institution?
   1. President or Chancellor
   2. Provost
   3. Vice President-Academic Affairs
4. Vice President-Student Affairs
5. Other Vice President
6. Other, within Academic Affairs
7. Other, within Student Affairs
8. Other ________________

Table 5

_Person Responsible for International Education Reports to:_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark #</th>
<th>2004 Texas #</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% report to:</td>
<td>% report to:</td>
<td>% report to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. (7) President or Chancellor</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>7:29</td>
<td>4:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>12:29</td>
<td>5:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President-Academic Affairs</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>8:29</td>
<td>18:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President-Student Affairs</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>1:29</td>
<td>4:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Vice President</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>1:29</td>
<td>4:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, within Academic Affairs</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>5:29</td>
<td>4:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, within student Affairs</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>3:29</td>
<td>1:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>0:29</td>
<td>6:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses regarding the question of to whom the director or head administrator for the international programs reports continue to vary. In 1994, 58.2% of the Texas institutions responding to this survey question indicated that the person in charge of the office reported to either the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Provost, or Chancellor, with the highest number (39.1%) reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the 2004 survey, 93% of
the Texas institutions responding to the survey question reported that the person in charge of the office reported to either the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Provost, or Chancellor, with the highest number (41.4%) reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A far greater number (58.4%) of international education administrators now report to the President, Chancellor or Provost as reported in the 2004 survey. In contrast, the number of responses to those same administrative categories yielded a 19.9% response in the 1994 survey. Often, the Provost is the Vice President for Academic Affairs; therefore, these results may simply indicate that more academic oversight occurred in 2004 than in 1994.

5. (8) Is there an institution-wide committee or task force concerned with international education issues of the international dimension of your campus? (Hodges' question wording: Is there an institution-wide committee or task force concerned with international education issues on your campus?)
(yes /no)

In 1994, 98.7% (55 of 56) of Texas institutions indicated they had an institution-wide committee or task force concerned with international education. In the current survey, 80% (4 of 5) of the benchmark institutions and 74.3% (26 of 35) of the Texas 2004 institutions responded they had an institution-wide committee or task force concerned with international education.

5a. (9) If yes, please circle number for area(s) in which the committee deals and indicate whether it is an advisory or policy committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Advisory</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exchanged programs/linkages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Study abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. International student advising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technical assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intensive English ESL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sponsored students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Foreign language instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>2004 Benchmark Advisor #</td>
<td>2004 Benchmark Policy #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (9) Exchange programs/ linkages</td>
<td>4:4 100%</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>4:4 100%</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student advising</td>
<td>3:4 75%</td>
<td>0:4 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
<td>0:4 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive English/ESL</td>
<td>2:4 50%</td>
<td>0:4 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored students</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
<td>0:4 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language instruction</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
<td>0:4 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of international studies</td>
<td>4:4 100%</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign visitor program</td>
<td>2:4 50%</td>
<td>0:4 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community liaison</td>
<td>3:4 75%</td>
<td>1:4 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 represents the number of institutions reporting having either advisory or policy committees or both in each of the areas listed. For example, in the area of “Community liaison,” a total of three benchmark institutions or 75% of those responding yes to the initial part of the question indicated they had an advisory committee in the “Community liaison” category. In addition to having an advisory committee in the “Community liaison” category, one of three institutions reported having both a policy committee and an advisory committee. The respondents were not asked to report whether they had one committee serving a dual purpose (i.e. policy & advisory) or separate policy and advisory committees in certain areas. In nine out of ten categories the percentage of policy-making committees at Texas institutions increased over the last ten years. In eight out of ten Texas institutions, the percentage of advisory committees also increased.

6. (10) Does your institution have a membership in any state, national, or international associations related to your international education mission? (yes / no)

Table 7

Members of International Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark #</th>
<th>2004 Texas #</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (10) Membership in international</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>34:35</td>
<td>54:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1994, 54 of 56 institutions responded to this question. Of the 54 responses received, 38 or 70.4% responded they held membership in an
international organization while 16 (approximately 30%) institutions reported no international association membership. In the 2004 Texas survey, 34 of 35 institutions responded to this question. Of the 34 institutions responding, 26 or 76.5% reported membership in an international association while eight (23.5%) reported no membership. One Texas institution failed to respond to this question. All five benchmark 2004 institutions reported membership in an international association. Comparison of the responses on the two Texas surveys revealed a slight increase in the percentage of Texas institutions holding membership(s) in international associations.

7. (11) Sources of funding for international education activities at your institution:

_Circle number(s) for all that apply_

1. Institutional funds budgeted for international education
2. Income generated through programs (e.g. overhead from international development projects, intensive English programs)
3. Grants/contracts from federal government agencies
4. Grants/contracts from state or local government agencies
5. Grants/contracts from U.S. firms
6. Grants/contracts from non-U.S. sources
7. Grants from foundations
8. Private gifts, grants, contracts
9. Student fees
10. Other ________________________
Table 8

Funding for International Education

Number of responses in each category: total participants responding to question and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (11) Institutional funds budgeted</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generated through programs</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>18:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/contracts from federal agencies</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/contracts from state or local agencies</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/contracts from U.S. firms</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/contracts from non-U.S. sources</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants from foundations</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private gifts, grants contracts</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1:32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty Texas institutions responded to this question on the Barker (1994) survey. "The most common source of funds was budgeted institutional funds, over 60% [sic 64%] ....” (p. 64). Responses to the 2004 survey continue to support the use of budgeted institutional funds as the most common source for funding, with 91.7% of the schools responding in the affirmative in this category.

While the percentage of institutions in the State of Texas relying on public funding, i.e., student fees and institutional budgets, increased, utilization of
income generated from the international programs themselves remained stable. An increase in the percentage of universities who indicate utilization of student fees was reported. Reliance on private sources for funding decreased. Benchmark 2004 institutions reported utilizing funds in all areas listed with exception of no institution reporting the use of grants or contracts from non-U.S. sources.

_Synopsis of Administration of International Education Programs_

In 2004, 67.6% of the Texas institutions surveyed responded in the affirmative when asked if a reference to international education was included in their mission statement. The 1994 survey revealed that 43.6% of the institutions responding had institution-wide written policies that addressed international education in contrast to 78.8% reporting these written policies in 2004.

Budgeted funds continued to be the most common source of funding in the area of international education. Since 1994, the use of public (university) funds to support international education increased. The greatest percentage shift in funding appeared in the area of student fees which increased from 48% (Barker, 1994) to 71.5% (2004) again indicating greater reliance on institutional funding in lieu of outside and/or private sources.

_Instructional Activities of International Education_

Part 2 of the questionnaire addressed instructional activities in three different areas: a) faculty development, b) curriculum, and c) out-of-country education (study abroad). This portion of the survey is made up of questions 8
through 21 (Hodges’ 2004 survey question numbers 12 through 30). A synopsis is presented at the end of each of these three areas.

**Faculty Development**

8. (12) Does your institution have a centralized database of faculty/staff international expertise, and interests (i.e., publications, travel or work abroad, sponsor of international student (students’) organization)?

   (yes / no)

9. (13) Does your institution have a centralized data base containing information about faculty participation in international education?

   (yes / no)

**Table 9**

*Faculty Expertise and Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark #</th>
<th>2004 Texas #</th>
<th>2004 Barker Texas Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (12) Database of faculty staff expertise</td>
<td>4:5 50%</td>
<td>34:35 14.7%</td>
<td>56:56 35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (13) Database of faculty participation</td>
<td>4:5 50%</td>
<td>34:35 20.6%</td>
<td>5:56 28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of Texas institutions responding affirmatively to the two questions concerning data bases of faculty expertise and participation decreased. Thirty-four of 35 Texas 2004 survey participants responded to both question 8 and 9. Of those 34 institutions responding to question 8 (14.7%) reported having a centralized database of faculty/staff international expertise and 20.6% reported having a faculty data base containing information about faculty participation in international education. These percentages were lower than the 35.7% for international expertise data bases and 28.6% for centralized data bases detailing faculty participation in international education as reported in
Barker's (1994) survey. The affirmative response rate of the benchmark institutions (2004) was 50%, which also decreased from a 66.7% response rate Barker obtained from his benchmark survey institutions in 1994 (p.117).

10. (14) In the past two academic years, approximately how many:

a. faculty from foreign institutions taught/conducted research on your campus?

b. of your faculty participated in programs, workshops or conferences in international education in the U.S.?

c. of your faculty participated in programs, workshops or conferences in international education abroad?

d. of your faculty taught/conducted research at institutions abroad?

Table 10

*Faculty Exchange and Activities*

Number of institutions responding in category: total survey participants responding to question and average number of faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># avg. # faculty</td>
<td># avg. # faculty</td>
<td># avg. # faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.(14) Faculty from foreign institutions</td>
<td>5:5 105</td>
<td>27:29 50.5</td>
<td>24:55 76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty participation international education in the U.S.</td>
<td>4:5 8.8</td>
<td>27:29 7.5</td>
<td>30:55 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty participation in international education abroad</td>
<td>4:5 9.3</td>
<td>28:29 6</td>
<td>28:55 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty taught/conducted research abroad</td>
<td>4:5 5</td>
<td>27:29 14</td>
<td>33:55 14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in this table represented the number of institutions responding to each category relative to the total number of institutions responding to this question. The 2nd number was the average number of faculty reported for each
activity. For example, in the category “faculty participation in international education in the U.S.,” four out of the five benchmark institutions reported a total of 35 faculty members in this category for an average of 8.8 members per institution (35 divided by 4 = 8.75). When the two Texas surveys were compared, there was a decline in the average faculty participation in the 1st three categories, with the 4th category, “faculty taught/conducted research abroad” remaining virtually unchanged.

11.(15) Does your institution provide centralized funding specifically for international education activities (e.g. programs, workshops, conferences, exchanges etc.)? (yes / no)

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Number responding to question: total survey respondents and % yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>2004 Benchmark #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (15) Centralized funding</td>
<td>5:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five of the benchmark institutions participating in the 2004 survey responded in the affirmative indicating their institutions provided centralized funding for international education. Approximately 44% of the Texas institutions reported centralized funding with that percentage increasing slightly over the 42.6% reported in 1994 by Barker.

12. (16 &17) Does your institution provide faculty incentives for international education activities? If yes, please circle all that apply:
1. In-house workshops/seminars
2. Off-campus workshops/seminars in the U.S. or abroad
3. Linkage programs (e.g. other institutions, other countries)
4. Foreign language classes
5. Teaching in international education programs out of the discipline (outside major teaching area)
6. Additional time to work for tenure
7. Other: ________________________________

Thirty-four of 35 participating Texas 2004 institutions responded to the yes/no portion of the question. All of the benchmark institutions reported providing incentives. The table below (Table 12) provides details regarding what types of incentives/activities might be provided for faculty who work toward internationalizing their programs. Percentages in this table reflected the number of institutions reporting incentives in each area and the percentage of the total number of institutions responding to the survey.

Table 12
Faculty Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. (16&amp;17) In-house workshops/seminars</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>9:35</td>
<td>11:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus workshops/seminars</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>6:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage programs</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>6:35</td>
<td>17:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language classes</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>2:35</td>
<td>12:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in international education programs outside discipline (outside major teaching area)</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>0:35</td>
<td>6:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional time to work for tenure</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>0:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6:35</td>
<td>2:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 lists six areas of activity that could be made available for university faculty members participating in international education activities. Respondents to the question were instructed to “circle all areas that apply.” resulting in some universities indicating the presence of incentives in several or all of the categories. In the 2004 Texas survey, the category receiving the greatest percentage of responses was “in-house workshops” with 9 out of the 35, or 26%, of the institutions responding in the affirmative. In the Barker (1994) survey, the greatest number of Texas institutions reported providing faculty incentives in the area of “linkage programs” with 17 of 56, or 30.4%, indicating the presence of incentives in this category. In the open-ended (“other”) portion of question 17, 6 of the 35 (17%) participants in the Texas 2004 survey listed incentive programs in the form of travel grants provided for faculty members, faculty development grants, and merit pay consideration.

Results from the Texas benchmark (2004) group revealed that 60% (three out of five institutions) reported incentives available in three of the four categories including: a) “in-house workshops/seminars,” b) “linkage programs,” and c) “foreign language classes.”

13. (18) Is there a reward system to encourage faculty to participate in internationalizing the curriculum?

13a. (19) If yes, please circle the number(s) for the activities rewarded:
   1. Curriculum development
   2. Developmental leave/sabbaticals outside the U.S.
   3. Research
   4. Processes to seek funding for international education curriculum
   5. Other _________________________________
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Table 13

*Faculty Rewards*

Number of responses in category: total number responding to survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # responses %</th>
<th>2004 Texas # responses %</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # responses %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13a.(19) Curriculum development</td>
<td>4:5 80%</td>
<td>4:35 11.4%</td>
<td>12:56 21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental leaves/ sabbaticals outside U.S.</td>
<td>2:5 40%</td>
<td>3:35 8.5%</td>
<td>10:56 17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3:5 60%</td>
<td>3:35 8.5%</td>
<td>9:56 16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes to seek funding for international education</td>
<td>2:5 40%</td>
<td>3:35 8.5%</td>
<td>10:56 17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1:5 20%</td>
<td>2:35 5.7 %</td>
<td>1:56 1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty percent (four of five) of the benchmark institutions responded in the affirmative to the yes/no question regarding a reward system to encourage faculty to internationalize the curriculum. Five of the 34 (14.7%) Texas (2004) institutions responding to this question reported the presence of a reward system to encourage faculty to internationalize the curriculum. In reporting his results to this same question, Barker (1994) did not report the total responding "yes" to the question but simply reported the percentage responding in each reward category in relation to the total number of respondents (56) to his survey.

Among the institutions indicating they gave rewards in given categories, the percentages of those giving rewards dropped in all categories from 1994 to
2004. The greatest decrease was reflected in the area of curriculum development with a 10% drop from 21.4% (Barker, 1994) to 11.4% reported in 2004. One institution reporting in the 1994 Texas survey and two institutions reporting in the 2004 Texas survey listed rewards provided for other activities than those listed. The “other” activities rewarded mentioned in the 2004 survey included “awards for teaching and research abroad” and “departmentally determined” rewards. Barker did not report the actual reward(s) listed in the “other” category in his survey results.

14. (20) In your opinion, when faculty participate in international education what is their perception of the effect on their standing for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Jeopardized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit raises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

Faculty Perceptions

Number of institutions responding: total number responses in category and %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Jeopardize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (20) Tenure</td>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>0:3</td>
<td>0:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>0:3</td>
<td>0:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit raise</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>0:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions about faculty participation in international education and the subsequent effect of this participation on careers remained consistent with a few exceptions. In the tenure category of this question, the selection of “Jeopardize”
increased from 2% (Barker, 1994) to 10% in 2004. In the area of “Merit raises,” the Barker (1994) survey revealed a 56% response to “No Effect” as compared to a 70% response in the 2004 survey. Of those responding to the question on perception, 100% of the benchmark institutions indicated faculty participation in international education was perceived to enhance both tenure and promotion opportunities.

Synopsis of Faculty Development

The responding Texas institutions in Barker’s (1994) survey indicated 64.3% of the respondents had databases to catalog faculty expertise and/or participation in international activities. The 2004 Texas survey revealed 35.3% of responding institutions possessed databases of faculty expertise and/or participation in international activities. Within the past ten years, the definition and sophistication of databases has evolved. This evolution in definition and expectations regarding the make-up of a database may have colored the response to these questions. Incentives and rewards for faculty participation in international activities remain negligible as reflected by the small number of institutions reporting incentives and the small number of responses in the breakdown categories. The increase in the perception that involvement in international activities could jeopardize an academic career is, of course, a concern. The 2004 benchmark institutions reported offering numerous faculty incentives. These responses coupled with their positive responses to the question concerning faculty perceptions regarding involvement in education indicate that this
involvement was strongly supported and rewarded on these benchmark campuses.

Curriculum

The second area of Part 2 of the questionnaire deals with curriculum development issues and consists of questions 15 through 18 (21-24).

15. (21) How are international/global studies organized at your institution?

_Circle number(s) for all that apply:_
1. Integrated/infused into regular curriculum (e.g. modules in existing classes)
2. Separate courses which specifically address international dimensions
3. Curriculum leading to degree in international/global studies, area specialization
4. Curriculum leading to a minor in international/global studies, area specialization
5. Curriculum leading to a certificate in international/global studies, area specialization
6. Other
7. No organized international/global studies offered

Table 15

Organization for International Studies

Number of institutions responding to category: number responding to question and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Benchmark # of institutions</th>
<th>Texas # of institutions</th>
<th>Barker Texas Total # of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. (21) Integrated/infused</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>20:33</td>
<td>32:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate courses</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>17:33</td>
<td>30:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum leading to a degree</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>9:33</td>
<td>16:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum leading to a minor</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>10:33</td>
<td>18:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum leading to a certificate</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>3:33</td>
<td>2:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>6:33</td>
<td>6:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No organized international/global studies offered</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>4:33</td>
<td>11:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question presented six options and was structured so institutions might respond to more than one option. In 1994, 19.6% of the Texas institutions responding indicated there were no organized international/global studies offered on their campuses as compared with 12.1% of the respondents from the 2004 study who stated they had no organized international/global studies offered on their campuses.

Slightly over 50% of the 1994 and 2004 respondents (53.5% and 51.5% respectively) reported the availability of separate courses dealing with international/global issues. Integration of international curriculum remains the most popular method of delivering an international perspective to students. Texas A&M University reported offering a dual-degree program in conjunction with a campus-abroad program. The University of Texas Public School of Health provided an extensive list of international activities linked to the following degrees.

The University of Texas Health Science Center-Houston’s School of Public Health offers a Master of Public Health and a Doctor of Public Health, each with a concentration in International and Family Health. Major research topics in the International and Family Health concentration include International Health (El Paso Campus). There are also international research activities in various Centers at the School of Public Health including the Center for Infectious Diseases, Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Research, Center for Society and Population Health, Center for Biosecurity and Disaster Preparedness, WHO
Collaborating Center for Health Promotion Research and Development, and WHO Collaborating Center for Occupational Health. The Nursing School [is] doing international research with the University of Tamaulipas on [involving] data analysis on [a] pain study instrument and [a] future collaborative research project. Health Information Sciences, Dental Branch, [and the] Medical School and Graduate School for Biomedical Science also have international studies. (University of Texas Health Science Center, open-ended response question number 21).

16. (22) If degrees or certificates are awarded in international studies, how many were awarded in the past two years?

Number of students awarded degrees  ______
Number of students awarded certificates  ______

Table 16

Degrees and Certificates Awarded

Number of institutions responding: number degrees/certificates reported and average number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # average</th>
<th>2004 Texas # average</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. (22) No. of degrees awarded</td>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>10:705</td>
<td>12:276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of certificates awarded</td>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty percent (two of five) of the benchmark institutions reported awarding certificates in international studies. The two benchmark institutions responding to this question reported an average of five degrees and five certificates awarded per responding institution. Ten of 35 Texas 2004 institutions reported awarding
degrees in international studies (28.6%) for an average 70.5 degrees per institution. Two of 35 Texas institutions (5.7%) reported awarding certificates in international studies for an average of 8 certificates per institution. A total of 12 of 56 (21.4%) Texas institutions responding to the Barker (1994) survey reported awarding an average of 23 degrees in international studies. The benchmark responses on this question were lower than those from the Texas 2004 universities indicating less activity in the area of specialized international degrees.

17. (23&24) Please circle number(s) for the languages offered by your institution, and indicate those offered as a major or minor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offered</th>
<th>Undrgrad</th>
<th>Undrgrad</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No major or minor</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Foreign Language Offered

Number of institutions offering major/minor/graduate degrees: total responses per language and%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Benchmark major</th>
<th>Benchmark minor</th>
<th>Benchmark grad</th>
<th>Texas major</th>
<th>Texas minor</th>
<th>Texas grad</th>
<th>Barker Texas Total major</th>
<th>Barker Texas Total minor</th>
<th>Barker Texas Total grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60% and 33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>0:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>60% and 35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13:26</td>
<td>13:26</td>
<td>4:26</td>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>26:40</td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>75% and 24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>11:18</td>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>18:26</td>
<td>24:26</td>
<td>5:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>9:14</td>
<td>3:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>50% and 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>4:7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>67% and 33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>1:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>0:0</td>
<td>0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>6:11</td>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>60% and 35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25:31</td>
<td>20:31</td>
<td>8:31</td>
<td>39:48</td>
<td>31:48</td>
<td>12:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
<td>(see table 17a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Barker (1994) survey, a total of 35 graduate degrees in foreign language were offered by the 56 responding Texas institutions yielding an average of less than 1 degree per campus (.63). The 2004 survey revealed a total of 19 graduate degrees in a foreign language were offered by 35 Texas universities, again averaging less than 1 graduate degree per campus (.54). The five benchmark institutions participating in the 2004 survey offered no graduate language degrees.

In the Barker (1994) survey, the 56 respondents reported 107 major degrees in foreign languages for an average of almost 2 (1.91) per campus. The 2004 survey revealed that 35 institutions offered 53 major language degrees for an average of 1.5 per campus. The five benchmark institutions participating in
the 2004 survey offered 19 major language degrees for an average of approximately 4 (3.8) per campus.

With regard to the opportunity for students to minor in a foreign language, the Barker (1994) Texas survey revealed the 56 Texas universities provided a total of 129 opportunities to minor in a foreign language for an average of 2.3 offerings per campus. The 2004 survey of Texas universities revealed 35 Texas universities offer a total of 58 opportunities for students to minor in a foreign language for an average of 1.6 offerings per institution. The benchmark institutions participating in the 2004 survey offered ten opportunities for students to minor in a foreign language, yielding an average of two per institution.

Table 17a

Additional ("other") Foreign Language Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Language</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Sign Lang.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek/Latin classic combined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas respondents to the Barker (1994) survey and the 2004 listed an additional ten languages not included in the survey response choices. No
indication of degrees offered was requested in the survey portion regarding “other” languages.

Benchmark institutions responding to the 2004 survey did not list any additional languages in the “other” category. Table 17a lists the ten languages not included in the survey choices and the number of institutions who placed the language on their survey response list. The 1994 Texas respondents listed an additional two languages (Hebrew and Portuguese) on their surveys. Eleven language choices were included in the original survey. The ten additional languages added in the “other” categories on the Texas surveys created a total of 21 language choices. Of the 21 languages, the 2004 institutions reported offering coursework in 19 and the 1994 Texas respondents offered courses in 13 foreign languages. The benchmark 2004 institutions offered courses in 11 of the foreign languages listed with no additional offerings.

18. (25, 26 & 27) Indicate which of the following are institution-wide requirements for undergraduate degrees:

   Foreign language                        If yes, number of semester hours ______

   Courses with international content     If yes, number of semester hours ______

   International experience (e.g. study abroad) If yes, number of semester hours ______

Table 18

Institution-Wide Requirements
Number and percentage of “yes” responses: total responses to the question and average hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># yes responses</td>
<td>% yes responses</td>
<td>avg. sem. hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emanrespondees</td>
<td># yes responses</td>
<td>% yes responses</td>
<td>avg. sem. hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg. sem. hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. (25,26 &amp; 27) Foreign language</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>10:32</td>
<td>25: 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>44.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with international content</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>6:32</td>
<td>16:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>3:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Some of the institutions that initially reported language requirements, international content courses or international experience courses did not report the number of semester hours required and were thus omitted in computing the average number of semester hours.)

The “no requirement” responses were significant on this particular question. While 4 of 5 benchmark 2004 (80%) institutions have a foreign language requirement, only 10 of 32 (31.2%) of Texas 2004 respondents answered this question in the affirmative. This means that 68.8% of the responding institutions did not report a foreign language requirement.

Approximately 19% of the responding Texas schools reported a requirement for courses with international content. One of 32 (3.1%) of Texas 2004 institutions indicated a requirement for international experience (study abroad).

19. (28) Does your institution offer English as second language courses (ESL)? If yes, Are students given academic credit for ESL courses?
Table 19

*English as a Second Language*

Number of “yes” responses and % offering credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Benchmark # yes responses</td>
<td>2004 Texas # yes responses</td>
<td>1994 Barker Texas Total # yes responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. (28) English as a second language offered</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>22:34</td>
<td>34:53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit for ESL</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>7:34</td>
<td>17:42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to question 19 (28) indicated that 60% of the benchmark and 64% of the Texas universities offer ESL courses. The percentage of schools offering credit for ESL courses was 60% for the benchmark institutions, 20.6% for the Texas institutions and 40.5% for the Texas institutions responding to the 1994 survey. While the percentage of Texas institutions offering ESL programs has remained stable, the percentage of those also offering academic credit for the ESL coursework has declined by almost 20%.

**Synopsis of Curriculum Issues**

Approximately 60% of all institutions responding to the international education surveys revealed the most popular method of presenting international curriculum to students continued to be integration of international issues into the established curriculum. In 1994, 57.1% of the 56 Texas institutions responding to the survey reported integration and/or infusion of international studies into their regular curriculum. In the Texas 2004 survey 60.6%, or 20 of 33 institutions responding, reported integrating international studies into their regular curriculum as did 60%, or 3 out of 5, of the benchmark 2004 institutions. The number of
degrees in international studies awarded to students in Texas tripled since 1994 from an average of 23 for the 12 institutions reporting in 1994 to an average of 70.5 degrees for the 10 institutions reporting in 2004. In response to one of the open-ended response questions regarding faculty incentives, one of the benchmark institutions indicated it provided institutional funding for site visits to develop proposed international study programs.

In the Texas 2004 survey, the percentages of universities offering minors, majors, and graduate degrees in ten of the foreign languages listed decreased from those same numbers obtained in 1994. For example, in the 2004 survey, 25% of the responding institutions reported offering a major in Russian as opposed to 40% of the 1994 respondents. A very consistent set of averages was present in the Texas university responses regarding Spanish. In comparing the 1994 results with the 2004 results, it was revealed that 81% of both the 1994 and 2004 institutions responding offered a major in Spanish. With regard to offering a minor in Spanish, both the 1994 and 2004 groups reported that 65% of the responding institutions offered a Spanish minor. Twenty-five percent of the Texas institutions reporting in 1994 and 26% of the Texas institutions reporting in 2004 offered a graduate degree in Spanish. Spanish was the most popular language offered as indicated by the high number of responses (31:35 in 1994) reporting offering Spanish and 48:56 institutions reporting offering Spanish in 2004. The 2004 duplicate survey revealed the offering of graduate degrees in six foreign languages. In comparison, the 1994 survey revealed ten graduate degree possibilities.
Out-of-Country Education

The final section of Part 2 addressed out-of-country education. This portion of the survey included questions 20 (29) and 21 (30). These questions related to study abroad programs and the existence of agreements between local universities and various international institutions and countries.

20. (29) How does your institution facilitate U.S. students' participation in credit-bearing study abroad programs?

Please circle number(s) for all that apply:
1. Consortia agreements
2. Agencies
3. Other Texas institutions
4. Other U.S. institutions
5. Your own study abroad programs
6. Direct exchange programs
7. Special programs for transfer of credits earned at overseas institutions
8. Financial aid/scholarships
9. Study abroad resource library
10. Study abroad orientation/debriefing programs
11. Study abroad advisor
12. Other ____________________________
13. None

Table 20

Arrangements for Student Participation in Study Abroad for Credit
Number of institutions: total survey respondents and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># institutions</td>
<td>% institutions</td>
<td># institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.(29) Consortia agreements</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Texas institutions</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S. institutions</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own study abroad programs</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct exchange programs</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special programs for transfer of credits from overseas</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid/scholarships</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>24:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad resource Library</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad orientation/debriefing</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad advisor</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0:35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of institutions/respondents participating in study abroad programs increased in each category. In the Barker (1994) survey, five universities (8.9%) indicated they had no study abroad programs in place at their institutions. Without exception, every institution responding to this question (both Texas and benchmark) in the current survey indicated they were involved in study abroad programs. Two of the Texas (2004) institutions did not respond to this question.
Consortia agreements were the most popular study abroad programs. Of the Barker (1994) survey respondents 55.4% indicated that consortia agreements were a vehicle for providing study abroad opportunities for students. When responding to the replicated survey, 74.3% of the Texas 2004 respondents and 100% of the benchmark 2004 institutions indicated consortia arrangements were a means of participating in credit-bearing study abroad. The use of agencies to facilitate student participation in credit-bearing study abroad was the least popular response with 14.3% of the Barker respondents, 34.3% of the Texas 2004 respondents and 40% of the benchmark 2004 participants indicating agency facilitation of study abroad. The benchmark responses in the area of providing opportunities for academic credit for study abroad were high in all areas.

21. (30) Please list countries where you have active institutional agreements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Country</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

Institutional Agreements

Number reporting agreements and average number of agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions/ average # agreements</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions/ average # agreements</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions/ average # agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. (30) Active institutional agreements</td>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>26/17.6</td>
<td>36/2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of active institutional agreements in reporting Texas universities has increased from 2.5 to 17.6 in the last 10 years with the total number of countries represented as having active institutional agreements also
increasing. All (100%) of the institutions participating in both the benchmark 2004
and Texas 2004 surveys reported agreements with more than one country.

Table 22

**Institutional Agreements With:**

List of countries / number times reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>X - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td>X - 6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Islands</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td>X - 21</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td>X - 2*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td>X - 20</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>X - 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>X - 3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>X - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td>X - 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td>X - 15</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td>X - 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America/West Indies</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X - 9</td>
<td>X - 72</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td>X - 8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>X - 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>X - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>X - 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.A.E.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td>X - 10^a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>X - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>X - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>X - 1^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 combines information regarding international institutional
agreements and the specific countries with which these agreements are held.

Twenty-six (74.2%) of the Texas 2004 universities participating in the survey
responded to this question. Five out of five (100%) of the benchmark 2004
institutions included lists of countries with which they had agreements.

The results of the Barker (1994) survey of Texas institutions indicated that 36
(64.3%) of institutions responded to the question concerning international
agreements. A total of 64 foreign countries were included in the list compiled from the responses on both the 1994 and 2004 surveys.

The Texas 2004 institutions listed the greatest number of agreements with Mexico (72 agreements), China (21 agreements), and France (20 agreements). Benchmark institutions reported the greatest number of agreements with Mexico (9), France (4), Spain (4) and Japan (4). The information from Barker’s original survey did not provide frequency numbers for the listed institutions.

Summary of Out-of-Country Education

Results of the updated 2004 survey indicated a 291% increase in the number of countries listed as having international agreements with Texas institutions. Twenty-three countries were listed in the Barker (1994) survey and 67 countries were listed in the 2004 survey. The increase in the number of agreements indicated an increase in the opportunities available to students for study abroad. In the 2004 survey, Texas A&M University reported a total of 120 agreements and referred the reader to their website for details. A complete list of the countries involved in the aforementioned 120 agreements could not be located on the A&M website. All five benchmark 2004 institutions reported having agreements with a total of 65 foreign countries.

International Student Support Services

Part 3 of the questionnaire consisted of 4 questions. Question 22 (31) requested the number of foreign students enrolled in Texas colleges and
universities. Questions 23, 24, and 25 (32, 33, and 34) detailed support services and activities provided for foreign students enrolled in the responding university.

22. (31) How many international students were enrolled [Fall 1992, Barker] in 2003?
   a. Graduate
   b. Undergraduate
   c. Non-degree programs

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions</th>
<th>avg. # students</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions</th>
<th>avg. # students</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions</th>
<th>avg. # students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.(31) Graduate</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>781.3</td>
<td>25:35</td>
<td>427.6</td>
<td>34:56</td>
<td>282.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>31:35</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td>44:56</td>
<td>167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree programs</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>168.5</td>
<td>10:35</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>10:56</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The benchmark 2004 institutions continued to lead the Texas 2004 institutions in the area of average enrollment of international students. The average number of graduate students enrolled in international programs in the responding Texas universities has increased from 282.5 in the 1994 study to an average of 427.6 in the 2004 study. When comparing the total enrollment of international students in Texas university graduate, undergraduate, and non-degree programs for both 1994 and 2004, the largest percentage of international students were enrolled in graduate programs. Sixty-five percent of the international students enrolled in the fall of 2003 in Texas institutions were
enrolled in graduate programs. Graduate students comprised 54.5% of the total international student enrollment reported in the Barker (1994) survey.

23. (32) Does your institution have programs to actively integrate the international student body into the overall college/university life? (yes / no)

Table 24

*Integration of International Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # responses</th>
<th>2004 Texas # responses</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.(32) Programs to integrate international students into college life</td>
<td>5:5 100%</td>
<td>32:35 87.5%</td>
<td>54:56 77.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five benchmark 2004 institutions had programs designed to integrate international students into college life. For the Texas institutions responding, there was a 9.7% increase from 1994 to 2004 in the number of institutions reporting programs designed to integrate international students into college life.

24. (33) Is there specific guidance provided to the staff and faculty in how to assist the foreign students on your campus?

Table 25

*Faculty Guidance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Four out of five benchmark 2004 institutions offer guidance for faculty in assisting foreign students. The Barker (1994) survey reported 47.3% of responding Texas institutions had a guidance program for faculty to train them in assisting international students. The 2004 follow-up survey revealed 56.2% of the Texas institutions reporting had faculty assistance programs for an increase of 8.9% over the last 10 years.

25. (34) Circle the number(s) for all activities/services provided to your international students:
   1. Initial orientation
   2. Pre-academic English as a second language program
   3. Counseling
   4. Immigration advising
   5. Assistance with documentation
   6. Exit interviews
   7. U.S. student peer assignments
   8. Student conferences on international affairs or global topics
   9. International club
   10. Foreign language club
   11. International week
   12. International students utilized as guest lecturers in the classroom
   13. Other services (please list)

Table 26

Activities/Services Provided International Students

Number of institutions responding to category: number of institutions responding to question and % yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions</th>
<th>% yes</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions</th>
<th>% yes</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions</th>
<th>% yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. (34) Initial orientation</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29:32</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>44:51</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-academic ESL</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14:32</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>30:51</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28:32</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>48:51</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration advising</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27:32</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>45:51</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance w/documentation</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26:32</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>43:51</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit interviews</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9:32</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>13:51</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. student peer assignments</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9:32</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>16:51</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student conferences on global topics</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7:32</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>15:51</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International club</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>26:32</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>38:51</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language club</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10:32</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>18:51</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International week</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>24:32</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25:51</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students as guest lecturers</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10:32</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>20:51</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10:32</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>5:51</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 25 (34) was a multi-response question. Numbers reported in the 2004 follow-up survey differed in several areas in relation to the like numbers in the Barker (1994) survey. Increases greater than 5% in the percentage of Texas 2004 institutions offering services can be noted in the areas of initial orientation (86.3% to 90.6%), international club (74.5% to 81.2%), and international week...
(49% to 75%). Decreases greater than 5% in the 1994 to 2004 Texas survey results occurred in the areas of pre-academic ESL (58.8% to 43.8%), counseling (94.1% to 87.5%), student conferences on global issues (29.4% to 21.9%), and international students as guest lecturers (39.2% to 31.2%). In addition to the activities/services listed above, one benchmark institution reported scheduling “field trips to cultural centers and nearby cities.” Texas institutions responding to the current survey reported a variety of receptions and trips provided for international students. The University of Texas at Dallas included the following list of additional activities:

…exit surveys/focus groups, immigration workshops/seminars, and free immigration attorney on campus for non F/J students, [international] health insurance, advising, weekly coffee highlighting different countries/holidays or cultures, Int'l [international] Education Week, Multicultural Leadership Program…

Synopsis of International Student Support Services

While the number of international students enrolled on Texas campuses has increased slightly, the greatest growth occurred in the enrollment of students in graduate programs. The benchmark institutions continued to lead the Texas institutions in the area of average enrollment of international students. The average number of graduate students enrolled in international programs in the responding Texas universities has increased from 282.5 in the 1994 study to an average of 427.6 in the 2004 study. When comparing the total enrollment of international students in Texas university graduate, undergraduate, and non-
degree programs, the largest percentages of international students enrolled in graduate programs. There was an increase of 9.7% in the percentage of affirmative responses from responding Texas institutions from 1994 to 2004 in the area of providing guidance for faculty members in assisting foreign students. The differences in percentages of responding institutions from 1994 to 2004 in the activities and/or services areas varied with increases in four areas and decreases in three areas. The largest change occurred in the area of international week activities with 49% of the responding institutions in Texas reporting this activity in 1994 compared to 75% reporting international week activities in 2004. The benchmark institutions provide strong support for study abroad as evidenced by the number of programs/arrangements they provide for students to gain credit for this experience.

Outreach

The final portion of the questionnaire dealt with university outreach programs. Questions 26 through 30 (35 through 39) detailed activities in the local community and international continuing education provided to businesses. Questions 31 through 33 (40 through 43) were designed to obtain information about university outreach outside the United States.

Community

26. (35) Does your institution participate in or sponsor any community-based programs which enhance understanding of global or international issues? (yes / no)

27. (36) Have outside speaker/guests visited your campus in the last two years to discuss international affairs, global issues, foreign cultures, etc? (yes / no)
28 (37) Are host families involved with individual international students? (yes / no)

Table 27

Community Relations

Number of institutions responding and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. (36) Outside speakers in last two years</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>28:32</td>
<td>50:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. (37) Host families involved with international students</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>18:32</td>
<td>34:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All benchmark institutions reporting had programs in place in all three areas listed resulting in 100% participation in these areas. Participation rates in community-based programs by the responding Texas institutions remained basically the same with the greatest difference being a 5.4% increase in "participation in community based programs" followed by a 4.5% decrease in “host family involvement with international students.” A slightly greater percentage of respondents to the Baker (1994) survey reported having outside speakers visit the campus for the purpose of discussing global issues.

29. (38) Circle number(s) for any of the following international continuing education programs which you now offer, or have offered, to the local business community:

1. Short-term foreign language
2. Import/export training
3. Training for foreign workers in the U.S.
4. Specialized English language training (ESL)
5. Tailored occupational programs
6. International business seminars
7. Other (please list): ______________________

Table 28

Services for Local Businesses

Number of institutions responding and %yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. (38) Short-term foreign language</td>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>8:18</td>
<td>22:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import/export training</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>10:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for foreign workers in U.S.</td>
<td>0:4</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>6:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized English language training</td>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>8:18</td>
<td>24:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailored occupational programs</td>
<td>0:4</td>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>10:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International business seminars</td>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>10:18</td>
<td>21:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>3:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short-term foreign language training (62.9% in 1994 and 44.4% in 2004) and international business seminars (60% in 1994 and 55.6% in 2004) were the most prevalent services provided. The number of institutions providing these services declined from 1994 to 2004. Texas institutions reporting in 2004 reported less involvement with community business outreach than institutions reporting in 1994 with the greatest decrease (11.5%) being recorded in training
for foreign workers in the United States. Benchmark 2004 institutions reported offering no training for foreign workers in the United States and no tailored occupational program.

30. (39) Circle number(s) for the services provided to the community:

1. International database of institution resources
2. Translating
3. International students utilized as guest speakers
4. Assistance to K-12 schools in your area to enhance international education
5. Document interpretation services
6. Other (please list):

_____________________________
_____________________________

Table 29

Services for the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. (39) International database of resources</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>4:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>17:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student as guest speakers</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>27:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to K-12 schools</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>18:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document interpretation services</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>8:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>3:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International students as guest speakers and assistance to K-12 schools were the most frequently reported community services reported by the responding Texas institutions in both the Barker (1994) and the 2004 surveys. In
1994, 57.4% of Texas institutions responding to Barker’s survey reported providing international students as guest speakers in the community. The percentage of Texas universities providing guest speakers in 2004 has increased by 2.6% to 60%. The greatest percentage increase occurred in document interpretation services with 1.7% of the responding Texas universities providing this service in 1994 and 20% of the responding Texas universities providing this service in 2004. The benchmark institutions reported high levels of community activity in all areas listed with the exception of document interpretation services.

**Summary of Community Outreach Programs**

In 2004, a total of 20 (57.1%) of the 35 Texas institutions responding to the survey responded to the question regarding outreach to the community while 18 (51.4%) of the 35 institutions responded to the question regarding outreach to businesses. On the original Barker (1994) survey, 47 of 56 Texas institutions (84%) reported providing outreach to communities and 35 of 56 (62.5%) Texas institutions reported providing outreach to businesses. While the emphasis on community outreach over business activity was constant in both surveys, the degree of this emphasis declined from a difference of 21.5% (84% to 62.5%) in 1994 to a reduced difference of 5.7% (57.1% to 51.4%) in 2004.

**Outreach Outside of the U.S.**

Programs involved in international outreach outside the U.S. were covered in questions 31 through 33 (40 through 42).

31. (40) Does your institution have a “sister” relationship in which it is involved with a city or institution outside the U.S.?
   *If yes, list location(s): _____________________________*
Table 30

*Sister Relationships*

Number of institutions responding and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # institutions</th>
<th>2004 Texas # institutions</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. (40) “Sister” relationship</td>
<td>3:5 60%</td>
<td>11:35 31.4%</td>
<td>21:56 37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Sister” relationships were reported by 3 benchmark institutions (60%), 11 of 35 (31.5%) of the Texas universities participating in the 2004 follow-up survey and 21 of 56 (37.5%) of the Texas institutions participating in the Barker (1994) survey. One of the benchmark 2004 institutions listed The University of Wales, Aberystwyth as the location of a “sister city.” Nine of the 11 Texas 2004 universities provided names of either cities or countries with which they had sister relationships. The countries and location, when listed, included China, France (University of Agen), Japan, Korea, and Mexico (Chihuahua and San Nicolas). Barker (1994) did not list the specific locations in the results of his survey.

32. (41) Does your institution offer distance education courses (using telecommunications technologies) outside the U.S.?  
If yes, list location(s): ________________________________

Table 31

*Distance Education*

Number of institutions responding and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Two of five (40%) of the benchmark institutions reported offering distance education opportunities outside the United States. Eleven of 31 (35.5%) of the Texas universities responding to the question regarding distance education reported they provided distance education courses outside the United States. Only one of 56 (1.8%) institutions reported offering distance education outside the United States in the Barker (1994) survey. This single respondent did not specify the location. The two benchmark 2004 institutions did not list any specific locations where distance education was being provided. The following is a the list of countries currently receiving distance education courses through the 11 Texas 2004 institutions responding to the survey question: Argentina, Canada, Chili, Mexico, South Africa, Middle East, and Venezuela.

33. (42) Does your institution provide technical assistance to foreign governments, institutions or agencies? If yes, please circle number(s) for the sponsoring agency (agencies) and list location(s): _________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsoring (contacting) agency</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. International agency (e.g., UN)</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. U.S. government agency (e.g., AID)</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foreign government agency</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other U.S. university (universities)</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foreign university</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. U. S. private agency</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Foreign private agency</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32
Foreign Technical Assistance

Number of institutions responding and % yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark # responses</th>
<th>2004 Texas # responses</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas Total # responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.(42)Technical assistance to foreign governments, institutions or agencies</td>
<td>2:5 40%</td>
<td>6:32 17%</td>
<td>15:46 32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a decrease of 15.6% in the percentage of Texas universities responding in the affirmative to the question regarding technical assistance to foreign governments. It is possible that while ten years ago universities were a primary source for technological training, foreign countries and businesses now possess the resources to train their workers internally or on-line. It is also possible that in light of the current concern over affiliation with some foreign governments, universities have not actively sought out opportunities to provide assistance to foreign governments.

Table 33

Technical Assistance

Number responding to category: number yes and %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Two of the benchmark institutions (100%) responding to question 33a. (42) reported providing technical assistance to United States Government agencies. All of the Texas 2004 universities responding to question 33a. (42) reported providing technical assistance to foreign universities (100%). The 2004 response to providing assistance to foreign universities showed an increase of 14.7% over the 86.7% reported by the Texas institutions responding to the Barker (1994) survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33a.(42) Sponsoring agency</th>
<th># institutions</th>
<th># institutions</th>
<th>Total # institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International agency</td>
<td>0:2 0%</td>
<td>3:6 50%</td>
<td>3:15 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government agency</td>
<td>2:2 100%</td>
<td>3:6 50%</td>
<td>9:15 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign government agency</td>
<td>0:2 0%</td>
<td>5:6 83.3%</td>
<td>8:15 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S. university</td>
<td>0:2 0%</td>
<td>2:6 33.3%</td>
<td>1:15 6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign university</td>
<td>0:2 0%</td>
<td>6:6 100%</td>
<td>13:15 86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. private agency</td>
<td>0:2 0%</td>
<td>0:6 0%</td>
<td>3:15 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign private Agency</td>
<td>0:2 0%</td>
<td>1:6 16.7%</td>
<td>4:15 26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

*Countries Provided Technical Assistance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33b (42) List of Countries</th>
<th>2004 Benchmark</th>
<th>2004 Texas</th>
<th>1994 Barker Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Azerbaijan,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unspecified)</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.A.E. (United Arab Emirate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 1994 to 2004, the number of countries receiving technical assistance provided by the Texas institutions responding to each survey has decreased. Respondents to the Barker (1994) survey listed 28 countries receiving assistance. Of the nine countries listed by the Texas 2004 respondents, three countries (Chile, Italy and South Africa) were not on the Barker (1994) list.
The two countries listed in the benchmark 2004 survey (Egypt and Indonesia) were present on the Barker (1994) list.

Synopsis of Programs for International Outreach Outside the United States

As revealed in Table 34, the list of Texas institutions providing assistance to foreign countries provided by Barker’s 1994 research (28 countries) was extensive in comparison to the list provided by the follow-up survey participants (9 countries). Technical assistance provided to foreign universities (86.7% in 1994 and 100% in 2004) and foreign government agencies (53.3% in 1994 and 83.3% in 2004) revealed the greatest percentage of participation on the part of Texas institutions responding “yes” to question 33 (42) (providing technical assistance to foreign governments, institutions, organizations). These percentages increased from 1994 to 2004 for a total increase over the past ten years, of 14.7% for foreign university assistance and 30% for foreign government assistance. The percentage reporting they provide technical assistance to other United States universities has increased from 6.7% reported in 1994 to 33.3% in 2004. Distance education to foreign countries as reported by responding institutions has increased from 1.8% (1994) to 35.5% (2004). But, as indicated in Table 32, the overall percentage of responding Texas universities giving technical assistance to foreign governments, institutions, or agencies has decreased from 32.6% in 1994 to 17% in 2004 (a decrease of 15.6%).

Model Programs

At the conclusion of the survey, participants were asked to provide “any comments they wished regarding international education.” Institutions were also
encouraged to provide the names of contact persons who were involved in model international programs on their campuses. The five benchmark institutions participating in the updated survey provided no comments and no references to model programs.

The Texas institutions responding to questions (43 and 44) on the 2004 updated survey provided some optimistic statements about their particular schools. In responding to an open-ended comment section on the most recent survey, the respondent from Trinity University reported “In 2004 we tripled our international student enrollment (Individual response detail for electronic survey question number 43). International students now comprise 6% of our total enrollment.” Another respondent articulated their university’s approach to the growing Hispanic population discussed in the review of literature section of this paper:

... [We are] a rapidly growing and designated Hispanic serving institution that provides open access to many first generation college students and a large commuter population. Our international programs are relatively young, yet quickly developing while facing the cultural and socioeconomic challenges of encouraging students to think globally and study abroad. Our goal is to develop an internationalized curriculum and academic/institutional culture while embracing a robust and diverse international student and scholar population. (The University of Texas at San Antonio, as reported in the individual response detail for electronic survey question number 43).
In the section where respondents were encouraged to fill out the names of persons who might provide information on model programs, a total of three names were provided. In Barker’s paper, he discussed two model programs. Because the responses were so limited, no follow up work was done regarding model institutions in the 2004 survey. All information provided in open-ended questions regarding unique international activities has been previously cited or discussed earlier in this review.
This study was an update of a study by the same name, conducted in 1994, by Dr. Thomas Barker. In the conclusion of his study, Barker (1994) called for a replication of his study to continue the analysis of the implementation of international education in Texas four-year colleges and universities. Barker’s (1994) survey was duplicated and mailed to the chief academic officers of the 79 private and public Texas four-year universities currently listed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating board. Barker’s (1994) survey was also adapted to an electronic format. The electronic Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the survey was included in the cover letter mailed along with the hard copy survey to each university. Upon receipt of the survey, the university representative could respond utilizing the hard copy and the stamped envelope included for returning the survey, or he/she could access the survey on-line through the URL provided. In addition to the mailed copy of the survey, an e-mail request for participation was generated and sent to each university official. The e-mail request contained a copy of the cover letter, and a direct link to the survey, allowing the respondent to access the survey directly and complete it on-line. Two e-mail reminders were also sent to each university that did not respond to the previous request(s).

The initial purpose of the study was to compare Texas institutions responding to the most recent survey to the responses obtained by Barker in 1994. The second
purpose of the study was to compare the results from the current Texas college and university responses to those obtained from the current benchmark institutions.

While describing the original survey, Barker (1994) noted:

The instrument was evaluated by a panel of experts to establish validity; a pilot survey was conducted with selected individuals in Texas four-year institutions completing the questionnaire. The returns were compared with a later mailing to presidents/chancellors of the same institutions. Because only minor differences were found, reliability was inferred (p. 150).

Because Barker’s survey questions were duplicated word for word from the original survey and only the numbering was changed the original validation process was accepted and not repeated before the 2004 administration.

While Barker’s initial results indicated that Texas institutions were behind the benchmark institutions in most area of implementation of international education, it was hoped that the ten-year time frame between surveys would have provided the 2004 institutions with an opportunity to grow in all areas of internationalization. In light of the current unrest in the world, an update of Barker’s information would provide valuable information concerning the efforts of Texas institutions to meet the continuing call for greater understanding of cultures other than our own.

In addition to soliciting responses to the 2004 survey from 79 Texas institutions, the 2004 survey was also mailed to the thirteen benchmark institutions Barker had selected for participation in the 1994 survey. The purpose for including benchmark institutions in the 2004 survey was to provide an opportunity to continue to compare the
status of the implementation of international education in Texas to universities with a long history of involvement in international education.

Fourty-two responses were received from Texas institutions. Seven of the Texas responses were rejected because they were either duplicate responses or largely incomplete. The response rate for the Texas surveys was 46.6%. Five of the benchmark surveys were received for a response rate of 38.4%. The Barker (1994) survey had a response rate of 70.9% for the Texas surveys, and 46.2% for the benchmark group.

The surveys received via United States mail were entered into the on-line survey system. Individual copies of each survey were obtained from the on-line survey service. Percentages and frequencies were calculated and downloaded from the on-line survey service. In addition, all open-ended response details were retrieved.

Summary/Analysis of Findings

Barker (1994) began his summary section with the following description of the survey:

The modified taxonomy of international education based on the literature contained four parts: (a) administration, (b) instructional activities, (c) international student support services, and (d) outreach. The taxonomy (Appendix C) did not address administration; however, the literature review revealed that this was an important aspect of international education and it was included in the instrument. The responses to the [1994] survey showed that most of the institutions had activities/programs in all of the areas of the modified taxonomy (151).
In anticipation of another study, Barker (1994) commented many Texas institutions were just getting started in the internationalization process at the time of his survey while the benchmark universities all had "a history of involvement with international education activities and programs spanning over a decade" (p. 115).

Barker continued:

It is expected that a longitudinal study some years hence would show the Texas institutions would compare more favorably to the norms of the benchmark institutions. It would also be expected that the recent signing [completion] of the NAFTA and GATT negotiations would cause Texas institutions to put more emphasis on international education. This could cause Texas institutions to add international education in their mission statement, establish institution-wide written policies, and international education offices, increase staffing as activity increases, establish more committees to advise and direct international education activities and programs, become members of more associations concerned with international education, commit more funds, and also see more sources of funding for international activities and programs (p. 115).

Overall results of the 2004 survey support the conclusion by Barker that Texas institutions would indeed, over time, increase their involvement and activity in all facets of international education. Texas 2004 institutions did report an increase in activity in many areas of international education. The Texas 2004 institutions compared favorably with the benchmark 2004 institutions.

Part 1: Summary/Analysis of Findings on the Administration Area of the Survey

Of the 35 Texas institutions responding to the initial question on the
2004 survey, 67.6% have mission statements including a reference to international education. Fifty-five institutions responded to the mission statement question in the Barker (1994) survey. Of the 55 institutions responding to Barker’s question, 43.6% verify a reference to international education in their respective mission statements. All of the benchmark 2004 institutions responding (4 of 4 for 100%) have mission statements referencing international education.

When the 2004 survey and 1994 survey responses regarding institution-wide policies addressing international education are compared, an increase of 24% in the number of institutions with institution-wide policies addressing international education is revealed. A 37% increase in institutions responding they had international education administrative offices is indicated in question #3. The average number of staff present in international education offices on Texas university campuses has remained stable with the exception of an increase in the area of part-time support. The average number of part-time support staff in international education offices in Texas universities has increased by approximately two (1.9) staff members.

Twenty-six (74.2%) of the Texas 2004 universities reported the presence of an administrator with primary responsibility for international education. In the 1994 survey, 73.2% of the Texas institutions reported the presence of an administrator with primary responsibility for international education. The percentage increases mentioned above indicate the placing of additional significance on international programs as well as greater oversight and concern for those programs at the higher administrative levels. Responses to the question regarding to whom the head administrator in the international office reported revealed a shift in the last ten years. A far greater
percentage of those administrators now report to the President, Chancellor, or Provost as reported in the current survey. In contrast, the greatest percentage reported to a vice president of academic affairs in the original survey. It should be noted some institutions use the terms Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs interchangeably. Regardless of which term is utilized in referring to the administrator, the trend is toward greater academic oversight of international education programs. Five of five (100%) of the benchmark 2004 institutions responded to the question regarding the presence of international education offices with 100% in the affirmative. This strong response continues to support Barker’s (1994) earlier observation that benchmark institutions appear more established due to their head start in developing international programs.

As noted earlier, there has been an increase in the number of international education offices in institutions of higher education in the state of Texas; however, the number of staff members working in these offices has changed very little. The Texas institutions reported almost twice as many full-time professional staff members compared to the benchmark group. Both groups reported the presence of part-time student workers in their international offices. A slight shift in some of the staffing numbers in international education offices in Texas is apparent with an increase in part-time support and a decrease in full-time support noted. It is possible this shift in staffing is a result of a decrease in financial support and reflects an effort on the part of the Texas institutions to stretch their current funds.

The percentage of universities reporting institution-wide written policies has improved by 37% as has the number of institutions with international education offices. While the number of administrative offices has increased, the number of staff persons
operating those offices has remained relatively stable. This may be a result of substantial financial constraints currently in place on all educational institutions in the state of Texas. Many educational institutions continue to do more with little or no increase in staff; this current staffing statistic reflects that trend.

The increase in the percentages of both policy and advisory committees indicates an increase in activity and in the influence of these committees on the creation of institutional policy dealing with the globalization of the curriculum. In nine out of ten administrative areas where committees are in operation, the percentage of policy-making committees in relation to the percentage of advisory committees has increased over the past ten years. The 2004 benchmark institutions reported a greater number of advisory committees when compared to the number of policy committees.

All of the benchmark 2004 institutions reported membership in an international association. Seventy-six percent of the 2004 Texas respondents reported membership in an international association as compared to the 70% figure in the 1994 study. The increase in memberships in organizations involved in international education again reflects additional activity in the area of globalization at the reporting institutions.

The percentage of institutions in the State of Texas who rely on public funding (student fees and institutional budgets) has increased significantly. Utilization of income generated from the international programs themselves remains stable while reliance on private sources for funding has decreased. The greatest percentage shift in funding is in the area of student fees; 48% of the institutions responding reporting reliance on these fees in 1994 compared to 71.5% of the Texas institutions responding reporting reliance on these fees in 2004. These figures indicate a continuance of the trend toward greater
reliance on internal funds versus outside funding programs to fund international education programs. The apparent move away from the use of grants and private funding for international education may be directly related to the responses received on the 2004 survey indicating a decrease in university outreach services provided for the community and businesses. If university involvement in the form of international outreach programs is not visible, accessible, and/or useful to the community, the resulting interest in funding programs may no longer exist.

Part 2: Summary/Analysis of Findings on the Instructional Activities of International Education

Part 2 of the questionnaire addressed instructional activities in three different areas: a) faculty development, b) curriculum, and c) out-of-country education. This portion of the survey is made up of questions 8 through 14 (8 through 21).

In 1994, 35.7% of the Texas institutions and 66.7% of the benchmark institutions reported the existence and maintenance of a centralized database of faculty expertise and participation in international education. In 2004, 14.7% of the Texas institutions and 50% of the benchmark institutions reported the existence and maintenance of a centralized database of faculty expertise and participation in international education. These figures represent a decline in the utilization of specific databases but may not indicate a decline in organizational systems to monitor these international education records. Records containing information on faculty expertise and participation may be included in one general university database instead of a specific stand-alone set of records.
The average number of faculty members from foreign institutions who have taught or conducted research on the Texas 2004 campuses responding decreased by 27 (26.9) members. The average number of faculty participating in all four of the faculty exchange and activities categories decreased from 1994 to 2004.

All five of the benchmark institutions participating in the 2004 survey responded in the affirmative indicating their institutions had centralized funding earmarked for international education activities. These 2004 benchmark data again reinforce Barker’s conclusion that longevity of the benchmark programs leads to increased activity and participation in all facets of the program. However, additional research would no doubt reveal additional factors producing this continued strong activity, i.e., leadership, historical, and/or political factors. Less than one half (44.1%) of the Texas 2004 institutions reported centralized funding; this percentage remained relatively unchanged from the 1994 figure (42.6%).

Faculty incentives for participation in international activities were present at many of the universities surveyed. Among those institutions reporting faculty incentives for international activities, an increase in the number of in-house workshops and seminars as well as linkage programs occurred in the Texas institutions over the last ten years. Further analysis of the reported data reveals a range of 0% to 26% of the Texas 2004 institutions providing incentives and a range of 0% to 30.4% of the Barker (1994) institutions reporting incentives. These low percentages of incentives reported also indicate that approximately 70% of the Texas institutions reporting in both the 1994 and 2004 survey provide no incentives for faculty involvement in international education. This high percentage of “no incentive” responses indicates a continuance of the trend of
minimal support for faculty who participate in international education activities. There has been little progress in the area of providing faculty incentives over the last ten years. Again financial, political, and leadership factors no doubt play a part in this lack of reported progress.

The 2nd portion of part 2 of the survey was designed to provide information on curricular organization and content. In the Barker (1994) study, 45 of 56 Texas institutions (80%) reported some sort of organization for international study. In the 2004 update, 33 of 35 (94%) institutions reported some form of organization for international studies. The most prevalent method of organization for international studies continues to be infusion or integration of international material into the current curriculum. The subjective question inquiring into the perception of the effect on faculty standing regarding tenure, promotion, and merit raises remained constant. Of those responding to the question on perception, 100% of the benchmark institutions indicated that faculty participation in international education was perceived to enhance both tenure and promotion opportunities. The responses to this question mirror the responses from question 13a (19) which indicates the number of universities offering faculty incentives for participation in international education has remained relatively constant since 1994. It would appear Barker’s (1994) lists of possible methods of organizing international curriculum continue to be current as evidenced by few additions being included in the “other categories” response section.

A significant finding in this portion of the survey is the increase in the reported average number of degrees awarded in international studies. In 1994, 12 universities reported offering 276 degrees for an average of 23 degrees per university. In 2004, 10
universities reported awarding a total of 705 degrees for an average of 70.5 degrees per campus. Two of the five benchmark 2004 institutions reported awarding an average of five degrees in the last two years.

The most common foreign languages offered by the Texas universities and the benchmark schools were Spanish, French, and German (listed in order of frequency) as reported in all surveys reviewed. The percentage of Texas 2004 universities offering major degrees and minor specialties in foreign languages decreased since the Barker (1994) survey. However, the variety of languages offered by Texas institutions has increased from a total of 13 in 1994 survey to 21 in 2004. The number of foreign language credits and international courses required by institutions surveyed remains stable. Sixty percent of the benchmark and 64.7% of the Texas 2004 schools report offering ESL courses. The Barker (1994) survey reported almost the same percentage as the Texas 2004 respondents with (64.2%) of the universities reporting the availability of ESL courses. The percentages of schools offering academic credit for ESL classes was 60% for the benchmark institutions, 20.6% for the Texas institutions responding to the 2004 survey, and 40.5% for the Texas institutions responding to the 1994 survey. While the percentage of Texas institutions offering ESL remains stable, the percentage of those also offering academic credit for ESL classes has declined by 20%. The apparent decline in the number of institutions offering ESL classes for credit does not bode well for the efficacy of international education. If a correlation exists between credit-based ESL offerings and greater emphasis on international education, the numbers reported would then reveal a regression in emphasis on international education in the ten years between surveys. This decrease in ESL for credit classes
may also reflect a lack of student need or a lack of students due to the tightening of immigration regulations resulting in fewer students available to enroll in the for credit programs.

In the Barker (1994) survey, a total of 35 graduate degrees in foreign language were offered by the 56 responding Texas institutions yielding an average of less than 1 degree per campus (.63). The 2004 survey reveals that a total of 19 graduate degrees in a foreign language were offered by 35 Texas universities, again averaging less than 1 graduate degree per campus (.54). The five benchmark institutions participating in the 2004 survey offered no graduate language degrees. While the number of degrees in international studies is on the rise, there does not appear to be a parallel increase in the number of foreign language degrees. The marketability of international degrees may make these degrees more attractive and it is also possible that while students are enrolling in foreign language courses, this activity will not appear as a “major” in university records.

Institutional participation in study abroad programs has increased in all categories surveyed. In the Barker (1994) survey, 8.9% of the responding universities indicated they had no study abroad programs available for students. In contrast, all institutions responding to the current survey revealed they had some type of study abroad program. All benchmark institutions in both the 1994 and 2004 survey reported study abroad advisors. The 1994 study revealed 30.4% of the institutions employed study abroad advisors in comparison with 63.6% of 2004 survey respondents. The number of international institutional agreements for study abroad has grown from an average of 2.5 reported by the 1994 Texas respondents to an average of 17.6 reported
by the 2004 Texas respondents. The number of countries with whom these agreements are held is extensive and has almost tripled (291%) since the results from the original Barker survey were compiled in 1994.

**Part 3: Summary/Analysis of Student Support Services**

In the current 2004 benchmark results, the 4 benchmark schools have a greater average number (168.5) of international students enrolled in non-degree programs than either the 10 Texas schools responding in 2004, average number was 53.5, or the 10 Texas schools responding in 1994, average number was 64.8. Graduate programs in the state of Texas, included in this survey, enrolled the greatest number of international students with 65% of the total number of foreign students reported enrolled in graduate programs in the fall of 2003. Graduate students comprised 54.5% of the total international student enrollment reported in the Barker (1994) survey. These results confirm a greater interest in graduate study versus undergraduate study exists in the international student population. Many universities have become reliant on foreign student graduate school enrollment to support many of their programs especially in the areas of math and science thus increasing the motivation to continue to recruit foreign students to enroll in these programs. The attitude and heightened interest in foreign students will of course result in increased foreign student interest in universities projecting this positive attitude towards their matriculation.

In the wake of September 11, the number of international students enrolled at Texas universities continues to grow in spite of increased tightening of immigration procedures. The opportunities for guidance for faculty regarding their work with international students has increased from 43.7% of institutions responding they offered
this service in 1994 to 56.2% of the universities offering this service in 2004. Texas institutions reported offering a variety of activities and services for international students with all categories on the survey being selected by a minimum of seven of the schools responding. The number of institutions reporting the presence of specialized activities for international students in the 2004 survey was down in 7 of the 12 categories from the number in those same 7 categories reported by Barker (1994). The greatest number of responding universities reported offering “initial orientation” with 90.6% of the 2004 respondents reporting this service in comparison to 86.3% of the 1994 respondents who reported offering this service. Several universities provided lists of additional activities not listed in the survey.

Part 4: Summary/Analysis of Findings on Outreach

This area addresses both community and out-of-country outreach activities. All of the benchmark 2004 institutions reported 100% participation in: a) sponsorship of community based international programs, b) sponsorship of outside speakers on visits to their campuses to discuss international affairs, and c) sponsorship of host families involved with individual international students. A total of 62.5% of the Texas 2004 participants and 57.1% of the Texas 1994 participants reported sponsorship of community-based international programs. In 2004, 87.5% of the Texas institutions reported sponsoring outside speaker visits to campuses for the purpose of discussing international affairs as compared to 89.3% of the Texas 1994 participants responding in the affirmative to this question. Approximately 56% (56.2%) of the Texas 2004 institutions and 60.7% of the Texas 1994 institutions had host families involved with individual international students, a decrease of 4.5% over the last 10 years.
All benchmark institutions have programs in place in all three areas of community relations addressed by the survey. Participation percentages in community based programs varied less than six percentage points in all three areas reported. Outside speakers and guest visits to the campus for the purpose of discussing international affairs is the most prevalent community participation activity reported.

While enrollment by foreign students has increased, the services provided for the students as reported appear to have remained stable. However, direct observation of three local university campuses reveals a great deal of campus participation and interaction with non-foreign students on the part of the foreign students observed. A general and continual assimilation/integration of foreign students seems to be evolving with the need for specialized programs to assist these students becoming less necessary, hence less formalized.

Short-term foreign language training and international business seminars were the two most frequently provided continuing education programs for community businesses as reported by the Texas 2004 universities. International students as guest speakers and assistance to K-12 schools are the most frequently reported community services reported by the benchmark 2004 institutions as well as the Texas institutions surveyed in both 1994 and 2004. Public schools continue to seek the resources of universities to enrich their own offerings in the area of internationalization.

Sister relationships were reported by 60% of the benchmark institutions participating in the survey. Of the eleven Texas universities participating in the 2004 survey, 31.4% reported sister city relationships. In the original Barker (1994) survey, 21 Texas universities (37.5%) report sister city relationships. Several of the Texas
institutions in both surveys report relationships with more than one city or university. In 1994, 37.5% of the Texas universities report offering distance education courses outside the United States. In 2004, 35.5% of Texas universities report offering distance education courses outside the United States.

The questions dealing with providing technical assistance to foreign governments or universities drew a very low number of responses with 15 Texas institutions responding in the affirmative on the Barker (1994) survey and 6 institutions responding affirmatively on the 2004 survey. The percentage of Texas universities providing technical assistance to foreign universities or countries has declined by 15.6% as represented by the comparison between the 1994 and 2004 surveys. Security concerns arisen in the post September 11 era may account for this phenomenon. Additionally, local expertise in technical areas may have increased reducing the need for such assistance.

Technological advances have been quite rapid in the past ten years with many countries developing international ties through business dealings. Many international businesses now operate worldwide. Some of these businesses were created exclusively to provide technological services. Technological applications and training are becoming stand-alone industries relieving the demand for much of the technological training provided by universities in the past. Technology training has evolved and is now being provided business-to-business rather than school-to-business.

Summary/Analysis of Findings on Model Programs

There were a few references to possible model programs operating at Texas universities in 2004. The benchmark 2004 institutions did not respond to this inquiry.
Due to this low response, the references to model institutions were not investigated as a part of this updated survey. Comments on unique or growing programs provided in the 2004 survey have been cited throughout the body of this paper.

Discussion

Barker’s (1994) review of the literature (pre-1994), as well as the review of current literature, reveals a consensus of opinion regarding international education. Educators, politicians, and business people have all articulated the need for a greater international perspective on the part of all citizens. The most recent edition of the *Phi Delta Kappan* educational journal contains a special section on international education. Susan Nall Bales (2004) states that:

…The public has a lot on its mind just now, from jobs and health care to “failing” schools and terrorist threats. Without a clear and well-stated message about the importance and promise of international education, this issue is unlikely to attach itself to other public goals that Americans are eager to address (p. 207).

The organization and titles of the articles in this special *Phi Delta Kappan* (November, 2004) section on international education appear succinctly relevant. The list begins with an article entitled, “How Americans Think about International Education” (Bales, 2004), then adds “Improving Student’s Capacity in Foreign Languages” (Met, 2004), then goes on to “Teaching the World: A New Requirement for Teacher Preparation” (Kelly, 2004), followed by “Harnessing Information Technology for International Education” (Roberts, 2004), and concluding with “Portraits of Pioneering Schools” (Roberts, 2004). While these selected articles were directed at K-12 institutions, they have K-16 impact. The topics and organizational structure mirror the Barker (1994) survey construction and
parallel the review of literature contained in this paper. Interest in the area of international education is expected to continue to grow as it is becoming clear the entire nation’s interest will be served by increasing international and cultural literacy among its population. With the increase in emphasis on the area of social studies and history at the elementary level in the state of Texas, as driven by the impending implementation of a social studies test as part of the fifth grade Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, internationalization of the elementary curriculum is critical.

Conclusions

The purposes of the study were met. A restating of the purposes and brief conclusions follow:

1. The initial purpose was a continuation of Barker’s (1994) efforts to determine the components of international education policies and programs as described in the literature. Literature published since Barker’s study in 1994 was reviewed. The current review of literature supported Barker’s (1994) earlier conclusions that the Arum (1987) taxonomy provided a comprehensive structure for developing the survey (with the addition of a section on the administrative structure of international education).

2. The second purpose of the study was to determine the emphasis given to international education by the government and other agencies. Barker (1994) found “the federal government had realized the importance of international education and had responded with legislation to support international programs” (p. 6). Barker also observed “while a number of politicians had called for internationalization of the curriculum, the SACS did not address international
education in the accreditation manual” (p. 6). The more recent 2004 review of literature supported Barker’s 1994 conclusion that though the political climate continues to be supportive of international education, the funding and personal support for university programs lags behind the rhetoric.


3. The third purpose was to examine the history of the development of international education concentrating on the post-WWII period and to determine what new components or structures were developed in the collegiate international education system in the United States. The review of post-WWII literature supported the components articulated previously by Barker (1994). As Barker predicted, the last ten years have resulted in increased university interest, dedication, and activity in the area of internationalization of the curriculum. The two gateway activities for internationalization, student travel abroad and foreign language acquisition, have shown growth at the university level.

4. The fourth purpose was to describe these components listed in #3 (4) above, as implemented in Texas four-year institutions of higher education in the areas of
administration, instructional activities, international exchange activities, support services, and outreach activities. This purpose was completed by Barker as of 1994 and updated through the re-administration of the international education survey and analysis of the updated data from 2004 in comparison to the Barker (1994) data for Texas four-year institutions of higher education. As noted previously, both the latest literature and the increase in student activity at the university level support the instructional and international exchange activities currently in place on Texas campuses.

5. The final purpose was to determine how the components of international education, as implemented in Texas four-year institutions, compared to the implementation of the components in the selected benchmark institutions. This purpose was completed by Barker as of 1994, and updated through the re-administration in 2004 of the international education survey to both Texas and benchmark institutions and through the analysis and comparison of this data. The 2004 benchmark responses continue to reveal a higher percentage of involvement in all aspects of international education on the part of the responding institutions when compared to the Texas 2004 university responses. However, Texas universities are narrowing the gap in many areas. Responses from the 2004 Texas universities indicate they have surpassed the benchmark universities in the awarding of graduate degrees and in the variety of foreign languages offered. The continued growth of benchmark institutions in most areas of globalization is a good predictor for continued growth of the Texas institutions. I believe Texas will continue to work towards the implementation of international
programs at the university level just as the benchmark institutions have.

Implications

As Americans continue to struggle with international turmoil and its effects on our everyday lives, many of the conclusions provided in the earlier review of literature continue to be validated. Understanding continues to be the key to peaceful coexistence in this shrinking world. Direct exposure to and active acquisition of knowledge of languages and cultures other than our own will continue to be the most efficient route to understanding. Pressure on educational institutions to effectively incorporate meaningful and effective international education programs into the current curriculum and concern for the future of international education continue to influence post-secondary educational philosophy and direction. Business continues to call for increased emphasis on global perspectives mandated by the realization that the United States is but one part of a global economy. Controversy continues regarding the universities’ roles and responsibilities for enhancing a global perspective in the educational, economic, and cultural literacy of our populace.

Current population trends suggest, in Texas as well as in other states sharing common borders with Mexico, the number of families where English is not the primary language will soon outnumber those for which English is the native language. Thus, the need for effective language instruction for all residents and the need to increase the opportunities for genuine cultural exchange will become more pervasive. As older Texans return to school and foreign-born residents seek increased educational opportunities, Texas secondary educational institutions must take the lead in providing practical solutions to the need for more foreign language training for these non-
traditional students. Texas educational institutions must continue to develop and implement curriculum to enhance cultural exchange and sensitivity to cultures other than our own.

Based on the current 2004 study, Texas universities have increased their institutional awareness and activity in the area of international education. These increases are supported by the increase in: a) the percentage of Texas institutions mentioning international education in their mission statement, b) the percentage of institutions reporting institution-wide policies addressing international education, c) the percentage of institutions reporting international education administrative offices, d) the percentage of international administrators reporting to Provosts or Chancellors, and e) the presence of both advisory and policy making committees dealing with international education issues on campus. University membership in international associations has increased slightly over the last ten years. There has been an increase in the number of degrees and certificates awarded in international studies. Opportunities for Texas university students to study abroad have increased as revealed in the percentage of universities offering numerous arrangements for student participation in study abroad for credit programs. Consortia agreements continue to be the most popular study abroad programs with the 2004 institutions reporting an average of 17.6 agreements in contrast to the average 2.6 agreements reported in 1994. The number of international students enrolled on Texas campuses has increased with the largest increases being reported in graduate programs. The percentage of Texas campuses providing specialized programs for international students has increased or remained relatively constant in most areas surveyed. The percentage of Texas institutions offering distance
education courses outside the United States increased from 1.8% in 1994 to 35.5% in 2004. All of the advances listed above constitute a great beginning for international education in Texas. However, we have much left to do.

Globalization is a fact not an ideology. Everything from averting the spread of nuclear and biological weapons to opening new markets and business opportunities and from solving global environmental and health concerns to managing international conflicts will require our citizens to have greater knowledge of other world regions (Engler and Hunt, 2003 p. 199).

All of the activity summarized above indicates increased internal activity towards the internationalization of education in Texas universities. While internal university emphasis and activity appear to have increased, manpower and financial support either decreased or remained stable. Staffing at international education offices decreased slightly. Reliance on internal versus external funding for international education programs increased while funding from grants and private sources decreased. Faculty exchange activities declined while faculty incentives to participate in international activities and to internationalize the curriculum decreased. The awarding of degrees in foreign languages declined, as has the percentage of institutions offering credit for ESL courses.

The trend toward the university’s internalization of international programs is also reflected in the decrease of outreach programs provided by universities to both businesses and the community. Outreach programs as reflected in the question regarding “sister city” relationships have decreased. While the percentage of institutions providing technical assistance to outside agencies increased, the number of countries
receiving this technical assistance decreased.

Outreach continues to be an area where Texas universities can take a lead in providing global exposure for those in the communities where the universities are located. Often universities provide a variety of opportunities for community and business members to access current information from all over the world. Maintaining and increasing the every-day contact with members of the surrounding communities will continue to provide a more global perspective to all aspects of life in a university community.

In conclusion, the Texas universities surveyed for this study continue to work and make progress towards the internationalization of educational programs. Texas four-year universities are currently providing more opportunities for students to study abroad with less external involvement and funding. The Texas universities appear to have done more with less in the last ten years; this is a reflection of a strong commitment to international education despite the difficulties involved in the process.

Recommendations for Further Study

As universities seek to provide basic foundations for global understanding, a more inclusive definition of international education needs to be developed. Rather than international education being identified or defined as a specific set of activities or methods, the term itself may need to be redefined as a “process” rather than a distinct or independent area for study. It is very difficult to articulate a set of elements, facts, or even concepts that, taken altogether, can be easily formatted into a curriculum for international education. The concept of internationalization in all current curricular areas of study, K-16, seems more practical and certainly more realistic in today’s world. “Even
within individual disciplines and traditional courses, international perspectives can be introduced to provide a broader context for understanding” (Jackson, 2004, p. 210). Activities designed to further define internationalization are required.

Study and research into the specific needs of today’s students would also provide more concrete information regarding international program design, integration, and curricular changes. Kagan and Stewart (2004) continue to articulate the need for changes in our current university program design. They state“…American students’ knowledge of other countries, cultures, and languages has not begun to keep pace with the escalating importance of this knowledge (of increasing global interdependence) to our nation’s prosperity and national security” (p. 195). These sentiments echo those of Simon (1990), one of the pioneers of support for international education quoted earlier in this review of literature. Kagan and Stewart (2004) continue:

As the comments to the right clearly indicate increasing global interdependence, [list of quotes from Rod Paige, Colin Powell, James B Hunt Jr. Morley Safer are highlighted] though a dominant feature of our age, has until recently been a neglected aspect of American education reform. What we may know intuitively – but have not dared to admit – is that American students’ knowledge of other countries, cultures, and languages has not begun to keep pace with the escalating importance of this knowledge to our nation’s economic prosperity and national security (p. 196).

Any of the four sections of the current 2004 survey could be isolated and surveyed in greater detail. Student perspectives on international education are rare in the published literature. As our population ages and seeks non-traditional learning
opportunities, the internationalization of continuing education curriculum will become more relevant, and therefore, continues to warrant attention. The possibilities of cooperation between international business and educational institutions continue to hold much promise especially in the area of funding for study and work opportunities abroad. Further research and study opportunities in the area of international education are endless.

Studies similar to Barker’s (1994) that concentrate on Texas will, of course, continue to be of special interest to local educators and politicians. However, international education is rapidly becoming an equity issue. This issue will demand increasing emphasis among the policy-making entities shaping this country’s educational institutions.

Studies concerning methods for teaching language would be an especially valuable addition to the body of literature dealing with the internationalization of education. This call for more research brings this study full circle in anticipation that the progress of internationalization of education in the nation and in the State of Texas is indeed moving in a positive direction.

The ultimate goal must be to expand the international dimensions of the campus. This will necessitate curriculum changes or modifications. The process must include higher administration, faculty, staff, and students. Once an international flavor is added, the institution will stand out among its peers and will add to the educational experience of the students (Barker, 1994, p. 166).

As a society, we must further engage and commit to intelligent dialogue and serious study of other cultures in order to enhance our own culture. The demands of the
global economy and our increasing integration and interdependence with those of differing religious, educational, cultural, and political backgrounds will necessitate an increased aptitude and focus among those engaged in the enterprise of education. Our society’s progress in this venture will be determined, at least in part, by our educational institutions’ success in the creation and implementation of effective programs that enhance the public’s interest and foster the desire to participate in honest cross-cultural exchange. While progress is apparent, complacency will yield regression in this area of study. The time is now and this moment marks the opportunity to make a choice for the future. The choice remains for each educator as he/she seeks to determine how the student’s need for global perspective affects his/her own instructional practices … will it be progress or stagnation?
APPENDIX A

TAXONOMY OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Studies</th>
<th>International Exchange</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Foreign language and area studies</td>
<td>&gt; Study abroad by U.S. students and scholars</td>
<td>Barker (1994) p. 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. U.S. students</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Travel and study abroad</td>
<td>Used with permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; International and topical problems and issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Peace/world order and/or global studies</td>
<td>b. U.S. university and group sponsored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development studies women in development</td>
<td>c. College/University consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. International relations</td>
<td>d. U.S. agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Comparative studies</td>
<td>e. foreign university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Direct enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Outreach</td>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Campus based</td>
<td>a. linkages and exchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community based</td>
<td>b. Professional meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sabbaticals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Foreign students and scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Foreign students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Foreign student program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. community programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. English programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foreign scholars programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Linkages/exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Professional meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sabbaticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Campus visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barker (1994) p. 174
Used with permission.
APPENDIX B

SURVEY COVER LETTER
Dear University Official Addressed or Designee,

In 1994, Dr. Thomas S. Barker conducted a survey on the implementation of international education at universities in the state of Texas. This survey was completed as part of his doctoral studies at the University of North Texas. Your university was a part of this study. I am currently a doctoral student enrolled in the College of Education at UNT and I am working on an update of Dr. Barker’s survey for my doctoral dissertation. The information you provide concerning your university will be very valuable to the study. I estimate that it will take approximately 30 minutes to complete the survey. This update of Dr. Barker’s study is very timely, and I hope to provide valuable statewide information on the topic of international education to both universities and state agencies. Please feel free to forward this survey to someone else on your campus if you determine that they have the requested information more readily available. This study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (940-565-3940).

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the survey results please provide your name and the information requested at the end of the survey. I thank you in advance for your assistance. If you have any questions, feel free to call me at [phone number] or you may wish to speak to my faculty sponsor, Dr. Jim Laney at the University of North Texas at (940) 565-2602 or email him at laney@coefs.coe.unt.edu. My email address is... (email address omitted for privacy)

To begin the survey please go to http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u19771624513 and follow the prompts provided.

If you prefer to complete the survey by hand, I have enclosed a hard copy and a stamped envelope for your convenience.

Again, my thanks in advance for your valuable assistance.

Thank you,
Sarah Hodges
APPENDIX C

SURVEY
SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Institution_________________________________________ Date____________________

Person completing survey_____________________________ Position_______________

Part 1. ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Directions: Circle Y for yes or N for no.

Y N 1. Does your institution’s mission statement address international education?

Y N 2. Do your institution-wide written policies address international education?

Y N 3. Does your institution have an international education administrative office?

If yes, please list:
Name of the office_______________________________________
Number of full-time professional staff ___________
Number of part-time professional staff ___________
Number of full-time support staff ___________
Number of part-time support staff ___________

Y N 4. Is there a person at your institution with primary responsibility for international education? If yes, please list the person’s title.

To whom does this person report within your institution?
Circle the appropriate number.
1 President or Chancellor
2 Provost
3 Vice President - Academic Affairs
4 Vice President - Student Affairs
5 Other Vice President
6 Other, within Academic Affairs
7 Other, within Student Affairs
8 Other: ____________________________________________

Used with permission.
Barker, 1994 pp.178-183
5. Is there an institution-wide committee or task force concerned with international education issues on your campus?

If yes, please circle the appropriate number for area(s) in which the committee deals and indicate whether it is an advisory or policy committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Advisory</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Exchanged programs/linkages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Study abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 International student advising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Technical assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Intensive English ESL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sponsored students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Foreign language instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Area or international studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Foreign visitor program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Community liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does your institution have a membership in any state, national, or international associations related to your international educational mission?

7. Sources(s) of funding for international educational activities at your institution?

Circle number(s) for all that apply:

1 Institutional funds budgeted for international education
2 Income generated through programs (e.g., overhead from international development projects, intensive English programs)
3 Grants/contracts from federal government agencies
4 Grants/contracts from state or local government agencies
5 Grants/contracts from U. S. firms
6 Grants/contracts from non-U. S. sources
7 Grants from foundations
8 Private gifts, grants, contracts
9 Student fees
10 Other: __________________________________________
Part 2. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Directions: Circle Y for yes or N for no.

Faculty Development:

Y  N  8. Does your institution have a centralized database of faculty/staff international expertise and interests (e.g. publications, travel or work abroad, sponsor of an international students' organization)?

Y  N  9. Does your institution have a centralized database containing information about faculty participation in international education?

10. In the past two academic years approximately how many…
   a. faculty from foreign institutions taught/conducted research on your campus? __________
   b. of your faculty participated in programs, workshops, or conferences in international education in the U. S.? __________
   c. of your faculty participated in programs, workshops or conferences in international education abroad? __________
   d. of your faculty taught/conducted research at institutions abroad? __________

Y  N  11. Does your institution provide centralized funding specifically for international education activities (e.g., programs, workshops, conferences, exchanges, etc.)?

Y  N  12. Does your institution provide faculty incentives for international education activities?

   If yes, please circle number(s) for all that apply:
   1 In-house workshops/seminars
   2 Off campus workshops/seminars in the U. S. or abroad
   3 Linkage programs (e.g., other institutions, other countries)
   4 Foreign language classes
   5 Teaching classes in international education outside your major teaching area
   6 Additional time to work for tenure
   7 Other: ________________________________________________

Y  N  13. Is there a reward system to encourage faculty to participate in internationalizing the curriculum?

   If yes, please circle number(s) for the activities rewarded:
   1 Curriculum development
   2 Developmental leaves/sabbaticals outside the U. S.
   3 Research
   4 Processes to seek federal funding for international education curriculum
   5 Other: ________________________________________________
14. In your opinion, when faculty participate in international education, what is their perception of the effect on their standing for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enhanced</th>
<th>No effect</th>
<th>Jeopardized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit raises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum:

15. How are international/global studies organized at your institution? Circle number(s) for all that apply:
   1 Integrated/infused into regular curriculum (e.g., modules in existing classes)
   2 Separate courses, which specifically address international/global studies
   3 Curriculum leading to degree in international/global studies, area specialization
   4 Curriculum leading to a minor in international/global studies, area specialization
   5 Curriculum leading to a certificate in international/global studies, area specialization
   6 Other: ___________________________________________
   7 No organized international/global studies offered

16. If degrees or certificates are awarded in international studies, how many were awarded in past two years?
   Number of students awarded degrees ____________
   Number of students awarded certificates __________

17. Please circle number(s) for the languages offered by your institutions and indicate those offered as major or minor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th># COURSES</th>
<th>UNDERGD MAJOR</th>
<th>UNDERGD MINOR</th>
<th>GRAD DEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arabic</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chinese</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 French</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 German</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Greek</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Italian</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Japanese</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Korean</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Latin</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Russian</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Spanish</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18. Indicate which of the following are institution-wide requirements for undergraduate degrees:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Courses with international content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>International experience (e.g., study abroad)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Does your institution offer English as second language courses (ESL)?

If yes, ______

Y  N  Are students given academic credit for these ESL courses?

Out of Country Education:

20. How does your institution facilitate U.S. students’ participation in credit bearing study abroad programs? Please circle number(s) for all that apply:

1. Consortia arrangements
2. Agencies
3. Other Texas institutions
4. Other U. S. institutions
5. Your own study abroad programs
6. Direct exchange programs
7. Special program for transfer of credits earned at overseas institutions
8. Financial aid/scholarships
9. Study abroad resource library
10. Study abroad orientation/debriefing programs
11. Study abroad advisor
12. Other: ________________________________
13. None

21. Please list countries where you have active institutional agreements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Country</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

22. How many international students were enrolled Fall 2004?

a. Graduate ______

b. Undergraduate ______

c. Non-degree programs ______

Directions: Circle Y for yes or N for no.

23. Does your institution have programs to actively integrate the international student body into the overall college/university life?

Y  N

24. Is there specific guidance provided to the staff and faculty in how to assist the foreign students on your campus?

Y  N
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25. Circle number(s) for all activities/services provided to your international students:

1  Initial orientation
2  Pre-academic English as a second language program
3  Counseling
4  Immigration advising
5  Assistance with documentation
6  Exit interviews
7  U. S. student peer assignments
8  Student conferences on international affairs or global topics
9  International club
10 Foreign language club
11 International week
12 International students utilized as guest lecturers in the classroom
13 Other activities/services (please list):

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Part 4. OUTREACH

Directions: Circle Y for yes or N for no.

Community:

Y  N  26. Does your institution participate or sponsor any community-based programs which enhance understanding of global or international issues?

Y  N  27. Have outside speakers/guests visited your campus in the last two years to discuss international affairs, global issues, foreign cultures, etc?

Y  N  28. Are host families involved with individual international students?

29. Circle number(s) for any of the following international continuing education programs, which you now offer, or have offered to the local business community:

1  Short-term foreign language
2  Import/export training
3  Training for foreign workers in the U.S.
4  Specialized English language training (ESL)
5  Tailored occupational programs
6  International business seminars
7  Other (please list):

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

30. Circle number(s) for the services provided to the community:

1  International database of institution resources
2  Translating
3  International students utilized as guest speakers
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4 Assistance to K-12 schools in your area to enhance international education
5 Document interpretation services
6 Other (please list)
   ______________________________
   ______________________________

Y  N  31. Does your institution have a “sister” relationship in which it is involved with a city or institution outside the U.S.? If yes, list location(s):
   ______________________________________________________________

Y  N  32. Does your institution offer and distance education course (using telecommunications technologies) outside the U.S.? If yes, list location(s) __________________________________________________

Y  N  33. Does your institution provide technical assistance to foreign governments, institutions, or agencies?

   If yes, please circle number(s) for the sponsoring agency (or agencies) and list location(s):

   Sponsoring (contracting agency)       Location
   1 International agency (e.g., UN)       ________________________
   2 US government agency (e.g., USAID)    __________________________
   3 Foreign government agency             __________________________
   4 Other US university (or universities) __________________________
   5 Foreign university                    __________________________
   6 US private agency                     __________________________
   7 Foreign private agency                __________________________

Please add any comments you wish regarding international education areas.

If your institution has a model program in any or all of the international education areas below, please complete the following:

   Contact Person and Phone Number
   ______________________________________________________________
   Administrative Structure
   Faculty Development
   Curriculum
   Out of Country Education
   International Student Support Services
   Community Outreach
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Please give the name, position, and phone number of the principal contact for international education at your institution:

Name: ________________________________________________________________________
Position: ________________________________________________________________________
Phone: (__________) ______________________________

THANK YOU for completing this questionnaire. If you would like a copy of the final results please complete the following:
Name ________________________________
Email address____________________________
MEMORANDUM

July 15, 1993

To: Presidents/Chancellors of Colleges and Universities

From: Kenneth H. Ashworth

Re: Survey of International Programs and Activities

Tom Barker of the University of North Texas is a doctoral student studying international programming at four-year institutions in Texas. He has developed the enclosed survey instrument to study and better understand the participation of institutions like yours. The survey complements a separate study of community and technical colleges' involvement in international activities.

In designing the survey instrument, Mr. Barker had the input and support of our Advisory Committee on International Issues. Because of this involvement, we believe that the information derived will provide valuable statewide information on this topic. It is our hope he may identify international initiatives which can serve as models for less experienced institutions.

I hope you will return the survey form to Mr. Barker in the manner he requests. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.
APPENDIX E

COMMISSIONER LETTER 2004
March 12, 2003

Dear Ms. Hodges:

Thank you for sending me a copy of the questionnaire you plan to use to update the study completed by Tom Barker in 1994.

As much as I would like to comply with your invitation to draft a cover letter encouraging university presidents to complete the survey, as a means of helping the research of a doctoral student, I have to decline. Given the heavy demands on the time of presidents and their colleagues and the fact that we no longer have an International Education Advisory Committee that has reviewed the study or the instrument, I just do not feel that I can urge the presidents to complete the questionnaire.

You might wish to consider sending a copy of your own cover letter that explains the importance of the project to the administrators or faculty on each campus who are responsible for international education. Doing so may encourage them to contact their presidents to offer help in completing the questionnaire. In addition, to the extent you can explain in your own cover letter to presidents ways in which the study’s data and conclusions could be helpful to them, I expect that the response rate will be higher.

In any event, I wish you the greatest of success in your research.

Cordially,

Don W. Brown
PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
Barker (1994)
Texas

Public

East Texas State University
Lamar University at Beaumont
Lamar University at Port Arthur
Laredo State University
Midwestern State University
Prairie View A&M University
Southwestern Texas State University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Sul Ross University
Tarleton State University
Texas A&I University
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
Texas Tech University
Texas Southern University
Texas Woman’s University
University of Houston
University of Houston – Clear Lake
University of Houston – Victoria
The University of North Texas
The University of Texas at Arlington
The University of Texas at Austin
The University of Texas at Dallas
The University of Texas at El Paso
The University of Texas at San Antonio
The University of Texas – Pan American
West Texas A&M University

Private

Abilene Christian College
Amber University
Austin College
Baylor University
Dallas Baptist University
East Texas Baptist University
Hardin-Simmons University
Houston Baptist University
Howard Payne University
Incarnate Word Colleges
Le Tourneau University
Lubbock Christian College
McMurry College
Our Lady of the Lake University at San Antonio
Paul Quinn College
Schreiner College
Southern Methodist University
Southwestern Adventist College
St. Edward’s University
St. Mary’s University
Texas Christian University
Texas Lutheran College
Trinity University
University of Central Texas
University of Mary Hardin – Baylor
University of St. Thomas
Wayland Baptist University

Medical

The University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth
The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

Benchmark

Public

University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Amherst, MA
University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE
University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Charlotte, NC

Private

Linfield College, McMinville, OR
Utica College of Syracuse University, Utica, NY
Warren Wilson College, Swannanoa, NC
PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
2004
Texas

Angelo State University
Austin College
East Texas State University
Houston Baptist University
Jacksonville College
Lamar University
Lon Morris College
McMurry University
Midwestern State University
Our Lady of the Lake University
Rice University
Sam Houston State University
Southwestern Adventist University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A&M International
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University Commerce
Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Texas Tech Health Sciences Center
Trinity University
Texas Woman's University
University of St. Thomas
University of Houston
University of Houston – Downtown
University of Mary Hardin Baylor
University of the Incarnate Word
University of Texas at Dallas
University of Texas at Tyler
University of North Texas
University of Texas at San Antonio
The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston
Texas Southern University
Texas Tech University
West Texas A&M University

Benchmark

Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
Linfield College, McMinnville. OR
Utica College, Utica, NY
Warren Wilson College, Asheville, NC
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