

# **INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

**Themes, Practices, and Case Studies**

Edited by  
**Rosalind Latiner Raby and Edward J. Valeau**



# International Education at Community Colleges

Rosalind Latiner Raby • Edward J. Valeau  
Editors

# International Education at Community Colleges

Themes, Practices, and Case Studies

palgrave  
macmillan

*Editors*

Rosalind Latiner Raby  
California State University  
Northridge, Chatsworth  
California, USA

Edward J. Valeau  
Superintendent/President Emeritus  
Hartnell Community College District  
President Emeritus, CCIE

ISBN 978-1-137-53335-7      ISBN 978-1-137-53336-4 (eBook)  
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-53336-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016937715

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature  
The registered company is Nature America Inc. New York

## PREFACE

The worldwide preoccupation with the internationalization of higher education is intensifying—both in terms of the rhetoric of policymakers and institutional leaders about the importance of internationalization and in terms of the action agendas of governments and institutions.<sup>1</sup> Much of the energy around internationalization in the United States and abroad, alas, is centered on recruiting international students, as institutions and countries seek to heighten their prestige and generate revenue. But as the chapters in this volume indicate, such a narrow lens on internationalization does higher education a disservice, ignoring the much wider impact that internationalization can have on the overall quality of an institution and especially on student learning.

The current conversation about internationalization among scholars frames internationalization not as a goal unto itself, but as a means of advancing the multiple larger goals of an institution, be they improving institutional quality, enhancing teaching and learning, ensuring that research is on the cutting edge, creating meaningful ties between the global and local through global engagement, and yes, enhancing revenue and prestige. This conceptualization of internationalization helps policymakers and the public (as well as faculty and students) see it not as a frill or simply as a moneymaker, but as an integral part of what a quality education should be in the twenty-first century.

Unfortunately, US higher education is not alone in needing to close the gap between rhetoric and reality; it is a worldwide challenge. And even more unfortunately, the US narrative about its higher education system that it is “the best in the world,” does not apply to internationalization. A

2013 survey conducted by the International Association of Universities, which included 209 US institutions in its respondent population of 1336 showed that the USA lagged behind other countries in several important indicators of internationalization.<sup>2</sup> US institutions are less likely than others around the world to have a strategic plan for internationalization in place or under development, and their leaders are perceived as assigning less importance than others to internationalization. In all measures of infrastructural supports, US institutions lag behind, including the likelihood of having a dedicated office, dedicated budget, monitoring and evaluation system, or explicit targets or benchmarks.<sup>3</sup>

Nor are the US data on internationalization particularly encouraging. According to the 2012 study of the American Council on Education, the overall level of internationalization at community colleges is lower than that of four-year institutions.<sup>4</sup> This finding is not surprising, given the history and culture of community colleges and the challenges addressed in this volume. The good news in the study is that some progress has been made by community colleges since 2006, such as starting up international partnerships for the first time. The conclusion of the ACE report emphatically notes the importance of internationalization at community colleges which serve some 40% of US undergraduates. It underscores the need to use models that work for non-traditional student populations.

Internationalizing community colleges requires a shift in mindset of policymakers and other stakeholders toward a recognition that international and global learning is an integral part of preparation for work and for citizenship. Citizenship is not tied simply to one's local community; the families, businesses, and culture of those local communities are inextricably linked with the rest of the world. The second shift required will be the recognition "that internationalization at home"—global learning opportunities that occur in the classroom, on the campus, or in the community—will be the key strategy for providing community college students with a global outlook and global competencies. Education abroad is without doubt a peerless learning opportunity (properly designed), but even if we greatly improve the participation rate in education abroad, the vast majority of all students will be non-mobile. Our focus should be on them.

This volume addresses a wide array of themes and includes many different perspectives. The editors and authors are among a growing group of educators seeking to stimulate reflection, dialogue, and action concerning

the vital role that internationalization plays in defining quality in higher education.

Madeleine F. Green

## NOTES

1. For a useful list of national policies on internationalization, see the website of the International Association of Universities <http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/national-policies>.
2. The survey population included only four-year institutions in the USA, and their equivalents in other countries. See Egron-Polak, Eva and Ross Hudson. (2013). *The 4th Global Survey of Internationalization in Higher Education* <http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/iau-global-surveys>.
3. For details on these comparisons, see Madeline Green. (2014). “The Best in the World? Not in Internationalization.” <http://www.nafsa.org/Content.aspx?id=49170>.
4. See American Council on Education (2012). Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: A 2012 Edition. <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/2012-Mapping-Internationalization-on-U-S-Campuses.aspx>.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND DEDICATION

We thank our community college colleagues and contributing authors, without whose voices this book would not have been possible. We would like to especially thank our special reviewers who helped with the blind review of the chapters: Marion Froehlich, Shahrzad Kamyab, Wendy Patriguin, and Michael Roggow. We would also like to thank the staff at Palgrave Macmillan for their support to which the editorship offers deep appreciation. Finally, we want to thank our spouses, Vera C. Valeau and Ronald S. Raby for their patience and their loving support.

We write this book for community college leaders whose decisions will impact learning across generations. We also want to dedicate this book to a pioneer in the field of US community college internationalization, Dr. Donald R. Culton. His inspiration and vision is seen throughout all the examples of community college internationalization shared in this book.

The original version of this book was revised.  
An Erratum to this book can be found at  
(DOI [10.1057/978-1-137-53336-4](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-53336-4))

# CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	1
	Rosalind Latiner Raby and Edward J. Valeau	
<b>Part 1</b>	<b>Exploring the Field</b>	7
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Global Is Not the Opposite of Local: Advocacy for Community College International Education</b>	9
	Rosalind Latiner Raby and Edward J. Valeau	
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Faculty International Experience and Internationalization Efforts at Community Colleges in the United States</b>	23
	Krishna Bista	
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>Mentoring in an International Professional Development Program</b>	39
	Tod Treat	
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>International Students' Struggles: Community College to the Rescue</b>	57
	Linda Serra Hagedorn, Shaohua Pei, and Lu Yan	

<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>International Students Immigrating to the Title IX Environment: A Qualitative Cultural Analysis of Community College International Students</b>	<b>75</b>
	Leah P. Hollis and Russell A. Davis	
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Appreciative Advising with International Students in American Community Colleges</b>	<b>93</b>
	Yi (Leaf) Zhang	
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>Study Abroad as Self-Authorship: Globalization and Reconceptualizing College and Career Readiness</b>	<b>111</b>
	Eboni M. Zamani-Gallaher, Raul A. Leon, and John Lang	
<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>Microaggressions and Intersectionality in the Experiences of Black Women Studying Abroad through Community Colleges: Implications for Practice</b>	<b>127</b>
	Tasha Y. Willis	
<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>Calls for Accountability: Measuring Internationalization at Community Colleges</b>	<b>143</b>
	Shawn Woodin	
<b>Chapter 11</b>	<b>Building the Pipeline for Community College International Education Leadership</b>	<b>163</b>
	Edward J. Valeau and Rosalind Latiner Raby	
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Case-Studies and Research Studies</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Study 1</b>	<b>Building a World-Class College: Creating a Global Community at Pima Community College</b>	<b>175</b>
	Ricardo Castro-Salazar, Kelley Merriam-Castro, and Yvonne A. Perez Lopez	

<b>Study 2</b>	<b>Internationalization and the Influence of Environmental Factors</b> Deborah M. Sipe	189
<b>Study 3</b>	<b>The Texas/Czech Republic International Connection: A Reciprocal Exchange of Faculty and Students</b> Juanita Gamez Vargas	203
<b>Study 4</b>	<b>Addressing Myths About International Students</b> Deborah Budd, Andreea Serban, Dianne G. Van Hook, and Rosalind Latiner Raby	215
<b>Study 5</b>	<b>Global Certificates: Bringing Intentionality and Ownership to Comprehensive Internationalization</b> Paloma Rodriguez	223
<b>Study 6</b>	<b>Innovative Approaches to Study Abroad at Harper College and Fox Valley Technical College</b> Opal Leeman Bartzis, Kelly J. Kirkwood, and Thalia M. Mulvihill	237
<b>Study 7</b>	<b>Partnering for New Possibilities: The Development of a Global Learning Certificate</b> Katherine Cierniak and Anne-Maree Ruddy	247
<b>Study 8</b>	<b>Creating and Enhancing a Global Consciousness Among Ethnic Minority Students in Community Colleges</b> Reyes L. Quezada and Paula A. Cordeiro	263
<b>Study 9</b>	<b>Community College Study Abroad and Implications for Student Success: Comparing California and New Jersey Community Colleges</b> Gary M. Rhodes, Janice M. Thomas, Rosalind Latiner Raby, Amparo G. Coddling, and Andrea Lynch	281

<b>Study 10</b>	<b>Transformative Learning Through Education Abroad: A Case Study of a Community College Program</b> Ashley Brenner	293
<b>Study 11</b>	<b>Ensuring Social Success: A Case Study of International Students' Social Experiences at Austin Community College</b> Sharon Miller	311
<b>Study 12</b>	<b>Community College International Internship Cultivation of Competence in Communication, Collaboration, and Critical Thinking</b> Marc Thomas	323
<b>Study 13</b>	<b>Conclusions: Focusing on the Future</b> Edward J. Valeau	337
	<b>Erratum to: Study 3, 5 and 12 of International Education at Community Colleges</b>	E1
	<b>Notes on Contributors</b>	341
	<b>Index</b>	347

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AACC	American Association of Community Colleges
AACJC	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
ACE	American Council on Education
CCCSE	Center for Community College Student Engagement
CCID	Community Colleges for International Development
CCIE	California Colleges for International Education
GLAI	Global Learning Across Indiana
GLC	Global Learning Certificate
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
IAE	Community College Initiative Instructors and Administrators of Egypt program
ICAB	Internationalization Collaboration Across Bloomington
IIE	Institute for International Education
ISO	International Students' Office
NACADA	National Academic Advising Association
NAFSA	Association of International Educators
SCI	System of Comprehensive Internationalization
SEVIS	Student and Exchange Visitor Information System
URM	Under-Represented Minority

### Community College Acronyms

ACC	Austin Community College
BCC	Bannockburn Community College (Pseudonym)
BCC	Berkeley City College
CCC	Coastline College

CCCD	Coast Community College District
CCSF	City College of San Francisco
COA	College of Alameda
COC	College of the Canyons
FVTC	Fox Valley Technical College
GWC	Golden West College
Harper College	William Rainey Harper College
IU	Indiana University
LC	Laney College
MC	Merritt College
MCCD	Mesa Community College District
MDC	Miami-Dade College
OCC	Orange County College
PCC	Pima Community College District
PCCCD	Pima County Community College District
PCCD	Peralta Community College District
RCCD	Riverside Community College District
SCCCD	Santa Clarita Community College District
VC	Valencia Campus

# LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1	Institutional progression of internationalization at community colleges	147
Fig. 2	Delphi method flowchart	150

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Comparison of the foreign-born and the US-born faculty on international experience, support for internationalization, international learning interest, and effects of internationalization	30
Table 3.2	Comparison between faculty with an international experience and faculty without an international experience	31
Table 4.1	General approaches to mentoring at each community college	44
Table 5.1	Top reasons for enrolling in a community college course	62
Table 5.2	Means and standard deviations of satisfaction with community college enrollment	63
Table 6.1	Question: Are you familiar with Title IX? If so, how?	85
Table 6.2	Question: What was your reaction to the news on sexual violence against women?	86
Table 6.3	Question: What is your response to sexual violence in your home [native] community?	86
Table 6.4	Question: What is the responsibility of both men and women to avoid sexual violence?	87
Table 10.1	Quantifying institutional internationalization: a tool for community college leaders	151
Table S4.1	International student programs over time	218
Table S7.1	Phases of the global learning across Indiana initiative and related activities	251
Table S7.2	Documents for analysis	253
Table S9.1	Gender and race profiles	286
Table S9.2	Comparative success markers	289
Table S10.1	Demographic information for student participants	297

## Introduction

*Rosalind Latiner Raby and Edward J. Valeau*

We approach this book with 30 years of experience and continuing commitment to the field of community college internationalization. Our first effort resulted in the 2007 *New Directions in Community College* publication that asked national leaders to define advocacy for community college internationalization, which includes internationalizing curricula, faculty/staff exchanges, international students, study-abroad programs, and partnerships with institutions in other countries. This book allows well-known scholars, community college practitioners, and emerging leaders an opportunity to expand and reflect on existing practices that demonstrate the dynamic nature of community college internationalization.

About 13 million students attend US community colleges. Students enroll for multiple reasons, including to earn their first credential, cer-

---

R.L. Raby (✉)

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department, Michael D. Eisner  
College of Education, California State University, Northridge

California Colleges for International Education

College of Humanities and Sciences, Southern California Campus, University of  
Phoenix

E.J. Valeau

Superintendent/President Emeritus, Hartnell Community College District  
Salinas, California, Co-Founder, the ELS Group, LLC

tificate or degree, to gain multiple credentials to advance their career pathway, to enhance remedial skills, to engage in lifelong education, or prepare to transfer to a four-year college/university. In meeting these diverse student needs, international education varies considerably within and between colleges. Grounding the various international programs is a belief that “it is important that college graduates, whatever their location, be not just *globally competitive* but also *globally competent*, understanding their roles as citizens and workers in an international context” (AACC 2012, p. 20).

Unfortunately, of the 1200 US community colleges, too few are internationalized and there is inconsistent benchmarking of which colleges are involved in internationalization efforts. In 2011, the American Council on Education surveyed 239 community colleges and found that less than 25 % had an internationalization plan (ACE 2012). In 2014, Institute for International Education (IIE) *Open Doors* showed that community colleges served 76,586 international students based on responses from 309 colleges and 4843 study-abroad students based on responses from 85 colleges (IIE 2014). There is no national benchmark for any other kind of international program.

This book assesses prior advancements in the field, current challenges, and where new emphasis needs to be placed to produce viable and sustained results that impact programming across all spectrums. In doing so, the book explores the trajectory of a changing construct that is moving international education from optional to integral (King and Ferish 1983).

## BOOK THEMES

This book is divided into two parts. The first explores theoretical constructs to help the reader understand the change process. The second part describes academic and case studies that identify how specific changes inform practice.

### *Part One: Exploring the Field*

In *Exploring the Field*, authors delineate two theoretical constructs. The first uses theory for advocacy and to ground best practices. Raby and Valeau explore the historical and current applications of why an emphasis on global is not in opposition to the US community college local mission and how to avoid elements that contribute to keeping internationalization

sidelined. Bista examines the profiles of community college faculty who are foreign-born, US-born with prior international experiences, and US-born without prior international experiences to show how personal profiles can enhance campus internationalization. Treat defines elements for effective mentoring that enhance mentee learning outcomes. Woodin defines categorical metrics of leadership and policy, organizational resources, curricular, co-curricular, professional development, and international student services to track internationalization progress in a college. Finally, Valeau and Raby build a comprehensive profile of those mid-level managers currently leading international programs to understand their role and importance in the college leadership pipeline.

The second set of theoretical chapters focus on changing practices that, when purposefully directed, can enhance overall student learning. Hagedorn, Pei, and Yan explore how some international students who study at four-year colleges/universities need the extra assistance that they find at the community colleges. They theorize how those elements that serve this population can be expanded to serve other student populations. Hollis and Davis reveal how and why knowledge of Title IX regulations prohibiting sexual assault is needed by international students. They define how to add this knowledge to current advising policies. Zhang depicts how academic advising in general, and appreciative advising specifically can meet international student needs and affect non-traditional learning experiences. Willis explores how purposeful advising in terms of racial, class, and gender dynamics influences peer interactions, student comfort, and ultimately, engagement with faculty. Zamani-Gallaher, Lang, and Leon share how the process of student self-authorship, the internal capacity to define one's beliefs, identity, and social relations, when added to the study-abroad experience, can enhance student career readiness and advancement.

### *Part Two: Research and Case Studies*

In *Research and Case Studies*, examples of internationalization are shared from programs in colleges of various sizes in Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Mid-Atlantic, Mid-West, Michigan, New Jersey, Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. These studies are grouped into categories that focus on (a) systemic college change, (b) CEO-directed change, (c) specific programmatic change, and (d) learning from student stories.

Comprehensive internationalization is a term currently used to illustrate how internationalization influences systemic change. Castro-Salazar, Perez, and Merriam examine how a single program established new college procedures and routes of communication that resulted in a comprehensive college-wide plan. Sipe uses regression analysis to represent how three environmental factors, namely setting, student demographics in terms of ethnic diversity, and primary industry in the college's service area help to promote or discourage institutionalization. These studies reveal how colleges do not operate independently and are affected by internal and external variants.

Leadership theories define the importance of executive officers in charting reforms at community colleges. Vargas uses frames of organizational decision-making to demonstrate how a president transformed and institutionalized a reciprocal faculty and student exchange program. Budd, Serban, VanHook, and Raby use content analysis, informal observations, and seat analysis to clearly show that the chief executive officer's opinion not only guides reform efforts but can also counter traditional myths about the role of international students in the community college. Rodriguez focuses on content analysis to show how the leadership of the provost and the president can facilitate development of a global learning certificate program whose e-portfolio activity is enhancing overall student learning.

Changes to specific international programs illustrate not only application but also a process through which staff, administrators, and faculty are involved in reform efforts. Bartzis, Kirkwood, and Mulvihill use faculty interviews to compare how faculty-driven efforts at two community colleges impact overall college reform efforts. Cierniak and Ruddy employ faculty/staff survey and policy content analysis to explain the process involved in developing a first-year global learning certificate and the role of collaboration between a university and a community college system. Quezada and Coreiro analyze study-abroad director interviews and webpage analysis to compare how five community colleges provide innovative pedagogies and practices for students of color to participate in study-abroad programs. Rhodes, Raby, Thomas, Coddling, and Lynch examine statistics at California and New Jersey community colleges to reveal how the programmatic change of studying abroad influences student success measures.

Finally, the importance of the student voice shows how student reflection can chart student learning and career preparation. Brenner employs ethnography to illustrate the broad spectrum of learning that results from participating in short-term education-abroad programs designed to capitalize on transformative experiences. Miller uses interviews to define ele-

ments needed to be adopted by international student advisors to help international students manage cultural and social stress. Thomas uses interviews to explore how education-abroad can be a vehicle for building student global competencies that are attractive to future employers. Combined, these studies show that community colleges are integrally involved in transformative learning based on lived student experiences which are integral to understanding the impact of internationalization and its importance to the mission of the community college.

### MOVING FORWARD

There is a special challenge for US community colleges to move from celebration of singular programs that make internationalization available to only a few students to sustainable change that influences the entire college community. This book shows a transformation is occurring in which commitment from all stakeholders is setting the pace for future endeavors. However, without sustained and systemic support for internationalization by all stakeholders, this book and all that has been said will serve only as a footnote and a contribution to the literature on internationalization. The danger is that if we continue to remain insular on internationalization, we further seal our fate and lose our opportunity to lead, thus relegating us to the role of being followers in the global economic competitive arena and race to the top. A key awakening is realization that reform is not based on chance, but on intentional designs created to guide comprehensive reform efforts. As editors, we found the experiences of the authors and their research to be both inspiring and critical in the quest to bring international education to the diverse populations served by US community colleges. We hope that the theoretical and practical commonalities found in this book will be acted upon in future publications of revised Board policies in community colleges and associations across the USA and in innovative programming dedicated to curricula and training our future international education leaders. Such a sustained and ingrained focus will prove the efficacy of this book.

### REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2012). *Reclaiming the American dream: A report from the 21st-Century commission on the future of community colleges*. April. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges Press. <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/21stCenturyReport>

- American Council on Education. (2012). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2012 edition*. <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/MappingInternationalizationUS Campuses2012-full.pdf>
- Institute of International Education. (2014). Community college data resource. *2013/2014 Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- King, Maxwell, & Fersh, Seymour (1983). International education and the U.S. community college: From optional to integral. *ERIC Junior College Resource Review*, Spring, ERIC Number: ED233780.

PART I

---

Exploring the Field

# Global Is Not the Opposite of Local: Advocacy for Community College International Education

*Rosalind Latiner Raby and Edward J. Valeau*

## INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

The vast majority of US community college students enroll in educational programs to advance a career pathway that often has labor market value. Most of these programs are terminal and hence, the only opportunity that a student has to gain international knowledge is during studies at the community college. International education is not new to US community colleges. For 60 years, faculty and leaders have understood the benefits of learning beyond borders, be it between local neighborhoods, inter-state, or cross-national. Internationalization is included in curriculum and pedagogy as community colleges define educational programs

---

R.L. Raby (✉)

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department, Michael D. Eisner  
College of Education, California State University, Northridge, CA, USA

California Colleges for International Education, Los Angeles, CA, USA

College of Humanities and Sciences, Southern California Campus, University of  
Phoenix, Costa Mesa, CA, USA

E.J. Valeau

Superintendent/President Emeritus, Hartnell Community College District,  
Salinas, California, Co-Founder, the ELS Group, LLC

and student services to serve changing multicultural communities (Raby and Tarrow 1996) and to create new credential and degree requirements to serve changing global employment needs (Treat and Hagedorn 2013). There are now multiple generations of community college leaders who argue that internationalization is an inherent component of community colleges that advances student knowledge and serves the needs of local communities (Gleazer 1975; Hess 1982; Eddy 2014; Ardalan and Sevanthinathan 2015).

Despite exemplary practices and empirical evidence that proves the importance of internationalization, the King and Fersh (1983) prophecy that “international education programs are no longer optional for community colleges, they have become integral” (p. 2) has not come true. Although there is no national community college policy that opposes internationalization, there remains a belief that serving the local community is the opposite of a global connection. As a result, internationalization is not included in community college leadership training programs (Opp and Gosetti 2014), is not a component of budget and finance discussions (Sutin et al. 2011), and is not institutionalized in strategic planning or college level action items (American Council on Education 2012).

In this chapter, we respectfully question why internationalization remains on the periphery and why global initiatives are not widely embraced. We look at the historic policies and voices of community college leaders and then unpack elements that contribute to keeping internationalization on the sidelines.

## HISTORIC ROOTS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES INTERNATIONALIZATION

The most frequently mentioned reason why community colleges do not embrace internationalization is that in some locations local funding sources must serve students within specific local geographic boundaries. This supposes that enhanced global knowledge would not serve local students. As authors, we are part of the literature that defined economic globalization as something that forced changes to the core community college mission (serving the local community). In this context, local and global are viewed as separate entities (Green and Siaya 2005; Levin 2010). Green (2007) explains that “given the local roots and focus of community colleges, it is not surprising that institutional leaders, board members, and community members may not value global learning as much as the more immediate

tasks of workforce development and teaching basic skills” (p. 19). In preparing this chapter, we conclude that internationalization does not simply broaden the mission, but rather it is a vital and integral component that specifically serves the mission of student success.

Throughout the history of community colleges, there has been a discussion on what it means to *fulfill local needs* and how these needs relate to the multiple missions of the institution (Fields 1962; Cohen 1974; Dougherty and Townsend 2006). The Carnegie Commission report, “The Open Door College” (1970), mandated that the community college be “flexible and geared to the changing requirements of society” (p. 1). With those requirements, community colleges have been “wrestling with distinctions we have created between liberal and technical education, between campus and community, between egalitarianism and meritocracy, between system and self” (Birenbaum 1974, p. viii). Application of this flexibility includes questioning who has the control to design curriculum, who oversees funding and governance, and how local emphasis can, in actuality, perpetuate inequalities and deny open access (Karabel 1972; Cohen 1974). Today, leaders in the field are questioning “if old rules can promote the causes that they were intended to, or if they are barriers to implementation of new initiatives” (AACC 2015).

Internationalization is an example of this flexibility. Community colleges adopted internationalization to support the needs of the local community, as the original dictates of the community college were to produce an international citizenry (Zook 1947)<sup>1</sup>, to respond to global economic flows (Cohen and Brawer 1996), to support first-generation and immigrant populations (Karabel 1972), and to respond to “world dependencies [we] are receiving and which in turn are calling for innovative ways of dealing with them” (Gleazer 1975, p. 1). Gleazer, the first American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) president, said that “while the Association [AACJC] has many high program priorities ... we believe that a fair share of time and attention should be given to the international dimension ... without neglect to the domestic scene” (Gleazer 1976, p. 5). In the 1974 issue of *New Directions in Community Colleges*, that charted noted changes in the field, Eskow and Caffrey (1974) claimed that local was never intended to be the opposite of global as there was a perceived need to “balance between local roots and a sense of world community” (p. 71). Hess (1982) echoes this as he questions why should serving local “imply an emphasis on regionalism and the immediate area to the exclusion of internationalism and a concern for global awareness”

(p. 34). Today, the drive for internationalization at the community college remains an internal choice that is linked to serve local communities as opposed to an external strategy adopted by universities that positions the institution in world-class competition (Shields 2013).

## ELEMENTS THAT KEEP INTERNATIONAL AS OPTIONAL

Systemic issues maintain community college international education efforts as optional to the general educational reform movement.

### *Differential Rationales*

Four rationales have historically explained why internationalization is important to higher education (Raby and Tarrow 1996; De Wit 2002; Altbach and Knight 2007; Raby and Valeau 2007; Green 2012; Lee 2014). These rationales guide institutional and national policies that place internationalization as a key component in higher education. While the rationales have not changed over time, their application is time stamped (Treat and Hagedorn 2013). As such, while these rationales guide community college advocacy, they also are a contributing factor that keeps internationalization as optional.

*The political rationale* indicates a need to understand others as part of national security and foreign relations and of people-to-people diplomacy by creating opportunities for social, business, and political networking (Schulman 2011). *The economic rationale* links education as a producer of human capital through supplying workforce skills to support a global economy and, with money-producing programs, leverages higher education as a global economic industry (Violino 2011; NAFSA 2014). *The humanistic rationale* focuses on lived experiences that result from the impact of cross-cultural learning that challenge how a student approaches gender relations and ethnic social networks (Green 2012). *The academic rationale* links international content to student comprehension, persistence, and measures of success (Mamiseishvili 2012; Raby et al. 2014, b).

The roots of these four rationales are linked to time-specific events that influence community college policy. The *Council on Learning* (1981) was influenced by changing multicultural relationships, the AACJC *Building New Communities* (1998) was influenced by changing global economies, and the *Commission on the Abraham Lincoln* (2006) was influenced by changing political climate. In each context, the rationale for an event-specific response was lessened over time as that event

held less relevance or was no longer supported through budgeting. In turn, the momentum garnered to support internationalization is curtailed which then is often in need of a serious event to jettison it to the front of the national agenda.

### *Culture of Individualism*

Internationalization centers on the individual. For example, without staff/faculty advocates, there is no one to teach an internationalized curriculum, serve on an international committee, or lead an internationalized program. Faculty has always studied the world. They have created links in their courses, no matter if the subject was biology, modern language, music, or business (O'Connor et al. 2013; Raby et al. 2014a, b). Faculty builds special bonds with students that are instrumental in getting them involved in internationalization efforts (Robertson 2015). Community college presidents make contacts with leaders at global counterparts and lead internationalization efforts (King and Breuder 1979; Manns 2014). The role of the individual is so pronounced that an industry of faculty and staff development programming through online webinars and in-person conferences supports internationalization efforts (Diversity Abroad 2015; CCID 2015; Forum 2015; NAFSA 2015). Often, it remains the role of the chief executive officer and trustee members whose personal interests extend to controlling monetary as well as non-monetary incentives (Brennan and Dellow 2013; Opp and Gosetti 2014) to shape, support, and define how international education is integrated into the campus. Executive officer's approach to internationalization is the first line of advocacy and sets the tone for programmatic changes.

While change is grounded in the individual, three systemic problems tend to emerge from such a focus. First, personal values are not always enough to enact transformational leadership patterns and singular efforts limit impact on systemic change (Frost et al. 2011). When an individual retires, changes positions or colleges, or gives up due to lack of support, another equally passionate champion is needed to offer their services to fill the void. Second, academia, government, business, foundations, and associations target specific stakeholders and then negotiate support accordingly. Such behavior bypasses comprehensive outreach and good governance. Thus, each time a new circumstance arises, learning must begin again with a new set of stakeholders. Finally, powerful opposing interests, from any corner of the organization, are committed to

block internationalization efforts. These anti-internationalists claim that international students take seats away from domestic students, that sending students away to study is counter to the community college mission, and that local is the opposite of global. However, no evidence exists to show that any of these positions are valid. Nonetheless, post-2008 recession, it remains that these individuals have the power to make choices to decrease overall support and, in some instances, eliminate international programs (Raby 2012).

### *Programmatic Insularity*

Marginalization of community college international education is directly linked to a conceptual and developmental pattern that supports singular programming rather than holistic integration. Despite advocacy for holistic change (King and Breuder 1979; Green and Siaya 2005; Treat and Hagedorn 2013), all too frequently, the first mode of behavior and decision-making is to develop a singular form of international education. A consequence is that as some programs gain a profit margin, the need to remain separate takes on a matter of rivalry in political and budget power struggles. An insularity of programs creates an insularity of offices. Today, few campuses support multiple international education programs under a common frame with a strategic plan for growth (Bissonette and Woodin 2013).

### *Exclusion in National Community College Reform Efforts*

National, state, and some accreditation agency policies that define retention, success, and completion objectives ignore the intersection of internationalization to these objectives (Green 2015). For example, while the AACCC “Reclaiming the American Dream” (2012) states how local communities are linked between and beyond borders and that “it is important that college graduates, whatever their location, be not just *globally competitive* but also *globally competent*, understand their roles as citizens and workers in an international context” (p. 10), it still does not explicitly mention internationalization as a course of action. International education is not visible in the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) best practices report (2013) or in the Lumina Foundation 2025 Goals (2015). While the Aspen Institute (2014) has been widely received throughout the nation and details tools needed by leaders to advance student access and success, it also mentions nothing about international pro-