School of Education Book Chapters   School of Education

1-2018

Changing the Light Bulb in Higher Education: "Transforming Internationalization"

James P. Barber
William & Mary - School of Education, jpbarber@wm.edu

Pamela L. Eddy
William & Mary - School of Education, peddy@wm.edu

Stephen E. Hanson
William & Mary - School of Education, sehanson@wm.edu

Changing the Light Bulb Series

Series Editor: David Silverberg

The intention of the series is to explore and illustrate case studies of, and learning from, the iconic question of "how many _____'s does it take to change the light bulb?" The first two books in the series center around how this question applies to the field of higher education, with one text highlighting issues of Leadership & Identity (Empowerment at the Tower: Leadership and Identity in Higher Education) and the other book focusing on issues of Teaching & Learning (Institutional Change from Within: Teaching and Learning in Higher Education). There are 21 chapter authors/co-authors in all from 11 institutions in 10 states. The books feature their reporting on how transformation initiatives occurred at their college/university, what challenges arose, and how they overcame those challenges. Interviews with the authors are included as well as probing questions for the reader.

Empowerment at the Tower

Leadership and Identity in Higher Education

Edited by David Silverberg

Dedicated to Steph, Cal, Tessa, Dan, Mom, and Dad.

Ladson-Billings, G., and W. F. Tate IV. 1995. "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education." *Teachers College Record* 97 (1): 48–68. Retrieved from Education Research complete database. (ISBN: 0161–4681.)

Leonardo, Z. 2013. "The Story of Schooling: Critical Race Theory and the Educational Racial Contract." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 34 (4): 599–610. doi:10.1080/01596306.2013.822624.

Loyola University. 2017. Retrieved from http://www.loyola.edu/about/university-profile.

MacMullan, T. 2015. "Facing Up to Ignorance and Privilege: Philosophy of Whiteness as Public Intellectualism." *Philosophy Compass* 10 (9): 646–660.

Mills, C. W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

New York University Press. 2006. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York. Retrieved from http://www.nyupress.org/19309chapt1.php.

Rector, K. 2017. "Baltimore Is Off to a Deadly Start in 2017." *The Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/sun-investigates/.

Smith, W. A. 2008. "Higher Education: Racial Battle Fatigue." In *Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Society*, edited by Richard T. Schaefer, 615–618. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

———. 2014. *Racial Battle Fatigue in Higher Education: Exposing the Myth of Post-Racial America*. Edited by K. J. Fasching-Varner, K. A. Albert, R. W. Mitchell, and C. Allen. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Takara, K. W. 2006. "A View from the Academic Edge: One Black Woman Who Is Dancing as Fast as She Can." *Du Bois Review* 3 (2): 463–470.

Chapter 5

Transforming Internationalization

Dr. James P. Barber, Dr. Pamela L. Eddy, and Dr. Stephen E. Hanson

College of William & Mary, Virginia

How many academics does it take to change a light bulb?

Not Academics, How Many Mid-Level Leaders?

In this chapter, Dr. Jim Barber (associate professor, School of Education), Dr. Pam Eddy (professor, School of Education), and Dr. Steve Hanson (vice provost for International Affairs and director, Reves Center for International Studies) explore how the transformation on internationalization at the College of William & Mary. I was pleased to hear their thoughts about the personal and professional benefits of reflecting on their institutional impact.

Pam: So for me this process [of reflection] has been "what is in that secret sauce here that has enabled some of the change in traction to be able to occur. And being able to track this, now coming onto a 10-year period has been really helpful to watch change unfold and to see how it moves from a textbook example into a reality."

Steve: Like any team effort where you do have partners across a big institution who share your principles and your objectives, when you make headway, when you actually think you've accomplished something, there's huge amount of satisfaction and sense of confidence that comes from that.

Jim: I think sometimes we lose sight of the fact that this can be a positive growth process, both personally and professionally, for the change agent. It's not just a service to the institution, although that's certainly a motivating factor to improve the institution and improve students' experience at the institution, there's also a benefit to you as an individual both personally and professionally.

INTRODUCTION

Internationalization is a reality of the higher education landscape in the twenty-first century, which reflects the development of a more global economy. For more than a century, colleges and universities in the United States and around the globe have worked to become international in scope in recognition of the influence of working in a global economy, to bolster relevance of their institutions in an increasingly connected world, and to improve the quality of education for their own students and academic communities. Our chapter focuses on the process of internationalization at the College of William & Mary (W&M), the oldest public university in the United States, as it moved from largely decentralized efforts and isolated international activities and programs to a centralized and strategic vision of internationalization.

At its core, internationalization is a systematic, integrative process intended to move higher education institutions from local and national entities to global institutions. Knight (2004) characterized internationalization as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of higher education" (p. 9). The American Council on Education (ACE 2012, para. 1) further focused on the strategy involved to make campuses more global in orientation, and defined comprehensive internationalization as "a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally-connected institutions" in the framework of their Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE).

The notion of universities as international entities is not new. The institutions that evolved into what we know as universities began over 1,000 years ago as centers of learning that brought together scholars from far and wide. One of the earliest institutions of higher education still in operation is the University of Al-Karaouine in Fes, Morocco, founded in 859 AD. Mobility of individuals across political boundaries was essential to the growth of early universities, as teachers and students from diverse backgrounds came together to share knowledge, resources, and new ideas.

Higher education institutions in the modern era share this role as centers of learning, attracting students and faculty from around the globe to pursue advanced study through teaching, and to generate new knowledge through research. However, the nature of higher education today is more competitive than it was in the ancient world, the Middle Ages, or even a generation ago. Colleges and universities, while still serving as centers of learning and knowledge production, are also part of a market in which educational institutions compete domestically and internationally for students, funding, and

prestige. Pursuing an internationalization agenda can strengthen an institution's advantage in these vital areas of student recruitment, faculty retention, grant funding, and ranking position relative to peers. A desire to become more international calls for deliberate and sustained efforts at organizational change (Kezar 2013; Kotter 2014).

TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

Transformational change shifts fundamental beliefs within an organization. Kezar and Eckel (2002) stated that "transformational change alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions of institutional behaviors, processes and products; is deep and pervasive and affects the whole institution; is intentional; and occurs over time" (pp. 295–296). At the core of transformational change is the process of getting individuals to think differently about processes, possibilities, and operations (Black and Gregersen 2008). Instead of thinking of mere improvements to a process that in essence retains the status quo, deep, transformational change moves beyond minor tweaks and instead involves questioning long-held assumptions to determine if current practices are appropriate or if the system can be improved (Kezar 2014).

One way to measure outcomes of an initiative is to analyze it using a change model to determine the level of change that occurred. Kotter (2014) created a popular eight-stage model for organizational change. Included in this model are the following steps: (1) create a sense of urgency; (2) build a guiding coalition; (3) establish a vision; (4) communicate the change initiative; (5) empower others; (6) celebrate short-term wins; (7) sustain acceleration; and (8) institutionalize change. Institutional leaders can create the sense of urgency to change regarding internationalization efforts by pointing out the need for students to be prepared for a global employment market and as a mechanism to enroll a robust and diverse student body by encouraging international student involvement. In our case, the transformation of internationalization on campus occurred when the eight stages of Kotter's model were employed. Central to this overall success was visionary leadership.

THE CASE OF WILLIAM & MARY

William & Mary was born as an international institution. The Royal Charter that founded the college on February 8, 1693, stated, "WILLIAM AND MARY, by the grace of God, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, King and Queen . . . do GRANT, that when the said College shall be so erected,

made, founded and established, it shall be called and denominated, for ever, the College of William and Mary, in Virginia." The institution that began over 300 years ago as a college for the Colony of Virginia, to educate the sons of colonial elites and spread the Christian faith to the local native population, is now a public institution in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We are a highly selective, four-year institution located in Williamsburg, Virginia; William & Mary is comprised of five schools (Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Law, and Marine Science). Nearly 9,000 students attend the institution, approximately 6,500 undergraduates and 2,500 graduate students. William & Mary is strongly grounded in liberal arts education, and this curricular orientation has proven beneficial in the internationalization process. A strong commitment to the fundamentals of liberal arts education, including interdisciplinary connections, student engagement, and broad approaches to inquiry, created an environment where faculty and staff were encouraged to experiment with international efforts. As such, many successful international programs existed across the university, often led by faculty members working alone or in small disciplinary groups. In 2010, as part of a strategic planning process, organizational changes were implemented to better coordinate the international involvements at William & Mary.

A key structural move was to create an upper-level administrative position of vice provost for International Affairs and director of the Reves Center for International Studies in 2010. This decision elevated the role of international affairs at William & Mary, and provided a seat at the table for an advocate of global education and internationalization. Organizationally, the creation of this position centralized the efforts of the institution, and provided a clearinghouse for students, faculty, and staff with international interests.

Though not without challenges, steady progress has been made in advancing internationalization at William & Mary. We have had some tangible markers of success in recent years. William & Mary has the highest percentage of public university undergraduate students studying abroad in the nation, with over 50 percent of students studying in more than sixty countries each year (Hoving 2015). In 2016, William & Mary was awarded with the Senator Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization from NAFSA: Association of International Educators. This award recognizes higher education institutions that make well-planned, well-executed, and well-documented progress toward comprehensive internationalization, especially those implementing innovative and creative approaches across several areas, including student and faculty access to a global education experience. In the next sections of this chapter, we will share insights into our process of transformational change at William & Mary over the past decade.

Internationalization Research at William & Mary

A university-wide faculty survey was conducted at William & Mary in 2009 on the general status of faculty work roles (Kulick and Martin 2009). This survey found that 66 percent of faculty claimed to use their research to address national or international issues. The inclusion of "national" issues in the survey question, however, clouded the measure of efforts focused on international issues. Further, exploration of international issues per se is markedly different than doing research that is international in scope. More to the point, the William & Mary faculty survey found that 41 percent engaged in research that focused on international/global issues. This percentage was well above the national averages that showed only 28 percent of public university faculty and 35 percent of private university faculty focused on international/global issues (Finkelstein, Walker, and Chen 2013). Understanding the reasons behind this high level of engagement of William & Mary faculty inspired a 2010 research study about internationalization at the university (Eddy, Barber, Holly, Brush, and Bohon 2013), specifically focused on faculty and student definitions of *global competency* and determining the experiences that promoted progress toward this outcome.

Data for this research were gathered in multiple formats. First, a campus-wide survey was administered to faculty members (*n* = 249). Second, focus groups were conducted with faculty members to understand better their approaches to internationalization (*n* = 30). Finally, focus groups with students occurred to learn how their experiences colored their global perspectives (*n* = 20).

From this phase of the research, several findings emerged. The majority of faculty respondents indicated participating in international activities, including conducting international research individually and via international collaborations, hosting international students and scholars, presenting at international conferences, and teaching and consulting abroad. The faculty helped nurture and sustain a robust study abroad program, which in 2010 involved about 45 percent of undergraduates studying abroad. Yet this work often occurred in silos and was viewed as "owned" by individual faculty and units. A lack of cohesion of efforts was apparent, which was at the forefront given the search for the inaugural vice provost for International Affairs that was occurring during the faculty focus groups. Students in this research also commented upon their personal transformation due to their study abroad experience but also noted frustration when they described their feelings of a social and academic disconnection that occurred upon their return to campus. They did not have a sense of integration of their learning; rather, the study abroad experience was often compartmentalized from the larger curriculum.

Shortly after the conclusion of the 2010 study at William & Mary, Stephen Hanson was selected as the first vice provost for International Affairs. He began his appointment on campus in 2011, and in the next section shares his first-person perspective on the change process in regard to internationalization at William & Mary.

EFFECTING TRANSFORMATION OF INTERNATIONALIZATION AT WILLIAM & MARY: NOTES FROM THE SENIOR INTERNATIONAL OFFICER

Reflecting on my first six years as the leader of our campus-wide internationalization efforts at William & Mary, it does seem that we've followed the general sequence set out by Kotter (2014) for bringing about enduring institutional transformation. To be sure, I was not personally familiar with Kotter's work when I began my work as vice provost for International Affairs and director of the Reves Center for International Studies. Instead, I've relied on insights derived from my academic background as a political scientist specializing in comparative politics and post-communist transformations. My doctoral training at the University of California, Berkeley, included a heavy dose of organizational theory, with a focus on the sociological theories of Max Weber and the seminal works of Reinhard Bendix, Philip Selznick, Aaron Wildavsky, and Ken Jowitt (who all taught at Berkeley in this period). My early exposure to these theorists instilled in me the importance of moving beyond purely "rationalist" models of human behavior to understand the critical roles in organizational change of charismatic leadership (and its "routinization"), of the moral principles and belief systems that inspire genuine commitment to a collective cause, and of the inevitability of informal patterns of resistance to "top-down" initiatives of all sorts. I have found that this training in organizational theory has been extremely valuable, both in my academic career as a specialist on Soviet and post-Soviet politics and in my later career as an academic administrator.

In what follows, I recount my approach to leading our internationalization strategy at William & Mary from 2011, when I was first hired as vice provost to 2016, when the second wave of stakeholder interviews were completed. I will use Kotter's eight stages of institutional transformation as a general rubric for presenting these reflections, as they do fit our particular case study remarkably well.

Creating a Sense of Urgency

When I arrived at W&M in August 2011, the sense of urgency to make radical changes to our institution's approach to internationalization in all its

manifestations was already widespread. As Eddy et al. (2013) have documented, the mood on campus concerning international initiatives at the time was one of general dissatisfaction and impatience with the status quo. In such an environment, to stand pat for an extended period in order to learn more about the campus culture was simply not an option. Here I benefited greatly from the prior work taken by Provost Michael Halleran in making internationalization a top priority after his own arrival at W&M in 2009. Early in his tenure, Provost Halleran had convened a university-wide faculty committee—the International Advisory Committee, or IAC—consisting of many of the most prominent international specialists among the W&M faculty, and representing a wide variety of academic schools and departments. The search committee that ultimately recommended my hire, too, was made up of an influential group of faculty leaders long active in international/global affairs.

Building a Supportive Coalition

No leader can transform a large organization alone. It is essential to maintain constant personal interaction with key stakeholders among the faculty, within the administration, and among important external constituencies such as alumni, donors, and members of the governing Board. At W&M, I was able to take advantage of the connections I had made with the IAC and the search committee to set up a great number of initial interviews with faculty and administrators across campus. William & Mary's relatively small size for a research university facilitated my work in this regard; with only five academic schools and an overall student population of around 9,000, my consultations could be reasonably inclusive and comprehensive.

In these first interviews, I tried simply to listen carefully and to learn the main complaints and aspirations of the many passionate supporters of a more thoroughgoing internationalization strategy at W&M. As it turned out, there was remarkable overlap in the viewpoints of both the faculty and the administration on the university's major problems in this arena. Stakeholders agreed that there needed to be a greater degree of information sharing about international initiatives across the university's various silos; that vague institutional proclamations about the importance of W&M's international dimension had to be backed up by concrete actions in pursuit of measurable goals; and in particular, that the finances of the Reves Center for International Studies, which managed study abroad and exchange programs, international student and scholar services and programs, and various high-profile lectures and conferences on international themes, had to be made much more transparent. I knew that I needed to make some significant changes in these three areas in the immediate future in order to maintain the enthusiasm of these stakeholders, who had vested many hopes in the creation of my position.

Articulating a Vision

The alchemy that produces a powerful, inspirational, and yet generally inclusive vision for a large organization is one of the hardest elements of leadership to teach. Yet articulating such a vision is absolutely crucial for successful institutional transformation. Although Kotter's formula places this step third, after creating urgency and building a coalition, I would argue that one must have at least some basic outline of one's vision for the future from the moment one accepts a leadership position. Deep and broad engagement with stakeholders is certainly critical to success, but no compelling vision was ever created solely through consultation or committee discussion. Ultimately, it falls to the leader to synthesize and articulate a common future goal that can appeal to a diverse group of brilliant and capable people, all with their own strong preferences on issues ranging from terminology (Should we use the word "global" or "international"? In what contexts?) to disciplinary approach (Should global/international approaches be primarily interpretive or causal? Quantitative or qualitative? Primarily academic or policy-relevant?). Hitting the wrong "notes" when promulgating a vision for university internationalization—usually a result of not taking a particular institution's organization culture fully into account—can sometimes permanently alienate important allies. Personally, I have been guided in my work as a Senior International Officer by the definition of "comprehensive internationalization" set out by the American Council on Education:

> Comprehensive internationalization is a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. It is an institutional imperative, not just a desirable possibility. (Hudzik 2011, p. 6)

I came to William & Mary precisely because I could see that most of the central institutional elements for a successful realization of this goal—a supportive top leadership; the placement of the most important international administrative offices in a single unit, the Reves Center; and stable, dedicated financial support for international programs—were already in place, thanks to the work of my predecessors in the Reves Center Directorship. Moreover, William & Mary's unique history made comprehensive internationalization a relatively easy sell: the university had been effectively "international" since its founding in 1693 as an overseas experiment in higher education authorized by the King and Queen of England. In short, my vision was to restore W&M's centuries-old reputation as one of the leading global liberal arts universities in the world, with the Reves Center acting as an institutional "hub" for W&M's international activities. I found in my stakeholder interviews that

such a vision resonated with almost all of the key constituencies—faculty, administrators, staff, students, and external supporters—I needed to mobilize.

Communicate the Change Initiative

Such an audacious vision, however, could not win over the skeptics all at once. To buy a bit of time, I told everyone at W&M repeatedly that I had a three-year plan for getting us started: in year one, I'd focus on internal reforms at the Reves Center itself while continuing my "listening tour" around campus; in year two, I'd switch my main focus to external promotion of W&M's international activities and partnerships; and in year three, we'd celebrate our internal and external successes in a rousing celebration of the Reves Center's twenty-fifth anniversary, which happened to take place in 2014. Sequencing my approach in this way also gave me time to solicit and include the input of my extremely capable staff at the Reves Center. Finally, this approach to year one gave me time to do a thorough budget review at Reves, the results of which I shared openly with the IAC and other interested faculty, who had previously been suspicious that Reves' resources were not being utilized in the best interests of W&M.

Along with the rollout of my three-year plan, I worked to bolster both internal and external communications about international activities at W&M. I created the new position of Reves Communications Manager, supported by a half-time assistant. We substantially upgraded the production quality of the Reves Center's biannual *World Minded* magazine, while working to ensure over time that it covered exciting international activities going on in every academic department and professional school. We also created a Reves listserv announcing international/global events at W&M to all interested faculty, staff, students, and alumni, while bolstering our presence in social media. Much of my early success as an SIO at W&M, I think, was really just the reflected glory of the amazing global accomplishments of the W&M academic community itself—now truly visible to the whole W&M community for the first time.

Empower Others

As we began to turn our attention from internal reorganization to external promotion of W&M as a global liberal arts university, we needed the support of faculty, staff, and administrative stakeholders more than ever. As every SIO soon learns, internationalization initiatives are sustainable only when they come from the "bottom up," and not only from the "top down." Accordingly, I tried to empower our campus community in their international endeavors in several interrelated ways. First, I reallocated some financial resources to provide greater administrative support for the key Arts & Sciences interdisciplinary programs that had historically been at the heart of W&M's international

efforts: International Relations, the Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations (ITPIR), Global Studies, and Africana Studies. The extra money was deeply appreciated by the core faculty as well as students in all four programs, producing a reservoir of goodwill among a key constituency that had long felt undervalued on campus. Second, I involved the faculty on the IAC at every step while working with the W&M administration to provide a more robust institutional architecture for our international efforts in the spheres of budgetary oversight, risk management for international travel, the support of international students, and so on. Third, working closely with University Advancement, I reenergized the Reves Advisory Board, a group of generous and influential alumni and members of the community who had previously felt unclear about their role in campus internationalization.

Celebrate Short-Term Wins

One side effect of our improved communications infrastructure at Reves was that we soon had a better handle on the full range of remarkable teaching, research, policy advising, and service-related activities going on in the international/global sphere at W&M. This led us to identify a few highlights to feature in our internal and external outreach efforts. In 2012, our study abroad participation rates reached the top rank among U.S. public universities—a fact that we tirelessly promoted at every opportunity for the next several years. Also that year, a team of our top-flight international relations researchers working with the W&M AidData program, led by Michael Tierney and Brad Parks, won a $25 million award from USAID to study foreign aid effectiveness on a global scale—the largest such award in the history of W&M to date. Naturally, we've leveraged this achievement to generate much positive publicity for W&M's internationalization efforts. The establishment of the William & Mary Confucius Institute (WMCI) in 2012 was another major milestone.

Sustain Acceleration

By the time we celebrated the Reves Center's twenty-fifth anniversary in 2013–2014, the momentum toward genuinely "comprehensive internationalization" at W&M was powerful. A major step in sustaining that momentum was the decision to place internationalization on the formal W&M strategic plan, as one of seven major priorities, with specific metrics for study abroad participation, international student diversity, and the expansion of W&M's global research footprint. This allowed us to transition toward a second three-year plan from 2014 to 2017, in which our major focus has been on achieving these strategic planning goals while consolidating the institutional gains described earlier. That being said, I'd caution that further "acceleration" of the pace of change by this point would have been a mistake, as there would have been a serious danger of staff burnout.

Institutionalize Change

This final step is in many ways the hardest of all. Many transformational leaders generate great energy and enthusiasm when they first arrive at an institution, only to leave with few sustainable institutional changes in place. It is admittedly hard to shift gears from the exciting, sometimes exhausting, "charismatic" phase of institutional transformation to the slow, patient work needed to formalize new rules and procedures for university internationalization. One way to ensure this shift as a leader is to delegate ever greater management autonomy to one's staff leaders. At W&M, the professional staff at Reves are by now fully aware of their respective roles and responsibilities, which they perform with aplomb. At the same time, other W&M administrative offices with whom we work closely have come to rely on Reves for expertise on just about every aspect of international teaching, research, and administration. Thus, as SIO, I no longer need to push constantly to ensure that internationalization remains a top university priority. Instead, I now focus my attention increasingly on securing external support for the Reves Center and for the myriad and inspiring international activities of W&M's outstanding students, faculty, and staff.

Continued Institutional Internationalization Research

The second phase of our internationalization research took place in 2015. Several key changes occurred between the 2010 research study and the follow-up study conducted in 2015. First, Stephen Hanson was hired in 2011 as vice provost of International Affairs and implemented his vision for internationalization at William & Mary, as detailed earlier. Second, a major curriculum review happened for the undergraduate programs, with the new College Curriculum, also known as the "COLL" curriculum (see http://www.wm.edu/as/undergraduate/curriculum/coll/index.php for more details) approved in late 2013. A central feature of the new COLL curriculum is a junior-level course (COLL 300: In the World) that focuses on providing students with an experience to take them out of familiar surroundings and enhance cross-cultural understandings. Finally, due to advocacy by the vice provost of International Affairs, a specific international goal was added to the university's 2015–2019 strategic plan, namely, foster stronger global perspectives and connections (William and Mary Strategic Plan 2015). Several key performance indicators were established, with associated timelines, for each of these international strategic goals. From a student perspective, two of the measures are to achieve 60 percent participation by undergraduate students in study abroad and sustaining 600 international students in the student body, representing at least sixty countries by 2018.

It is against this backdrop of change that the second phase of our internationalization research was conducted in 2015. In this stage of the study, a faculty

survey was replicated based on the survey format used in our 2010 study ($n = 117$), and focus groups were conducted again with faculty ($n = 40$), and students ($n = 14$). In addition to these data sources, we conducted interviews with leaders of the Reves Center and with leaders across campus ($n = 3$). It is here that we began to see early signs of transformation of internationalization on campus.

Key findings from the 2015 study highlighted the transformation efforts under way at William & Mary. First, the centralization of policies, procedures, and communication in the Reves Center for International Studies represented a stark departure from the siloed efforts noted in 2010. The faculty focus groups revealed less tension about international efforts and a buy-in to efforts to create global experiences for students in classes and for faculty research. Obviously, the students involved in this updated study have little to no awareness of past practices and events for study abroad, so many of the findings for this stakeholder group were the same; students engaged in transformational experiences during study abroad, but they have less success with linking this new learning back to their on campus academic programs.

We found that disciplinary differences exist in how internationalization is conceived, and therefore in how it is promoted among faculty. Faculty members in the sciences viewed "science is science" irrespective of world location, and because so many environmental or scientific concerns cross borders, science was perceived on a more common playing field. Those in education likened international foci with intercultural competencies necessary in the classroom and in educating about diversity more broadly. Likewise, those in business saw global trade as ingrained in all industry, even domestic companies. Increasingly, law faculty observed the role of international legal issues emerging, in part due to increasing permeable borders for students. Finally, faculty in the arts and sciences held the strongest disciplinary ties; for example, those in modern language, anthropology, and international studies readily bought into the concept of internationalization.

What is still a work in progress is how learning outcomes are measured for international activities. For faculty leading study abroad, a narrow focus on the experience of participating in a program at an international site dominated discussions of learning outcomes, with less conversation about connection of learning abroad back to "home" academic programs and life experiences outside of college. Integration of learning did not occur with any intentionality. What remains a question for the next stage of our institutional study is if the full implementation of the COLL curriculum will resolve this issue as the shared curriculum for students, in particular the *COLL 300: In the World* class, scaffolds students' learning throughout their four years on campus. As a capstone of the transformational change efforts under way at William & Mary, as noted earlier, was the receipt of the 2016 Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization from NAFSA: Association of International Educators in recognition of the level of innovation occurring on campus.

THE ROLES OF FACULTY IN TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

Our 2015 research uncovered several ways in which faculty members were integral to the transformation on campus. At the same time that Vice Provost Hanson was engaged in the change process from his leadership position, faculty members were engaged from their respective positions as teachers, researchers, and advisors. Faculty play a central role in any change process on campus as they constitute the heart of the academic process. Faculty members control the curriculum, which grounds the learning experiences of students during their college years, and they are the face of the college to students and parents. Thus, how faculty think about and work toward instituting comprehensive internationalization on campus matters. Our research highlighted how individual faculty agency, and the associated work and dedication to building student abroad programs, all contributed to the changes on campus.

As evident in our 2010 study, it was individual faculty members that built and sustained the institution's study abroad programs over time. Faculty in Arts & Sciences used their disciplinary ties in other countries to begin fostering partnerships in regions around the globe. It was this individual spadework that allowed the study abroad programs to take root, and many of these programs became associated with particular faculty and programs, namely, modern languages, international studies. Our business school faculty were early supporters of global experiences for students given the opening of world markets. Because many of the university faculty had been participants in study abroad as undergraduates, the faculty members' personal experiences underscored for them the need to develop programs for their own students so they could have these in-depth learning experiences. High levels of student mobility were already evident at the university in 2010 as nearly half of all undergraduates had some form of international study away experience. The professional schools also offer international experiences for graduate students. The School of Education created a Global Studies short course in 2012 to accommodate working professionals, and the Mason School of Business incorporates international study abroad in the MBA programs. Importantly, a survey of new business school undergraduates at William & Mary found that a majority of students had traveled abroad prior to entering college. Many William & Mary students enter with a global mind-set in place and are eager to engage in thinking about international perspectives in their academic experiences.

A cornerstone to the change process was the revision of the undergraduate curriculum with a requirement for cross-cultural experiences at the COLL 300 level. Prior to this revision, the curriculum was unchanged for twenty years. The pressure to take a fresh look at student learning objectives and program goals added urgency to the curriculum review. Massive involvement of faculty across campus contributed to the new design. The provost initiated this process

with a white paper and a series of lectures that posed the question: *What is the purpose of a liberal arts university?* In part, the curriculum revision answered this question. A focus on key signatory common courses established a grounding for all student experiences. The series of COLL courses created a trajectory of shared experiences for students. Deep readings and group discussions kick off the COLL 150 courses, in which students explore a range of methods of inquiry. COLL 100 courses are akin to historic survey courses in which students are introduced to a range of theories and beliefs about the world. The topics explored in COLL 200 use different paradigms and methodologies to provide a basis to hone critical thinking skills. As noted, COLL 300 courses provided students with a cross-cultural context. Finally, COLL 400 course-work provides students an opportunity for individual inquiry into a research topic of their own making and interest. It is within this COLL curriculum that faculty work and student learning intersect. This curriculum revision provided key leverage in moving forward on efforts to internationalize the campus.

The curriculum review and revision also addressed an issue that emerged prominently in our research in both 2010 and 2015: a need for more intentional integration of learning. The ability of college graduates to connect, apply, and synthesize skills and knowledge across disparate contexts is essential for success in today's economy (Barber 2012). Integration of learning is a desired outcome of higher education; however, faculty and students alike indicated a lack of integration between international efforts (notably study abroad programs) and the larger college experience and curriculum.

The COLL curriculum eliminates some of the disciplinary boundaries to integration of learning by encouraging interdisciplinary study, collaboration, and cross-cultural experience. As the new William & Mary curriculum unfolds over its four-year rollout (with the COLL 300 requirement fully implemented in 2017–2018), it will be essential to investigate the ways in which international study abroad experiences are connected to the larger curriculum and programs of study. Faculty members and the professional staff in the Reves Center will need to work collaboratively to ensure that international experiences are integral to the overall college experience and not viewed as faculty or students as compartmentalized.

LESSONS LEARNED: STRATEGIES FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION AND TRANSFORMATION

As we conclude this chapter about transforming internationalization in higher education, we want to share six strategies for our colleagues who are involved in similar change processes on their respective campuses.

First, faculty matter and are important partners in the process of transformation. We've outlined earlier some of the key roles that faculty have in the university landscape, and want to highlight the partnership that was

developed between administration and faculty at William & Mary. Few look at faculty learning in the change process, but Steve Hanson's professional experience as a faculty member and background in organizational studies provided a strong foundation for building a shared process for change that acknowledged faculty roles. What resulted was not two parallel change processes (administrative and faculty) but rather a single transformational effort.

This leads to our second point, which is that institutional leaders need to be adept at framing change and knowledgeable of change theories. Frameworks such as Kotter's (2014) Process for Leading Change are valuable tools in developing and operationalizing a transformation in higher education. No doubt some institutions may attempt to employ a top-down mandate to internationalize, but these efforts will fall short of meeting the end goals if faculty are not involved or if faculty, staff, students, alumni, and other key stakeholders feel they have no voice in the process.

Next, any effort at change in terms of internationalization needs to consider student learning. We as educators must ask of our internationalization efforts: what do we expect students to learn, how to we measure that learning, and how can we document and communicate that learning to others? There is no universal way to measure the impact of internationalization on student learning, no silver bullet for assessment in international programs. However, each institution should consider how it can assess student learning in a way that supports the overall mission of the institution, demonstrates student progress toward the achievement of learning outcomes agreed upon by faculty members, and supports the allocation of resources (human and financial) to various international efforts. The data collected through assessment of student learning can then be used to improve the educational experiences offered, and help students to more fully integrate international learning experiences with the rest of their curriculum and life experience.

Fourth, institutional structure is important. The step of creating a vice provost for International Affairs position taken by Provost Halleran assured leadership and advocacy for international efforts at William & Mary. Without this key organizational change, the transformation process in our internationalization efforts would have looked very different, and may not have happened at all. We heard repeatedly in our data collection that action needed to accompany words and ideas. The creation of a leadership role at the vice provost level signaled across campus that this change effort was more than an aspiration, and that this focus had support and resources to support the transformation process.

Fifth, effective change processes call for broad-based participation. The new vice provost tapped into the base of influential faculty on campus, as noted earlier, to help leverage the change process. Historic relationships and partnering agreements helped to jumpstart the transformation process. Understanding these key roles occurs only when new leaders ask about them and understand fully the contextual culture of the institution. The IAC played

a crucial role as a convening group for the Hanson, but also as purveyors of communication across institutional silos and areas. Certainly, leadership is critical to successful transformation, but leadership occurs at a variety of levels within the institution and includes faculty leaders.

Finally, it's necessary to discuss the issue of resources and financial support. We have been fortunate at William & Mary to have resources available to facilitate our change process, but feel strongly that internationalization can be successful with limited resources. For example, changes to policy regarding the acknowledgment of internal work for tenure and promotion signals that internationalization is important and values work on campus. Changes to curriculum are within the purview of the faculty, and, though costly in terms of time, typically do not require the resources required of other change efforts. Finally, public recognition of international work, through vehicles like the *World Minded* publication noted earlier, provides a relatively low-cost mechanism for sharing the good works of campus members and units.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we hope that this snapshot of the transformation process at William & Mary can be helpful to colleagues at other colleges and universities as they consider their own routes toward internationalization. Change is a difficult process, and one that must be intentional, collaborative, and sustained over time for transformations to occur. Our intention with this chapter was to pull back the curtain on our efforts, and document our journey toward internationalization, including both the challenges and the successes.

The process of writing this chapter has allowed us the opportunity to reflect on the great progress that has been made over the past decade, and also to consider the work yet to be done. Internationalization in higher education is a continuous improvement process, and our efforts as an institution, though moving forward, are by no means complete.

Interviews

"Light bulb moments" are often seen as being serendipitous and fleeting. I hope that the following interview questions and answers deepen understanding about how these moments can be cultivated and sustained. The "Light Bulb Moment Worksheet" (appendix A) offers a framework for stimulating transformation at your college or university.

Changing the Light Bulb

David: How many academics does it take to change a light bulb?

Jim: So the first thing that came to mind for me is you—of course—need a committee (you need some faculty, you need some students) to help and let us know if the light is bright enough. You need external stakeholders to weigh-in, so it would be a group process for sure.

Pam: But as you know with so many smart people in the room sometimes it's hard to get liftoff. I think one of the things we miss . . . is what can actually occur in the middle, with mid-level leaders. And that I think is an area in which we could change a lot of light bulbs quicker than waiting to just think that someone else is going to take charge and do it for us.

Steve: I think that's an excellent point to make because, as a vice-provost-level person, I'm always looking at the middle-level leaders to be honest. [If you] try to get everything done by a grassroots committee of faculty or students you'll wait a long time; if you don't consult at all it's a dead letter. But if you find a Jim Barber and a Pam Eddy once in a while and then run with them and serve on committees and do so thoughtfully and prepare for the committee meeting and report back to their peers—you know those "nodes in the network," to use network theory, which is quite appropriate here—that's when information flows are effective and that's when you know you're going to be building legitimacy and support.

Question

What could be done to enhance the way that your college/university identifies, trains, and supports mid-level leaders?

Change Agency

David: How has your life prepared you to be a change agent?

Pam: I always tell the story that I'm the oldest of five children. And so I think in ways there is family experience that adds into this, but then also your experience both through your schooling and your professional life in terms of say, observing the situation, making sure you're advocating for others, [and] then being able to say "OK, I'm willing to pull the trigger on this to move forward."

Jim: I would say that I had really good mentors, both as a professional and as an academic, that really got the message across to me that your voice is important; the conversation is different when you speak up and contribute. And so I often remember that advice and think about looking at a situation that I wish was different, it's not going the way that I think it should go optimally, and decide to speak up and throw my two cents in because there likely are other people in the room that are going to support me and may be thinking the same thing.

Steve: I'm the third of four kids and for us it was a question of getting a word in edgewise. So you had to learn how to speak and kind of assert opinions in a way that didn't alienate everybody. I was also lucky to grow up in a family that had a lot of international influence. My father was born in China and my grandfather was a missionary in China. Berkeley, where I grew up, was an international town. I grew up in

a kind of quite crazy time in the 1960s and 70s with lots of things going on that were worldly and a million different influences which you either synthesize (and find a way to articulate for people to buy into as a vision) or it might overwhelm you.... So the good thing is to have a diverse background like that and then be able to find a niche where your own synthesizing of that is useful to other people.

Question

How does the family system you grew up in inform your thinking about change agency?

Advice

David: What advice do you have for others who want to transform higher education?

Steve: I would start by saying you can't neglect the internal or the external aspects of this work. And by that I mean, starting with forging ties with faculty across campus who are those mid-level leaders . . . and making sure that students are bought in and feel that they're being supported. But then at the same time, outside of that network, you have to be able to get alumni on board and you have to get the Board of Visitors on board or the Board of Regents. You have to make sure the president and the provost are supportive. At least at the beginning it is Janus-faced, it is back and forth movement. It takes energy and commitment and it's so rewarding. Janus, the Roman god, is two-faced, so external and internal.

Pam: I'm sitting here smiling as Steve was saying that because I've used that phrase in some of the work I do with organizational change . . . but I think often our administrators come up from areas of their own discipline that may not have had exposure to this. And on a surface level unless you understand that it's actually organizational theory and operations you may think "oh, this just means we have to be nice to people and bring all the stakeholders on board." But there's really a much deeper sense of understanding that Steve brings to this enterprise because of his background in Org Theory, that if you actually understand how systems work you can take more intentional change efforts to advance and transform systems.

Jim: My advice for others that are looking to create change on their campus is less organizational and more relational. I think finding others on campus who are interested in the same type of change and are willing to work alongside you is vital and it makes a difficult task enjoyable. And so for me finding those connections and identifying those colleagues who are going to support you and share that enthusiasm-and also be there when the going gets tough-was an important part of the process for me. You've got to find where those other folks are who are going to be in the good fight with you.

Question for Reader Reflection

What could be done to deepen transformation-oriented relationships and skills at your college/university?

REFERENCES

American Council on Education, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement. 2012. *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2012 edition.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/2012-Mapping-Internationalization-on-U-S—Campuses.aspx.

Barber, J. P. 2012. "Integration of learning: A grounded theory analysis of college students' learning." *American Educational Research Journal* 49 (3): 590-617. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212437854.

Black, J. S., and H. B. Gregersen. 2008. *It Starts with One: Changing Individuals Changes Organizations.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Eddy, P. L., J. P. Barber, N. Holly, K. Brush, and L. Bohon. 2013. "Internationalizing a Campus: From Colonial to Modern Times." *Change Magazine* 45 (6): 43–50.

Finkelstein, M. J., E. Walker, and R. Chen. 2013. "The American Faculty in an Age of Globalization: Predictors of Internationalization of Research Content and Professional Networks." *Higher Education* 66 (3): 325–340.

Hoving, K. 2015. "William & Mary Maintains Top Spot in Study Abroad among Public Universities." Retrieved from http://www.wm.edu/offices/revescenter/news/2015/william—mary-maintains-top-spot-in-study-abroad-among-public-universities.php.

Hudzik, J. K. 2011. "Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action." Retrieved from https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf.

Kezar, A. 2013. *How Colleges Change: Understanding, Leading, and Enacting Change.* New York: Routledge.

Kezar, A., and P. Eckel. 2002. "Examining the Institutional Transformation Process: The Importance of Sensemaking, Inter-related Strategies and Balance." *Research in Higher Education* 43 (4): 295–328.

Knight, J. 2004. "Internationalization Remodeled: Definitions, Rationales, and Approaches." *Journal for Studies in International Education* 8 (1): 5–31.

Kotter, J. P. 2014. *Accelerate: Building Strategic Agility for a Faster-Moving World.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kulick, K., and J. Martin. 2009. *W & M Faculty Survey Report: 2009.* Williamsburg, VA: Faculty Assembly. Retrieved from http://wmpeople.wm.edu/asset/index/kmkuli/facultysurveyreport2009withcorr.

Taylor, W. 2013. *The Origins of Study Abroad at the College of William & Mary: 1924–1930.* Unpublished manuscript.

William & Mary Strategic Plan. 2015. Retrieved from http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/plan/globalperspectives/index.php.