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Abstract

This research was conducted through a co-op experience with the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). This paper articulates what international partnerships the community colleges of AACC’s Global Education Commission have established with institutions abroad, what contributes to successful partnerships, and what challenges may be faced and how to overcome them. AACC’s website has been updated with this information in the form of a best practices section that is easily accessible to both AACC and community colleges. I approached this topic from a pragmatist perspective with a combination of organizational theory and globalization theory. There is much research available on the history of community colleges and current studies advocating community colleges as a solution for disadvantaged students, but not much information available on current practices of community colleges, especially in the area of international partnerships. I conducted a mixed-methods research project (quantitative evidence of partnerships plus qualitative interviews and questionnaires) and added my own recommendations for further study and utilization of the results. In the future, I will administer a survey to the AACC international staff and community college presidents and international education directors to assess the usefulness of the research.
Chapter 1 – Introduction (3-5 total pages)

Many community colleges are contributing to intercultural understanding by internationalizing their colleges. Internationalization is the active response of the field of education to globalization, a process that is beyond control (Raby & Valeau, 2007, p. 6). The internationalization of community colleges is important because since the acceleration of globalization (due to advances in communication technologies and easier travel) people are now coming into contact with other people from many diverse cultures. There has been a lot of research conducted about the importance of internationalization, but hardly any research has been done on the specifics of internationalization at community colleges.

It is important to consider specific areas in order to gain a broad perspective of how each community college is internationalizing their programs. However, there has not been much research into this area (Green, 2007, p. 16). Important aspects to consider include:

- Programs and initiatives that promote global awareness
- Encouraging inclusiveness relating to race, ethnicity, and religion
- Broadening the study of globally themed academic courses: foreign languages, ELL, etc.
- Promoting the US community college model and recruiting and hosting international students worldwide
- Enhancing international study abroad and exchange for students
- Offering faculty exchange and opportunities
- Establishing partnerships with institutions abroad
- Memberships in international organizations
- Mission statement including international/global issues
- Best practices or unique and special initiatives

It is also important to consider barriers to internationalization that community colleges may face. These could include, but are not limited to institutional leaders not viewing internationalization as relevant, lack of institutional strategy, fragmented international programs and activities, lack of funding, global learning not focused in the classroom, individual attitudes,
personal knowledge and expertise, and a general non-internationalized mind-set among staff and students (Green, 2007, pp. 19-21). More research is needed to understand what specifically hinders community colleges in the internationalization process.

Green (2007) recommends strategies to overcome these barriers, such as ensuring active leadership, creating a strategic framework for action, using available assets, ensuring faculty development and engagement, committing to meeting student needs, and providing supporting structures and resources (pp. 22-24). These suggestions may be helpful, but more research is needed on what has specifically assisted individual community colleges in internationalizing their programs.

I worked with the American Association of Community Colleges to articulate what international partnerships the Global Education Commission community colleges have established with institutions abroad, what contributes to successful partnerships, and what challenges may be faced and how to overcome them. I analyzed and provided my own recommendations for community colleges attempting to develop partnerships in terms of the current research in the field. I updated AACC’s website with this information in a form that will be easily accessible to both the AACC and community colleges. This was needed because there was no easily accessible information on this topic on their website and there has not been any significant research into best practices when forming international partnerships at the community college level. This study provides a starting point for further research into what partnerships community colleges have developed, what challenges they face when forming partnerships, and what strategies they utilize to overcome the challenges.

My research questions include:

- What types of international partnerships do the Global Education Commission members have? (Study Abroad, Sister College/Cities, Faculty Exchange, Student Exchange, Faculty and Student Exchange, Dual Degree, Other)
- What challenges have they faced when forming their international partnerships?
- What strategies do they utilize to overcome these challenges?
- How does this relate to other research on international partnerships?
I approached this topic from a pragmatist perspective, which Creswell (2003) defines as advocating utilizing methods that suit the purposes of the research, and is not committed to any one system of reality. I also utilized the organizational theory, which Levin (2001) defines as examining the ways that organizations change, and globalization theory, which Levin (2001) defines as categorizing the institutional behaviors that have contributed to or defined organizational change. There is much research available on the history of community colleges and current studies advocating community colleges as a solution for disadvantaged students, but not much information available on current practices of community colleges, especially in the area of international partnerships.

This study is important because there is virtually no research on what international partnerships community colleges have established. It provides an important base study of what types of international partnerships community colleges have, the challenges they encounter when forming such partnerships, and strategies for overcoming these challenges. It helps to prepare institutions that are beginning the partnership process to be able to foresee problems and establish strategies to deter problems before they arise. Conducting this research through the American Association of Community Colleges enables the results to be distributed to member institutions from an advisory and prominent standpoint.

Limitations

Time constraints are a huge limitation of this study. Due to the co-op length (about 10 weeks), I was only able to survey the global commission members (64 institutions (5%) out of about 1200 community colleges that AACC represents). Therefore, the study only represents a small sample of the total number of community colleges and cannot be generalized to the larger population. Also, the Global Education Commission members nominate themselves to serve on the commission, so they may express more interest in international partnerships than the majority of community colleges. This study is limited to community colleges, not junior colleges or four year institutions. The time of year of the study is also a limitation, as the study was conducted during the summer and many college faculty members and staff were away on vacation or were not required to be on campus so some responses were missing or incomplete. Another limitation is the voluntary nature of the responses. If colleges are planning partnerships that they do not
want others to know about, or had extremely negative interactions with partners, they may not have shared them with me in fear that their responses would be published and they would be looked at unfavorably or other colleges would try to move in on their partnerships.

**Definition of Terms**

**Community college**- a two-year college established to serve a specific community and typically supported in part by local government funds; may award associate degrees or prepare students to transfer to a four-year college or university

**Study abroad**- one-way study (not an exchange) of students and/or faculty to engage in learning activities. These may be offered for credit or non-credit, include service learning opportunities, be short-term or long-term, or occur once or recur (for example, on an annual basis).

**Sister college/city**- mutual understanding between two colleges or cities, or a college and a city

**Faculty exchange**- An articulated agreement for the exchange of faculty (usually equal numbers each way)

**Student exchange**- An articulated agreement for the exchange of students (usually equal numbers each way)

**Faculty and student exchange**- An articulated agreement for the exchange of faculty and students (usually equal numbers each way)

**Dual degree**- A formal agreement where each institution offers credit to all students involved in the program (native and international students)

**Other**- A category for all other partnerships- capacity building partnerships, virtual classroom partnerships, etc. See Appendix D for a list of “other” partnership types.

**Summary**

I will be conducting research into the Global Education Commission members’ international partnerships, including what challenges they encounter when forming such partnerships, and what strategies they utilize to overcome those challenges. This is important because there is not much, if any, available research on this topic. It will be helpful to community colleges looking to establish international partnerships by providing a resource on best practices
to help them avoid problems before they begin. I will be conducting this research through a pragmatist lens, and utilizing the globalization and organizational change theories. Finally, I will share my research through a best practices section of the AACC website.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review (5-7 pages)

“International education must be a high priority. The world is populated by far too much misunderstanding, hatred, and violence. Education demands that the learner clarify his or her attitudes and perceptions, replacing fixed notions with genuine openness. This is the bounty offered by higher education, the potential to transcend the narrow ideas that set people against one another.”

-Eduardo Padron, President of Miami-Dade College in Florida (Boggs & Irwin, 2007, p. 26)

Internationalization of the community college is especially important. As Green (2007) states, “For those students whose education ends with their community college experience, community colleges are likely to constitute the only formal academic opportunity to learn about other countries, cultures, and global trends” (p. 16).

Raby & Valeau (2007) list four rationales for the internationalization of colleges: the political rationale, economic rationale, humanist rationale, and academic integrity rationale (pp. 8-9). The United States provides an example of the political rationale by recognizing that community colleges can promote national security and world peace by helping educate students from developing countries and by promoting the study of foreign languages (Boggs & Irwin, 2007, p. 29). Levin (2002) subscribes to the economic rationale, stating, “[Community colleges now respond] to customers who are not just students, but include participants in the economic marketplace; [rationalize] organizational actions on the basis of efficiency and productivity measures; and [project] an image of a competitive and technologically advanced organization” (p. 123). Stromquist (2002) illustrates the humanist rationale: “[Universities] have a social responsibility to create and offer learning environments that foster the students’ development of intercultural adaptability and human solidarity” (p.130). Milliron (2007) supports the academic integrity rationale by challenging colleges to change the status quo to serve the students’ current needs (p. 37).

When community colleges were developed in the U.S. in the 1960’s, their primary objective was “to serve the underserved and to expand access to postsecondary education and training, fulfilling needs of individual students, and serving local communities” (Levin, 2001, p.
Since the 1990’s, this has changed. Recent changes “include government policies to reflect both societal and economic concerns such as the training of a globally competitive workforce and private sector demands for an increase in work-based training and specific skill acquisition for workers” (Levin, 2001, p.238). Raby & Valeau (2007) second this assertion of change since the 1990’s and add that in 2001, AACC surveyed 1171 colleges and found that 78% offered study abroad opportunities, nearly a 30% increase since 1995 (pp. 7-8).

Understanding globalization is the key to understanding the importance of internationalizing the community college campus. In *Education in a Globalized World*, Stromquist (2002) explores globalization’s effect on universities and provides a history of globalization and education. Stromquist (2002) describes the importance of internationalization as:

> Universities have a social responsibility to create and offer learning environments that foster the students’ development of intercultural adaptability and human solidarity; they also have a responsibility to engage the rest of society in a critical understanding of ongoing economic and political developments throughout the world. (p. 129)


> [Internationalization demands] sensitivity training in international thinking with the purpose of fostering certain attitudes that lead to international solidarity, rejection of racial prejudices, and understanding of other cultures. The other overriding objective is to impart certain skills and competencies that will enable young people to function in an international setting, such as mastery of foreign languages, knowledge and insights into foreign cultures, and the history and geography of other nations. (p. 108)

Stromquist (2002) emphasizes partnerships as a tool to internationalize the campus by quoting Firebaugh & Miller (2000), “Global expertise should include the development of internal
and external partnerships that promote a vision that recognizes diversity and the preparation of students from a cross-cultural perspective around values such as tolerance, respect, and appreciation of ethnic differences” (p. 129). Suarez-Orozco (2007) adds to this, listing the main international objectives of internationalization as raising public consciousness about issues that are now of global concern and are therefore the responsibility of everyone, and strengthening international cooperation and networking to ensure high quality in cross-border higher education (p. 156).

Raby & Valeau (2007) describe the importance of advocacy for internationalizing institutions of higher education:

> Despite almost three decades of intense discussion, many educators still do not see international education as a key component of the community college’s mission. For example, in a recent study of internationalization in the community college, Green and Siaya (2005) found that international education is still a peripheral activity rather than an institutionalized component. (p. 5)

The literature on the challenges and strategies encountered by institutions when forming international partnerships comprises a very small amount of studies. IIE’s white paper, *Expanding Education Abroad at U.S. Community Colleges* (2008) identifies three major challenge areas. These are: serving the diverse community college student body (including work and family obligations of students and lack of funds to study abroad), institutional constraints (including stakeholder support, institutional funding, dedicated office staff, and the peripheral status of education abroad), and the need for further professionalization of the field (including risk management, legal issues and ethics, evaluation of programs, and pre-departure orientation and re-entry programs).

Green (2007) proposes several challenges to internationalization of community colleges. These are institutional leaders who do not view internationalization as relevant, a lack of institutional strategy, fragmented international programs and activities, lack of funding, a lack of focus on global learning in the classroom, individual attitudes, personal knowledge and expertise, and a general non-internationalized mind-set among staff and students (Green, 2007, pp. 19-21).
In terms of strategies, Green (2007) recommends ensuring active leadership, creating a strategic framework for action, using available assets, ensuring faculty development and engagement, committing to meeting student needs, and providing supporting structures and resources (pp. 22-24).

IIE’s white paper, *Expanding Education Abroad at U.S. Community Colleges* (2008) recommends four major changes:

1. Philosophical change- articulating support in college mission statements, strategic plans, budgets, and through stakeholder actions with trustees, administrators and faculty who support policy and practice by initiating and sustaining reforms. Internationalize the curriculum, recruit international students, and provide work or volunteer opportunities to assist with development outreach.

2. Economic change- secure a line-item in the budget to staff the study abroad office.

3. Programmatic change- need study abroad office, develop infrastructure including how to establish programs, define faculty selection, advertise programs, define a risk management program that emphasizes best practices and ethics, and secure long-range planning.

4. Recognizing the real barriers to success- lack of institutionalization of study abroad, not lack of student interest (includes institutional synergy to integrate across disciplines and stakeholders, professional development, student outreach, and networking and collaboration). (p.24)

NAFSA: Association of International Educators published a report entitled, *Strengthening Study Abroad: Recommendations for Effective Institutional Management for Presidents, Senior Administrators, and Study Abroad Professionals* (2008). They provide criteria for the institutional management of study abroad pertaining to institutional commitment, study abroad infrastructure, adequate resources, and clarity and accountability (NAFSA, 2008, p.5). The criteria is as follows:

Institutional Commitment:

1. Institutional planning has established and embedded study abroad as an integral element in the academic offerings of the institution.

2. A financially sustainable plan is in place to support the study abroad office.
3. Study abroad is integrated into the academic life of the institution.
4. Systems and processes are in place to provide institutional oversight.

Study Abroad Infrastructure:
5. There is a structured approach to program planning and a faculty-driven process for course approval and credit transfer.
6. Study abroad options are regularly updated to respond to academic opportunity and student need.
7. Clear institutional policies guide study abroad credit transfer.
8. Programs promote the health and safety of students studying abroad, and manage institutional risk.
9. Programs are regularly evaluated, and evaluation leads to improvements.

Adequate Resources:
10. The institution actively seeks and retains knowledgeable and experienced personnel to lead and operate the study abroad office.
11. Financial aid policies and fundraising practices encourage student participation in study abroad.
12. Policies and practices are in place that control the costs associated with study abroad programs.

Clarity and Accountability:
13. Critical information related to study abroad is communicated to all stakeholders.
14. Clear contracting and auditing procedures exist, including conflict-of-interest policies.

(p.5)

Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) recommends utilizing checklists to internationalize the curriculum/college. See Appendix E for these checklists.

Research Problem and Theoretical Framework

I approached the research of best practices in forming international partnerships from a pragmatist perspective, which Creswell (2003) defines as advocating utilizing methods that suit the purposes of the research, and is not committed to any one system of reality (pp. 11-12).

Creswell (2003) explains that there is a concern with “what works” and solutions to problems (p.
Pragmatism justifies utilizing mixed-methods research since it is not committed to any one system of philosophy and reality (Creswell, 2003, p. 12). This enables my research, which entails seeking out qualitative and quantitative results (how many partnerships there are, and what directors feel are the challenges to initiating partnerships) to be as complete as possible by not limiting the results to only quantitative or qualitative research.

Another pragmatist knowledge claim is that “pragmatists agree that research always occurs in social, historical, political, and other contexts… may include a postmodern turn, a theoretical lens that is reflexive of social justice and political aims” (Creswell, 2003, p. 12). This is also relevant to my research, since I looked at the challenges community colleges face when establishing partnerships, especially in terms of institutional support, the importance of providing a global education to all students, and other factors, some of which can be considered political and oriented towards social justice.

I utilized the organizational theory, which Levin (2001) defines as examining the ways that organizations change, specifically changes in formal structure, organizational culture, goals, programs, or missions in institutions. It is important to understand these variables in each college in order to understand the specific challenges they may face and strategies they may utilize when forming partnerships.

Globalization theory was used to guide the research. Levin (2001) defines globalization theory as categorizing the institutional behaviors that have contributed to or defined organizational change. Levin (2001) suggests that consciousness of a global society, culture, and economy may be the cornerstones of globalization (239). He also states, “higher education institutions, because of their cultural, social, and economic roles, are caught up in and affected by globalization” (Levin, 2001, p. 239).

Globalization theory helps to explain the importance of community colleges (which are often heavily reliant on workforce/vocational education) forming international partnerships to prepare their students for the new modern workplace. In fact, Levin (2001) states that because of globalization, “education is vocationalized, and training is driven by the demands of business and industry” (p. 239). Levin classifies internationalization as a set of behaviors including recruiting students from other countries, delivering college curriculum in other nations, and inculcating of
others’ cultural values, including the promotion and display of international images, symbols, and practices (p. 240). These behaviors are all evidenced in the partnerships that I studied.

I conducted research on the common challenges community colleges face when forming international partnerships, the strategies they utilize to overcome the challenges, and overall best practices that community colleges can adopt in order to make the partnership process easier. I completed this research from a pragmatist perspective that allowed me to adapt my methods to achieve the most thorough results utilizing a mixed-methods approach. The pragmatist lens was further refined by utilizing the organizational theory, which analyzes how organizations change and analyzes the variables specific to community colleges, and globalization theory, which explains the importance of international partnerships.

In conclusion, there has been much research into the history and background of globalization and internationalization of institutions of higher education, but practically no research into what individual institutions are doing to internationalize their campuses. I conducted research into what partnerships individual institutions have formed, the challenges they encountered when forming the partnerships, and the strategies they utilized to overcome the challenges. I conducted this research through a pragmatist lens and a combination of the globalization and organizational change theories.
Chapter 3 – Research Methodology (4-7 pages)

This section describes the research design and rationale, measures and instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis. The research attempts to answer these questions:

- What types of international partnerships do the Global Education Commission members have? (Study Abroad, Sister College/Cities, Faculty Exchange, Student Exchange, Faculty and Student Exchange, Dual Degree, Other)
- What challenges have they faced when forming their international partnerships?
- What strategies do they utilize to overcome these challenges?
- How does this relate to other research on international partnerships?

Research Design

To answer these questions, I conducted open-ended surveys and interviews through email and phone calls. For a sample email survey, see Appendix A. I explained the background of the research and asked them to provide a contact person for each partnership, along with the country of the partnership. Once I was provided a contact person, I interviewed them over the phone or through email and asked them to identify the challenges they encountered when forming partnerships and the strategies they utilized to overcome those challenges. I contacted all colleges on the Global Education Commission (64 colleges). I analyzed the data by grouping the responses into categories (challenges, strategies, and sub-categories), and analyzed the percentage of responses falling into each category. I also analyzed the responses by percentage of types of partnerships, partnerships by continent/region, and partnerships by country. I compared the results of our study with those of broader studies to see how the global education commission compares to the broader community of colleges and universities.

Rationale

I viewed this research through the pragmatist lens which enabled me to conduct research utilizing whichever tools were best suited to the task. A combination of surveys and interviews was the most feasible research design given the time and personnel constraints of the co-op assignment and would allow me to gain insight into the challenges and strategies being encountered and utilized in the community colleges. I decided to focus on the Global Education
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Commission because they had determined that they were interested in learning about their members’ international education activities at a previous commission meeting and I was able to survey all members in the allotted time.

Ethical considerations

Due to ethical considerations, I am not publishing the results of the interviews by name of college. Some colleges are exploring partnerships and do not want their possible partnerships to be exploited by others, and some did not want to be associated with negative comments.

Pending research

I will not be able to complete the survey to assess the effectiveness and helpfulness of my research until after the Graduate Co-op Defense. I am still waiting on some responses from colleges from my first survey, so I am sure that I will not have the results by the end of August. I would like to survey the AACC international staff and community college presidents and international education directors to see if the best practices section on the website is helpful to them. I would also like to expand the scope of the research beyond the Global Education Commission members, and have been asked to do this part-time past the end of the co-op assignment. Other pending research includes determining why certain types and locations of partnerships are more popular than others and how community colleges decide to form partnerships in some regions but not others. Future research would include broadening the survey and analyzing whether the results of the Global Education Commission members are typical of all community colleges and how the results compare to all higher education institutions.
Chapter 4 – Results (5-12 pages)

Findings

Overall, I received responses from about 60% of the Global Education Commission members. The missing responses could be due to the time of year of the study (summer, when colleges are not in session), the workload of community college administrators, an unwillingness to share information on their partnerships, or time constraints. More research needs to be conducted into this area. See Appendix B for a list of colleges who provided responses.

Partnerships

Partnerships fell into seven categories: study abroad, sister colleges/cities, faculty exchange, student exchange, faculty and student exchange, dual degree, and other. By far, study abroad was the most popular partnership category, totaling 44% of all partnerships (160 reported partnerships). The next popular partnerships fell into the “other” category, at 25% of all partnerships. Next were sister colleges/cities, at 11%, closely followed by faculty and student exchange partnerships, at 10%. Faculty exchange was the next most popular category at 7%, and dual-degree and student exchange were the least popular at 2 and 1 percent, respectively.

More research needs to be conducted to determine the reasons for the differing popularities of partnerships. However, study abroad is probably the format that most international education directors are aware of at the collegiate level. Sister colleges/cities may be popular because the term is vague and encompasses any number of informal understandings between institutions. Most colleges seem to prefer sending faculty along with students, which may account for the low number of student exchange and higher number of faculty and student exchange. According to respondents, dual degree programs are unpopular because of the amount of time and work that goes into creating dual accreditation programs. See Appendix C for charts of the partnership types by individual colleges.
When analyzing the results by continent/region, the data roughly coincides with the 2005/2006 *Open Doors* report published by the Institute of International Education (IIE). The *Open Doors* report was based on the reports of 114 community colleges. They found that the most popular destination is Europe, followed by Latin America, Asia, Oceania, and Africa. Our data, based on the reports of 39 community colleges, mostly matches the IIE results, even with the inclusion of locations in North America in the Latin America category. The only category where our information differs is between Oceania and Africa, where we found more programs sending students to Africa than Oceania.

### Global Commission Study Abroad Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32% (includes North America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the sister college/city partnerships (11% of partnerships), most were in South America, then Europe, North America, Central America and the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa. No sister college/city partnerships were reported in Australia.

When it comes to faculty exchange (7% of partnerships), the most popular destination is North America, Central America and the Caribbean, followed by Asia and Europe. The least popular destinations for faculty exchange are in South America, Africa, and none were reported in Oceania. A possible explanation for the huge difference in the popularity of certain regions over others could be that faculty members feel that participating in an exchange with another developed country would assist them more professionally than an exchange with a developing country where the faculty may not have had as much academic training. However, this is just speculation as virtually no research exists in this area and it is extremely difficult to generalize from 26 total faculty exchange partnerships.

Student exchange (1% of partnerships) was divided between two areas: North America, Central America, and the Caribbean (one partnership) and Europe (three partnerships). Again, it is not clear why this occurs, but could be because these regions have more established student
exchange partnerships and colleges feel more comfortable allowing students to attend without faculty members to guide them. However, there were too few partnerships reported to draw any significant conclusions.

Faculty and student exchanges (10% of partnerships) mostly occur in Europe and Asia. The next popular locations for faculty exchange are North America, Central America, and the Caribbean, Africa, and South America.

Only 6 dual degree partnerships were reported (2% of partnerships). Three partnerships were in North America, Central America, and the Caribbean, two were in Asia, and one was in Europe. Due to the low amount of reported dual degree partnerships, it is impossible to generalize from these results.

In the category of “other,” (25% of partnerships), the most popular location of partnerships was Asia. (See Appendix E for a list of activities falling under this category). The next most popular location is Africa, followed by Europe and North, Central America and the
Caribbean. The least popular location for “other” partnerships was South America.

In North America, Central America, and the Caribbean the most common partnership type is study abroad, at 56% of the reported partnerships in that region. Mexico and the Dominican Republic are clear leaders in study abroad among the Global Education Commission participants.

The second largest partnership category in this region is “other,” at 20%. Again, Mexico leads this category. The sister college/city relationships amount to 11% of the partnerships in the region, also with Mexico having the highest amount of sister college/city relationships. There were four faculty and student exchanges (5% of partnerships in the region): Mexico- 3, Dominican Republic- 1. There were also three dual degree partnerships (4%) in Mexico. There were only two faculty exchange partnerships (3%) in this region, one each in Guatemala and Mexico. There was one student exchange partnership (1%) in Barbados.

Mexico is clearly the leader of North America, Central America, and the Caribbean region with a total of 36 partnerships. Costa Rica follows at 15 partnerships, and the other countries are distributed between one and four partnerships each.
In South America, the most popular partnership category is sister colleges, at 45% of all partnerships in this region. Peru leads this category. The next popular category is study abroad, at 26%, also led by Peru. The category of “other” is the third largest category in South America, at 18%. Colombia has the highest number of reported “other” partnerships. Faculty exchange partnerships are less common at 5%, with one each in Argentina and Chile. There were only two faculty and student exchanges reported in Brazil, also totaling 5% of South American partnerships.

In this region, partnerships in Peru were the most common (13). Colombia and Argentina tied for the next most popular position with six partnerships each. Next follows Chile (3), Bolivia and Brazil (2), and Guyana and Venezuela (1).

In Europe, the predominant partnership category is study abroad, at 68% of the total partnerships reported in Europe. The country with the highest number of study abroad partnerships is Italy. Faculty and student exchange accounts for 11% of the Commission’s European partnerships. Faculty exchange partnerships make up 8% of the total European partnerships. The next popular European partnership category are the sister college partnerships, at 7%. All of these partnership categories are fairly evenly divided amongst the European countries.

Three percent of all European partnerships are student exchange partnerships. These are split evenly between Estonia, France, and Germany. There are two partnerships that fall into the “other” category (2%), one each in Bulgaria and France. There is one European dual degree partnership (1%) in Russia. Further research is needed to explain why the study abroad category is so much more predominant than the other types of partnerships.
Italy (16 partnerships) is the Commission’s most popular partner country. Next is the United Kingdom (14 partnerships). This is followed by Spain, (11 partnerships), and France and Germany (10 partnerships each). Denmark follows with 6 partnerships, and Ireland, Russia, and the Ukraine each have 5 partnerships. There are four partnerships each in Austria, the Czech Republic, and the Netherlands, and three partnerships each in Belgium, Finland, and Greece. Estonia and Switzerland each have two partnerships, and Bulgaria, Eastern Europe (region), Northern Ireland, Lithuania, Macedonia, and Portugal/The Azores each have one partnership.

In Africa, the largest partnership category is the category of “other” (61%). This may be because many countries in Africa lack adequate learning facilities and faculty and U.S. community colleges are able to work with Africa’s colleges to develop capacity, structures, facilities, and workforce training to enable Africa’s colleges and people to succeed. The second largest partnership category is study abroad, at 24%. Faculty and student exchange partnerships (9%) are located in Senegal and Liberia. There is a sister college partnership in Liberia, and a faculty exchange partnership in South Africa.

South Africa has the highest total number of Commission partnerships in Africa at 15 total partnerships. Next is Namibia (7 partnerships), followed by Senegal and Liberia (2 partnerships). Benin, Botswana, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and West Africa each have only one Commission partnership.
In Asia, the most popular categories of partnerships are study abroad and “other” partnerships. These two categories are tied at 33% (28 partnerships each). The next most popular partnership category in Asia is faculty and student exchange, at 15%. Faculty exchange follows faculty and student exchange with 12% of the total Asian partnerships. Sister colleges make up 6% of the total Asian partnerships. China leads in all of these categories.

China is the most popular Asian partnership location - 36 total partnerships. Next are Japan- 14, India- 11, Turkey- 6, Vietnam- 4, Thailand and the Republic of Georgia- 3 each, the United Arab Emirates- 2, and Armenia, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Laos, Pakistan, and South Korea- 1 each.

There were only four reported partnerships in Australia. Two of these were study abroad partnerships, and two were faculty exchange. It is unclear why Australia and the region of Oceania are unpopular for international partnerships amongst the Global Education Commission Members. More research needs to be conducted to determine the reason behind this low
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number of partnerships. There was also one study abroad partnership in an unspecified location reported by a Commission member.

Challenges

In addition to asking the Global Education Commission members about the types of partnerships and their locations, I also asked them to describe the challenges they encountered when forming international partnerships and the strategies they utilize to overcome those partnerships. According to the survey results, establishing the partnership presents the biggest challenge to the Global Education Commission members. The next biggest challenges in order are: logistical challenges, financial challenges, preparedness (of institution, students, and faculty), promoting the concept/marketing, and the ongoing challenges of maintaining the partnership.

Establishing the partnership constituted the largest percentage of the Global Education Commission’s comments. A lack of institutional support was the most commonly reported challenge in this category. The next most commonly reported challenges include identifying potential partners abroad/establishing relationships and the long process of establishing relationships. Other challenges focus on finding the available human resources to run the programs, a faculty commitment to the partnerships and global education, and the differences in the school systems of the two countries which sometimes limit the number of students eligible for higher education (contrary to the U.S. community college philosophy of open access for all).
Other comments include creating a win-win situation for both partners, aligning the institutional goals and objectives of the two institutions, negotiating bureaucratic regulations and policies, the political structure of the country, and developing a partnership based upon mutual strengths. Other challenges include building a supportive campus climate at the U.S. institution, building a supportive campus climate at the partner institution, building institutional support at the partner institution, developing a mutual interest for sister school relationships since they are not initially money-making, the difficulty of establishing dual degree agreements, and assessing credits.

Logistical challenges were the second most widely reported types of challenges encountered by the Global Education Commission members when establishing partnerships. The most commonly reported logistical challenge is language barriers. Time zones and changes in partnership management personnel were the next most widely reported challenges. Delays in communication, and shipping issues were other commonly mentioned problems. Other comments included such logistical challenges as needing compatible technologies for virtual classrooms, inconsistent email access in other countries, lodging in other countries, safety concerns, partner campuses not being prepared for students in enough time, finding housing for participants, obtaining student work visas for vocational programs, and the logistics of organizing a trip to Africa.

Financial challenges are the third most popular response to the question of challenges in forming partnerships. Most were in regards to funding challenges. The global economic recession was also a popular response. Other comments were made about students having trouble paying for courses, challenges establishing payment plans so students can utilize their financial aid, and needing a minimum enrollment of students to provide a faculty escort. Additional comments included foreign students not having adequate finances for a U.S. community college education, the cost of staff travel, faculty in both institutions needing to make an adequate salary to be able to travel abroad for faculty exchange, money transfer issues, faculty carrying big sums of money in foreign countries because the payment plan is outdated, and the economic difficulties encountered by the partner institutions.

Challenges in preparing for the partnership were the next largest category. Most focused on the foreign students’ English competency. Some comments were about colleges being
unprepared to deal with the needs of international students or not having international student support staff in place. Other comments included guest faculty being unprepared for the interactive nature of the American classroom culture, foreign students being unprepared for American educational programs, not having a pre-departure orientation, the language needs of the American students, and the challenges students face by having family and work obligations when trying to leave the country.

Promoting the partnership and ongoing challenges received the same amount of responses as preparing for the partnership. The biggest challenge in promoting the partnership is in marketing the concept. Another comment was made about getting the correct information to international students about American programs. Ongoing challenges were split evenly, with one comment each. These include maintaining the initial excitement over the partnership, cultural issues, students’ behavior in the host country despite a cultural orientation, and the unwillingness of faculty to take on another role (mentor, cultural leader) besides teaching.

**Strategies**

The respondents also described the strategies that they utilize to overcome the multiple challenges they face when forming and maintaining international partnerships. Most were strategies for establishing the partnership. A lot of strategies were proposed for planning the partnership. Funding strategies were also a popular response. Strategies to prepare the campus for the international partnership came next, followed by strategies for marketing the partnership and for the format of the relationship.

The most commonly cited strategy from the survey results for establishing the partnership was to utilize native speakers in the community or campus to provide the initial contact for the partnership. Other popular strategies for establishing the partnership include being patient, utilizing goodwill, positive enthusiasm, and building trust, learning about the partner’s culture, and evaluating how credible the potential partner is, including carefully selecting opportunities and evaluating agreements. Other comments were made about utilizing existing relations and partnerships, focusing on quality of partnerships, not quantity, developing communication, and evaluating the purpose of the partnership, including establishing short and long term goals and expectations.
Other strategies suggested include strengthening existing partnerships, investigating whether faculty have pursued opportunities for partnerships or have contacts in other countries, being financially ready to travel, and controlling the agenda and schedules. Our respondents recommend establishing overseas partnerships with faculty and staff visits in the beginning, and evaluating the faculty and administrative support of the partnership (including from the board for international initiatives, if one exists). Colleges should investigate whether there are supporting institutions or partners that could assist with the partnership, and form an advisory committee made up of faculty and staff to determine the direction of the partnership. The partnership should be evaluated to determine if it is consistent with the goals and needs of the college district, and to determine its sustainability.

Before creating a Scope of Work document or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) associated with international exchange, one should conduct a preliminary review of the curriculum. The contract process should be started early, since it can be long, and the contract should be sent in English for clarity. If the partnership is a dual degree partnership, accreditation officers should be notified and engaged in the beginning of the partnership process. Official MOU’s are needed to institutionalize the partnership to sustain the cooperation, and they should be detailed in who is offering what and what each party can expect from the other. The U.S. community college should make it explicitly clear to the partner institution that they cannot guarantee transfer to a four year university, since some overseas partners may try to demand a transfer guarantee.

Strategies for planning the partnership were the next most popular type of strategy. The most emphasized strategy for planning the partnership is utilizing face to face meetings with the partner. Others suggested learning about the channels of decision making so that the college contacts someone who can actually make decisions. They also suggest determining how to best serve international students academically, determining a clear educational objective for the partnership, using translators to assist with the language barrier, and assigning a dedicated, non-faculty person to work on the partnership.

Other strategies include being prepared to move more slowly than you would like, using technology (email, telephone, VOIP), utilizing a trip coordinator, and establishing a contact at a
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foreign hotel and using the same accommodations in return trips. The program should be manageable, with achievable goals, assessment criteria, and specific courses. U.S. community colleges have more flexibility in adapting college credit courses to the overseas format, and should adapt them. Another strategy utilized was a “credit-for-credit” award, and structuring alternative methods of course completion prior to student engagement in the program. One respondent suggested following through on agreements to keep them active, and another suggested working with providers for study abroad.

Funding strategies were the third most commonly cited. The most recommended strategy for funding is grants, specifically those offered from the U.S. Department of Education and USAID/HED grants. Others recommended evaluating costs, specifically considering if the program is viable, self-sustaining, and if there are any unexpected costs. When developing a partnership, the college will need specified funding for the partnership. Recommendations included seeking a combination of internal and external support for programs and searching for grants every day.

Corporate donors are another source of external funding. A creative strategy for soliciting donations is to host a donor luncheon where donors are invited to donate to a fund for students who cannot afford to study abroad. Private donors and businesses can also create scholarships. The college can also sponsor professional international conferences to collect funds for scholarships.

When dealing with international students, a helpful strategy is to have international students demonstrate that they have the financial backing for their courses in the U.S. Shorter more intense courses are cheaper for students because less money for lodging, meals, and incidental costs is needed and they are more flexible in dates, allowing flights to be cheaper. Another way to cut students’ expenses is to make them aware of all of the financial aid available to them. Adding trips to pre-existing trips is a strategy to cut staff travel costs. Another strategy to cut costs is to utilize as many in-house staff as possible because providers are much more expensive. Faculty exchanges need to be free, providing housing, meals, and other expenses on both sides of the partnership.
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For dual degree partnerships, seed money (research and development money) is needed. An idea of a creative payment plan to utilize financial aid money is to have students pay the equivalent of their full semester’s tuition to the college’s foundation and then the foundation offers a scholarship to the incoming student that will pay the costs of study in the U.S. while they similarly pay home tuition/fees to their institution’s foundation.

There are many strategies associated with preparing the campus that were offered by the respondents. The most commonly cited strategy was to develop institutional support. Along with institutional support, the support of the college president is imperative, and the president should be included in all stages of the relationship. The passion of individual faculty members is also important.

A fully staffed international office is the key to implementing the recommended strategies. Along with this, an institution wide advisory committee can provide direction and support for the international partnerships. An orientation should be provided for guest faculty, and they should be assigned a mentor. There should also be a training session for faculty and staff to inform them about partnership opportunities. The college should publish college-specific international travel guidelines, and a comprehensive guide for travel in the partner country should be provided to students before they depart. Applying with the State Department to register your travel is important for the safety of the participants.

The community college must have an English as a Second Language (ESL) program and an international student support system. Students should be assisted with their travel/visa documents. Programming should be designed for international students for holidays when the institution is not in session. College staff can help with language mentors, tutors, and dealing with other college personnel on behalf of the foreign student or as their ombudsman.

Strategies for formatting the partnership include beginning with student orientation programs for international and U.S. students. There should also be an orientation for faculty (of all partner institutions). Language study should be included in the partnership. A 10-14 day program is the most effective length of time. There should be a mix of classroom observation, business and industry visits, and cultural activities. Living in homes provides a true cultural immersion experience. A knowledgeable overseas director is extremely helpful. When dealing
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with international students requiring a TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) with a score of over 500 helps. If it is too difficult to actually travel abroad, utilizing live link (internet-based communication software) and teaching classes collaboratively can help share different perspectives much more economically. Hybrid programs - a mix of home institution-based class with a shorter time abroad can also help lower expenses. Upon return, faculty should report on the project, including student testimonials and projects.

Responses about marketing the partnership include utilizing agreements not just for publicity, but for their academic merit. Intensive marketing campaigns of the programs should be implemented. International student support systems should be marketed as well. Each academic department should be involved in the development of the strategy to attract foreign students. Invitations to other universities should be extended for their students and faculty to participate in the program. One response suggested working through organizations like AACC and other nationally recognized agencies to get correct information to potential students. Visiting language classes is a good marketing strategy, along with conducting information sessions and utilizing former study abroad students to staff information tables. Academic advisers can also include study abroad information in their mandatory advising sessions with students. Maintaining an international office website is also an effective marketing tool. Public announcements about the partnership should be released, and announcements should be forwarded to the campus. Working with high schools that teach the languages of the partnership countries is a good strategy to recruit future students.

The last category of suggested strategies is networking strategies. These include building relations, networking with other institutions that have partnerships to begin the process, and attending partnership events. Building relations with embassies and joining organizations like AACC and Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) is also recommended. Contacts should be kept informed by a departmental newsletter, and colleges should routinely exchange information and advice with their contacts.

Results

This study on international partnerships has enabled the development of a best practices section on the AACC website. This section of the website covers types of partnerships,
challenges to forming partnerships, and strategies to overcome those challenges. There are links to useful resources, including grants, tips on writing grants, publications, and articles, as well as checklists and other practical documents that will enable the directors of international programs at community colleges to facilitate the development of their international partnerships as much as possible. This will be helpful to community colleges that are just beginning to form partnerships as well as those that have partnerships and wish to expand their programs. It will also help researchers and members at AACC and other international education organizations since research into community colleges’ international partnerships is rare, if not nonexistent. It is a good starting point for further research and has elicited a commitment by the international office to continue this research past the co-op time period.
Chapter 5 – Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations (3-5 pages)

Before conducting the research, I questioned what types of international partnerships community colleges have, what challenges they encounter when forming these partnerships, the strategies they utilize to overcome the challenges, and how the findings relate to current research.

Out of the 61% of Global Education Commission members that responded, study abroad partnerships were the most common type of partnership, followed by partnerships that fell into the “other” category, sister colleges/cities, faculty and student exchange, faculty exchange, dual degree, and student exchange, respectively. Most partnerships were in Europe, followed by Asia, North America/Central America/Caribbean, South America, and Africa, respectively. The most common partnership country in Europe is Italy, in Asia is China, in North America, Central America, and the Caribbean is Mexico, in South America is Peru, and in Africa is South Africa. More research needs to be conducted to find out why these areas and types of partnerships are more common than others, and if these results are able to be carried over to the larger higher education community.

The challenges to forming international partnerships mostly consisted of challenges related to establishing the partnership. Logistical and financial challenges followed closely. A smaller number of responses were devoted to preparing the campus and people involved with the partnership, promoting/marketing the partnership, and the ongoing challenges of maintaining the partnership. Our respondents mentioned all of the challenges reflected in the current literature, and introduced some new challenges that were not mentioned in the literature.

Most of the strategies to overcome the challenges focused on establishing the partnership. Strategies for planning the partnership, funding the partnership, and preparing the campus and people involved in the partnership followed closely. A smaller number of responses involved strategies for formatting the partnership, marketing the partnership, and networking. Again, our respondents mentioned all of the strategies reflected in the current literature, and added some new strategies that were not mentioned previously.

The current research into community colleges’ specific international partnerships, and the challenges and strategies to these partnerships is very thin. In fact, there has not been any
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previous research solely devoted to the international partnerships of community colleges. However, our findings did relate to the Institute of International Education’s (IIE) Open Doors report (2005/2006). In fact, our percentages of popular locations of partnerships closely corresponded to theirs. Also, our respondents mentioned all of the challenges and strategies proposed by researchers, and added new challenges and strategies. Overall, this research met the original objectives of the study/co-op, although I did not receive as many responses as originally planned.

Implications

Although this research is only representative of a small fraction of community colleges (around 5-6%), it has far-reaching implications for the field of international education at community colleges. It provides a starting point for research into what types of international partnerships community colleges have and how and where they are established. This research can also be used to justify programs or grants for community colleges or the involvement of the American Association of Community Colleges in various initiatives. Many people are unaware of the numerous international activities community colleges are involved in and opportunities for further action in the field of international education become lost to community college leaders. This research can be used as a teaching tool to spread awareness of the international partnerships community colleges are involved in, and will also assist community college leaders in forming more international partnerships. The AACC is a particularly valuable vehicle for spreading this information due to their wide membership of community colleges and connections to important government officials, non-governmental organizations, and others. Many people in various positions have already expressed their interest in this research and have confirmed its value to their particular professions and organizations.

Recommendations

Since this research comprises the initial research into the field of community colleges’ international partnerships, there is a lot of research that still needs to be conducted. Future research needs to be conducted to understand why certain types of partnerships, regions, and countries of the world are more popular than others. In order to generalize the results to the broader population, a bigger survey needs to be administered to all community colleges. It would
also be helpful to investigate why certain colleges did not respond, although this might be hard to determine. Webinars on forming partnerships would be a creative way of presenting this information, although the capacity does not currently exist at AACC to carry this out, but could be developed in the future.

The American Association of Community Colleges should encourage the community college leaders to submit newspaper articles about their innovative international partnerships. With the second largest category of partnerships being "other," at 25%, there are many interesting and educational stories that readers of major newspapers would be interested in. Given the current focus by the Obama administration on community colleges as the vehicle to pull the U.S. out of the economic recession, now is the time to advocate for and publicize the international efforts of community colleges. According to The Washington Post, The Chronicle of Higher Education, and Inside Higher Ed (Washington, D.C. based newspapers), community colleges are in the limelight and should take advantage of their key situation to highlight their activities (personal communication, 8/6/09).

However, AACC could also put together a publication showcasing the international partnerships of their members. This could include a profile of the colleges’ international partnerships, advice from the college on forming partnerships, and the possible future directions of the college. This could also be offered online, in the form of short informational videos. This could be helpful as a marketing tool and as a resource for community college leaders wishing to learn more about forming and maintaining international partnerships or who want to partner with other community colleges to implement international programs. It would be in-line with AACC’s strategic action area five: global and intercultural education.

I believe in the future it would be useful to community college leaders and AACC to develop a section on the website where community college leaders and international education directors could update their activities regularly. There should also be a discussion board where community college leaders and international education directors could ask questions, leave comments, and receive feedback on any number of international education related questions from AACC staff and each other. This would be a way of bringing AACC’s services into the current communications technology-driven world. Right now, the software does not exist to offer
this format on the AACC website, but a group could be set up through an external website, like Google.
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Appendix A

Survey

Special Request for Information- Name of College

Dear (name of President),

AACC is seeking your assistance to expand the Global Education Commission's project from 2007-2008 on community colleges' international activities. We are fortunate to have a graduate student intern from Drexel University to help us with this project as part of her research, so we would appreciate a response by July 8 or sooner, since she will only be here for the summer.

On our last survey, you listed your (list of partnerships).

We are seeking to identify the following information about the above partnerships and any other international partnerships:

- Barriers/challenges involved when forging international partnerships with other countries
- Strategies to overcome these barriers/challenges
- Final outcomes (was the partnership successful or not?)

To obtain this information, we would like to contact the appropriate person(s) at your college in the next few weeks. Please provide for each partnership:

  Country:
  Name of initiative:
  Contact name:
  Contact phone and email address:

If you have other partnerships with other countries, please list their contact information as well.

Thank you for responding with the requested information as soon as possible due to our time constraints. We appreciate your continued assistance with this project and we look forward to sharing the results with you soon. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,
Judy
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Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Education Commission Reported Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Pie chart] Reported Partnerships (39 Colleges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Pie chart] No Reported Partnerships (25 Colleges)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnerships Reported by Current Commission:
- St. Petersburg College (FL)
- Ridgewater College (MN)
- Mount Wachusett Community College (MA)
- Madison Area Technical College (WI)
- Everett Community College (WA)
- Dyersburg State Community College (TN)
- Cascadia Community College (WA)
- Illinois Central Community College (IL)
- Laramie County Community College (WY)
- Tompkins-Cortland Community College (NY)
- Wayne County Community College District (MI)
- Riverland Community College (MN)
- Pierpont Community & Technical College (WV)
- Riverside Community College District- Riverside City (CA)
- Mesa Community College (AZ)
- Parkland College (IL)
- Bergen Community College (NJ)
- Kern Community College District (CA)
- Darton College (GA)
- Bronx Community College (NY)

Partnerships Reported by Past Commission:
- Mount Hood Community College (OR)
- Salt Lake Community College (UT)
- Kentucky Community & Tech College System (KY)
- College of Lake County (IL)
- Whatcom Community College (WA)
- Muscatine Community College (IA)
- Davidson County Community College (NC)
- Butte College (CA)
- Highline Community College (WA)
- City College of San Francisco (CA)
- Georgia Perimeter College-Clarkston (GA)
- Gateway Community College (CT)
- Eastern Iowa Community College District (IA)
- St. Louis Community College-Meramec (MO)
- Portland Community College (OR)
- Bristol Community College (MA)
- Broome Community College (NY)
- Lone-Star Community Colleges- Cy-Fair (TX)
- Kankakee Community College (IL)
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Appendix C

Charts of Partnership Types by Individual Colleges

![Bar chart for Study Abroad Partnerships (44%)](chart1.png)

![Bar chart for Sister Colleges/Cities (11%)](chart2.png)
Community Colleges’ International Partnerships 44

Partnerships
- Faculty Exchange (7%)
- Student Exchange (1%)
- Faculty and Student Exchange (10%)

Dual Degree (6%)

Parkland College
City Colleges of San Francisco
Broome Community College
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Other Partnerships (25%)
Appendix D

Types of Partnerships Included in the “Other” Category

Developing community colleges

- Restructuring schools in the style of U.S. community colleges
- Building educational infrastructure
- Developing a community college educational system in Egypt
- Assisting technical colleges
- Design and open a new media center
- Establish the first community college in the Republic of Georgia
- Developing and promoting the community college system throughout Southern India

Training Partnerships

- Fire science technology training
- English language training
- Training for program development
- Workplace skills training
- Technical assistance and training to leaders of service agencies in the country
- Agricultural technician training
- Basic education instruction training
- Technology training for students and teachers
- Health occupations training
- Pharmacy technician training
- Trustee training
- Wastewater management and operation training
- Environmental technician training

Developing and Providing Classes/Curricula

- Nursing
- Manufacturing
- Continuing Education
- Importing and exporting
- Information Technology
- Spanish
- Biotechnology
- Electronics
- Welding
- Culture
- Robotics
- E-commerce and technology
- Education
- Business (including business development)
- Curriculum for sworn (certified) land surveyors
- Dispute and conflict resolution
- Culinary arts
- Psychology
- Global economics
- Comparative media culture
- Russian
- American studies
- Entrepreneurship
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- Trade
- General management
- Accounting
- Customer service
- Computer literacy
- Engineering
- Science
- Advanced communications and telecommunication
- Journalism curriculum development
- Construction
- Corporate readiness and life skills
- Mathematics
- Applied Technology

Capacity Building

- Small business resource development
- Distance education technology
- Computer systems technical support
- Workforce development
- Developing human resource capacity
- Equity legislation
- Faculty development
- Partnerships with Chambers of Commerce

Various Partnerships

- Unspecified
- Focus on rural at-risk children
- Suburban gangs study
- Tourism industry projects
- Videoconferencing classes/Virtual college
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CCID Checklists to Internationalize the Curriculum/College

Checklist 1: Campus Events Planned by the International Office:
- Conduct “internationalize the curriculum” workshops.
- Celebrate international holidays.
- Utilize speakers from local businesses/NGOs/organizations to speak on various international topics.
- Have an international speakers bureau of college employees to speak to community groups on varied international topics.
- Develop ties with your Sister City organizations and participate in their programs.
- Host international visitors on campus.
- Visit the National Council for International Visitors in Washington, D.C., to arrange for international visitor groups to visit your campus.
- Celebrate International Education week.
- Sponsor faculty forums on global issues.
- Involve international students/clubs in your campus programming.
- Develop international partnerships for faculty with local international firms.
- Develop collaborative programs with your sister colleges abroad to include students and faculty.
- Write a grant application for a Title VI A or B grant.
- Become active members of international organizations for the community college like CCID, the Midwest Institute, NAFSA, etc.
- Participate/sponsor/host programs in collaboration with your local Council on World Affairs.
- Invite sister college faculty to teach at your college.
- Work with your regional Department of Education sponsored CIBER or research center to participate in their programs.
- Encourage/reward faculty for developing and including international modules in the courses they teach.
- http://campusinternationalization.wordpress.com

Checklist 2: Offering Study Abroad Programs
- May be long or short term in an international setting beyond U.S. borders.
- May be offered for credit or noncredit.
- The overseas experience may be discipline specific, field experience, research oriented or cultural immersion.
- You may partner with other community colleges, local four-year institutions, one of your sister colleges, or utilize a company specializing in developing study abroad programs.
- These programs will be organized and led by your faculty.
- You may utilize the Congress-Bundestag program.
- Your college may participate in consortia sponsored study abroad programs, such as CCID’s Troika.

Checklist 3: Faculty Development Opportunities
- Train faculty to lead study abroad programs.
- Develop faculty internship opportunities abroad.
- Set aside a portion of your Staff Development funds to sponsor professional development opportunities abroad for faculty.
- Have your faculty teach at your sister colleges.
- Participate in consortial faculty international development programs.
- Participate in Fulbright Group Study Abroad programs.
- Participate in other Fulbright programs such as the Guest Lecturer Abroad or Teacher Exchange Programs.
- Encourage your faculty to develop and lead study abroad programs.
Have faculty travel abroad on grant funded programs to develop curriculum, engage in economic development abroad, or other grant activities.

Enable faculty to attend regional or national conferences where international faculty development is discussed or they present on their experiences.

**Checklist 4: Internationalizing the College:**

- The college mission statement should include commitment to internationalization.
- The President is committed to and on the record supports international education.
- The college budget supports international education initiatives and programming.
- The college has memberships and actively participates with local, regional, national, and international organizations.
- The college is ideally a member of several international community college organizations.
- The college provides international professional development opportunities for its faculty and staff.
- The college values international students and provides appropriate international student services for them.
- The college provides an "International Center" where all things international are coordinated.
- An International Committee or similar group exists to provide campus and community programming.
- The campus culture encourages faculty to internationalize their courses.
- The campus culture values and nurtures diversity, ethnicity, and multi-culturalism.