

DISSERTATION

EXAMINING COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION AT
TWO STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs):
A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION PROCESS

Submitted by

Jermain Griffin

School of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 2017

Doctoral Committee:

Advisor: Louise Jennings

Linda Kuk

Jennifer Wolgemuth

Stephen Mumme

Copyright by Jermain Griffin 2017

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

EXAMINING COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION AT TWO STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs): A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION PROCESS

This study examines how state comprehensive universities (SCUs) made internationalization an institutional priority amidst competing interests. This study integrated the American Council on Education's Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012), organizational change theories including evolutionary and revolutionary change (Burke, 2014), and literature on SCUs (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2005, 2007) in a qualitative comparative case study design to understand how comprehensive internationalization can be achieved at an SCU.

The research is presented in three manuscript chapters. The first manuscript chapter focuses on how campus advocates for internationalization understood the concept of comprehensive internationalization. Internationalization at both institutions was centered on the curriculum and co-curricular experiences, with less attention to other features of a comprehensive international model. This key finding corroborates past iterations of how internationalization is described in US higher education, raising questions about the ground support for broader efforts of internationalization at SCUs that encompasses other key features of comprehensive internationalization as outlined by leaders in the field, including the American Council on Education (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) (2016).

The second manuscript chapter explores how internationalization advocates characterized how internationalization occurred at their institutions and how it was working. Participants from both institutions attributed increased communication between colleagues, primarily among the faculty, but also with some staff divisions, as key to building momentum for internationalization at their institutions. Finally, the third chapter examines how SCUs managed comprehensive internationalization against other competing interests. Participants from both institutions shared different degrees of struggle with finances and public support for publicly-funded higher education among other competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this project would not have been possible without the support of numerous advisors, mentors, colleagues, friends, and family. First, I would like to thank my excellent committee: Drs. Louise Jennings, Linda Kuk, Jennifer Wolgemuth, and Steven Mumme. Louise, thanks so much for sticking with me through this long, meandering process as I muddled through my research. I am forever grateful for the countless revisions and for your encouragement! Linda, thank you for giving me an opportunity to be in the CSU higher education leadership program and for seeing me through to the end! Jenni, thank you for taking me on as an advisee with Linda and for continuing after the move to USF! Steve, thank you for agreeing to serve on the committee! Your advice during the proposal meeting was invaluable.

I would also like to thank so many wonderful colleagues from Fairfield University who encouraged me to pursue the Ph.D. There are so many great people who gave me advice, support, and perspective on just how great life can be. I would like to send a special thanks to Drs. Janie Leatherman and Mary France Malone for all the support and encouragement over the years. Thank you both for your mentorship. I would also like to thank my colleagues at the American Council on Education (Wei, Sue-Yeon, Vincent, CPRS, CIGE) for their collegial support over the last year or so. Thank you, Dr. Robin Matross Helms for reminding me that the dissertation is top priority!

I would also like to give a special thanks to my CSU cohort mates: Of course, the East Coast Cruisers – Gina Hurny, Stephanie Krebs, and John Lehman, and the rest of the group: Julie Draper, Lori Lander, Tamara Stevens, Mike Gawronski, Tricia Fechter Gates, Ben Newhouse, Liz Bahe, John Carmichael, Kevin Abel, Angela Marquez, Angela Andrade, Cynthia Núñez

Armendariz, Derek Morgan, Judy Ortiz, and Kate McCaffrey Kenny. I quietly admire you all and am so fortunate to be your fellow cohort member!

I would like to thank my family for their ongoing support. Mom and Dad, thank you for your strength and for your resilience. Tony, Mike, and Michelle – thanks for the support guys!

Finally, to Nadia and Sophia, without you this is not possible. The journey, the accomplishment is special only because I get to share it with you. Thank you for being in my life.

Thank you God for carrying me such a long way. Wow!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of the Study.....	4
Organizational change.....	5
Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs).....	6
Problem Statement.....	8
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Case Study Research	11
Comparative Case Study Method.....	12
Research Questions.....	13
Central Research Question.....	14
Related Research Questions.....	14
Chapter 2 – Manuscript 1.....	14
Chapter 3 – Manuscript 2.....	14
Chapter 4 – Manuscript 3.....	15
Chapter 5 – Discussion and Implications.....	15
Significance of the Study.....	16
Delimitations.....	16
Limitations.....	17

Researcher’s Perspective.....	18
CHAPTER 2: COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION: ANALYZING THE PERESPECTIVE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION ADVOCATES AT STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs).....	
Literature Review.....	21
Comprehensive Internationalization.....	22
Methods.....	28
Participants.....	29
Data collection.....	29
Data analysis.....	31
Findings.....	33
SCU-North.....	33
Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences.....	35
Faculty development.....	37
Institutional support.....	38
SCU-South.....	40
Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences.....	41
Global Learning.....	43
Campus-wide Impact.....	44
Cross-Case Analysis.....	46
Discussion.....	50
CHAPTER 3: INTERNATIONALIZING THE SCU: HOW COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION WORKS AT TWO STATE	

COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs).....	55
Literature Review.....	56
State Comprehensive Universities.....	56
Internationalizing U.S. campuses.....	59
Comprehensive internationalization.....	60
Organizational change in higher education.....	63
Evolutionary change.....	64
Revolutionary change.....	64
Transformational change.....	65
Methods.....	67
Participants and settings.....	67
Data collection.....	68
Data analysis.....	69
Findings.....	69
SCU-North.....	70
SCU-South.....	70
How internationalization happened at the SCU.....	71
Campus climate and communication.....	71
Administrative structure	75
External pressure.....	76
How internationalization works at the SCU.....	78
Collaboration and partnerships.....	78

Administrative structure and staffing.....	81
Administrative plan (Reaccreditation strategy)	83
Curricular and co-curricular initiatives.....	85
Discussion.....	86
How internationalization happened.....	86
Is internationalization working?.....	90
Discrepant data.....	91
 CHAPTER 4: AN EXAMINATION OF COMPETING INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES TO INTERNATIONALIZATION AT STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs).....	
	95
Literature Review.....	95
SCUs: Ideal environment for comprehensive internationalization?.....	99
Challenges.....	102
Methods.....	106
Data collection.....	106
Data analysis.....	107
Findings.....	108
SCU-North.....	108
SCU-South.....	109
Competing interests: Finance.....	110
Competing interests: State support.....	113
Competing interests: Faculty morale.....	116
Other competing interests.....	119

Balancing the competing interests.....	120
Discussion.....	122
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	126
Summary of the Study.....	126
Overview of the Research Study.....	127
Purpose of the Study.....	127
Research Questions.....	128
Central research question.....	128
Related research questions.....	128
Research question: Chapter 2.....	128
Research question: Chapter 3.....	128
Research question: Chapter 4.....	128
Significance of the Study.....	129
Summary of Findings.....	129
How do SCUs manage comprehensive internationalization?.....	134
Implications of the Study.....	136
Limitations of the Study.....	137
Recommendations for future research.....	138
Summary.....	139
REFERENCES.....	140
APPENDICES.....	148
Appendix A: Consent to Participate in a Research Study.....	149

Appendix B: Consent Script to Participants in a Research Study on Comprehensive Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs).....	152
Appendix C: Interview Protocol.....	154
Appendix D: Notice of Approval for Human Research.....	156

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement Model for Comprehensive Internationalization.....	23
Table 2: Collected Data Used for Chapter 2.....	30
Table 3: Defining comprehensive internationalization: codes and categories.....	32
Table 4: Defining comprehensive internationalization themes.....	47
Table 5: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement Model for Comprehensive Internationalization.....	61
Table 6: How internationalization happened: Themes.....	87
Table 7: How internationalization works: Themes.....	90
Table 8: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement Model for Comprehensive Internationalization.....	9

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Everyone agrees that America’s students must be prepared for the global environment of the 21st century. Today, no campus planning report fails to stress the importance of ‘internationalizing the university’...But look behind the rhetoric: “internationalize” maybe closer to a buzz word than a deep-seated reality for most colleges and universities. In fact, there are significant constraints on the internationalization of American higher education. In an era of tight budgets, most institutions lack the financial resources for major international initiatives. And institutions with a lot of international activities often lack the coherent strategic direction that provides connective tissue across them,” (Altbach & Peterson, 1998, p.36).

As we advance through the second decade of the 21st century, we find United States (U.S.) higher education faced with a myriad of challenges. An issue of great significance is the rapidity of globalization (Friedman, 1999; Giddens, 1999), which has prompted new opportunities for technological innovations, movements of people, and rapid access to information, among other fascinations (Altbach, 2006). The effects of globalization have challenged U.S. higher education institutions to develop new strategies that not only lead to the proliferation of aptly prepared students, but also institutions that can respond swiftly and nimbly to the fluidity of societal disruption via technology, global economics, or geopolitics (Hovland, 2006). The need to adapt is reverberating at the institutional level for many U.S. colleges and universities, thus compelling institutions to strongly consider internationalization as a key priority for the future (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Despite recent political events in the U.S. that appear to reflect a sense of anti-globalism, the U.S. higher education community remains largely committed to embracing a more interconnected world (Fain, 2017). Nevertheless, the external pressures of globalization do not necessarily usurp other pertinent issues facing US higher education, including affordability, institutional diversity, student retention, and other institution-specific issues (Altbach, Berdahl,

& Gumpert, 2011; Kezar, 2001). The task of developing an effective institutional strategy that addresses globalization is an added pressure to the already full plates of many college and universities as Altbach and Peterson (1998) indicated in the quote above. This is true especially for state comprehensive universities (SCUs) (Henderson, 2009, 2011), which represent local or regional institutions that serve a wide constituency, sometimes providing vital services to the public as part of historic missions that may or may not be reflective of the times (Henderson, 2011). The question of where and how internationalization fits as a priority for such institutions is the focus of my research.

The aim of this study was to examine and understand how two SCUs, located in two different regions of the US, were able to implement and manage comprehensive internationalization at their respective institutions amid competing institutional priorities, as well as the challenges they have faced. The two institutions in this comparative case study have both previously participated in the American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Laboratory (2017), a program designed to support participating higher education institutions develop institution-wide internationalization strategies. The two SCUs in my study participated in the ACE Internationalization around a similar time frame, thus the study offers detail of their implementation progress in parallel.

My study explored comprehensive internationalization as an organizational change process in higher education. I employ a comprehensive internationalization framework developed by the ACE Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) grounded in several large-scale studies of internationalization activity at different types of higher education institutions in the US (American Council on Education, 2012; Green, 2005). The CIGE manages the ACE Internationalization Laboratory through the support of ACE's 1,800-plus member

institutions from the higher education sector (American Councils on Education, 2017). The ACE Internationalization Laboratory is aimed at providing selected institutions with customized support for the development and implementation of internationalization processes at their respective institutions. The ACE-supported project began in 2002 and provided support for over 100 higher education institutions that sought guidance on developing an internationalization plan. The Internationalization Laboratory is a two-year process that typically includes about 8-10 institutions at a time (American Council on Education, 2017). The ACE Internationalization Laboratory is a fitting sampling mechanism to use for my study because it serves as a base for participating institutions to take major steps towards comprehensive internationalization, which means a form of internationalization that connects the entire institution (American Council on Education, 2012). My study focuses on two SCUs that completed the two-year internationalization project within the last 10 years.

The remaining sections of this chapter provide an overview of the background for the study, including its purpose, the methodology, and significance for the field. Additionally, this chapter highlights the format used to answer its research questions: Three manuscript chapters with comparative case studies exploring key aspects of comprehensive internationalization at two SCUs.

The first manuscript chapter explored how two SCUs conceptualized and prioritized comprehensive internationalization using recent theories on the concept as a frame of reference. The second manuscript, framed through internationalization and organizational change theories, delved into how the two SCUs generated interest for and implemented some iteration of comprehensive internationalization at their institutions. The third manuscript chapter also relies on internationalization and organizational change theory to understand how the two SCUs in this

study navigated comprehensive internationalization against other competing initiatives. The conclusion highlights how the three manuscript chapter address the overarching question of how these SCUs manage support for comprehensive internationalization in a challenging environment of competing interests and scant resources. Finally, the chapter addresses the study's limitations and my perspective as the researcher.

Background of the Study

The study of internationalization in higher education has proliferated over the last two decades, with critical dialogue about its definition (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2003; NAFSA, 2011), its potential for implementation (Green, 2005; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006), and the need for greater investment in the development of campus-wide internationalization processes for higher education institutions (Hudzik, 2011). Research on the internationalizing of US institutions is emergent. Porforio (2012) studied the perspectives of higher education executives on the internationalization process and found study abroad programming to be viewed as the most commonly implemented and accepted type of internationalization among participating institutions, with finance-related issues representing the most significant obstacle to internationalization efforts.

Hurd's (2007) multi-site case study on internationalization as an organizational change process at three regional public universities is an important contribution to the field, as it is one of the few examples of how smaller public institutions have approached internationalization organizationally. Drawing on organizational change models from Kotter (1996), and Eckel and Kezar (2003), Hurd proposed what he described as a transformational change model in higher education for the internationalization process. Hurd's (2007) findings suggested that internationalization, as an organizational change process, required institutional leaders with a

vision for such change, advocates that supported leadership in its vision for internationalization, and the communication of that vision to a wider constituency through varied mediums.

At the national level, policy makers have begun sounding the alarm for a broader focus on internationalization as part of a national strategy for higher education. Helms (2015) highlighted the existing structures of support for internationalizing higher education at federal level including international education programs supported by the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Education. However, the diversity of higher education institutions and their autonomy from federal oversight make a national strategy for internationalization less tenable (Helms, 2015).

So that places onus on these autonomous institutions to determine if internationalization is an adequate approach for their respective schools. For some institutions, this process is already part of the organizational culture while for others, it would require a mandate for change. The next section overviews organizational change literature, which is a central component of this study.

Organizational Change

Two common ideas of organizational change are *revolutionary change*, which Burke (2014) described as a “jolt to the system” (p. 77), where the change is rapid, and *evolutionary change*, a form of organizational change that is incremental and more of a building-block process that can lead to large-scale organizational change over time (Burke 2014; Kezar, 2001).

According to Burke (2014), evolutionary change is the more representative form of organizational change compared with revolutionary change, which is considered a more dramatic form of organizational change that rarely occurs. The description of gradual organizational change stems from Porras and Robertson’s (1992) work on the degree of organizational change,

which included first order change or change that continuously improves over time.

Revolutionary change reflects what Gersick (1991) defined as the deep structural change within an organization, transforming the organizational direction, power distribution and accountability.

This type of large-scale, revolutionary organizational change is not without criticism. Burke

(2014) identified a number of ways that revolutionary change can be thwarted. For instance,

ideas of sweeping, transformational change are likely to confront an engrained organizational

culture that is too difficult to penetrate. This is likely to result in more gradual or what Quinn

(1996) referred to as continuous change or in other words, evolutionary change. Kezar (2009)

argued that, among the many challenges institutions face in driving organizational change, one of

the major obstacles is organizational dysfunction. She pointed out the difficulty in higher

education institutions of synergizing efforts on singular institutional priorities (Kezar, 2009).

This study of comprehensive internationalization at two SCUs explores several outcomes of

internationalization activity at these institutions through organizational change literature.

Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs)

My study examined research on organizational change efforts that involved aspects of

internationalization, including Hurd's (2007) study, which raised questions about the type of

organizational change approaches that best supports internationalization processes at regional

public institutions. More in-depth research is needed to further examine how SCUs fit

internationalization into institutional plans while managing a myriad of priorities; such priorities

include addressing the rising cost of higher education, a sluggish economic recovery from a

recession, and the historic commitments from local/regional partners to serve local needs

(Henderson, 2007, 2009, 2011) that might contrast with an internationalization strategy.

The Carnegie Foundation (2017) described SCUs or public comprehensive universities as master's colleges and universities that offer a minimum 50 master's degree and up to 20 doctoral degrees. The institutions are further categorized in three classes: Master's/L (larger programs), Master's/M (mid-size programs), and Master's/S (smaller programs) (Carnegie Foundation, 2017). The ACE Internationalization Laboratory (2017) cohorts have included 10 SCUs classified as Master's/L programs. This study relies on Fryar's (2015) characterization of SCUs, which built on descriptions from The Carnegie Foundation (2017) and Henderson (2007, 2009, 2011) by describe attributes common with comprehensive universities including diversity of student population, graduation rates, and finances.

It is important to underscore that SCUs are typically regional universities that have served a significant role in building up and supporting many of the small, regional hubs across the U.S., but they have often been overlooked in higher education research. Some researchers posit that this neglect coupled with being outpaced by larger public and private, more prestigious institutions, has at times led such institutions to grasp at prestige-seeking opportunities when it might not be in the institution's best interest or within its capacity to achieve such prestige (Henderson, 2007, 2009; Wright et al., 2004). Internationalization is complicated in this way because there is a growing chorus of voices that suggest that this phenomenon is becoming more of a necessity than a privilege for institutions. Recent studies of comprehensive internationalization at community colleges and technical colleges would support this view (Butler, 2016; Piazza, 2015).

This study adds to the literature of exploring the realities of implementing comprehensive internationalization – in some form – at US higher education institutions through an in-depth examination of two SCUs. These institutions have a history of supporting underserved regional

and local communities, but some argue that their contributions to US higher education and society are often times underappreciated (Geiger, 2005; Henderson, 2007, 2009, 2011; Thelin, 2004). Moreover, these institutions continue to serve a significant portion of the US postsecondary education population and are confronted with the challenge of adapting their institutions to reflect a globalized world while preserving an institutional identity often tied to historic mission (Altbach, 2006; Henderson, 2007, 2009). This study illustrates how these SCUs (Henderson, 2007, 2009) are able to facilitate a comprehensive internationalization process while managing other priorities on limited resources. SCUs are expected to face challenging times in the 21st century including societal pressures of sustaining missions to support public goods such as local or regional development, public education and other forms of service delivery beneficial to the community (Henderson, 2007, 2009; Lyall and Sell, 2006).

Problem Statement

The impact of globalization on world markets has increased the demand for providing an education for college graduates to be able to compete globally (Giddens, 1999). Over the last 20 years, higher education scholars and practitioners have begun examining the varied efforts of the higher education sector to adjust its offerings to better meet the changing demands in global markets (Altbach & Knight, 2007). According to the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) (2017) task force for internationalization:

“Internationalization is the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. To be fully successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the academic community in global networks and partnerships” (NAFSA, 2017).

Internationalization efforts are prominent at institutions classified as Research Universities or institutions with very high research activity by the Carnegie Foundation (2017). The majority of these institutions focus upon “student exchanges” via efforts to both bring international students to campus and to send domestic students abroad. For example, New York University has committed vast resources to creating the NYU Global division, which manages its branch campuses in partner countries, international student recruitment to the main campus in New York City, and traditional study abroad opportunities for traditional students (New York University, 2017). Several institutions add additional dimensions of internationalizations. For example, the University of Virginia, University of Connecticut, University of Maryland and The Ohio State University are among the institutions that participate in a global consortium of research-intensive institutions, *Universitas 21*, to promote global citizenship and institutional innovation through collaborative research, student mobility, and scholar-practitioner exchange (Universitas 21, 2017).

For several comprehensive institutions (Carnegie Foundation, 2017), the move to internationalize has been less pronounced. The American Council on Education (ACE) measured internationalization levels at 188 comprehensive institutions in the U.S. and discovered that almost half of those institutions had low levels of internationalization activity at their institutions (Green, 2005). The empirical study, which did not identify institutions by name, also found only one percent of comprehensive institutions to have high-level internationalization activity (Green, 2005). More than half of the institutions in that study were public comprehensive institutions (Green, 2005) or state comprehensive universities (SCUs) (Henderson, 2007).

This study examined how two such SCUs implemented and managed internationalization through a framework described as *comprehensive internationalization*. John Hudzik (2011), a

past President of NASFA, contributed an important definition of comprehensive internationalization, describing it as “a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise,” (p. 10). According to Hudzik (2011), a key point of comprehensive internationalization was that successful implementation should be predicated on an institution-wide commitment to internationalization, which extended internationalization as only a series of activities aimed at one outcome such education abroad or the transition of international students to a campus.

Comprehensive internationalization is aimed at viewing internationalization as a substantial, institution-wide process. This study primarily draws from the ACE Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization, which emphasizes six key areas: articulated institutional commitment, administrative structure and staffing, curriculum and learning outcomes, faculty policies and practices, student mobility, and collaboration and partnerships (American Council on Education, 2012).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how state comprehensive universities (SCU) made internationalization an institutional priority amidst competing interests. This study built on research measuring levels of internationalization at nearly 200 comprehensive universities (Green, 2005), research on internationalization as organizational change (Hurd, 2007), an internationalization survey mapping progress and challenges at different types of US higher education institutions (American Council on Education, 2012) and the research of institutions

that participated in a multi-year internationalization project supported by ACE. A case study design (Yin, 2009) was used to examine the successes and challenges of internationalizing at two SCUs that successfully completed the ACE internationalization project, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

Case Study Research

Qualitative research is about the richness that emanates from the data shared by participants. “We conduct qualitative research when we want to empower *individuals* to share their stories, hear their voices, and minimize the power relationships that often exist between a researcher and the participants in a study,” wrote Creswell (2013, p. 48). Creswell (2013) described qualitative research as an integrative experience that encompass the researcher, participants, an authentic setting pursuant to its participants, and the process of deep analysis of gathered data through coding and the development of themes. This perspective built on Merriam’s (1998) description of a qualitative study as “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of single instance, phenomenon, or social unit” (p. 27). Denzin and Lincoln (2011) described qualitative research as a process of deep understanding of phenomena through sense making or interpretation.

This study benefited from the qualitative approach as it built my understanding of how comprehensive internationalization were engaged at SCUs through in-depth interviews with participants at both institutions with first-hand knowledge of institutional efforts to implement this process. This approach allowed for a deeper examination of the context in which the phenomena in this study – comprehensive internationalization at SCUs – was able to be examined in great detail for patterns that would lend itself to a critical analysis. In this study, the qualitative research approach enabled the researcher to see – both the problem and potential solutions –

through the lenses of my participants who were actively engaged in the process at their respective institutions. The next section overviews the qualitative case study approach, which was used to analyze and interpret findings for this study.

Comparative Case Study Method

Yin (2009) advised use of the case study approach to answer “how” and “why” questions. Yin (2009) also stressed the importance of context when trying to understand a specific phenomenon. A case study approach allows for an in-depth exploration of a specific context within a conceptual or practical problem that adds richness to a study. For instance, to understand how internationalization became an institutional priority at regional public universities already dealing with a myriad of issues, it was important to have a deep understanding of the institutional environment prior to their decision to become more internationalized. This knowledge would inform my research of how key institutional leaders agreed to mobilized resources to make internationalization a priority (Yin, 2009).

Baxter and Jack (2008) highlighted context as a key differentiation between a holistic (single) case study with embedded units and multiple or collective case study. The holistic case study design with embedded units is focused on one particular case. Though considered more robust than a single case study because of the data provided from additional cases, the multiple case study design can require additional resources and time to execute effectively (Yin, 2009). The choice to do a comparative case study is also aided by Yin’s (2009) guidance for offering case study research that is generalizable, which can be a challenge with single case studies. A study with multiple cases offers a way to see if the results are in any way replicable (Yin, 2009). This study uses comprehensive internationalization theory and organizational change theory (in two chapters) to examine patterns of internationalization activity at SCUs.

This comparative case study centered on two SCUs with similar but contrasting institutional contexts to better understand how each institution implemented a comprehensive internationalization process. The comparative case study approach helped develop a cross-case conclusion about the comprehensive internationalization process at the two SCUs in my study (Yin, 2009).

The comparative case study approach built my understanding of how comprehensive internationalization worked at the two SCUs through in-depth interviews with participants at both institutions with first-hand knowledge of institutional efforts to implement this process. This approach allowed for a deeper examination of the context in which the phenomena in this study – comprehensive internationalization at SCUs – was able to be examined in great detail for patterns that would lend itself to a critical analysis.

The study was bound by institution type and the fact that both institutions participated in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, which meant that both institutions developed internationalization teams that were tasked with assessing and reconfiguring internationalization at their respective institutions. The study incorporated an inductive research strategy that included an examination of institutional documents along with open-ended, semi-structured interviews with key participants that served on internationalization laboratory teams from both institutions (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clark, 2006; Thomas, 2003).

Research Questions

This comparative case study was guided by one central research question and two related research questions. To fully explore these questions, the study was broken into three publishable manuscript chapters. The three manuscript chapters resulted in additional research questions.

Below is a description of the overall research questions for the study and research questions for each manuscript chapter, which were designed to help answer the larger research questions.

The following are the central research question and related research questions that drive this study:

Central Research Question

1. How do two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) gather support for an institution-wide internationalization strategy amidst competing institutional priorities?

Related Research Questions

1. How does each campus prioritize internationalization and why?
2. How was campus internationalization implemented at these two SCUs?

The abovementioned research questions were used to develop the following key questions for each of three manuscript chapters.

Chapter 2 – Manuscript chapter 1

1. How is comprehensive internationalization conceptualized and prioritized at each campus? This question was addressed through interviews with key participants from the internationalization process at the two SCUs in this study. The findings were derived primarily from participant's descriptions of comprehensive internationalization and additional comments from participations related to different aspects of the internationalization experience at the two SCUs.

Chapter 3 – Manuscript chapter 2

2. What elements created an environment that both supported and constrained comprehensive internationalization at state comprehensive universities?

3. How does a comprehensive internationalization process work at state comprehensive universities (SCU)? This chapter explored these questions through an analysis of participant's reflections on the elements they believe resulted in broad support for internationalization on their campuses leading up to their institution's participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory. Additionally, the chapter examines the current state of internationalization at the two SCUs through the lens of participants and an analysis of supporting documents and Websites to understand the reality of internationalization at these two SCUs.

Chapter 4 – Manuscript 3

4. How do state comprehensive universities (SCUs) manage internationalization against its competing priorities?

This chapter analyzed participants' reflections on the challenges of internationalization at their institutions. Their respective institution's competing interests were examined to understand in-depth the difficult choices administrators, faculty, and staff at SCUs are confronted with while attempting to internationalize their institutions.

Chapter 5 – Discussion and Implications

5. The fifth and final chapter of the study summarized the findings from the three manuscript chapters. The study concluded the SCUs experienced iterations of comprehensive internationalization driven by both campus advocates (mainly faculty) and administrative leadership. The study also reiterated the notion that comprehensive internationalization was not a monolithic process nor was easily associated with a singular organizational change approach for higher education.

Significance of the Study

This study examines a key issue that is affecting all types of higher education institutions in the U.S. – the need to develop students with an increased global awareness, preparing them for a world that has becoming increasingly connected through technology, commerce, and in some cases, ideology. How state comprehensive universities (SCUs) fit in the world of internationalized higher education is critical to scholar practitioners engaged in the study and implementation of internationalization in higher education. The issue of internationalizing higher education is not going away nor is it privy to just the elite private institutions or prestigious public flagship institutions. Recent dissertations on comprehensive internationalization processes are technical colleges and community colleges are evidence that the higher education sector is in search of more studies that explore reach of internationalization throughout U.S. higher education (Butler, 2016; Piazza, 2015).

This study contributes needed research through a case study approach that offers an in-depth inquiry at dynamics at SCUs including the organizational tradition and history common with such institutions. These are regional public universities that were established to be a fixture in the local and regional communities by producing its teachers, care workers, industry workers, and community advocates among other professions (Henderson, 2009, 2011). This study raises the important question of how comprehensive internationalization would fit in such an environment.

Delimitations

The study was conducted at two state comprehensive universities (SCUs), with one located in the northeast region of U.S. and the other in the U.S. southeast region. Both institutions participated in the American Councils on Education (ACE) project known as the

Internationalization Laboratory (American Council on Education, 2017) within the last 10 years. Interview participants from both institutions that were part of the respective internationalization teams during and after their respective schools' participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory.

Limitations

One limitation of the study is that it is bound by the two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) identified for this study. There were other institutions considered for the study, but the analysis was limited to two SCUs. Another limitation is the participation selection for the study. Interview participants both institutions were selected by a point-of-contact significantly involved with the internationalization process at the two SCUs of focus in this study. The results of the study are limited to an analysis of participant comments about the internationalization process at their institutions, however the study does provide scholar practitioners with a unique institutional perspective of the comprehensive internationalization process that might be applicable or useful to similar institutions.

Also, this study is limited in that it focuses on aspects of comprehensive internationalization that reflect an iteration of revolutionary or evolutionary change. The concept of widespread change in an institution could also include a focus on the leadership dynamics behind the process as it is presumed that such an institution-wide change process would leadership equipped to manage complex organizational issues, but the primary focus of this is not on the role of leadership in comprehensive internationalization, but on the outcomes and how they reflect the nature of organizational change as either revolutionary or evolutionary.

Researcher's Perspective

My study captures several of my research interests in the field of higher education, including international education, public higher education, and organizational change. The focus for this study is derived from a collection of experiences that I have had as a student in regional public university, as a guest living and working in new communities in the U.S. and abroad, and as a practitioner that has advised undergraduate students with a passion to study International and Area Studies. I believe this study offers another example of how publicly funded U.S. higher education institutions can impact the world with limited resources.

At my undergraduate institution, I recall a faculty member who was assigned to all international-related activities, e.g., study abroad opportunities, Fulbright programs, etc. This person was a tenured faculty member in Political Science, but somehow managed to juggle these other responsibilities. I wondered then as I do today how this person was able to fulfill these roles without experiencing burn out. I also wondered about the number of students that might have missed out on opportunities to experience another part of the world or meet someone who might have inspired them to learn a new language or sit in on a talk that discussed a part of the world unlikely to be explored in the local or national news. That person remains at the institution to this day and some students have benefited, but there is a lingering question of what might be if the institution had more resources. I also understand that the institution had a number of other priorities to deal with, including student retention.

I have reflected on my undergraduate experience throughout my travels in our country and in several other countries including a two-year stay in El Salvador as a Peace Corps volunteer and later as a program manager in – what was at the time in 2007 – a post-conflict Sudan. I began pursuing this Ph.D. while working in an undergraduate program focused on

International and Area Studies, where the vast majority of our students chose to study abroad. These experiences were excellent opportunities to observe how the internationalization of curriculum could impact student perspectives of the world and their place in it.

My disposition as a researcher is that my work on internationalization contributes to the public good through research that illustrates how our institutions of human capital development can contribute to raising our awareness of the world's diversity and the myriad of ways in which we are all connected. Internationalization is not merely about preparing for an interconnected marketplace, but it is also about embracing a deeper inclusion of perspectives, philosophies, and cultures through education. I believe the SCUs represent a conduit to the many rural and small towns in the U.S. The potential impact of research and practice that leads to greater internationalization in such areas is endless.

CHAPTER TWO: COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION: ANALYZING THE
PERSPECTIVE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION ADVOCATES AT
STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs)

This article chapter explores how key participants in the comprehensive internationalization process at two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) conceptualize comprehensive internationalization. The in-depth examination of the perspectives of these advocates for internationalization informs theory-practice linkages with respect to internationalization and organizational change within higher education institutions. Drawing from the expanding literature on internationalization in higher education, I analyze the perspectives of key participants significantly involved in what is believed to be the early stages of a comprehensive internationalization process at their institution.

One missed opportunity of recent studies is the exploration of how implementers of this intended organizational change perceive comprehensive internationalization. It should not be presumed that there is a common understanding of comprehensive internationalization in US higher education as there is a plurality of institutions serving an increasing diverse student population.

The limited, but detailed history of SCUs suggest that large scale initiatives are not likely to gain much traction without broad support from personnel outside of the administrative leadership. This manuscript chapter explored the perspectives of campus actors, who were predominantly outside of the administrative leadership at both SCUs, to better understand their perspective on the phenomenon of comprehensive internationalization, and to gauge where and

how momentum for such large scale initiatives is directed in the future. This manuscript chapters reviews the expanding literature on internationalization in higher education.

Literature Review

This chapter is framed around the evolving concept of comprehensive internationalization. Early conceptualizations of internationalization in higher education focused on transforming discrete elements of international education, e.g., study abroad, international student recruitment, or international higher education partnerships. Over the last past few decades, however, scholars have focused on comprehensive internationalization as an evolution of the internationalization process operationalized in the higher education setting. The early work of international education scholars such as Altbach and Peterson (1998), and Knight (2003, 2004) explored the meaning of internationalization as a comprehensive, campus-wide process.

Their perspectives on internationalization in the higher education space highlighted the need to explore the internationalization of higher education in broader terms beyond specific outcomes such as an increase of international students or an increase in the number of students that go abroad. (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2003, 2004). The definition of internationalization continues to evolve as higher education scholars work to make sense of how this phenomenon is appropriately fitted and assessed in higher education (Altbach & de Wit, 2015; de Wit, 2013).

In recent years, higher education groups such as the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) have invested resources in exploring the impact of internationalization activity at their institutions. The next section overviews contributions from both education associations to the research of internationalization in higher education including the concept comprehensive internationalization.

Comprehensive Internationalization

Researchers affiliated with the ACE conducted wide-scale studies on internationalization in U.S. higher education institutions over the past two decades and are credited with introducing the term *comprehensive internationalization* (American Council on Education, 2012; Olson, 2005). In the early 2000s, ACE, which holds a substantial membership of more than 1,800 public and private higher education institutions, created an “internationalization index” to gauge levels of internationalization at a wide variety of institutions (Green, 2005). Their work highlighted progress in some aspects of internationalization, including increased support for cross-border studies and institutional investment in faculty with international interests and/or expertise (Green, 2005; Olson et al., 2006). The ACE Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), a research unit that focuses primarily on internationalization efforts in higher education, described comprehensive internationalization as “a strategic, coordinated process,” (American Council on Education, 2012, p.3) aimed at bridging different units and agendas on the college campus for the sole purpose of advancing internationalization.

The ACE CIGE (2012) developed a comprehensive internationalization model to outline its vision for how to holistically embed internationalization in the institution. Table 1 illustrates the six strands of the ACE CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization. *Articulated institutional commitment* refers to key institution documents, such as a mission or strategic plan that symbolize the institution’s public support for internationalizing. *Administrative structure and staffing* could represent a physical presence of internationalization in the form of an international education center with staffing dedicated to advancing internationalization through program initiatives that could lead to *curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes* such as courses, academic majors, or out-of-the-classroom experiences that emphasize regional studies

and a deep commitment to building foreign language capacity (American Council on Education, 2012).

The model also includes *faculty policies and practices* as a key indicator of comprehensive internationalization, where faculty commitment to internationalization through teaching, research and service is supported. Perhaps the most common method for internationalizing U.S. campuses, *student mobility*, remains integral to most institutions, as study abroad or international student recruitment are popular practices for most higher education institutions. The effectiveness of *collaborations and partnerships* between institutions in different countries can have a significant impact on the level of mobility of students between campuses. (American Council on Education, 2012).

Table 1

Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement Model for Comprehensive Internationalization

Rubric	Description
Articulated institutional commitment	Internationalization is established as a priority, i.e. mission statement, a strategic plan, establishing a task force committed to campus internationalization.
Administrative structure and staffing	Resources dedicated to international programs office with professional staff and/or faculty members who manage several internationalization activities and programs.
Curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes	Academic offerings with a focus on global trends, Area Studies, and foreign language skill development. Co-curricular programming that reinforces internationalization of curriculum.
Faculty policies and practices	International work valued in faculty tenure process. Faculty with a background of international research or practice. Funding and institutional support for international research.
Student mobility	Resources to give more domestic students access to education abroad activities. Strategic plan to increase international student population on campus.
Collaboration and partnerships	International partnerships that impact the entire institution. The development of campus-wide

Note. Adapted from “The Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement” by the American Council on Education (2012), *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses, 2012 edition*.

The Association of International Educators (NAFSA, 2017) has worked in parallel with ACE to clarify the concept of comprehensive internationalization and how it might be realized on college campuses in the U.S. and abroad. In a NAFSA report on comprehensive internationalization, Hudzik (2011) described it as an institutional commitment that impacted both the entire campus environment as well as external linkages to the institution. Hudzik (2015) reviewed comprehensive internationalization as a framework where it might be operational in higher education institutions: “It is not internationalization *or* globalization, and it is not local *versus* global in how higher education responds; rather a blending of all these concepts now drives not a piecemeal approach to higher education international engagement but a more comprehensive one,” (p. 20). In other words, Hudzik (2015) described comprehensive internationalization as a form of organizational change in higher education that reflects both local and global perspectives in its organizational structure.

Hudzik’s (2015) recent notions on internationalization as an organizational change process stem from early work that attempted to make sense of internationalization in the context of organizational change. Olson (2005), a key contributor to the ACE research on internationalization during the early 2000s, described comprehensive internationalization as a form of transformational change that required time to evolve and ferment in higher education institutions. Recent dissertation studies have explored comprehensive internationalization at different types of institutions including at community colleges through the lens of an increased presence of international students (Brennan & Dellow, 2013) or through the perspective of

technical college leaders trying to implement a comprehensive internationalization process (Piazza, 2015).

In his dissertation, Piazza (2015) asked interview participants at two technical colleges why it was important for their schools to participate in a comprehensive internationalization process, but it was not clear how participants in that study understood the concept comprehensive internationalization. Butler's (2016) dissertation, on the other hand, sought to understand how participating executives, faculty members, staff, and students at Virginia community colleges defined internationalization (p.55). Participants' perspectives on internationalization, varied with their respective roles at the community college campuses in the study (Butler, 2016). For example, faculty members in the study discussed internationalization in terms of curriculum and learning approaches, and administrative staff involved with the colleges' international activities framed the concept from that specific experience (Butler, 2016). Due to conflicting viewpoints on what internationalization was, Butler (2016) recommended an institutional definition as part of successful internationalization for community colleges.

The distinction between community colleges and SCUs is important, as most SCUs were started as teacher's colleges or technical colleges and have evolved their institutions into four-year degree grant institutions. These are not research universities that produce hundreds of doctoral graduates nor are they baccalaureate colleges that only offer a bachelor's degree. These are teaching-centered institutions that offer bachelor's and master's degree primarily. Unlike flagship public institutions, however, the SCU environment is built around faculty members who are expected to focus more on teaching than research while committing time for institutional service in areas across campus (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2007; 2009). In other words, if you apply Butler's (2016) logic of needing a broader definition of internationalization, then it is

conceivable to surmise that comprehensive internationalization at SCUs hinges on its personnel, mainly faculty members, having at least a common understanding of the internationalization's importance to their institution.

The few peer-reviewed references to comprehensive internationalization as organizational change are largely focused on a transformational change process (Hudzik, 2015; Olson, 2005), which means a large-scale change that permanently affects the institution's mission and organizational structure (Kezar, 2001; Levy and Merry, 1986). We do not know to what extent comprehensive internationalization as large-scale organizational change is embraced by U.S. higher education institutions. ACE advocates such large-scale change through its CIGE and its Internationalization Laboratory, which facilitates a 20-month internationalization training for higher education institutions that is centered on their Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (American Council on Education, 2012).

Since 2003, more than 100 US colleges and universities of all classifications have participated in the program, which is designed to help participating institutions create and execute an internationalization plan (American Council on Education, 2017). Typically, 10-12 participant institutions are selected to be part of an internationalization cohort that involves a series campus visits from ACE internationalization staff and three cohort meetings at the ACE headquarters in Washington, DC. A key outcome of the internationalization lab is a final report that outlines strengths, opportunities, and challenges with advancing an internationalization agenda at their respective institutions (American Council on Education, 2017).

This manuscript chapter examines how key participants from two SCUs that participated in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory within the last 10 years, conceptualize and operationalize *comprehensive internationalization* within their own institution. The question of

how key participants, who brought expertise as both specialized faculty and professional staff, perceived comprehensive internationalization is important because of the type of institutions they serve. According to recent studies, public comprehensive universities enroll more than 50 percent of all undergraduate students at public institutions in the U.S. (Fryar, 2015). SCUs are also known for having the most diverse student population based on a wide range of demographics, e.g., race, gender, age, aptitude, etc. (Fryar, 2015).

Few studies explore how SCU's approach comprehensive internationalization. One recent dissertation (Manzke, 2015) examined global citizenship programming at three public comprehensive universities. However, the study convoluted the terms *global citizenship* and *internationalization*, which are quite distinct. As mentioned earlier, internationalization, in the higher education context, prioritizes world perspectives in the operation of the institution, e.g., curriculum, faculty, facilities, etc. (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2003, 2004). Global citizenship is a concept that is built around the premise of global linkages based on an assumed sharing of global perspectives. Jorgenson and Shultz (2012) provided a crisp explanation of the differences between these concepts, "...global citizenship education is distinguishable from programs for the internationalization of higher education given its combination of global perspectives linked to citizenship. Internationalized education has become a key means to promote a globalized and corporatized education linked to what is called the "knowledge economy," a reference to the drive to use a globalized model to organize research and teaching," (p. 2).

This manuscript chapter is built on a working conceptualization of comprehensive internationalization, which is established by ACE and explored by international education leaders in some depth (American Council on Education, 2012; Hudzik, 2015). What I examine

here is the correspondence between ACE's conceptualization of comprehensive internationalization and that of two of the university members of an ACE Internationalization Laboratory cohort that are engaged in implementing and sustaining an institution wide form of internationalization. This study is critical for SCUs because it helps to answer a key question for such institutions that are interested in having an institution-wide strategy for internationalization: How do internationalization advocates at SCUs conceptualize comprehensive internationalization? This manuscript seeks to understand the long-term viability of the concept of comprehensive internationalization at SCUs through the lens of its advocates, who drive the momentum for internationalization for their institutions.

Methods

The central question of my larger dissertation study is *How do two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) gather support for an institution-wide strategy amidst competing institutional priorities?* This manuscript chapter contributes to addressing the question by focusing on one of my study's additional research questions: *How is comprehensive internationalization conceptualized and prioritized at each campus?* A qualitative case study approach was used to explore this question in detail (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2009). Case studies are limited to the specific cases in focus, but located in the details of those cases are data that can provide generalizable knowledge to a specific field of study. In this instance, the case study method was used to analyze the perspectives of key personnel involved with institution-wide internationalization planning at their respective schools. The case is bound by two SCUs that invested in transforming internationalization on their campuses through participation in programming offered by the ACE including initiatives with its CIGE.

Participants

For this manuscript, a total of 20 faculty members, staff and administrators from two SCUs agreed to participate. One SCU was located in the northeast region of the U.S. and is identified as SCU-North in the manuscript. SCU-North is a former teacher's college that eventually joined its state-affiliated system. The SCU has been serving its region for nearly 150 years and devised a plan within the last 15 years to enhance internationalization at the institution. The seven participants interviewed at SCU-North include one administrator, two staff personnel, and four faculty members.

The second SCU was located in the southeast region of the U.S. and is referred to as SCU-South in this manuscript. SCU-South also started as a teacher's college over 100 years ago. Like SCU-North, the school ultimately grew to be part of the state's university system. A total of 13 identified internationalization advocates agreed to participate: One administrator, three staff, three faculty/program directors, and seven faculty members. SCU-South also started as a teacher's college over 100 years ago. Like SCU-North, the school ultimately grew to be part of the state's university system. The institutions and their participants were not identified by name to protect their confidentiality.

Data collection

Two main sources of data were collected for these case studies: interviews and documents. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the data collected and analyzed for this manuscript. Participants were recruited for the interviews through an ACE Internationalization Laboratory contact at each institution. At SCU-North, key informants were identified for individual interviews through a faculty member involved with the internationalization process at the institution. At SCU-South, key informants were identified for individual interviews through

the school’s international education office. All but one of the individual interviews took place on campus between October 2014 and November 2014 at both campuses. One interview with a SCU-South faculty member was conducted via Skype Voice Internet Protocol (Hay-Gibson, 2009) in December 2014. The interviews were semi-structured, allowing for participants to respond in areas that were relevant to their expertise. Participants answered between 7-10 questions focused on comprehensive internationalization and organizational change. The first question participants answered was *How would you define comprehensive internationalization?* Responses to this question and additional comments in the transcripts about internationalization at the two SCUs were analyzed for this manuscript.

Table 2

Collected Data Used for Chapter 2

Source	SCU-North	SCU-South
Individual interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One administrator • Two staff personnel • Four faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One administrator • Three staff personnel • Three faculty/program directors • Seven faculty members
Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic plans • Governance document • Web site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation plan • Strategic plan • Web site

Second, documents were collected from several sources. The websites of both institutions were also reviewed for content focused on describing or discussing comprehensive internationalization in any form. Strategic plans from both institutions that focused on internationalization were also reviewed. I reviewed the strategic plans in an effort to triangulate data from the semi-structured interviews that highlighted participants’ perspective on

comprehensive internationalization. Specifically, I checked their strategic plans to determine how internationalization was articulated as part of each institution's mission. The accreditation plan for SCU-South was also reviewed, as some participants referred to it as part of their discussion of comprehensive internationalization. Web sites for both institutions were also checked to observe references to internationalization including the term *comprehensive internationalization*. The aim in checking these documents was to examine consistencies between participant's respective interpretations of comprehensive internationalization and the reality on the ground based on what is publicly endorsed by the institution and its various offices.

Data analysis

Analysis largely focused on the descriptions of comprehensive internationalization provided by participants during the individual interviews. My framework for analysis drew upon the ACE CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012). Participants' responses were first reviewed in Microsoft Office with research memos capturing initial patterns and themes through inductive analysis (Patton, 1980; Bowen, 2005). To aid the analysis process, I used NVivo Qualitative Data Analysis Software (QDAS) (Kimbler, Moore, Schladen, Sowers, & Snyder, 2013). The use of software allowed for a more robust review of participant responses and a better organization of themes and how they sometimes overlapped.

The ACE CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012) guided my second phase of data analysis. I first marked all participant responses to questions about defining comprehensive internationalization. A review of participant's comments to that question and other internationalization-related questions led to the development of codes and subsequent categories, which represented the six strands of the ACE CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization: 1) Articulated institutional commitment 2) Administrative structure and

staffing 3) Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes 4) Faculty policies and practices 5) Student mobility and 6) Collaborations and partnerships (American Council on Education, 2012).

Coded responses were examined in an additional phase of analysis in order to examine each of category more fully. In this phase, several themes were identified from the sub codes including *Global learning*, *Technology*, and *Faculty Mobility*. This process was done for each interview. Table 3 (below) illustrates a complete list of the codes and categories developed under the “Defining Comprehensive Internationalization.”

Table 3

Defining comprehensive internationalization: codes and categories

Codes	Categories
Articulated institutional commitment	• Administrative Leadership
Administrative structure and staffing	• HR Development
	• Recruitment
	• Staff development
	• Staff leadership
Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes	• Global Learning
	• Global Perspectives
	• Technology
Faculty policies and practices	• Faculty development
	• Faculty leadership
	• Faculty mobility
	• Faculty morale
	• International expertise
Student mobility	• International students
Collaborations and partnerships	• Local community

Further analysis of codes and categories, specifically reviewing for patterns and consistencies from participant responses, yielded overarching themes, which best captured the perspective of comprehensive internationalization at each institution. These perspectives were reviewed against internationalization-related documents from both SCUs and websites that

highlighted internationalization or the lack thereof at both institutions. For instance, one theme from both institutions was that comprehensive internationalization represented *transformative experiences*, which would broadly impact the developing and teaching of courses to reflect internationalization. I reviewed strategic plans for evidence of a commitment to internationalization of the curriculum, the websites of both academic colleges for signs of internationalization in academic departments, majors, faculty-led study abroad courses, funding opportunities, and other mechanisms that illustrate signs of transformative experiences as a sign of comprehensive internationalization. This approach was applied to a review of all themes that emerged after a careful review of participant responses. These themes will be discussed in the findings section.

Findings

The following section describes key themes constructed from the analysis of participants' definitions and conceptualizations of comprehensive internationalization. Starting with within-case analysis, I first examine each institution separately, SCU-North followed by SCU-South. I then provide a cross-case analysis of how participants at these SCUs conceptualize comprehensive internationalization, which offers some understanding on how these key actors might prioritize the implementation of a comprehensive internationalization strategy.

SCU-North

SCU-North, located in the US northeast region, was established in the mid-1800s as a normal school or a teacher's college. It is located in a small town of less 40,000 people, which is more than 90 percent White, and a few hours by car from urban centers and international airports. It has a student population of more than 5,000 students with more than three-quarters enrolled as undergraduate students. Over the last 10 years, SCU-North has participated in

several internationalization activities sponsored by the ACE including its Internationalization Laboratory. One outcome of their participation in the ACE internationalization project was the drafting of a strategic plan to push for campus-wide internationalization at their institution.

A review of the institution's website found some internationalization activity that fit in all six areas of the ACE CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012), which are: (1) Articulated institutional commitment, (2) Administrative leadership, structure, and staffing, (3) Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes (4) Faculty policies and practices, (5) Student mobility, and (6) Collaboration and partnerships. For instance, one key attribute of "Articulated institutional commitment" is the existence of an internationalization committee. SCU-North posted information about several internationalization-related committees on its website. The word "internationalization" appeared once in its mission statement, however, an emphasis on comprehensive internationalization was not as explicit in its Web presence or print materials.

Through the process of piecing together Web resources, shared documents and individual interviews with campus advocates for internationalization, a broader picture of the reality of internationalization at SCU-North emerged. The campus advocates that participated in this study were part of the campus task-force for internationalization and were engaged in the institution's participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory. I interviewed seven committee participants, the majority of whom were faculty members, about their perspectives on comprehensive internationalization. Analysis led to the identification of three major themes representing key facets of comprehensive internationalization: (1) Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences (2) Faculty development and (3) Institutional support. The following section will discuss those themes in detail.

Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences. All seven interview participants framed comprehensive internationalization as a transformative process that would foster a deep educational experience that facilitates global perspectives. Faculty discussed comprehensive internationalization in the context of students learning in an environment that prepared them to embrace a pluralistic society. From the perspective of faculty in the study, comprehensive internationalization meant infusing curriculum in a manner that contributed to student development and cultural integration. One faculty member described comprehensive internationalization as enhanced curriculum that prepared students for a more globalized world, regardless of academic major.

We can talk about the global economy, science, culture, arts...all of it is affected by Europe Russia, etc. You cannot really isolate America from the rest of the world. It's too late. Our curriculum should prepare students to think about how America fits into the rest of the world, and that's if you're an Art student, a Biology, and even a Sports Management students.

Another faculty member described comprehensive internationalization as the creation of an environment that is cross cultural via the curriculum and all other aspects of the students' experience at the institution.

In other words, I see a role for internationalization in the Sciences, Mathematics, not just in the Social Sciences and Humanities, but to infuse so that you're not saying, 'Here's a kid, undergraduate student, they've taken a course in Asian History. Beautiful. Lovely.' To me that's not internationalization. That's compartmentalizing internationalism and what I would rather see is infused in all kinds of classes. Some element of that cross cultural experience and competency to be infused in everything the student does. And not just curricular, but housing, who lives where, because we learn not just in the classroom, obviously. We learn everywhere we are. So to infuse that international element as broadly as possible to the undergraduate experience...it's a large goal.

Essentially, the perspective of faculty members involved with internationalization appeared to suggest that a critical focus for them was internationalizing curriculum, teaching and learning experiences for students. Responses from staff participants also viewed learning as a

key component of a discussion on internationalization, but all staff respondents also included out-of-class experiences into their conceptions of comprehensive internationalization.

Staff participants interviewed for this study were actively engaged in planning and managing student mobility programs emphasized building on student mobility, or opportunities for students to study abroad. However, several participants indicated that comprehensive internationalization went beyond international travel programs. For example, one staff member described comprehensive internationalization as “infusing global perspectives into all aspects of what this college does. From teaching, to research, to student learning, to co-curricular activities, applied learning or practical learning experiences like internships, service learning.”

To be transformative, then, according to these participants, required infusing internationalization throughout campus experiences, at home and abroad. Participants thus discussed the importance of providing unique teaching and learning opportunities within communities on campus and with partner campuses abroad through educational technology. At SCU-North, faculty and staff worked to integrate technology into some of the institution’s international education ventures, as I learned through the interviews and several webpages describing international course learning initiatives through both SCU-North and its university system. While discussing exchanges in Russia and Australia, one administrator described comprehensive internationalization as a process that facilitated the free flow of ideas via technology – beyond study abroad. “You don’t have to be in each other’s country to visit each other’s backyard, but using the Internet, Skyping allows that to occur...so it’s sort of a total gestalt. We want our faculty/students to be very entrepreneurial.”

Both faculty and staff participants also identified the increased enrollment of international students as a key element of the co-curricular experiences that would help to create

a transformative learning environment campus-wide. The SCU-North international programs office Web page provided information on programming, including on-campus housing experiences, for its small, but growing number of international students.

Additionally, there were a number of activities, primarily advertised through the school's international education office, that promoted cross-cultural learning opportunities for students on campus. One interesting example was an international film series that gave students access to a number of foreign films purchased by the institution's library at the request of the international office. Only one participant discussed this project as an outcome of efforts to internationalize the learning experiences of students on campus.

While several faculty participants seemed to put greater emphasis on curriculum internationalization in their descriptions of comprehensive internationalization, faculty and staff participants from both SCUs did offer examples of other elements that contributed to comprehensive internationalization such as student mobility, be it study abroad or international student enrollment. The next section discusses how some participants included faculty development in their discussion of comprehensive internationalization.

Faculty Development. In describing comprehensive internationalization, a plurality of participants described faculty and faculty development as vital to the internationalization process. Faculty policies and practices related to comprehensive internationalization emphasized faculty mobility and faculty expertise. For example, one faculty participant at SCU-North shared that faculty were key to understanding comprehensive internationalization, "to the extent that we can get faculty from abroad to teach on our campus and to the extent that our faculty have things like Fulbright awards or other awards to teach abroad."

In order to foster a culture of faculty who are committed to creating scholarship that is international in scope or developing curricula with a global focus, the recruitment of such faculty is vital. According to one administrator, some faculty at the institution had experience teaching or producing scholarship while abroad, but the majority of faculty had not been abroad in a teaching or research capacity. The administrator added that faculty candidates were now asked questions related to internationalization during the interview process, such as “What is your familiarity with internationalization? What does it mean to you? It could make or break a search when we have three candidates?”. From this perspective, comprehensive internationalization includes some change in culture that reached the faculty recruiting process.

The institution’s website includes faculty development efforts that might contribute to comprehensive internationalization. For example, faculty members can apply for small grants to support the development of courses with a global/international focus. The institution also has a campus-wide committee focused on supporting internationalization efforts for both faculty and staff. Participants’ emphasis on the role of faculty in comprehensive internationalization resonated with literature on SCUs, which described the role of faculty at these types of institutions to be highly active, in terms of both teaching and service to the institution (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2007, 2009). A plurality of participants also framed comprehensive internationalization in the context of administrative leadership, discussed next.

Institutional Support. Most participants discussed the role of administration in their descriptions of comprehensive internationalization. The administrator participant highlighted administrative leadership as a central cog to understanding the process, highlighting the comprehensive internationalization could not exist without administrative leadership: “I think it has to start at the top. If you have a president or a provost that is not interested, it doesn’t get the

resources that it needs. I think schools that are doing a really good job...it begins at the very top. They show interest. They encourage their faculty....”

Additionally, several faculty participants acknowledged the role of administration in key decisions that impacted internationalization at university. “In the literature, it says that what makes internationalization work is an administration, which is supportive. Often that means they make speeches saying how important it is, but what you need is administrative leadership that is good and we have two really good people. That has been the difference,” one faculty member shared. An example of engaged leadership that matches actions with words, the decision to allow the institution to participate in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory was an investment from the administration. All participants believed a most telling sign of administrative support for internationalization was the enhancement of the school’s international education office, including the creating of new positions to facilitate internationalization activities. I observed that the international education office is placed in one of the more visible buildings in the middle of campus frequented by students for classes, meals, and campus activities.

However, the central role of internationalization is not consistently evident. For example, the institution’s strategic plan, available on the university website, offers little regarding internationalization as an institutional priority. There is one mention of internationalization in a section focused on enhancing the educational experience for students, but not much else. Additionally, the strategic planning committee is an institution-wide collective, but no one from the school’s internationalization committee is listed as part of the institution’s strategic planning committee.

Despite the questions raised about the level of engagement at the administration level regarding internationalization, it was clear from interview participants at SCU-North that some

of level of support for internationalization was present. That institutional support was largely described as instrumental for the other two key cogs of their interpretation comprehensive internationalization: transformative experiences and faculty development. In November 2014, one month after visiting with participants at SCU-North, I met with participants at another institution to gather their perspective on comprehensive internationalization.

SCU-South

SCU-South was also established as teacher's college in the mid-1800s. It became recognized as a regional public university in the mid-1900s. Located in a US Southeast town of less 20,000 inhabitants, also a predominantly White population, SCU-South enrolls more than 17,000, with undergraduates representing more than 80 of the total student body. Like SCU-North, this SCU also participated in several ACE internationalization programs over the last 10 years, including its Internationalization Laboratory. Like SCU-North, one outcome of participation in ACE was the development of an internationalization strategic plan.

The senior international education officer at SCU-South was my point of contact for securing interviews with participants who were identified as internationalization advocates primarily through their affiliation with the campus' global learning committee and through their departmental expertise. I was able to secure individual interviews with 13 participants including faculty members, department chairs, academic deans, and staff personnel. As was the case at SCU-North, the majority of interview participants from SCU-South were faculty members. Analysis led to the view that SCU-South participants conceptualize comprehensive internationalization as providing *Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences through global learning* that has a *campus-wide impact*. The following section discusses these inter-related themes in detail.

Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences. As was the case with participants at SCU-North, nearly all of the 13 participants from SCU-South framed comprehensive internationalization in the context of transforming curricular or co-curricular experiences to emphasize global perspectives and global learning that includes student and faculty mobility, and learning opportunities for those who are not likely to go abroad. Responses centered around student learning within and outside of the classroom as the key element in defining and achieving comprehensive internationalization.

One faculty member from the schools' vast languages division described comprehensive internationalization as a phenomenon that should be realized through the student experience. Internationalization must be far-reaching for its students, regardless of major. The faculty member added the following:

The degree of internationalization that is possible for students with different majors. I think the thing that can be really hard is that you can't define internationalization as just sending students abroad or just having some international content in some courses. Because a university that is comprehensive as ours, we're not a liberal arts school, we have to have things that are international, that fit every student's possible major in mind and we have to provide multiple experiences for students.

Another faculty participant added that comprehensive internationalization required the community to view study abroad, international students, cross-border studies, and similar activities as intricate parts of the learning experience for students who were able to take advantage of these activities. Nearly half of the interview participants discussed student mobility specifically as a key component to comprehensive internationalization. For example, one faculty member stressed the importance of the institution creating mechanisms that incentivize more student mobility such as ensuring all admitted students have passports and flexible opportunities to go abroad as early as the first year:

And so no longer will it be, if a student is lucky enough to have this professor, if a student is lucky enough to join this club, if a student is lucky enough to study abroad...we're not leaving it to luck anymore. We're determined that, if you come here, this is what you're going to get. You're going to get a global focus. You're going to get an international focus.

This faculty member represents the view that global and international learning should be woven into the campus experience so that all students could access it.

One distinction from SCU-North was the amount and array of information related to internationalization that was available on the SCU-South website. I easily found information on internationalizing curricular and co-curricular experiences, including language in the university's overall strategic plan and in a separate *internationalization* strategic plan located in a web page that documented internationalization activity at the institution. Secondly, there was an aggressive push to increase the number of students who study abroad for a summer, winter, or semester term. The institution's Web site advertised small grants for faculty members to develop short-term study abroad courses and grants for students. A variety of majors that overlapped with cross-border studies or regional studies were available for students, whether or not they chose to study abroad. SCU-North also offered majors in cross-border and foreign languages, but there were differences in the availability of options, with SCU-South having a wider availability of study options.

A few SCU-South participants referenced the need to recruit more international students in their discussion of student mobility as a key element of comprehensive internationalization. While there was some recruitment of international students, it remained a work in progress due to limited resources. Additionally, some faculty participants described the integration of visiting international students through exchange programs as another avenue for advancing internationalization.

Global Learning. A majority of participants at SCU-South referenced the term *global learning* during their descriptions of comprehensive internationalization. Multiple faculty participants shared the perspective that global learning was synonymous with comprehensive internationalization in that it created boundless opportunities for student learning, whether they were on campus, abroad, or in the community. One professor defined comprehensive internationalization as a, “process by which a global or international perspective is...expressed or engrained across the disciplines in academia. So you would take in a global perspective or an international perspective with students thinking of different disciplines as part of a global exercise.

Another faculty member stressed that it was important to understand the distinction between global learning and internationalization. The faculty participant believed the difference between the two concepts was in the variety of learning foci found in global learning with its emphasis on bringing in students and faculty without experience or overt interest in study abroad whereas internationalization, the faculty participant’s opinion, largely focused on traditional international education activities, e.g., study abroad, international students, and partnerships with institutions from other countries to expand such opportunities. Comprehensive internationalization was this larger process that would produce global learning and other attributes that reflected an institution wide commitment to internationalization. A few other faculty member participants both emphasized global learning and expressed some consternation with the concept of comprehensive internationalization based on their respective experiences as faculty members. One faculty participant at SCU-North openly expressed a similar reservation about the term, comprehensive internationalization as something too abstract or obscure to have

as a campus-wide platform. Several faculty participants from both schools were more comfortable discussing internationalization in the context of global learning.

Campus-wide impact. A third of the participants from SCU-South discussed comprehensive internationalization as a process that involved all aspects of the campus; these participants were all affiliated with the campus' international education office.

“Comprehensive internationalization is where each department, whether that would be an academic or administrative unit, is somehow involved in promoting international education. Not only putting international aspects in their coursework, but also departments can be involved in increasing their intercultural communication skills,” one staff member shared.

Another staff participant described comprehensive internationalization as a process that has wide support from the administration to all the day-to-day staff personnel. One other international office staff person stressed that comprehensive internationalization needed to go beyond the work of their office. The participant added that it was about building connections across campus that foster wide-scale internationalization. “You can talk about academic advisors...you can talk about financial aid...You can talk about the registrar office...you can talk about housing on campus because they house international students...you can talk about admissions...there are many parts of the campus that are important. Those areas that are staffed by staff, not faculty,” one other staff participant added. In other words, internationalization and global learning goes beyond the classroom to involve other aspects of campus life.

Several faculty participants did not emphasize comprehensive internationalization as extending beyond academic activities, but they did conceptualize internationalization as something that could be operational through education and training of faculty, students, and staff personnel. For example, one faculty member/program director stated,

A University should be dedicated to the ongoing education of everyone, and that includes faculty, staff, and administrators. Institutional change is really important for sustaining over time, so it's not just as long as this one person is here pushing it, but we get it put into the rules, the policies, the training and all of that. That actually comes from staff. That comes from the structure of the institution.

Overall, it appeared that a majority of participants were attempting to make sense of comprehensive internationalization in terms of campus impact, albeit through a vision that is predominantly focused on learning and training.

Importantly, SCU-South decided to focus on global learning in its strategic plan in order to maintain its regional accreditation. The campus' strategic planning committee selected global learning as a central focus of its institution's strategic plan – a move that solidified the institutionalization of global learning campus-wide. A strategic plan is required for all higher education institutions in the region, and SCU-South decided to focus on internationalization and global learning for its plan. Additionally, the school's final report to ACE included a campus-wide strategic plan for internationalization, which would be facilitated by SCU-South's international education office in consultation with campus advocates (mostly faculty) and leaders from the campus administration.

Overall, when SCU-South participants described their view of comprehensive internationalization, which focused on transforming curriculum for students to have learning experiences that reflected the influence of international foci, in and out of the classroom. They also viewed global learning as a key characteristic of comprehensive internationalization. Despite the institution's ambitious goals to increase the number of students that studied abroad, participants believed comprehensive internationalization could not be realized without an impact on a majority of students that do not study abroad. There needed to be supplemental learning opportunities on campus that reinforced the importance of understanding world cultures and

perspectives such as area/regional studies or online courses international partner institutions. Their perspective on comprehensive internationalization also included some effort by participants to see it as internationalization with a broader impact.

The findings illustrate both similarities and distinctions between the two institutions. The next section discusses how the findings at these SCUs overlap and differ.

Cross-Case Analysis

Both SCUs exhibited attributes of internationalization that fit into all six strands of the ACE CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012). For example, both institutions have integrated internationalization into their strategic plans in some capacity. Both SCUs have office dedicated to advancing internationalization activities. Both institutions were explicit in their emphasis on internationalizing curricular and co-curricular experiences. A key concern of the present study is how much of this reality is understood by the identified campus advocates for internationalization. The advocates at both campuses are primarily faculty. In general, faculty play a pivotal role in research and teaching in higher education institutions. This reality is heightened at SCUs where faculty engagement in teaching and service typically outweighs focus on research (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2007, 2009). To understand how internationalization advocates at SCUs view comprehensive internationalization is to understand where the sustained momentum for comprehensive internationalization will be at such institutions.

Participants from both SCUs largely defined comprehensive internationalization as a deep institutional change that would be centered on transforming the learning experience for students. This would involve a transformation of curricular and co-curricular experiences for students. Essentially, a majority of key participants at both institutions conceptualize

comprehensive internationalization as a holistic learning experience that aims to capture all students, on campus and abroad. Table 4 illustrates the similarities and differences with themes for both SCUs.

SCU-North and SCU-South both drafted strategic plans for internationalization following participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory. For both institutions, a key recommendation/goal in their internationalization plans was to transform the curriculum experience in an effort to not only encourage more student mobility, but to reach a broader segment of the student population that would participate in traditional international education activities, e.g., semester abroad, summer abroad.

Table 4

<i>Defining comprehensive internationalization themes</i>	
SCU-North	SCU-South
Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences	Transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences
Faculty development	Global learning
Institutional support	Campus impact

The interview responses, institution websites, and documents showed curriculum transformation to be more of an overt focus at SCU-South, which was in part because of greater access to resources. For instance, at SCU-North there was a curriculum internationalization committee designed primarily to help faculty develop international content in their courses, but a dearth in resources limited the capacity of faculty that could be supported by the committee at one time. A similar program existed at SCU-South, which was supported partially by funds through its strategic plan for internationalization.

Another example from SCU-South is the restructuring of its general education program, which reaches all first-year students, to have a global focus in the required first-year seminar and

other general education courses. This overhaul of the SCU-South General Education Program required local and state approval, and the commitment of participating faculty to redesign their general education courses to reflect a more global focus. SCU-North offered multiple opportunities for students to take international content courses on campus and in some cases, digital courses with students from other schools in the state university system and from other countries, however, these courses were optional and not necessarily managed by SCU-North, but by institutional partners within the university system.

Furthermore, both institutions discussed student mobility as a key part of internationalization, but added that only a small segment of the student population had the opportunity to study abroad. Several participants from SCU-South emphasized that comprehensive internationalization needed to include learning opportunities for a majority of students without the means or interests to travel abroad to another country. For example, faculty expertise in international areas could introduce more students to global perspectives through teachings, the use of technology and local activities that may or may not necessarily involve the actual movement of students away from their campus. This was reflected in both their descriptions of comprehensive internationalization and in their accreditation plan, required for all institutions that were part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) (2017). SCU- South chose to focus its accreditation plan on transforming the learning experience for its students with an emphasis on global education for students, faculty, and staff.

During the interviews, participants at SCU-North integrated the movement of faculty, as part of a broader focus on faculty development, more into their descriptions of comprehensive internationalization. Participants framed faculty development as essential to comprehensive internationalization at their institutions. Among some SCU-South participants, the role of

faculty was part of their overall discussion of internationalization at their institution, but not necessarily in their descriptions of comprehensive internationalization. A few faculty participants discussed the role of faculty in the internationalization process in terms of course development, faculty-led courses abroad, campus mobilization, and related topics.

The irony of this finding was that SCU-South had a faculty development office staffed by tenured faculty and full time staff. Additionally, a review of their strategic plan for internationalization and internationalization-related content on their webpages illustrated that SCU-South valued faculty development through a number of faculty grants available through monies to implement its accreditation plan. For example, SCU-South offered several grants for faculty to develop short-term study abroad courses and/or to participate in international trainings during the summer. SCU-North did offer a few grants for course development, but offerings were more robust and more visible at SCU-South. In sum, the impression from SCU-South participants was that faculty development was an ideal component of comprehensive internationalization, but it was not framed by most participants as core to comprehensive internationalization. The evidence of faculty development contributing to internationalization at SCU-South was clear through a review of its internationalization webpage. It should be noted that administrators at both institutions expressed a strong enthusiasm for faculty to take a more active interest in pursuing outside funding for international opportunities.

While participants from both institutions reference administrative leadership in general discussion of internationalization at their institutions, SCU-North participants emphasized administrative leadership as a key component of comprehensive internationalization at their institution. The importance of administrative support to make internationalization a campus-wide reality was emphasized by both faculty and staff participants. There were references to the

President and the Provost as two essential administrative leaders, with whom the campus-wide internationalization ambitions could not be realized beyond the enthusiasm of a handful of faculty. At SCU-South, staff participants in the study emphasized that comprehensive internationalization needed to be a collective effort across the campus' various offices. All staff interview participants from SCU-South were affiliated with the university's international education office. The campus-wide strategic plan for SCU-South appeared to support their view of comprehensive internationalization as something that connected across all facets of the campus. SCU-South's university plan included internationalization as a highly component whereas SCU-North integrates internationalization into one key priority of the institution's strategic plan.

During my campus visits, I observed both international education offices to be central locations for facilitating any iteration of comprehensive internationalization on their campuses and abroad. Both international offices were highly visible on campus, located in areas that were frequented by students. The office at SCU-South was much larger and more frequented by staff and visitors, but both offices were clearly situated and staffed to demonstrate at least some institutional commitment to advancing internationalization at their institutions.

Discussion

The findings inform us of how campus advocates, who are predominantly faculty, at SCUs view comprehensive internationalization. The literature describes comprehensive internationalization as organizational process with tentacles that connect various segments of the campus to focus on internationalization (American Council on Education, 2012). There were aspects of this idea evidenced on both campuses, but in ways that were arguably fragmented. For instance, participants at SCU-North did explicitly describe comprehensive

internationalization as a campus-wide process, but expressed sensitivity towards administrative leadership as a key cog of driving comprehensive internationalization. There was some mention of internationalization in its campus-wide strategic plan, but no strong indication of a systemic philosophy from participants about comprehensive internationalization beyond curriculum transformation, faculty development, and administrative leadership.

The same could be argued for SCU-South, despite a more vibrant sense of support for the idea of internationalization as campus wide through initiatives. Though staff participants discussed comprehensive internationalization as a campus-wide phenomenon, they all worked in the international programs office. Faculty participants at SCU-South had varied interpretations of comprehensive internationalization, with a strong majority emphasizing curriculum transformation, followed by a focus on a development of global perspectives, which participants described as global learning.

When participants at these institutions thought of comprehensive internationalization, the focus weighed heavily towards curriculum and learning experiences. At SCU-North, there was some emphasis from a majority of participants on faculty development, e.g., trainings, curriculum development, funding opportunities, and SCU-South demonstrated commitment to faculty development with a key administrative office to support these efforts along with a number institution funding opportunities for faculty to focus its pedagogical efforts on international issues.

These findings confirmed past research about the faculty perspective of internationalization in U.S. higher education. Dewey and Duff (2009) found that faculty from research-intensive universities viewed internationalization through the following prisms: faculty research and teaching, curriculum, study abroad programs, and other areas, e.g., international

students, fundraising, and institutional partnerships. The faculty members in their study were part of an institutional committee that was the driving force behind internationalization (Dewey & Duff, 2009). Another important observation in both cases was the importance of faculty education to campus wide initiatives. There are several case studies available that focus on the role and perspective of administrators concerning internationalization (Hudzik, 2015; Merckx & Nolan, 2015), but my study raises the point that faculty “buy-in” for broad, ambitious initiatives like internationalization was just as, if not more critical. “While it is damaging enough if the faculty aren’t allies of internationalization, it is “game over” if they are opposed or hostile to it,” (Hudzik, 2015, p. 85).

Conversely, there are risks associated with having faculty members dominate the governance of an institution-wide process like comprehensive internationalization. One risk raised in the literature is a sense of insularity of among core faculty driving an initiative, which could be counterproductive towards having broader support from faculty members with less experience, expertise, or interest in making global connections through their teaching and scholarship (Childress, 2009; Knight, 2003; 2004).

Another risk of a faculty-dominated perspective is the neglect to the other key aspects of comprehensive internationalization. The ACE model of comprehensive has six strands: 1) Articulated institutional commitment 2) Administrative structure and staffing 3) Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes 4) Faculty policies and practices 5) Student mobility and 6) Collaborations and partnerships (American Council Education, 2012). Participant responses, again predominantly faculty members, focused largely on curriculum, faculty, and mobility. The emphasis on leadership and campus-wide support extends over into articulated institutional commitment and administrative structure, but these areas of emphasis were supported more by

observations of documents than participant perspectives. This suggests a muddled perspective of comprehensive internationalization at both institutions that consists of good work, but perspectives that are skewed by expertise of the advocates.

The aforementioned point also highlights the limitations of the study. The informants for this manuscript were recruited by a key advocate for internationalization, involved with the campus' participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory and other initiatives to drive internationalization efforts on the campus. The reality is that the key advocates for this campus-wide initiative are faculty, therefore their perspective or understanding of the phenomenon, comprehensive internationalization, is imperative for scholars or practitioners interested in exploring the feasibility of this process at SCUs.

The findings in this manuscript also suggest that comprehensive internationalization at SCUs can be a transformative change process (American Council on Education, 2012; Hudzik, 2015), provided that the system wide change is centered on learning. Transformational change literature describes an upheaval of an organization's missions, values, and objectives through pressures that can be both internal and external (Kezar, 2001; Levy & Merry, 1986; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995), but there was not a sense from participants of the breadth and depth of change in the institution needed to realize comprehensive internationalization beyond academic affairs and to a lesser extent, student affairs.

In analyzing participant interviews from the two SCUs separately and collectively, there is a question of how much these key internationalization advocates see internationalization as part of an organizational overhaul compared to a more singular focus on the transformation of the institution's academic experience. For instance, there were very few references to institutional partnerships as a key part of comprehensive internationalization. Partnerships were

referenced in the context of describing some past learning or teaching opportunities, but not as a key element to realizing comprehensive internationalization. The need to hire faculty and staff with international expertise was referenced by a few participants at both institutions, especially at SCU-North, but only a small minority mentioned how they felt comprehensive internationalization would impact human resources or other offices such as development, admissions, or facilities management. This observation reflects the perspective of the key internationalization advocates at both institutions are predominantly faculty.

At smaller institutions with limited budgets like SCUs, this is a critical point as faculty at these institutions are often times asked to prioritize teaching and institutional service a significant while managing research expectations (Henderson, 2007; 2009). Coupled with large teaching loads, faculty at their institutions are also asked to serve in administrative capacities as part of their service to the institution. Essentially, the faculty members are the likely drivers of institution-wide efforts at these schools that would involve galvanizing student and/or staff support. Therefore, how these actors understand or perceive an institutional initiative that requires change in approach or method is critical.

CHAPTER THREE: INTERNATIONALIZING THE SCU:
HOW COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION WORKS AT
TWO STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs)

At many U.S. public higher education institutions, the call for rethinking the higher education model is building momentum. Several flagship public universities and statewide systems are at the center of budgetary cuts and public policy struggles between these universities, the State Legislatures that approve their funding, and an increasingly skeptical public in search of tangible value to the higher education experience for students and the local economies they serve (Mitchell & Leachman, 2015; Pew Charitable Trusts, 2015). Also concerned are competitive public higher education institutions that are focused less on research and more on graduating workers that are employable in local economies in a variety of roles, including teachers, social workers, or local business personnel? (Henderson, 2009, 2011; Lyall and Sell, 2006).

In the last 15 years, public higher education institutions have begun exploring the phenomenon of internationalizing their campuses as a way to maintain competitiveness locally and globally. This paper focuses on how university-wide mandates to create a campus environment centered on internationalization are implemented at such institutions. The phenomenon of *comprehensive internationalization* has gained traction on US colleges campuses at a time when both the cost and the utility of the US higher education model is under increased scrutiny by scholars, practitioners, perhaps most importantly, the parents of current and potentially future students (Mitchell & Leachman, 2015). The goal of this chapter is to provide an in-depth examination of the emergence of institution-wide internationalization at two state

comprehensive universities (SCUs) to better understand how comprehensive internationalization can be implemented in public higher education institutions that fit the profile of SCUs, which are described in literature as diverse, but fledgling institutions as a way of remaining competitive while continuing to serve local and regional communities. Two cases are examined through comprehensive internationalization and organizational change literature.

Literature Review

This section begins with a review of the scant literature on SCUs to provide greater understanding of their role within the U.S. higher education landscape. Internationalization and organizational change perspectives in higher education are then examined as a guide for the key research questions of this manuscript chapter.

State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs)

Henderson (2007, 2009) described SCUs as regional universities, many of which originally formed as normal schools or teacher's colleges that are usually part of state university systems as second or third tier public higher education institutions. Henderson referred to the SCU as the "People's University," (p. 5) because of a belief that these institutions represented greater access to higher education for the U.S. middle class. Some SCUs were initially founded as community colleges or satellite campuses of flagship public universities (Fryar, 2015). In her chapter on comprehensive universities, Fryar (2015) built on Henderson's (2007) work of SCUs by describing public comprehensive institutions in two categories, 1) historical comprehensives and 2) contemporary comprehensives. Historical comprehensive institutions were described as four-year degree granting schools that were not established as research schools or as land grant institutions. Contemporary comprehensives institutions identified were codified using the Carnegie Foundation (2017) classification, which described SCUs or public comprehensive

universities as master's colleges and universities that offer a minimum 50 master's degree and a maximum of 20 doctoral degrees (Fryar, 2015).

A majority of SCUs serve a wide spectrum of largely undergraduate students from diverse ethnic backgrounds, socioeconomic classes, and perhaps, most importantly, from varying levels of academic preparedness as SCUs (Fryar, 2015). SCUs are also more likely to have trouble retaining and graduating students. Additionally, SCUs are usually located in smaller, often times rural, populations centers that are relatively far from major metropolitan areas or international (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2009).

Additionally, SCUs have been subject to both ridicule and neglect from higher education researchers. "Even in fictional accounts of life in colleges and universities the SCUs are largely overlooked..." Henderson (2011, p 36) wrote. Researchers whose work has included a focus on the history of public colleges and universities have found comprehensive universities to most fit Coser's (1974) model of the "greedy institution," where personnel are expected to give an inordinate, almost unhealthy, commitment to their time and effort for the institution (Henderson, 2007; Hendrickson, Mueller, & Strand, 2011; Wright et al., 2004). Henderson (2009, 2011) argued that faculty members at SCUs were asked to maintain a research agenda while having an even greater focus on teaching, and institutional service. At these institutions, faculty are also asked to dedicate significant time towards local or regional service.

Like other public institutions, the SCUs are reliant on shrinking public budgets that are subject to partisan state budgetary processes, which can be quite complex as state legislatures grapple over how to spend limited tax revenues to support public services such as K-12 education and community health. It is not always merely a matter of revenues and expenses, but also sometimes a struggle that involves public accountability for how state funds are spent and

the ideology of state lawmakers whose responsibility it is to decide which programs should be funded and which ones should be cut. Their decisions have to be considered both from the standpoint of fiscal feasibility and from the perspective of what is politically savvy as lawmakers must make decisions that affect her ability to remain in office (American Academy of the Arts and Sciences, 2015).

Mitchell and Leachman (2015) suggested that the national support of current higher education models was tepid as concerns about the overall cost and quality of U.S. higher education were continuously scrutinized. There is widespread debate in the public sphere about whether states should be responsible for paying college tuition at current levels, which, as noted earlier, have been diminishing (Coleman, 2016). This discussion about the feasibility of public financing for higher education affects all types of public higher education institutions, but especially the most vulnerable institutions with less prestige and fewer independent sources of financing. This is the space where many SCUs operate today (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2009, 2011).

These unique and challenging dynamics at SCUs prompt the question of how any large institutional initiatives would be realized, let alone sustained, in such an environment. This question is certainly relevant for internationalization as the recent local and national elections also reflected a friction towards globalization and its consequences for local communities in the U.S. (Altbach & de Wit, 2016). The election outcomes suggest that an antagonism towards globalism might have persisted well before the 2016 U.S. elections, which raises the question of if and how SCUs might have been successful implementing some iteration of comprehensive internationalization up to this point (Altbach & de Wit, 2016). This manuscript chapter examines two cases of SCUs that sought to implement university-wide plans regarding

internationalization in an environment where there was meager public appetite for more public spending on higher education and growing populist concerns about globalization. The next section discusses literature on how internationalization has evolved in higher education.

Internationalizing U.S. Campuses

The internationalization of U.S. higher education has been increasingly explored in education research over the past two decades. Jane Knight's (2003, 2004) work represents a key voice on the expanding internationalization literature. She explored the evolution of internationalization as a process that would integrate the attributes of increasing globalization and multiculturalism into higher education. Other education research scholars have explored the internationalization of higher education from multiple angles, including a focus on mobility (Tarrant, 2010) and international partnerships (Altbach & Teichler, 2001).

The research of internationalizing higher education institutions extends well beyond the U.S.; however, I focus on the research agenda for the internationalization of U.S. higher education because my concern is the impact of this phenomenon on education and society in this country. The American Council on Education (ACE) (2017) led research efforts to support the exploration of full scale internationalization in U.S. higher education institutions. ACE (2017) is credited with developing terminology to describe internationalization on institution-wide scale – *comprehensive internationalization*.

It is an important distinction to note that internationalization in higher education is the process of integrating global perspectives into aspects of the institution, be it the internationalizing of curriculum to include international perspectives or the process for recruiting faculty, which might include criteria such as capacity for international research (Knight, 2003). Comprehensive internationalization is a process where the above mentioned examples are part of

institution-wide process to integrate international or global perspectives into the institutional identity and operations (American Council on Education, 2012). The next section introduces the idea of comprehensive internationalization and the limited literature that has explored the concept.

Comprehensive Internationalization

For more than 10 years, a growing number of U.S. higher education institutions have supported the idea of comprehensive internationalization via participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, a two-year project designed to assist participant schools in developing plans to build comprehensive internationalization on their campuses (American Council on Education, 2017). After several longitudinal studies on internationalization at a variety of institutions (Green, 2005), ACE developed a comprehensive internationalization model with six strands: Articulated institutional commitment; Administrative structure and staffing; Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; Faculty policies and practices; Student mobility; Collaboration and partnerships (American Council on Education, 2012). Below, Table 5 provides brief descriptions of the six components of the ACE internationalization model.

The ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012) provides a map for understanding internationalization in a way that looks beyond the traditional international education approaches of study abroad or international student recruitment. According to ACE (2012), comprehensive internationalization should also include some articulated support from the institution's administrative leadership, which could come through the form of a developed internationalization plan or a mission statement that reflects the institution's value of internationalization as a core part of its identity. Another important component is an

administrative structure that reflects the institution’s commitment to internationalization through measures such as the hiring of staff to fill key roles or the restructuring of key offices to reflect internationalization as a priority in order to have access to the institution’s resources (American Council on Education, 2012).

Other key components of comprehensive internationalization should also include some commitment to curricular and co-curricular initiatives, which would imply some impact on the learning experience of students (American Council on Education, 2012). Faculty policies and procedures are also important for an institution seeking comprehensive internationalization, which could be pursued through activities that affect faculty development or incentivize faculty to pursue more international-focused research, for example (American Council on Education, 2017). Lastly, another key component of the ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012) is the fostering of collaborations and partnerships. This is an area where some institutions will pursue memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with compatible institutions from across the globe. Those international partnerships could be realized through exchange programs that support students or faculty mobility. Some institutions also opt for exchange programs that enable collaboration with online education (American Council on Education, 2012).

Table 5

Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement Model for Comprehensive Internationalization

Rubric	Description
Articulated institutional commitment	Internationalization is established as a priority, i.e. mission statement, a strategic plan, establishing a task force committed to campus internationalization.
Administrative structure and staffing	Resources dedicated to international programs office with professional staff and/or faculty members who manage several internationalization activities and programs.

Curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes	Academic offerings with a focus on global trends, Area Studies, and foreign language skill development. Co-curricular programming that reinforces internationalization of curriculum.
Faculty policies and practices	International work valued in faculty tenure process. Faculty with a background of international research or practice. Funding and institutional support for international research.
Student mobility	Resources to give more domestic students access to education abroad activities. Strategic plan to increase international student population on campus.
Collaboration and partnerships	International partnerships that impact the entire institution. The development of campus-wide policies for the cultivating international partnerships.

Note. Adapted from “The Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement” by the American Council on Education (2012), *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses, 2012 edition*.

Education researchers are only beginning to explore the concept of comprehensive internationalization and its range of applicability in the academy. Little peer-reviewed published research focuses on how U.S. institutions understand and implement comprehensive internationalization. Scholars and practitioners are, however, utilizing strategies from education associations such as ACE, Association of International Educators (NAFSA), and the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) in an effort to enhance practices at their campuses (American Council on Education, 2017; NAFSA, 2017). Still, public research on comprehensive internationalization is largely focused from the perspective of administrative leadership as the key driver of the internationalization process at institutions (Hudzik, 2015; Merckx & Nolan, 2015).

One recent dissertation explored how technical colleges were able to implement comprehensive internationalization, leaning primarily on the perspective of the college leadership (Piazza, 2015). The study, drawing largely on global competence literature (Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006; Olsen & Kroeger, 2001), which aims to codify a learner’s ability to

demonstrate an aptitude for global understanding a series of debated attributes that include language capacity and one's articulation of issues (environment, politics, etc.) on a global scale, found that achieving comprehensive internationalization could work at technical colleges with supportive top leadership, key personnel, a focus on learning, and a plan for assessment (Piazza, 2015). The study opens the door for additional research on comprehensive internationalization. Such research must address the complexity of higher education settings, which scholars agree is organizationally fluid and multipolar, in that there are multiple power interests within and outside of the higher education institution that can influence decision making (Hudzik, 2015; Hurd, 2007; Kezar, 2001; Kotter, 1996). The next section provides a review of organizational change literature that examines the complexity of change with the higher education institution. The review will help offer some understanding of how comprehensive internationalization might fit within the lexicon of organizational change in the higher education context.

Organizational change in higher education

Hudzik (2015) described comprehensive internationalization as an organizational change process, which denoted a very complex process that could affect the organization entirely. Relevant literature suggests that organizational change is not a monolithic approach; however, it is not without its guiding principles. This study does not explore organizational change theories comprehensively, but offers an overview of change theories commonly associated with higher education. Organizational change literature tends to build around two approaches: 1) that organizational change is as *evolutionary change*, which is incremental in some aspects of the organization, but not at its core, or 2) that organizational change is manifested as *revolutionary change*, where change is rapid, permanently affecting the organization's mission and structure

(Burke, 2014; Kezar, 2001; Levy and Merry, 1986). The next sections discuss these notions of change in more detail.

Evolutionary change. In her review of organizational change models common in higher education, Kezar (2001) found evolutionary change to be most prevalent. Research on evolutionary change in higher education suggests institutions are sensitive to external factors, but that institutions are likely to find ways to internalize outside concerns through a refining or further expansion of the institution (Clark, 1983). For example, SCUs have responded to changes in their local and regional economies over the decades by expanding their academic programs, developing departments and program offices that eventually led to their institution's status transitioning from a regional teacher's college or technical school to a state university (Henderson 2007, 2009).

In building on the work of Orlikowski (1996), and Weick and Quinn (1999), Burke (2014) also emphasizes that evolutionary change is the most common type of organizational change, but that the change is typically consisting of micro improvements or incremental changes in a system. A continuous pattern of such small actions could lead to broad change, but Burke (2014) suggests that evolutionary change is more likely to result in fragmented instances of change that are not connected to systemic transformation. A deliberate, planned change driven an individual or group within an organization aimed at enhancing a specific aspect of the organization can lead to incremental or evolutionary change that addresses a specific issue without disrupting the system (Burke, 2014; Orlikowski, 1996; Porras & Robertson, 1992; Weick & Quinn, 1999).

Revolutionary Change. When continuous change is consistent and results in more substantive change, this would be an example of a disruption or revolutionary change (Burke,

2014; Gersick, 1991). A revolutionary change to an organization results in a form of change that affects its mission and organizational environment in a manner that has long-term implications (Burke, 2014; Gersick, 1991). For instance, when an institution decides to employ a campus-wide assessment of all international-related activity, it creates a gateway to information about international research, internationally-focused teaching and other related programs that have now become known to the broader campus. Such an assessment would raise awareness of what exists and what is lacking, in terms of campus-wide internationalization.

Burke (2014) analyzed the role of small events or activities resulting in or contributing to large-scale change through the work of Malcolm Gladwell's (2000) book, *The Tipping Point*. Though not necessarily considered a research manual for organizational change, Burke (2014) advises observation of Gladwell's (2000) understanding of how phenomenon starts – a few committed, persistent enthusiasts who build momentum through word of mouth until it spreads vigorously, which potentially unleashes change that is deep and pervasive (Burke, 2014; Gladwell, 2000). Change that reaches such a level has the potential to transform an organization (Burke, 2014; Gladwell, 2000).

Transformational Change. An upheaval of systems and the people functioning within them is one way to describe *transformational change* (Burke, 2014; Kezar, 2001; Levy & Merry, 1986; Porras & Robertson, 1992; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). It is also referred to as a second-order change with atypical, disruptive activity that results in a dramatic shift of direction for an organization or institution (Burke, 2014; Kezar, 2001; Levy & Merry, 1986; Porras & Robertson, 1992; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). Transformational change can come from a tsunami of pressures through an internal and external environment that can result in a severe impact on an organization or institution's existence. The transformational change is considered a planned

change by an individual or group to change the organization in a profound way (Burke, 2014; Porras & Robertson, 1992). When that action leads to unplanned, but permanent, radical changes in the organization's mission, its strategy, or organizational culture, it becomes revolutionary change (Burke, 2014; Kezar, 2001; Levy & Merry, 1986; Porras & Robertson, 1992; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

While there is a good amount of research on transformational change as an example of organizational change in higher education, there is very little research that uses organizational change theory to better understand the phenomenon of internationalization in higher education. One example is Hurd's (2007) study, which explored internationalization strategies at three public regional universities, was framed on Eckel and Kezar's (2003) core principles successful transformational change in higher education: 1) Senior administrative support (p.81), 2) Collaborative leadership (p. 87), 3) Flexible vision (p. 93-94), 4) Visible action (p. 98-99), and 5) Staff development (p. 102).

Hurd (2007) concluded through his findings that two of the three institutions were transformed institutions. The changes were documented to have occurred gradually over time and presented evidence of wide-scale change towards internationalization. There were seven attributes used to define the institutions as having transformed into more internationalization universities: 1.) Vision 2.) Campus champions 3.) Continual communication 4.) Flexible opportunism 5.) Buy-in for the vision 6.) Institutionalized outcomes and 7.) Transformational change (p. 232). Hurd's (2007) study remains one of the few to examine institution-wide internationalization of US higher education through organizational change literature.

This manuscript chapter examines the plight of SCUs that are aiming to create and sustain an institutional environment to foster comprehensive internationalization. Two key

research questions for this paper are: from the perspective of key actors involved in comprehensive internationalization at two SCUs, 1) what factors contributed to the creation of an environment for comprehensive internationalization at these respective institutions, and, 2) How has the comprehensive internationalization process been engaged, sustained, and challenged at these respective institutions?

This study informs education scholars about approaches used by SCUs to advance wide-scale internationalization in an environment where public support for higher education is waning (Gardner, 2016). This study contributes needed research on the practical realities of how wide-scale change can occur in institutional environments with limited resources. The next section reviews the methodology used to gather and analyze data for this paper.

Methods

In order to answer the research questions for this manuscript, a qualitative case study approached was used. This approach is helpful in exploring the “why” research questions through in depth analysis of qualitative data, e.g., individual interviews, focus group interviews, document analysis, etc. (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). This qualitative case study is bound by two SCUs that engaged in strategic planning for campus wide internationalization within the last 10 years with the aid of the ACE’s CIGE.

Participants and Settings

A total of 25 faculty and staff personnel at two SCUs participated in semi-structured interviews between October 2014 and November 2014. In December 2014, I interviewed one faculty member via Skype Internet Protocol. One SCU was located in the Northeast region of the U.S. The other SCU located in the U.S. Southeast region. As part of their agreement to participate in this study, the two participating institutions are identified as SCU-North and SCU-

South in the study. Individual participants are identified by a generic description of their role at the University.

At SCU-North, seven faculty and staff personnel participated in semi-structured interviews. An additional five faculty and staff members were part of a 45-minute focus group interview. At SCU-South, 13 faculty and staff personnel participated in individual interviews.

Data Collection

Participants took part in a semi-structured interview answering questions about comprehensive internationalization at their respective institutions. Participants were asked to give their perspective on a number of areas regarding comprehensive internationalization, including the level of support from their administration, how they would describe internationalization currently at their institutions, and the elements that prompted the institution to support comprehensive internationalization. Participants reviewed the interview protocol, enclosed in Appendix A, prior to the scheduled interview. Each participant also had an opportunity to review their interview transcript and to provide Email approval for their comments to be used in this study. Four participants from SCU-South and three from SCU-North responded to confirm accuracy of transcripts. There were no concerns raised from the transcript reviews. In addition to the interviews, I also examined relevant documents from both campuses including strategic plans for internationalization from their ACE Internationalization Laboratory participation, multi-year institutional strategic plans, and relevant institutional Web pages for signs of the internationalization activity, and inactivity described in some of the interviews.

Data Analysis

I transcribed and reviewed each interview, then imported all transcribed text into NVivo, a Qualitative Data Analysis Software (QDAS), for further analysis (Kimbler et. al, 2013). My analytic questions centered on examining how, from the perspective of the participants, this “comprehensive internationalization” process, or some iteration of it, evolved in an environment like a state comprehensive university (SCU) and how constructs of comprehensive internationalization were operationalized through processes of organizational change. My analysis came largely from, but were not limited to, responses to the following interview questions (1) *From your perspective, can you describe how internationalization works at your institution?* (2) *Can you describe the external/internal elements that you believe prompted your institution to develop and execute a plan for comprehensive internationalization?*

I performed an inductive analysis of participant responses through NVivo and identified key themes from the two SCUs, as the initial themes stem from a review of the transcript data (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clark, 2006; Thomas, 2003). A focused, deductive analysis was then performed through an examination of those themes with literature reviewed earlier in this article, e.g., SCUs, comprehensive internationalization, and organizational change (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clark, 2006). The following sections examines the two cases and summarizes the results.

Findings

This section reviews the analysis of findings from campus visits and document review at the two SCUs. The section first offers a brief historical overview of the two SCUs, then examines from the perspectives of the participants for each SCU: (1) How internationalization happened and (2) How internationalization works at the SCU.

SCU-North

Established in the mid-1800s as normal school, SCU-North was primarily a teacher's college. The comprehensive university contributes to its local and regional economy, located several hours from an international airport or major metropolitan area. The school has a little more than 5,000 students, the majority being undergraduates. In the last 10 years, SCU-North has participated in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory. The SCU-North internationalization effort was led by a team of 17 faculty members and 10 staff/administrative personnel, 12 of whom I interviewed for this study. I spoke with eight of these participants during individual interviews. The four additional participants were part of a focus group.

SCU-North has been part of its state university system for over 50 years. The school traces its earliest internationalization activity during the peak of the Mass Higher Education Era, which occurred from 1945-1975 (Cohen, 1998). In recent years, SCU-North has established academic programs that encourage cross-border studies and regional studies. The school's participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory was a turning point in the school's transition towards a broader focus on internationalization. SCU-South decided to participate in the ACE lab around the same time as SCU-North.

SCU-South

SCU-South opened its doors in the mid-1800s to create teachers for its local economy. Over the years, the normal school expanded its scope of focus, eventually becoming recognized as a comprehensive university that would eventually become part of its state's university system. SCU-South is located in a very small, rural town with a population below 20,000. In fact, there are nearly as many students enrolled at SCU-South as there are in the town.

SCU-South traces its earliest internationalization activity back to the World War II era. One distinction from SCU-North is a long history of student activism around a variety of world events that were important to the campus community at that time. Like SCU-North, this southern comprehensive university also committed resources towards academic programs that promoted cross-border studies and regional studies.

The next sections describe how both SCUs evolved into institutions that developed broader interest in internationalization. A cross-case analysis of the perspectives of participants from both SCUs are discussed under two categories: (1) How internationalization happened and (2) How internationalization works at the SCU.

How Internationalization Happened at the SCU

This section discusses what participants believed were key elements to creating an increased emphasis on internationalization at their respective institutions. A majority of participants from both SCUs highlighted campus climate and communication as key factors in pursuing comprehensive internationalization at their institutions. Additionally, participants at SCU-North shared that a change in administrative structure was also critical for internationalization at their institution. At SCU-South, participants described an external requirement as another key impetus for making internationalization a larger priority at their institution. The following paragraphs discuss these findings in some detail.

Campus climate and Communication. A review of participant responses at both SCUs found similar themes as a change in the *campus climate* and enhanced *communication* among colleagues resonated as an impetus for a broader focus on internationalization at both institutions. First, the majority of “internationalization advocates” at both institutions were

predominantly faculty, which is reflective of the research on SCUs, schools where faculty are generally asked take a more active role in institutional service (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2009).

For both institutions, the impetus for internationalization was gradually supported by a slow expansion of campus actors, largely faculty, who began to see the value or relevance of internationalization to their area of expertise or role on campus. For example, one faculty member at SCU-South described the campus environment towards internationalization prior to the school's participation in the ACE lab as disjointed. "If I wanted to work in Mexico, I didn't think about if the University had a relationship with some institution or whatever," one SCU-South faculty member shared. The participant added:

I just did it...complete freedom! But the flipside of that, of course, was that you were working on your own and that's very hard to build something that's lasting because it depends on a single person. It's not very institutionalized. Of course you had to worry about money. You could not do anything that was more broad-based. It was very ad hoc.

At SCU-South, a small cluster of faculty mobilized with supportive administrators to investigate opportunities to learn more about and capitalize on the work people were doing in silos. Hence, the school's decision to invest resources (nearly \$10,000) to participate in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, a roughly 2-year capacity building initiative for higher education institutions that want to increase internationalization activity throughout their institutions (American Council on Education, 2017).

A similar story emerged from the accounts provided by interview participants at SCU-North. Faculty advocates from SCU-North also highlighted participation in the ACE internationalization lab as a capacity building tool, in terms of helping core faculty members and supportive administrators to be more cognizant of the international activity, e.g., research already taking place at their institution.

“It’s not that we didn’t want to do more or that everything we were doing was done well, but we showed our campus administration that we not only do internationalization, but we do it very well,” one SCU-North faculty participant shared.

At SCU-North, a small number of faculty advocates for internationalization were credited with documenting international activities that were later shared with the institution’s administration to highlight the potential for the SCU to become more internationalized. This contributed to the institutional support that financed the school’s participation in the ACE internationalization lab.

Participants’ reflections from both SCUs on the internationalization illustrated a change in the campus climate through capacity building from the ACE lab, which helped participants at both institutions to become more aware of the international work that was already happening on their campuses. “What I would say now, 10 years later, is that the number of key personnel [working toward internationalization] is higher,” One SCU-North faculty member reflected. “There are more of us who are working consistently toward internationalization efforts.”

Participants at both institutions believe the number of faculty advocates has steadily grown since being part of the ACE internationalization lab. A core group of impassioned believers at these institutions changed their environment through small segments of engagement that over time began to influence peers of the importance of internationalization on their campuses (Burke, 2014; Gladwell, 2000).

A majority of participants at both SCUs attributed enhanced communication as a key factor in the increased engagement with internationalization at both institutions. Specifically, there was a perception that peer-to-peer sharing of international-related projects led by faculty that were already happening over time helped to build momentum for internationalization in both

cases. At SCU-North, the growing plurality of voices among faculty, mostly, and some staff was actually instrumental in gaining support from the institution to invest in ACE's two-year internationalization project. "That was valuable because we could present the administration an example of the work already underway. To get that on paper in a formal fashion, here's all the players, this is what we're doing..." one SCU-North faculty member shared. Participation in the ACE internationalization project would provide the needed structure to help advocates at SCU-North better capture all of the internationalization activities organized by both faculty, e.g. teaching, service and staff, e.g., student programming, library services, etc.

Participants at SCU-South, an institution that dwarfs SCU-North in terms of student enrollment and campus acreage, had a similar experience. Prior to taking part in the ACE project, there was a perception that while international activities occurred on campus, there was little coordination on activities. According to some participants, no thread existed to connect international expertise that was already incubating on the campus in several departments including a foreign language department of more than 10 faculty members. The institution's participation in the ACE internationalization project, with a team led by its senior international officer (SIO) was viewed by the majority of SCU-South participants as a key moment for greater communication, which eventually led to increased participation among faculty and staff participants. Through the lab activities, campus advocates also learned best practices and challenges at other institutions, which contributed to the realization for some participants' that SCU-South was actually well positioned to increase internationalization activity at the institution. One SCU-South faculty member shared the following:

One of the intriguing things was, through the process (Internationalization Lab) we would meet with other groups (University teams), ultimately when people were talking to us about what we were doing, they kept on saying, 'Wow! You're doing a really good job!

That's a good idea!' We found that we were actually, comparatively speaking, doing a really good job.

The planned change of participating in the ACE Laboratory with the aim of improving internationalization on their campuses yielded at least one outcome that reflected revolutionary change. Both institutions had become more informed about the nature of internationalization that already existed on their campuses and were able to articulate this message to the wider campus and local community. This was a way to build out long-term organizational support for internationalization efforts (Burke, 2014; Gersick, 1991; Gladwell, 2000).

Administrative structure. Participants from SCU-North identified positive changes in the administrative structure as a catalyst for increased internationalization activity. Changes included the restructuring of the international education office to create two separate units, one focused on student mobility (study abroad) and the other focused on academic initiatives, which was viewed by SCU-North participants as an important outcome of the institution's investment in the two-year ACE Internationalization laboratory.

Additionally, a majority of SCU-North participants credited the institution's administration for listening to the small, but burgeoning movement of faculty and staff personnel advocating for internationalizing the campus. After years of languishing in hard-to-find locations on the campus, the institution's two international education offices were eventually relocated to more visible office spaces on campus with high student/faculty traffic in the vicinity. "They have literally elevated us to the most prominent building on campus," one faculty member shared. "Real estate is hard to come by on a college campus."

In comparison to the SCU-South campus, SCU-North has a smaller base of operations for promoting mobility programs for students and faculty, and for promoting campus-based internationalization activities. Perhaps this helps to explain how participants at SCU-North

framed increased staffing as a major catalyst for internationalization on the campus. The impression from a majority of SCU-North participants was that the restructuring of international offices represented a form of transformational change, as described by Eckel and Kezar (2003), in how the institution would manage international-related initiatives going forward. Prior to this change, there was a point when a former Provost had assumed responsibility of international initiatives, which participants found to be a less effective strategy. This key change in the administrative structure transformed the way the institution would manage its international activities going forward as senior administrators and tenure-track faculty members were no longer expected to handle the added responsibility of managing the SCU's international programs. The change also released faculty members from the strain of additional administrative work on top of the expectations already existing at SCUs (Henderson, 2007).

Some participants at SCU-South also mentioned an increase in international program staff as a way to sustain internationalization, but more key positions were already in place at SCU-South to help facilitate what they would argue are still the early stages of their institutional transformation towards internationalization. SCU-South also differentiated from its northern peer in this part of the study because its internationalization efforts overlapped with the development of a reaccreditation strategy.

External pressure. SCU-South was required by its accrediting body, the SACS, to develop a multi-year plan of campus wide engagement on a particular issue that demonstrates the institution's achievement of accreditation standards (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, 2017). After gauging the interests of the faculty, staff, and students, the university adopted an accreditation plan that focused internationalizing curricular and co-curricular activities.

SCU-South weighed several initiatives to make the primary focus of its re-accreditation plan, but ultimately chose internationalizing learning experiences because of the depth and breadth of its reach across the campus. “Almost all of it went directly to things that benefited students and faculty,” one faculty member shared. “That made some financial sense, in that respect. If you’re going to have to devote a certain amount of money to something, at least make sure that it really speaks to your core function, which is instruction and the people who provide that instruction.”

External pressure to provide evidence of the institution’s meeting or exceeding accreditation standards was viewed by participants as a key driver of internationalization at the school. The process of determining institutional focus for the accreditation involved a clash of ideals and values as some campus actors, according to participants, campaigned for other initiatives, including diversity and sustainability, and questioned the appropriateness of internationalizing the institution over the aforementioned issues. After a period of negotiations and campus-wide dialogue within academic departments and the larger college bodies, a plurality of campus participants led by internationalization advocates eventually agreed on an accreditation strategy that reflected some of those ideals. SCU-South is currently in the middle phase of implementing that accreditation strategy and most participants marked this as a key moment that led to an enhanced focus on internationalization. The external pressure of reaccreditation created an opportunity for the institution to create campus-wide strategy where internationalization was a key focus. This outcome of change has long-term implications for the institution that continue to unfold (Burke, 2014; Gersick, 1991). The next section examines participant perspectives regarding the state of internationalization at the two SCUs.

How Internationalization Works at the SCU

A majority of participants from both SCUs had similar views on how internationalization was successfully implemented. Key areas were collaborations and partnerships, changes in administrative structure and staffing, and changes to curricular experiences that reflect the influence of internationalization. The following programs offer detail on these perspectives.

Collaborations and partnerships. In discussing the state of internationalization at their respective institutions, participants from both SCUs described an emphasis on *collaborations and partnerships* as a key driver of internationalization at their respective institutions. Specifically, there was an emphasis on international partnerships that created opportunities to do collaborative work in local school districts or community centers. For instance, there were references to international scholars or students interacting with children from locals at both institutions. Descriptions of this particular activity were more robust at SCU-South as its School of Education illustrated several examples of exchange projects that involved its student teachers visiting schools abroad and international school teachers visiting SCU-South as well as elementary school-aged students in neighboring schools to share cultural and educational practices. One SCU-South faculty member shared that her daughter benefited from such an exchange program, organized by the institution's international office in partnership with the School of Education, when a school teacher from the Middle East region visited her daughter's classroom. I know, as a parent, that internationalization has an impact on the community," the faculty member shared. "This is predominantly...a more rural community and there's not a large Muslim population...to meet somebody from Pakistan was really incredible."

Other SCU participants shared detailed accounts of international partnerships feeding into community networks. For example, one professor from the arts described leading students on

research projects in Sub-Saharan Africa and forming linkages that were later fomented through a reciprocal visit from colleagues at partner institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa to the SCU-South campus. The faculty member described a deep connection that extended beyond common interest in the arts and into the community by attending football games, participating in choir practice at a community church, and visiting local schools to give music classes. “And so there’s this presence, now, it’s both a musical presence so the discipline is represented, but it’s a cultural presence of things that only those students, those low percentage of students that’s been able to go to Africa has experienced,” the faculty participant shared. “Now it’s in their classes, now it’s in their choir practices. That to me is impact...and it’s in the community.” The emphasis on collaborations and partnerships also resonated in the discussions with participants from SCU-North.

Participants at SCU-North discussed the value of internationalization through local engagement in more broad terms. One faculty member suggested that there were pockets of Education students, for example, that have participated in grant-funded trainings to help select students integrate the concept of internationalization as part of their curriculum and teaching strategies. The professor added that while such projects would benefit local districts served by graduates, such efforts to localize internationalization through community were not as well organized.

Still, some participants acknowledged that the existing cultural diversity of the town and campus offered potential for future internationalization efforts locally. One staff participant was surprised when they realized upon venturing off campus that SCU-North was located in a town that held a surprisingly large number of immigrants who were receptive to some of the institution’s local initiatives focused on internationalization. The participant added that

increasing the number of faculty members recruited internationally also contributed to the cultivation of local partnerships that enhanced in the institution's profile in the area of internationalization.

Some participants also cited the school's affiliation with the state's higher education system as an asset for advancing internationalization through collaborations with peer institutions on study abroad programs or online courses that might bring students together from university partners in the US and abroad. "Those connections to other institutions is real important on this campus," one faculty member shared. "If we can tell our President that we are working with top tier institutions– his ears perk up." SCU-North also sought to broaden participation in "education abroad" through integration of technology in institutional partnerships, thereby reaching students who could not afford to travel overseas.

ACE (2017) recommends sustaining international partnerships through strong organizational management that extends beyond the relationship of faculty experts, whose contact with an institution would be limited to her research agenda or faculty-led course (Gatewood & Sutton, 2017).

If you examine international partnerships driven by institutions rather than individual experts, it really would depend on the context surrounding the institutional engagement. A connection like the one referenced at SCU-South that involved an exchange of teachers from different countries, to institute such program would require deep levels of coordination to facilitate that kind initiative would need change advocates to manage the various components of coordination for buy-in and successful implementation (Burke, 2014; Gladwell, 2000). It would also take a great set of institutional partners who are open to substantial collaboration.

Both SCUs maintain an exhaustive list of education abroad partnerships for students interested in studying away for a semester or intercession break or pursuing an internship. Both institutions also offer resources for faculty development towards creating pedagogy or research that links with existing or new institutional partners. Beyond descriptions shared by faculty participants, the nature of these partnerships is not entirely clear for either institution. A list of SCU-South's existing international partnerships from the school's webpage indicates more than 50 such partnerships. The majority of these partnerships are for study abroad exchange programs or faculty teaching/research collaborations. In few cases, SCU-South has developed dual degree programs with international partner institutions. Similar activities have occurred at SCU-North, but on a slightly smaller scale as they have less than 30 institutional partners abroad, but campus advocates work with the administration to identify institutional partner institutions that mesh well with a plurality of faculty scholarship interests.

Administrative structure and staffing. Another common theme from the findings was the description of the organizational structure that reflected long-term support for internationalization at both SCUs. A majority of SCU-North participants cited the success of the restructured international education offices as proof that internationalization continued to emerge as an institution-wide priority. The prime location of the offices and the good working relationship between the personnel in those offices and the faculty were key examples of success. Additionally, faculty and staff participants largely agreed that the SCU-North administration continued to be supportive of internationalization activity at the institution, however, one staff participant suggested that the institution could do more with the recommendations produced in their internationalization strategic plan as such as increase efforts for international student recruitment, as resources were limited in that area.

One faculty participant from SCU-North opined that the Provost at the time of the interviews was not the chief academic officer when the institution participated in the Internationalization Laboratory, which was several years prior. Therefore, the Provost was perceived to not be as enthusiastic about internationalization as the institution's President by some campus advocates. "I don't think our current chief academic officer is *not* committed to internationalization," the faculty member shared during the interview. "You've got to convince him. He has to be convinced on the bottom line. Most of the administrative change that occurred following the school's participation in the ACE internationalization lab have continued or expanded, confirming the institution's commitment to some iteration of comprehensive internationalization.

Participants at SCU-South described the organizational structure as largely supportive of internationalization efforts in part because of the current accreditation plan focused on internationalization, but also due to its willingness to hire personnel to manage a growing international education office that manages a large portfolio of student mobility programs, faculty mobility programs, and more than 50 international partnerships. There was a near consensus about the former, in terms of administrative support, but participants were divided about the level of support for the campus' international education office. "We're increasing our numbers, sending more students abroad, doing more things, but everybody's a director, everybody's a manager, we really need administrative staff," one faculty member commented. Over time, the SCU-South international office increased its staff with support from the institution's administration.

A majority of SCU-South participants highlighted organizational support through the institution's budgetary commitment to staffing personnel to implement its reaccreditation plan

Support includes salary for a faculty member in charge of an office to implement the plan as well as administrative staff that are shared with the international education office. Some faculty participants acknowledged this visible support for internationalization from the administration, but lamented that the institution was capable of doing far more to advance internationalization. “We have to have a committed person or a committed group of people whose job it will be to make sure that, from day one here at the University, students will get idea of what we’re trying to do with them right up to their senior year,” one faculty member commented.

In the year following these interviews, the administration appointed a faculty member to serve in a senior administrative role to oversee all international-related activities at the SCU as the institution began implementing its internationalization plan as part of its reaccreditation process. Essentially, the pace of change in this instance was driven by the university prioritizing internationalization around an institution-wide mandate (reaccreditation) to meet external education quality standards (Kezar, 2001).

Administrative plan (Reaccreditation strategy). SCU-North includes language within one its strategic planning goals to support internationalization, which is significant for the SCU. The situation at SCU-South differs, however in that its efforts to internationalize are tied to a reaccreditation strategy, required every five years (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, 2017).

A majority of participants at SCU-South tied much of the recent institutional support for internationalization to the implementation phase of its reaccreditation plan, which represented a campus wide mandate to, at the very least, internationalize curricular initiatives such as first-year general education courses and increasing the number of faculty-led study abroad courses. Students are now required to take additional foreign language course work. The accreditation

plan also included faculty development opportunities to assist professors in adapting courses to receive an international designation.

“We always had supporters in certain departments and certain areas,” one staff member shared. “But, since the accreditation plan, it’s forced everyone to really think about what area they’re involved in, whether it’s food services, or whether it is the tech department or the English department, all of the departments and colleges, to really think about how they are contributing to internationalization on campus.”

The immediate successes attributed to implementation of the re-accreditation plan also raise important questions about the sustainability of these initiatives, in this case the sustainability of an attempt at comprehensive internationalization. SCU-South will need to develop a new accreditation plan every five years to meet SACS standards. What happens to the infrastructure to support comprehensive internationalization after the life-cycle of the re-accreditation plan? Where will the incentive come from to continue these initiatives? Currently, the re-accreditation plan includes generous funding for faculty member to develop an array of international collaborative works for teaching and research. It is reasonable to expect many of these projects to be at-risk once the mechanism of external pressure has ended and the University is reaccredited.

Some faculty participants pointed to a critical outcome from the re-accreditation strategy, which focused on internationalizing the curriculum in ways that might alleviate concerns about sustainability of internationalization at SCU. One example would be the internationalizing general education courses for incoming students. An initiative thought by some participants to have long-term impact on curriculum planning and teaching across disciplines at the institution.

Curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Participants from both institutions discussed comprehensive internationalization in the context of curricular and co-curricular activities. A majority of participants at SCU-North participants highlighted changes such as an increase in the number of online courses with students from other countries that were available to SCU-North students. Also, the number of students engaged in Education Abroad experiences had increased. SCU-North participants also cited student engagement through campus activities and clubs focused on international relations such as the Model United Nations. Both campuses had international education offices located in campus buildings that were frequented by students regularly, making the planning of student-centered initiatives on campus advantageous.

Participants at both campuses also highlighted the need to continue building internationalization-related programs on campus that could reach the majority of students that would not likely go abroad. Both campuses enjoy support for interdisciplinary academic programs focused on world regions and languages. SCU-South appears to have a larger budget to hire language specialists to teach a variety of languages including Spanish, French, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic. Additionally, SCU-South is enjoying a myriad of mobility program opportunities for both students and faculty through its re-accreditation plan.

As is the case with most initiatives at SCUs (Henderson, 2007, 2009) faculty members are leading the implementation of the re-accreditation strategy, with some input from other campus divisions including student affairs and admissions. The governance structure for these initiatives at SCU-South includes a broad list of stakeholders, the majority of whom were not directly part of the ACE Internationalization Laboratory. Meanwhile at SCU-North, the campus governance for its internationalization committees, including curriculum internationalization,

largely consists of the same actors that were involved with the SCU-North's ACE Internationalization Laboratory team.

The findings highlight paralleled experiences at the SCUs that show common experiences as well as the critical nuances within these organizational structures and the elements that can drive such institutions to pursue broad sweeping changes in an effort to meet external demands from the industry and the general public. The next section discusses the importance of the findings and includes comments on discrepant data that offers important context for the analysis.

Discussion

A review of findings from two SCUs in different regions of the US show similar patterns among participants' descriptions of internationalization activity at their respective institutions. A number important observations came to light including a realization that while these SCUs differed in a variety of ways including by geography, enrollment size, and available resources, both institution were quite similar regarding how internationalization gained momentum at both campuses and how it has been maintained. Conversely, the key differences between the two cases is also important to highlight as some elements will determine the long-term viability of internationalization at both institutions.

How Internationalization Happened

The organizational transition towards broader support for internationalization at SCU-North and SCU-South was propelled by a change in the campus climate at both institutions led by a core of international advocates, with the support of the key administrators who realized the need for emphasizing international education. Hurd (2007) identified these actors as *campus champions* in study, as advocates who were vital to influencing change at the institution. In the SCU environment particularly, these advocates were very likely to be faculty members as they

are expected to commit to a wider variety of activities in comparison with peers at doctoral research institutions (Henderson, 2009, 2011; Wright et al., 2004).

Another common finding at the SCUs (included below in table 6) was the role of increased communication among colleagues at both institutions. Specifically, faculty with international expertise creating buy-in among their peers. Both campuses had internationalization committees that were represented the interests of faculty members in several disciplines. The faculty advocates on these committees coordinated with their administrations and some staff personnel to build wider support for internationalization at their institutions by advocating at department meetings and faculty gatherings in their respective academic division.

Table 6

<i>How internationalization happened: Themes</i>	
SCU-North	SCU-South
Change in Campus Climate	Change in Campus Climate
Increased Communication	Increased Communication
Administrative Structure	External pressure

A majority of participants believed this was the most significant contribution of the two-year ACE Internationalization Laboratory, as it provided a structure for community members, primarily faculty, to become more aware of colleagues among the faculty and staff who were active internationally or had interests that would contribute to an overall international strategy.

The small, but growing number of studies on institution-wide internationalization all cite communication as a key factor among their findings (Davis, 2016; Hurd, 2007; Piazza, 2015). In the ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012) increased communication can be applied to the *Articulated Institutional Commitment* section, where a campus-wide taskforce is

an essential component, bringing stakeholders together to advance campus internationalization (American Council on Education, 2012).

The findings also found distinctions between the two SCUs with respect to internationalization processes. At SCU-South, support for internationalization centered on the school's re-accreditation strategy. Participants tied the evolution and the current state of internationalization to their accreditation strategy focused on internationalization of learning experiences. This accompanied both the promise of financial support for related initiatives in a difficult budget environment.

The immediate outcomes of the re-accreditation plan have significantly enhanced internationalization activity at SCU-South, in terms of increased funding for faculty mobility programs, student mobility programs, and collaborate research with faculty from partnership institutions in the US and abroad. The changes were revolutionary for SCU-South as external pressure to meet accreditation standards galvanized broad campus engagement and internal pressure to eventually determine a campus plan focused on the internationalization of learning was the right strategy for the SCU (Burke, 2014).

At SCU-North, an emphasis on increased staffing and resources to support internationalization was viewed as an impetus for wide-scale efforts to push for comprehensive internationalization. Specifically, the resulting change created one administrative role to oversee all international program related to mobility and one position to focus on curriculum and campus-based programming centered on international education. Additionally, the relocation of the school's international education office to a more frequented location on campus from the basement in a less frequented building was also viewed as a key reason for the increased emphasis on internationalization at their institution.

Essentially, how internationalization happened at both SCUs differs by external/internal factors. For SCU-South, it was a combination of external pressure from an accrediting body to produce a re-accreditation plan and the internal influence of campus stake holders – mostly faculty members, with some staff and student support – that led to the school adopting an accreditation plan focused on internationalization. At SCU-North, it was the combination of internal support of institutional leadership to commit scarce dollars towards increased resources for internationalization and the active campaigning of a small, but dedicated number of international advocates, who are again mainly faculty, to mobilize broader support for internationalization.

An important observation in understanding how internationalization happened at these two SCUs is the combination of gradual, but continuous changes that occurred e.g., increased communication among peers over time and the key organizational decisions that had lasting impact on the institutions, e.g., the restructuring of key offices and the adoption of a campus-wide plan (Burke, 2014). The findings illustrate that internationalization, similar to other initiatives at public comprehensive institutions, is largely predicted on its faculty members to lead the process (Henderson 2007; Wright et al., 2004). In the case of SCU-South, the external factors that influenced priorities towards internationalization provide a dynamic stimulant to help propel change. In the case of SCU-North, the incremental work of campus advocates eventually manifested itself through the influencing of a significant reorganization that improved campus internationalization.

Is Internationalization Working?

Overall, participants from both institutions identified markers of success with their internationalization strategies. Below in table 7, the findings illustrate that participants from both SCUs had similar views on what made internationalization work at their institutions.

Table 7

<i>How internationalization works: Themes</i>	
SCU-North	SCU-South
Collaborations and Partnerships	Collaborations and Partnerships
Administrative structure and staffing	Administrative structure and staffing
Curricular and co-curricular	Curricular and co-curricular
	Administrative plan (Accreditation)

SCU-North and SCU-South highlighted enhanced engagement with local community members and international partners as result of increased support for internationalization at their respective campuses. Participants from both institutions explicitly and implicitly linked their historical missions at institutions founded to serve local constituencies with a broader vision of internationalization through cultural exchanges.

Both institutions also pointed to administrative structures as evidence of progress towards internationalization at their institutions. As previously mentioned, participants at SCU-North viewed the restructuring of its international education unit as an organizational turning point in favor of campus internationalization. At SCU-South, the administrative support through the hiring of additional personnel to implement internationalization strategy and the overall growth of internationalization-related activities were signs of significant and sustained progress towards internationalization at their institution.

One important distinction among themes was the source of support for many current international endeavors at SCU-South: a campus mandate to advance internationalization as part of its reaccreditation plan for the University. The external pressure for reaccreditation offered SCU-South an opportunity to develop a plan for change that would transform the way the institution would prioritize internationalization. Given the success of the plan, with it being adopted as the institution's reaccreditation strategy, it can be argued that the SCU's attempt at transformational change produced a change outcome that was revolutionary, at least in the short run as the accreditation plan was only for five years (Burke, 2014). Still it is an important aspect of the findings to highlight. There were other themes that did not resonate as much, but still provide added context and some caveats for the findings of this study.

Discrepant data

Nearly a third of the total number of participants at both institutions described internationalization as a work in progress. One participant at SCU-South described their process as "emergent internationalization." A few more participants at SCU-North articulated a perspective on internationalization as an initiative that required a methodical, sustained momentum that would likely extend beyond the careers of current advocates for it to be successful.

Among some cautiously optimistic participants at SCU-South, there was concern expressed about the long-term viability of internationalization at the SCU because of the level of commitment required of its faculty members. Several participants at SCU-South, faculty and administrators, acknowledged the challenging reality for many faculty members at SCUs where the demands for commitment to teaching, research, institutional service and community service (Henderson, 2007; Wright et al., 2004) can be unreasonable. The word "tired" was mentioned

numerous times in reference to faculty engagement at SCU-South in general, but also in relation to how faculty morale might affect the long-term viability of internationalization in a higher education environment where faculty members are asked to be, in some instances, de facto leaders of the institution.

A clear deficiency identified at both institutions was the presence of faculty policies or practices that reflected internationalization as a relevant component of the faculty tenure and review process (American Council on Education, 2017). However, the reality at most higher education institutions is that international work is not quite a key determining factor for faculty tenure and promotion (Helms, 2015). This would represent a clash of ideals and ethics within academia should US institutions begin to adopt review policies (Kezar, 2001) that implied international research or teaching should be weighted significantly for faculty review for tenure and promotion.

Overall, both cases show great opportunity for growth of internationalization as well as the fragility of institutional support and momentum at SCUs that makes sustaining internationalization quite difficult. Both SCUs exhibited attributes of comprehensive internationalization. Conversely, the findings support the notion that there is no monolithic approach to comprehensive internationalization in any higher education context (American Council on Education, 2012; Hudzik, 2011). For example, both institutions have articulated a commitment to internationalization through the institutional Web pages and campus documents outlining strategies for advancing internationalization. SCU-South had more publicly accessible documents to review, but both institutions exhibited attributions of work towards their iteration of comprehensive internationalization.

A review of the findings through the lens of organizational change literature also highlighted the ambiguity of comprehensive internationalization as a type of organizational change (Hudzik 2015). Both cases offered change outcomes that illustrated how internationalization in the context of the SCU can exhibit attributes of both evolutionary change and revolutionary change. In the case of SCU-North, the core team of advocates built a case for increased support for internationalization over the years, which led to its participation in the ACE Laboratory and the subsequent restructuring of how the SCU's international offices, which was a revolutionary change outcome for the institution (Burke, 2014). Conversely, the efforts of SCU-North campus advocates for internationalization did not lead to dramatic change in mission towards internationalization, aside from inclusion among several other priorities. In that regard, the change is more evolutionary as the strategic mission did not significantly shift toward greater prioritization of internationalization (Burke, 2014).

The results were similar at SCU-South except their internationalization efforts were in at least some ways affected by external factors: public scrutiny over the value of public higher education in a politically conservative state and regional accreditation requirements. From the interviews, documents, and Web resources, it was clear that the latter external factor weighed heavily in its decision to explore a campus wide process for internationalization.

Conversely, an analysis of findings also shows that the campus was actively building support for internationalization through sense making or internationally-engaged colleagues reasoning with less engaged colleagues over time through evidence of research, faculty-led courses that yielded student participation (Kezar, 2001; Weick 1995). The engagement of colleagues remains a work in progress, but the accomplishment of forging institutional plan for internationalization is radical change for the institution. At the same time, it remains known how

the institution will change once the SCU is once again up for reaccreditation at the end of its current 5-year cycle.

Despite the examples of progress at both SCUs, the future of internationalization at both institutions are uncertain. Both SCUs expressed concern over waning state support. Moreover, future support for internationalization at both institutions rests in the hands of the collectives of internationalization advocates and whatever support they can continue to muster from their respective administrations.

CHAPTER FOUR: AN EXAMINATION OF COMPETING
INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES TO INTERNATIONALIZATION AT
STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs)

This chapter focuses on the complexities to fitting internationalization into institutional priorities in an environment with limited financial resources. In some cases, those limited resources are coupled with high expectations of productivity from the general public and the State Legislature. Additionally, there are other campus priorities that might be viewed as equally if not more pressing for the institution.

Interviews with faculty, staff, and administrative leaders from two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) are examined along with institutional Web pages and documents to understand how these institutions deal with internationalization as one its competing interests (Henderson, 2007). The chapter adds to the literature on comprehensive internationalization as a phenomenon within the public higher education context, particularly the unique context of the SCU. Detailed accounts of the challenges with implementing internationalization at an SCU are examined from participants who were part of a multiyear efforts to lead an expansion of internationalization initiatives at their institutions.

Literature Review

This manuscript chapter is part of a dissertation that aims to better understand how comprehensive internationalization can work in U.S. public higher education. I am particularly interested in what Henderson (2009) called SCUs, which are public universities that are typically more focused on teaching and service than research, yet with some expectations that faculty maintain research commitments that rival peers at research universities (Henderson, 2007, 2009).

These institutions were historically normal schools or teacher's colleges that eventually developed into teaching universities, which offered predominantly bachelor's degrees, master's degrees and a few doctoral degrees (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2009). In chapter two, I examined how campus advocates at SCUs conceptualized comprehensive internationalization, which was indicative of how these internationalization advocates might direct limited time and energies towards internationalization at their respective institutions. Findings indicated that these campus champions for internationalizations, who are mostly faculty, conceptualized comprehensive internationalization largely around curriculum internationalization (Griffin, 2017a).

Though a comfortable, organic approach for a majority of participants discussing comprehensive internationalization, a focus on curriculum posed a potential limitation to the long-term sustainability of comprehensive internationalization as their perception of the concept that did not necessarily capture aspects of internationalization outside of teaching and research. Moreover, this was a significant point because their notions of comprehensive internationalization were largely fragmentations of the American Council on Education (ACE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012), which these institutions leveraged as guidance for how internationalization could look at their institutions.

Chapter three provided more perspective on the thought process of the mostly faculty participants interviewed for my study. Through their descriptions of how internationalization happened and what internationalization was in its current state, it was better understood how comprehensive internationalization was supported and constrained in an SCU-environment. For both institutions, a supportive campus environment that included both faculty and administrative leadership was found to be essential to generating broader support for campus wide

internationalization (Griffin, 2017b). Additionally, both SCUs interpreted internationalization through the expansion of institutional partnerships, changes in administrative structure and changes in the curriculum. Additionally, external factors such as a reaccreditation requirement was critical to the sustainability and growth of comprehensive internationalization at one of the SCUs (Griffin, 2017b).

I build on this prior work to study the long term viability of comprehensive internationalization by examining the difficult choices these two SCUs face in terms of setting institutional priorities. Recent publications on the state of public higher education paint a picture that suggests it will remain difficult for SCUs to find additional resources for broad, aspirational initiatives such as comprehensive internationalization. Before delving into some of the background on the growing crises in U.S. public higher education, this paper will briefly discuss the concept of comprehensive internationalization. Researchers affiliated with education associations such as the ACE and the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) began to look at internationalization as more of an institutional process rather than from the various aspects of international activity that commonly associated with internationalization. Soon ACE developed a series of research volumes that introduced the concept of comprehensive internationalization (American Council on Education, 2012; Green, 2005; Olson, 2006). NAFSA also developed a series of position papers that explored this notion of comprehensive internationalization as a way to implement internationalization at the institutional level (Hudzik, 2011).

While internationalization of universities might focus on adding global courses to the curriculum or adding study abroad programs, comprehensive internationalization refers to wide-ranging, integrated efforts that organize the campus around an international focus. The concept

of comprehensive internationalization for this manuscript chapter is framed through the research of the ACE Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) (2017). Their Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (See Table 8 below) outlines a holistic definition of comprehensive internationalization illustrates how it is a process intended to impact the entire campus and its systems.

Table 8:

Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement Model for Comprehensive Internationalization

Rubric	Description
Articulated institutional commitment	Internationalization is established as a priority, i.e. mission statement, a strategic plan, establishing a task force committed to campus internationalization.
Administrative structure and staffing	Resources dedicated to international programs office with professional staff and/or faculty members who manage several internationalization activities and programs.
Curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes	Academic offerings with a focus on global trends, Area Studies, and foreign language skill development. Co-curricular programming that reinforces internationalization of curriculum.
Faculty policies and practices	International work valued in faculty tenure process. Faculty with a background of international research or practice. Funding and institutional support for international research.
Student mobility	Resources to give more domestic students access to education abroad activities. Strategic plan to increase international student population on campus.
Collaboration and partnerships	International partnerships that impact the entire institution. The development of campus-wide policies for the cultivating international partnerships.

Note. Adapted from “The Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement” by the American Council on Education (2012), *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses, 2012 edition*.

The six strands of the ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012) are: (1) *Articulated institutional commitment*, which focuses on internationalization as a priority through mission statements and a strategic plan; (2) *Administrative structure and staffing*, which involves a commitment of human resources to advance internationalization initiatives; (3)

Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes, focuses on transforming academic programs and co-curricular programs to reflect internationalization; (4) *Faculty policies and practices*, which focuses internationalization affecting the tenure process and faculty member's research or teaching agenda; (5) *Student mobility*, the most traditional aspect of internationalization is further enhanced; and (6) *Collaboration and partnerships*, which focuses on broadening institutional linkages abroad and locally (American Council on Education, 2012).

Comprehensive internationalization as a concept and institutional practice is beginning to gain attention from higher education scholars in recent years. Some international higher education scholars have argued that real internationalization must be comprehensive for it to be something beyond international education (de Wit, 2013). Hudzik (2015) described comprehensive internationalization as neither monolithic in approach or as a plausible adventure, institutionally, without some form of common focus among key campus actors, e.g., administration, faculty, staff, etc. His edited text includes case studies of internationalization efforts at different types of higher education institutions in countries across the globe (Hudzik, 2015). The focus of this dissertation study is the state of internationalization in U.S. higher education, particularly at SCUs.

SCUs: Ideal environment for comprehensive internationalization?

Recent dissertations have explored the feasibility of comprehensive internationalization at technical colleges (Piazza, 2015) and at community colleges (Butler, 2016) in the U.S. While these topics require further research, it is equally important to understand the potential of internationalization at SCUs, publicly funded, regional higher education institutions that enroll more than half of U.S. students attending public four-year institutions, yet receives little attention in education research (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2009). SCUs, public institutions historically started

as normal schools, community colleges, or teacher's colleges, are typically less prestigious public institutions, less selective in terms of admissions policies, and require its faculty members to focus more on teaching and service compared with faculty members at larger, flagship public research-intensive universities (Henderson, 2009, 2011; Wright et al., 2004).

One criticism of SCUs is that there is a propensity by the leadership at some of these institutions to engage in mission creep or the pursuing of popular initiatives in an effort to build prestige at their institutions in order to keep pace with more presumably prestigious, financially secure public research universities and private colleges (Baker & Baldwin, 2015; Henderson, 2009, 2011; Morphew, 2009; Wright et al., 2004). This point is salient in the context of SCUs because these institutions are funded predominantly through state-appropriated funds and student fees, two reservoirs that have been drying up of late (Fryar, 2015; Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016; Weerts & Ronca, 2012;).

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (Mitchell et al., 2016), the pace of economic recovery has been slow in the US higher education sector since the 2007-09 recession. While there has been some increase in funding for higher education at the state level, public funds for state colleges and universities has not kept pace with the rising cost of tuition, fees, and amenities common with the US college experience for undergraduate and graduate students. Mitchell et al. (2016) indicated that funding for public higher education institutions was around \$10 billion below pre-recession funding levels. Conversely, the average cost of tuition has increased by more than \$2,000 since the recession (Mitchell et al., 2016). "Because tuition increases have not fully compensated for the loss of state funding, and because most public schools do not have significant endowments or other sources of funding, many public

colleges and universities have simultaneously reduced course offerings, student services, and other campus amenities,” (Mitchell et al., 2016).

Research on public financing for US higher education has drawn a variety of conclusions over the economic situation for public higher education. For instance, Weerts and Ronca (2012) found research that supports both Democratic and Republican arguments for meager financial support, correlating the former’s legislative agenda to heavily tax with higher education spending and the latter’s propensity to cut taxes and overall spending with support for higher education (McLendon, Hearn, & Mokher, 2009; Tandberg, 2008). In their own research, Weerts and Rona (2012) argued that other public initiatives such as K-12 education and correction facilities were likely to be a greater priority for state legislatures. They also found Republican state legislatures, to their surprise, to be more generous in higher education spending compared with Democratic-led Legislatures. The study found a relationship between increased public funding for two-year colleges and Republican spending on public higher education (Weerts & Rona, 2012). A key point here is the illustration of research that examines possibilities for a decline in state funding for public higher education.

The aforementioned points on funding for US public higher education encompass all public institutions, but arguably some of the most vulnerable institutions in such an environment are the SCUs, which are more susceptible to corrosive political agendas that affix higher education into a larger discussion of accountability for taxpayer dollars. In her book chapter on SCUs, Fryar (2015) discussed her analysis of Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data that found comprehensive universities relied on state funding for nearly a third of their revenue in comparison to research universities, who get about a quarter of revenues from state appropriations (Fryar, 2015).

SCUs are typically outpaced on endowment revenues by research institutions, which Fryar (2015) examined by looking at “the value of endowment holdings, which are, on average, \$4,035 per full-time equivalent (FTE) student at historical comprehensive universities and \$20,411 per FTE at state research/flagship universities,” (Fryar, 2015, p. 33). As teacher-centric institutions, it is not surprising that SCUs on average would spend nearly half of institutional funds on instruction, however, some might argue that the commitment is not vigorously reflected in the average starting salary of assistant professors at SCUs (\$58,000) in comparison with new hires at research/flagship institutions (\$70,000) (Fryar, 2015).

A review of the public sentiment for state-funded higher education and the financial situation of SCUs raises a question of how and why internationalization would find a space among the limited number of institutional priorities that SCUs can afford. Griffin (2017a) learned that internationalization advocates at SCUs, predominantly faculty, described internationalization as a phenomenon inextricably linked with learning, therefore the potential for a base of grassroots support exists. Griffin (2017b) observed how the internationalization process can take priority at SCUs – linkages that foment communication and influence campus culture, but inevitably involve executive decision makers who find incentive to support initiatives pushed by advocates. But what happens once the threshold of implementation has been crossed? How does internationalization remain an institutional focus in an environment where resources are scant and public skepticism of state-funded higher education grows?

Challenges

First, some of the challenges raised with the internationalization of higher education include a perception that this phenomenon is another form of colonization from Western cultures through globalization (de Wit, 2013). The argument that the focus of internationalizing higher

education as a response to globalization feeds into the narrative that internationalization, as described in western research, is more market driven than it is focused on ethics of interconnectedness (de Wit, 2013). Some higher education researchers have raised this concern through research on global citizenship education, which aims for international higher education that is more inclusive in its dialogue on how the world's higher education institutions can embrace different ideologies and cultures as part of an internationalization process (Shultz, Abdi, & Richardson, 2011).

Another concern of internationalizing higher education is the increase of nationalism and ideological conflicts in the world, which pose yet-to-be determined impact on existing and potential international partnerships (Altbach & de Wit, 2015). For example, changing political dynamics could affect national policy towards higher education, as some countries have national strategies for internationalization (Helms, Rumbley, Brajkovic, & Mihut, 2015). The 2016 vote in the United Kingdom (U.K.) to leave the European Union (E.U.) has unknown consequences for higher education in the U.K. as it is not yet known how the decision to leave the E.U. affect students frequenting U.K. institutions from E.U. countries (Hunt, 2016). In the case of the U.S., which does not have a national strategy for internationalization, meaning that there is no federal standard or guidelines as to how U.S. higher education institutions might internationalize, an increase in nationalism across some states could make it increasingly difficult for higher institutions to enhance opportunities for international engagement in some parts of the country.

Despite not having a national policy or strategy for internationalization, education associations focused on internationalization research connect diverse institutions such as the ACE and Association of International Educations (NAFSA). In Hudzik's (2011) NAFSA report on comprehensive internationalization, he suggested that a homogenous approach to

internationalization implementation is not ideal because of the diversity of higher education institutions. Conversely, he added that guidelines for broader internationalization that avoid homogenization could be a feasible and intrusive approach to articulate suggested approaches for internationalizing higher education at the national level (Hudzik, 2011). Additionally, Hudzik (2011) cited the commodification of higher education through internationalization as another challenge. Green's (2005) extensive research on comprehensive internationalization with ACE highlighted potential threats to internationalization including an unclear mission related to internationalization, poor organizational structure, weak institutional zeal toward internationalization efforts, access to resources or gaining consensus among institutional constituents that it is feasible to dedicate limited financial or human capital towards internationalization (Green, 2005).

The point of consensus building or developing buy-in for initiatives highlights the issue of institutional priorities. For SCUs, the challenge of setting and meeting institutional priorities in an environment where resources are scant, largely reliant on public support (state appropriations) and many students without the capacity to pay fees, is an increasingly cumbersome reality (Fryar, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2016). In such an environment, difficult choices must be made to determine where and how limited resources are used in SCUs.

The process of changing an institution to become more internationalized comes at the expense of other initiatives. The challenge of managing competing initiatives in a higher education environment is an area that is under researched. According to Kezar (2009), whose work on organizational change in higher education is well-cited, competing interests can threaten meaningful change in institutions. "When stakeholders in higher education are aware of other projects that vie for resources and attention with theirs, the competition to move their issue up in

the pecking order can lead to paralysis, especially as leadership turns over and priorities shift,” (Kezar, 2009, p. 19). Kezar (2009) argued that sharing information and networking were approaches to build support for initiatives. In a scenario where there are numerous initiatives in competition, she suggested building a list of all competing initiatives that gives a voice to all constituents (Kezar, 2009).

The feasibility of Kezar’s (2009) approach is unclear, especially in institutions like an SCU. In a competitive environment, Kezar’s (2009) assertion of institutional paralysis seems more plausible than a scenario where constituents are willing to table their initiatives and adjust their teaching or planning for the good of the institution. In his review of change theory, Burke (2014) includes a discussion of dialectical theory, where change involves a clashing of values and agendas (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). In such an environment, the change is not seamless, but requires both creativity and diplomacy in order to find a solution that reduce tensions in a manner that is considered satisfactory (Burke, 2014; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

In an organizational environment that survives on dwindling resources, there are going to be some losers. How SCUs confront such a reality is generally not well researched. This chapter’s focus is on understanding how internationalization is handled in such scenarios. To achieve many, if not all aspects of comprehensive internationalization as defined by the ACE CIGE requires a substantial commitment from the higher education institution (American Council on Education, 2012).

The key question driving this manuscript chapter is “*How do state comprehensive universities (SCUs) manage internationalization against its competing priorities?*” The implications for addressing this question extend beyond internationalization. Aside from highlighting how, in fact, SCUs balance internationalization against other initiatives in an

environment of stretched resources and opposing values, the paper also contributes to the needed research on the organizational realities of regional public universities under increased pressure to do much with fewer resources. It offers contexts for higher education scholars and practitioners who are interested in learning more about the nuanced involved with organizational change in an environment such as an SCU.

Methods

The research question for this manuscript chapter required an in depth exploration of gathered data to understand the phenomenon of internationalization against competing priorities at SCUs in detail. It required a case study methodological approach to examine how competing interests are managed in this environment (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). This was accomplished by reviewing interview transcripts, institution documents, and institution Web pages from two SCUs that participated in this study. This qualitative case study is bound by two SCUs that engaged in strategic planning for campus wide internationalization within the last 10 years with the aid of the ACE CIGE. The names of the institutions and its participants are disclosed in this study. The institutions are given the pseudonyms SCU-North and SCU-South.

Data Collection

A total of 25 faculty and staff personnel at two SCUs participated in semi-structured interviews between October 2014 and November 2014. In December 2014, I interviewed one faculty member via Skype Internet Protocol. One SCU was located in the Northeast region of the US. The other SCU located in the U.S. Southeast region. As part of their agreement to participate in this study, two participating institutions are identified as SCU-North and SCU-South in the study. Individual participants are identified by a generic description of their role at the University.

At SCU-North, seven faculty and staff personnel participated in semi-structured interviews. An additional five faculty and staff members were part of a 45-minute focus group interview. At SCU-South, 13 faculty and staff personnel participated in individual interviews. Participants had the flexibility of answering up to 15 questions about comprehensive internationalization at their institutions. Participants were asked to give their perspective on a number of areas including the level of support from their administration, how they would describe internationalization currently at their institutions, and the elements that prompted the institution to support comprehensive internationalization. Each participant had an opportunity to review their interview transcript and to provide Email approval for their comments to be used in this study.

Data Analysis

I transcribed and reviewed each interview, then imported all transcribed text into NVivo, a Qualitative Data Analysis Software (QDAS), for further analysis (Kimbler et. al, 2013). In addition to the interviews, I also examined relevant documents from both campuses including strategic plans for internationalization from their ACE Internationalization Laboratory participation, multi-year institutional strategic plans, and relevant institutional Web pages for signs of the internationalization activity, and inactivity described in some of the interviews.

For this chapter, I analyzed the data to inform my understanding of the greatest challenges to internationalization at their institutions and how these SCUs cope with these complexities. I asked participants to describe the competing interests for internationalization at their institutions. Participants also referenced the complications of choosing internationalization over other institutional priorities throughout the interview. An inductive analysis of participant responses was performed through NVivo and identified key themes from the two SCUs, as the

initial themes stem from a review of the transcript data (Boyatzis, 1998; Thomas, 2003; Braun & Clark, 2006). A deductive analysis was then performed through an examination of those themes with literature reviewed earlier in this article, e.g., SCUs, comprehensive internationalization, and organizational change (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clark, 2006). The following sections describes the two cases and summarizes the findings.

Findings

In this section, participant's reflections of the difficulty of managing comprehensive internationalization against other competing interests for two SCUs are discussed in detail. First, this chapter will briefly describe the two SCUs, followed by a discussion of findings that highlight both a shared perspective and a strong contrast in how these institutions have confronted competing interests with internationalization.

SCU-North

This SCU began as a normal school, a school to train teachers, in the mid 1800s. Following World War II, SCU-North experienced substantial growth as did most U.S. institutions during the so-called "Mass Higher Education Era," a period lasting from 1945-1975, in which the US higher education sector had exponential growth of enrollments and academic programs to meet the swelling demand for postsecondary education (Altbach et al., 2011). During this period, SCU-North became recognized as a State Teacher's College that started offering bachelor's degrees and a few years later, master's degrees.

During the Mass Higher Education Era, SCU-North also joined its state university system and became a comprehensive institution. During this period, SCU-North also began sending students abroad. In the decades following the growth period of U.S. higher education, momentum for higher education would experience the ebbs and flows of an economy that

experienced growth and protraction (Altbach et al., 2011). In recent years, state investment in higher education has been flat, negatively affecting SCU-North's capacity to advance campus initiatives. Griffin (2017b) learned that one of the few initiatives to gain momentum within the last 10 years was internationalization, based on the institution's investment towards its participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory and the subsequent hiring of staff to manage all of its operations for student mobility.

SCU-South

Similarly, SCU-South made internationalization one of its few campus priorities at a time when public funding for higher education was flat at best. The institution is younger than SCU-North, having opened its doors in the early 1900s. Like SCU-North, it was first a normal school before growing into a Teacher's College. Unlike SCU-North, this southern comprehensive began offering bachelor's degrees several years before World War II. However, it also exhibited several milestones during the growth years of higher education, including a transition from a college to a university and inclusion in the state university system. SCU-South also received its accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (SACS) during this period. Griffin (2017a, 2017b) found that this SACS accreditation was a key driver for internationalization at SCU-South as the institution was required to develop a plan for reaccreditation around the time that campus momentum was building for internationalization among faculty, primarily. After gauging campus interest, the SCU-South accreditation plan adopted the internationalization of learning as its main campus initiative (Griffin, 2017b).

Analysis of internationalization efforts at these two SCUs makes visible the challenging realities that confront their respective plans to advance and sustain a comprehensive internationalization strategy at their institutions. Fifteen categories of competing interests cited

by participants were synthesized into three key themes: finances, state support, and faculty morale. The following section highlights the nuances of these competing interests and considers how they threatened the long-term viability of internationalization at their schools.

Competing interests: Finances

At both campuses, the issue of limited finances resonated with a strong plurality of participants. Between the two institutions, there were 33 total coded references of scarce finances as a competing interest to internationalization. At SCU-North, participants described limited finances as an impediment to realizing a more complete, ideal pattern of internationalization as opposed to a more piecemeal experience. “The value of internationalization is clear, however the resources in order to accomplish it are not always there,” one faculty member shared. “A number of faculty have a real deep-seated appreciation of internationalization and what it can do. However, resources are always limited.”

A review of state university budgets approved during the economic recession between 2007-2010 showed declines in state appropriations for institutions that were part of SCU-North’s university system. SCU-North’s state cuts were about 3.5 percent during this period. This happened to also be the same period when internationalization was gaining significant momentum at SCU-North. The institution was able to commit significant resources to hiring permanent staff to manage both the mobility programs and international curricular programs, which were identified as two key aspects of internationalization at SCU-North (Griffin, 2017b).

Despite these commitments, interview participants at SCU-North shared that additional commitments to internationalization beyond staffing critical leadership positions remained difficult due to financial pressures from other offices on campus. One academic dean shared that budget woes for SCU-North were normal, particularly in an economic climate that was slowly

recovering from an economic recession. “Would our international programs director like more staff? Probably, but the director must compete with needs for faculty, staff in residence halls, etc.” the academic dean commented. “The budget is the big place to compete and because international programs reports to the Provost, it’s the Academic Affairs budget. The Academic Affairs budget is the biggest part of our budget but inside Academic Affairs there’s lots of competition.”

SCU-North’s strategic plan does not include internationalization as one of its key priorities. It is found within a key priority focused on enhanced learning at the institution. Internationalization is one of several goals or proposed initiatives that falls under this priority. There are clear signs of support for internationalization at SCU-North as Griffin (2017a, 2017b) has previously documented; however, the evidence supports the narrative of finances as a strong competing interest with internationalization at SCU-North. My findings drew a similar conclusion at SCU-South under a very different context.

Unlike SCU-North, the articulated support for internationalization at SCU-South was quite clear as the institution had dedicated an entire Web space that outlined the institution’s short-term and long-term plans for internationalization. This included integrating internationalization into its reaccreditation plans, which focused on internationalizing the learning experience. Through the interviews, I learned that several mandates under the school’s reaccreditation plan were unfunded at the time. The fall semester was nearly complete and SCU-South was still waiting for State budget appropriations to be released.

Some faculty participants lamented that their reaccreditation plan, which gained university wide support through a campus review process, had occurred during a time when the institution’s budget, along with that of all budgets in the state’s university system, was being

reduced. One major concern was that the reaccreditation plan had budgeted to support faculty travel for research or teaching. A failure to fund faculty proposals risked harming faculty support for the internationalization of learning plan and other related internationalization initiatives. The funds would help subsidize faculty support for travel from the institution's international programs office. A review of their financials showed nearly a 35 percent drop in funding for faculty proposals over a five-year period. Hence, the funding package in the reaccreditation plan would help to buffer that aspect of campus internationalization at SCU-South.

In a follow up interview in December 2014, I learned that funding for the reaccreditation plan was finally released. An additional review of the reaccreditation plan Web pages revealed that faculty projects for international research or teaching were being funded, and those faculty recipients were sharing reports of their work. Still, the overall environment for financial support for all initiatives, including internationalization, remains tenuous as the reductions in public funding for higher education in the State continue (Pratt, 2016).

While budget woes emerged as a competing interest at both institutions, participants at SCU-South described a more distressed situation as a result of diminished annual budgets. The campus' reaccreditation strategy – to internationalize the learning experience – was in jeopardy due to a delayed budget. Moreover, the general sentiment at SCU-South was even with approved budgets, there difficult financial decisions for the institution that posed a formidable challenge to internationalization. “Chancellors, and provosts, and deans and have to decide where to put those very limited resources,” one faculty lamented. “And so when you start talking about new initiatives, for example, I was talking about new offices, new official ...those kinds of things. Their eyes start to glaze and go, ‘Well, yeah, but where’s that money coming from?’ And that’s a

reasonable question. How then can you slice that loaf of bread? It's a finite amount. I guess you can say money is a competing interest.”

The following two sections delve further into themes that resonated far more with the realities at SCU-South, hence this SCU-South will be the focal point of discussion in the subsequent section. Faculty advocates discussed internationalization in the context of their institution's relationship with state government and how the challenge of getting internationalization to its current phase has been a strain on faculty advocates.

Competing interests: State support

The managing of weakened support from the state emerged as a key theme in the findings. This was a key issue at SCU-South as 10 participants discussed the effect of the state legislature and constituent support on their campus priorities, including internationalization. Several participants reflected on consecutive years of budget cuts. A key challenge for several advocates was the increasing sentiment in their state that the SCU's priorities should be centered on the student's capacity to gain full employment following graduation.

“Our Legislature is looking at the university like a job-training place,” one faculty participant shared. “They want to see that everybody gets jobs when they leave because they feel we should use taxpayer's dollars to educate people to get jobs and of course, I also want students to get jobs in the fields that they study, but I'm more of a person who believes the University education teaches people to think and to work competently in many fields including those that maybe don't exist yet.”

Some participants argued that decreasing budgetary support from the state was in part due to a change in leadership in the Legislature and governorship that was focused on compelling public higher education institutions to produce student outcomes. One faculty

member opined that internationalization was also threatened by local and regional perceptions about the purpose of public higher education. “We have a local, domestic constituency here that I think, to some extent, is suspicious about anything that we’re doing that doesn’t apply to what their frame of reference is all about,” a faculty member shared. “This is a very insular community here... Always has been. So what goes on in the capital is not necessarily something that a lot of people here care about or want to get involved in.”

The faculty member added that the institution’s reaccreditation plan to internationalize the learning experience had the potential to ease skepticism over the value of such higher education initiatives on a regional level. This participant’s comments offered a different perspective from a majority of faculty advocates at SCU-South who identified the local and regional partnerships as a core part of internationalization at their institution (Griffin, 2017b). While other participants were not as explicit about issues with state government and public perception, other participants did allude to issues through discussion of the economy or expectations related to graduate outcomes. Some participants were more optimistic about the SCU’s relationship with the public, citing local and regional partnerships as an area of opportunity.

SCU-North also identified partnerships as a key part of internationalization at their institution, however I did not observe the public skepticism for higher education institutions at SCU-North as vividly as I did at SCU-South. Two participants from SCU-North did reference their reliance on the state government as an impediment to advancing their initiatives due to the meager budgetary support, but the general perspective from participants at SCU-North did not suggest state support or lack thereof was a key issue in terms of identifying competing interests of internationalization.

At SCU-South, participants described the impact of withering state support for public higher education in a myriad of ways that fertilized the argument that it was indeed a real competing interest at SCU-South. Aside from mounting pressure by the state government and general public to illustrate how a SCU education led to gainful employment, participants also cited other sources of degenerating state support, including an inability to give faculty and staff raises, a strict enrollment quota that limited the number of out-of-state/international students they can recruit, and an inability to fund planned initiatives on time, if at all. These examples illustrate different paths whereby the state support posed a serious threat to internationalization, despite the fact that it was integrated into a mandated reaccreditation plan. “Coming up with the vision (for internationalization) is great,” a faculty member shared. “Whether they actually get there, how close to what they want to do, depends on how much buy-in they got from the State, the faculty, the staff, the students...how much money they ended up getting...it affects how successful they are at it.”

These findings reinforce the current research that support for public higher education is on the decline (Fryar, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2016). Faculty and staff are being asked to do more with fewer resources, and demonstrate to families, the general public, and local governments that the public higher education remains a critical investment (Fryar, 2015; Weerts & Ronca, 2012). SCU-South’s commitment to internationalization, in the eyes of many state residents and government officials, may threaten what they see as the public university’s obligation to prepare students to contribute to the local economy. It was not clear from speaking with SCU-North participants if they were facing a similar issue.

Competing interests: Faculty Morale

Nearly half of the interview participants at SCU-South disclosed a concern for colleagues engaged in supporting internationalization who were reaching their limits. Both administrators and faculty members who championed internationalization admitted that it was not without a price. SCU-South participants touted the commitment of faculty to its students at SCUs, but also lamented that the environment required its staff, particularly faculty members, to engage in teaching, service, and research commitments that were well beyond the limits. Faculty participants lauded the core of faculty advocates who were committed to advancing internationalization by managing committees, developing proposals, and coordinating the necessary administrative efforts to secure wider buy-in for internationalization. “In that kind of environment you will find that there is certain level of being tired people and that may impact your success level because there are a lot of things that are going on at the same time,” a senior official shared.

One faculty member was very forthcoming with an analysis of the reality for faculty advocates of internationalization at SCU-South. “Competing interests for the faculty are simply time and reward. Our faculty don’t have the time to do these things anymore,” one faculty member shared. “Anything that faculty do to help us along with these kinds of initiatives comes out of their hides. It comes out of the time they spend on their research. It comes out of the time they spend on their teaching. It comes out of their time they spend on the god-awful number of committees we put them on. It comes out of the hide of their personal lives.”

The perspective of internationalization as a strain on faculty advocates and particularly how it is viewed as one more thing SCU faculty need to commit their limited time towards reflects the examples of faculty life at the SCU as described by Wright et al. (2004) and

Henderson (2007, 2009). The anecdotal comments from interviews and the school's Web presence showed that there was strong, concerted effort to advance internationalization. The easy accessibility of public documents that outline a strategic plan, a team of administrators and faculty members who are volunteering their time to manage campus wide internationalization effort demonstrates at least a modicum of support. The complication, as expressed by faculty participants, was that the limited resources with high expectations for faculty productivity had pushed some SCU-South faculty to a breaking point.

Conversely, the discussion of faculty morale as a competing interest with internationalization also involved the resistance to change by some faculty members who were being asked to redesign courses to reflect international content. In some cases, faculty members who taught general education courses were expected to redesign their courses to meet a new institutional requirement to have general education courses with international content. Some participants felt the reaccreditation plan was a helpful mechanism to encourage faculty to consider redesigning courses to reflect internationalization. The key, according to some participants, was that focus on internationalizing the teaching and learning experience was a more palatable way for some faculty to digest the concept of internationalization in a larger, institutional context. When the focus was more on internationalized learning than comprehensive internationalization, attitudes of some senior faculty in disciplines with strict requirements such as the Sciences or School of Education were more receptive to the concept of internationalized teaching and learning.

Still, the reality for faculty advocates at SCU-South remained that efforts to broaden support among faculty and staff towards comprehensive internationalization were not likely to be sustainable if the current environment of low resources and high expectations remained

unchanged. Some participants expressed a passion to serve students, but also an exasperation with how the optimum expectations from the State, from administrators, from students, from the community have converged on some faculty members, pushing them to a breaking point. One faculty participant lamented:

You have people on campus who are teaching 3-4 classes, those classes range from 40 to 50, sometimes to a 100 or 180 or over 200 students. Dealing with more work because there's always something else that either the State or the accrediting agencies are asking for, these people are asking for...so you're constantly on these committees doing reports or gathering data. You also have your research that you're supposed to be undertaking. Especially for younger faculty, that's it. They either push this stuff out or they're not getting tenure and promotion. When you add all of those competing interests and I've left out completely the fact that many of us have families (laughter)...we have children and wives that we'd like to see on occasion. When you add all of that, that's a competing interest because this is just one more thing, as important as we deem it to be, it's just one more thing that's loaded.

The faculty participants that I spoke with at SCU-North were largely energetic and optimistic about their efforts to advance internationalization. It is important to note that SCU-North had a smaller team of internationalization advocates. Also, while the institution was supportive of internationalization as a campus-wide effort, the scale of that effort did not compare with SCU-South, which had made internationalization central to the institution's strategic plan. This may be a key reason that advocates at SCU-North did not share similar grievances with counterparts at SCU-South concerning how promoting internationalization affected work-life balance.

Overall, the interviews with faculty and staff participants yielded nearly 15 categories of discussion on the competing interests with internationalization at SCU-North and SCU-South. Participants were clearly concerned about the funding situation for public higher education institutions without the large endowments or prestigious alumni networks. Yet, according to participants, expectations from the state and, in some cases, the community are disconnected

from the challenging realities of under-resourced public regional institutions.

Internationalization, albeit important to participants in this study, was viewed with a sobering perspective that it faced real limitations in the SCU environment. The next section briefly describes some of the discrepant categories that contribute to the aforementioned narrative of competing interests with internationalization at SCUs.

Other competing interests

Faculty and staff participants at SCU-North did not have as much of a pessimistic outlook on public perception towards higher education in their state, but participants felt internationalization may have peaked in terms of its prioritization at the institution. Several participants cited other campus initiatives such as advising services, diversity, and facilities as viable competition for scarce funding. Though SCU-North's administration committed to staffing two international offices, both faced critical budget concerns at the time of the interviews. The campus maintains its internationalization committees, which consist mostly of faculty advocates, but in terms of visibility, participants' assertions that internationalization was just one more initiative at SCU-North was debatable given that internationalization was not front and center in the institution's webpages. Conversely, a closer look at internationalization-related activities such as international partnerships, study abroad, and international students revealed several activities that demonstrated consistent activities in areas of strength for the SCU.

SCU-South is a larger campus per square mile with several thousand more enrolled students compared with SCU-North; SCU-South also has a far more visible presence of support for internationalization. Regardless, SCU-South is challenged by a sizable number of campus initiatives and priorities that rival with internationalization for commitment of limited resources. For example, a few faculty participants discussed the institution's financial commitment to

athletics as a real impediment to not only internationalization, but Academic Affairs. In recent years, the institution has invested more than \$10 million into its football program to become more competitive nationally.

The rising cost of higher education falling on the shoulders of the student is a related issue – a sizable amount of the institution’s investment in the stadium is expected to be recouped through student fees. “The students are paying more in fees and that means they’ll have less money,” one faculty member shared. “And we’re trying to tell them that internationalization is a worthwhile investment. It is an investment.” One that might be usurped by rising annual costs for students. Participants from both institutions discussed students’ capacity to afford college tuition let alone the cost of spending a summer or semester abroad, which is considered a key component of internationalization (American Council on Education, 2012).

Overall, a review of data showed two institutions working to make sense of how this phenomenon known as internationalization could fit in their complex institutions.

Balancing the competing interests

The competing interests with internationalization as described by participants at both SCUs confirmed my questions about the feasibility of sustaining comprehensive internationalization in an environment with low resources and high expectations. The impression from participants was that these institutions were managing the competing interests by varied methods. It was clear that both institutions were very sensitive to the fiscal realities for public higher education (Mitchell et. al, 2016; Weerts & Rona, 2012). The situation at SCU-North, which has staffing to support internationalization, but also the perception that internationalization is just one of a myriad of priorities for the institution, feeds into Kezar’s (2009) argument of competing interests fostering organizational paralysis. The foundation of

support for internationalization at SCU-North exists, but growth is slowed by muddled voices.

The dominant voices at SCU-North appeared content with integrating internationalization in with other campus initiatives such as engaged learning, diversity, and sustainability, that ensure slow, gradual support at the SCU.

In contrast, SCU-South's support for internationalization was out front with both its Web presence and its (delayed) funding support for faculty and student mobility programs, and for revitalizing the curriculum to reflect the prioritizing of internationalization. However, anecdotal data illustrated concern towards the state's career-outcome approach to public higher education and the increased pressure from the government and general public for fledgling SCUs to continuously prove that dwindling taxpayer dollars were well invested in their institutions. Even with the certainty of a five-year, mandatory reaccreditation plan, the viability of internationalization was confronted with the sobering reality of limited resources, weakened state support for the institution, and public skepticism of the intended function of higher education institutions.

A strategy for how SCU-South managed their competing interests appeared tied to the institution's reaccreditation plan to internationalize the learning experience, which did offer potentially lasting impact should, for example, faculty members continue to buy in to the concept of redesigning their courses to reflect international or global perspectives. What happens to internationalization after the reaccreditation process, which lasts five years, remains unclear. Interview participants were impassioned by the idea of internationalizing the campus further, but a little despondent when reflecting on the amount of strain and sacrifice involved with championing major campus initiatives in an institutional environment with limited resources and tepid public support.

At SCU-North, there was also a sobering reality that the scope of internationalization would inevitably be limited by the number of available resources. In the case of this SCU, there was collective of actors whose efforts pushed through substantive changes in the organizational structure that benefited internationalization, e.g., two permanent administrative roles to manage mobility programs and academic/community initiatives, respectively. One administrator suggested that the institution's hiring practices would also incorporate a focus, particularly for faculty hires, on selecting candidates that expressed some level of commitment to internationalization as part of their research. This was never confirmed through the institution's human resources department or the institution's job listings.

The next section will discuss the implications of these findings for scholars and practitioners with an interest in understanding how internationalization competes with other interests in SCUs.

Discussion

Two distinct SCUs provided a very different picture of internationalization at their campuses and it is generally accepted among internationalization researchers that the process is not and should be monolithic (Green, 2005; Hudzik, 2015). What is important to understand, however, is the context in which such a process would or could be implemented. For SCUs in particular, it is imperative to have access to examples of internationalization plans that are being implemented in such a challenging environment. The findings for this study highlighted the raw, complex road SCUs must travel to identify a feasible path for implementation without fracturing the institution that is rife with challenges and demands from within and outside of the institution.

The findings contribute to a broadening scope of how we understand internationalization to be implemented in public, regional universities or SCUs. In this case, we are provided with

detailed examples of the sometimes unartful ways that scholars and practitioners attempt to reason with how this phenomenon would actually fit into the larger institutional picture. An organizational portrait that participants from the study described as cracked and fading due to long-standing challenges from public skepticism over the purpose of such publicly funded institutions. It should be restated, that these participants were campus advocates of comprehensive internationalization, who have been actively engaged in the process on their campuses for a decade or so. The successes of both case studies were highlighted in previous manuscript chapters (Griffin, 2017a; 2017b).

This chapter sounds the alarm on the reality of implementing comprehensive internationalization at an SCU. The two cases in the study provide examples that support past arguments that SCUs are public higher education institutions that are hamstrung by a heavily reliance on state-level funding while having meager-to-modest endowments and a diverse student body that includes a fair number of students that either could not afford to pay tuition, were not adequately prepared for college based on admissions data, or were students from an underrepresented demographic (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2007, 2009). At both SCUs, finance-related issues were the main competing interest to internationalization. The priorities at both public, regional schools were broad and the resources were few.

The case of SCU-South, with its dour outlook on public support and the described exasperation of overextended faculty, illustrated the depth of conflict such institutions can confront when attempting to implement a broad initiative such as internationalization. SCU-South had considerably more human resources, financial resources, and institutional support than SCU-North to support internationalization, but this arguably also contributed to increased pressure and strain from raised expectations unmatched by increased resources necessary for

execution. In fact, it could be argued that advocates at SCU-North might have a better understanding of its institutional capacity in that internationalization is embedded in the institution's strategic plan, but it is not marketed publicly, at least, as a primary initiative. It is one of several initiatives and for some interview participants this seemed reasonable. One participant at SCU-North actually said that while internationalization was important, it should not be the institution's top concern.

It is important to note that at some point following their participation the ACE Laboratory within the last five years, both institutions experienced some turnover within their administrations with new leaders being appointed. In both cases, these leaders expressed open support for internationalization and actually had professional experiences that reflected their positive attitudes towards internationalization. Still, both institutions experience a deficit in at least one key area of the CIGE model with limited resources, something that internationalization experts have noted as vital for long-term success (Green, 2005; Olson, 2006).

In addition to enriching her understanding of internationalization within the context of the SCU, the paper also contributes to a much needed discussion about the state of affairs at SCUs. There are some larger, unanswered questions from this paper such as, *how can state comprehensive universities (SCUs) prepare for a likelihood permanently lost State funding?* It is also imperative to understand how many SCUs are encountering situations similar to that of SCU-South, where faculty appeared to be taxed, under pressure to deliver results with little incentive beyond one's earnest passion to serve students.

Ultimately, the paper echoes the sentiments of past scholars who concluded that there was no monolithic approach to internationalization (American Council on Education, 2012; Hudzik, 2015; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006). However, because both institutions participated in

the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, it was reasonable to examine internationalization at the two SCUs through the ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012). For both institutions, realizing that iteration of internationalization remains a work in progress. The challenges outlined above pose a significant threat to the capacity of both institutions to sustain its current momentum for internationalization.

This chapter illustrated two scenarios of SCUs coping with rival priorities for internationalization that were both parallel and quite distinct. Both institutions demonstrated that financial resources, from public funds and student fees, were essential for most if not all operations that these institutions including internationalization. The findings educated us in on the contrasts that can impact the likelihood of institution wide initiatives at SCUs such as internationalization.

In some instances, the institution can be quite sensitive to public sentiment and expectations from state lawmakers. In other instances, the pressures can come from campus initiative may have enough similar aspects to create confusion such as diversity or initiatives that have very little relationship such as athletics, but can find an equally strong voice on the campus. The study does not provide a definitive answer to its research question. It offers rich detail of institutional experiences where faculty, staff, and administrators working in a complex, public university environment have to think strategically about the best approaches for dealing with the large, campus wide initiatives such as comprehensive internationalization.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

This chapter offers a summary of this comparative case study on comprehensive internationalization at state comprehensive universities (SCUs). Within the last 10 years, these two SCUs were part of the American Council on Education (ACE)'s Internationalization Laboratory (2017), a roughly 2-year program designed for institutions aiming to develop an institution-wide plan for internationalization. ACE employs a Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012), which categorizes comprehensive internationalization in the following six areas: (1) *Articulated institutional commitment* (2) *Administrative structure and staffing* (3) *Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes* (4) *Faculty policies and practices* (5) *Student mobility* and (6) *Collaboration and partnerships* (American Council on Education, 2012).

I used the ACE model along with organizational change theories to understand how SCUs were able to implement a comprehensive internationalization process, given that SCUs are considered some of the more challenged public higher education institutions. (Burke, 2014; Henderson, 2007). In the following sections, I will provide an overview of the study, a summary of the findings for and their implications. Limitations of the study will also be briefly discussed. Lastly, I conclude with recommendations for future research and final thoughts.

Summary of the Study

Over the last decade, the concept of comprehensive internationalization of higher education has been explored by education research units and field practitioners (American Council on Education, 2012; Hudzik, 2011; 2015). While recent dissertations have explored how a comprehensive internationalization process could work at U.S. technical colleges (Piazza,

2015) and US community colleges (Butler, 2016), we know very little about the realities of implementing such wide scale change at public higher education institutions, which Henderson (2007) described as state comprehensive universities (SCUs). This study used a combination of the ACE's Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012), organizational change theories including Kezar's (2001) work on organizational typologies, and literature on SCUs (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2005, 2007) in a qualitative comparative case study design to understand how comprehensive internationalization can be achieved at an SCU.

The study was divided into three manuscript chapters. In chapter 2, the first manuscript chapter explored how key advocates of the internationalization process at two SCUs actually understood the term comprehensive internationalization and its relevance to their campus environment. In chapter 3 (manuscript #2), the process of how these SCUs developed and implemented comprehensive internationalization agendas was explored. Chapter 4 explored how the SCUs managed the difficulties of prioritizing comprehensive internationalization with other institutional initiatives in an environment where scant resources met outsized expectations. This chapter will provide an overview of the findings for the aforementioned manuscript chapters, but first the design and methodology for this study will be discussed.

Overview of the Research Study

Purpose of the Study

The study aimed to examine how state comprehensive universities (SCUs) make internationalization an institutional priority. The study used literature on comprehensive internationalization theory (American Council on Education, 2012; Green, 2005; Hudzik, 2011; Olson, 2006), organizational change in higher education (Burke, 2014) and state comprehensive universities (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2007). The study was designed to offer much-needed case

studies that illustrated in detail how publicly funded institutions like SCUs attempted to implement an organization wide strategy such as comprehensive internationalization. Additionally, the study also aimed to demonstrate the elements within and outside the SCU that might enable or prevent such institutions from sustaining an institution wide agenda such as comprehensive internationalization.

Research Questions

This study was built around the following research questions:

Central research question. How do two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) gather support for an institution-wide internationalization strategy amidst competing institutional priorities?

Related research questions. 1. How does each campus prioritize internationalization and why? 2. How was campus internationalization implemented at these two SCUs?

The abovementioned research questions were used to develop the following key questions for each of three manuscript chapters:

Research question: Chapter 2. How is comprehensive internationalization conceptualized and prioritized at each campus?

Research questions: Chapters 3. 1. What elements created an environment for comprehensive internationalization at state comprehensive universities (SCUs)? 2. How does a comprehensive internationalization process work at state comprehensive universities (SCU)?

Research question: Chapter 4. How do state comprehensive universities (SCUs) manage internationalization against its competing priorities?

Significance of the Study

The study contributes to the growing discussion of internationalizing U.S. higher education by offering rich detail on the context within which some U.S. public colleges and universities are seeking to become more internationalized. This study specifically focuses on the contributions of SCUs, predominantly master's degree granting institutions that Henderson (2009) described as "the most neglected and least understood segment of American higher education," (p. 1). Through a quality case study design (Yin, 2009) this study fills a gap in the literature about the efficacy of instituting wide scale change such as internationalization in the SCU context. Additionally, the study is one of the few to examine comprehensive internationalization with organizational change theory. The study explores important questions about the feasibility of comprehensive internationalization in such an environment through concrete examples of success and lessons learned such institutions. Finally, this is one of only a few studies to examine how former ACE laboratory institutions implement principles and practices advocated by the CIGE model. Aside from the importance of comprehensive internationalization in this segment of U.S. higher education, it sounds the alarm for greater research emphasis on the plight of SCUs and their significance to the future of U.S. public higher education.

Summary of Findings

In chapter two, the findings indicate that internationalization advocates at both SCUs largely framed comprehensive internationalization around the idea of transforming curricular and co-curricular experiences for students. A majority of participants, predominantly faculty members, were framed internationalization as an issue that would impact the learning experience for students. SCU-North participants also emphasized faculty development and institutional

support as key attributes of participant's descriptions of comprehensive internationalization. SCU-South participants linked comprehensive internationalization with global learning or the development of global perspectives through curricular and co-curricular experiences.

While a plurality of voices described comprehensive internationalization as primarily the transformation of the learning experience to incorporate a more global perspective, other comments suggested that there was some intent or reflection on internationalization as something far more robust than curriculum internationalization. A fewer number of participants discussed *comprehensive* internationalization as an initiative with broader impact outside of the classroom. Overall, participants left an impression of intrigue and commitment to foster internalized learning while needing more time to process how this phenomenon significantly touches aspects of the institution outside of a faculty advocate's area of expertise.

In chapter three, participants described internationalization more broadly while reflecting on how the process began and developed at their respective institutions. Participants from both institutions attributed increased communication between colleagues, primarily among the faculty, but also with some staff divisions, as key to building momentum for internationalization at their institutions. This increased dialogue within and among campus stakeholders was believed to have a lasting effect on perceptions toward internationalization among faculty over time. At SCU-North a small cohort of faculty members kept a journal of disparate international activities as the institution struggled through a period of weakened support for internationalization. With the help of the current administration, faculty advocates at SCU-North were able to use the ACE internationalization lab to engage more colleagues through department meetings and division meetings to consider adapting teaching and research practices to promote internationalization.

Participants at SCU-South also marked the institution's participation in the ACE internationalization lab as a critical point in educating peers about the international activities already happening on campus through colleagues and in some cases, staff offices. A key moment for SCU-South was the decision to transform its general education program so that each general education instructor would incorporate a global perspective in her syllabi.

One key difference between the institutions was the impact of an external issue at SCU-South – the need to be reaccredited. This accreditation requirement led to a campus wide discussion over the right strategic plan, which ultimately led to SCU-South adopting internationalized learning as its strategy. Through the strategic plan, SCU-South has prioritized additional resources to support existing international programs and boost new initiatives. SCU-North participants pointed to a slow, but steady buildup among, mostly faculty, advocates and key support in the administration, which led to a stronger institutional commitment towards internationalization in the form of newly created leadership roles and new, more accessible office space on campus.

At both institutions, internationalization was not described as “comprehensive internationalization,” but as a work in progress. Participants from both SCUs described collaborations and partnerships – local and international – as examples of how they believed internationalization had impacted their institutions. Additionally, both participants described solid administrative support as the basis for their current state of internationalization. This opinion was not unanimous in either case, as both SCUs included dissenters who doubted the overall institutional direction/support for internationalization. Overall, most participants attributed recent successes with internationalization in part to administrative support for increased resources including staffing and prime office space on their respective campuses.

Participants from both SCUs certainly discussed enhancements of curricular and co-curricular experiences as examples of internationalization working at their institutions. This included not only an emphasis on education abroad opportunities for students, but also on campus enrichment opportunities and academic programs that reflected their institution's emphasis on internationalizing the campus. Several participants at SCU-South tied the institution's progress with internationalization to its reaccreditation strategy to internationalize learning at the institution by infusing its required general education courses and funding faculty efforts to develop syllabi in their disciplines that reflected an emphasis on world perspectives.

The chapter highlighted the internationalization process at both institutions as incremental with elements of uncertainty that either institution would reach an optimum form of comprehensive internationalization as outlined in the ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012). One concern at both institutions was the continued financial support from their states for higher education. This concern was expressed in greater detail among participants at SCU-South.

In chapter four, concern with state support would be one of the key themes from an examination of the competing interests both institutions managed while attempting to internationalize. State support for public higher education – or the lack thereof – was a major issue at both institutions, but it would be more pronounced with participants at SCU-South. Some participants described a general public and a state government that was increasingly skeptical about the utility of publicly funded higher education. Participants described pressure coming from the public for taxpayer-funded institutions to deliver more tangible outcomes such as students graduating with well-paying jobs, which one might argue is reasonable. The issue for

SCU-South and SCU-North to a lesser extent was that fitting internationalization with such competing priorities would be a challenge.

Another significant challenge cited by both institutions was a limited supply of finances to support an increasing number of students to spend a summer or semester abroad, or to support faculty research abroad. The complication is from rival institutional initiatives such as campus sustainability, campus diversity, and athletics, for example, that vie for these limited funds. Unlike peer institutions with flagship or high research intensity status, SCUs typically do not enjoy sizable endowments, fundraising drives led by high-profile alumni networks, or large, autonomous programs that generate substantial revenues for their institutions (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2009).

Perhaps most disconcerting was that neither case yielded any concrete ideas about how to overcome the finance issue. Participants spent a considerable amount of time lamenting the fiscal situations in their states, but it was difficult to gauge how a lack of state funding affected internationalization long-term at their institutions. The uncertainty surrounding fiscal support for these institutions suggests that these SCUs will have very difficult choices in the future as state budgets for higher education tighten further, as expected (Fryar, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2016, Weerts & Ronca, 2012).

Another key finding from this chapter was the competing interest of managing faculty morale. Faculty morale was issue with several participants from SCU-South, who expressed an impassioned commitment to supporting their students, but also felt that the institution already required so much of faculty and staff, that adding internationalization as one other compulsory project, through an embedding into the institution's policies and procedures, had its limits. This was a key issue not only because of the potential risk to work-life balance that these participants

expressed, but also because it appeared that at SCU-South that the long-term success of internationalization would require campus advocates to enlarge the group of campus and community stakeholders supporting internationalization to avoid burn out. It was unclear from my findings at SCU-North if such concerns were as prevalent, but participants there were also looking to broaden support beyond the core group of faculty members that had been involved with building momentum for internationalization for nearly two decades.

These findings support the notion that there are very real threats to the sustainability of internationalization in such environments where the advocates pushing change are a small, loyal, but demoralized group. Whether these institutions can achieve a level of comprehensive internationalization outlined by the ACE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (2012) is a separate matter.

How Do SCUs Manage Comprehensive Internationalization?

The main research question for this study was: *How do two state comprehensive universities (SCUs) gather support for an institution-wide internationalization strategy amidst competing institutional priorities?* First, the findings in this study support the idea that there is no monolithic approach to internationalization, as institutions will adjust to fit their specific needs (American Council on Education, 2012; Butler, 2016; Green, 2005; Hudzik, 2015; Piazza, 2015). It should be noted, however, that the institutions in this study invested in an internationalization program designed to aid their institutions in crafting long-term plans for implementing some form of internationalizing using model designed to outline what is comprehensive internationalization (American Council Education, 2012).

The findings of this study illustrated that both SCUs exhibited attributes of internationalization that would fit in all six categories of the ACE Model for Comprehensive

Internationalization: Articulated institutional commitment, Administrative structure staffing, Curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes, Faculty policies and practices, Student mobility, and Collaboration and partnerships (American Council Education, 2012). Still, a majority of participants were hesitant to describe their internationalization activity as comprehensive internationalization. The findings also illustrated that aspects of comprehensive internationalization accentuated qualities found in multiple organizational change typologies. First the very notion of needing to be more internationalized is some way reflective of broader change in society towards globalization. The manner in which these institutions responded was iterative as both SCUs gradually developed systems to enhance internationalization on their campuses through actions that stimulated both evolutionary and revolutionary change at each institution (Burke, 2014).

A key point of change for both institutions was the convincing of faculty members over time to understand how this phenomenon of internationalization could fit into their respective research or teaching expertise (Kezar, 2001; Weick, 1995). Both institutions observed some interest in faculty adapting curriculum to be more reflective of global perspectives. This appeared to be more apparent at SCU-South with its change in general education requirements for all first year students to have introductory course that reflected global perspectives. This required an adaptability of faculty instructors of general education courses to amend their course syllabi, something that a majority of faculty instructors were initially opposed to, but were open to the idea through convincing over time (Burke, 2014; Kezar, 2001; Levy and Merry, 1986).

Both institutions had some level of support from administrative leadership proving such large scale institutional efforts need administrative guidance to be implemented. The reality of these two SCUs, however, is that ambitious initiatives such as comprehensive

internationalization, in whatever form, are held together by very fragile pieces within (overextended faculty/staff advocates, limited resources) and outside (Waning state support, Accreditation demands) the institution. Institutions with the organizational dynamics of SCUs such as described in this study will need time to also build capacity and interest among campus staff to contribute to the long-term viability of large scale initiatives such as comprehensive internationalization, which is intended to be an institutional agenda that extends beyond curricular and co-curricular experiences or pedagogical and research foci. The next section discusses the implications of this study.

Implications of the Study

The study adds needed context on the internationalization process for a growing number of higher education institutions that are contemplating an internationalization strategy for their institution. The study specifically highlighted some of the challenges and opportunities of implementing an internationalization process that an SCU might encounter. The case studies inform practitioners of the nuance that campus leaders and advocates may confront in attempting large scale change such as internationalization with limited resources, minimal public support, and competing institutional initiatives.

The seemingly arduous effort to advance and sustain some iteration of comprehensive internationalization at these two SCUs offered realistic perspective of the scope of challenges scholars and practitioners of large scale change may face in such an environment. The study also creates new discussion and opportunity for future research in an area of U.S. higher education that is sorely under researched – SCUs or regional public universities. In terms of internationalization studies, this research illustrates the limitations of a comprehensive internationalization model for certain types of higher education institutions without human or

financial resources to realize the various aspects of comprehensive internationalization in full. The next section delves further into limitations with a review of those within this study.

Limitations of the Study

Originally, the study was intended to interview participants at four SCUs, but one of the SCUs refused to participate in the study. A third SCU in the southern region did agree to participate in the study, but the data gathered from their participation proved insufficient to include as a comparative case. A comparative case study with participants from three or four SCUs sharing their perspectives on internationalization would provide additional, robust point of views to my research.

The ACE CIGE conducts mapping internationalization survey every four years to gauge internationalization efforts at institutions (2017). The survey examines, for example, levels of partnerships, student mobility, and institutional mechanisms to empower international officers and academic leaders to advance internationalization at their institution (American Council on Education, 2017). This study might have been enhanced with more consultation from ACE to observe trends they are observing from SCUs regarding internationalization. Additionally, the study would have benefited from a survey to a broader sample of participants at both institutions to gain an understanding of the internationalization that extended beyond that of advocates that were selected for me to interview by contacts at both institutions. A statistical analysis of causal relationship between internationalization and other campus element would have further enriched the study. A review of limitations in this study generates several possibilities that one might consider in future research. The next section briefly reviews some avenues for additional research in areas related to this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

Internationalization scholars will find ample opportunity to conduct assessment of internationalization processes willing institutions. The expanding alumni of the ACE Internationalization Laboratory (2017) might be a good source of subjects for a longitudinal study about the efficacy of implementing internationalization strategies at their institutions several years removed from participation in the ACE internationalization project. A comprehensive assessment of progress towards internationalization of a sample size between 15-20 institutions would be invaluable to the both education researchers in this field and senior international officers that are looking for successful models to be adopted for their respective internationalization mandates, should their institution have one.

Hudzik's (2015) recent volume on case studies of internationalization at institutions across the globe offered intriguing models for review and adaptation where appropriate. However, a similar volume of U.S. cases studies on internationalization is vital as U.S. institutions are so distinct and autonomous. A collection of case studies that show both successful efforts and impediments confronted when attempting to implement aspects of internationalization. As public funding for higher education continues to diminish, it will become increasingly challenging for institutions with minimal resources to undertake any sort of large scale initiatives without making difficult choices. At SCUs, such scenarios are likely to pose great difficulty because the unique level of relationship and expectations faculty members at SCUs receive from their leadership.

Lastly, additional research is needed to understand the various ways that internationalization affects local communities in proximity to the aspirational institutions. This would be particularly intriguing with SCUs because of their historical significance to local and

regional economies (Fryar, 2015; Henderson, 2007, 2009; Wright et al., 2004;). The implications for such a study could influence public perceptions of internationalization-related activities in a manner increases the importance of internationalization to the general public.

Summary

Through a comparative case study approach, I learned the depth of successes and complications that accompany efforts to internationalize at state comprehensive universities (SCUs), described as fledgling public universities with waning support (Henderson, 2007, 2009; Wright et al., 2004). Some aspects of this less than optimistic view of SCUs was reflected in some comments from participants, however, there was also a sense of resilience among participants to find some iteration of internationalization that would benefit their students, but remain manageable for them as advocates and implementers. The elements confronting SCUs suggest that greater flexibility and innovation will be necessary to navigate difficult choices as it is easy to assume that public support for higher education is likely to continue on a downward trend. If that is the case, the path for internationalization at SCUs remains uncertain and is likely to be iterations of internationalization limited by the difficult organizational realities at SCUs and with U.S. public higher education.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P.G. & Peterson, P. M. (1998). Internationalize American higher education? Not exactly. *Change*, 30, 36-39.
- Altbach, P. G. & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 5-25.
doi: 10.1177/102831530151002.
- Altbach, P.G. (2006). *International higher education: Reflection on policy and practice*. Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education. Retrieved from: https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pubs/Altbach_2006_Intl_HigherEd.pdf.
- Altbach, P. G. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 290-305. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303542.
- Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R.O., & Gumport, P.J. (2011). *American higher education in the twenty first century: Social, political, and economic challenges (3rd ed.)*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P.G. & de Wit, H. (2015). Internationalization and global tension: Lessons from history. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19, 4-10.
doi: 10.1177/1028315314564734.
- Altbach, P.G. & de Wit, H. (2016, November 11). Now we face the (temporary?) end of American Internationalism. *University World News*. Retrieved from: <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20161110203906750&q>.
- American Academy of the Arts and Sciences. (2015). *Public research universities: Changes in state funding*. Cambridge, MA: American Academy of the Arts and Sciences. Retrieved from: <https://www.amacad.org/content/publications/publication.aspx?d=21942>.
- American Council on Education (2012). Mapping internationalization on US campuses: 2012 edition. *Center for internationalization and global engagement*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Mapping-Internationalization-on-U-S-Campuses.aspx>.
- American Council on Education. (2017). *Center for internationalization and global engagement*. Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Center-for-Internationalization-and-Global-Engagement.aspx>.

- Baker, V.L. & Baldwin, R.G. (2015). A case study of liberal arts colleges in the 21st century: Understanding organizational change and evolution in higher education. *Innovative higher education*, 40, 247-261. doi: 10.1007/s10755-014-9311-6.
- Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13 (4). Retrieved from: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-4/baxter.pdf>.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brennan, M. & Dellow, D. A. (2013). International students as a resource for achieving comprehensive internationalization. *New direction for community colleges*, 161, 27-37. doi:10.1002/cc.20046.
- Brown, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Burke, W. W. (2014). *Organization change: Theory and practice*, (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Butler, D. C. (2016). *Comprehensive internationalization: Examining the what, why, and how at community colleges*. Unpublished dissertation, College of William and Mary. (ProQuest 10111570).
- Carnegie Foundation (2017). *Carnegie classifications: Descriptions*. Retrieved from: <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu>.
- Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of studies in international education*, 13, 289-309. doi: 10.1177/1028315308329804.
- Cohen, A., M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coleman, M.S. (2016, October 7). After years of neglect, public higher education is at a tipping point. Washington Post, Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/10/07/after-years-of-neglect-public-higher-education-is-at-a-tipping-point/?utm_term=.53499f0bcaf5.
- Coser, L. A. (1974). *Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment*. New York: The Free Press.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *Introduction: The discipline and practice of*

- qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- de Wit, H. (2013). Reconsidering the concept of internationalization. *International higher education*, 70, 6-7.
- Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher education*, 4, pp.491-504.
- Eckel, P.D., Hill, B. & Green, M. (1998). *En route to transformation. On change: An occasional paper series of the ACE project on leadership and institutional transformation*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Eckel, P.D. & Kezar, A. (2003). *Taking the rein: Institutional transformation in higher education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Fain, P. (2017, January 30). Forceful response. *Inside higher ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/30/higher-education-leaders-denounce-trumps-travel-ban>.
- Friedman, T. L. (1999). *The lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Picador.
- Fryar, A.H. (2015). The comprehensive university: How it came to be and what it is now. In M. Schneider & K.C. Deane (Eds.), *The university next door: What is a comprehensive university, who does it educate, can it survive* (1st ed., 19-41). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, L. (2016, May 22). Where does the regional state university go from here? *Chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Where-Does-the-Regional-State/236555>.
- Gatewood, J. & Sutton, S.B. (2017). *Internationalization in Action: International partnerships, Part one: Definitions and dimensions*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/newsroom/Pages/Internationalization-in-Action.aspx>.
- Gersick, C. J. G. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 10-36.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world*. London: Profile.
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Green, M. F. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at comprehensive universities*. American Council on Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Measuring-Comprehensive.pdf>.

- Griffin, J. (2017a). Comprehensive internationalization: Analyzing the perspective of internationalization advocates at state comprehensive universities (SCUs). *Examining Comprehensive Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs): A Comparative Case Study of the Internationalization Process*. Unpublished dissertation, Colorado State University.
- Griffin, J. (2017b). Internationalizing the SCU: How comprehensive internationalization works at state comprehensive universities (SCUs). *Examining Comprehensive Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs): A Comparative Case Study of the Internationalization Process*. Unpublished dissertation, Colorado State University.
- Hay-Gibson, N. V. (2009). Interviews via VoIP: Benefits and disadvantages within a PhD study of SMEs. *Library and information research*, 33, (105), 39-50.
- Helms, R. M. (2015). Internationalizing the tenure code: Policies to promote a globally focused faculty. *Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement*. Washington: American Council on Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalizing-the-Tenure-Code-Policies-to-Promote-a-Globally-Focused-Faculty.aspx> .
- Helms, R. M., Rumbley, L.E., Brajkovic, L., & Mihut, G. (2015). Internationalizing higher education worldwide: National policies and programs. *Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement*. Washington: American Council on Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalizing-Higher-Education-Worldwide-National-Policies-and-Programs.aspx> .
- Henderson, B.B. (2007). *Teaching at the people's university*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Henderson, B. B. (2009). The work of the People's University. *The journal of the state comprehensive university*, 1, 5-29.
- Henderson, B. B. (2011). Publishing patterns at state comprehensive universities: The changing nature of faculty work and the quest for status. *The journal of the professoriate*, 5, 35-59.
- Hendrickson, R.C., Mueller, M.A., & Strand, J.R. (2011). Political science careers at comprehensive universities: Building balanced careers at "greedy" institutions. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 44, 1, pp. 129-134.
- Hovland, K. (2006). Global learning and liberal education. *Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)*. Washington, D.C., AAC&U. Retrieved from: <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/publications/shared-futures-global-learning->

[and-liberal-education.](#)

- Hudzik, J. K. (2011). Comprehensive internationalization. *NAFSA: Association of International Educators*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Hudzik, J.K. (2015). Barriers and barrier reduction for omprehensive internationalization. In J.K. Hudzik (Ed.), *Comprehensive internaitonalization: Institutional pathways to success* (1st ed., 76-91). London and New York: Routledge.
- Hunt, S. (2016, July 12). Four things that must happent to protect higher education after Brexit. *The times higher education*. Retrieved from: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/four-things-must-happen-protect-higher-education-after-brexit>.
- Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of studies in international education*, 10 (3), 267–285.
- Hurd, D. L. (2007). *Leading transformational change: A study of internationalization at three universities in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University. (UMI 3252063).
- Jorgenson, S. & Shultz, L. (2012). Global citizenship education (GCE) in post-secondary institutions: What is protected and what is hidden under the umbrella of GCE? *Journal of global citizenship and equity education*, 2, 1-22.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. J. (2009, Novemeber/December). Change in higher education: Not enough or too much? *Change*, 41, 18-23.
- Kimbler, J., Moore, D., Schladen, M. M., Sowers, B., & Snyder, M. (2013). Emerging technology tools for qualitative data collection. *The qualitative report fourth annual conference, Nova Southeastern University*. Retrieved from: <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqrc/>.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International higher education*, 33, pp. 2-3. Retrieved from: <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/7391/6588>.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of studies in international education*, 8, 5, doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832.

- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Levy, A., & Merry, U. (1986). *Organizational transformation: Approaches, strategies, theories*. New York: Praeger.
- Lyall, K.C. & Sell, K.R. (2006). *The true genius of America at risk: Are we losing our public universities to de facto privatization?* Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Manzke, R. J. (2015). *Attributes of innovative global citizenship programs at mid-sized public universities*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin. (UMI 3702682).
- McLendon, M. K., Hearn, J. C., & Mokher, C. (2009). Partisans, professionals, and power: The role of political factors in state higher education funding. *The journal of higher education*, 80, 686–713.
- Merkx, G.W. & Nolan, R.W (Eds.) (2015). *Internationalizing the academy: Lessons of leadership in higher education* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Mitchell, M. & Leachman, M. (2015). Years of cuts threaten to put college out of reach for more students. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/years-of-cuts-threaten-to-put-college-out-of-reach-for-more-students> .
- Mitchell, M, Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2016). Funding down, tuition up: State cuts to higher education threaten quality and affordability at public colleges. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up>
- Morphew, C. C. (2009). Conceptualizing change in the institutional diversity of US colleges and universities. *The journal of higher education*, 80, 243–269.^[1]_{SEP}
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2017). Contribution to internationalization of higher education. Retrieved from: http://www.nafsa.org/Learn_About_NAFSA/Mission,_Vision,_Values/NAFSA_Campus_Internationalization/.
- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of studies in international education*, 5(2), 116–137.
- Olson, C.L (2005) Comprehensive internationalization: From principles to practice. *Journal of public affairs*, 8, 51-74

- Olson, C.L., Green, M.F., & Hill, B.A. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington: American Council on Education.
- Orlikowski, W.S. (1996). Improving organizational transformation over time: A situated change perspective. *Information Systems Research*, 7(1), 63-92.
- Pew Charitable Trusts (2015). *Federal and state funding of higher education: A changing landscape*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education>.
- Piazza, B. R. (2015). *How do technical college leaders initiate and implement change to facilitate comprehensive internationalization at their campuses*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin. (UMI 3702763).
- Porforio, V. P. (2012). *Internationalization strategies in traditional higher education institutions across the United States*. Unpublished dissertation, The Sage Colleges. (UMI 3547576).
- Porras, J. I. & Robertson, P. J. (1992). Organizational development: Theory, practice, and research. In M.D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, 2nd ed., 719-822). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Pratt, T. (2016, August 25). Poor and uneducated: The South's cycle of failing higher education. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from: <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/08/the-failures-of-southern-universities/497102/>.
- Quinn, R. E. (1996). *Deep Change Discovering the Leader Within*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (2017). Accrediting standards. Retrieved from: <http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp>.
- Tandberg, D. A. (2008). The politics of state higher education funding. *Higher education in review*, 5, 1–36.
- Tarrant, M.A. (2010). A conceptual framework for exploring the role of studies abroad in nurturing global citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 14, 433-451 doi: 10.1177/1028315309348737.
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (2002). *Summary of the annual review of developments in globalization and regional integration in the countries of the ESCWA region*. United Nations.
- Universitas 21. (2017). *About Universitas 21*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.universitas21.com/about>.

- Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M.S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 510-540.
- Weerts, D. J. & Ronca, J. M. (2012). Understanding differences in state support for higher education across states, sectors, and institutions: A longitudinal study. *The journal of higher education*, 83, 155-185.
- Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weick, K.E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development: *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.
- Wright, M. C., Howery, C. B., Assar, N., McKinney, K., Kain, E. L., Glass, B., Kramer, L., & Atkinson, M. (2004). Greedy institutions: The importance of institutional context for teaching in higher education. *Teaching Sociology*, 32, 144-159.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE OF STUDY: Exploring Comprehensive Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs): A Comparative Case Study of the Internationalization Process at Two Public Comprehensive Institutions.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Louise B. Jennings, Ph.D., Professor, School of Education, louise.jennings@colostate.edu, 970-491-5425.

CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jermain Griffin, Doctoral Student, jermain.griffin@colostate.edu or jermaingriffin@gmail.com, 203-870-5292.

WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH: You are a key participant engaged in the comprehensive internationalization process at your institution. Your perspective of how internationalization was implemented and how it is sustained will inform this study.

WHO IS DOING THIS STUDY? Jermain Griffin will be conducting this study with the support of his doctoral dissertation committee led by Dr. Louise B. Jennings.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY? To better understand how State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs) implement and sustain comprehensive internationalization.

WHERE IS THIS STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST? Your participation in the study would include up to 3 one-on-one interviews at a time and location that is convenient for you at your respective institutions with the investigator of this study. These interviews would last 75-90 minutes each, and will be audiotaped with your permission. Follow-up interviews, if necessary, would take place through Skype, a voice-over Internet protocol service. The follow-up interviews may be needed to check the accuracy of preliminary analysis or to ask further questions. Your total time commitment will be no more than 5 hours.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO? You will be asked to share your perspective on how the comprehensive internationalization process started at your institution. You will also describe and discuss the processes and initiatives of the comprehensive internationalization experience at your institution.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY I SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY? You should only participate in this research if engaged in the comprehensive internationalization process at your institution

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS? There are no apparent risks to participating in this study. It is impossible to identify all potential risks in research procedures,

but the researchers for this study have performed due diligence to minimize any known and potential, but unknown, risks.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY? There are no known benefits to participating in this study, but the potential overall benefits of the study include an increased understanding of how state comprehensive universities (SCUs) implement and sustain institution-wide agendas for internationalization. The study may help similar institutions gather best practices for implementing and sustaining a comprehensive internationalization agenda in complex times.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY? Your participation in this study is voluntary. Should you decide to participate, you may withdraw your consent and cease your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT I GIVE? We will keep private all information that identifies you private, to the extent permitted by the law. It is possible that some of the information you provide will be combined with information provided by other participants for a future publication that discusses the results of our study. Any publications related to this study will incorporate a vigorous effort to protect your identity. Pseudonyms will be used to conceal your private information in published versions of this research. The use of pseudonyms does not guarantee complete anonymity, as the identities of university participants may be accessible on the Internet. We may be asked to share the research files with the CSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) ethics committee for auditing purposes.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS? Before you decide to accept this invitation to take part in this study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. If you later have additional questions about this study, please contact the investigator, Jermain Griffin at 203-870-5292. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the CSU IRB at: RICRO_IRB@mail.colostate.edu; 970-491-1553. You will receive a copy of this consent form for your records.

WHAT ELSE DO I NEED TO KNOW? Your participation in the study will be recorded and stored in a concealed space only known to the researcher. In the recordings you will be identified by your pseudonym only to protect your identity. You may be contacted for an additional follow-up conversation to clarify aspects of your interview or to check the accuracy of the interview's transcription.

Your signature acknowledges that you have read the information stated and willingly sign the consent form. Your signature acknowledges that you have received, on the date signed, a copy of this document containing 3 pages.

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Name of the person providing information to participant

Date

Signature of Research Staff

APPENDIX B: CONSENT SCRIPT TO PARTICIPANTS IN A RESEARCH STUDY
ON COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION AT
STATE COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES (SCUs)

Date

Dear Participant,

My name is Jermain Griffin and I am a researcher and doctoral student from Colorado State University in the School of Education's Higher Education Leadership program. I am conducting a research study on the implementation and sustainability of comprehensive internationalization at state comprehensive universities (SCUs). The title of my project is *Examining Comprehensive Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs): A Comparative Case Study of the Internationalization Process*. I am conducting this study with the support of Dr. Louise B. Jennings, a professor at the School of Education who is serving as dissertation chair.

I would like to interview you because of your key role in the comprehensive internationalization process at your institution. I would like to interview a maximum of three times for this study. Your participation in each interview will take approximately 75-90 minutes. The interviews will be semi-structured, as your responses and questions are welcomed. The attached list of questions for this interview will serve as a guide for our conversation. Follow-up interviews may be necessary to ask further questions or to confirm the accuracy of preliminary findings. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this study, you may withdraw your consent and cease your participation at any time without penalty.

All interviews will be recorded and stored securely. Your information will be concealed with a pseudonym. Jermain Griffin will analyze the data gathered for this study. There are no direct benefits to you, but we hope this study will enhance understanding how SCUs implement and sustain institution-wide agendas for internationalization. The study may result in indirect benefits to you and other researchers and practitioners in your field. For example, this study may serve other SCUs that consider developing strategies for comprehensive internationalization or assist highlighting potential new directions for your own institution.

There are no known risks for your participation in this study. It is not, however, possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researchers have necessary measures to minimize any known and potential, but unknown, risks.

To participate in the research, please contact Jermain.Griffin@colostate.edu or jermaingriffin@gmail.com to schedule an interview.

If you have any questions, please contact Jermain Griffin at 203-870-5292 or Dr. Louise B. Jennings at 970-491-5425. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the CSU IRB at: RICRO_IRB@mail.colostate.edu; 970-491-1553.

Sincerely,

Dr. Louise B. Jennings
Principal Investigator & Advisor
Colorado State University
Louise.Jennings@colostate.edu

Jermain Griffin
Co-Principal Investigator & Doctoral Student
Colorado State University
Jermain.Griffin@colostate.edu

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

TITLE OF STUDY: Exploring Comprehensive Internationalization at State Comprehensive Universities (SCUs): A Comparative Case Study of the Internationalization Process at Two Public Comprehensive Institutions.

The following interviews questions are divided into three sections: a.) Comprehensive internationalization and b.) Organizational change

A. Comprehensive Internationalization

1. How would you define comprehensive internationalization?
2. Can you describe internationalization at your institution prior to its decision to participate in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory?
3. Can you describe the opportunities and challenges related to internationalization at your institution prior to participating in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory?
4. From your perspective, can you describe how internationalization works at your institution?
5. From your perspective, can you describe the impact of internationalization on students, faculty, staff, institutional partners, and the regional communities that are served by your institution?
6. Can you describe the opportunities for growth of comprehensive internationalization at your institution?

B. Organizational Change

1. Can you describe your institution's organizational structure at the time it decided to pursue a comprehensive internationalization strategy?
2. Can you describe the external/internal elements that you believe prompted your institution to develop and execute a plan for comprehensive internationalization?
3. From your perspective, can you discuss the rationale for your institution's participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory?
4. Can you describe your role in the comprehensive internationalization process at your institution?
5. From your perspective, how would you describe the institutional support for internationalization following your institution's participation in the ACE Laboratory?
6. Can you describe some of the other competing interests that your institution manages?
7. From your perspective, can you discuss how these priorities influence the development of comprehensive internationalization at your institution?

C. Follow up

1. Is there anything that would you like to add that was not addressed during our discussion?
2. Do you have any questions for me?
3. Is there someone that you recommend I interview?

APPENDIX D: NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

DATE: September 12, 2014
TO: Jennings, Louise, 1588 School of Education
Kamberelis, George, 1588 School of Education, Griffin, Jermain, 1588 School of Education
FROM: Swiss, Evelyn, Coordinator, CSU IRB 2
PROTOCOL TITLE: Examining comprehensive internationalization at state comprehensive universities (SCUs): A comparative case study of the internationalization process
FUNDING SOURCE: NONE
PROTOCOL NUMBER: 14-5243H
APPROVAL PERIOD: Approval Date: September 12, 2014 Expiration Date: September 11, 2015

The CSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects has reviewed the protocol entitled: Examining comprehensive internationalization at state comprehensive universities (SCUs): A comparative case study of the internationalization process. The project has been approved for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol. This protocol must be reviewed for renewal on a yearly basis for as long as the research remains active. Should the protocol not be renewed before expiration, all activities must cease until the protocol has been re-reviewed.

If approval did not accompany a proposal when it was submitted to a sponsor, it is the PI's responsibility to provide the sponsor with the approval notice.

This approval is issued under Colorado State University's Federal Wide Assurance 00000647 with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP). If you have any questions regarding your obligations under CSU's Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Please direct any questions about the IRB's actions on this project to:

IRB Office - (970) 491-1553; RICRO_IRB@mail.Colostate.edu
Evelyn Swiss, IRB Coordinator - (970) 491-1381; Evelyn.Swiss@Colostate.edu

Swiss, Evelyn



Swiss, Evelyn

Approval is to recruit adult participants with the approved recruitment and consent materials. The above-referenced project was approved by the Institutional Review Board with the condition that the approved consent form is signed by the subjects and each subject is given a copy of the form. NO changes may be made to this document without first obtaining the approval of the IRB. NOTE: Submission of Letters of Cooperation from Institutions is required to be submitted to IRB prior to enrollment.