

Assessment of the Level of Internalization of Teacher Education Institutions in the Philippines: Basis for Development Programs

Marilyn U. Balagtas
Marla C. Papango
Zenaida Q. Reyes
Marilou M. Ulbiña

*Philippine Normal University,
Manila, Philippines*

This study assessed the level of internationalization of ten Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) that constitute the National Network of Normal Schools (3NS) in the Philippines. These institutions were assessed in terms of their strengths and weaknesses in four domains in teacher education and nine dimensions of internationalization using the rubric in gauging the level of internationalization of TEIs in the Philippines developed by Atweh, Balagtas, Papango, Reyes, and Ubiña (2012) based on the framework for internationalization of Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines developed by Padama et al. (2010). These four domains are: (1) Knowledge Creation and Application; (2) Quality and Excellence; (3) Culture of Sharing and Service; and (4) Growth, Efficiency, and Accountability. The nine dimensions of internationalization in Higher Education Institutions are: (1) Curriculum and Instruction; (2) Facilities and Support System; (3) Cooperation and Development Assistance; (4) Diversity of Income Generation; (5) Research Collaboration; (6) International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking; (7) Academic Standards and Quality; (8) Mobility and Exchanges for Students and Teachers; and (9) International Students Recruitment. The results reveal that none from TEIs are internationalized to a great extent in all the four domains of teacher education. They are, however, internationalized to some extent in academic standards and quality (domain 2), knowledge creation and appreciation (domain 1), and growth, efficiency, and accountability (domain 4), but internationalized to a little extent in culture of sharing and service (Domain 3). In terms of the dimensions of internationalization, they are strong or internationalized to a great extent only in curriculum and instruction but considered weak in all other eight areas of internationalization of HEIs. The results of the study were used as the basis in proposing development programs for individual TEI and for a network of TEIs in the country.

Keywords: *Assessment, Internationalization, and Development Program*

With the onslaught of technology, the world has shrunk into a global village that people mobility and information generation have increased in unimaginable proportions. Nations needed to reach out to other countries not only for political and economic reasons, but also for educational purposes. Internationalization of higher education institutions has been among the challenges of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) in the Philippines because collaboration and intercultural exchange have been imperatives of the global village. In an article titled *International Higher Education: Models, Conditions and Issues*, Bernardo (2002) listed some opportunities for internationalizing higher education which include (1) student and staff mobility; (2) internationalizing curricula through international studies; (3) research collaborations; (4) international networks; (5) transnational distance education; (6) twinning and articulation programs; and (7) international quality assurance. However, in the same article, Bernardo (2002) further analyzed the underlying issues on programs cost, research capability, lack of involvement in international networks, and inability to comply with quality assurance process as deterrents to internationalization of higher education institutions in the Philippines.

In cognizance of these challenges and issues in higher education, which also affect teacher education, the Philippine Normal University (PNU), being the National Center for Teacher Education (NCTE), whose mandate is “to provide technical support to the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and to the Department of Education (DepEd) in their programs and projects that chart policies and recommendation on teacher education, teacher training, teacher education curricula, professional development for teachers and educational leaders in the country” (Republic Act No. 9647, Sec 3a, 2009) would want to give its share to respond to these challenges and issues. To realize its mandate as the NCTE, PNU led pioneering projects in the Philippines through the National Network of Normal Schools (3NS). PNU acts as the lead shepherd or the one that sets the “over-all directions of the 3NS” (Defensor, 2013). The 3NS, initiated by the CHED under the leadership of Dr. Nenalyn P. Defensor, was launched at PNU during its 110th Foundation anniversary, it being the first normal school established by the Americans in the Philippines. The network is an arm of CHED for its project dubbed as “Save Our Normal Schools” which was conceived to address serious challenges faced by Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in the country. As the lead shepherd, PNU is expected to lead or collaborate with the other nine (9) member institutions of 3NS in all efforts to improve the quality of programs, operations and services of TEIs in the country.

Moreover, PNU, being one of the recognized producers of quality teachers in the country, has embarked on a series of projects and programs that prepare teachers for the challenges of a globalized society. Given its commitment of producing excellent teachers for a better world, PNU acknowledges its role in leading TEIs in equipping Filipino teachers with ways of thinking, ways of working, tools for working and living in the world - the very 21st century skills. Dr. Ester B. Ogena, the present PNU President has actually set internationalization as one of PNU’s strategic directions from 2012 to 2022 to realize its vision of making PNU a nationally responsive Teacher Education University and an internationally recognized leader in Teacher Education.

More specifically, PNU has set five strategies for internationalization, and these are: (1) to develop an internationalization program that will increase the number and expand diversity of foreign students and faculty; (2) develop an international relations strategic plan to ensure a strategic position within the global teacher education network and academic community; (3) develop and produce scholarly work and products that attract international audience; (4) position PNU as a hub of academic activities and exchanges relevant to teacher education and basic education to ensure its international presence; and (5) participate in international network of TEIs to promote collaboration and partnership in the conduct of research, extension, and production (Philippine Normal University, 2012).

Cognizant of these strategies, the researchers felt the need to contribute to the realization of PNU's vision for internationalization by identifying its level of internationalization and so with the other member TEIs in the network so that it can provide a basis for spearheading development programs in teacher education in the country. Thus, the researchers conceived of analyzing the level of internationalization of member institutions of 3NS using a validated rubric earlier developed by the researchers themselves. Specifically, this research aims to gather information from teachers, students, administrators, and staff of 3NS and ask them to assess the level of internationalization of their very own institution. Information culled from the survey serves as the basis for proposing development projects that could help improve processes and practices of TEIs.

Framework of a Development Program for Internationalization of TEIs

Globalization and internationalization are buzzwords in conferences and other academic assemblies, which usually are considered compelling reasons for an academic institution to change or modernize its programs and practices in order to compete globally. With the advent of global rankings of countries and universities, everyone in the academe becomes conscious of how one's country or institution can be included in the ranking as such is an indicator of progress, quality, and capability. The question, however, is how stakeholders can contribute to the global competitiveness of their institutions. One possible step is for the stakeholders to assess their institutional strengths and weaknesses so that they can eventually work towards national and international recognition through specific development programs.

Assessment as defined by Balagtas and Dacanay (2013) is the process of gathering information and organizing them into an interpretable form for easy decision making. Assessment is imperative to have basis in determining the capacity of the institution to compete globally. The results of such assessment could show the strengths and weaknesses of the institutions assessed and define the specific actions they have to take in enhancing their programs and practices towards globalization and competitiveness. Internationalization of the institution is one possible concrete action towards global competitiveness.

According to Bernardo (2002), internationalization could be construed as related to educational and development goals. Educational goals are related to assumptions of universal knowledge and the need for collaborative international efforts and

perspectives. The development goals, on the other hand, are related to the mission of developed countries to provide assistance and support to less developed countries in their efforts at improving their capabilities in their higher education institutions.

In this study, internationalization refers to the process where two or more foreign institutions collaborate in the delivery of academic, research, social, and economic activities for their mutual benefits and understanding. According to Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, and Henry (1997), any activity that involves a cross-country collaboration contributes to the internationalization of the activities of the partners. Examples of such internationalization activities include: international students in undergraduate or postgraduate courses; internationalization of the curriculum and comparative curricula studies; international research conferences; international publications; collaborative and/or comparative cross-country research projects; professional development programs; and international consultancies.

In internationalizing Higher Education Institutions (HEI) in the Philippines, Padama et al. (2010), as cited by Balagtas et.al (2012), proposed a framework for internationalization with nine (9) dimensions: (1) Curriculum and Instruction; (2) Facilities and Support System; (3) Cooperation and Development Assistance; (4) Diversity of Income Generation; (5) Research Collaboration; (6) International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking; (7) Academic Standards and Quality; (8) Mobility and Exchanges for Students and Teachers; and (9) International Students Recruitment. To translate these dimensions of internationalization in TEIs in the Philippines, Balagtas et al. (2012) developed an instrument that has the dimensions reflective of specific indicators on how TEIs could improve their programs and practices as institutions offering teacher education programs. This contextualization of internationalization reflects the areas of commitment of the PNU, being the premier teacher education institution in the Philippines and the NCTE, and whose vision is “to make PNU internationally recognized and nationally responsive Teacher Education University” (PNU, 2012). PNU Administrative Manual (2005) stipulated the four areas of commitment, which were incorporated in the framework for the internationalization of a TEI. The four areas of commitment which were considered domains of internationalization in this study include (1) Commitment to Knowledge Creation and Application; (2) Commitment to Quality and Excellence; (3) Commitment to Culture of Sharing and Service; and (4) Commitment to Growth, Efficiency, and Accountability.

Figure 1 shows the framework of internationalization in teacher education and how this could be used in making institutions more globally competitive. The development programs hope to further strengthen the institutions in the areas they are strong at and capacitate them in areas where they needed help.



Figure 1: Framework of the Development Program

As shown in the figure, the internal stakeholders of the 3NS, which include the officials, faculty, staff, and students, assessed the strengths and weaknesses of their institution in terms of the nine dimensions of internationalization listed by Padama et al. (2010). These dimensions were classified into four domains by Balagtas, et.al (2012). Several indicators of an internationalized teacher education institution concretized the domains and dimensions of internationalization, which were all reflected in the instrument developed by Balagtas, et al. (2012) that has been adopted in this present study. Through the examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the 10 normal schools in each of the domains and dimensions of internationalization, the researchers believe that the member institutions of the 3NS will have basis in improving their own internationalization efforts. The analysis will also help them as they synergize with other member institutions in their network to sustain their identified strengths and to improve on the areas they are weak at. Knowing their respective institution's strengths in internationalization will also enable them to see what they could offer to other TEIs in the region so that they are also able to contribute as well to the global competitiveness of the country.

Method

This descriptive-survey-developmental research describes the level of internationalization of the 10 surveyed institutions belonging to the 3NS as assessed by their own internal stakeholders to have basis for a proposed development program. Each institution has 23 to 36 internal stakeholders for a total of 308 who served as assessors. About 27% of these are students, 52% are faculty, 7% are staff, and 12% are officials. About 2% of the respondents did not indicate their identity in the

instrument. To assess their level of internationalization, the 4-pt scale rubric in assessing the internationalization level of TEIs developed by Balagtas, Atweh, Papangao, Reyes, and Ubiña (2012) was used. This instrument has been content validated with Cronbach's Alpha ($r= .88$) indicative of high internal reliability coefficient, also high intra-rater reliability ($r=.88$) as well as high inter-rater reliability ($r=0.76$). For data gathering, the consent of the institution's President was first sought, and those s/he identified as participants mostly from the college offering education programs attended a forum where they were introduced to the framework of internationalization. The forum participants also served as the assessors who gathered a set of documents (e.g. curricular programs with syllabi, technical reports, list of foreign students and faculty, President's reports, annual reports, memoranda of understanding/agreement, etc.) that could gauge the institution's level of internationalization. Descriptive statistical procedures were used to describe the strengths (areas with average rating from 2.5 to 4) and weaknesses (average rating is below 2.5) of the institutions, which serve as basis for the proposed developmental program. The average ratings also classify the institutions into five (5) levels, namely: not internationalized (0-0.49); internationalized to a little extent (0.5 to 1.49); internationalized to some extent (1.5 to 2.49); internationalized to a great extent (2.5 to 3.49); and internationalized to a very great extent (3.5 to 4).

Results and Discussion

Strengths and Weaknesses on Internationalization of the 10 Member Institutions in the 3NS

Institution 1: A Normal School in Manila. Among the nine (9) areas of internationalization, this institution is seen strong in the area of *academic standards and quality* having been rated as 3.14 out of 4, which means **internationalized to a great extent**. The assessment on the level of internationalization of this institution in this area seems to conform to the high performance of its graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), because it has been consistently at the top among those TEIs that have the most number of teacher applicants who passed the examination. Other areas that this institution is seen as strong include the dimension on *curriculum and instruction* (2.69) and *facilities and support system* (2.58). Such results can be attributed to the University leadership's vision of becoming internationalized; hence, its curriculum and instruction including its facilities and support system are being developed to be on a par with other top rank universities in Asia and in the world. This institution, being the NCTE is also expected to lead reforms in teacher education. One evidence of its leadership is the creation of curricular programs considered alternative to what the CHED provides, which is equally effective as that of the curriculum prescribed by the CHED as it produced graduates, whose performance in LET is high making their institution among the top performing TEIs in the country. The institution, however, is viewed weakest in *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* (1.32) and on the dimension of *research collaboration* (1.42). This explains why this institution has been assisted in these areas in an applied research grant by the Australian Agency for International

Development (AusAID) through the efforts of the University of New England (UNE) SIMERR, National Research Centre, an institution in Armidale, Australia that has led the development of the Australian National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST). This grant established a national research center called Research Center for Teacher Quality (RCTQ), which was envisioned to provide evidence-based inputs to policy formulation that could improve teacher quality in the Philippines. The other dimensions of internationalization that the institution is also weak include *international and intercultural understanding and networking* (2.36), *international students' recruitment* (2.23), *cooperation and development assistance* (1.92), and *diversity of income generation* (1.61). As a whole, the institution is considered **internationalized to some extent** (2.29). This means that this institution should continue developing itself “to level up teacher education for a quality nation...as it moves along with global demands” (Ogena, 2013).

Institution No. 2: A Normal School in Palawan. The member institution of 3NS in Palawan is seen strongest in the area of *curriculum and instruction* (2.59) and *facilities and support system* (2.54) both are interpreted as internationalized to a great extent. The institution is viewed as weak or rated as internationalized to a little extent in Cooperation and Development Assistance (0.98), *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* (1.15), and *research and collaboration* (1.17). Other dimensions such as *international and intercultural understanding and networking* (1.52), *international students' recruitment* (1.51), and *diversity of income generation* (1.71) are rated internationalized to some extent, which area dimensions still considered as also a weakness. As a whole, the institution is considered of **internationalized to some extent**. This means that the institution has to develop internationally benchmarked programs and practices to continue to be “leaders in Philippines education” (Sespeñe, 2013).

Institution No. 3: A Normal School in Bicol. The stakeholders of a normal school in Bicol assess their institution strong in the area of *curriculum and instruction* (3.21), *facilities and support system* (3.03), *international student recruitment* (3.88), and *academic standard and quality* (2.84) with all these dimensions interpreted as internationalized to a great extent. It can be noted that the institution is strong in four areas of internationalization compared to the first two normal schools in Luzon. This strength of the institution could be explained by the international accreditation it has gone through since it is the only ISO certified institution among the 10 member institutions under the 3NS. However, just like other normal schools, the institution is viewed weak in *diversity of income generation* (0.05), and *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* (1.2). This can be explained by the fact that the budget of a state university is mostly dependent only on the appropriation in the national budget. The other dimensions that the institution is known weak or rated internationalized to some extent include *international and intercultural understanding and networking* (1.9), *cooperation and development assistance* (1.61) and *research collaboration* (1.69). As a whole, the institution is considered of **internationalized to some extent**. This means that the institution still needs some development programs to continue to help “steer the country towards progress and development” (Lauraya, 2013).

Institution No. 4: A Normal School in Leyte. Stakeholders from a normal school in Leyte rated their institution **internationalized to some extent** with a 1.92 overall rating. Such rating reflects the objective evaluation of the stakeholders of the institution as they see this assessment as input to its improvement. As cited by Cruzada (2013), “know thyself, the unexamined life is not worth living”, which she said is an inscription at the Temple of Delphi, a concept that holds true for a person, as it does for the society, and may also be true to an institution. Specifically, respondents evaluated their *facilities and support system* (3.28) and *curriculum and instruction* (2.8) internationalized to a high extent. These data reveal that this institution’s curricular offerings, its strategies in teaching and the facilities that support its delivery of the programs can well compete with standards overseas. Meanwhile, in regard to *academic standards*, they rated their institution internationalized to some extent (2.05). This means that at least 25% of its programs are level 3 accredited by nationally/internationally known accrediting bodies; at least 20% of the faculty and administrators are recognized for their expertise here and abroad; at least 25% of the administrators and staff have special trainings or exposures abroad; the institution is cited by only 2 recognized international societies/publications as a good institution for learning; and at least 25% of the faculty and administrators are recipients of scholarships, fellowships or grants abroad. However, the stakeholders viewed *research and collaboration* (1.22) and *international/intercultural understanding/networking* (1.22) internationalized to a little extent since the institution has had few researches and twinning programs of international level. Such perceptions support the stakeholders’ views on mobility of students/faculty and income generation. The institution’s faculty rated their institution poorly in terms of *mobility and exchanges of students and teachers* and in terms of *diversity of income generation* which both got 0.63. Such ratings prove that there have been very few student and faculty exchanges between this institution and foreign institutions. This also means that less than 3 % of the faculty members taught, received trainings or served as consultants abroad.

Institution No. 5: A Normal School in the Iloilo. Stakeholders’ ratings on the level of internationalization of a normal school in Iloilo reached an overall rating of 2.68 interpreted as **internationalized to a great extent**. The institution was evaluated highly for its *curriculum and instruction* (3.43); *academic standards and quality* (2.95); *international students’ recruitment* (2.95); and *facilities and support system* (2.9) - all internationalized to a great extent. Whereas, in terms of *cooperation and development assistance*; *diversity of income generation*; and *mobility and exchanges for faculty and students*, the stakeholders evaluated it internationalized to some extent. These evaluations can well be supported by the fact that the institution has had some of its programs accredited at level 4 by the Accrediting Association of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP). Such evaluation also confirms what this institution has been consistently doing “to live by its core values” one of which is “excellence” (Subong, 2013).

Institution No. 6: A Normal School in the Zamboanga. The level of internationalization of a normal school in Western Mindanao in the dimensions of *curriculum and instruction* (2.48), *facilities and support system* (2.13), and *research collaboration* (2.07) garnered the highest means and interpreted as internationalized to some extent. The faculty, students and staff of this university perceived these dimensions as their strength since these are the very reasons why they were awarded as the Center of Development (COD) in Teacher Education. On the other hand, the dimensions on *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* (0 .47), *diversity of income generation* (1.11), and *international students' recruitment* (1.26) have the lowest means. The data imply that these dimensions are the normal school's weak areas, which are interpreted as internationalized to a little extent or not internationalized at all. This is easily explained by their geographic and socio-political conditions. The university is located in Mindanao, the southernmost island in the Philippines. Peace and order is problematic in the area; thus, most foreign embassies issue travel advisories to their citizens not to travel to Mindanao. Since many cases of kidnapping of foreigners and locals including conflict situations are often sensationalized abroad, very few foreign nationals go to Mindanao. Overall, this university however, has a mean score of 1.78, which means **internationalized to some extent**. This then confirms what the President of this institution expressed, which should be an endeavor of the 3NS, that is, "to improve and transform teacher education in the country to meet the challenges posed by globalization" (Ho, 2013).

Institution No. 7: A Normal School in the Bukidnon. The stakeholders from the normal school in Bukidnon reveal an overall rating of their institution as 1.58 with a corresponding description of **internationalized to some extent**. This means that the institution needs development programs in its "journey towards excellence driven by substance and not form" (Barroso, 2013). For a closer look at the areas for development, the respondents rated the institution's *curriculum and instruction* highest at 2.45, followed by *facilities and support system* at 2.07 and *academic standard and quality* at 1.87, which were both rated internationalized to some extent. Meanwhile, *international and intercultural understanding and networking* had 1.43 rating; *international students' recruitment* had 1.01; *cooperation and development assistance* had 0.95; and *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* had 0.71 - all interpreted internationalized to a little extent. In contrast, the respondents rated *diversity of income generation* the least at 0.39 which reveals that in terms of creating projects and programs that will help the university gain revenues, this institution cannot yet compete with internationalized benchmarks.

Institution No. 8: A Normal School in the Cebu. The top two dimensions of internationalization of a Normal School in Cebu are the *academic standard and quality* (2.76) and *curriculum and instruction* (2.55) which are interpreted as internationalized to a great extent. This indicates that the Normal School is strong in these dimensions. They were able to strengthen these dimensions since these are the very same indicators which the CHED requires for the schools to be awarded as the Center of Excellence in Teacher Education, a title which this Normal School carries. This Normal School is also a Center of Excellence (COE) in Teacher Education. As

regards the three lowest means, this Normal School has these dimensions, namely *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* (0.84), *cooperation and development assistance* (1.19) and *diversity of income generation* (1.19), which are all interpreted as internationalized to a little extent. These serve as their weaknesses as well. This condition happens because the Normal School was built primarily to educate teachers in the province. In 1902, this Normal School was established as a “tributary school of Philippine Normal School in Manila” (Lopez, 2013). From then on, it became a very strong provider of quality teachers in the province of Cebu. Recent efforts on internationalization, however, are on their way. Overall, this institution has a mean score of 2.03, which is interpreted as **internationalized to some extent**.

Institution No. 9: A Normal School in the Ilocos. The stakeholders of a normal school in Ilocos assessed their institution’s level of internationalization highest in the area of Facilities and Support System having been rated as 2.58 out of 4, which means internationalized to a great extent. The institution is viewed as weak in diversity of income generation (0.09), *cooperation and development assistance* (0.24), both interpreted as not internationalized at all. The other dimensions interpreted internationalized to a little extent are *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers* (0.54), and *research and collaboration* (0.75), *international students’ recruitment* (0.84), and international and intercultural understanding and networking (0.99). Meanwhile, the dimensions on *curriculum and instruction and academic standard and quality* were considered internationalized to some extent. As a whole, the institution is considered **internationalized to a little extent**. This level indicates that there is really a need for development programs for a higher level of internationalization of this TEI as it continues to be “a bastion of tradition and excellence” in the northern part of the Philippines (Pascua, 2013).

Institution No. 10: A Normal School in Pangasinan. The stakeholders of a normal school in Pangasinan assessed their institution’s level of internationalization as in need of improvement in almost all areas of internationalization although it is now working on its Level 4 accreditation status for its teacher education program. Nevertheless, the assessors see their institution as having potential in *facilities and support system*, *academic standards and quality*, and in *curriculum and instruction* since these dimensions were all rated equivalent to level 2 in internationalization, which is interpreted as internationalized to some extent. The institution is viewed as weak in *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers*, *cooperation and development assistance*, *diversity of income generation*, and *international students recruitment* as these dimensions were rated not at all internationalized. Moreover, assessors also see their institution internationalized to a little extent in the dimensions of *research collaboration and international and intercultural understanding and networking*. As a whole, this institution sees itself as **internationalized to a little extent**. This means that it needs development programs in all areas of internationalization to have a successful “journey towards global excellence” (Estira, 2013).

Across Institutions. Figure 2 shows the areas of strength and weakness of the 10 normal schools in the 3NS along the nine (9) areas of internationalization. As shown in the figure, the stakeholders of the 3NS see the network as strong or **internationalized to a great extent** in only two (2) areas - *curriculum and instruction* and *facilities and support system*. They have the potential to be strong in *academic standards and quality, international and intercultural understanding and networking, and international students' recruitment* as these dimensions are interpreted **internationalized to some extent**. On the contrary, the network needs to strengthen its *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers, cooperation and development assistance, diversity of income generation, and research collaboration*. As a whole, the institutions in the network are internationalized only to some extent; thus, explains the need for development programs for internationalization.



Figure 2: Over-all Level of Internationalization of Normal Schools in the Philippines

Development Program for the Normal Schools in the Philippines

Based on the data on the level of internationalization of each member institution of the 3NS, several schemes in the design of a development program for the areas each institution is weak at are hereby proposed. The first scheme could be done by the individual institution through the efforts of its own stakeholders without reliance on its network. The other three schemes would require the efforts of the members of the network. The development of these programs is based on the assumption that those institutions, whose internal assessors assessed their institution as internationalized to a great extent, will assist another member institution in the 3NS identified as weak in the same area. This development model is actually highlighted as strategy for oneness in ASEAN 2015. ASEAN 2015 promotes cooperation

among ASEAN University Network (AUN) members to increase mobility for both students and staff within the region (ASEAN Secretariat, 2009). However, if no institution is considered strong in a certain dimension of internationalization, then the whole network has to synergize to establish a network with other institutions in other countries that are considered strong in the specific area of internationalization. The following schemes are named to capture the proposed development programs for the internationalization of the programs and practices of the individual institutions or the whole network.

- Self-Development.** This scheme could be done by the institution itself in order to increase its level of internationalization along the nine areas identified in this study without the assistance of a member institution in the network. This model of development jibes with the philosophy of education of PNU, that is educating for **personal renewal and social transformation**, which captures what Warner (1992, cited in Qiang, 2003) describes as one of the models for internationalization, that of the need for self-development and social transformation. The framework for development using this scheme will be based on the instrument used in gauging the level of their internationalization. The indicators of internationalization in the rubric used to gauge their level of internationalization could be transformed into strategies for development. The institution should then examine the areas one is weak at and extra efforts should be exerted on these weak areas in order to reach the desired level that will make the institution more recognized not only in the Philippines but at least in Asia. Below is a sample of development program proposed for individual institutions to implement without the necessary assistance of the 3NS.

Domains, Dimensions, and Strategies for Development	Levels of Development				Level of Internationalization Targeted/Attained in school year —
	1	2	3	4	
	Internationalized to a <u>little</u> extent	Internationalized to <u>some</u> extent	Internationalized to a <u>great</u> extent	Internationalized to a <u>very great</u> extent	
Domain I: KNOWLEDGE CREATION AND APPRECIATION					
A. Curriculum and Instruction					
1. <u>Design at least 85%</u> of <u>courses</u> that allow different race/ethnicity, religion, culture, class and gender, social class and people with disability to learn together.	Below 3 of the given strategies have been put in place in the institution	At Least 3 of the given strategies have been put in place in the institution	At Least 5 of the given strategies have been put in place in the institution	At Least 8 of the given strategies have been put in place in the institution	
2. <u>Offer at least 5</u> courses on foreign languages in the institution					
3. <u>Offer at least 8</u> courses that may serve as a venue for understanding and appreciation of the culture of other countries e.g.: Multicultural Education, Global Education, International Education, World Geography, World Literature, Peace Education, Ecology, Environmental Education, Education for Indigenous People, Comparative Education					
4. <u>Design at least 5</u> customized programs that are responsive to the demands of different sectors, agencies or organizations here and abroad.					
5. <u>Design at least 5</u> programs delivered in different modalities that could allow students from other countries to take courses at their own time and place e.g.: Distance Education,					

Correspondence Education, Open University, University in the Air, Virtual Classrooms)					
6. <u>Provide at least 7</u> of the following functional information and communication technologies that could facilitate efficient and effective learning e.g.: internet connection, e-library, teleconferencing technologies, e-journal, e-testing, webinar, video conferencing, social networking sites					
7. <u>Establish at least 7</u> laboratories functional to test theories or theorize from experiences e.g.: laboratory school for pre-school, elementary, high school learners; a computer laboratory; multimedia room; speech laboratory; a science laboratory; and other laboratories for teaching and learning					
8. <u>Provide at least 10</u> special learning experiences within one's country and/or across countries a year where students could appreciate the culture of other tribal groups/classes or races. e.g. : home stays, Cultural Field trips, Mission work e.g. spiritual, school-based, church-based), Literary immersion, Feeding program , Cultural shows, Film festivals, Photo exhibit/galleries, Cultural exchange programs, School visits, community works/immersion					
9. <u>Create at least 2</u> joint full program/s or course/s curriculum with foreign institutions/universities					
10. <u>Regularly updates at least 85%</u> of the syllabus of course offerings to integrate the new trends and address pressing issues around the globe that have implications to education.					
Other emerging strategies for internationalization (Please specify)					

2. **Sisterhood/Brotherhood Thinking.** This principle describes a relationship where one strong member of the family of the network adopts one or more member institutions of the network considered weak in the area of internationalization. It is shown by the formula below:

Strong 3NS member institution/s + weak 3NS member institution/s = One or
Similar Development Program/s on Internationalization

3. **Collective Thinking.** In the event that no institution is considered strong in a certain indicator of internationalization, then 3NS through its Steering Committee or Lead Shepherd should create an internationalization committee that could scout for possible foreign university as partner in a development program. One case that could be cited to illustrate this scheme is what the Philippine Normal University has done when it forged partnership with the University of New England (UNE) in Armidale, Australia. UNE established a Research Center for Teacher Quality (RCTQ) in partnership with PNU through the support of the Australian Agency for

International Development (AusAID) to conduct applied research to provide evidence-based policy advice directed at strengthening teacher quality in the Philippines. Since PNU is the lead shepherd of the network, this research center can then become the link not only of PNU to UNE but with it is its network with nine other member institutions. The formula is shown below.

3NS Internationalization Committee/Lead Shepherd + a foreign partner
Institution = Development Program on Internationalization

4. ***Service-Oriented Thinking.*** This principle describes a relationship where one strong member of the family of the network adopts for a development program one or more member institutions not belonging to the network but also offering teacher education programs in the region. The program could be organized to be conducted in partnership with any other member institutions in the network or another foreign institution.

Strong 3NS member institution/s + another strong member institution + weak non-3NS member institution/s in the region = One or Similar Development Program/s on Internationalization

Conclusions and Recommendations

The analysis made on the strengths and weaknesses of the 10 member institutions of the 3NS in the Philippines gives a picture of the development programs in teacher education in the Philippines as well as their capacity to be the country's resource that could be shared with other countries in terms of the preparation and development of teachers at least in Asia if not beyond it. Apparently, among the nine areas for internationalization, the country's *curriculum and instruction* could be a potential area for internationalization. As the country prepares for the ASEAN 2015, the government could then promote the country's TEIs particularly their curriculum and instruction in producing teachers for the ASEAN community. The present teacher education curriculum in the Philippines can be considered internationally benchmarked; hence, it can also develop teachers in the other countries in the ASEAN region. The *facilities and support system* of these TEIs particularly those belonging to the 3NS are also being improved to deliver effectively the curriculum for teachers. The *standards and quality of their programs and services* are also potential strength including initial efforts for *international and intercultural understanding and networking* as well as *international student recruitment*. However, to help strengthen TEIs as a country's resource, the government can also facilitate the *mobility and exchanges for students and teachers*; establish *cooperation and development assistance* at least with the ASEAN countries; *diversify the sources for income generation*; and establish *research collaboration*. Since the member institutions of the 3NS are all government institutions created basically to produce teachers for the Filipino people, government efforts and resources should be appropriated for them so that they will be able to produce teachers who are on a par with those teaching in top rank universities in Asia. Since ASEAN 2015 is two years

away, efforts should then be doubled to enable TEIs in the country be of help in making the Philippines a country to consider when it comes to the preparation or development of teachers at least in the ASEAN community.

References

- Association of Southeast Asia Nation Secretariat (2009). *Roadmap for an ASEAN Community*. Retrieved on July 15, 2013 from <http://www.aseansec.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/RoadmapASEANCommunity.pdf>
- Balagtas, M., Atweh, B., Papango, M., Reyes, Z., & Ubiña, M. (2012). *Development of a rubric in measuring the internationalization level of teacher education institutions in the Philippines*. PNU Press: Manila.
- Balagtas, M., & Dacanay, A. (2013). *Assessment of Learning 1. In the Philippine Normal University, Professional Education, a reviewer for the Licensure Examination for Teachers*. Manila: PNU University Press.
- Barroso, V. M. (2013). *Bukidnon State University's (1924) academic joyrney... yesterday, today, and in the future*. In the Commission on Higher Education & the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*. Manila: PNU Press.
- Bernardo, A. B. (2002). *International higher education: models, conditions and issues*. Retrieved on July 15, 2013 from <http://pascn.pids.gov.ph/DiscList/d01/s01-12.pdf>
- Cruzada, E.C (2013). *The premier teacher training institution of the eastern visayas: Leyte Normal School*. In the Commission on Higher Education & the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*. Manila: PNU Press.
- Defensor, N. (2013). *The normal schools then and now, service to country, service to humanity*. In the Commission on Higher Education & the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*. Manila: PNU Press.
- Estira, V. C. (2013). *Pioneering sustainable undertakings: Pangasinan State University*. In the Commission on Higher Education & the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*. Manila: PNU Press.
- Ho, M. E. (2013). *Educating minds, redefining the future*. In the Commission on Higher education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press.
- Lauraya, F. L. P. (2013). *A community of scholars, committed to excellence, innovation and good governance: Bicol University*. In the Commission on Higher Education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press.
- Lopez, M. T. (2013). *A nurturing spirit; Cebu Normal University*. In the Commission on Higher Education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press.

- Ogena, E. B. (2013). Setting the bar in teacher education: The Philippine Normal University (1901). In the Commission on Higher Education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press.
- Padama, E., Balagtas, M., Lacuata, F., Acierto, E., Alfuente, R., Irapta, A., Rodriguez, A., & Ruiz, E. (2010). *Towards the development of a conceptual framework for internationalizing higher education institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines*. CHED-ZRC NCR 1 Research Project.
- Pascua, M. E. (2013). *The bastion of tradition and excellence*: Mariano Marcos State University. In the Commission on Higher Education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press, p.71.
- Philippine Normal University (2012). *Strategic development plan 2012-2022*. Manila: PNU Press.
- Philippine Normal University (2005). *Administrative manual*. Manila: University Press.
- Qiang, Z (2003). *Internationalization of higher education towards a conceptual framework*. Retrieved on August 10, 2011 from <http://www.wwwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=pfie&aid=1801>
- Republic Act No. 49647 (June 30, 2009). *An act designating the Philippine Normal University as the country's national center for teacher education, appropriating funds therefor, and for other purposes*. Retrieved on July 15, 2013 at http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2009/ra_9647_2009.html
- Sespeñe, J.S. (2013). *Holistic nurturing of the TAO-the humane being*: Palawan State University. In the Commission on Higher education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press.
- Subong, P.E (2013). *Thy name resounds; West Visayas State University*. In the Commission on Higher education and the National Network of Normal Schools, *An enduring legacy, the journey of normal schools in the Philippines*, Manila: PNU Press.
- Taylor,S., Rizvi,R., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Educational policy and the politics of change*. London: Routledge.