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Global Learning: Reaching across Horizons

Students sometimes think of global learning as coextensive with opportunities to expand their horizons through international exchange—to visit new places, experience new things, and forge new possibilities. These students correctly understand that their perspectives will shift as they occupy new geographical and intellectual positions, and they may indeed find more expansive views in unfamiliar places. But at each new location, they will encounter a new horizon—a new line beyond which they cannot see, wherever they stand. As Ferdinand Magellan and his crew knew well, it is possible to piece together a more complete understanding of the global whole by continually shifting one’s location; but it isn’t possible to occupy all positions—to see all horizons, or even more than a single horizon—at once.

It is, however, not only possible but necessary to try to envision how different perspectives and horizons intersect. For, while the horizon may represent an outer limit to one’s perspective, one’s connection to others extends far beyond this demarcation line. In the twenty-first century, it is more apparent than ever that local occurrences have global consequences, and that global systems—financial, technological, natural, ideological—have palpable local effects. Helping students grapple with this complexity and its ethical consequences, and preparing them to act responsibly in the world, means helping them piece together the connections between what they know and what they can only imagine.

Thus, to an extent, successful global learning rests on helping students understand the limits of their own horizons, whatever their location, while imagining other horizons that exist simultaneously. Victor Kazanjian points toward this idea when he says of perspective-taking and positionality, “These two factors are so crucial in how human beings process information and construct knowledge … that they must be the starting place for where we begin to think about global education” (2013). Kazanjian describes an exercise where he places a box in the center of a table and asks students, each with a differently incomplete view, to describe the box comprehensively without moving either it or themselves. This exercise underscores the importance of knowing one’s own position well and communicating effectively with diverse others.

But what, exactly, is global learning, and how can it build such capacities? This issue’s authors bring various perspectives to this question, but they generally agree that defining global learning necessitates taking a close look at what students should be capable of doing when they graduate from college—as contributing author Fernando Reimers suggests, what knowledge, skills, and competencies they will need to build an appealing future for all. As a whole, this issue’s authors concur, students will need to be able to think integratively and collaborate across disciplines in order to address today’s complex, real-world problems. They will need to have a keen sense of social responsibility and civic commitment and a well-developed corresponding skill set in order to address contemporary challenges like economic inequity and global sustainability in ways that contribute to the greater global good.

What kind of educational experiences, then, will produce these outcomes? Again, this issue’s authors reach consensus around opportunities grounded in what contributing author Tammy Birk might call the “in-between”—those that are integrative, interdisciplinary, and intercultural, occupying spaces that connect different ways of knowing and being and different scales of place, from local to global. They argue that students need opportunities to apply their learning in real-world contexts, whether at home or abroad, and to reflect with others on their experiences. They offer a variety of intellectual approaches and curricular models designed to facilitate such experiences, including learning communities, community-engaged learning, and cross-institutional collaboration. And they challenge readers to rethink what might be possible within their own institutional contexts.

In sum, when envisioning the future of global learning, this issue’s authors call us to imagine what exists beyond our own horizons—not only the horizons of our individual perspectives, but also the broader horizon of what seems possible in today’s world. After all, higher education is preparing students for both careers and global challenges that don’t yet exist. Preparing students well means asking them to imagine what exists not only beyond their own perspectives, but also beyond the vanishing point of what can currently be predicted—and equipping them with the skills they need to address those complex realities, whatever they are.

—KATHRYN PELTIER CAMPBELL, editor of Diversity & Democracy
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Living in a highly interdependent world is not an option—but at present, being educated to do so competently is. Despite the many courses and initiatives designed to support international and global education in colleges and universities around the country, the undergraduate curriculum as a whole is not adequately preparing most students to be capable global citizens (see Reimers 2013; National Research Council 2007). Lack of serious commitment to designing a curriculum that prioritizes global learning for all undergraduates has on most campuses made global education a peripheral undertaking, limited primarily to those students and faculty specializing in international area studies. Without leadership to make global education more central to the undergraduate curriculum, global learning will become ever more marginal—with compounding consequences for most college graduates, who will be ill-equipped to live as global citizens.

Bringing global education to the core must begin with deliberation among faculty and administrators about the kinds of competencies graduates should be able to demonstrate, and to what purpose. Imagine, for example, a world where all college graduates understand how their lives are influenced by global processes and events, where they have the motivation and capacity to collaborate with others across national boundaries to advance the well-being of humans and the planet. Imagine a world in which graduates can alleviate global conflicts by promoting peace with others, where they are able to communicate productively, unburdened by prejudice, with people from different cultural backgrounds. Imagine, in short, an interdependent world in which all college graduates have the skills to take care of themselves, of others, and of the environment, as well as the dispositions to contribute to the many communities of which they are a part, including those that transcend national boundaries.

Such a world requires three things: (1) specialists with deep expertise in various disciplines, (2) collaboration among these specialists to engage with and overcome global challenges, and (3) global education for all students, not just those specializing in international area studies. Unfortunately, at present, most colleges and universities are better at the first of these priorities—educating experts, including those in international area studies—than they are at advancing collaboration among these experts or promoting the interdisciplinary study of global subjects among all students. Imagining and deliberating about how to ensure that all graduates gain the skills, knowledge, and capacities to contribute to building a better future is the first step to making such a world a reality.

**Articulating the Aims of Global Education**

In order to create a strategy for global education that is appropriate to institutional contexts and deeply rooted in faculty expertise, leaders at each campus should empower a group of faculty from across programs—including the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and professional disciplines—to work with key administrators on bringing global education to the core of the undergraduate curriculum. Given the heterogeneity of higher education institutions in the United States, it is impossible to issue uniform prescriptions for how to do this (Rosovsky 2014). Yet while each institution is different, all can follow a process of goal setting, auditing, curriculum development, benchmarking, and assessment that can facilitate institution-specific strategies for sustaining continuous improvement.

The faculty and administrators working together on this global education committee will need to articulate a vision of the aims of global education before detailing the learning experiences that such an education entails. Such an exercise is central to defining, and engaging support for, global education in the undergraduate curriculum. This exercise could enable global education to move from the periphery to the core of the curriculum at a time of competing priorities, and at a moment when higher education faces fundamental questions about its social relevance, accountability, and sustainability. Articulating the aims of global education can help clarify how such an education might help graduates obtain jobs, help faculty increase instructional effectiveness, and help institutions serve a more diverse student body, among other priorities.

To center global education within the undergraduate curriculum, college faculty and administrators will need to be more intentional, strategic, and effective—and they will need to start by addressing difficult questions head on. Not least among the contentious topics to be addressed is the question of how to frame global education efforts. Take the popular but contested term *global citizenship* as an example. Some argue that this term is inherently contradictory because there is no “global jurisdiction”;
others identify it as a form of global neocolonialism, an attempt by global institutions to undermine nation-states.

In my view, the concept of global citizenship conveys the capacity to engage in a global commons. It connects global education to the larger civic mission of colleges and universities. All of our lives are greatly affected by events that are global in nature, that transcend and cannot be managed solely by national governments or institutions. With the increased ease of communications and travel and the deterritorialization of much economic activity (including the production of goods and the delivery of services), new opportunities are arising for global engagement, along with new challenges to global well-being. As some individuals benefit disproportionately from globalization, others experience increased inequality and exclusion; as new challenges to environmental sustainability arise, so do related challenges of unsustainable population growth, human conflict, and poverty. Globalization itself can compound the impact of some of these challenges, turning local problems—a health epidemic, for example, or a political conflict—into global phenomena as people move physically and often virtually around the planet.

Educators need to equip students to live in these highly interconnected times. We need to help them develop global civility, a sense of themselves in and at peace with the world, so that they become capable of making the best of the interdependence that, like it or not, defines the era in which we live.

Educators need to equip students to live in these highly interconnected times. We need to help them develop global civility, a sense of themselves in and at peace with the world, so that they become capable of making the best of the interdependence that, like it or not, defines the era in which we live.

I would thus argue that global citizenship is a generative framework for faculty and administrators to consider as they articulate the aims of global education at their institutions. Nonetheless, stakeholders at each college or university need to determine what vision and framework best aligns with their institution’s mission and priorities.

**Specifying Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies**

In addition to articulating a vision of the ultimate aims of global education, faculty and administrators will need to deliberate the knowledge, skills, and competencies that college graduates need to construct that imagined future. Such deliberation will allow faculty and administrators to design a curriculum that provides students the opportunities they need, within and beyond the classroom, to achieve global learning outcomes. The concept of global citizenship, for example, invokes a definable set of knowledge, skills, and competencies. Some see these outcomes as deriving naturally from deep inquiry with any subject, given that globalization is manifest in so many processes. But I believe that preparing students for global engagement means ensuring they attain specific knowledge, skills, and competencies that may or may not derive seamlessly from deep study of particular fields. Given the heterogeneity of institutions—their varying missions, capacities, and starting points for undertaking global education—each institution will need to develop a process that prioritizes the knowledge, skills, and capacities most aligned with its institutional mission and local conditions and resources.

Faculty and administrators leading global education efforts will need to establish what knowledge should be acquired by all students and what knowledge varies by field and should be infused in different programs of study. The global education committee may decide that in order to become global citizens, all students should know some basic facts about the world, such as population figures and growth rates or levels of concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Whatever knowledge they acquire, students should also understand the drivers of global processes connected to this knowledge, as well as the consequences of these processes for the global ecosystem. They should know how development processes work in areas related to their fields of study, and they should know something about the institutions and initiatives that support development efforts. This knowledge can and should lead to an understanding of potential levers of change, providing the intellectual foundation necessary to contribute effectively to improving the world.
More important than learning facts is developing the capacity to use those facts: to locate the knowledge that is needed and to make sense of that knowledge competently. Thus global citizens need the cognitive skills that allow for problem solving in a globalized context. They need the capacity to draw on knowledge from different disciplines or domains of practice to design solutions to practical problems, such as reducing hunger and poverty, promoting health or education, curbing population growth, reducing humankind’s carbon footprint, or preserving the Earth’s ecosystems. Students need opportunities to develop these problem-solving skills and capacities by generating innovations that are domain specific—for example, systems of delivering microcredit to support small producers in the developing world, or ways of using low-cost technology to support educational innovation. Designing such innovations requires contextual understandings of relevant problems, disciplines, and practices.

Global citizens also need the competencies to work with others across lines of difference. They need to be skilled in negotiating agreements and building relationships in different cultural contexts. They need to understand their own identities and recognize their similarities and differences with the many others with whom globalization will bring them into contact. They need to have empathy and concern for others, as well as awareness of their own privilege.

**Infusing Global Education through Curricular Design**

Opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, and competencies described above are not mere corollaries of deep study. They require educators to develop specific exercises that engage students in linking knowledge across disparate domains, with a focus on inventing solutions to global problems. Thus in addition to determining what knowledge, skills, and competencies are priorities at their institution, faculty and administrators will need to negotiate how best to offer a more global curriculum. They could do this by creating new requirements or new majors, infusing global pathways into existing majors, introducing more interdisciplinary courses, or pursuing a mix of all of the above.

In reviewing the existing curriculum, the global education committee may find many courses and initiatives that support global education on their campus. But they may also find that few of these are organized into an intellectually coherent curriculum, existing instead as stand-alone activities. This is often the case for study abroad opportunities or courses in foreign languages or foreign cultures, which may be sought out by those who are interested but remain poorly integrated with other academic experiences and peripheral to the experiences of most students. In higher education at large, there are many courses that cover topics global, comparative, and international—but there are few global education requirements, curricular sequences, or clear pathways to well-defined global learning outcomes. There are many foreign language courses, study abroad programs, international centers, and student-generated initiatives, but few systems to assess students’ overall global learning or the effectiveness of global education efforts, and little recognition for students who demonstrate mastery. (Editor’s note: see Kevin Hovland’s article on page 8 of this issue for information about an emerging method of assessing students’ global learning.)

As a result of this state of affairs, students and faculty are often in the dark when it comes to understanding how the many components supporting global education on campus are part of a coherent picture, and how these various elements are aligned—or not. Many colleges offer maps of the physical campus and its surroundings, but few offer intellectual roadmaps that help undergraduates and their advisors chart a path toward the development of desirable global learning outcomes. If these maps exist, they are often the private domain of some faculty, tacit knowledge that is not examined, evaluated, or shared across groups and is therefore unable to inspire collective action. The global education committee will need to fill this void by developing appropriate pathways of global education opportunities on their campus and sharing these maps widely to promote deliberation, improvement, alignment, and assessment of results.

In developing these maps, the committee may aspire to depth and rigor but be tempted toward superficiality, often the path of least resistance in trying to satisfy many constituencies and serve many different students.
The committee members may feel pressured to devote as little time as possible to this new curricular priority. But deep study requires time, the most precious resource for learning, and devoting adequate time to global studies may require difficult conversations about institutional priorities. Higher education institutions currently exist in times of great contestation over purpose, turmoil over governance and resources, and justified concern about the future. Prioritizing global education in this context will require thinking about the curriculum as part of a complex system that includes mission, resources, faculty, students, and key partnerships. Those involved with designing curricula will need to ask how these different priorities intersect. For example, a number of institutions have prioritized increasing the percentage of tuition-paying international students, who often come from privileged backgrounds and who, like all students, represent their particular circumstances of origin. How can the global curriculum balance and engage the perspectives of these students while fostering greater global education outcomes among all students?

Advancing global education on campuses will require serious deliberation, planning, and hard work in curriculum development. It will require faculty, after reaching working agreements about the kinds of knowledge, skills, and competencies graduates should exhibit, to engage in the difficult work of creating a sequence of curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular opportunities that lead to mastery in these areas. These exercises in the old arts of curriculum design need to engage with current debates about how to offer the best possible undergraduate preparation, making the most effective use of increasingly limited resources. They need to be aligned with current ideas about the value of project-based pedagogies that help students develop the capacity to do: to instantiate knowledge by generating solutions to specific problems. They need to engage with current debates about the appropriate role of entrepreneurship education, innovation labs, design-based education, and online and blended learning as part and parcel of the rethinking of undergraduate education.

**Seeking Shared Goals and Models**

While each institution will need to develop the curriculum that best fits its mission, capacity, and context, higher education at large also needs communities of practice that can provide models and benchmarks for institutionalizing rigorous programs of global education. Organizations like the Association of American Colleges and Universities and NAFSA: Association of International Educators are studying, disseminating, and fostering exemplary practices supporting collegial deliberation, integration of global studies in the liberal education curriculum, and design and implementation of global education curricula. One example in this search for good models is the list of annual recipients of the Senator Paul Simon Award for Internationalization, granted by NAFSA as a result of a peer-reviewed process. While the awards are given for comprehensive, broadly based internationalization, the criteria include evidence of a coherent global focus in the curriculum.

While engaged academic planning for global education is indeed a challenge to the status quo, it is not a challenge to the values of a liberal education. The knowledge, skills, and competencies needed for global citizenship require an understanding of topics related to public health, demographics, economics, and politics, and also those rooted in literature, art, and languages. Integrating learning across these disciplines and connecting it with opportunities for students to design and construct solutions to shared global challenges can only enhance the depth of understanding available through discrete fields of study. If the goal of a liberal education is to educate well-rounded, multidimensional individuals who are ready to live life with purpose, those individuals will need to know how to connect different bodies of knowledge. They will develop those connections not in the context of a single course or even in the sum of all the courses they take, but also in the interstices of the curriculum, the synapses that connect various courses with cocurricular and extracurricular activities.

Unless faculty and institutional leaders develop a vision of global education as part of the undergraduate curriculum, aligning institutional resources with explicit curricular planning, global education will remain peripheral to the purpose of liberal education. Unless it becomes part of the core, undergraduate students will remain underprepared for the twenty-first century—lacking the knowledge, skills, and competencies they urgently need to engage as global citizens in an increasingly important global commons.

The author would like to thank Larry Bacow, Steven Bloomfield, Kathryn Campbell, Jorge Dominguez, Ethan Van Drunen, Richard Freeland, Kevin Kalra, Ken Kay, Robert Moore, and Henry Rosovsky for their generous feedback on drafts of this article.
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What Can Global Learners Do?

KEVIN HOVLAND, senior director for global learning and curricular change at the Association of American Colleges and Universities

It is perhaps inevitable that conversations about global learning turn to maps and questions of navigation. The concept itself is tangled in metaphors of space. When institutions map their global learning efforts, they often create documents that show where they have study abroad programs, where they have partnerships with other institutions, and perhaps where their students are from. The use of such maps to chart the geography of global learning opportunities suggests the need to similarly chart the metrics for improving global learning. But can we simply add these metrics to our existing maps? What would their inclusion mean for how we envision global learning—and global learners—at our institutions?

Plotting Global Learning

To begin to answer this question, it is helpful to consider where many of the current maps for global learning originated. A quick look at the history of the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U’s) Shared Futures initiative helps provide context. AAC&U launched Shared Futures in 2001 to engage with colleges and universities in exploring how the principles and traditions of liberal education might better align with efforts to ensure that students gain the knowledge, skills, and perspectives they need to thrive within dynamic social, political, cultural, and economic contexts—contexts more and more frequently characterized as global. We called this vision of context-rich liberal education “global learning” in order to differentiate it from well-established practices in international education. In doing this, we were reacting to trends we saw across higher education as institutions deepened their commitments to addressing elements of personal and social responsibility in the curriculum. We saw that institutional missions and curricular debates were beginning to focus on questions of democracy, identity, and civic engagement—in domestic contexts initially, and soon in global contexts as events made it more difficult to imagine such questions and issues in isolation from worldwide trends.

In some cases, this shift was framed as a political or moral imperative. At many Jesuit institutions, for example, institutional leaders saw a focus on global challenges as aligned with their social justice missions. In other cases, these leaders were simply acknowledging the reality of operating in a more complex, interdependent, and interconnected world. Different institutions evolve within their own contexts, their environments swirling with economic, political, and cultural issues that have variable significance and weight depending on how global change has affected the states and communities in which these institutions exist. Then as now, there was not a single model of global learning that fit all institutions.

New ideas are often expressed in familiar language. So it was not surprising that in the early stages of Shared Futures, when AAC&U asked our members how they were approaching global learning, we received answers framed in the idiom of international education. Ten to fifteen years ago, the international education agenda simply provided the categories, metaphors, and examples into which thought and conversation flowed. Colleges and universities had lengthy, well-established commitments to international education, and within institutions certain disciplines and programs had carved out areas of deep knowledge and specialized methodologies for better understanding the world.

In a sense, these well-established international education efforts provided maps for many institutions’ early efforts in global learning. The American Council on Education (ACE), for example, conducted an influential series of surveys to measure internationalization on campuses in the United States. Originally conducted in 2001, these surveys led to ACE’s internationalization index, which includes six dimensions: articulated commitment, academic offerings, organizational infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students and student programs. The survey questions in the academic offerings category can be read as a map of the most common international priorities and assumptions at the time:

- Does your institution have a foreign language admissions requirement for incoming undergraduates?
- Does your institution have a foreign language graduation requirement for undergraduates?
- To satisfy their general education requirement, are undergraduates required to take courses that primarily feature perspectives, issues, or events from specific countries or areas outside the United States?
- At your institution, what percentage of undergraduate courses offered by the following departments had an international focus? (Business, history, political science)
Did your institution administer for credit any of the following undergraduate programs last year? (Study abroad, international internships, international service opportunities, field study)

How many undergraduate students at your institution studied abroad last year? (Green 2005, 6)

Today, there are few institutions in which the conversations about either international or global learning expectations are so narrowly conceived. However, these survey questions illustrate two points. First, the list indicates that we have traditionally measured success primarily in relation to institutional resources and offerings, not in reference to student learning. In other words, we have mapped the geography of global learning in terms of where it occurs, not what outcomes it produces. Second, the list does suggest a set of assumptions about those outcomes, conceived in terms of what “international learners” can do: speak a foreign language, live comfortably in another culture, and have some mastery of the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in a relevant profession—likely business, cultural work, or diplomacy.

If that list and that profile of a learner seem too narrow, how would we rewrite them today? Rather than starting by mapping international or even global educational opportunities across an institutional geography, what would happen if we began by mapping what global learners can do?

**Profiling Global Learners**

If, instead of mapping where our internationalization efforts occur on campus and in the curriculum, we focused on mapping the development of global learners, we would likely create a very different set of maps. Instead of the geographic default that naturally comes to mind when thinking about a complex, interconnected world, we might find ourselves considering an alternative metaphor: the functional magnetic resonance image, or fMRI. Focusing on global learners rather than on global learning, these maps would show not the structures and courses that our old maps displayed, but something that is happening within students themselves.

While this is an intriguing visual, the key to giving it some practical relevance lies in the effortful task of defining global learning outcomes and identifying the characteristics of work through which students could reliably demonstrate that they were exercising the “global learner” parts of their brains. One attempt at this task is AAC&U’s recently published global learning rubric, part of the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) suite of rubrics aligned with the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes. In the global learning rubric, a working committee of Shared Futures faculty members and administrators defined global learning as a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people’s lives and the earth’s sustainability. Through global learning, students should (1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, (2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and (3) address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably. (AAC&U n.d.)

This definition represents an ambitious vision of undergraduate education, and one that fully reflects AAC&U’s long-term commitment to framing liberal education around compelling challenges at the intersections of diversity, democracy, civic engagement, social responsibility, and sustainability. It is the product of long conversations and
should be seen as suggesting the kinds of approaches that multiple stakeholders on campus might work through within their own contexts. Focusing on global learners—who they are and what they can do—may help those conversations become more concrete and productive as they progress.

The global learning rubric is further articulated as a set of domains mapped across a developmental arc. Those domains are Global Self-Awareness, Perspective Taking, Cultural Diversity, Personal and Social Responsibility, Understanding Global Systems, and Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts (Anderson and Blair 2013, 10). The domains represent complex and overlapping expectations. But with widespread campus conversation and collaboration, it should be possible to translate the milestone and capstone markers in each domain to answer the question—what can a global learner do? For example:

- A global learner articulates her own values and responsibility in the context of personal identities and recognizes diverse and potentially conflicting positions vis-à-vis complex social and civic problems.
- A global learner gains and applies deep knowledge of the differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems.
- A global learner understands the interactions of multiple worldviews, experiences, histories, and power structures on an issue or set of issues.
- A global learner initiates meaningful interaction with people from other cultures in the context of a complex problem or opportunity.
- A global learner takes informed and responsible action to address ethical, social, and environmental challenges.
- A global learner applies knowledge and skills gained through general education, the major, and cocurricular experiences to address complex, contemporary global issues.

The rubric domains are overlapping and flexible, and this list does not exhaust the possibilities. But in each domain, students will require scaffolded instruction to introduce, develop, and master the requisite knowledge and skills.

The Global Learning Rubric is just one example of how the profile of a global learner—the real-life equivalent to the metaphorical fMRI—is being reconceived. Similar efforts are underway on campuses across the country and around the world. Institutions are using rhetoric in their missions and admissions statements promising that their degrees will help students solve the big challenges the world faces. But as our vision of the global learner changes, the infrastructure that supports these learners must change as well.

Creating New Maps for Global Learning

The complex range of outcomes suggested by the global learning rubric will not be met in a single course. Instead, they will only be met across a wide variety of curricular and cocurricular learning experiences through which students will be able to recognize a coherent vision of themselves as developing global learners. Implicit in the theory of the global learning rubric is the notion that students will understand and take responsibility for how the parts of their learning come together. They will demonstrate their progress and reflect on the connections they are making through well-crafted assignments. Thus, if we are going to focus on mapping what global learners can do, we also need to focus on mapping how we might design and implement the kinds of assignments that would provide evidence of progress and achievement.

One of the complicating factors in rethinking what global learners can do involves distinguishing between the goal of developing specific global expertise (the global learner as a candidate for the foreign service exam, for example) and the goal of developing a more general level of global understanding (the global learner as citizen living in an interconnected world). Though these two goals are not in contradiction, they can confuse efforts on campus to define global learning. Ideally, comprehensive maps of global learning will account for both of these goals.

The Shared Futures initiative has primarily focused on general education, for two reasons. First, general education designed to help students become global learners carries all the elements of engaged liberal learning; and second, global challenges provide coherence to general education designs in which distribution requirements can cloud the sense of interconnection and integration they were originally intended to provide. If general education is geared toward encouraging global learners, all students who complete their general education requirements will share some common ways of approaching problems and some baseline knowledge and skills needed to begin to frame global questions. At the end of the process, however, not all global learners will look the same, nor will they share a common set of literacies. They will follow significantly different paths through the major and through cocurricular and life experiences. Thus the disciplines are also critical to global learning. Recognizing this, most disciplines have already begun the important task of asking their own central questions: What is a global engineer and what can she do? What is a global historian and what can he do? What is a global chemist and what can she do? What is a global nurse and what can he do?
These questions imply a focus on action, and with it, a central role for problem solving and integration in global learning. If the ability to integrate knowledge, skills, and perspectives in order to solve problems is the hallmark of a global learner, then upper-level problem-solving capstones that link general education to the major may become signature design features of the global curriculum. Such a move would align with current shifts across higher education toward more problem-centered learning strategies that focus greater attention on competencies and proficiencies than on course content. What would education look like if it were based around a large sample of complex problems that we wanted advanced students to be able to wrestle with, learn from, practice on, and suggest solutions to? Would it be possible to reach agreement about what made such problems “global”? Could we expand these problem-centered experiences into curricular pathways with capstone experiences designed to ensure that students acquire certain knowledge and skills? Could we distinguish between the outcomes associated with general global competencies and those associated with deeper explorations—both discipline based and “global”?

If we can answer these questions in the affirmative, we may be able to identify elements of global learning that are foundational, including skills that are necessary for global learning but that also extend beyond it (such as evidence-based reasoning, critical thinking, and communication). We may be able to identify global knowledge that is so fundamental that it would comprise a basic level of global literacy, as well as specific global knowledge associated with capstone-level understanding of the topic at hand. With these elements in mind, we might be able to ask all students to demonstrate their capacities as global learners, through global learning experiences that are in fact quite different from each other. Such a possibility might suggest that global learning is more about developing integrative ways of thinking and the capacities to connect knowledge in ways attuned to an interdependent world than it is about building a specific concrete body of knowledge. This might sound similar to the goals of a good capstone experience, and we should apply our global systems thinking to curricular design and take advantage of such existing frameworks. But just as a good liberal education is not necessarily global by nature, a good capstone experience will not inevitably lead to global learning.

All of this suggests a third kind of map, one that connects the geographies of international and global learning with the fMRI of the global learner profile. With this map, it might be possible to imagine how aspects of the global learner profile align with the curriculum—showing what students can actually do in relation to what educational opportunities they have. The resulting three-dimensional map could not only show foundational global skills and knowledge, but could also reflect more advanced problem-centered and disciplinary endeavors, both depicted against the backdrop of students’ curricular opportunities. On this map, foundational global learning experiences would be broadly construed, representing the kinds of cross-cutting capacities students need to pursue more sophisticated work. Peaks of capacity would appear in areas of more advanced work, where the specific knowledge and skills associated with global learning would be situated. When layering global learner profiles across a campus, these peaks would most likely cluster in topics that have traditionally been associated with global/international concerns—area studies, international affairs, cultural studies, etc. However, over time, such a map might encourage additional experimentation in less familiar areas—especially those associated with complex, transdisciplinary problem-centered learning.

**Conclusion**

With three-dimensional maps charting the capacities of global learners against the opportunities for global learning, we can identify multiple areas of the curriculum and cocurriculum that are, in various student-specific ways, forming the foundation for global learning. Some students would build on that foundation in a wide variety of disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, or grammatical contexts. Others might not. But all students would have the basis for taking their cross-cutting capacities into a world of work and civic engagement that is global beyond disciplinary boundaries.

Ideally, these students’ identities as global learners would be unbound by their time in college, with its scaffolded global learning experiences and opportunities. Their global learning maps would extend outward in space and time as they continue to gain skills, knowledge, and practice in navigating a complex and interconnected world, through formal education and through life experiences. Charting their own multidimensional, twenty-first-century pathways, these students would have the capacity to become lifelong global learners.
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As global learning gains traction in undergraduate core curricula and colleges and universities revise their mission statements to include larger commitments to global awareness, the educational imperative to “globalize” feels more insistent than ever. At the same time, higher education sometimes seems to be caught in a closed critical loop: attentive to global learning because it’s obviously good to be global. While it is good to be global, it is also important to be clear about the conceptual framework that guides our work in global learning—the motives and ambitions that compel us to advocate for global priorities in the first place.

Indeed, there can be many different rationales for global learning, serving many possible ends. A neo-mercantilist rationale focuses global learning on a narrow set of vocational and market-friendly ends; an internationalist rationale enlists it for the cultivation of cross-cultural awareness and competencies; a liberal-aesthetic rationale claims it for the larger goals of self-enrichment. These rationales may be useful, but in my view, none provides a focused attention to global learning as a critical citizenship project—an affirmation of the larger ethical dimension of this work and its link to the responsibilities of citizenship, especially across multiple scales and contexts.

I want to suggest the value of a critical cosmopolitan rationale in providing this missing focus. In general, to hold a cosmopolitan perspective means to effectively extend one’s identity, identifications, and ethical obligations beyond the bounds of what is familiar or proximate, to think and act with a strong concern for all humanity. In contrast to potentially universalizing forms of cosmopolitanism, critical cosmopolitanism resists abstract and overly general truths about humanity or globality, any ethic that asks us to ignore difference, and the potential erasure of local identities and smaller-scale solidarities. In challenging the traditional relationship between the global and the local—as geographies, sites for citizenship practice, and sources of identity and belonging—critical cosmopolitanism offers a complex, transformative, and socially relevant framework for global learning.

The Trap of Dichotomous Logic
There has been a persistent tendency in higher education to imagine the global and the local as “separate objects which impact one another, like billiard balls” (Cox 2005, 181). In this way of thinking, the global and the local collide and ricochet off one another before each ultimately falls into its separate pocket. I thought this way for some time, assuming that if I wanted to globalize my teaching, I had to locate the work of my course somewhere other than where we were. The global, both literally and abstractly, was somewhere else, up there, over there. Columbus, Ohio—like a good billiard ball—could affect my understanding of the global, but, beyond that, it was difficult for me to imagine the local and the global in anything other than an antonymic relationship.

With isolated courses prioritizing a “global perspective,” “global awareness,” or “global understanding,” curricular structures can manifest and reinforce this dichotomous logic. While these global courses are not usually explicitly opposed to another set of courses foregrounding attention to local knowledge, any courses that are not specifically identified as globally conscious are often presumed not to be globally conscious. This majority of unmarked courses becomes identified—conceptually and practically—with the local, which in turn becomes the generic standard, the familiar and expected learning orientation. Thus, whether intentionally or not, an institution that anchors its global commitments in a subset of courses or requirements can end up building a curricular architecture that relies upon and affirms a binary logic. While intended as an important antidote to parochialism and insularity, the addition of these courses can result in a curricular framework that resists seeing place and identity as relational in character.

I have seen this phenomenon take shape at my institution. A late addition to our Integrative Studies curriculum (Otterbein’s signature general education core since the 1960s), the Global Perspectives requirement was designed to compensate for the largely Western emphasis of the other required courses in the program. But with Global Perspectives courses in place, faculty in the rest of the Integrative Studies curriculum sometimes felt liberated from the need to think comparatively about cultural phenomena; to study critical issues that crossed national, cultural, and disciplinary boundaries; or to prioritize global civic engagement. This is not to say that these faculty members were hostile to global inquiry or obsessively local in their interests; but in isolating the Global Perspectives requirement, the curriculum assumed
a binary framework that, over several years, began to feel less and less elastic.

When Otterbein’s faculty began to radically revise the Integrative Studies curriculum in 2009, we wanted to imagine a core curriculum that identified as critically cosmopolitan, or simultaneously global and local in perspective. Some initially found this perplexing, accustomed as they were to organizing principles that discouraged faculty and students from conceiving of socio-civic identities and identifications as multiple, layered, or fluid in form. Because the curricular structure had assumed that the global and local did not coincide, it had prevented a more flexible understanding of both subjectivity and belonging and stymied efforts to teach and learn about the contemporary world in more nuanced, complex, and accurate ways. In rethinking the curriculum, we hoped to find an avenue to move beyond this binary approach.

**Beyond the Local/Global Binary**
For those who see the local and global as antonymous, it is easy to assume that the dominance of one term will necessitate the depreciation of the other. If global learning is a priority, they assume, local learning will be demoted; the global will both overwhelm and undervalue the local communities and conversations that are immediately in need of attention and care. It is understandable that some faculty and students would feel the need to protect the local from the encroachment of the global. But this common anxiety arises from a binary way of thinking that assumes that attention to one term is going to shortchange the other.

Critical cosmopolitan teaching and learning works to complicate—and, ideally, unsettle—this binary logic. It does so by investing in *thinking relationally about the local and the global*. As a framework for global learning, critical cosmopolitan education is committed to unsettling the traditional and highly reified opposition of local and global, to imagining a more dialogic and dynamic relationship between these terms.

Because critical cosmopolitan teaching and learning positions the global and the local as relational, and because it underscores the ways that the global and the local implicate and inform one another, critical cosmopolitan education denies that the global is a category that transcends other categories. And this, I believe, is a good thing. A transcendent understanding of the global—common enough in traditional forms of global education and cosmopolitan discourse—is often every bit as fetishistic as romantic versions of localism. Critical cosmopolitanism insists that the global and the local are mutually constitutive terms—porous rather than rigid, and interdependent in character. Even though they appear to occupy very different scales, the global and the local are not exclusively opposed, but instead co-constitute, inform, and shape one another.

While many educational efforts draw attention to the global implications of local actions as well as the local consequences of global or transnational phenomena, it is important to move beyond considerations of mutual influence to think about how various scales of place actually define and actuate each other. This is one of the most significant advantages of a critical cosmopolitan framework, especially when characterizing pedagogical practices or constructing learning goals. Critical cosmopolitan discourse foregrounds the fact that the local and the global are always implicated in one another and related internally. It destabilizes the binary and underscores the complex interplay between local and global scales and communities. When we imagine global learning as critically cosmopolitan, we create courses and curricula that construct new ways of representing the “in-between”—the complex lived space that defines itself as simultaneously global and local.

At Otterbein, critical cosmopolitan language helped us design new learning goals (see sidebar on page 15) and accompanying objectives for the Integrative Studies Program that define the relationship between the global and the local as nuanced and relational. In the redesigned program, we consistently ask students to think about the global and the local as dynamic and interactive scales that are never isolated from one another. In doing so, we do not allow the word “global” to serve as shorthand for simultaneously global and local. We do not rely on one word to signal both exclusivity and inclusivity at once, even at the cost of a denser or lengthier set of learning goals.

When global learning relies on a critical cosmopolitan framework, it invites students to draft a new language...
that is capable of describing the contemporary relationship between identity and location. It also invites them to imagine new identifications, questions, and forms of representation for the space that emerges between traditional spatial scales. In so doing, critical cosmopolitan learning challenges dualistic thinking about place, the facile opposition of here and there.

**The Limits of Global Citizenship**

Cosmopolitanism is generally identified with the move toward “global citizenship,” or engagement with the world that extends beyond the state. That engagement can be defined in primarily moral terms—especially in cases where global citizenship is understood as a horizon or ideal—or it can be attached to legal or institutional ends. In either case, global citizenship can provide a framework for enlarging the ethical, rather than the political, boundaries of community.

What are the practical implications of enlarging the ethical boundaries of community and, by extension, one’s responsibilities to fellow members of one’s community? Because traditional understandings of citizenship assume that persons are anchored in bounded communities, students tend to see their rights and responsibilities as citizens in territorial terms. The idea of global citizenship obviously challenges and transgresses territorial identities, and with them, the notion that one’s ethical obligations are clearly delimited by geography. In this way, global citizenship not only introduces new forms of social belonging and allegiance, but also introduces new relational responsibilities, especially between people who do not share the same local group loyalties and identities.

There has been a significant movement in higher education to claim global citizenship as an institutional, curricular, and pedagogical goal. Colleges and universities that name global or international commitments in their mission statements often join those commitments to the larger concept of global citizenship. General education programs that emphasize global learning objectives often tie programmatic goals to global citizenship. And individual faculty increasingly enlist the language of global citizenship to explain their learning goals for courses that they identify as global in perspective or practice. Because of this, it is easy to feel—optimistically—that higher education has already become convinced of the value of teaching for global citizenship and, by extension, of cosmopolitanism. The problem, of course, is that those of us involved in designing these institutional, curricular, and pedagogical initiatives may not have fully examined what we mean by global citizenship. Too often, the rhetoric implies that global citizenship is a lifestyle choice or a byproduct of openness to international experiences without adequately emphasizing the ethical and political dimensions of the concept.

This is not to say that we ought to ban the rhetoric of global citizenship. Indeed, such language ties global learning to educational ends that are ethical, engaged, and socially transformative. It presses academe to move beyond reductive neo-mercantilist, internationalist, or liberal-aesthetic interpretations of global learning. It also underlines and enlarges the historic civic role of higher education and, in so doing, affirms the continued importance of the public interest. Even though what constitutes global citizenship may be an open question, the language of global citizenship offers a legible way of naming the desire for commitments and responsibilities that exceed the nation-state. These are important reasons to continue using and exploring the rhetoric of global citizenship in curricular and pedagogical contexts. But we need to do more. We need to think seriously about the centrality of ethical and political questions in education for global citizenship, and we need to insist that such inquiry is present in our institutional, curricular, and pedagogical initiatives.

**Critical Cosmopolitan Citizenship**

While adopting a global citizenship framework may be bold, I want to suggest that we would benefit from an even bolder move: exploring a model of citizenship identity and practice that includes a commitment to global citizenship but also affirms other forms of civic belonging. In other words, I am suggesting that we enlarge our view once more, and investigate what is gained by considering citizenship from a critical cosmopolitan perspective.

In what ways might the goal of critical cosmopolitan—rather than global—citizenship introduce new and compelling questions for teaching and learning? Critical cosmopolitanism acknowledges that each individual can occupy a multiplicity of subject positions, civic identities, and forms of belonging. In contrast to the global/local binary, it enables us to maintain multiple sites of political responsibility at a time when an increasing number of contemporary citizens feel simultaneously responsible for—and invested in—various communities of fate and choice: local, sub-state, national, and transnational. Many people—especially college students and young people—understand scale and allegiance as flexible and transient. Their civic attachments and commitments are shifting, overlapping, and reconstituting themselves in new ways. So how do we teach to this new understanding of citizenship as multiple, evolving, and elastic?

While some versions of global learning position global citizenship as an alternative or more expansive form of civic identification than local or national ties, critical cosmopolitan
learning insists that contemporary citizenship is, in fact, multidimensional and variable. It acknowledges that identity is complex and allows for civic attachments and obligations that transcend local, national, and transnational boundaries. Offering an alternative to the national versus global citizenship debate—often erroneously represented as the battle between patriotism and cosmopolitanism—critical cosmopolitan citizenship recognizes that human loyalties can exist on many different scales. For this reason, it affirms the significance of global or transnational forms of citizenship even as it underscores the value of civic attachment in more bounded communities.

Critical cosmopolitan citizenship allows students to own simultaneous and diverse forms of civic belonging and responsibility. It also encourages students to reject any understanding of citizenship that is predicated on a false choice between local, regional, or national identifications and global or transnational commitments. For these reasons, I believe that a critical cosmopolitan—rather than, strictly speaking, a “global” or “local”—model of citizenship offers an especially useful and robust model of civic engagement for critical pedagogical work. In suggesting the permeability and interdependence of the global and the local, it allows students and faculty to see ethical engagement and public participation as having an impact on multiple social and spatial locations.

Otterbein’s new Integrative Studies learning goals reinforce the critical cosmopolitan approach to citizenship. One of the primary tasks of the curriculum is to encourage public engagement and social responsibility in local, national, and global contexts. Faculty ask students to investigate multiple and evolving forms of civic identification and action, rather than assume that a curricular attentiveness to global learning would produce such a dynamic exploration. Our learning goals reinforce the permeability of the global and the local, place and space, here and there.

**Action, Not Status**

Critical cosmopolitan learning offers an enlarged and invigorated conception of citizenship. Rather than define citizenship entirely as a conferred legal status, critical cosmopolitan learning conceives of citizenship as an *active practice* beyond the occasional and formal exercise in political decision making (i.e., voting). Critical cosmopolitan learning expands our understanding of citizenship to include broader involvement in public life; and in so doing, it invites new conceptions of social participation and commitment, in new contexts that include social media and online communities.

At the same time, critical cosmopolitan learning problematizes the very idea of citizenship. By encouraging students to imagine new identities and tasks for the twenty-first-century citizen, critical cosmopolitan teaching and learning challenges the popular notion that citizenship is a devitalized and static identity. Such learning introduces different possibilities regarding what constitutes a “good” citizen. The person who affirms and critiques human rights or successfully contests the terms of traditional power structures may manifest a more active and energetic investment in citizenship practice than the one who simply votes. Thus critical cosmopolitan learning recognizes the necessary role of oppositionality and counter-discourses in citizenship practice.

In many ways, critical cosmopolitan citizenship offers a radically expanded and experimental version of civic identity. Critical cosmopolitan teaching and learning benefits from this forward- and outward-looking approach, challenging students to be both speculative and utopian. When encouraged to challenge binary forms of thought and narrowly defined versions of action, our students can redefine belonging—not only to embrace distant places, but also to expand what is possible for future generations.
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**Otterbein’s Integrative Studies Program**

The Integrative Studies Program aims to prepare Otterbein University undergraduates for the challenges and complexity of a twenty-first-century world. It foregrounds interdisciplinary and integrative skills, competencies, and ways of knowing and is committed to the premise that one’s learning should serve and shape one’s chosen responsibilities in and to the world. The program’s learning goals are

1. To inspire intellectual curiosity about the world as it is and a deeper understanding of the global condition;
2. To assist students in cultivating intercultural knowledge and competencies;
3. To promote active and critical reflection on the human self in its full range of contexts;
4. To challenge students to critically examine their ethical responsibilities and choices in both local and global contexts;
5. To encourage purposeful public engagement and social responsibility.

Awakening Global Awareness in the Humanities

Marcia Bronstein, professor of English and English as a Second Language and curriculum coordinator of the Global Humanities Institute at Montgomery College, Maryland

SHELLEY JONES, associate professor of Spanish and curriculum coordinator of the Global Humanities Institute at Montgomery College, Maryland

SHARYN NEUWIRTH, professor of English as a Second Language and curriculum coordinator of the Global Humanities Institute at Montgomery College, Maryland

Since founding the Global Humanities Institute (GHI) at Montgomery College in 2012, participating faculty have taken a comprehensive approach to global studies at our institution. We are charged by the National Endowment for the Humanities, which supports our work with a challenge grant, to (1) bring global perspectives to the humanities and other relevant disciplines; (2) establish faculty training and development programs that promote globalization of humanities curricula; (3) enrich the college culture by highlighting issues, topics, and events of global significance; (4) develop academic partnerships with institutions abroad; and (5) create a model program that can be replicated by other colleges and universities near and far.

While we have launched a range of initiatives supporting these goals, the GHI’s key focus in its first four years is on transforming the curriculum by preparing full- and part-time humanities faculty to teach courses and lead interdisciplinary learning communities centered on global themes. Two concurrently convening groups of GHI faculty fellows meet twice monthly to study global theory and issues, internationalized curricula, pedagogy that promotes cultural awareness, and service that addresses global problems. Our goal is to create curricula that guide students in critical contemplation of and humanistic response to the globalized world. The GHI’s first internationalized humanities courses and learning communities will be offered in fall 2014. Over three years, forty-eight faculty fellows will transform thirty humanities courses and nine learning communities, potentially affecting thousands of students.

Backward Design
The GHI’s two faculty fellowships—one focused on individual courses and the other on learning communities—take the concept of “applied humanities” as inspiration. To apply humanities means to “embody” and “enact” insights and values gained through humanities study (Nikitina 2009, 36). Students of applied humanities are preparing to be not only humanist scholars, but also alert and responsive citizens of the world. The goal of the GHI fellowships is that students gain the global knowledge, skills, and attitudes (such as openness to various perspectives) that will help them become engaged, humane, and ethical participants in an increasingly globalized and interdependent world.

To help realize these outcomes, GHI faculty fellows engage in a process of backward design (Wiggins and McTighe 2005). Building on the college’s outcomes assessment process and existing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), GHI fellows use backward design to create Internationalized Student Learning Outcomes (or ISLOs, a term coined by Sharyn Neuwirth) that guide the development of global curricula. Backward design begins with identifying end goals, as faculty ask themselves the following questions in sequence:

1. What knowledge, skills, and attitudes do I want my students to gain as a result of internationalized study? What outcomes should occur as a result of internationalized course work?

2. How will my students demonstrate these learning gains? What assignments will enable my students to demonstrate achievement of the ISLOs? How can I create tasks that will allow students to apply the global knowledge, skills, and attitudes they have acquired?

3. What teaching methods and materials will prepare my students to achieve the ISLOs? How can I make students active participants in building their knowledge base, examining their beliefs and attitudes, and applying skills to real-world situations?

Fellows begin this process of inquiry by identifying a “big idea” or “big question” that will determine the overarching theme of their internationalized course or learning community. Identifying a big idea or question helps fellows discern the most important and relevant aspects of course content, as well as appreciate the content’s potential to affect students’ enduring understanding of how the world works.

Example I: Individual Courses
Through the GHI faculty fellowship Teaching Humanities in a Global Context, faculty members from diverse humanities disciplines use backward design to internationalize an individual course that they currently teach. As described above, they begin by identifying a big idea or question (see fig. 1, column A). They then pinpoint global competencies that they want students to develop (see fig. 1, column B). Stating specific competencies in this manner helps faculty members sharpen their focus and helps students see the importance of what they learn.
After selecting a big question and identifying global competencies, fellows consult the existing SLOs for their current courses (see fig. 1, column C). In most cases, fellows are inserting new global content into an already-packed course, so rather than create additional outcomes, fellows internationalize their existing SLOs to create ISLOs. In other words, they place the general SLOs in a specific international context, so that as students achieve the internationalized form of the course outcome, they also master the SLO (fig. 1, step 1). Once they have written the ISLOs, fellows determine the means of assessing them (fig. 1, step 2). Faculty fellows then use the stated ISLOs and assessment measures to guide their selection of materials, learning activities, and pedagogies.

Example II: Learning Communities

Exploring global themes such as poverty, peace building, a sustainable earth, or global citizenship necessitates reaching across disciplinary boundaries. “Quality interdisciplinary education” is crucial in developing “global consciousness … [the] capacity and disposition to understand and act on matters of global significance” (Harvard Graduate School of Education 2014). Thus in the GHI fellowship creating Global Humanities Learning Communities, humanities faculty work in pairs to join and integrate courses across disciplines as a means of exploring a compelling global issue. This internationalization of two linked courses takes advantage of the role of learning communities as a high-impact educational practice that can rouse students’ passionate commitment to learning (Kuh, O’Donnell, and Reed 2013).

Following backward design, learning community faculty fellows pose inter-disciplinary big questions and link their two courses’ existing outcomes into integrative ISLOs that reflect the union of disciplines in approaching real-world problems (see fig. 2). They then write integrative assignments that preserve “disciplinary grounding” while meaningfully and purposefully joining different analytical frameworks (Dunlap and Sult 2013, 28, 38). Finally, they create team-taught lessons and other experiences to enable student learning.

The Role of Service Learning

Service offers a meaningful way for students to apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they develop by studying the humanities. Service learning is more than an opportunity to witness and respond to global ills; indeed, it can affect students’ attitudes about the world and transform their belief in their ability to be agents of change. GHI faculty fellows capitalize on this potential by including assignments within their courses and learning communities that use service activities as opportunities for powerful experiential application. To support the creation of these activities, the fellows learn best practices in service learning, articulate their vision of service for their students, select a service partner, and devise assessments in the form of reflection assignments occurring before, during, and after service is performed.

In the GHI learning communities, faculty envision global service as occurring “glocally”—at community organizations that serve immigrant communities, for example, or at the college, where students may educate others about an international issue or raise money for a cause. In the fall 2014 learning community A Right to Work in the World—developed to explore worldwide issues of discrimination, education, and rights affecting women and work—a service project will connect students virtually with the Women’s Network of Morazán, El Salvador. Students enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Big Question/Big Idea</th>
<th>B. Global Competencies</th>
<th>C. Existing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</th>
<th>Step 1: Determine Internationalized Student Learning Outcome (ISLO)</th>
<th>Step 2: Select Method of Assessing ISLO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do developed countries have a moral responsibility for dealing with world hunger? Ethical principles can be used to analyze and make difficult choices. Application of different ethical principles and criteria can lead to different conclusions.</td>
<td>Global learning helps students to “Function effectively and ethically in a complex, rapidly changing world that is increasingly interdependent yet fraught with conflicts and disparities” (University of Minnesota 2010) “Gain a deep, comparative knowledge of the world’s peoples and problems” (AACU n.d., “Shared”)</td>
<td>Students will be able to Acquire and apply practical methods and strategies for handling and solving ethical problems Develop systematic ways of considering and dealing with ethical conflicts Present analysis and conclusions on a current ethical issue in a coherent manner</td>
<td>Students will be able to Apply ethical principles to assess whether affluent nations have an ethical responsibility to address hunger in poorer countries Explain and present conclusions</td>
<td>Students will take a position and participate in a debate: Do wealthier countries have an obligation to feed the world’s poor? Students will be assessed on their ability to support their position with ethical arguments and examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty member Tulin Levitas, professor of philosophy at Montgomery College, contributed to the development of this figure.
in the learning community will research the problems, needs, and innovations of the rural women workers the network serves. In reflection papers, students will describe, contrast, and compare women and work in Morazán and other settings they have studied, using the analytical tools they have learned in their integrated sociology and women’s studies courses. In consultation with the Women’s Network, they will create a fund-raiser supporting a cause designated by the Morazán workers.

In the short term, service projects like these provide real-life contexts within which students can apply the concepts they learn in class, enact humanism, and move toward global competence. On a more enduring level, these projects are a rich, bracing way to develop and refine the skills, knowledge, and values that will be needed in the future. Global learning helps students to “explore the historical legacies that have created the dynamics and tensions of their world” (AAC&U n.d., “Shared”) and “understand—and perhaps redefine—democratic principles and practices within a global context” (AAC&U n.d., “Shared”).

Students will be able to “adapt and apply methodologies gained in one situation to new situations” (AAC&U n.d., “Integrative”) to identify the nature, causes, and implications of social problems (Social Problems and Issues). Students will be able to “analyze the dynamics and practices of power structures that can create social, political, cultural, and personal circumstances of inequality. How can they be corrected to create more equality among groups and individuals?” (Women’s Studies)

**Conclusion**

The work of the GHI is well underway. In addition to supporting the faculty fellowships, the GHI has hosted noted humanities scholars whose work focuses on globalization. We offer online resources, including language learning software, to the college community and the public. We have initiated Humanities Days, a new tradition at Montgomery College, featuring college and community speakers, workshops, and multimedia on topics of global consequence. We have formed partnerships with institutions abroad to enable teaching collaborations, faculty and student travel, and scholarly exchange. Through this multifaceted approach, we aim to mobilize and apply the humanities to help guide students and the institution toward higher and broader levels of learning that will build global consciousness, competence, participation, and exchange.

For more about the GHI, visit http://globalhumanities.montgomerycollege.edu.

**FIGURE 2. Backward Design in Global Humanities Learning Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input for Identifying ISLOs for the Learning Community</th>
<th>Steps in the Process of Backward Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Big Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Step 1: Determine Integrative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are inequalities between women and men manifested in the workforce?</td>
<td><strong>Internationalized Student Learning Outcome (ISLO)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we ensure the labor rights of women across borders?</td>
<td><strong>Step 2: Select Method of Assessing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Global Competencies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integrative ISLO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global learning helps students to</td>
<td>Students will present a critical analysis and evaluation of an international human rights treaty (such as the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women) and its role in protecting the labor rights of women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Explore the historical legacies that have created the dynamics and tensions of their world” (AAC&amp;U n.d., “Shared”)</td>
<td><strong>Students will be able to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Understand—and perhaps redefine—democratic principles and practices within a global context” (AAC&amp;U n.d., “Shared”)</td>
<td>Apply a critical perspective (e.g., feminist, race, Marxist) when analyzing the effect of international law in protecting the labor rights of women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Adapt and apply methodologies gained in one situation to new situations” (AAC&amp;U n.d., “Integrative”)</td>
<td>Identify omissions and recommend improvements to international law to increase labor protections of women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Paired Existing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</strong></td>
<td>Identify omissions and recommend improvements to international law to increase labor protections of women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to</td>
<td><strong>Students will be able to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the nature, causes, and implications of social problems (Social Problems and Issues)</td>
<td>Identify omissions and recommend improvements to international law to increase labor protections of women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the role of the government, organizations, and other groups in identifying and solving a variety of social problems (Social Problems and Issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the dynamics and practices of power structures that can create social, political, cultural, and personal circumstances of inequality. How can they be corrected to create more equality among groups and individuals? (Women’s Studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GHI learning community faculty fellows Sahar Sattarzadeh, adjunct professor of sociology, and Tara Tetraault, adjunct professor of women’s studies and anthropology, contributed to the development of this figure.
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[Campus Practice]

Engaging with Global Issues in Local Communities

Arlene Walker-Andrews, associate provost for global century education at the University of Montana

Many problems that contemporary societies face are universal, intellectually challenging, and unlikely to be solved by a single person from any one discipline. Take access to water as an example: as Nathaniel Uchtmann warns, "Water-related human morbidity and mortality ... is already widespread, and almost 80 percent of the global population faces exposure to high threat levels of water insecurity" (2011). Providing potable water in all regions will require collaboration from people with diverse disciplinary backgrounds working together at scales from local to global. To address challenges like these, higher education must prepare today's students to recognize the difficulty of such issues and build on their own diverse strengths.

To prepare today's students—tomorrow's citizens—for a life of unprecedented volatility, to give them the skills to address global problems, and to help them communicate across borders and cultures, the University of Montana (UM) created the Global Leadership Initiative (GLI). Stemming from an awareness that global issues are complex and urgent, the program reflects UM's distinct view of global education. At UM, global education is not equivalent to international studies; it is not the same as study abroad; it is not equivalent to international studies; it is not focused on acquiring a second language. These are all worthy goals that may contribute to an appreciation of global issues, but they do not by themselves encapsulate or ensure global learning. Instead, global learning at UM focuses on global problems: those complex, poorly defined, loosely structured challenges common to all people, and perhaps to all life on the planet. The daunting tasks associated with addressing these problems require knowledge, appreciation of differences, interdisciplinary perspectives, problem-solving abilities, collaborative skills, and leadership—outcomes that UM aims to instill in students through the Global Leadership Initiative.

Program Structure

UM began piloting the Global Leadership Initiative in fall 2011. Each year, the program enrolls up to two hundred incoming freshmen, selected randomly from a volunteer pool with the goal of creating a cohort that is representative of the entering class. The GLI is not an honors program; it is open to any student admitted to the university. Participating students, designated as GLI fellows, will receive recognition at graduation after completing a four-year sequence of scheduled activities that provide hands-on learning and community interaction. The sequence includes (1) the Context for Big Questions, (2) Models of Leadership, (3) Beyond-the-Classroom Experiences, and (4) Capstone Projects.

Context for Big Questions: In the first semester of the first year, students explore global questions through semester-long, credit-bearing freshman seminars focused on issues like human rights, discrimination, sustainability, world health, and the relationship between mind and body. Potential instructors submit seminar proposals to the faculty-led GLI task force. Seminars must infuse an interdisciplinary approach, and faculty members often partner to create team-taught courses that better ensure multiple disciplinary perspectives. Faculty are encouraged to include service learning and civic engagement as seminar components. This year, for example, students in the seminar Can Giving Change the World? solicited, analyzed, and funded proposals from nonprofits using $10,000 donated by the Living by Giving Foundation. Students in Women's Rights and Women's Roles around the World created a website on self-image called More Than a Face (http://morethanaface.weebly.com/) and a multicultural feminist zine called La Femmina.

First-year GLI fellows must attend two lectures each semester offered through the many speaker series on campus, and almost half live in a living-learning community that occupies one floor of a residence hall.

Models of Leadership: In the second year, students engage in workshops, retreats, and other activities where leaders from a range of sectors (such as nonprofit, government, business, education, and fine arts) share their stories. Students receive leadership training in on-campus workshops and at one-day retreats, typically held at a university-owned forest research center an hour's drive from campus. In fall 2013, these retreats focused on public health (with faculty-moderated panels composed of several physicians and a medical anthropologist) and on conservation (with panelists from the Wilderness Society and the Nature Conservancy). Students also meet with peers to discuss big questions that interest them.

Beyond the Classroom: In the third year, students enroll in internships or fieldwork, participate in extensive service-learning projects, conduct research, or (when appropriate) study internationally. The GLI director works with several offices across campus (Academic
Enrichment, Internships Services, Civic Engagement, and International Programs) and with faculty to help GLI fellows identify suitable placements. A semester in advance, students apply for funding (contributed by private donors) by submitting budget requests and short essays that describe how their proposed experiences connect with the big question they want to explore. All applicants to date have received some funding. Through their placements—many of which are in Montana—students get hands-on experience while focusing on shared, complex, and messy global issues. (Editor’s note: See Cody Dems’s essay on page 21 for an example of one student’s third-year experience.) Students also interact with each other in the classroom, on discussion boards, and through cocurricular activities like their self-organized GLI student club, book club, service days, and social events. The program also funds a US passport for all eligible students, whether or not they intend to study internationally.

**Capstone Project:** Students in the first GLI cohort will enter their senior year in fall 2014. As seniors, these students will work together in multidisciplinary teams, first to define and sharpen a shared question and then to determine how each student can contribute to investigating that question using his or her academic major and specific skills. Faculty mentors will guide students from different majors as they create team products such as white papers and multimedia presentations. These group projects can offer a foundation for additional inquiry to students who must complete individual capstone projects for their majors.

**High-Impact Local Learning**
The GLI exploits several high-impact practices, including first-year seminars, undergraduate research, service learning, internships, learning communities, and capstone projects (Kuh 2008). Participants benefit from opportunities to learn with and from diverse peers who take different approaches. The GLI also makes use of experiential learning as emphasized by proponents of place-based education and provides a foundation for understanding and participating in local and global change.

The GLI’s approach to global learning is one of the initiative’s particular strengths. Unlike global learning programs that emphasize study abroad or other international experiences, the GLI allows students to focus on global problems at the local level—often a more viable approach. At UM, a strong sense of place provides an important point of access to the study of global issues. In Montana, students see firsthand the effects of climate change, scarcity of water, and species endangerment. Montana is also the setting for seven Native American reservations whose people are affected by global challenges like discrimination and poverty. Through experiential learning, students become invested in their local community while grappling with far-reaching problems that are repeated all over the planet. In the process, they see firsthand how personal experiences are connected to universal ones. Students who study or intern internationally also make connections between the local and global. For example, one student has spent the spring 2014 semester in Denmark, gaining knowledge and experience about cohousing projects to share with peers working on a sustainability initiative in Montana.

The opportunity to become involved locally is important to the program’s success. Students who are unable to travel because of their majors or personal circumstances can acquire vital communication and collaboration skills in their own communities. Addressing local instances of global problems demands some of the same skills as international study, including perspective-taking and effective communication across cultural barriers, and it requires students to invest in and honor the values and concerns of a community.
In addition to helping students address global issues successfully, the GLI aims to educate informed citizens who can contribute to a democratic society. Supporting students as they immerse themselves in local concerns, learn to listen to others, and collaborate to effect change is a good start.

Although the GLI is still in its infancy, initiative leaders hope to extend lessons learned from the pilot to all UM students. UM’s current general education coursework is organized primarily by disciplines, but big questions might provide a more navigable structure. Similarly, while nearly half of all UM students participate in activities beyond the classroom, we hope to increase such opportunities and encourage experiential learning. By using big questions to provide a context for general education coursework and a focus for major study, the GLI offers a mechanism to help students make deliberate choices about their educations while clarifying how their majors offer approaches to global problems. The initiative provides a practical context for education, interdisciplinary perspectives, and application outside the boundaries of the university—as well as the opportunity to make a difference.
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[PERSPECTIVE]
Seeking Common Ground in the Swan Valley

CODY DEMS, junior studying resource conservation and communication at the University of Montana

As a junior in the Global Leadership Initiative at the University of Montana, I spent my fall 2013 semester exploring, through place-based field work, the complex, overarching global challenges of sustainable natural resource management. These challenges span all countries and cross cultural and political boundaries. It is possible to practice using the tools for addressing global problems by engaging at the local level. Despite having the opportunity to study abroad, I chose to observe and understand global issues within a neighboring locale.

During my field experience, I had the privilege of living and studying in the rural community of Condon, Montana, a two-hour drive north of Missoula. With a human population of 548, Condon’s landscape is wild, and its views are monumental. Mountain peaks guard the valley floor, overlooking the Swan River and the surrounding wildlife-rich forests. The two-month-long field course is offered by Northwest Connections, a nonprofit organization focused on community conservation and education. Alongside ten peers from universities around the country, I learned about the interconnectedness that exists among people, across the natural environment, and between people and the environment.

I have always had an interest in freshwater: its movement, its use, and its health as an ecosystem. Through the Northwest Connections course, I explored the mountains, forests, and fields of the Swan Valley while discussing the complex internal and external interactions of the watershed. Students in the course toured sawmills, logging operations, and forest fire burns. We visited with ranchers, environmentalists, and business owners. We tracked bears, debated the health of fisheries, and studied wolves. Through communication with the local people and wildlife, I came to wholeheartedly appreciate the importance of a healthy watershed.

The community of Condon is actively working to preserve the integrity of nearby rivers and streams, while balancing environmental, social, and economic health. These overlapping goals have led to collaborative efforts from groups of people with diverse interests who are working proactively to address current and future problems. By participating in these efforts, I have witnessed the need to communicate and to listen. I have learned to seek common ground and focus energy toward shared goals rather than apparent differences. I have concluded that productive communication and a deep understanding of place are catalysts toward developing globally relevant solutions and an appreciation for our interconnected world.

I thank the people of the Swan Valley for sharing their homes, their time, and their company. I am grateful to them for teaching me lessons that far surpassed my expectations, for challenging my thinking, and for inspiring me to pursue collaborative approaches to difficult global problems.
Interdisciplinary teaching is a natural approach to synthesizing the range of expertise necessary to address complex global issues. At Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama, faculty have been working to reconceive the traditional team-taught interdisciplinary course using a model that produces the type of systems thinking required for responsible global citizenship. Taught annually, the resulting upper-division, three-credit-hour course counts toward the general education social sciences requirement and enrolls between fifteen and twenty-five students. Through the new course model, we are achieving global learning objectives while advancing our college’s Jesuit mission, which calls us to engage with real-world problems, both at home and abroad.

Spring Hill College’s new course model combines three key principles: radical interdisciplinarity, geographical integration, and problem-based learning. To advance radical interdisciplinarity, the course convenes nine professors from different disciplines around a pressing global topic such as petroleum, human migration, or water. To achieve geographical integration, the course follows a local to global arc, helping students develop an understanding of the course topic across different spatial scales. Finally, to encourage problem-based learning, the course prompts students to investigate solutions to pressing problems by engaging with the community. In this article, we share some of the theory and practice relating to these three key principles.

**Radical Interdisciplinarity**

Our approach to radical interdisciplinarity arises from our primary goal for students: developing systems thinking. We see systems thinking as a defining characteristic of global learners and global citizens. Understanding how local realities are defined by systems of which we are all a part—economic, political, environmental, or cultural—empowers students to become effective actors in a globalized world. As Donella Meadows (2009) has shown, systems thinking is inextricably tied to problem solving. In Meadows’s view, only by understanding how a system’s structures produce problems can one find the inflection points that enable real solutions. Systems thinking methodology is powerfully illustrated in Paul Farmer’s *Pathologies of Power* (2005), where Farmer uses case studies to reveal the structures that create individuals’ lived realities.

The benefits of radical interdisciplinarity for developing systems thinking are straightforward. By offering nine perspectives on a particular issue, our course model helps students understand the multiple structures that are implicated in any one global problem. Facilitating collaboration between nine professors is easier than one might think. Each spring, our course steering committee publishes a call to the entire faculty announcing the course topic for the coming year and inviting applications from those who wish to participate. From the resulting applicant pool, the steering committee selects nine professors whose offerings seem wide-ranging but complementary. The committee then groups these faculty members in teams of three, with each team designing one-third of the course: for example, in our petroleum course, professors worked in teams focused on Environmental Impact (biology, chemistry, and history), Global Systems (economics, political science, and communications), and Human Impact (psychology, English, and fine arts). Each professor teaches two to three class sessions during the semester in addition to attending four planning meetings and grading one assignment. While these activities are in addition to the regular course load, we offer a small stipend of $200, and faculty find the workload reasonable. They also appreciate the intangible payoff of working with colleagues across disciplines on an innovative pedagogical project.

**Geographical Integration**

The course’s second important innovation is geographical integration. Faculty have intentionally designed the course to move through layered spatial scales—the nested geographies of which we are all a part, from local to regional, national, and global. The arc of the course extends from the local to the global, interweaving assignments, field trips, and speakers to build knowledge about each layer. For example, in our human migration class, students began by exploring the personal level, interviewing family members to write their family’s migration autobiography. They subsequently interviewed local migrants from the Philippines, Tanzania, Saudi Arabia, Cambodia, Guatemala, and India about their migration experiences. In their final assignment, they conducted case studies of migration systems outside the United States (for example, global immigration networks or migration patterns for international refugees).

Moving from the personal to the local to the global is key to helping students understand the complexity of each course topic. Speakers and field trips...
can encourage students to navigate the connections between different spatial scales. For example, in our current course on water, we toured a local water treatment facility and heard from a local nonprofit organization working to protect the Mobile Bay watershed early in the semester; later on, an engineering professor who works with Engineers Without Borders will share his work on water issues in El Salvador, Cambodia, and Ethiopia. By emphasizing the need to traverse different spatial scales—to move between the local and the global—we hope not only to illustrate the complex systems involved in these issues, but also to help students locate themselves within various structures while suggesting different levels of possible intervention.

**Problem-Based Learning**

The course’s final important innovation is capitalizing on problem-based learning. After spending a semester exploring a specific issue and the systems that produce it, students want to *do* something to address the issue. Opportunities to develop solutions are critical to helping students transition from the role of learners to the role of global citizens: people who can use their knowledge responsibly to act in the world.

A serendipitous class exercise near the end of the petroleum course led us to become more intentional in our approach to problem-based learning. After spending a semester exploring a specific issue and the systems that produce it, students want to *do* something to address the issue. Opportunities to develop solutions are critical to helping students transition from the role of learners to the role of global citizens: people who can use their knowledge responsibly to act in the world.

A serendipitous class exercise near the end of the petroleum course led us to become more intentional in our approach to problem-based learning. After spending a semester exploring a specific issue and the systems that produce it, students want to *do* something to address the issue. Opportunities to develop solutions are critical to helping students transition from the role of learners to the role of global citizens: people who can use their knowledge responsibly to act in the world.

A serendipitous class exercise near the end of the petroleum course led us to become more intentional in our approach to problem-based learning. After spending a semester exploring a specific issue and the systems that produce it, students want to *do* something to address the issue. Opportunities to develop solutions are critical to helping students transition from the role of learners to the role of global citizens: people who can use their knowledge responsibly to act in the world.

A serendipitous class exercise near the end of the petroleum course led us to become more intentional in our approach to problem-based learning. After spending a semester exploring a specific issue and the systems that produce it, students want to *do* something to address the issue. Opportunities to develop solutions are critical to helping students transition from the role of learners to the role of global citizens: people who can use their knowledge responsibly to act in the world.

They synthesized their knowledge from the course, set priorities, developed solutions, and advocated for their perspectives. In our current water course, we are formalizing this assignment as the course’s capstone. We have also designed a campus-wide education day to be held at the end of the course so that students can inform the campus community about water issues.

**Practical Considerations**

The component most essential to the course’s success is a group of creative and engaged colleagues—a resource that is available at no additional cost. Therefore, the course can be taught inexpensively, requiring just one adjunct salary to fund a course release so that someone can serve as course coordinator. This coordinator manages the course’s many moving parts and implements the teaching team’s decisions: drafting the syllabus and assignments, arranging field trips and speakers, keeping the grade book, and attending all class sessions. With a few thousand dollars more, the institution can offer modest stipends to the teaching team and honoraria to the speakers. In sum, the course model offers a lot of innovation for little expense.

We are grateful for the support this course has had from our Jesuit institution and from the Association of American Colleges and Universities, whose Shared Futures initiative offered both impetus and incubation for our innovations. However, we think that the course model has potential beyond our felicitous circumstances and hope that this article piques readers’ interest in beginning a comparable pedagogical approach. After all, we cannot produce systems thinkers without thinking innovatively about our own educational systems.

The authors wish to recognize the course steering committee (Lesli Bordas, Margaret Davis, Jamie Franco-Zamudio, Kristina Kotchemidova, Leigh Ann Litwiller Berte, Wanda Sullivan, and Tom Ward) and the fourteen other professors, representing thirteen academic departments, who have taught in the courses described here.
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“Living in Washington, DC,” observed BBC foreign correspondent Kim Ghattas in her recent memoir, *The Secretary*, “is like being on a big university campus with lecture halls where ideas are tested and debated … I can learn to my heart’s content” (2013, 233). Indeed, Washington is in many respects one vast learning laboratory. As home to the national government, leading media and arts organizations, nonprofits, think tanks, and advocacy groups, as well as a vast slate of conferences and symposia, the city offers opportunities for learning that are nearly endless. For the students of the Washington Internship Institute (WII), the city becomes their classroom; and for students in Global Women’s Leadership Development, a new WII curricular initiative, this classroom offers key opportunities to learn about the primacy and interconnectedness of gender issues across the landscape of the twenty-first century.

Liberal Arts in the Nation’s Capital
Each semester, a new cohort of undergraduate students representing over twenty-eight partnering colleges and universities around the nation and the world applies for a semester-long immersion in experiential learning, internships, and public service and leadership. WII provides each admitted student with an individual advisor, fully furnished housing, access to networking events, and a vigorous cocurricular program series offering a comprehensive look at the issues and events that characterize our times. Functioning as a satellite campus for our partner institutions, WII has successfully reproduced a small liberal arts college experience in the nation’s capital. Students earn a full semester’s credit by participating in an internship, an accompanying reflection seminar, and one of five elective academic tracks—Inside Washington: Politics and Policy, International Relations and Foreign Policy Studies, Environmental Law and Policy Studies, Global Health Policy Studies, and the new interdisciplinary academic immersion elective on Global Women’s Leadership Development.

The Global Women’s Leadership Development seminar represents WII’s investment in training a corps of future leaders committed to advancing gender equality and alleviating the global issues that impede women’s physical, economic, and social advancement. Gender inequality persists around the world, with women’s sexual and economic exploitation coexisting alongside their rise to positions of national leadership in places as diverse as Denmark, the Central African Republic, and the United States. WII wanted to offer students the chance to study and gain experience related to these converging challenges and opportunities, which will likely characterize much of the coming century.

Interdisciplinary Exploration
The Global Women’s Leadership Development seminar typifies the interdisciplinary nature of WII. The class uses a combination of scholarly texts, policy papers, news media reports, and arts and cultural texts to introduce students to the political dynamics, social and cultural norms, and institutions and rules that affect how women strive for and maintain leadership positions throughout the world. The course meets once a week for three hours, with each session typically split between class discussion and site visits or guest speakers. Class sessions might also include role play, simulations, and other exercises based on the day’s theme and texts.

WII has structured Global Women’s Leadership Development around the Essential Learning Outcomes defined by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2014). The course curriculum and activities reflect these objectives, including Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World, Intellectual and Practical Skills, Personal and Social Responsibility, and Integrative and Applied Learning. Throughout each semester, students pursue these Essential Learning Outcomes through assignments that introduce them to diverse research methods and writing contexts and encourage them to develop practical and scholarly skills. For example, students form research teams to observe
and take field notes on work being performed in public spaces, with attention to categories like gender, race, class, and age. Students also research, write, and orally defend their own policy initiatives to foster effective leadership by and for women and girls.

**Vibrant Experiential Learning**

While Global Women’s Leadership Development is an intensive classroom experience, the real vibrancy of the course comes from treating Washington as a vast classroom. Students in the class, for example, have discussed the role of women as heads of state with Laura Liswood, secretary general for the Council of Women World Leaders and senior adviser at Goldman Sachs, as well as women’s role in and portrayal by the media with Erin Fuller, president of the Alliance for Women in Media. Sarah Peck, a US Department of State official who has extensive experience with gender issues in South Asia, spent a morning with students in fall 2013 discussing possible outcomes for women in Afghanistan after the coming US withdrawal. The Peace Corps, the New America Foundation, and Chemonics International have all contributed to the experiential learning components of Global Women’s Leadership Development by showing students the range of national and international opportunities available for women’s leadership.

Substantive, hands-on internships are essential to students’ experiential learning. Four days a week, students intern with an international nongovernmental organization, a women’s political or advocacy group, a corporation, or a government agency. Students have served in internships with such organizations as Vital Voices, Emily’s List, the National Organization for Women, Women for Women International, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People’s Washington Bureau. At the end of each semester, students from all five academic tracks participate in a capstone experience: the Active Learning and Global Citizenship Forum, a formal academic poster session where they convey both their classroom and experiential learning throughout the semester in relation to their learning outcomes.

**An Unparalleled Opportunity**

Of WII’s five academic tracks, Global Women’s Leadership Development has consistently been one of the most popular. The course offers students an unparalleled academic and experiential education opportunity and has opened new doors for WII in interdisciplinary gender studies programs across the nation. Offering significant evidence of the course’s value, Coastal Carolina University recently established a Women’s Leadership Scholarship Fund under the innovative leadership of Terri DeCenzo, executive director of Women in Philanthropy and Leadership for the university. This fund enables Coastal students to come to Washington specifically to study in the Global Women’s Leadership Development track.

Producing leaders who understand the complex roots of contemporary challenges—and who are able to contextualize those challenges using a strong foundation in interdisciplinary study—is the primary goal of the Washington Internship Institute. We strive to create citizen-leaders who, regardless of their majors or professional goals, can serve as agents of change in a world that grows exponentially more complicated daily. Using one of the overriding challenges of our times as a springboard to this goal, Global Women’s Leadership Development gives students the intellectual and experiential grounding that will help them participate in making global gender equality a reality.
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How can we best prepare students to be culturally competent, globally aware citizens capable of leveraging the knowledge and skills necessary to engage difficult global issues? Failure to provide such an education invites a grim future for all, but determining how best to do so can be daunting. To foster creative approaches to teaching about global challenges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) created its Global Challenges Project.

Conceived by George Mehaffy, AASCU’s vice president for academic leadership and change, the project (which I direct) uses technology effectively and cost-efficiently to support faculty as they educate students to become globally competent and engaged citizens.

Massive Collaborative Design
The Global Challenges Project is the first offering developed using AASCU’s Red Balloon model. The model draws its guiding metaphor from a Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency exercise where teams used the Internet and social networking to locate red balloons scattered around the country. The winning team of five individuals found all ten balloons in less than nine hours by relying on a social network of some four thousand people. George Mehaffy (2010) thought that American classrooms could benefit from a similar model, one that relies on the “wisdom of the crowds” and uses technology to connect faculty and students in building content superior to what any single faculty member might be able to create alone.

The Global Challenges Project deploys this model while building on the Seven Revolutions framework developed by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), a leading nonpartisan think tank in Washington, DC. CSIS developed the framework as a lens through which to consider seven key drivers of global change: population, resources, technology, information, economies, conflict, and governance. As participants in the Global Challenges Project, faculty from multiple disciplines on a dozen campuses across the country collaborated to design learning objectives, lessons, assignments, activities, quizzes, and exams associated with these seven global challenges.

These scholars have assembled valuable teaching resources—including videos, books, articles, and web-based materials—that they have refined on their home campuses and through institutes and workshops around the country. These materials have evolved into what AASCU is calling a Massive Collaboratively Designed Course. An effective alternative to MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), the course curriculum is available for use on any campus. Created collaboratively, the course encourages collaboration in another sense: it provides educators with a set of tools to bolster their teaching in content areas outside of their disciplines, allowing modifications to make the best use of an instructor’s particular expertise, to highlight issues of special relevance to the campus or the community, and to meet specific learning objectives. The course uses a blended model, where supplemental assignments and interactions outside of the classroom allow students to meet face-to-face less often than in a conventional course. Finally, project offerings include a pre- and post-course test, and campuses using these materials can join a national assessment effort aimed at measuring students’ learning and attitudinal shifts. Nationally, faculty use the Global Challenges course in a wide range of settings, including honors programming, first-year experiences, writing or speaking classes, global studies classes, and discipline-specific courses.

Example: Fort Hays State University
At Fort Hays State University (FHSU) in Hays, Kansas, the course has been taught by faculty from multiple disciplines as an offering in the upper-division integrative component of the general education program. Students come from all majors, and although most are in the upper division, the course also serves freshmen and sophomores in FHSU’s Kansas Academy of...
CIVIC LEARNING FOR SHARED FUTURES

Mathematics and Science (KAMS). In fall 2013, international students comprised about one-third of students in the course, a composition that added to the richness of the global conversation. The FHSU course builds on several elements included in the AASCU Global Challenges course shell, which students access in lieu of a textbook at a cost of $50 per student. (The course shell comes bundled with a digital subscription to the New York Times, allowing students to examine global challenges through the lens of evolving news and current events.) Adopting the learning objectives developed by the AASCU scholars, FHSU faculty begin the course by requiring students to identify relevant issues and trends, and ultimately ask students to create solutions to the seven challenges. In addition to studying the seven challenges, students explore the futures perspective, considering possible, probable, and preferable futures (see, for example, Bell 2010).

Promising Evidence

Preliminary assessment data and anecdotal evidence suggest that the Global Challenges Project is effectively advancing global learning and engagement. With challenging content and tested pedagogical approaches, the course confronts students with the promise and peril of our interdependent world. Most students who have encountered the material have responded with a sense of social responsibility and a desire to take action—signs of civic learning at its best. 🌍

The following scholar campuses have participated in the Global Challenges Project: California State University–Fresno; Dalton State College (Georgia); Fort Hays State University (Kansas); Fort Lewis College (Colorado); Georgia College and State University; Kennesaw State University (Georgia); Northern Arizona University; Richard Stockton College (New Jersey); Southeast Missouri State University; University of Arkansas at Fort Smith; University of Minnesota Duluth; and Western Kentucky University. To learn more about the Global Challenges Project, visit www.AASCUGlobalChallenges.org. To learn more about the Seven Revolutions framework, visit www.CSIS.org.
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Global Challenges Project Course Learning Objectives

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Upon completion of the course, students will be able to
1. Identify issues, trends, and impacts for key global challenges; drawing from various disciplines;
2. Explain the relationships between and among global challenges;
3. Employ credible resources in learning about key global challenges;
4. Analyze political, economic, social, and/or environmental impacts of key global challenges;
5. Evaluate approaches and/or solutions to key global challenges;
6. Create a solution toward a more preferable future for issues related to one or more key global challenges.

ATTITUDES

Upon completion of the course, students will have
1. Developed a sense of global empathy to better understand how these trends are affecting and being affected by different groups of people;
2. Recognized the importance of key global challenges;
3. Acquired an intellectual curiosity about key global challenges;
4. Developed an interest in taking action and being engaged locally or globally.
The patient looked at me with questions in her eyes. It was clear that even though I knew what treatment and care she needed to get better, I could not start any of it without making sure she understood and agreed to the health care team’s plan. Not only did we speak different languages, she also originated from a part of the world I knew very little about. My education had not prepared me to care for this patient.

The nurse I have imagined in this scenario could be practicing anywhere in the United States. In a world where populations within countries are becoming more diverse as people are regularly moving across borders, today’s nurses must be able to care for patients from socioeconomic, ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds that are different from their own. To do so successfully, they must develop greater appreciation for, understanding of, and sensitivity to people’s differences, as well as the ability to apply these capacities to their nursing practices (Levi 2009). It is thus critical that today’s nursing students receive educations that improve their cultural competence, giving them the confidence to provide patient-centered care that takes into account their patients’ cultural beliefs, behaviors, and needs (Papadopoulos 2003).

Cultural competence is a key aspect of the broader concept of global learning. At the University of Virginia’s School of Nursing (SON), we follow the American Council on Education in defining global learning as “the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students acquire through a variety of experiences that enable them to understand world cultures and events; analyze global systems; appreciate cultural differences; and apply this knowledge and appreciation to their lives as citizens and workers” (Olson, Green, and Hill 2006, v). Both in the classroom and in their clinical practica, our nursing students acquire knowledge of diverse perspectives and health care systems that they can incorporate into their nursing practices. This learning can take place at home or abroad, and it encompasses skills, knowledge, and attitudes that are necessary for work in both local and international contexts.

Global Learning at Home
The SON aims to address global learning goals across the entire nursing curriculum. By involving nursing faculty in retreats, surveys, curricular analysis, and workshops, we have implemented global learning objectives in a wide variety of courses, at academic levels from undergraduate to doctoral. We are now in the midst of completely revising our undergraduate nursing curriculum, an opportunity we are using to infuse global learning objectives into all undergraduate nursing courses.

In most courses, the SON’s global learning objectives relate to developing cultural competence at one of four levels, from the most basic (having cultural awareness, knowledge, and sensitivity) to the most advanced (being a culturally competent practitioner) (Papadopoulos 2003). Most nursing students practice these learning objectives at home in the United States, through clinical experiences at more than three hundred domestic sites. Many of these sites provide care for underserved vulnerable populations, requiring students from different backgrounds to display a great deal of cultural competence as they deliver patient-centered care.

The lessons nursing students learn on site and in the classroom are augmented by globally focused on-campus activities like the monthly International Forum, where students, faculty, alumni, visiting scholars, and community partners present on topics like “UVA School of Nursing Global Health Impact in Malawi” and “Current Issues in Global Health Policy.” The forums are arranged by the SON’s Global Initiatives (GI) office, which is housed within the school’s Rural and Global Health Care Center. The GI office also arranges for international visiting scholars—including students, clinicians, and faculty members—who offer perspectives from other cultures while learning about US health care systems. In any given year, the SON hosts up to eight exchange students from Denmark, New Zealand, and Australia, and in 2013, 6.6 percent of all SON enrollees were international students.

Global Learning Abroad
The GI office helps develop and support the school’s international work through programs that intertwine education, research, practice, and service. Through the GI office, the SON offers international experiences as part of the core curriculum across all nursing programs, undergraduate through doctoral, allowing students to fulfill core requirements through an international experience. Graduate students can engage in either a practicum or a research experience that ranges from two weeks to several months long. Undergraduate students can choose between a two-week experience (held between semesters), a
mentored independent research project (held over the summer), and a semester exchange (during the fall semester of the student’s final year) (Baernholdt et al. 2013). In the 2012–13 academic year, fifty-two students (7 percent of all SON students) participated in international learning experiences across sixteen countries.

These international opportunities depend on networks and partnerships guided by the principles of mutuality and reciprocity (Hanson 2010). We strive to create win–win situations where students gain important educational experiences and partners receive a final product that meets their needs, such as a community needs assessment or a solution to a specific problem with which they have wrestled. Students have created patient education materials in Denmark and Ethiopia, developed radio commercials for a clinic in Honduras, and helped develop a children’s summer camp on the Grand Bahama Island. With our university partners, we operate reciprocal student exchanges that require no extra academic fees. To cover the additional costs of travel, we offer international scholarships funded largely through alumni donations. Students who receive these international scholarships must serve as ambassadors of their specific sites for future students and must be willing to present at one of our international forums. All students who travel abroad participate in a post-trip debriefing where they reflect in small groups, evaluate their experiences, and suggest improvements.

International Lessons, Domestic Applications

Students often choose to study abroad because they want to experience life in another culture. But they come back to campus with so much more than that. Their understanding of and respect for cultural differences increases exponentially as they practice nursing in another country. They develop cultural competence that relates directly to their nursing practice in the United States. As one student wrote, “In Malawi I learned about primary care nursing at its best, how I believe it should be. I learned to function using my basic nursing assessment skills in a way that few nurses use anymore while practicing in America today.” Another noted, “I created memories for a lifetime and have a new appreciation for the global community of nurses. We are all treating patients with the same kind of issues but with different health systems in place. There are loads of ideas taken from the Danish health care system that I would love to implement into our current system right here in the United States!”

By offering a globally focused curriculum with local and international opportunities to learn cultural competence, the SON will graduate students who are well-informed and better equipped to engage with and serve a multicultural community.
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Save the Date: Global Learning in College: Cross-Cutting Capacities for Twenty-First-Century College Students

AAC&U will host its second Network for Academic Renewal meeting on Global Learning in College on October 16–18, 2014, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. At the meeting, participants will articulate a vision of the global learner and will explore efforts to design educational experiences—across the curriculum and in the community—to help students develop the cross-cutting capacities they need. For more information, visit http://www.aacu.org/meetings/.

Global Learning VALUE Rubric

Among the rubrics offered by AAC&U’s Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) initiative is one designed to help campus teams evaluate students’ global learning. Developed by a team of experts, the rubric includes a definition and glossary to help stakeholders interpret student learning outcomes. To download the rubric, visit http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/globallearning.cfm.

Global Learning in College Podcasts

In October 2013, AAC&U hosted its first Network for Academic Renewal Meeting on Global Learning in College. Keynote addresses from that meeting—on topics such as “What Happens to Learning When It Becomes Global?” (by Haifa Jamal Al-Lail and Victor Kazanjian) and “Building the Infrastructure for Successful Engagement with Global Learning” (by Harvey Charles)—are available as free downloads at http://www.aacu.org/Podcast/.

Study Abroad and Global Learning: Exploring Connections

The fall 2009 issue of Peer Review features articles on best practices in campus study abroad programs, research on the impact of study abroad, and analysis of the role and limitations of study abroad as a strategy for global learning. To download the issue or purchase print copies, visit http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/.

Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education

In this 2006 AAC&U publication, Kevin Hovland examines the evolving definitions of global learning in the context of previous reform efforts in the areas of diversity, democracy, and civic engagement. The publication also illuminates how global learning converges with the most powerful current models of liberal education. To order, visit http://www.aacu.org/publications/.

Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice

This 2006 AAC&U publication is designed to help colleges and universities construct and assess the impact of multiple well-defined developmental pathways through which students can acquire global learning. Author Caryn McTighe Musil argues for establishing clear global learning goals that inform departments, divisions, and campus life and suggests assessment frameworks. To order, visit http://www.aacu.org/publications/.
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In this 2006 AAC&U publication, Kevin Hovland examines the evolving definitions of global learning in the context of previous reform efforts in the areas of diversity, democracy, and civic engagement. The publication also illuminates how global learning converges with the most powerful current models of liberal education. To order, visit http://www.aacu.org/publications/.

Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice

This 2006 AAC&U publication is designed to help colleges and universities construct and assess the impact of multiple well-defined developmental pathways through which students can acquire global learning. Author Caryn McTighe Musil argues for establishing clear global learning goals that inform departments, divisions, and campus life and suggests assessment frameworks. To order, visit http://www.aacu.org/publications/.

Save the Date: Global Learning in College: Cross-Cutting Capacities for Twenty-First-Century College Students

AAC&U will host its second Network for Academic Renewal meeting on Global Learning in College on October 16–18, 2014, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. At the meeting, participants will articulate a vision of the global learner and will explore efforts to design educational experiences—across the curriculum and in the community—to help students develop the cross-cutting capacities they need. For more information, visit http://www.aacu.org/meetings/.

AAC&U Announces New “Civic Inquiries and Actions in the Disciplines” Project

AAC&U has received a grant from the Robert R. McCormick Foundation to expand the work of the Chicago Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Action Collaborative. The collaborative was originally launched in 2012 to advance the civic agenda embedded in the national report A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy’s Future, released at the White House in cooperation with the US Department of Education. While the first phase of the project focused on “Creating Civic-Minded Institutions,” this second phase will focus on expanding civic learning’s footprint in colleges and universities by working with faculty to advance “Civic Inquiries and Actions in the Disciplines.”

Fourteen colleges and universities will have been engaged in the Chicago Action Collaborative during its 2012–14 time span. The seven institutions in the second phase include City Colleges of Chicago, Governors State University, Lewis University, Northern Illinois University, North Park University, Roosevelt University, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. Among other things, the project will involve educators in a summer institute and will lead to the development of a set of campus tools to advance and assess civic learning. Through this initiative, AAC&U will also produce a set of templates and tools to promote civic inquiries and actions across a range of majors and specializations. These templates and tools will be available to all of higher education via AAC&U’s online campus toolkit.

More information about the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement project is available at http://www.aacu.org/civic_learning/index.cfm.
Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Calendar

The following calendar features events on civic learning sponsored by members of the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network and others. For more information, please see the websites featured below, or visit AAC&U’s CLDE Calendar online at http://www.aacu.org/civic_learning/events.cfm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CLDE MEMBER EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WEBSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2014</td>
<td>5–7</td>
<td>American Democracy Project and The Democracy Commitment National Meeting: Forging Civic Pathways for Students Between Our Institutions</td>
<td>Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td>thedemocracycommitment.org/2014-adptdc-annual-meeting/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>2014 NASPA Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Conference</td>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td><a href="http://www.naspa.org/events/2014CLDE/">www.naspa.org/events/2014CLDE/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>7–17</td>
<td>Summer Institute of Civic Studies</td>
<td>Medford, Massachusetts</td>
<td>activecitizen.tufts.edu/civic-studies/summer-institute/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16–18</td>
<td>Frontiers of Democracy 2014</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>activecitizen.tufts.edu/civic-studies/frontiers/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>4–9</td>
<td>Stewardship of Public Lands Seminar (American Association of State Colleges and Universities)</td>
<td>Yellowstone National Park</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aascu.org/meetings/spl14/">www.aascu.org/meetings/spl14/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>9–11</td>
<td>Imagining America 2014 National Conference</td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>imaginingamerica.org/convenings/national-conference/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16–18</td>
<td>Global Learning in College: Cross-Cutting Capacities for 21st-Century College Students</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aacu.org/meetings/">www.aacu.org/meetings/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAC&U and the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network

As part of its commitment to preparing all students for civic, ethical, and social responsibility in US and global contexts, and building on the momentum generated by the 2012 White House release of the report *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*, AAC&U has formed the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network. Coordinated by Caryn McTighe Musil, AAC&U senior scholar and director of civic learning and democracy initiatives, the network includes thirteen leading civic learning organizations that are committed to making civic inquiry and engagement expected rather than elective for all college students. *Diversity & Democracy* regularly features research and exemplary practices developed and advanced by these partner organizations and their members:

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF)
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)
- The Bonner Foundation
- Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtoP)
- Campus Compact
- Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)
- The Democracy Commitment
- Imagining America
- The Interfaith Youth Core (IFYC)
- Kettering Foundation
- NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)
### Upcoming AAC&U Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network for Academic Renewal</strong> Global Learning in College: Cross-Cutting Capacities for 21st-Century College Students</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>October 16–18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network for Academic Renewal</strong> Transforming STEM Education</td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>November 6–8, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100th Anniversary AAC&amp;U Annual Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>January 21–24, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### About Diversity & Democracy

*Diversity & Democracy* supports higher education faculty and leaders as they design and implement programs that advance civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity to prepare students for socially responsible action in today’s interdependent but unequal world. According to AAC&U’s Statement on Liberal Learning, “By its nature…liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.” *Diversity & Democracy* features evidence, research, and exemplary practices to assist practitioners in creating learning opportunities that realize this vision.

### About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,300 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities of every type and size. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.

### AAC&U Membership 2014

- **Masters** 31%
- **Baccalaureate** 24%
- **Associates** 12%
- **Res & Doc** 17%
- **Other*** 16%

*Specialized schools, state systems and agencies, and international affiliates*