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In this issue of Peer Review, we feature a range of articles that explore best practices in study abroad programs. Although the amount of time spent away and the settings vary, these increasingly popular programs often have a positive effect on students’ global awareness and responsibility. During spring 2009, my daughter Gillian, now a senior at Goucher College, studied in the United Kingdom to fulfill her college’s study abroad requirement. Because Gillian’s experiences were more typical than extraordinary, I thought it appropriate to give my editor’s note to her to get a student’s perspective on this issue’s rich topic of study abroad.

—SHELLEY JOHNSON CAREY

When I stepped off of the bus onto the University of East Anglia (UEA) campus, I was both relieved and terrified. I was relieved that after a nearly twenty-four-hour journey, I had reached my destination safely. I was terrified because it was my first time so far from home and I didn’t know what to expect during my six months of study abroad in Norwich, England. After getting my bearings, I rolled my oversized suitcase ten blocks through the snow to check in with the international student office, up three flights of stairs in my new flat, and into my room where I collapsed onto an unmade bed. I was finally “home” in a place I had never been before.

UEA international students are mixed in with the school’s general population, so all of my flatmates were from the United Kingdom. And unlike at Goucher College, my home school, there are no dining halls at UEA, so I had to cook my meals. Sometimes I was too tired to cook, so I bought prepared foods—many of which were new to me—from the supermarket. Who knew that the combination of tuna and canned corn would make for such a tasty sandwich?

Most of my UEA classes were in large lecture halls, a change from the small classes I was accustomed to. With almost one hundred students in some of my classes, I never had the chance to get to know the professors who taught those courses. Therefore, when I got behind in my British Television class, I couldn’t figure out how to catch up. When I signed up for that course back at Goucher, I thought that televisions would be as common in England as they are in the United States. However, it turned out that very few UEA students had televisions—most likely because the annual license fee to operate a color television is £142 (about $300). Unfortunately, without a television to watch, I wasn’t able to grasp the differences between the British and American broadcast systems and my grade suffered. In contrast, I had a great experience in my art history class, which was held in the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts on the UEA campus. During this class I had the chance to learn in a wonderful public art museum setting, just steps away from international art collections and gallery exhibitions.

Although most of my time was spent in Norwich, I was able to travel to London a few times to visit friends who were also studying abroad. I also had the chance to go to Amsterdam with the international student group, and during my spring break I went to Paris and Venice with my mom. While touring the British Museum and the Louvre, I was excited to recognize paintings and sculptures that I had studied in previous art history classes at Goucher.

Although I sometimes felt homesick and depended on Skype to check in with family and friends, I enjoyed my time at UEA, where I met students from all over the world. I use Facebook to keep in touch with my new international friends. I also picked up a new habit during my time abroad. In England, fast-food restaurants charge for each packet of ketchup, so I only ordered one or two. Now when I go to American restaurants, I think before I grab a handful of anything—napkins, condiments, or straws—because it is so easy to waste in a country where we have so much.

I was happy when I boarded the plane to come home in June, but I was also proud that I’d gone far from everything familiar to me and made the best out of most situations. While I appreciated learning about a different culture, I also came back with a sense of how much alike we all are. As I look toward life after graduation, I know that my study abroad experiences have made my college education more meaningful and enhanced my abilities to connect with and appreciate all types of people.

—GILLIAN M. CAREY

Kevin Hovland, director of global learning and curricular change, Association of American Colleges and Universities

There are few colleges or universities that do not embrace the goals of increasing global awareness, global citizenship, and global responsibility as part of their educational mission. Yet, across all sectors, institutions continue to struggle to develop the best practices for translating goals into concrete curricular and cocurricular global experiences that are flexible, rigorous, and relevant to all students in all programs.

Since 2001, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has worked through its Shared Futures: Global Learning and Social Responsibility initiative to help member colleges and universities envision and enact global learning models that foreground questions of diversity, identity, citizenship, interconnection, and responsible action. Shared Futures supports the efforts of faculty, staff, and administrators as they create curricular, cocurricular, and integrated experiences that enable all students—those who study abroad and the vast majority who do not—to approach the world’s challenges and opportunities from multiple perspectives and to wrestle with the ethical implications of differential power and privilege.

Consequently, the nearly one hundred institutions that have participated in Shared Futures projects over the years represent a rich resource of lessons learned. Individuals and teams on those campuses continue to probe what they mean by global learning—in theory and practice—and explore the implications of global learning across institutional structures. The short answer to the first question in the title is that definitions of global learning continue to evolve. As we see the shape that the term is taking, more and more often the short answer to the second question is “everyone.” Global learning is not a task to be assigned to an individual, an office, or a department; it is a complex set of goals and outcomes to be coordinated across and throughout the institution. Consequently, study abroad as a vehicle for global learning needs to be carefully situated within a broader institutional and educational context.

WHAT IS GLOBAL LEARNING?

This need is supported by evidence from employers. In 2006, AAC&U commissioned a series of focus groups with business leaders, followed by a national survey to learn their impressions of how well colleges and universities prepare students for work. Business leaders thought that colleges were underemphasizing “global issues,” with 72 percent urging greater attention. The following year, AAC&U again asked employers to reflect on how colleges should assess and improve student learning. When asked to evaluate recent college graduates’ preparedness in twelve areas, which included such things as critical thinking and communications skills, global knowledge received the lowest scores. Only 18 percent of employers rated graduates as very well prepared in global knowledge; 46 percent felt that graduates were not well prepared. Nearly one half of employers responding to the survey did not think their recent college hires had the global knowledge necessary for advancement.

Such data reconfirms our conviction that college and university students will benefit from a careful and intentional alignment of global learning goals with the essential learning outcomes of a liberal education—what it means to be a well-educated citizen for the twenty-first century. By linking global learning and liberal education, institutions can overcome the mistaken view that liberal education is only “learning for learning’s sake,” disconnected from the practical skills and needs of work. On the contrary, they will demonstrate that liberal education attends to work life, civic life, and personal life in a dynamically shifting, globally integrated environment.

Advancing global learning helps campuses affirm the relevance and urgency of liberal education and gives it shape and coherence. As AAC&U’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) National Leadership Council argues, “Global integration is now our shared context. The potential benefits of global interdependence are extraordinary, but so too are the challenges. Wealth, income, and social power are dramatically unequal within and across international
boundaries. We are reminded daily of the clash of cultures, histories, and worldviews. The globe itself is fragile and vulnerable as are our shared civic spaces. These global challenges will be with us for the foreseeable future.” (AAC&U 2007).

Both AAC&U's Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative and its Shared Futures initiative are organized around a set of essential learning outcomes, which are best developed through a contemporary liberal education. These outcomes provide a new framework to guide students’ cumulative progress beginning in school and continuing at successively higher levels across their college studies. While the word “global” appears only once in the outcomes, global concerns are infused throughout the entire set of outcomes; global learning is knowledge focused by engagement with big questions; skills practiced extensively … in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance; personal and social responsibility anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges; and integrative learning demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems.

Nearly a decade ago, when we began to develop the Shared Futures initiative, our queries about global learning were usually forwarded to the campus study abroad office or to the department of international affairs. By focusing attention on student learning outcomes, in the subsequent years, we have seen a marked increase in efforts to design more comprehensive global learning strategies. The following, for example, are working definitions of global learning submitted by a few participants in a March 2009 Global Learning Forum sponsored by AAC&U. At Barry University, global learning “encompasses both everyday intercultural interaction on campus and the formal study of global cultures and issues across the curriculum.” Chestnut Hill students focus on the “centrality of relationships in living and working for the common good and … understand the diverse world in which they live.” At Northern Arizona University, global learning includes issues of environmental sustainability, diversity, and multicultural education. Northern Arizona students learn about the interaction among diversity, environmental sustainability, and global engagement.

“GLOBAL” AT HOME AND ABROAD

More and more, institutions are defining global learning as a vehicle for integrating multiple disciplinary perspectives and weaving together existing commitments to explore diversity, build capacity for civic engagement, and prepare students to take responsibility for common global problems. At Whittier College, for example, faculty, staff, and administrators “have been exploring how global learning can connect to the college’s long-standing commitment to and support of domestic diversity.” They are seeking ways to “use the multiethnic, international community settings in Los Angeles to both engage … students with cultures different than their own, while giving them a sense of global interconnections.” Such language is increasingly evident among the institutions we have followed through Shared Futures activities. The challenge that remains, of course, is establishing an institutional “home” for such coordination. Whittier is using its Liberal Education Program (general education], majors and interdisciplinary programs, study abroad

---

**Essential Learning Outcomes for the Twenty-first Century**

Beginning in school, and continuing at successively higher levels across their college studies, students should prepare for twenty-first-century challenges by gaining:

**KNOWLEDGE OF HUMAN CULTURES AND THE PHYSICAL AND NATURAL WORLD**

- Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts
- Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

**INTELLECTUAL AND PRACTICAL SKILLS, INCLUDING**

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving

Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

**PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, INCLUDING**

- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

**INTEGRATIVE LEARNING, INCLUDING**

- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems.

Source: College Learning for the New Global Century: A Report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise. 2007. AAC&U.
Global Learning: Lessons Learned

- Global learning cannot be achieved at one time or in one place.
- Global learning must take into account the developmental stage of the student.
- Global learning must be built sequentially (in developmentally appropriate ways).
- Colleges and universities need help in developing assessment tools to track the multiple expectations of global learning and to help determine the best teaching strategies for each.
- Global learning should be a rehearsal of real-world problems.
- Global learning should simultaneously address international interconnection and interdependence and inequality, injustice, and American power—at home and abroad.
- Disciplinary frameworks are important—they provide tested tools to students and scholars to bring analytical power to bear on a problem or problems, but for global learning, particularly at the level appropriate to undergraduates, interdisciplinary questions offer great promise.
- General education is a promising area for global learning because it has evolved to address this tension between breadth and depth, between disciplinary tools and perspectives in comparison. General education is also about integration of learning and learning to learn, two elements of global learning that cannot be overemphasized.
- There are local/global intersections in every community. Colleges and universities can identify and utilize them.
- The key questions of Shared Futures—what does it mean to be a responsible citizen in today’s global context and how should one act in the face of large unsolved global problems?—are central questions for liberal education and key questions around which to organize curricular and cocurricular engagement.

opportunities, and an emphasis on using Los Angeles as a ‘learning laboratory’ to achieve the following [student learning] goals:

- an understanding of how other countries and societies interpret U.S. values
- an understanding of how the United States interprets the values of other countries and societies
- an understanding of how individual choices affect or influence other societies and countries
- an understanding of how individual consumption impacts the world’s ecological system, cultural values, cultural evolution, and economy.

CREATING COMMON GROUND

Similar thinking across institutional types has led AAC&U to adopt a strategy for Shared Futures that emphasizes both the multiplicity of meaning within the term “global learning” and its potential to create intellectual and institutional common ground. On that common ground, individuals representing different disciplines and divisions can come together to shape a curriculum around real-world, complex global problems and individuals from both student affairs and academic affairs can collaborate around creating integrative curricular and cocurricular opportunities for students to apply their learning. Study abroad and study away infrastructure and personnel have a critical role to play in this common endeavor.

Our interest in common ground has led us to emphasize general education designs, but it is appropriate across all elements of the curriculum and cocurriculum. Through Shared Futures, AAC&U led efforts to build coherent, vertically and horizontally integrated, general education curricula around complex, multidisciplinary global issues such as:

- Health and social justice, which explores issues like HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, food supplies and security, and pandemic influenza as rich areas of interconnected global learning
- Sustainability, which has proved to be a popular topic with which colleges and universities reinforce the importance of scientific literacy, interdependence, social responsibility, and civic engagement in the curriculum
- Globalization, wealth, and poverty, which is a useful framework for placing moral and ethical questions within interconnected economic, cultural, political, and social contexts
- Identity, culture, and border crossings, which helps students begin to see how their own identities are related to currents of power and privilege, both within a multicultural United States and within an interdependent and unequal world
- Religion in global contexts, which raises questions about one source of potential conflict and reconciliation in a shared future

Participating institutions demonstrated convincingly that using global questions to frame general education requirements is an effective educational practice. Evidence from the field suggests that they are also effective in bridging curricular with cocurricular experiences.

Northern Virginia Community College, another institution participating in the Global Learning Forum, divides its global learning outcomes into knowledge/content, attitude/mode of being, and skills. In each category, students will be able to do the following:

Knowledge/Content

- Understand the interconnectedness and interdependence of global systems
- Understand the historical, cultural, economic, and political forces that shape society and explain their own situation in this context
- Develop a nuanced/complex understanding of culture as a concept and the deep/complex/dynamic nature of culture
- Understand various/different cultures and how culture is created
Understand the relationship of power and language, and how language interacts with culture
Understand the connections between power, knowledge, privilege, gender, and class (locally and globally)
Understand conflict and power relationships.
Understand how language frames thinking and perspective (“the language you speak creates the box in which you think”)
Recognize how stereotypes develop and where they come from

Attitudinal/Mode of Being
- Develop a sense of perspective and social responsibility
- Overcome provincial/parochial thinking
- Reduce their own prejudice
- Appreciate difference; value and acknowledge other cultures as legitimate
- Improve cultural self-awareness and understanding of one’s self in the global context (one’s own place and connections)
- Demonstrate greater appreciation of or an interest in learning about different cultures
- Develop empathy and perspective consciousness
- Demonstrate open-mindedness and an understanding of complexity

Skills
- Think, work, and move across boundaries—in diverse environments with a range of people
- Develop and use skills in conflict resolution
- Develop and use intercultural communications skills
- Demonstrate language proficiency
- Take informed responsibility for actions in a globally connected world
- Link theory and practice through their own experience both as citizens and in professions
- Internalize and apply cultural understandings and knowledge

Seek out multiple perspectives—inside perspectives as well as outside ones
In many ways this list recapitulates the LEAP essential learning outcomes. Clearly, it is impossible to make progress across all of these goals without integrating multiple parts of the educational experience. And of course, each of these experiences should be aligned to a developmental arc as well—we can’t expect students to achieve the highest degree of success at a single, first exposure. Comprehensive curricular pathways need to be designed. Study abroad or study away is strengthened by opportunities for course-based preparation and reflection. The knowledge, skills, and experiences gained in study abroad or away, in turn, expand and deepen the insights that students bring to what they are learning in the rest of their courses. Equally important to success—especially at a large urban commuter institution—is finding creative ways to bring students into generative contact—to create spaces and opportunities for them to share their diverse experiences and identities in the context of global challenges.

**SHARED FUTURES, SHARED RESPONSIBILITY**

In the specific context of study abroad or study away, we must encourage conversation and shared responsibility between faculty and staff who are involved in those programs and those who are not. Such efforts should not be focused only on recruiting additional faculty to lead study abroad, but should endeavor to refine the overall context in which study away occurs so that it is more reflective of a globally interdependent world. Students need opportunities and experiences in which they can explore the relational nature of their identities—identities that are variously shaped by the currents of power and privilege, both within a multicultural United States and within an interconnected and unequal world. Diversity is about everyone; and global is about everywhere. There exists enormous potential on campus for fruitful collaborations within and across these movements.

As the Northern Virginia Community College example shows, when global learning is translated into multiple desired student learning outcomes, the results are ambitious, if not overwhelming. What will a campus look like if this collective responsibility is embraced? What will study abroad or away experiences look like? How will associations such as AAC&U help colleges develop the necessary deep roots for such change?

Such questions have led us to focus more and more on the integrative value of global learning and its role in general education design. Such integration requires cooperation, collaboration, and communication across departments and divisions, between disciplines and, ideally, between academic and student affairs. Global learning must be designed at the institutional level. In recent years, we have seen increased attention to ideas such as global citizenship, global awareness, and global responsibility in institutional mission statements. Such statements of commitment are easy; it is the implementation that is difficult. Global learning takes a curriculum and it requires multiple experiential opportunities for students to practice in the real world what they are learning in the classroom.

The corollary to such an integrative vision of global learning is that it takes a highly developed faculty and staff. Many of the institutions that have participated in Shared Futures projects have had great success developing and sustaining faculty/staff learning communities around the global issues listed above. Through such learning communities, institutions are able to bring existing resources to bear on efforts to build coherent strategies for enabling global learning in students.

**REFERENCE**

The need for more U.S. students to go abroad is now pro-claimed in academic mission statements, business associations’ manifestos, and even federal legislation. Gaining the knowledge, skills, and attitudes through an international experience is no longer just the interest of individual students. It has now become a priority of the collective. Why, then, has study abroad emerged as a national priority? There may be myriad explanations, but we can certainly all agree on one: globalization. The world is becoming “flat,” as Thomas Friedman argued. With the explosion in communications technology and the multinationalization of production, we recognize the importance of an educated workforce becoming more knowledgeable about other cultures as essential so that the United States remains economically competitive. In the aftermath of 9/11, the Iraq war, and Abu Ghraib, we regard sending students abroad as one of the most effective diplomatic tools, both to improve our damaged reputation in the short term and to help resolve intractable international conflicts in the long run. In terms of the environment, health, and poverty, we know that finding global solutions to the toughest problems facing our planet depends upon armies of individuals capable of cooperating across borders.

But in the face of this dramatic growth and these sweeping changes across our society, are we in fact succeeding in developing a mass of global citizens? Are our students meeting the challenges of globalization and our priorities as a nation?

RESPONDING TO THE CHALLENGES OF GLOBALIZATION
Let us begin with the bad news. The percentage of U.S. students studying abroad lags far behind that of most highly industrialized countries. As a percentage of all U.S. students, study abroad participation has actually not increased significantly over the last decade. Our students also tend to study abroad for ever shorter durations, especially as compared to their Asian and European counterparts. Fewer of our students succeed at even attaining the minimum goal of study abroad—the acquisition of intercultural competencies. Most disturbingly, while we witness substantial growth in the number of students going to centers of globalization, such as China or India, to areas of national security interest, such as the Middle East, and to countries most adversely affected by the global economy, such as in Africa and Latin America, the vast majority of students continue to choose to spend their semesters abroad in affluent European nations. Our study abroad pedagogy indeed still follows in the tradition of the European grand tour, whereby aristocratic students traveled to European capitals to supplement their liberal arts educations and to accumulate the treasures of the “Old World.” Where we have succeeded in study abroad is extending its access and attraction beyond the upper economic tiers of our student bodies.

In the course of this democratization, however, study abroad has also experienced what I would label “massification.” Too many of our students, if anecdotal information serves, express greater interest in filling their passports with stamps of different countries than in learning the languages of the nations in which they are studying. Undergraduates show more facility at finding the best bargains for travel and shopping—not bad skills in and of themselves—than at creating networks of peers from different cultures with whom they may end up collaborating. Many still see study abroad as a semester off, a break from the grueling demands of higher education in the Age of Globalization. They may, in fact, seek in the study abroad experience an escape from the more complicated implications of globalization, including a more competitive job market, the fading of their own national identity as exceptional, as well as effects of terrorist threats, environmental degradation, and the plight of those most suffering in the world.
FOSTERING GLOBAL CITIZENS

Fortunately, not everything is so bleak. While the United States falls behind its European and Asian counterparts in deploying international education for purposes of workforce development and national economic competitiveness, it stands in front in using the study abroad experience to instill in students a sense of civic responsibility and action. Across the country, study abroad programs are emerging in developing countries that either encourage or require volunteer or internship work in community service organizations. More and more study abroad programs include research projects that pertain explicitly to environmental, health, and social problems affecting the most vulnerable regions of the world. Civic engagement has even entered into our traditional “island” programming in Western capitals where one finds American students volunteering and interning, and, as a result, having a positive impact on those locales. The American zeal for civic life that Tocqueville described and the call for U.S. higher education to strengthen democratic participation that traces back to Jefferson now extend beyond our regions and borders. Our students are not merely striving to improve the commonweal of their own country, but of the entire globe.

Alas, while the number of these types of opportunities grows, they still constitute the minority. Why is that? In part, this lack of civically oriented study abroad programs can be ascribed to American identity. Our strong sense of individualism has, of course, filtered down to higher education, which emphasizes satisfying the desires of individual students over meeting the needs of our society. Moreover, if we are to believe a common lament, the increased cost of higher education has turned students into customers who are treating their college education as a product that they have purchased. The culture at U.S. universities is thus not well suited toward the expansion of knowledge and skills in service of the public good. Study abroad offices are largely self-supporting, which equally compromises our efforts to create programs conducive to the development of global citizens. Study abroad offices feel tremendous pressure from central administrations to meet numerical goals. This forces them both to intensify their own marketing efforts and to rely on an emerging study abroad industry replete with providers endeavoring to exceed their own bottom lines and turn a profit using amateur Madison Avenue techniques. So even when the curricula of our study abroad programs contain greater exposure to global issues, increased opportunities for civic engagement, and more skill development aimed toward solving global problems, we find ourselves pushing these loftier goals onto students against their primary expectations for travel, adventure, and general pleasure-seeking.

PREPARING STUDENTS FOR THE FORCES OF GLOBALIZATION

How, then, can colleges and universities militate against the business of study abroad and attract students to participate in programs that might better prepare them for the forces of globalization? In editing The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship, a volume conceived by some of my comments above, I have identified several recommendations, explicit and implicit, from higher education administrators, business leaders, and study abroad practitioners from across the country and the world. Let me mention a few that I regard as helpful to those of us navigating our way through this exciting period of internationalization our campuses. First, we need to underscore the American Council on Education’s recommendations that are already underway at several colleges and universities across the United States: senior administrators should promote the need to internationalize their campuses as a means of preparing their students to meet the challenges of globalization. Presidents and chancellors must advocate for study abroad to external constituencies, including legislators, businesses, the local community, and donors as crucial to workforce development and economic competitiveness of their states and regions. Chief academic officers, for their part, need to champion study abroad internally to deans, department heads, faculty, and students as a central component of the process of internationalization. With the help of our senior leaders, we should witness continued growth in study abroad in a way that serves the needs of our communities here and abroad.

Second, we should articulate a vision for study abroad, as for global learning more broadly, that is aligned with the type of institution in general, and the values of the specific institution in particular. For example, a research university might tie study abroad to its need to train graduates in skills that make them capable of working alongside other academics in international settings. A land-grant institution might connect study abroad’s focus on global civic engagement to the university’s commitment to transfer knowledge and help improve the standard of living in the region, state, and even across the world. Nursing schools may advertise the need to prepare nurses who can spend time assisting others around the globe and also become more adept at working with diverse cultures at home. Liberal arts colleges may link global learning to the development of a moral citizenry that has the critical capacity, cultural sensitivity, and experiences to make a difference through their graduates’ lives. If a particular university values, say, individual creativity or human rights, these might be integrated into study abroad as well. The principles must be broad, so as to provide sufficient room for grassroots development from all university constituencies. Individual
schools and departments should be encouraged to develop their own programming based on their unique needs within the broader framework outlined from central administrators. Individual faculty should be motivated to do the same. We should even encourage students to assist in developing study abroad programming based on their own engagement experiences and interests within or outside the institution. By envisioning from above but cultivating development from below, not only will more students study abroad, but our programming will be better oriented toward meeting our collective values and goals. University partnerships can also be identified within this context, as well those partnerships that go beyond study abroad, such as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and businesses. We can make a much more convincing case to donors who are considering supporting study abroad, and we will have a better idea how to fund study abroad from limited resources. In fact, when a vision is spelled out, students will enthusiastically get with this “team spirit.”

Third, growth of global-citizenship-oriented study abroad depends upon its integration into the rest of the curriculum. We often complain that our students land in their study abroad destinations expert on where to find the lowest-priced drinking holes and the best places to access WiFi, but with faint knowledge about their host country’s culture, history, geography, or politics. At the same time, students return from some of the most effective study abroad experiences finding neither coursework for them to take in order to deepen their knowledge, nor engagement opportunities for them to continue developing their civic sensibilities. The antidote to the former is a haphazard rush to develop predeparture courses linked explicitly to individual study abroad programs, only to be hamstrung by logistical challenges, especially since such courses require extra-early application deadlines, and additional financial resources for their instruction. The solution to the latter is essentially nonexistent. I would, however, recommend colleges and universities take a different tack and follow many of their peers who show less concern for linking specific predeparture, study abroad, and post-experience coursework, and more concern for ensuring the existence and expansion of general coursework that exposes students to global systems, area studies, and world language training; with affording them a recognized global pathway that appears on their official college transcript; and with providing them a cultural milieu whereby faculty invoke more international examples as a pedagogical tool even in their courses that do not inhere international content. When we integrate study abroad into the curriculum, participation levels will increase in a direction that most of us will find meaningful.

Fourth, study abroad programming must intentionally engage students. One of the most important lessons in higher education in the last ten years has certainly been that the more engaged students are in and outside the classroom, the better they perform academically. George Kuh, founder of the National Survey of Student Engagement, who famously proposed this idea, has correctly identified study abroad as a model of engaged education. Living abroad by itself is, however, insufficient, as we know painfully well that students can virtually isolate themselves from the culture at large, living with other Americans and frequenting only places catering to American students. Even living in “home stays,”—sometimes touted as the hallmark of a seriously engaged study abroad program—does not adequately meet the global learning goals of study abroad today. Students need menus of accredited courses at foreign institutions that actively help them achieve particular global learning skill sets. They need research opportunities that both teach them how other countries conduct research and facilitate the creation of international teamwork that they can develop over their lives. They need opportunities to participate in civic projects to learn how to work alongside people from across the world to cultivate the habits of mind and action that will promote further engagement in the future.

Fifth, colleges and universities should strive to make quality study abroad programming accessible to everyone. Accessibility is not merely a moral issue but also a practical one. Currently, too few science, engineering, and agriculture students study abroad, when we may need them most to graduate with international experience. Males study abroad in significantly lower rates than females, in part due to the entrenched narrative of study abroad in the United States as an extension of a kind of Swiss finishing school that has little to do with serious academic work. If we do not rewrite this story and get more men abroad, we face a serious gap among our graduates as compared to other rich countries. Most importantly, the percentage of minority students studying abroad does come close to approximating their overall representation at colleges and universities. The fact that African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans too infrequently study abroad may relate to the significant expense of the study abroad experience. It may also be attributed to cultural fears, family anxieties, and, as we have learned, the need for greater pastoral care in preparing these students for the experience. Their disproportionately low representation may also have to do with how we have sold the study abroad experience. Whatever the reasons, these low participation rates among minorities not only widens the academic achievement gap so many have worked so hard to narrow, but also fails to meet our collective need of preparing as many people as possible for the global challenges confronting us all.
PARADIGMS IN STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMMING

Finally, we should rethink our traditional student learning paradigms in our study abroad programming. Over the last decade, study abroad has made great strides in integrating itself into the undergraduate curriculum. It has, in fact, adopted many of the student-centered learning models that predominate our campuses. Study abroad is setting goals, establishing student-centered learning activities in support of them, and matching all of these with assessment tools. Study abroad has adopted the actual learning categories of home curricula, including knowledge, skills, and attitudes, by simply modifying them with the word “global.” Unfortunately, the grafting of the learning models used at our own universities does not always work very well in some of the study abroad programming we most wish to expand.

A wonderful development in international education has been the spawning of deep partnerships between U.S. colleges and universities and poorer higher education institutions and NGOs around the world. These new types of partnerships should be applauded, but they cannot always be expected to replicate our own student learning models. They may have neither the infrastructure nor the resources. Their principle business, as is in the case of the NGOs, may not be the development of students. To expect these institutions to mirror our own paradigms may be unreasonable at best and imperialistic at worst. That is, we should be mindful that the development of the U.S. student in these contexts may come across to our partners as yet once again about the development of the colonial subject, the American student, at the expense of those students and citizens in the countries with which we are partnering. If our aim is to develop global citizens, we must understand that the experience of studying at a university in a developing country may not be only about the formal acquisition of knowledge delivered in the classroom but also the holistic experience of studying at that institution, including adapting to its academic culture and the institution’s limited resources. With regards to NGOs, the U.S. student may have to be decentered and integrated into organizations trying to fulfill their main goal, the development of the community. In this experience, too, we can still expect deep learning to occur. Indeed, what justifies the conveyance of college and university credit may have to be reconsidered in light of these new types of partnerships. If we fail to show flexibility here, we will fail to attract our students to these destinations and programs.

More students than ever are studying abroad. In fewer than fifteen years, participation has risen over 300 percent, from under 75,000 students in 1994 to nearly a quarter million last year. As a result, more of our young people are graduating with greater knowledge about the world and able to move within it with greater maturity. Yet as much as we can laud these accomplishments, we should not become self-satisfied. Our times demand setting the study abroad bar even higher. Study abroad can now be one of the main educational vehicles to reach what our country and world need most: masses of individuals capable of understanding, analyzing and actually helping to ameliorate the challenging problems confronting humanity.
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Global Learning through Short-Term Study Abroad

Laura Donnelly-Smith, staff writer and associate editor of Peer Review, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Short-term study abroad experiences—those in which students are engaged for fewer than eight weeks—are the most common type of undergraduate study abroad in the United States. According to the Institute of International Education’s 2008 Open Doors report, more than half of all American students who studied abroad in the 2006–07 academic year (55.4 percent) participated in short-term programs. Short-term programs are increasing in popularity for many reasons: they are generally more affordable than longer programs, they appeal to students who might not be able or willing to commit to a semester or a year abroad, and they allow students in structured academic programs like engineering, nursing, and education to study abroad without falling behind in their programs. But because widespread participation in short-term study abroad programs is a relatively new phenomenon—(during the 1996–97 academic year, only 3.3 percent of students studying abroad participated in short-term programs)—there is little formal research describing either the best practices for short-term study abroad or the learning outcomes that can accompany it.

Defining and Defending Short-Term Study Abroad

While nearly all institutions define short-term study abroad as programs that last less than a semester or quarter, there is a great deal of variation within the short-term category. Short-term programs can range from weeklong programs conducted during spring break in conjunction with a single course, to three- or four-week programs conducted during January term or in the summer, to longer programs of up to eight weeks that can involve homestays, travel to multiple sites, and service or research experiences. Many short-term programs include several or many of these elements. There is no “average” short-term study abroad program; the variations are as numerous as the institutions that host them.

For the majority of the twentieth century, students who studied abroad were from wealthy families who could afford to send those young adults to study foreign languages or the humanities in European capital cities (Lewin 2009, xiv; Dessoff 2006, 22). The explosion of globalization at the end of the twentieth century helped encourage greater numbers of students from more diverse backgrounds and fields of study to go abroad. However, not all of them desired or were able to dedicate a year or even a semester to an in-depth experience abroad, and institutions—and for-profit companies—began offering shorter-term programs that appealed to greater numbers of students. But because longer-term programs had been the norm for so many years, short-term study abroad has suffered an often unjustified reputation problem.

“Short-terms have kind of been the stepchild of study abroad,” says Lisa Chieffo, associate director of the University of Delaware’s Center for International Studies. “They were initially often summer programs with a ‘vacation-y’ image. And a lot of purists don’t believe a month is a long enough time for a significant experience abroad. All this is even more reason that institutions must have strong academic foundations for their short-term programs.” Sarah Spencer, director of short-term programs at the University of St. Thomas, says something as simple as how institutions frame their short-term programs can go a long way toward helping counter the stereotypes. “Avoid two four-letter words: trip and tour,” she recommends. “A trip is a one-time, isolated thing. A good short-term program is strongly connected to coursework and an integral part of a larger learning experience.”

Though many faculty members still feel that “longer is better” when it comes to study abroad, at least one study has found evidence that duration of stay is insignificant in terms of the degree to which students who study abroad are globally engaged. A 2009 study from the University of Minnesota (Paige et al. 2009)
surveyed more than six thousand alumni from twenty universities who had participated in study abroad over a period of fifty years. The study found no significant difference in global engagement—defined for the study as degree of international and domestic civic commitment and volunteerism—between students who had studied abroad for longer and shorter time periods. Most of the respondents, however, reported their global engagement stemmed from their time abroad. “Certainly there is a strong value in being in a place for a long time,” says Eric Lund, director of international and off-campus studies at St. Olaf College. “But this move to short-term programs is expanding the number of students who can gain from studying abroad, and I think that’s a very positive thing.”

**MAKING THE MOST OF THE EXPERIENCE**

Faculty members and program directors agree that when working with a short time frame for study abroad, preparation is tantamount to success, both for the students and for the faculty member leading the group. Nearly all short-term programs are faculty-led, rather than exchanges with foreign institutions, and this setup provides many built-in benefits, explains Andreas Sobisch, director of the Center for Global Education at John Carroll University. Faculty members have a much larger degree of control over the program, and are able to ensure that the program activities are closely integrated with the content of the students’ coursework back home. “When I teach a short-term program for ten, fifteen, or thirty days, I can really control the content of that program,” Sobisch says. “I love longer programs for the immersion, but many students in longer programs don’t use their time abroad wisely in an academic sense—they hang around with all American students and travel for fun. In a short program, I can model for the students how to continually process what they are learning.”

One common format for short-term programs is the January or winter-term course. Many institutions offer a winter term of approximately one month, and this time period offers an ideal opportunity for students who cannot travel abroad for a longer time to experience international education. The University of Delaware (UD) focuses on winter term with its study abroad offerings—the university has had a winter term since the late 1970s, and is offering about seventy study abroad options for winter term 2010. About 40 percent of UD students study abroad, and of that number, about 90 percent participate in short-term programs. Winter-term programs at UD typically require students to enroll in six credits of academic work that is connected to the study site, as well as a zero-credit pass/fail course that requires students to reflect upon their international experiences. Students in UD’s winter term Materials Science/Engineering program in France, for example, enroll in Topics in Modern European History: French History, and Materials Science for Engineers. While abroad, they study at scientific research centers and visit universities in several French cities. At the University of St. Thomas, students in the January term course Theological Reflection: AIDS, Apartheid, and the Arts of Resistance travel to Gugulethu, Cape Town, South Africa, for a program offered by the theology department. Students study the theological dimension of how art, music, and film functioned during apartheid (and today) to resist oppression and stigmatization, while also completing service-learning projects through a partnership between the college and a charity in South Africa. “This program hits all the things that are so powerful about short-term study abroad,” Spencer explains. “It’s only three weeks, but these students really get to know South Africans and contribute to the community there.” Students who participate in one winter-term program often participate again in later years and are able to draw connections between the experiences, Lund says. He has had students participate in a winter-term course

**Five Best Practices for Short-Term Study Abroad Programs**

1. **Start with strong, clear academic content.** Answer the question, Why is it important to teach this course abroad? Make sure the learning objectives and the site itself are closely integrated. Make sure all short-term programs are connected to an academic course and are at least as rigorous as those taught on the home campus.

2. **Make certain faculty are comfortable and competent with experiential teaching.** A faculty member might give brilliant lectures, but can he or she teach experientially, integrating the unique features of the site abroad to ensure students make connections and have authentic learning experiences?

3. **Ensure integration with the local community.** Professors and students should not simply go from classroom to hotel to site visits on a chartered bus. Students tend to learn best in programs where there is some sort of service or experiential learning project that puts them in contact with the host community.

4. **Bring in lecturers from the host country.** Professors and academic experts from host country institutions provide perspectives students’ regular professors cannot provide.

5. **Require ongoing reflection for both individual students and the group as a whole.** Students should keep structured journals of their study abroad experience, using guided reflection practices to help them process and understand their experiences. The group should regularly engage in structured discussion.

Sources: Sarah Spencer, director of short-term programs, University of St. Thomas, and coeditor, *The Guide to Successful Short-Term Programs Abroad* (2002); and Lisa Chieffo, associate director, Center for International Studies, University of Delaware
on colonial influences and indigenous people in South Africa, and then later investigate the same themes in Australia during a different program.

Summer programs offer similar options for in-depth study. In the Maricopa Community College system, summer programs ranging in length from one week to one month are offered at five system colleges. Education students at Mesa Community College can enroll in a month-long program of experiential learning in Xalapa, Mexico, that includes field experience working in Mexican classrooms and seven academic credits in education and Spanish. Chandler-Gilbert Community College offers a ten-day Bridge to Belize program focusing on environmental ethics and philosophy. The University of Connecticut’s Liverpool program is a three-week summer study abroad experience that specifically targets first-generation and minority college students. The students take a three-credit course at the University of Liverpool on the historical and modern effects of the transatlantic slave trade, travel to historic sites around England, and complete a three-credit independent research project with UConn faculty members upon their return.

A third option for short-term programs are those in which the international experience is part of a larger, semester-long academic course. At John Carroll University, Sobisch coteaches a spring semester political science/history class with a colleague. The course, Berlin: From Reich to Republic, includes a weekend study trip to Berlin during John Carroll’s spring break. “This class is my ideal of how short-term study abroad can really work,” Sobisch says. “We have class for seven weeks before the trip, and the students have to keep a journal every day that they are abroad. When they’re back, they write a research paper on one of the themes of the course. Many students continue with these themes and eventually expand their papers into senior theses.”

Short-term domestic study-away programs, though not common, provide a cost-effective option for students who cannot afford international airfare but still want the educational benefits of learning out of their element. At Susquehanna University, which began requiring an international or domestic study-away experience for all students in fall 2009, students can enroll in a two-credit biology course, Topics in Biology: Disaster Impacts in Society—Hurricane Katrina, which dovetails with Susquehanna’s frequent Hurricane Relief Team trips to New Orleans. These trips to New Orleans, when taken with the academic course, satisfy the university’s study away requirement.

Where and What Are Students Studying Abroad?

A few of the short-term study abroad programs offered in the 2008-09 and 2009–10 academic years:

- **Antarctica**—Humans and the Environment (Virginia Tech, fall semester and winter break 2009)
- **Australia**—Contemporary Australia (Arcadia University, winter term 2010)
- **Czech Republic**—Study of Central Europe (Valdosta State University, spring intersession 2009)
- **England**—Arts of Medieval and Renaissance Britain (Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, spring semester and spring break 2010)
- **Finland**—International Perspectives in Recreation and Health (Ithaca College, summer 2009)
- **Ireland**—Schooling in a Democratic Society (Kent State University, spring intersession 2010)
- **Israel**—Archaeological Field Work in Apollonia-Arsuf (Brown University, summer 2009)
- **Kenya**—Primatology and Conservation Biology (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, summer 2010)
- **Mexico**—Cattle Production, Processing, and Marketing in Northern Mexico (Kansas State University, spring break 2010)
- **Panama**—Tropical Plant Systematics (Ohio University, winter intersession 2010)
- **Poland**—Krakow Summer Engineering Program (San Diego State University, summer 2009)
- **Spain**—Astronomy and Spanish in Granada (Goucher College, summer 2010)
- **Tanzania**—Swahili (Howard University, summer 2009)

WHAT WORKS FOR STUDENTS?

Faculty members and study abroad administrators and program directors tend to agree that students get the most out of short-term programs that are highly structured, require ongoing reflection, and include in-depth experience working or studying with host country participants. Universities and colleges should also strive to offer all or at least most of their short-term programs internally, rather than relying on external service providers, many of which offer academically weak programs that are more focused on tourism. As short-term study abroad becomes more popular, institutions are standardizing the way in which these programs are developed, approved, and carried out, rather than simply allowing
an individual faculty member to gather students, collect checks, and take a study tour in Spain or England, as was often the case in the past.

Within the Maricopa Community College system’s extensive study abroad program, new options must be approved through a process that involves a preprogram site assessment, a detailed written application, and ultimately approval by both the individual college and the system’s office of international education. “All travel and study abroad options have to be connected to an approved course that’s in the course bank, and they must equal or surpass the quality of a course offered on campus,” explains Kathryn Howard, program coordinator for the Department of International and Intercultural Education for Maricopa Community Colleges. “Faculty have to submit a detailed justification for the site they’re proposing. Just studying abroad because it’s interesting wouldn’t be approved.” In their proposals, faculty members must document how each contact hour for the course would be earned and which competencies the program would fulfill. “Going to a museum abroad is educational, but there must also be a presentation, discussion, something like that,” Howard says. “Every activity must be closely tied to what students are learning in the classroom.”

Some program directors also recommend limiting the number of sites visited to one or two, rather than trying to visit many countries within a three- or four-week program. “If you are staying in one or two places, students are able to become more deeply involved with the content,” says University of Delaware’s Lisa Chieffo. “Students have fewer authentic experiences when they’re spending so much time travelling around.” Spending the entire program in one locale also can allow students to interact more authentically with host country residents, whether in the classroom, in service programs, or in short-term homestays. Mesa Community College’s month-long Guanajuato, Mexico, program places students with Mexican families, where they experience immersion into the Spanish language and explore the cultural highlights of Guanajuato, including art galleries, museums, and archeological sites along with two credit-bearing classes. They become, in effect, residents of the city for a month.

The most important aspect of planning a short-term study abroad program is ensuring that participants avoid the “island” or “bubble” effect, says Sarah Spencer, of the University of St. Thomas. Programs abroad that mostly involve traveling by coach between historic sites may allow students to see a greater amount of the host country, but offer much less in terms of engaging educational experiences. “In some programs, the only local residents the students get to know are the bus driver and the guide,” Spencer says. “Even in a short, non-language-focused program, students need to know the basic polite phrases in the local language and have contact with local people in and out of the classroom.”

**REENTRY FOR RETURNING STUDENTS**

Reentry programming for returning students is also increasingly a feature of short-term study abroad programs, though it is still used much less frequently than in long-term programs. Most often, institutions have “study abroad ambassadors” or peer counselor groups made up of returning study abroad students who discuss their experiences with prospective students and give advice. Professors can also hold meetings to reunite a study group, discuss current events and news from the host country, and help students draw connections with any future study abroad programs they are planning. At St. Olaf College, a weekly World Issues Dialogue draws students from across campus—study abroad alumni and not—to meet for dinner and discussion. Conversation tables, available at most institutions, are especially beneficial for foreign language students who want to practice their speaking skills. Ideally, says John Carroll University’s Andreas Sobisch, institutions might have study abroad students enroll in a one-credit class to prepare for a short-term program, and then require a one-credit follow-up course the following semester in which students would produce a paper, presentation, or capstone project about the experience.

While short-term study abroad may be replacing semester and year programs as the norm on college campuses nationwide, it is important to remember that only about 2.1 percent of all American college students participate in a study abroad program of any length. Institutions must continue to develop programs that are appealing and accessible to a broad range of students, including those who have traditionally been overlooked by study abroad offices. Significant progress has already taken place in this area, but program directors agree there is much room for growth. “Not everyone can study abroad,” says Sobisch. “But well-designed short-term programs definitely provide the opportunity to a larger number.”

---
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Applying Standards to Creative Programming in Education Abroad

- Joan Gillespie, associate vice president for academic affairs and assessment, IES Abroad/The Institute for the International Education of Students

Programs for American undergraduate students abroad reflect the range of choices available to program sponsors in location, community partners, curriculum, housing, facilities, staff support, term length, and admission requirements. Quality standards for programs abroad allow for these differences, provided in each case that the program format adheres to its goals for student learning and development. In this respect, standards for quality in education abroad follow the same principle as those for all institutions of higher education in the United States: strict adherence to the institution’s mission and flexibility in planning how to achieve that stated mission.

The Institute for the International Education of Students (IES) is a nonprofit program provider that is organized as a consortium of nearly 175 U.S. colleges and universities whose representatives direct its academic governance policy and procedures. Founded in 1950, it operates ninety programs at thirty-two locations in Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, and South America. In 2008-09, IES enrolled more than five thousand students in fall, spring, summer, full-year, and short-term programs.

IES Abroad offers an example of an international education system that applies principle to practice, adhering to two sets of standards in operating its programs of education abroad, the IES Model Assessment Program (MAP) and the Forum on Education Abroad Standards of Good Practice. Both sets of standards are explicit in describing the framework for planning and operating a program abroad and the types of policies and procedures that are required to support the framework. IES Abroad administrative and teaching staff collaborate to interpret the standards in the context of the locale and to create a total learning experience to support goals for student learning and cultural adaptation. Two examples are presented here of the creative application of the standards to the planning of intentionally designed, fully integrated educational environments: internships and community-based learning in Rome and field study in Beijing.

COMPREHENSIVE STANDARDS APPLY TO A VARIETY OF PROGRAMS

The IES MAP standards emerged from discussions across IES with international administrative and teaching staff and members of the consortium about what constitutes academic quality in education abroad, specifically in terms of programming for students’ intellectual and intercultural growth. The document focuses on three categories: (1) the student learning environment, including coursework, internships, and field study; (2) resources for student learning, including administrative and teaching-staff qualifications, student qualifications, facilities, housing, health, and safety and risk management; and (3) the field of assessment of student learning and development abroad. These categories serve as a framework for the design, development, and evaluation of programs abroad. The IES MAP is undergoing its fifth revision — evidence of expanding goals for student learning and development abroad, the dynamic nature of educational opportunities, and the changing academic and sociocultural needs and interests of the American undergraduate population.

The IES MAP served as the starting point for the Standards of Good Practice, first drafted in 2004 by the Forum on Education Abroad. The forum undertook the project of writing clear and comprehensive standards for the field shortly after its creation to provide a means to assess program quality in light of the growing number of student enrollments abroad and of program types. The forum was awarded the status of Standards Development Organization by the federal government, conferring legitimacy to the Standards of Good
Practice for a variety of program types. The Standards of Good Practice address the same categories as the IES MAP standards and also articulate standards that apply to the field at large. As guidelines for program evaluation, both documents follow the premise that a program should be evaluated according to its own mission and goals. The IES MAP formulates this idea in the phrase “standards, not standardization” in program quality (IES Abroad 2008a).

DEFINING HOLISTIC GOALS FOR STUDENTS
The IES MAP articulates common goals for students that are the basis for program-specific goals in the categories of intellectual development, the development of language skills in language-immersion programs, and the development of intercultural competencies in the context of personal growth. IES Abroad undertook a three-year project beginning in 2006 to explore the intersections between courses, cocurricular activities, and community engagement as complementary means to achieve these program goals. It held workshops at a number of program sites for administrative and teaching staff to collaborate in setting goals for students and expanding learning opportunities based on those goals. The IES 3-D Program Model evolved from these workshops, with 3-D representing the three dimensions of holistic learning and development—cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (Gillespie, Braskamp, and Dwyer 2009).

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING IN ROME
Two curricular options at IES Abroad Rome—internships and community-based learning—are designed to meet academic goals for Italian language fluency, knowledge of different communities within the city, and understanding of Italian culture. Octavio di Leo, director of IES Rome, says, “These two elements are fundamental, integral parts of the program as a language immersion program.” Since previous work in Italian is not a prerequisite for admission to the program, internships and community-based learning give students an entry point to a segment of Italian society regardless of their language level.

Goals for student development are imbedded in the planning and implementation of the internships and community-based learning through the work of two full-time staff members who also teach the companion seminars. One of the most difficult—and most important—lessons to learn in working across cultures is that of culturally based values. By observing and listening, students not only become aware of values in their host community but also begin to assess their own culturally based values and attitudes.

IES Abroad identifies the goal of internships and community-based learning as fostering students’ significant intellectual and personal development by providing them with structured experiences at a work site that complement and enhance classroom learning. The mission statement for experiential learning at IES Abroad specifies that “the academic component provides students with cultural, political, and socio-economic insights that further their understanding of the host environment and host culture” (IES 2003). These goals emerge from the standards in the IES MAP that apply to internships: “Internships make effective use of location and local resources … help develop intercultural, cognitive, and interpersonal skills … [and] require students to synthesize the practical and theoretical aspects of their work site.” (IES 2008a).

Internships in Rome require students to work at a placement site one to two days a week and take a companion academic seminar on the Italian education system, labor system, and organizational culture. Substantive work assignments paired with a high level of interaction between students and full-time employees distinguish the program, which enrolls an average of 25 percent of the student population every term, a significant representation.

The community-based learning program, the only one of its kind in Rome for American undergraduates, partners with a Jesuit refugee center, and with la Comunità di Sant’ Egidio, a lay Catholic association that was established in 1968 to assist poor and marginalized populations in the city and that also engages in international conflict mediation. These partnerships follow current thinking at IES Abroad that IES Centers should identify a segment or segments of the local community to which it can make an organizational commitment and which in turn will contribute to the program concept of a total learning environment. The companion seminar uses the methodology of participatory observation to teach students basic skills such as conducting interviews and taking field notes and prepares them for their work and their major assignment—a field journal. Course content examines the major social issues challenging practitioners in a diverse range of fields, including community development, public health, and conflict management. Students complete a project on behalf
of the organization, working with administrative staff and the target population.

**MOBILE LEARNING COMMUNITIES IN BEIJING**

The management philosophy of IES Abroad Beijing is the team approach that bridges administration and academics. This concept translates into the practice of placing staff members who are qualified to teach in the classroom and, conversely, training instructors for a role often restricted to staff—that of field trip leaders. The program is housed at Beijing Foreign Language University (BeiWai), an elite language-training university, and offers two tracks: a rigorous Language Intensive Program that was the original curriculum, and a new broad curriculum, the Contemporary Issues Program. Conceptually, both curricula aim to immerse students in the host environment through language learning and field study.

Language Intensive Program students must meet the prerequisite of having studied Chinese for the equivalent of two college semesters. Mandarin Chinese, offered in the program at multiple intermediate and advanced levels, constitutes two-thirds of the semester course load for most students. At the higher language levels, courses expand beyond conversation to the learning activities of reading, writing, and listening. The Language Intensive Program requires students to take a language pledge that they will use Chinese in designated areas and at designated times.

The following model for “mobile classroom learning” serves both a ten-day trip and shorter trips. A preparatory information session includes a discussion in English with experts on the geography, society, and culture of the destination and in Chinese with the director on basic travel tips. Students are introduced to special vocabulary of the region and provided with a glossary sheet that they are expected to use as a reference when they talk to their hosts during the trip.

Student experiences on field trips are fully integrated into course assignments. Itineraries include formal and informal meetings with local people at which students engage them with questions and in conversation. In the Language Intensive Program, students might be required to keep a trip journal on specific topics or make a class presentation, depending on their written and oral skills. Students in the Language Intensive Program are led by their language teachers, who continue classes in context and hold students to their language pledge. One of the field study destinations, Yunnan River Province in the southwest, is specifically chosen to introduce students to people and their history in a rural region and to increase students’ awareness of the ethnic diversity of China. The student body is divided into small cohorts of fifteen to eighteen students to maximize their learning and minimize their impact on their destinations. The groups follow reverse itineraries that include a Tibetan village, where they stay with families, enter into family and community life, and learn about education, livelihoods, the local environment, and customs in the village. The itinerary also takes students through Yunnan’s mountains, where they are led on a four-day hike by a local guide who introduces them to the Mosuo people, one of the world’s few surviving matriarchal societies.

The Contemporary Issues Program, organized in three modules during a fourteen-week term, dedicates one module to a topic that includes the ten-day field study. An economics course and a course on ethnicity in contemporary China share the objective of deepening students’ understanding of what it means to be “Chinese” by offering them firsthand experiences with the multiple populations, communities, and ways of life in their host country. Research assignments in Contemporary Issues courses are linked to the field study, and a number of students also pursue independent research projects in connection with the itinerary.

Students in both the Language Intensive Program and Contemporary Issues Program contribute to a newsletter with articles in English and Chinese about their experiences. These articles focus on the Chinese families who hosted the students and individuals who met with them; these profiles are not assigned topics, but they clearly represent the significant impact of the one-to-one interactions that occur on the trips. The many issues in modern China’s economic life—power, water resources, population displacement, economic development, and entrepreneurship—converge in this account and give a new personal dimension to course topics. Many other examples might illustrate how standards provide the framework that is filled out by administrators and faculty. Whatever example might be chosen, it must acknowledge the symbiotic relationship between the on-site administrative and teaching staff and students. Just as gifted administrators and faculty inspire students, so do curious and engaged students inspire the life of an academic program abroad.
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Translating Study Abroad Experiences for Workplace Competencies

One of the positive benefits often attributed to participation in study abroad is the importance employers place on it during the recruiting and hiring process for college seniors. It seems intuitively obvious that having an international experience would benefit students moving to globally competitive organizations. Unfortunately, however, employers do not necessarily value the study abroad experience as highly as other cocurricular activities in which students can choose to participate.

At Michigan State University (MSU), we initiated research of the hiring process by asking employers their opinions about the value of study abroad. The results were not encouraging, as employers placed low importance on study abroad compared to other cocurricular activities. However, follow-up research showed that students were not articulating their international experiences in ways that had meaning for employers. Experience gained on study abroad may have value to employers, but students have to unpack their international academic experience by critically reflecting on it, and reframe their stories in the context of the workplace and in language employers understand. This article shares findings from our research and how it led to the development and delivery of our Unpacking Your Study Abroad Experiences seminars for returning study abroad participants.

EMPLOYER RESEARCH

Our early questions probed the value employers placed on study abroad and their understanding of the types of international learning programs available to students. Approximately 20–25 percent of respondents in some way valued study abroad. Generally, their companies could be described as large multinational firms. Yet it was clear from their comments that employers possessed little knowledge of what study abroad was about. Many mentioned that they had no first-hand experience with these programs because study abroad was not available to them during their undergraduate days or they were not aware these programs existed. Even though we could take some solace that one-fifth of employers valued study abroad, the information we had did not tell us very much about how employers weigh the study abroad experience in their evaluation of candidates during the hiring process. Further studies showed that employers seldom tapped into the study abroad experience in evaluating résumés and in initial interviews with students. Yet employers were emphatic that they were looking for experiences that added value to their companies. The impression recruiters often gain from hearing students describe their study abroad experience can best be summed up as “academic tourism.” Students’ presentations are like travelogues: highlighting the cool places they visited with a little academic work thrown into the mix. Employers often take away from the interview the impression that study abroad was a lot of fun, but contained little (work-related) substance.

In informal employer focus groups, we explored why study abroad just does not resonate as a useful experience in identifying qualified candidates. Many recruiters could not frame the study abroad experience against other cocurricular activities students elected to pursue simply because they themselves had no exposure to it as undergraduates. Nearly all recruiters had pursued internships and participated in student organizations as undergraduates and could draw upon their experiences to relate to the students they were interviewing. However, for older recruiters, study abroad programs did not exist when they were in school, and for many younger recruiters, they were not prominently promoted.
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by their institution (or they simply chose not to participate in international study programs).

The onus, therefore, is on students to translate study abroad into a framework recognizable to employers and to draw the connection between study abroad and the world of work. Employers want to know how the experiences students have had by graduation have contributed to the development of workplace skills and competencies. A typical question an employer might ask a student is, “In what ways will your experience abroad add value to my company?” Most students have given little thought to how study abroad has shaped and prepared them for the world of work and are unable to give meaning to their experience in ways that employers can identify. In other words, graduating seniors have flunked one of their most important exams—the hiring interview—because they were not prepared with appropriate examples of skills acquired from their international experiences.

FOCUSING ON COMPETENCIES
We shifted our research focus to examine what behaviors, skills, and competencies gained from study abroad appear relevant in the workplace. Our focus groups of approximately 450 employers generated a comprehensive list of possible traits and competencies gained from study abroad that we then tested in a series of questions to focus group participants, asking them to compare new and recent hires with and without known international study or internship experiences. The majority of the employers selected three competencies in which internationally experienced hires demonstrated higher abilities. The results produced a meaningful separation between the two student groups.

The first group of traits in which internationally experienced hires demonstrated higher abilities, as selected by more than 50 percent of the employers, included:
- Interacting with people who hold different interests, values, or perspectives
- Understanding cultural differences in the workplace
- Adapting to situations of change
- Gaining new knowledge from experiences (picked by 45 percent of employers)

Another group of traits also emerged, with more than 30 percent of employers recognizing that recent hires with international experiences excelled beyond their peers in:
- Ability to work independently
- Undertaking tasks that are unfamiliar/risky
- Applying information in new or broader contexts
- Identifying new problems/solutions to problems
- Working effectively with coworkers

Employers recognized that study abroad could influence the development of all of the skills and competencies on the original list. However, when fewer than 30 percent of employers chose a particular competency, it was harder to attribute study abroad as a sole or major contributor to the development of that trait. We decided to focus our attention on the leading traits, being aware that an individual student’s international experience may contribute to the other competencies as well. Employers reacted positively to this list. They cautioned, however, that simply going abroad did not guarantee that these skills or competencies were actually developed and displayed. This is similar to what employers say about internships. The value of study abroad depends on how well the student can reflect on and articulate his or her experience. Students must successfully articulate to the employer the skills gained and how these skills/competencies can apply in the workplace. The results from the final survey and these employer comments prompted us to design a reentry program, now called Unpacking Your Study Abroad Experience, that provides a venue for students to reevaluate their experiences from the perspective of the workplace.

UNPACKING YOUR STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCE

Theoretical underpinnings. We draw mainly from social learning theory, which is based on the premise that the interaction between environment, behavior, and the person’s psychological processes affect learning and identity. Of particular interest is Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy, which refers to an individual’s confidence in his/her ability to negotiate the challenges inherent in the larger social world (1997). Study abroad experiences provide a variety of challenges students must negotiate: from public transportation systems, markets, menus, and pharmacies to higher-order things like language, customs, cultural norms and, of course, their academic coursework. One of the reasons experiential learning in study abroad is so powerful is that it engages all four sources through which Bandura suggests self-efficacy expectations are learned:
- Performance accomplishments (learning by doing, mastery)
- Vicarious learning or modeling (watching others perform)
- Verbal persuasion, for example, encour-
management and support from others (or lectures from their professor)
- Physiological arousal; for example, the anxiety that arises in connection with the behavior (As in the first few days of cultural immersion and the students’ consciousness that they have to behave differently and learn new things to get what they need.)

We set out to accomplish three main objectives in unpacking. First, we sought to help students make critical connections between their learning experiences abroad, both inside and outside the classroom, in the context of career preparation. Second, we aimed to challenge the meaningfulness of their study abroad experience by probing deeper in to the ways it may have helped them develop academically, culturally, professionally, and personally. Finally, we wanted to help students find confident ways to articulate more effectively the skills and knowledge they developed through study abroad.

A typical unpacking session. The workshop is offered twice each semester and, additionally, when requested by a faculty leader. Designed to last two hours, there are four segments to the workshop: importance of skills and competencies to employers, doing authentic reflective practice, debriefing the unpacking exercises, and a wrap-up exercise.

We begin with a fifteen- to twenty-minute discussion of the skills and competencies sought in candidates for employment. The key skills are defined in the context of the workplace. Then the skills and competencies that are closely associated with study abroad are introduced. By introducing the skills and competencies early, we shift the focus away from the academic confines of campus to the world of work. Realizing that many of the students who attend expect to attend graduate or professional school at some point, we have also established a second frame of reference, and that is the personal statement commonly used in graduate school admissions.

A brief overview (ten minutes) of authentic reflective practice is covered prior to entering into the unpacking exercises. Students are provided with suggestions for doing authentic reflection. We then chose one to two student volunteers to participate in a debriefing (unpacking) of their experience. We have a general idea of the types of study abroad experiences that students bring to the workshops through introductions at the beginning of the session. We try to select someone who has had a full semester away or an international internship for the first exercise because it allows us to draw out more of the skills and competencies. We have found that short, faculty-led study experiences require more effort to get students to articulate their experience; unfortunately, some have very little to say. We try to do unpacking interviews with at least two student volunteers from the audience each session.

Our interviews are focused on making connections to the student’s stated career goals or interests. By the end of their interview, they typically have a list of bullet points describing knowledge and skills gained that they can incorporate into a resume or a personal statement. Each interview is different, customized to help the student think about his or her experience in new ways and especially in relationship to their intended career trajectory. The goal is to probe for depth (and a little discomfort) to help the student increase conscious learning, transferable skill awareness, and their ability to articulate skills with concrete examples from their learning abroad experience.

During the final thirty minutes, we direct students in an exercise in which they unpack the experiences of one of their peers. This exercise gives them practice in mimicking the reflective steps introduced by the exercise leader. The final fifteen minutes of the workshop stress the different ways to present the skills and competencies in résumés and interviews: as bullet points on résumés and as stories told during the interview. We provide the students with contact information for trained career advisers and encourage them to make appointments when they begin their job search or applications to graduate school.

UNPACKING FOR ONE MSU STUDENT

Several examples of an unpacking have been developed and can be found in our original unpacking research brief, available for download at www.ceri.msu.edu. We offer one here to portray the process and its outcome.

Students are notorious for compartmentalizing experiences; keeping academics in one box, cocurricular experiences in separate boxes, and social life in yet another. Our conversation with a student we’ll call “Alex” began with a vibrant description of the social life in Rome, but we soon found a more compelling story. Alex was a junior general business management major who studied abroad in Italy and Cannes for the summer with an MSU-led program in advertising and public relations to take electives needed to graduate. The program started in Rome studying European advertising and ended at an international advertising festival in Cannes. He was the only male in the group of twenty-five and the only one without an advertising background. The class was structured into small groups; each group was to do an advertising project that would develop an effective ad campaign for an Italian audience. His initial response about the quality of his program was rather negative: he felt he got very little out of it that would help him in his career.

Alex had a lot to say about the group project. The trouble started immediately. His group project partners argued and bickered about whose idea was better. He thought he was disadvantaged due to his lack of background in advertising. As the
bickering continued and time became precious, Alex took it upon himself to take control of the group and instill some order and planning. He began mediating some of the conflicts, drawing attention back to the specifications in the assignment outline. Through his leadership, an idea and a project plan were decided upon and tasks assigned to each member. He monitored the project's progress, making sure each member stayed on her assignment. The group did well in producing a quality final product.

Alex expressed regret that it wasn’t a business project that would “count.” That statement needed to be challenged. We turned the tables a bit on Alex and asked, “If you saw someone from a different discipline work with a team of experts, earn their trust, guide them through a process of creative decision making, manage deadlines and specifications for a project that was completed in a quality way on time, what would you call that person?”

Initially, Alex looked at us blankly. It just took two words to prompt his realization: “A manager.” Clearly, Alex developed skills (listed below) that could easily be reflected and valued by employers on his résumé:

- Led a project team of advertising students in developing an ad campaign
- Mediated creative differences between team members
- Managed project objectives and work assignments to successfully meet deadlines.

As good as those bullets are, Alex and his team missed out on some critical opportunities for cultural learning to enhance the quality of their project. When Alex was asked how the group went about gauging the effectiveness of their product for the Italian market, they simply relied on their professor’s assessment and the advertising they saw in class. Although the group went out every night to a local bar where twenty-to thirty-year-old Europeans hung out, they did not once solicit the opinions of their European counterparts. Nor did they really pay attention to advertising on Italian television or other media. They totally separated their academic exercises from the social and cultural aspects of their program.

**CONCLUSION**

Over the past few years, we have extended our unpacking in several ways. We now provide predeparture “packings” so that students might make their experiences more purposeful and intentional. We have modified the work-focused unpacking for our freshman seminar abroad participants so that the focus is on college learning when they begin on-campus studies shortly after their return.

From a career services perspective, one of our challenges is to get students to think more broadly about the array of experiences they’ve had in which they have developed skills relevant to the workplace. Some of the most meaningful learning experiences do not happen in class, but occur in study abroad, student organizations, and service-learning experiences. From our observations, students need help in making sense of their collegiate experiences and in connecting their classroom, cocurricular, and life experiences. Critical reflection and being able to articulate one’s skills with meaningful examples is essential to ongoing professional development. Our work underscores the importance of helping students become more conscious of the transferable skills, knowledge, and attitudes they gain that are assets in work and organizational settings.

Like many other study abroad offices, the MSU office of study abroad had been trying diligently to attract students to post-study-abroad sessions that would help them reflect meaningfully on their experiences and integrate them into their personal, academic, and professional lives. It was not until we made the obvious connection with students’ careers that students began to attend our workshops in larger numbers. We learned from these sessions that personal and academic meaning come through a purposeful direction that students envision for themselves.

We are encouraged by our workshops that students can gain significantly from participation in global education.

**REFERENCE**

Study Abroad or Study Away: It’s Not Merely Semantics
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Increasingly, colleges and universities have made study abroad—or, as some are calling it, education abroad—an important component of their students’ educational experience. They argue (and we agree) that study abroad provides students with a global perspective, and thus better prepares them for living and leading in our globally interdependent society. As Chickering and Braskamp have argued, developing and internalizing a global perspective is an essential part of a holistic development paradigm—well grounded in sound student development theory (2009).

Since this generation and future generations of students are and will be increasingly interacting with a larger, more globalized community, they need to become ever more competent in understanding, talking with, relating to, and working with persons who differ from them politically, socioeconomically, and religiously. Might a domestic program, designed to meet these same educational learning and developmental objectives, influence students to think, reflect upon themselves, and interact with others, and thereby generate outcomes similar to those of a study abroad program? We would argue, yes. While study abroad is an important educational experience that can foster the development of these desired learning outcomes and developmental skills, mindsets, and behaviors, so too are domestically based off-campus study programs. Thus, we introduce “study away” as a concept and educational strategy that integrates study abroad programs with domestic programs. Diverse cultures within a local, regional, or national community should be recognized for providing learning opportunities and experiences that can also be transformative.

According to the IES Abroad Web site Alumni Career Resources section, an international experience is important because “It shows your versatility, your ability to adapt to change, global work experience (if applicable), cultural sensitivity, and also highlights the increased confidence and global awareness you likely gained as a result of living and learning abroad.” In other words, study abroad fosters the same general learning skills, self-identity formation, and interactions with others we hope all students have acquired by the time of graduation. We do not assume college graduates who work in the international arena work in the country of their study abroad experience, and many graduates who studied overseas often take positions in the United States. However, they still interact daily with a diverse workforce. Today, even in many rural locations, the United States has become so richly diverse that one does not need to travel more than a few blocks from a campus to have a cross-cultural experience, hear other languages spoken, meet people from different cultural traditions, and discover religious practices different from one’s own. The U.S. population is no longer majority and historic minorities, but inclusive of large immigrant populations. Even what constitutes a majority is shifting by state and region. We are a global nation.

[Students] need to become ever more competent in understanding, talking with, relating to, and working with persons who differ from them politically, socioeconomically, and religiously

STUDY AWAY

If a common goal of diversity and multicultural programs and internationalization programs is to assist students to live effectively
One can offer a study away program locally to students who are reluctant to go far from home and campus, or unable to afford an experience overseas.

With difference, why do we assume only an international program experience can do this? If there are critical skills we want students to acquire and engage in, does it matter whether these are acquired internationally or locally? Thus, we argue for retiring the terms “study abroad” and “education abroad,” and instead adopting “study away.”

As both a concept and strategy, study away recognizes that students can have experiences that open their minds, hearts, and behaviors to difference and allows them to experience such difference firsthand, either internationally or domestically. Additionally, by expanding the concept of study abroad to study away, the range of experiences that can move students toward living effectively with difference is greatly expanded. These various options provide students with multiple entry points to such learning. For some students the entry point will be an on-campus course and an internship or volunteer activity; for others it will be a short- or long-term study away program. For some that program will be overseas; for others it will here in the United States. Thus one can offer a study away program locally to students who are reluctant to go far from home and campus, or unable to afford an experience overseas. At the same time, domestic program options provide opportunities for students returning from overseas study away programs to use or try out what they learned abroad in a local cultural setting. Programs both domestic and international can address such issues as immigration, migration, and resettlement of immigrants, and domestic programs can allow students who have been abroad to further their knowledge within their own communities.

At a time when colleges and universities are struggling to be more responsive to diversity and to increase the diversity of their student bodies, becoming more serious about domestic program options within a broader-based study away effort may be a productive next step. Whether real or imagined, tensions often exist between internationalization and multiculturalism. Internationalization efforts are often located in the academic program, while multicultural programs are generally found in student life (Olson, Evans, and Shoenberg, 2007). All too often, points of intersection are noted, but there is little overlap. Similarly, tensions exist between issues of domestic minorities and immigrant populations. Study away presents an opportunity to build on the experiences many campuses have with internationalizing and to embrace (but not smother) the goals of multiculturalism by positioning those who work in the diversity arena as valued partners.

There may also be the potential to both expand programs to groups of students traditionally underrepresented in study abroad and to reduce costs. The development of new programs is expensive. The cost of developing host-family stays for international programs can be high and requires community links or relationships that often do not exist and take time to build. However, as an alternative, a domestic program might build on already existing community relationships, or be developed in conjunction with a broader initiative with the admissions office.

Students are increasingly looking for programs with community-based education opportunities, such as service learning or internships. These programs are not easily developed overseas, but many local opportunities may already exist, although these opportunities are not traditionally linked to the study abroad office. Students today are often seeking courses and cocurricular activities that focus on issues ranging from social justice and conflict resolution to national identity and assimilation. Why must we look only overseas for programs that can meet such needs? At the same time, many campuses are interested in expanding their ability to offer nontraditional languages, but deciding which ones to offer and finding teachers or native speakers to staff language programs can be a challenge. Perhaps we need look no further than members of the local campus or community. Granted, these are not trained language instructors, but programs exist for using such speakers effectively in academically structured language programs (see, for example, the Council of Independent Colleges program, Network for Effective Language Learning: www.cic.org/projects_services/grants/nell.asp, or the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs: www.nasilp.net).

Our suggestion is that college leaders and faculty need to identify what it is that students are expected to learn and how they are expected to develop while in college, and then identify specifically what can be best achieved by student participation in a study away program, regardless of location. The development of such learning outcomes should make it possible to align the work of different campus constituencies that increasingly have diversity, multicultural, international and/or global initiatives among their goals. For example, one of us has proposed a framework that connects three major domains of student development—cognitive, intrapersonal,
and interpersonal—with four sociocultural environmental interventions—culture, community, curriculum, and cocurriculum (Braskamp, Braskamp, and Merrill forthcoming).

Using the term study away, educational leaders can work together to discuss and determine desired and meaningful outcomes, and then build appropriate environmental interventions that will include communities beyond the campus including those in the neighborhood and across national boundaries.

AN EXAMPLE
Today, Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) purposefully uses the term “study away” to emphasize its commitment to a global–local nexus. Not only does this recognize the diversity found in its Pacific Northwest location, but most importantly, it is derived directly from its mission statement, “Educating students for lives of thoughtful inquiry, service, leadership, and care—for other people, for their communities and for the earth.” Especially over the past two decades, PLU has been very intentional in planning and implementing a campus-wide set of integrated programs to internationalize the institution, using local as well as global environments. As stated in the long-range plan, PLU 2010: The Next Level of Distinction (2003)

PLU’s aspirations to academic excellence and an engaged community are framed by a global perspective. Such a perspective is, in one sense, without boundaries and, in another, profoundly local. International education is not a flight from the university campus or American society, but ultimately a more vital and insightful way to engage them both. (PLU 2003)

Each PLU study away course or program has individualized learning objectives, but when looked at broadly, there is considerable similarity and overlap. For example, “to identify similarities and difference in cultural values,” “to recognize ethnocentric reactions that inhibit the cultivation of crosscultural understanding,” and “to challenge one’s own stereotypes and myths about people” are not all that dissimilar. Yet these learning objectives come from intensive, month-long study away programs that range from Makah Culture: Past and Present at Neah Bay, in which students study a Northwest Coast Native American community some 120 miles from the PLU campus, to The Hilltop in Tacoma, which explores issues of poverty and homelessness only fifteen minutes from campus. New programs being developed focus on the History of the Civil Rights Movement, which in the Northwest also includes the expulsion of the Chinese community and an active present-day reconciliation project; The Origins of Blues and Jazz, and Northwest/Southwest: Native American Perspectives on the Environment. All of these programs include similar learning objectives.

The following learning objectives—
(1) to understand the complexities of changing patterns of urban and rural life, environmental challenges, and the minority experience; (2) to be able to distinguish cultural myths from cultural content; and (3) to broaden student’s knowledge of approaches to and strategies for social change and the values placed on the processes by diverse groups—could just as easily be drawn from PLU domestic study away offerings. However, they were, in fact, taken from PLU’s semester-long study abroad programs. The first is from Continuity and Change in a New World Power in Sichuan, China; the second from Contemporary Global Issues: The Norwegian Approach to Development, Conflict Mediation and Peace Building in Norway, and the last from Development, Change and Social Development in Oaxaca, Mexico. While each of these programs has additional learning objectives specific to their location, including important language-learning objectives, when global learning objectives are viewed in their broadest sense and without country or regional specificity, they contain many overlapping goals that do not require great leaps of faith or academic gyrations to identify points of commonality that can be met either internationally or locally.

Recognition of the similarities in learning objectives is reflected in the assessment programs PLU uses for its study away programs. These address a broad set of programmatic learning goals, including a student’s experience and familiarity with cultural diversity; intercultural skill level; knowledge of global issues and processes; and commitment to citizenship. In the end, it is PLU’s intention to measure the global learning and development of study away students as they move along a global education continuum of four phases—introductory, exploratory, participatory, and integrative—in order to give real substance to what it means for PLU to be preparing students to be globally competent citizens (see www.diversityweb.org/digest/vol8no3/kelleher.cfm) With learning objectives that move with each phase from descriptive to comparative to analytic and ultimately to reflective and demonstrable achievement and accomplishment, a student could conceivably progress through the continuum taking exclusively on-campus courses. As an ideal, however, a student would meet the introductory-phase learning objectives through on-campus coursework, meet the exploratory phase knowledge and skill level objectives, and begin to be able to explain and articulate the values perspective and personal engagement objectives though a January or summer short-term course. In this way, the student would be better prepared to engage more fully with all of the learning objectives tied to participating in a semester of study away, and then return to the campus to undertake meeting the integrative phase objectives.
While PLU’s domestic programs were not originally designed with the intention of creating lower-cost options than programs requiring travel overseas (they were designed by faculty members with specific academic expertise), the current economic crisis surrounding higher education makes existing domestic programs and the development of new ones an attractive way of increasing cost-effective study away options. At PLU, the average cost of a short-term overseas January-term study away course is more than $5,000 per student (even with tuition included as part of a student’s comprehensive fee for the academic year). A domestic program that costs a participant only a few hundred dollars for travel, room, and board becomes a more realistic option. Even given students’ limited resources, such programs may also hold the potential for increasing the number of students who participate. They can also serve as an attractive option for students who are reluctant to participate in an overseas program because it takes them far from home or otherwise out of their comfort zone.

There are other advantages to consider. Not all faculty members have international expertise and even some who do find it too daunting to consider leading a group of students overseas. Thus, the development of domestically based short-term off-campus courses and semester-long programs has the potential to expand faculty participation to those whose expertise is more locally, regionally, or nationally focused. For example, teaching an Introduction to Asian Art in the Northwest course may lead to one taught on the ground in China and Korea somewhere down the road.

Also, as noted above, the development of domestically based programs must go hand in hand with the development of closer relationships with local domestic minority or immigrant communities. The addition of a semester-long study away option in Puget Sound, a diverse neighboring community, is being considered for the strengths it will add to the academic program. As such, it will have the same elements as an overseas program. The study of a language will be included (although choosing a language for the program will prove challenging—Cambodian, Korean, Russian, Filipino/Tagalog, Vietnamese and Northwest Coast languages are all spoken in Puget Sound). A host-family option is also essential, as will be a local participatory community-based education opportunity. Internships with volunteer agencies will provide a lived experience through which students will have opportunities to integrate their academic and intercultural knowledge and skills, examine their values perspectives, and put into practice what it means to live, learn, and work in a global context. Within all of this, PLU also has the potential to further develop closer ties with diverse neighboring communities, and to increase interest—and perhaps ultimately college enrollment, whether at PLU or elsewhere—among the youth of these communities, reinforcing the work of the admissions office to increase diversity in the student body.

As such, the development of a study away program that includes both international and domestic off-campus study options can make it possible to align better the work of different campus constituencies that increasingly all have diversity, multicultural, international, and global initiatives in their units’ goals. Working together with the common understanding that study away is multidimensional can allow different academic and administrative units to construct meaningful outcomes and build community across institutional boundaries.
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Developing a Global Perspective for Personal and Social Responsibility
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One of the four essential learning outcomes of a liberal education advocated by the Association of American Colleges and Universities is for students to develop a sense of personal and social responsibility. Through its Core Commitments initiative, AAC&U (2007) is working with colleges and universities to make this goal a central part of a movement in higher education to change the way we can think and educate our young people for the twenty-first century. The authors of this article argue that this essential learning and developmental goal—which we call global perspective—can be enhanced if it is further interpreted within the context of educating students to be citizens of a global society.

The traditional-aged college student needs to develop and internalize a global perspective into her thinking, sense of identity, and relationships with others. This holistic student developmental perspective is grounded in sound student developmental theory, but given the changing societal demands and expectations, we argue for an enhancement of student development along four “vectors” that one of us (Chickering 1969; Chickering and Reisser 1993) identified and defined as important in the psychosocial development of college students. These four vectors are:

1. Moving through autonomy toward interdependence
2. Establishing identity
3. Developing purpose
4. Managing emotions

MOVING THROUGH AUTONOMY TOWARD INTERDEPENDENCE

In the second edition of Education and Identity, Chickering and Reisser shifted the emphasis of this volume from developing autonomy to moving through autonomy toward interdependence. They wrote, “With the growing knowledge that every action has an impact on others and that freedom must be bound by rules and responsibilities, individuals moving toward interdependence learn lessons about reciprocity, compromise, sacrifice, consensus, and commitment to the welfare of the larger community.” (140) That “larger community” now requires not only global; “reciprocity, compromise, sacrifice, consensus, and commitment” (140) but also much greater sophistication than was the case forty years ago. We need to understand, empathize, and communicate with persons who differ dramatically in national origin, ethnicity, religious, and spiritual orientations, as well as in race and gender. So moving through autonomy toward interdependence has become a much more challenging task and much more critical for leading a satisfying and productive life.

ESTABLISHING IDENTITY

Identity is the second vector that one needs to develop to take on a global perspective. Colby and Sullivan (2009) recently identified it as one of three major constructs for understanding the development of individual and social responsibility. Identity refers to one’s special sense of self, having a coherent self-image that can serve as a motivational force. They argue that persons with a civic and moral identity and sense of obligation to society are more apt to behave in ways that fulfill individual and social responsible goals. Thus, from today and into the future, students’ horizons for developing identity need to be global. Our identity formation must be enriched by more wide-ranging experiences, knowledge, and insights.
DEVELOPING PURPOSE

Purpose, the third vector, related to intentionality and establishing priorities, centers around the questions of “Who am I?” and “Who am I going to be?” It has both an inward and outward characteristic. Inwardly, it brings to an individual a sense of calling, an attachment to something beyond themselves that provides meaning and significance. It is also motivating—it energizes the person into action.

Outwardly, purpose has consequences, since the actions based on fulfilling that purpose influence others. Developing purpose is a way to think broadly and to view one’s life in a manner that encompasses career plans and aspirations as well as personal interests and interpersonal and family commitments and responsibilities.

Sullivan and Rosen, in A New Agenda for Higher Education: Shaping a Life of the Mind for Practice (2008) argue that college professors should foster in students a “life of the mind for practice,” which means that they are to act on their own sense of who they are (i.e., being engaged in the world to make a difference). It is not a life of abstraction and withdrawal from the real world, but instead a life of active engagement to make a difference in the lives of others. In short, it means guiding students to go beyond analytical and critical thinking and to find meaning and purpose in their lives (Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward 2006).

Human development, even when it needs to include a global perspective, still must be concerned with community. Since the beginning of recorded time, communities have been grounded in family, tribe, and place. Today’s communities, which include neighborhoods, churches, schools, clubs, and local networks, are more diverse and pluralistic and cannot be as stable and lasting as those in the past. Thus, developing a sense of purpose requires us to become as competent as we can in understanding persons who differ widely in their political, religious, and spiritual orientations; in privilege and social class; and in ethnicity and national origin. And a global perspective has become critical for effective contributions to purposes larger than our own self-interest.

MANAGING EMOTIONS

Managing emotions relates to one’s capacity to respond realistically and productively to, and have control over, one’s emotions—such as anger, depression, guilt, fear, and lust. The ability to manage emotions becomes critical to effectively tackle social problems as we bring diverse backgrounds and perspectives to a variety of hot topics.

In his groundbreaking publication, Emotional Intelligence (1995), Daniel Goleman says, “Anatomically the emotional system can act independently of the neocortex. ... Some emotional reactions and memories can be formed without any conscious, cognitive participation at all ... in the first few seconds of our perceiving something we not only unconsciously comprehend what it is, but decide whether we like it or not; the ‘cognitive unconscious’ presents our awareness with not just the identity of what we see but an opinion about it. Our emotions have a mind of their own, one which can hold views quite independently of our rational mind” (18, 20).

Thus, awareness of our emotional reflexes is step one. Allowing feelings to percolate, accepting them, naming them, and respecting them are critical. The second step is increasing our capacity for flexibility so that our varied feelings do not take charge but add depth and texture to our responses. Then we can broaden our repertoire of verbal and nonverbal responses and exercise more conscious choice about when and how to express them. Personal, rich, and engaging encounters with other cultures and persons different from ourselves challenge our built-in emotional reactions. Experiencing unexpected reactions when we are misunderstood increases our awareness of these built-in reflexes and helps us modify them so they better reflect the person we want to be.

These four vectors of student development need to be recast if we are to educate students for a global society. Helping students form and internalize a global perspective requires us to assist students in how they think, view themselves, and relate to others unlike them. Having students develop a global perspective means helping them develop the capacity to think with complexity, taking into account multiple cultural perspectives. They need to form a unique sense of self that is authentic and consistent with their own cultural background, and to relate to others who differ with respect and openness. Developing a global perspective stresses personal and social responsibility that is based on interdependence, identity, purpose, and emotional intelligence.

FOSTERING A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE ALONG THE FOUR VECTORS

Have we met the demands and challenges of including a global perspective in
preparing our students for the twenty-first century? Derek Bok, in Our Underachieving Colleges (2006), concludes that our students today receive “very little preparation either as citizens or as professionals for the international challenges that are likely to confront them” (233).

In this report, we present evidence to shed some light on the question raised by Derek Bok, based on results from the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI), which includes scales that measure cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions (Braskamp, Braskamp, and Merrill 2008). While the GPI was not specifically designed and constructed to measure the vectors of student development as proposed by Chickering and Reisser (1993), some GPI scales reflect four of these vectors that are important to developing a global perspective.

During fall 2008, 245 undergraduate students took the GPI before and after they spent a semester abroad, and they demonstrated growth in their holistic global development (Braskamp, Braskamp, and Merrill 2008). In this report we provide results of a follow-up study, based on approximately five hundred students who studied in more than thirty different programs during the 2008–09 academic year. As shown in the figure below, students progress more on some dimensions than in others, with students showing the most difference in their knowledge and understanding of cultural differences before and after their semester abroad. That is, the difference of 0.31 between the pre-test and post-test mean on the knowledge scale is the largest gain recorded, and it is consistent with the results of the earlier study. (Since the sample size is so large, the gains on all eight scales are statistically significant. Thus we are using the criterion that a difference between the post-test and pre-test means on a scale has to be 0.10 or above to be considered an important educational or practical difference.) Over a semester, students also increased their amount of social interactions with others unlike them (social interaction scale); gained a level of respect for and acceptance of cultural perspectives different from their own and greater emotional confidence when living in complex situations (affect scale); increased awareness of their own identity and purpose in life (identity scale); and developed a more complex view of their understanding of what is true (knowing scale).

The education abroad experience in general has a positive psychological impact on students’ own personal development, as measured by a set of eight items that correlated most highly with an established scale of well being—Inventory on Learning Climate and Student Well-Being (Walker 2008). Students express a greater self-confidence in their ability to meet new situations, communicate with others not like them, and have a lesser need to be continuously supported by others. Overall, students express a greater willingness and ability to view themselves as global citizens, based on a set of nine items from all three dimensions (cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal). That is, they have a better understanding of cultural differences and greater awareness of who they are as unique persons, and are more comfortable in relating to others unlike them.

However, after a semester abroad, students express a relatively lower gain in developing an interdependent view of their relationships with others (i.e., they did not increase as much in their social concern for others by being in another country for a semester). A more detailed analysis shows considerable variability among the centers and programs, with students at some of the centers showing significant gains in developing greater social justice perspective. Since we cannot publish the results of individual institutions participating in this research to protect institutional confidentiality, we can only point out that some programs are more effective than others in influencing students to develop a greater sense of social responsibility while studying abroad for a semester.

In summary, study abroad fosters a global perspective, but not equally across the all the dimensions of a holistic global development. These changes over a semester abroad are generally similar to the differences between first-year and upper-class students, with the exception that students at different class levels show greater differences on the knowing scale than students before and after a study abroad experience.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Education abroad does and can have an important influence on the holistic and global development of students. It may prove to be one of those defining experi-
ences in the life of college students that advances them in their journey toward a more refined and defined sense of self. It can be a powerful avenue for students to develop holistically (Gillespie, Braskamp, and Dwyer 2009). But developing students to be global citizens requires an intentional effort. The challenge for leaders and faculty is to provide experiences and opportunities that integrate how students think, feel, and relate to others. That is, they specifically need to help students gain experiences that prepare them to live in an increasingly globally challenging context. Commonalities between domestic issues of multicultural education and global issues of internationalization are greater than their differences in today’s world. In its publication, At Home in the World, the American Council on Education (Olson, Evans, and Shoenberg 2007)) argues that “visible leadership and collaborative strategies that transcend the historical divide between internationalization and multicultural education are needed to ensure that students can live ethical, meaningful, and productive lives in an increasingly diverse and complex world” (v).

Thus, what is important is that leaders and faculty do not limit their perspective to cultural differences that historically have been associated with nations and countries. They instead need to understand and respect justice, equity, fairness, and equal opportunities as virtues and values that should not be viewed as assumed universal truths, but as important and contested goals and ends in our dialogues that also accept different traditions. In short, we live in a global world in which multiple perspectives about knowing, sense of identity, and relationships with others serve as powerful influences in our society.

We suggest three strategies for helping students develop a global perspective in enhancing their personal and social responsibility. First, a campuswide initiative is required, with faculty as the key interven-

tionists in creating in- and out-of-classroom conditions that foster a global perspective. Neither formal classroom instruction nor experiences such as travel abroad, community involvement, and social encounters are sufficient alone to guide students in their journey to become global citizens. Both are needed. Faculty members, as well as students, need to:

- Sustain person-to-person contact with each other, individually and in groups.
- Work in some institutional or organizational context providing service, as a volunteer, as an intern, or for pay.
- Read ethnographic anthropological studies, sociological research, narrative descriptions, novels, poems, and plays.
- Attend theatrical or musical performances, poetry slams, sports events, and movies, pertinent to the culture, human relationships, and social problems.
- Reflect, with journals, factual diaries, metaphors, analogies, pictorial representations, individually and with a group.

Second, bring the cultural differences associated with studying abroad into the campus culture. Not everyone can study abroad, but all campuses should take advantage of their pluralism—the cultural differences due to the presence of international students; students from rural, suburban, and urban backgrounds; and those from varying religion and faith traditions. Third, use pedagogical strategies, based on active learning practices such as internships, field trips, and service-learning activities. Integrate these experiences and reflection with rigorous and critical, constructive, and creative thinking.

For optimal impact, these strategies must be implemented within a community that stresses both challenge and support, a principle for helping students learn and develop that has been around for more than a half a century. But it now needs to be balanced with new conditions and expectations. Being challenged should not only be viewed as important in one’s intellectual pursuit, but rather as an emotional pursuit as well. Faculty as mentors can play a powerful role in helping students become who they are by stressing what is unique and meaningful to each student. It is more nurturing than telling, bringing out from within rather than pouring in from the outside. In these ways faculty and professionals can help students develop a powerful global perspective.
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No Pain, No Gain

Mark Schaub, executive director, Padnos International Center, Grand Valley State University

As higher education professionals in the United States, we work in a particular culture of student service, often driven by our nation’s litigious and competitive environment, and often driven by the values and priorities of our particular institutions. At my university, for example, we pride ourselves on constructing policies and procedures that “do the right thing” for our students: their health, their happiness, their degree progress, and their very comfort. The plush housing units sprouting on our campus, bountiful student buffet of custom-prepared cuisine, and recreational facilities that would make many resort owners envious are all evidence of these services. At the same time, we embrace the principles of liberal education, with our commitment highlighted in our mission statement and values, and as evidenced by our substantial general education curriculum. These two values—student comfort and liberal education—also stand, at times, in opposition. In order to foster the critical thinking and global awareness we aim for in our graduates, we must make them uncomfortable somehow. One cannot overcome racism without emotionally painful conversations or thought. One cannot expand one’s horizons without painful conversations or thought. One cannot overcome racism without emotionally uncomfortable somehow. Some students, of course, are not quite as ready for that emotional trauma is on center stage. Yet every semester this event is the highlight of my term, and I enjoy the experience. I take “pleasure” in their pain. The students are sharing their stories of study abroad discomfort: culture shock, adjustment to that culture, the reverse culture shock of returning to the United States and to our idyllic campus.

This confession of schadenfreude does not come easily, especially for someone who strongly supports our institutional value on making things go smoothly, and comfortably, for our students (they are, after all, the focus of my work!). German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer wrote of this oft-borrowed word from his native language: “To feel envy is human but to enjoy Schadenfreude is devilish.”

My devilish self is not some masochistic version of the student affairs professional run amok. This schadenfreude is, I believe, my academic affairs side—that philosophy major side of me—that is deeply committed to the liberal education goals of our institution. That part of me sees not pain, but growth. Sees not emotional anguish, but an acknowledgement of having changed through experience. The study abroad experience is indeed a high-impact educational experience, so of course we can expect that these experiences will have an intense emotional impact. When my colleagues and I see the transformations in students, we see past the emotional trauma and recall the students we knew before they left the United States. They were bright and eager students. But they didn’t seem to be quite this confident, focused, articulate, or as interesting to talk to. In these students returning from a semester or year abroad, we see and hear the world becoming smaller and becoming a better, more peaceful place.
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