

GLOBAL LEARNING AND TEACHING INSTITUTE



3/1/2013

An AIEA Regional Forum

Hosted by the Center for the Study of Global Change at Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) and the Office of International Affairs at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), with sponsorship from the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA)

Global Learning and Teaching Institute

FINAL REPORT

OUR APPROACH

Understanding of and commitment to global learning must be shared broadly among individuals and units on our campuses, not only located in a select few individuals within international offices or other units. This approach depends on continuous dialogue and mutually reinforcing activities among faculty, administrators, and staff who are responsible for fostering, encouraging, and implementing global learning and teaching on campuses. Ideally, the integration of global learning must intersect with a shared agenda focused on student learning so that all related campus initiatives are systemically and systematically integrated into and across missions, strategies, policies, people, practices, meanings, teaching and learning.

This Institute was designed not only to educate and provide professional development in the area of global learning, but to specifically encourage this type of dialogue and generate steps toward implementation. Over one hundred individuals from sixteen institutions across the U.S. gathered at the Global Learning and Teaching Institute in Indianapolis on March 1, 2013, which was proudly selected as an annual AEA Regional Forum. Participants represented many differing levels of international education. Some of them were just beginning the journey to defining strategies of global learning at their institutions, while others were further along yet still seeking means of enhancing internationalization efforts. The mix of experiences, institutions, and responsibilities facilitated a learning experience that integrated various perspectives and insights on global learning.

With experts in the area of global learning -- Larry Braskamp, Hilary Kahn, Hilary Landorf, Gil Latz, Dawn Whitehead, Joan Wynne -- and the participants themselves, we recognized that there was much experience and awareness as a collective group. As such, we aimed to share expertise and facilitate conversations both within the respective tracks and across all the professional staff, faculty, and administrators. Because global learning rests on collaboration, dialogue, shared understanding, and commitment, we mimicked as many of these qualities as possible at the institute.

None of us can undertake this effort alone. From our own respective roles and responsibilities, from our own offices and organizational units, from our own mandates and missions, we must recognize how we all fit together, how we all can work together, and how we all should have a shared vision and approach. The institute brought us a bit closer to seeing how we all must deliberately intersect as we pursue global learning across our respective campuses, curriculum, and courses.

Hilary E. Kahn

*Thank you to our Advisory Board,
for their guidance in planning and
developing the program:*

*Monte Broaded
Director
Center for Global Education
Butler University*

*Michael Brzezinski
Dean
International Programs
Purdue University*

*Elaine Meyer-Lee
Director
Center for Women's
Intercultural Leadership
St. Mary's College*

THE INSTITUTE AT A GLANCE

The institute included three main components: **track sessions**, **keynote address**, and **cross-track dialogue and synthesis**.

Through participation in one of the three distinct **track sessions**, administrators, faculty, and staff were encouraged to think deeply, broadly, and deliberately about the unique yet interrelated paths and practices for comprehensive global learning:

- **Faculty and Course Track:** Instructors from a variety of disciplines learned about global learning outcomes and explored innovative ways to achieve such outcomes in their teaching and classrooms.

Leader: Hilary E. Kahn
Director, Center for the Study of Global Change,
IUB

- **Professional Staff and Faculty Development Track:** Staff and faculty from centers for teaching and learning, and other similar units, explored the evolving importance of internationalization and global teaching on their campuses and gained skills and strategies to share with faculty and others.

Leaders: Hilary Landorf
Director, Office of Global Learning Initiatives
Florida International University
Joan Wynne
Associate Professor
Florida International University

- **Administrator and Strategies Track:** Administrators and international education leaders considered how to systematically and intentionally integrate international learning within departments, units, programs, schools, and campuses.

Leaders: Gil Latz
Associate Vice Chancellor, IUPUI
Dawn Whitehead
Director, International Curriculum, IUPUI

The **keynote address**, “Creating Encounters with Difference that Make a Difference,” was presented to all participants by Larry Braskamp, Senior Fellow at the American Association of Colleges and Universities.

To wrap up the day, Hilary Kahn and Dawn Whitehead facilitated a **cross-track dialogue and synthesis** through small-group discussion followed by reporting out to and sharing with the whole group.

16 institutions and 26 campuses were involved in the dialogue:

Anderson University

Appalachian State University

Butler University

Clemson University

Florida International University

Indiana University:
Bloomington, East, and
South Bend Campuses

Ivy Tech Community
College:
Bloomington, Central
Indiana, Columbus,
Franklin, Kokomo, and
Muncie Campuses

Indiana University-Purdue
University Indianapolis

North Carolina Agricultural
and Technical State
University

Ohio State University

Purdue University

Richard Stockton College
of New Jersey

Saint Mary's College

University of Kentucky

University of
Massachusetts

Western Kentucky
University

THE INSTITUTE IN DETAIL

Faculty and Course Track

Hilary E. Kahn was the leader of the Faculty and Course Track, which involved faculty from a variety of disciplines and professions who wanted to learn more about global learning outcomes and explore ways to achieve such outcomes in their teaching and classrooms. Though the track emphasized the internationalization of teaching and learning, the participants were reminded that this is much more than an individual endeavor or the responsibility of a single office. Curriculum and course internationalization does not happen in isolation, but rather is part of broader comprehensive internationalization at our institutions. Global learning was also shown to involve not only the academic curriculum, but also co-curricular, off-campus, and informal spaces of learning. Thirty-eight individuals registered for this track.

The Faculty and Course Track began with a brief history of international education and how it is currently practiced in the 21st century. The global and collaborative nature of science, scholarship, and knowledge today must be recognized in our classrooms. Geographies are changing and boundaries are shifting, and we must equip our students with the skills, attitudes, knowledge, and responsibility to recognize the interconnectedness of our complex world. As such, it was shown that global learning must not only emphasize *what* is taught in our courses, but it must, perhaps more importantly, consider *how* this content is taught. Classrooms must be re-conceptualized as “global” and thus include collaboration, dialogue, multiple perspectives, and transformative learning. Classrooms should become international communities of learning that work on navigating across cultures, understanding the interdependence of the general and the specific, and breaking down dichotomies and boundaries. To reach this, courses must be designed intentionally and backwards such that global learning goals and outcomes are defined first, long before faculty determine what specific content to employ to reach their defined learning objectives. Backward course design was therefore introduced as the most effective model for course internationalization.

While the track focused on course internationalization, it also discussed the broader curriculum. All forms of curriculum internationalization rest on a shared vision of student learning goals, and there are a variety of ways to approach curriculum internationalization, from the “add on” course or module, to more comprehensive strategies that have both breadth and depth. There is no “right” or “wrong” way to approach curriculum internationalization, as the purpose and structure is ultimately linked to institutional needs, resources, and goals. The Faculty and Course Track reviewed many different forms of internationalization, and encouraged the participants to consider the specificities of their own institutions when developing curriculum.



Faculty too must think about the specific particularities of their teaching contexts. They must consider what type of teaching techniques best suit their learning objectives and how situational factors impact their classrooms and objectives. To create global classrooms, educators should think outside of their traditional teaching tool box; textbooks, lecture notes, and a lab manual are clearly no longer sufficient. In fact, faculty may have to stretch beyond typical disciplinary modes of teaching. The track introduced various practical steps to integrate global learning into classroom activities. These included the use of interactive technologies, role

playing, self-reflection, project-based learning, disorientation, international students' voices, social media, service-learning, fieldwork, and social action art, to name only a few. The track prioritized how global learning must be anchored in the lives of students, how students must not see global learning only about the world "out there" but more specifically about themselves and their communities. Global classrooms must always bring the global back home.

Faculty and Course Track Discussions and Interactive Activities:

The Value Added: While interdisciplinarity is key to global learning, higher education is still structured by disciplinary boundaries; different intellectual fields define and approach internationalization in distinct ways. Participants were encouraged to discuss how global learning enhanced the overall goals for their disciplines and professions. For example, how does global learning make you a better social worker? How does it make you a more effective historian? This first activity asked the participants to articulate the value added of global learning for their disciplines and professions.

Global Learning Outcomes: The second activity involved the vital role of learning outcomes. The participants reviewed various lists of global learning outcomes that have been developed by organizations and institutions. Participants were then asked to determine which global learning outcomes are most relevant for their specific disciplines and professions. Table discussions were held about which global learning outcomes best enhance the overall learning objectives for disciplines and professions and which are more or less relevant for specific fields of practice and inquiry.

Designing Learning Activities and Assessments: Participants were asked to first choose a global learning goal that they determined to be vital in their class/discipline/profession. They were asked to consider what they can do in their course (inside class and out) to work towards achieving this goal, and how will they know if their students actually achieve the learning outcome they set forth. They were then asked to design a classroom activity, assignment, and/or means of assessment that would deliberately work towards achieving their stated goal and outcome. Each participant was asked to discuss and receive feedback on their designed activity, assignment, and/or assessment.

I have been challenged to reframe how I approach my classes - to ask: "How can I reframe my approach to communication within a global perspective. How do I teach this material within the context of a global environment? How do I teach to make it the global diverse environment in which you live and work?!"

**Breadth of
administrative, faculty,
and professional staff
roles at the forum:**

Advisor
Adjunct Faculty
Administrative Assistant
Assistant Director of
Service Learning
Assistant Professor
Associate Dean
Associate Director
Associate Faculty
Associate Professor
Associate Provost for
International Affairs
Assistant Department Chair
Collection Development
Librarian
Dean
Director
Education Specialist
Faculty
Graduate Student
Instructional Consultant
Instructor
Librarian
Professor
Program Chair
Program Coordinator
Project Coordinator
Senior Lecturer
Vice Chancellor
Vice Provost
Visiting Lecturer

Professional Staff and Faculty Development Track

Hilary Landorf and Joan Wynne were the co-leaders for the Professional Staff and Faculty Development Track. The goal of this track was to equip faculty and staff, many from teaching and learning units, with an overall understanding of the process of global learning and concrete strategies to be able to lead successful global learning development workshops on their own. Fifteen individuals participated in this track. The group self-reported their range of experience in the area of internationalization from beginner to advanced, with some reporting they were “new to the process” and others reporting “6+” years in the field.

Part I of the Professional Staff and Faculty Development Track entailed a series of activities that allowed participants to discuss the components of global learning and induce robust student global learning outcomes. Activities included “Think/Pair/Share,” “Visual Thinking Strategies,” and a simulation using the case study, “The Problem with Hoodia.” In “Think/Pair/Share,” participants thought about the meaning of global learning, paired with their neighbors to discuss, and then shared with the group as a whole. In “Visual Thinking Strategies,” participants responded to a cultural and place-bound visual image by answering the following open-ended questions: “What is happening in this picture? What do you see that makes you say that? What more can you find?” By remaining neutral, probing for evidence, acknowledging multiple points of view, and connecting responses when appropriate, the facilitators modeled essential components of the global learning process. In the simulation, participants read “The Problem with Hoodia,” a case involving a complex global problem, and proceeded to solve the problem by role-playing the various groups and using democratic deliberation to discuss. Participants also reflected on the strengths and challenges of the activities themselves.

Part II of this track involved learning the terminology, various instruments, and activities for assessing what students know and are able to do after they have engaged in global learning. Participants were given sample syllabi and discerned appropriate assessment activities and instruments from the content of the courses. At the end of the workshop, the facilitators provided all participants with a flash drive filled with global learning information, activities, and assessments.

In general, participants said that they became aware of the diverse nature of global learning during the workshop. Of those who completed the evaluation, 50 percent said that global learning is a complex and multidimensional entity. Half also stated that the concepts learned in this workshop are worth exploring and implementing in their own classes. A great majority of the participants noted that the workshop also helped in separating the concepts of globalization versus internationalization and local versus global, and exposed them to the impact that the analysis of important issues can have on global learning.

Of the 13 participants who completed a post-workshop survey, 12 stated that the introduction of interactive strategies, such as group discussions, case studies, and visual thinking strategies were excellent. The flash drive containing information, activities, and assessments that was given to each participant was also greatly appreciated.

All of the participants stated that they enjoyed the workshop and appreciated the interactive format and efforts of the facilitators. They also appreciated the opportunity to talk about their own experiences within the context of the workshop.

Administrator and Strategies Track

Gil Latz and Dawn Michele Whitehead were the co-leaders for the Administrative Strategies Track. Thirty-two participants registered for this track, holding a variety of positions, and self-reported a range of experience in the area of internationalization. The session started with a discussion of the individual goals the participants had for the workshop and their concerns and/or successes in the area of internationalization on their home

campuses. An overview of comprehensive internationalization was presented, followed by the identification of strategies for comprehensive internationalization. Participants then completed an interactive exercise on the purpose of internationalization for their institutions, sharing individual reflections in groups of no more than four. A fruitful discussion about the competing rationales for internationalization on their home campuses occurred first in small groups and then in the large group. A case study of IUPUI was presented next. The morning session ended with an asset mapping activity that allowed participants to identify assets on their home campuses in the area of internationalization, discussing in small groups the similarities, differences, and ways to overcome some of the perceived challenges.

The two afternoon sessions were practical and addressed the roles of international partnerships and study abroad in comprehensive internationalization. The international partnerships session was facilitated by Ian McIntosh, Director of International Partnerships at IUPUI. The panel included faculty members from the IUPUI




Confucius Institute, the Indiana University School of Medicine, the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology-Indianapolis, and the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management who had participated in successful international partnerships that developed into 2+2 programs and lucrative international research collaborations. The study abroad session was facilitated by Dawn Michele Whitehead, with a panel comprised of faculty/staff members from the School of Dentistry, the Kelley School of Business, and the School of Liberal Arts.

Different models of study abroad were presented, as well as the development of study abroad programs. In both sessions, participants posed many questions to the panelists, and fruitful discussions (both theoretical and practical) occurred.

Keynote Address: Larry Braskamp

Encounters with Difference Make a Difference

With the recent focus on global holistic student development, there is a need to better understand the dimensions of global learning and development and the experiences of students in and out of the classroom and, more importantly, the relationships among them.” In his address, Larry Braskamp focused on this and how institutions of higher education can create encounters of difference in the lives of students that will foster the growth in global learning and development of students. Research findings from the Global Perspective Inventory were used to frame a strategy for designing effective interventions to foster global learning.



Cross-Track Dialogue and Synthesis

Hilary Kahn and Dawn Whitehead led this final conversation in which participants were organized into small groups by campus teams or institutional types. The goal was to have faculty, staff, and administrators work together to define shared internationalization goals and strategic next steps. Groups were given the following instructions:

- Imagine that your group will reconvene in two months. At that time, you will be expected to report back on the steps you have taken over the past two months to further global learning and internationalization at your institution.
- What will you have to do in the meantime to demonstrate progress? Take some time to answer this individually, from your particular perspective (whether your goals are specific to a course or more broadly across curricula or campuses).

The conversations that these questions sparked were lively and insightful. They generated new cross-campus collaborations and novel points of intersection across various campus units. The discussions demonstrated how everyone has roles and responsibilities in promoting and practicing global learning. As a concluding activity, it reaffirmed the overall philosophy of the institute: that global learning demands conversations, collaborations, and comprehensive visions of our goals, as well as understanding of the particularities of our institutions.

I thought it was all useful. The time was well-structured. I did not get tired all day. Very engaging workshop. I enjoyed the opportunity to hear from other institutions at the end.

PRESENTER BIOGRAPHIES IN DETAIL

Larry A. Braskamp is a Senior Fellow at the American Association of Colleges and Universities, Senior Scientist at The Gallup Organization, and a member of the Board of Trustees at Elmhurst College. He was a faculty member at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and held administrative positions as a Dean of Applied Life Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Dean of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He served as the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at Loyola University Chicago. He is a coauthor of numerous articles and several books, including *Putting Students First: How Colleges Develop Students Purposefully*, and the survey instrument, *Global Perspective Inventory*. Currently he is President of the Global Perspective Institute and has collaborated with the American Association of Colleges and Universities on a project, "Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement," funded by the Department of Education.



Hilary E. Kahn is the director of the Center for the Study of Global Change at Indiana University where she is involved in the deeper internationalization of Indiana University and encourages innovative research and interdisciplinary scholarship in the field of Global Studies. She is also the director of the Ph.D. Minor in Global Studies, the Voices and Visions: Muslims and Islam from a Global Perspective Project, and the Framing the Global Project, as well as faculty in International Studies and Anthropology. She has expertise in international teaching and learning, visual pedagogies, human rights, and interdisciplinary approaches to transnational and cross-cultural understanding and scholarship. Her background in ethnography and visual anthropology are critical to her work in international education and promoting cultural understanding and dialogue.



Hilary Landorf is the director of the Office of Global Learning Initiatives and an associate professor in the College of Education at Florida International University. She has a Ph.D. in International Education from New York University, an M.A. from the University of Virginia, and a B.A. from Stanford University. Her current research interests include integrative global learning in higher education and the connection between global learning and human capability development. Her recent



publications include "Toward a Philosophy of Global Education" in *Visions in Global Education*, and "Education for Sustainable Human Development" in *Theory and Research in Education*.

Gil Lutz is the Associate Vice Chancellor of IUPUI and IU Associate Vice President for International Affairs, where he oversees the IUPUI Office of International Affairs. This office serves as IUPUI's hub of international activities, including the coordination of recruiting, advising, and admitting international students and scholars, developing strategic international partners, and promoting curricular internationalization. Previously, from 2002-2011, he was Vice Provost for International Affairs at Portland State University, where he had been a professor of geography and international studies for nearly twenty years.



Dawn Michele Whitehead is the director of International Curriculum at IUPUI. She has a Ph.D. in Education Policy Studies-International and Comparative Education and an M.S. in International and Comparative Education from Indiana University-Bloomington. Her current research interests are issues of teacher quality in Ghana and international service learning and its impact on students, their future career paths, and on international partners. Whitehead also teaches for the International Studies Department and has utilized interactive video to internationalize her own courses as well as in professional development programs for faculty and teaching staff.



Joan Wynne, Ph.D., is Associate Professor at Florida International University (FIU) and directs the Urban Education Master's Degree Program in the College of Education. The influence of her students and educators like Lisa Delpit, Asa G. Hilliard III, and Robert P. Moses has driven her research and writing about transformational leadership, quality education as a constitutional right, and building partnerships among youth, parents, schools and communities. Her newest book, *Confessions of a white educator: Stories in search of justice and diversity*, explores what works and doesn't work in public education. Her last ten years have been dedicated to two lines of inquiry. One concerns researching the visionary curriculum and pedagogy of the Algebra Project and the Young People's Project, organizations that are deeply rooted in American history and grassroots communities. The second is the exploration of what it means to be a citizen of the world. For the last three years, Wynne has been facilitating university faculty workshops to explore the content of global learning and the kind of pedagogy needed in the classroom, regardless of the discipline, to engage students in looking at the world through multiple lenses. She is committed to the vision of her university to develop its students, through the global learning initiative, as collective problem-solvers, not just as individual vessels of knowledge for self-aggrandizement.



Great conference. Hope you continue it in the future.

