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Introduction

For nearly two decades, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has worked with higher education institutions to make global learning a key characteristic of undergraduate education. The importance of global learning at AAC&U is reflected in our structure—the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Global Initiatives is one of three educational affairs program offices. The Shared Futures initiative described in these pages gives focus to AAC&U's current global work. That focus reflects ongoing campus efforts to reform and update the undergraduate curriculum and will in turn, we hope, shape continuing efforts to incorporate global issues in both general education and major programs.

Campus and AAC&U efforts have converged in a series of national curriculum and faculty development projects. While these projects have shared a commitment to improving undergraduate education, they have variously focused on world and Western civilizations, multiculturalism and diversity, American pluralism and democracy, and civic engagement and social responsibility. They have not generally been described with the language of global learning. Until now, we have not explored the history and nature of those projects specifically to show how the work of many hundreds of colleagues across the country over these two decades has fed a growing national consensus on the important outcomes of a college education. This consensus includes global knowledge, global engagement, intercultural knowledge, and intercultural competence. These outcomes are important for all students, no matter their field of concentration.

The genesis and evolution of the Shared Futures initiative in AAC&U's earlier work is the subject of chapter 1 of this publication. It will not be giving too much away to say here that the futures referenced are those of students from all around the world. That those futures are shared is, of course, a truism, but the term also reflects a growing sense that interdependence is shrinking, flattening, or otherwise changing the shape of the world. Shared futures, however, do not exist solely in that broadest sense. They are found in regional, national, local, familial, racial, and sectarian relationships. They also exist in our conception of the undergraduate curriculum. As the emerging sets of common goals and purposes surrounding global learning on campuses demonstrate, reform efforts aimed at improving liberal education and global learning share both a history and a future.

Chapter 1 highlights the role of global learning in a complex and shifting set of assumptions, goals, and practices in liberal education. To best understand AAC&U's current efforts to support global learning in the undergraduate curriculum, it is necessary
to place them in the context of national diversity and civic engagement work. Perhaps most importantly, this chapter shows that global learning is, and has been for many years, essential to any high-quality liberal education. While the chapter focuses on analysis drawn from earlier AAC&U initiatives, it should be noted that the essays and reports from these initiatives distill the energy and experience of numerous faculty members and administrators from campuses across the country.

The second chapter suggests that global learning goals are increasingly evident in campus conversations. At the same time, evidence from a research scan of liberal arts colleges that was funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation illuminates a disconnect between rhetorical support for these goals and their integration into curricular designs.

Chapter 3 describes some of the ideas that have shaped two Shared Futures curriculum and faculty development projects, and provides examples of how campuses are translating these ideas into curricular practice. While the examples are drawn primarily from the Liberal Education and Global Citizenship project, the ideas continue to engage participants in AAC&U’s newest global learning project, Shared Futures: General Education and Global Learning. Supported by the Henry Luce Foundation, this ongoing project includes sixteen institutions selected to serve as leadership sites for developing global learning models and promoting the use of global learning as an organizing principle for general education programs.

Finally, the conclusion explores some key cross-cutting issues raised in AAC&U’s global learning projects and their implications for campus structures and habits.

AAC&U holds no illusion that this paper represents the final word on the subject of global learning, or that the definitions drawn from those campuses with which we have worked will serve all institutions equally well. We do, however, feel that it is necessary and useful at this time to share some of what we have learned both from the colleges and universities that have participated in our curriculum and faculty development projects and from the increasing numbers of institutions that are crafting mission statements, strategic plans, and other means to engage students in the challenges of an interdependent world. By reviewing these ideas about global learning now, we hope to illuminate more clearly a productive path into our shared future.
CHAPTER 1
Toward Education for a World Lived in Common

The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Global Initiatives is charged with fulfilling a central AAC&U strategic goal: "to educate students for a world lived in common by encouraging the higher education enterprise to fulfill its civic mission both in a diverse but still highly stratified United States democracy and in an interdependent but fractured global community" (AAC&U 2002b). This goal grows out of our past work with campus leaders and practitioners even as it provides an organizing framework for our current endeavors.

Engaging Cultural Legacies

In 1990, the Association of American Colleges (as AAC&U was then called) launched a major effort to revitalize general education core curricula. The Project on Engaging Cultural Legacies: Shaping Core Curricula in the Humanities was funded by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and brought together sixty-three institutions eager to broaden notions of a "common cultural heritage" as traditionally manifested in core Western civilization courses. As Betty Schmitz notes in her report from the project, this represented a collective effort on the part of participating schools to update the "master narrative" of core curricula to better reflect the plurality of cultures around the world and, increasingly, within the United States (1992, v).

Coinciding with the height of the culture wars, the project sought to avoid the simple dichotomy of "Western versus multicultural." Instead, Schmitz writes, project planners and participants asked students to "see diversity—in both culture and perspective—as an integral dimension of any intellectually rigorous encounter with either 'Western' or 'world' civilizations." Difference and multiplicity became organizing principles for new curricula. In the creation of new courses and the selection of core texts, faculty placed "new emphasis on multiplicity, cultural pluralism, and cultural interaction—both as subjects in themselves and as resources to help undergraduates grasp the texture of the world they inhabit" (vi).

Engaging Cultural Legacies laid the foundation for AAC&U's current understanding of global learning—the elements of this foundation seem relatively commonplace today, but were considered novel in their time. Designers of curricula became convinced that the study of Western civilization neither asks nor answers all the questions necessary for students to locate and test their own stake in important global issues. They took the first steps in translating this conviction into the curriculum by requiring that undergraduates complete either broad surveys of "world civilizations" or comparative courses organized around key
interdisciplinary themes. And they faced resistance from within the university and from the broader society to the de-centering of Western perspectives.

Diversity, it was argued, is a necessary part of any rigorous intellectual pursuit of knowledge. By broadening the pool of civilizations and cultures worthy of study, these core curricula challenged students' parochialism. Perhaps because of the resistance faced, diversity was often defined as multiplicity of perspectives so that it did not necessarily connote social, political, economic, and cultural challenges to power.

The same forces that presently drive institutions to adopt the term "global" to describe an appropriate education for the twenty-first century were noticeable in these earlier efforts. Project participants desired curricula that matched "the rapidity of global political and socio-economic developments" and "the anticipation of a new century" (Schmitz 1992, 3). New relationships and changing notions of community meant that the "master narrative" no longer seemed to fit. Schmitz reflects on these changes in her report:

Colleges and universities … [address] both fragmentation and ethnocentrism in undergraduate education by developing interdisciplinary core courses that engage cultural multiplicity and interconnections. In so doing, they are attempting to come to terms with the intellectual and curricular implications of a new social and political consciousness of cultural pluralism at home and abroad…. [A] dialogical model for engaging culture is fast replacing a unitary model. (111)

Curricular innovations developed through this project echoed similar reform efforts at hundreds of institutions across the country.

Through these efforts, students did not simply learn about more of the world's peoples and traditions; they also—by design—reflected on the "patterns and webs of human meaning." The dynamic interplay of cultures and civilizations—interaction, sharing, clash, and conflict—replaced what had functioned as the organizing narrative of earlier generations of courses: "a view of history as the evolution of human freedom" from Athens through Rome, England, and to the United States (Schmitz 1992, vii). The United States and Western Europe were de-centered in this curriculum; neatness and order gave way to mixing and complexity.

In translating these aspirations into campus practice, some of the critical global elements of Engaging Cultural Legacies were de-emphasized. Curricular design often perpetuated, in practice if not in theory, the dichotomy between Western and non-Western cultures. Participating institutions were reluctant to incorporate critical analyses of the cultural legacies at play in the United States into their curricular designs. Finally, questions of civic engagement and social responsibility—both as student learning outcomes and as institutional obligations—remained underdeveloped in this phase of curricular reform (Schmitz 1992, 112).

In the afterword to the project report, Carol Geary Schneider and Betty Schmitz challenge the academy to embrace the potential for transformational liberal learning that the Engaging Cultural Legacies reform efforts represented. The best examples of curricula from
the field, they contend, compel students to wrestle with complexity, breadth, integration, and
diversity in their study of the world while also paying full attention to those “meanings and
responsibilities of citizenship in a multicultural society” (emphasis added):
Negotiating one’s affinities and commitments to diverse communities within U.S.
society is a challenge for all citizens—and a special challenge for liberal education.
Crossing borders and boundaries, working cross-culturally, negotiating difference,
sustaining multiple and perhaps competing commitments, developing one’s
value system while honoring that of others, making consequential choices while
recognizing significant disagreement, sustaining a sense of relation to the entire
polity: These are some of the societal requirements confronting curricula engaging
cultural pluralism in the U.S. (113)
One hundred and thirty institutions would eventually work to meet this challenge
through AAC&U’s next major initiative, American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy,
and Liberal Learning.

American Commitments

Launched in partnership with the Ford Foundation, American Commitments began in 1993
and continued through 2001. In addition to support from the Ford Foundation, AAC&U
received funding for American Commitments from the National Endowment for the
Humanities, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, the
W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, and the Philip Morris Companies, Inc.
Through American Commitments, colleges and universities moved diversity and democracy
to the very heart of national conversations about liberal learning. Participants developed
an intellectual and moral foundation upon which to build
subsequent work, including efforts to demonstrate the
essential place that global learning plays in liberal education.

American Commitments called upon the academy to embrace its social responsibility to teach diversity as a strand in civic preparation. The novelty of this call derived from
the decision to encourage curricular conversations about
democracy and social justice that gave sufficient attention to cultural, ethnic/racial, religious,
and gender differences and that recognized that differences often involve profound inequalities.
In this way the project raised fundamental questions that appealed to the intellectual traditions
of the academy while also summoning its moral authority. In one of the project’s reports, The
Drama of Diversity and Democracy, a national panel of distinguished scholars and educational
leaders write,

American Commitments called
upon the academy to embrace its social responsibility to
teach diversity as a strand in civic preparation.

What does it mean to be an American? What is the meaning of American
democracy? How does a commitment to justice frame our responses to the
persistence of unequal power and large pockets of political, economic, cultural, and educational disadvantage in this society?

These are questions of principle with which this society must struggle. But they are also questions that cannot be adequately addressed unless we as a citizenry have an accurate understanding of our nation's long history with diversity. (1995, 6)

The report insists that the academy take responsibility for engaging local communities and the public at large with these questions. For these are not simply intellectual questions; they are “integritically related to unsolved issues of social difference and societal marginalization.” "Failing or fearing to define as public questions the connections between difference and inequality," the panel argues, “we make too little progress as a nation with answers sufficient to live by” (6–7).

American Commitments represented a more explicitly political and moral treatment of diversity than Engaging Cultural Legacies. "When we discuss diversity in the context of United State histories and democratic values," the panel writes in its report, "we are not simply talking about multiple forms of knowledge or disparate points of view." "Our basic message to campus and community is simple but not easy," the panel concludes.

We have reached the limits of an earlier conception of American society: monocultural, monochromatic, individualistic. As an older era ends and we struggle with alternative conceptions of the future, leadership is needed, at the level of principle, at the level of knowledge, at the level of building human capacities for associated living. The academy, which has already become a gathering place for American pluralisms, does not have the answer to all these questions. But it is our mission to raise fundamental questions. It is time for us to do so. (7)

American Commitments focused on U.S. pluralism and the legacies of American histories. Yet it developed an essential ingredient for global learning—a moral imperative to imagine the future and to build capacities for associated living. American Commitments also made clear that quality liberal education is not possible without attention to diversity, social responsibility, and civic engagement. These are not tangential issues; they are foundational.

“Education for a World Lived in Common with Others”

While the connection between legacies of inequality and democratic aspirations was quite clear in the American Commitments initiative, the application of democratic principles to AAC&U’s global learning goals was less developed. AAC&U’s work in the initiative crystallized a set of ideas that pointed toward the global community, but these connections remained in need of elaboration. While the projects that made up the American Commitments initiative explored the generative tensions between United States democracy and diversity, AAC&U continued to seek similar strategies for addressing ideas of global citizenship—strategies that would avoid naive or hegemonic attempts to export the American political system, while
seeking to engage the “fundamental issues of how we live together and on what terms we form our communalities” (AAC&U 1995, 7).

Lee Knefelkamp and Carol Geary Schneider address this theme in “Education for a World Lived in Common with Others,” an article that draws directly from the American Commitments initiative to show how democracy, social responsibility, and civic engagement can powerfully intersect. The title of the article echoes a passage from Maxine Greene’s The Dialectic of Freedom that calls for an education built upon dialogue—an education that requires “a special form of critical thinking ... a powerful vision and reflection born of an awareness of a world lived in common with others” (quoted in Knefelkamp and Schneider 1997, 327). While primarily engaged in a conversation about diversity and U.S. pluralism, the authors provide a vision of justice-seeking and relational education that applies equally to an emerging sense of global learning. “Our campuses seek to move ... from faculty-centered teaching to student-centered learning,” Knefelkamp and Schneider write. “But we propose an even richer ambition—the goal of becoming justice-centered communities in which learning fosters new capacities for engaged citizenship and aspirational or justice-seeking democracy” (340).

Such an approach moves well beyond content to include the learning process. “Higher education,” they continue, has long contended that, by developing students’ rational capacities and societal knowledge, it prepares them for citizenship. We believe, however, that we will prepare learners more effectively for citizenship if they have direct and substantial opportunities to collaboratively explore contested issues in contemporary society, and if they have opportunities to test, experientially as well as intellectually, the societal consequences of different policies and courses of action. (341–42)

It is through opportunities for collaborative practice and dialogue that democracy is linked to global learning. Such democratic practice becomes a central part of global learning when students are engaged with real, unscripted, and complex questions—questions that cut across national borders and require action from all citizens, thus complicating the relationship between citizenship and nationality.

In her article “From Diversity to Engaging Difference,” Carol Geary Schneider takes the democratic lessons of American Commitments and attempts to link them to events in South Africa. In the process, she elaborates more fully the link between liberal education and the arts of democracy. The capacities we seek in our students, Schneider writes, are “dialogical, deliberative, confrontational—necessarily personal, experiential, and face-to-face” (1997, 120). In the context of United States pluralism, this need for face-to-face experience
is a call for affirmative action and the creation of truly diverse institutions. In the context of
global learning, it has traditionally represented a call for study abroad and global service-
learning experiences. As we continue to insist that the United States be seen within global
frameworks, however, the range of opportunities to practice global arts of democracy will
surely expand and become more prominent in our understandings of liberal education.

In 1998, Carol Geary Schneider and Robert Shoenberg wrote the inaugural paper in
a new series of AAC&U publications—The Academy in Transition. In that paper, Contemporary
Understandings of Liberal Education, the authors place examples of higher education’s
transformation within the broader context of core values of education and the “kinds of learning
students need to negotiate a rapidly transforming world” (4). Conversations about these core
values, the authors note, were leading to the development of widely shared learning goals, many
of which reflected the intellectual complexity and social responsibility called for in the American
Commitments and Engaging Cultural Legacies projects.

Schneider and Shoenberg identify five key learning goals “implicit in contemporary
campus efforts to reconceive both their degree requirements and their undergraduate
curricula” (7):

1. Acquiring intellectual skills or capacities
2. Understanding multiple modes of inquiry and approaches to knowledge
3. Developing societal, civic, and global knowledge
4. Gaining self-knowledge and grounded values
5. Concentrating and integrating learning

Within the third goal, the authors have bundled many of the insights from a decade of
work on democratic, global, and multicultural curricular reform and design. “Traditionally,”
they write, “history and ‘Western Civilization’ requirements have been based on the premise
that educated people should know something about societies and events remote in time, but
which help to explain contemporary society.” They continue,

The academy is now adding the further expectation that students will learn about
cultures separated from the dominant culture by distance and/or assumptions,
experiences, or differential power. With rapidly increasing frequency, general
education requirements include study of a non-European culture and of
contemporary cultural diversity (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc.)
and justice issues, both in the United States and abroad. Many campuses promote
service learning programs explicitly designed to involve students with challenging
societal issues. Through projects to increase student study abroad, colleges and
universities are developing more accessible and more diverse ways to support
global knowledge and cross-cultural competence. (8)
The reconfigured curriculum “assumes a world society characterized by a multitude of life experiences and informed by complex intersections among historical experiences, gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religious values, political assumptions, cultural styles, and so on.” And returning to the larger theme of democratic, relational, and experiential learning, the authors turn once again to the work of Maxine Greene: “The liberally educated person, many now argue, needs not only substantial knowledge but also the skills and awareness to negotiate what philosopher Maxine Greene has called ‘a world lived in common with others’” (12).

In other words, the world has changed. Or more precisely, our understanding of it has changed. The world now seems smaller, its interdependencies more obvious. As a consequence, students must recognize and define their place within complex sets of intersections. They need undergraduate curricula that help them do this by more fully reflecting the world.

Globalizing Knowledge

In the first decade of sustained effort to strengthen liberal education for an interdependent world, AAC&U’s analysis and initiative designs reflected persistent tensions between domestic diversity work and engagement with world cultures and civilizations. In 1999, Grant Cornwell and Eve Stoddard explored these tensions in an influential paper for AAC&U’s Academy in Transition series. Cornwell and Stoddard had been leaders in both Engaging Cultural Legacies and American Commitments. But, drawing from their own work, they now brought an integrative perspective to the challenge of educating students for a world lived in common.

In Globalizing Knowledge: Connecting International and Intercultural Studies, Cornwell and Stoddard elegantly map the demands to internationalize and diversify the curriculum and locate the confluence of these movements in citizenship—both local and global. “The nature of the world today,” they write, “is such that U.S. and global realities, whether economic, cultural, political, environmental, or social, interpenetrate and mutually define each other to the degree that isolating U.S. studies from international studies is increasingly impracticable” (1999, viii).

Cornwell and Stoddard suggest a number of new categories for thinking about the relationship between identity and geography—ways of looking at these issues that challenge the centrality of the nation state. These include globalization, diasporas, interculturalism or hybridity, and positionality.
Globalization

While “globalization” means many things to many people, current events and popular culture seem to demand that significant effort be made to account for it. This demand is heard in the offices of the presidents and provosts as well as departments and dormitories. There is a shared sense that globalization represents a quantitative and qualitative shift in the way we live. Consequently, it must be addressed in the undergraduate curriculum. “Insofar as globalization is actually shaping the world we live in,” Cornwell and Stoddard write,

it is clear that every area of the world is affected by it, though not equally or with equal benefits. But it means that the objects of knowledge which organize our curricula and the methods used to study those objects need to change. Rapidly increasing interaction and interdependence characterize the United States as well as the rest of the world. (12–13)

Diasporas

The concept of diaspora provides a compelling framework for exploring personal identities and global processes. This concept opens vistas that are often invisible from a national or international perspective. “To map the world with diasporas,” Cornwell and Stoddard argue, “is to highlight the connections among people who are spread around the globe and to make visible what connects them. It also makes visible the historical processes which led to dispersal and can lead the scholar to ask different sorts of questions than would be asked of people within a single state” (13).

Interculturalism or Hybridity

A third new category of analysis, interculturalism or hybridity, is “the existential manifestation of globalization,” according to Cornwell and Stoddard (17). “Interculturalism” is the term they use to signify the confluence between multicultural and international, applying the lessons of the study of U.S. diversity to the rest of the world and the lessons of global studies to our understanding of local, regional, and national and transnational cultures in the U.S. “Intercultural” can be used as a synonym for “global” in the cultural sphere, but as we have seen and will continue to explore, global is a multivalent term.

Positionality

Finally, Cornwell and Stoddard use the term “positionality” to suggest the political and ethical components of their call for globalized knowledge. Positionality serves to remind us that knowledge itself is subject to the forces of global change. As the authors put it, “the power relations of the knower and the object of the knowledge have to be taken into account and the knower must reflect consciously on how his or her location shapes what is seen” (20).
From Global Knowledge to Global Learning

There are multiple meanings attached to the adjective “global” evident in conversations about curricular change. One emphasizes the complexity and multiplicity of our lives. It implies expansiveness in thought and attitude—the opposite of narrow or parochial world views. When “global” was used in the AAC&U board of directors’ Statement on Liberal Learning, this was its primary meaning. “Because liberal learning aims to free us from constraints of ignorance, sectarianism, and myopia,” the statement reads, “it prizes curiosity and seeks to expand the boundaries of human knowledge. By its nature, therefore, liberal learning is global and pluralistic” (AAC&U 1998).

Another definition emerging from campuses represents an attempt to differentiate global learning from other traditional frameworks for organizing study of the world, such as international studies and area studies programs. At Beloit College, for example, in order to reduce confusion and conflict between advocates of international education and global learning, faculty members agreed that both approaches should

- focus on entities or processes that cannot be contained or controlled by one state;
- pertain to the world in its entirety;
- emphasize spatial and temporal dimensions;
- be organized around dispersed, highly mobile, transnational phenomena and processes such as flows of people, culture, labor, commodities, and capital;
- include flows of physical elements such as disease, air, and water;
- recognize and contend with the individual as a reality that is continuously and inevitably in relationship with other people, places, and processes throughout the world.¹

Such a definition is often contradicted within curricular designs that seem to suggest that diversity, democracy, and pluralism are primarily American concerns, while “international experiences,” more diffusely envisioned, await our students “out there.” “Global,” in this sense, serves to remind our students and our curricular designers that the United States is part of the globe and that global learning can and must occur in all geographic locations.

“Global” also implies an ethical call to action. What do we do with knowledge? AAC&U argues that liberal education “has the strongest impact when studies reach beyond the classroom to the larger community, asking students to apply their developing analytical skills and ethical judgment to concrete problems in the world around them, and to connect theory with the insights gained from practice” (AAC&U 2002a, 25–26). Closely related to the ethical imperative is a civic commitment—a sense of global ethics that emerges in the context of evolving definitions of citizenship and interdependence.

AAC&U’s current multi-project Shared Futures initiative, launched in 2001, attempts to weave together each of these different elements of a global learning agenda. Shared Futures is built upon the belief that successfully engaging students with large, unscripted, global questions

¹ This list is drawn from an unpublished, internal report.
requires more than a single course or even a collection of related courses. It should be an overarching goal of a well-designed curriculum. In fact, it should be a primary characteristic of a liberal education. Recall that in *Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education*, global knowledge was found in one of the five goals. The Shared Futures initiative contends that, for students to be liberally educated for the twenty-first century, *global learning* must inform all of the five goals: acquiring intellectual skills or capacities; understanding multiple modes of inquiry and approaches to knowledge; developing societal, civic, and global knowledge; gaining self-knowledge and grounded values; and concentrating and integrating learning.

Liberal learning and global learning converge when students have multiple opportunities to apply new knowledge to their own developing sense of place in the world. Such opportunities require that students develop the capacity to analyze issues from multiple perspectives (perspectives that take privilege, power, democratic opportunity, and patterned stratification into account), recognize the value of ethical and moral reflection, and apply knowledge and values to real-world problems.
CHAPTER 2

From Theory to Practice: Global Learning in the Curriculum

Today's students are faced with issues that are increasingly defined in global terms: environment, development, health, disease, peace, security, resources, inequity, human rights, freedom. These issues do not respect national borders, nor do they fit neatly within existing academic disciplines or divisions such as social sciences, natural sciences, arts, or humanities. Students, faculty, and administrators might wonder how global issues will transform their own lives and futures and should recognize that they will require new ways of thinking about education. Evidence from AAC&U's scan of liberal arts colleges, however, suggests that while rhetorical support for global learning is clear, such support is not always effectively matched by curricular innovation.

Curricular Logjams and Disconnects

The curriculum is the most critical site for engaging all students with fundamental questions about their changing world. As the previous description of the Engaging Cultural Legacies project noted, new "curricular narratives" raise important new questions and open fresh vistas onto age-old issues. Such periodic reformulation reinvigorates general education as well as the majors and reinforces connections between these two pillars of undergraduate education. As faculty and administrators clarify their goals for global learning, they begin to tackle the difficult challenge of rethinking their curricular designs to offer more effective pathways for students to explore their place in an interdependent but starkly divided world.

To get a better sense of where these questions are addressed in undergraduate curricula, in 2002–3 AAC&U conducted a research scan of the global learning goals and strategies of approximately one hundred liberal arts colleges. Funded by a grant from the Mellon Foundation, this study found that nearly half of these liberal arts colleges include in their mission statements commitments to prepare graduates to thrive in a future characterized by global interdependence.

For example, Hartwick College graduates "will be noted as being able to thrive in the webbed world of the next millennium; a world of global interdependence in which people of the broadest range of national, ethnic, social, and personal backgrounds will interact personally and technologically." Occidental College seeks to provide students "with a total educational experience of the highest quality—one that prepares them for leadership in an increasingly complex, interdependent and pluralistic world." Earlham College "stresses global education, peaceful resolution of conflict, equality of persons, and high moral standards of personal..."
conduct." Morehouse College strives to "cultivate the personal attributes of self-confidence, tolerance, morality, ethical behavior, humility, a global perspective, and a commitment to social justice." Bryn Mawr College encourages its students "to be responsible citizens who provide service to and leadership for an increasingly interdependent world." Similarly, Texas Christian University seeks to "educate individuals to think and act as ethical leaders and responsible citizens in the global community," and, as an institution, hopes to be "recognized for our global perspective."

In most cases, the use of such language appears to be of relatively recent vintage. The statements tend to use "global" more often than "international," and often link global learning with diversity and multiculturalism. Institutions highlight "interdependence" in their mission statements and talk about global learning within the context of responsible citizenship, social justice, and leadership.

While the aspiration to global learning is clear in these mission statements, the curricular practices associated with this aim are often much less encompassing. AAC&U's initial inquiries to chief academic officers were often redirected to those people on campus with primary responsibility for study abroad or, less frequently, foreign language study. We also received materials describing institutions' international affairs major. Many seem to equate "global" education with "international education." Some see "global" as a trendier or more politically correct version of existing international practices.

These initial challenges aside, we did discover evidence that campuses are seeking new approaches to global learning. Currently, the language of global citizenship and social responsibility finds frequent expression in new majors, minors, and concentrations. Many liberal arts colleges have created new global studies majors and minors. Most are differentiated from existing international affairs majors by a shift in focus from international to transnational questions, and most emphasize cultural difference and language study.

Sarah Lawrence College, for example, offers a Global Studies major that "seeks to provide a coherent critical framework with which to study such increasingly fluid cultural and national crossings" (www.slc.edu). Course offerings emphasize cultural intersections and overlapping colonial and postcolonial histories.

Washington and Lee University, to take another example, created its Global Stewardship Certificate Program to

- introduce students to the ideals of global responsibility;
- provide an overview of central themes and problems confronting the world at the beginning of the twenty-first century;
- educate students about the interconnectedness of transnational problems and solutions;
- encourage students to apply this exposure of the global community to a specific area or discipline;
• offer educational opportunities to increase a practical orientation toward
global stewardship;
• provide students with exposure to a variety of approaches for global stewardship.
(www.wlu.edu)

The language and commitments of global learning are also finding their way into
general education programs and are resulting in newly articulated distribution requirements.
At the College of St. Benedict and St. John's University, for example, students are required
to take one course that carries a global perspectives flag. St. Benedict and St. John's argue
"all students are world citizens and need a strong foundation for expanding their awareness
of global interdependence and for working toward building a world community." In courses
earning the global perspectives flag, "students should be made
aware of the diverse patterns of thought, values, and beliefs
manifested in different cultures" (www.scsbju.edu).

Institutions often have a single course requirement
designed to accomplish many different things: address
domestic diversity, provide a non-Western perspective to
balance a Eurocentric curriculum, increase global knowledge,
and help students to recognize their own positions in the
world. The result is a logjam of learning goals that threaten to
overwhelm inadequate curricular structures.

One response to this logjam is to refocus and expand
diversity requirements. At Colby College, for example, students must now complete two courses
where they previously took one—and the focus of the courses has shifted toward structural
questions of justice and change:

Beginning with the Class of 2007, students are required to pass two courses that are
centrally concerned with: (a) the structures, workings, and consequences of; and/or
(b) efforts at political and cultural change directed against; and/or (c) progress in
overcoming prejudice, privilege, oppression, inequality, and injustice. One of these
courses must deal with these issues as they concern the United States, and one
must deal with these issues in a context other than the United States.¹

Such reform, while encouraging, brings additional challenges. “Global Issues” or “Global
Awareness” distribution requirements can be very diffuse. As a result, it is often not clear how
students will be expected to connect the learning objectives of required “global” courses with a
broader sense of their education. The shift at Colby, for example, produced a dramatic increase

¹ Students prior to the Class of 2007 are required to pass one course centrally concerned with how diversities among
peoples have contributed to the richness of human experience. Courses that may be taken to fulfill the requirement are
those that (a) focus on history, perspectives, or culture of non-Western peoples or on a culture whose origins lie outside
of the European traditions; (b) focus on issues and/or theories of ethnicity, gender, or class as these may be found
anywhere in the world; or (c) examine the nature, history, and workings of prejudice as experienced by any group
(www.colby.edu).
in the number of courses that satisfied either the new international or the new United States diversity requirement. In the history department, there were ninety-seven courses offered by the department in 2003–4. Of those, thirty-five satisfied the older combined diversity requirement; twenty satisfied the new United States diversity requirement; and forty-one satisfied the new international diversity requirement. In other words, the total number of courses that satisfied one of the new diversity requirements increased from thirty-five to sixty-one. So, for example, courses focusing on Yugoslavia, the Russian empire, or European politics, culture, and thought now satisfy one half of Colby’s diversity requirement. Offerings in the government department follow a similar trend.

Making global issues the focus of first-year core requirements helps to break the logjam but can raise questions of depth of learning and rigor. Elon University requires first-year students to complete The Global Experience, a seminar established in 1992. The course "examines public responsibility in a global context. It explores some of the implications created by cultural and natural diversity and the possibilities for human communication and cooperation within this diversity." While faculty members are free to teach the course from various perspectives, the course is framed by six concepts:

1. The importance of individual responsibility
2. The relationship of humans to the natural world
3. Globalization and tribalization as powerful global forces
4. The impact of imperialism and colonialism
5. The nature of culture
6. The plights of disempowered groups (www.elon.edu)

Less common are institutions that recognize the limitations of one or two required course categories and instead turn to the larger general education curricular design to address global learning. Montclair State University vertically integrates global and civic issues throughout three interdisciplinary courses designed to "raise students’ awareness about what it means to be responsible citizens of our community, the USA, and the world." The first of these courses, Contemporary Issues I: Scientific Issues, "draws upon basic principles from biological and physical sciences to demonstrate the application of the scientific method, scientific data analysis, reasoning, and logic to an examination of selected contemporary issues such as global climate change, nuclear waste disposal, genetic engineering, environmental health risks, dwindling energy resources, planetary exploration, and new developments in medicine." Students take Contemporary Issues II: National Issues during the sophomore year, when they explore "issues of importance within the USA today." Themes for this course "might be drawn from concepts of justice, race, ethics, gender, culture, or the self." Finally, at the junior level, students in Contemporary Issues III: Global Issues explore similar themes with an explicit focus on the world outside of the U.S.: "Specialists in different disciplines with
expertise in global issues will collaborate to present comparative perspectives on contemporary issues. Of course, comparisons and contrasts will be made with the American experience (www.montclair.edu).

While most colleges and universities have not yet implemented comprehensive global curricula, many institutions recognize the interdisciplinary nature of global learning and therefore see it as a fundamental challenge to disciplinary structures. They also acknowledge the need for significant faculty development around global learning. Consequently, new interdisciplinary global centers offer additional sites for change. Bryn Mawr, for example, has established a number of centers to encourage innovation between and within existing departments and programs. These centers "are intended to address the immobility plaguing institutions of higher education in general, an immobility created both by a continuing departmental structure that maintains a nineteenth-century vision of the academy and by a response to the limitations of that vision which resulted in establishing nondepartmental programs":

The Bryn Mawr Center for International Studies, for example, is designed to serve as a forum for defining global issues and confronting them in their appropriate social, scientific, cultural, and linguistic contexts. Topics of particular interest might include transnational migration, environmental issues, ethnic relations within nations previously defining themselves as homogeneous, human rights issues, nongovernmental organizations, international security arrangements, changing states and political control, development and social justice issues, and trade and investment agreements. (www.brynmawr.edu)

It remains to be seen, of course, how the work of such centers will find its way back into the undergraduate curriculum.

These hopeful trends and examples notwithstanding, the Mellon-funded study also shows that few liberal arts colleges have developed comprehensive or integrated approaches to global learning. AAC&U's research suggests that

- global awareness requirements within general education are overwhelmingly satisfied by a single non-Western culture distribution course, avoiding interdependence as an object of study itself, thus reinforcing a fractured view of the global community;
- within general education, domestic diversity requirements and global awareness requirements are seen as discrete, unlinked units, reinforcing the idea that the United States somehow stands outside of global analysis;
- there is little evidence that students are provided with multiple, robust, interdisciplinary learning opportunities at increasing levels of intellectual challenge to ensure that students acquire the global learning professed in the mission statement;
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- science is largely missing as a site for global learning. Additionally, the research shows that
- global learning is overwhelmingly understood in cultural terms rather than through other frames such as economic disparaties, environmental sustainability, health and HIV/AIDS, security, or human rights;
- global learning is often defined as a desired outcome of general education, but is utilized neither as a framework for the design of coherent, integrative general education curricula nor as a way to link general education and learning in the majors;
- while social responsibility and civic engagement are often mentioned as markers of students successfully prepared for global interdependence, such learning outcomes are poorly defined and not well integrated into global components of the curriculum;
- there is a deep-seated belief—on campus and in the public—that global education is primarily external, and necessarily achieved through study abroad, yet the vast majority of students across all sectors in higher education either lack access to or choose to forgo high-quality study abroad opportunities.

Shared Futures Guiding Principles:
Connecting Aspirations and Practice

Colleges and universities are striving to close this demonstrated gap between their global learning aspirations and existing curricular designs. They are searching for solid learning objectives and outcomes as foundations upon which to construct such curricula. The Shared Futures initiative is designed to coordinate and facilitate transformation of the major and general education while encouraging institutions to look to liberal education for useful and appropriate language and practices for reform.

The Shared Futures initiative argues that a twenty-first-century liberal education must provide students with the knowledge and commitment to be socially responsible citizens in a diverse democracy and increasingly interconnected world. Colleges and universities committed to liberal education, in other words, have important responsibilities to their communities, their nation, and the larger world.

A liberal education should help students
- gain a deep, comparative knowledge of the world’s peoples and problems;
- analyze global issues and events through inquiry and inform themselves about the historical, geographical, cultural, political, economic, scientific, and religious contexts within which these issues must be understood;
- recognize that citizenship in a nation is only one factor in understanding the world;
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- recognize similarities and differences in and among cultures and the multiple perspectives, values, and identities they engender;
- sustain difficult conversations in the face of highly emotional and perhaps ungenial differences;
- understand—and perhaps redefine—democratic principles and practices within a global context;
- gain opportunities to engage in practical work with fundamental issues that affect communities not yet well served by their societies;
- translate global learning into ethical and reflective practice, mindful of the consequences of their actions in a locally diverse and globally heterogeneous community;
- recognize the impact of global issues on their own lives, and believe that their own actions, both individually and collaboratively, can, in turn, influence the world.

While Shared Futures advocates for deeper knowledge and understanding of the world, it also calls for transformation of undergraduate education. By moving global learning goals out of the one or two multicultural course requirements and sharing responsibility for these outcomes across the curriculum, it is possible to increase student engagement as well as the coherence and integrity of the undergraduate curriculum.
In designing Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy, AAC&U argued that higher education has a historic opportunity to assume new leadership in preparing students to become more informed, socially responsible, and engaged citizens, skilled in the arts of inclusive democracy and schooled in the arts of liberal learning. To meet this opportunity, we must ensure that liberal education attends to global learning goals.

Consequently, when we look to the field for examples of global learning on campuses, we need to differentiate our broad civic objectives from narrower efforts to "internationalize" the curriculum—efforts that are often confused with global learning because of a similar interest in combating parochialism and expanding students’ horizons. Internationalization has been a valuable framework for campus action for decades, and it too is responding to a heightened sense of urgency and a growing sense of qualitative global changes. Its traditional strategies for organizing action include developing robust study abroad programs capable of attracting greater numbers of students, increasing the numbers of international students on U.S. campuses, encouraging the study of foreign languages, increasing opportunities for faculty to develop international relationships, and reflecting an international perspective in the curriculum.

The Shared Futures vision of global learning builds on these efforts and moves beyond them by offering an alternative way to engage all students—in all of their diversity—with questions arising from some of the most pressing historical trends of our time. AAC&U’s Shared Futures initiative asks of students, “What does it mean to be a citizen in the evolving global context?” and “How should one act in the face of large unsolved global problems?” These questions, fundamental to reflective thinking in the early twenty-first century, are most powerful if curricula are intentionally designed around them. Significantly, global questions can also serve to provide coherence and connect the disparate parts of undergraduate education. Shared Futures supports global learning that occurs in multiple curricular locations and that takes increasingly complex forms. So far, the initiative has focused on both the major and general education.

Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy

The first funded project of the Shared Futures initiative, Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy (2001–5), supported a curriculum and faculty development network of eleven institutions that focused their global learning reform efforts on redesigning selected majors.
The major project designers and participants agreed represents an ideal place where introductory (general education) exposure to diversity, global perspectives, and social responsibility can be reinforced and integrated at appropriate developmental levels through the study of complex global questions. These questions must be sufficiently capacious to allow rich disciplinary exploration, but must also highlight the value of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches.

Participating institutions were encouraged to think about their own curricular reform agendas in the context of emerging new intellectual categories—both those outlined by Cornwall and Stoddard in *Globalizing Knowledge* (1999) and those that emerged from project participants and additional members of the advisory panel. Strategies on participating campuses were multifaceted and were not limited to single categories. The following examples, consequently, do not exhaust the rich variety of experience of project participants, but merely suggest the range of curricular thinking.

**Globalization**

As part of its participation in the Liberal Education and Global Citizenship project, the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee (UW–M) planned one track of an ambitious multi-tracked global studies degree program. UW–M faculty created both lower- and upper-division interdisciplinary core courses for the new global studies major. Core lower-division courses required for all global studies majors include Global Studies I—People and Politics, Global Studies II—International Trade and Environmental Trade, and Global Studies III—Globalization and Information Technology. Upper-division courses are located in one of five tracks in the major, each track linking the College of Letters and Sciences with a professional school. The tracks are global management (business administration), global cities (architecture and urban planning), global classrooms (education), global security (nursing and social welfare), and global communication (under development).

The curricular architecture that emerged from the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee is powerful evidence of the transformational potential of global learning frameworks on existing disciplines and fields. The global studies program is conceived less as a self-contained discipline, and more as a catalyst for change, a laboratory for interdisciplinary thinking and teaching, and a strategy to bridge liberal education and professional education.

**Diasporas**

Albany State College set out to create a more global curriculum by developing junior- and senior-level courses focusing on the African diaspora in a world context. Four departments—English and modern languages, history, political science and public administration, and psychology, sociology, and social work—applied their particular disciplinary lenses to questions of citizenship and identity between Africa, the Caribbean, and the United States. Specific courses developed include the following:
• Comparative Literature: Explorations in History and Culture, a close examination of how authors examine histories, cultures, and philosophies of their homelands and their views of colonialism, xenophobia, and multiculturalism

• Introduction to Humanities, a course that familiarizes students with traditional and international aspects of literature from Africa, the Caribbean, and America as well as history, art, and music related to that literature

• Race and Politics in the United States and the Caribbean (1900–1970), a comparative study of the economic, social, political, cultural, and artistic experiences of people of African descent in the United States and the Caribbean as they fought to acquire civil rights and political independence from oppressive political systems

• Culture and Global Citizenship, an introduction to major theoretical perspectives and critical analyses of the intersections of global citizenship and education, stratification, religion, age, gender, race/ethnicity, formal organizations, colonialism, and human movements

Positionality

The American University of Paris (AUP) was unique in the project due to its location outside of the United States. Consequently, AUP brought to the project, in the words of team leader Celeste Schenck, evidence of “the undeniable centrality of positionality in any global studies conversation, whether in the micro-space of the classroom or in the global realm of international relations.” As a consequence, Schenck argues, institutions must “build developmental curricula in light of openly discussed and consciously understood institutional and disciplinary positionalties” while they also develop “home-grown and locally relevant pedagogies, such as service learning and simulation projects, to complement other classroom methods of globalizing our students’ experience and knowledge.”

One of the curricular strategies employed by AUP was an advanced integrative course, Re-negotiating Nationhood. Students explored their positionalties through year-long investigation of “a particular global hot spot.” Assigned randomly “to interdisciplinary, intercultural teams, students explore differences, mediate and resolve conflicts, debate situational versus universal ethics, and either achieve consensus or manage difference.”

Interculturalism

Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) emphasized the intersection between local and global cultural dynamics by linking a study abroad program in Trinidad and Tobago with an experiential living/learning program in the Salishan community of Tacoma. As team leader Barbara Temple Thurston explains, Trinidad and Tobago is a rich learning environment due to
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1 Quotations from campus representatives and project advisers in this chapter and in the conclusion are drawn from unpublished, internal reports.
“its magnificent cultural, racial/ethnic, environmental and religious diversity, … its economic foothold in the global gas/oil industry, and its historical backdrop of colonization and slavery.” While many students are able to make connections between diverse approaches to difficult issues, FLU sought to reinforce these connections by creating opportunities for returning students to live (at least temporarily) in Salishan, a subsidized housing community serving immigrants from East Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America. “The intellectual framework of the Trinidad/Salishan project,” Temple-Thurston notes, “evolved from seeking initially a shift in students’ racial consciousness to the broader and more inclusive frame of the local/global dialectic.” Faculty members from five majors designed courses that capitalized on this framework and could be taught either in Trinidad or Tacoma.

"The Arts of Democracy"

City University of New York—Brooklyn College argued that the international and domestic diversity of its student body made the campus a rich location for using democracy as a lens for the study of global change. Consequently, activities reflected the project’s subtitle—“The Arts of Democracy.” Under this organizing principle, ten departments committed themselves to developing new required courses in the major that explicitly addressed globalization and democracy. Each course was also to include an experiential element—internship, field work, or community service in Brooklyn. The common theme of the reform was that the “arts of democracy” would link classroom learning to action in Brooklyn and New York City, local communities that are also crossroads for global migrations.

Human Rights

On many campuses, project participants wrestled with competing claims made by proponents and critics of human rights discourse. Of special salience to the project were questions about the sources and uses of claims for universal rights and values, the dangers of cultural and political imperialism, the role of the individual in culturally specific contexts, and the problem of cultural relativism. The United Nations, as the leading institutional advocate for human rights as well as a potential locale for global citizenship, was also the subject of rich debate.

Rochester Institute of Technology, for example, translated these conversations into efforts to create resource modules for possible inclusion in a required senior seminar capstone course on globalization, human rights, and citizenship. Modules with a human rights focus included Poets without Borders: The Poetry of Witness and Human Rights Activism and Globalization and Gender: Human Rights and Family and a Democratic World Order.
Justice

At John Carroll University, faculty from three departments created a team-taught, interdisciplinary sophomore-level course that serves as a comparative introduction to the methods employed by each discipline. The course, Justice and Democracy in a Global Context, was designed to take advantage of the critical perspectives of history, political science, and religious studies on global interdependence and social responsibility. The first half of the course provides an overview of critical issues, while the second focuses on a single specific case study. In 2003, the case study was Bosnia, while in 2004, students examined issues related to the United States–Mexico border.

In conjunction with Justice and Democracy in a Global Context, John Carroll offers a clustered learning community as a capstone experience. The first learning community in spring 2004 focused on El Salvador and combined three courses: The Politics of Central America, Christian Social Justice, and Race and Gender in Latin American History. Students were also offered an additional credit for a spring break immersion trip to El Salvador.

Additional Cross-cutting Questions

While the categories above were translated into concrete curricular practices, there remained additional questions yet to be fully addressed in the curriculum.

Chandra Talpade Mohanty, a member of the project’s advisory panel, argued forcefully that notions of global citizenship and arts of democracy would be necessarily incomplete without attending to legacies of colonialism. Preferring the term “decolonization” because it “signals agency and the undoing/demystification of power and domination at many levels,” Mohanty argued that “without a nuanced understanding of the global and differentiated histories of colonialism and imperialism, it is impossible to understand the world we live in now—and to see the continuities and discontinuities in the ways in which power is exercised as well as resisted.”

Other questions were raised in the context of individual identity. One of the main objectives of the Shared Futures initiative is to allow students to recognize the construction of their own identities as shaped by the currents of power and privilege, within both a multicultural United States and an interconnected and unequal world. Throughout the project, team members, advisory board members, and invited speakers modeled this process for the group. In October 2002, for example, the Liberal Education and Global Citizenship project played a major role in shaping the theme of AAC&U’s biennial Diversity and Learning Conference. Members of the project advisory board opened the conference with a powerful plenary, “Global Citizenship and Transglobal Identities,” in which they shared personal stories of journey and transformation from India, Nigeria, China, and the United States.

Participants also discussed constructed notions of citizenship and questions of who defines the roles, rights, and responsibility of citizens. Saskia Sassen, the Ralph Lewis Professor
of Sociology at the University of Chicago, delivered a keynote address at an AAC&U global learning symposium at the 2003 annual meeting that foreclosed naïve understandings of citizenship. While acknowledging that "citizenship as a formal institution is still largely national" (14), Sassen went on to explain how she thinks of "citizenship as a kind of incompletely theorized agreement between the state and its citizens" (16).

For example, globalization, Sassen argued, "has the effect of partly unbundling the unitary character of citizenship":

Globalization makes legible the extent to which citizenship, which we experience as some sort of unitary condition, is actually made up of a bundle of conditions. Some of them are far less connected to the national state than the formal bundle of rights at the heart of the institution of citizenship. There are citizenship practices, citizenship identities, and locations for citizenship that are not as inevitably articulated with the national state as is the formal bundle of rights. (2003, 16)

Project participants were keenly aware that global citizenship is a complex and at times contradictory notion, and were careful to differentiate between the practice of civic engagement through global issues and the category of global citizenship.

Shared Futures: General Education for Global Learning

The frameworks and questions discussed above are still shaping campus discussions about global learning. While participants in Liberal Education and Global Citizenship continue to address these issues in the context of their major programs, an additional set of institutions participating in AAC&U’s current global learning project, Shared Futures: General Education for Global Learning, are addressing them in the context of general education. These institutions are using well-designed and intentional general education curricula to create connections between students’ lives and identities and the challenges of the interdependent world in which they live.

Launched in October 2005, Shared Futures: General Education for Global Learning combines the best theory and practice of general education reform with the transformative promise of global content. Supported by a grant from the Henry Luce Foundation, the project has created a network of sixteen colleges and universities working together to use global learning as an organizing principle for general education programs and to prepare students for citizenship in a world of global change and interdependence. Each participating institution is committed to increasing the coherence and integration of their general education curricula by introducing, in multiple locations, global questions that grow in complexity in developmentally appropriate ways.²

² The participating institutions include Arcadia University (Glenside, Pennsylvania), Butler University (Indianapolis, Indiana), California State University–Long Beach (Long Beach, California), Chandler-Gilbert Community College (Chandler, Arizona), Dickinson College (Carlisle, Pennsylvania), Drury University (Springfield, Missouri), Hawaii Pacific University (Honolulu, Hawaii), Marquette University (Milwaukee, Wisconsin), Mesa Community College (Mesa, Arizona),
While all sixteen institutions are demonstrating leadership in designing and assessing global curricula, change strategies are as varied as the participating institutions themselves. Drury University’s core curriculum is an especially good example of the role that global learning goals can play in creating coherence by linking multiple elements of the curriculum. Drury’s Global Perspectives for the Twenty-first Century (GP21) is a vertically structured core designed to help students synthesize the perspectives and insights of many disciplines into a coherent understanding of the world, its peoples, and future possibilities. The GP21 curriculum is described in detail in the appendix.

AAC&U looks forward to future opportunities to share the fruits of this project: additional models and strategies for creatively moving global learning to the center of undergraduate general education.
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Otterbein College (Westerville, Ohio), Stephens College (Columbia, Missouri), United States Military Academy (West Point, New York), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Chapel Hill, North Carolina), University of Wyoming (Laramie, Wyoming), Wheaton College (Norton, Massachusetts), and Whittier College (Whittier, California).
CONCLUSION:

Global Learning and Liberal Education

While economic globalization, threats of global terrorism, and global health crises have captured the attention and imagination of today's public, the questions of power, privilege, ethics, social responsibility, political action, and personal identity central to these global issues have always been fundamental to liberal education. The undergraduate curriculum must constantly adapt to new contexts.

Fortunately, increased attention to the global contexts of liberal education comes at a time of intense and creative reevaluation of undergraduate learning across the academy. More and more institutions are sharpening their student learning goals and undertaking deep examinations of the various practices that are most effective in achieving those goals. Such institutions are revisiting curricular designs and institutional structures, and as a consequence may be more open to the challenge of educating students with the knowledge and commitment to be socially responsible citizens in a diverse democracy and increasingly interconnected world.

This convergence between global learning and liberal education can by seen in AAC&U's recently launched campaign, Liberal Education and America's Promise: Excellence for Everyone as a Nation Goes to College (LEAP). LEAP is a continuing campaign to expand public and student understanding of what really matters in college—the kinds of learning that will truly empower them to succeed and make a difference in the twenty-first century.

LEAP calls public attention to the emerging New Academy—an academy that promotes collaborative leadership and educational programs that foster liberal education outcomes in all students. These outcomes include knowledge of human cultures and the natural and physical world, intellectual and practical skills, individual and social responsibilities, and integrative learning.

Students are achieving these outcomes by engaging in challenging studies in the liberal arts and sciences through major and minor fields. They are also exploring the world's major questions, both contemporary and enduring, in the classroom, the community, and the field. Institutions are implementing new pedagogies that entail active, hands-on, collaborative, and inquiry-based learning, as well as milestone and capstone assessments that help students deepen, integrate, and demonstrate their learning at progressively more challenging levels.

As argued in chapter 1, ensuring that this vision of a twenty-first-century liberal education is characterized by attention to global learning is both necessary and a natural product of ongoing education reform. Global learning offers a coherent and timely framework through which to develop the four main categories of liberal education outcomes mentioned above—knowledge, skills, responsibility, and integration.

Increased attention to the global contexts of liberal education comes at a time of intense and creative reevaluation of undergraduate learning across the academy.
In addition, global problems and challenges provide a context—both current and pressing—for student action as well as for their studies. Global issues serve as real tests for further articulation of individual and social responsibility as outcomes of a liberal education. They provide students with opportunities to develop important civic knowledge and to engage—globally and locally—in civic practice. They demand intercultural knowledge and competence, and they demand ethical reasoning and action.

Of course, while aspiring to the goals articulated by both the Shared Futures initiative and the LEAP campaign, few institutions have found effective ways to help their students fully accomplish them. Institutional structures and curricular designs have evolved over time. Chapter 2 suggests that these structures and designs will not change quickly or easily; nor are institutions likely to abandon existing objectives and goals. Global learning goals are gaining visibility and value in higher education, but they do not yet sit comfortably within structures and designs created for other purposes. What is needed is an intentional and comprehensive renegotiation of the goals of undergraduate education. At this moment in history, we cannot engage in such a renegotiation without paying significant attention to global learning.

Fortunately, innovations such as thematic learning communities (or linked courses), service learning, experiential learning, vertically integrated curricula with first-year seminars and senior capstones, the teaching of science through problem-based inquiry, and undergraduate research are well established in a growing number of institutions across the nation. These curricular and pedagogical innovations present promising new opportunities for multidisciplinary exploration of global themes even as they point the way for structural innovation.

As chapter 3 shows, many of the global learning categories explored by the participants in Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy do not fit neatly within existing majors or departments. Globalization, diaspora, democracy, justice, human rights, decolonization, transglobal identities, and global citizenship are subjects more often found in new interdisciplinary centers and experimental learning communities than in general education or major programs. But engaging students with such complex global issues necessarily involves crossing disciplinary and divisional boundaries and integrating multiple perspectives and disparate experiences. Institutions and departments are not yet organized for such learning. We are only beginning to witness how these issues will challenge disciplinary assumptions, shape research and teaching agendas, and transform majors.

The religious studies department at Beloit College provided the clearest instance in the Liberal Education and Global Citizenship project of how a department could transform a major. Instead of using the traditional East-versus-West architecture, the major is now organized to explore the dynamic local and global manifestations of religions. Moving away from a rigid dichotomy based on the historical or geographical origins of religious traditions, Beloit faculty focus on the dynamic and pluralistic practice of religion in both local and global contexts. The department’s foundational courses—Understanding Religious
Traditions in a Global Context and Understanding Religious Traditions in Multicultural America—ask students and faculty to view local and global manifestations of religious expression comparatively. Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Study of Religion, an advanced “methods” course required of majors, “considers diverse academic approaches to studying religion as well as the nature, meaning, and function of religion in a diverse world” (Duerst-Lahti 2005, 2–3).

Many faculty members are eager to engage the intellectual challenges of global learning, but as Cornwell and Stoddard note in Globalizing Knowledge, “few faculty are currently trained to think or teach this way. Educational reformers have been pushing for faculty to move out of the narrow areas of specialization that Ph.D.s typically require, but even so, understanding global processes goes beyond most visions of interdisciplinarity” (1999, 30). Consequently, the need for faculty development opportunities is intense, and the need to rethink graduate education urgent.

Teaching courses in the manner Cornwell and Stoddard suggest is full of both risk and reward. In internal reports, Liberal Education and Global Citizenship participants and project advisers noted the satisfaction as well as the frustration that accompany team teaching and designing interdisciplinary courses in institutions that lack the necessary structure and experience to support them. Gail Hamilton at American University of Paris observes that interdepartmental cooperation is difficult and asks, “Should these issues be addressed first before investing precious time and energy in interdisciplinary activities?” On the other hand, for Vincent Fuccillo, the chair of the political science department at Brooklyn College, those challenges present “a wonderful opportunity for many of my faculty to further their cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary activities. Here was a chance to challenge the standard, orthodox, and conventional departmental organization of the college in powerful and fruitful ways.” Advisory board member Jan Monk adds,

Faculty drawn to teaching globalization are likely to include those who have been associated with specific area specialties. Moving to address globalization draws on the strengths of their specific regional knowledge, but also challenges their sense of confidence in teaching new material. Further, their expertise may be questioned by colleagues on curriculum committees who have specialties in other regions. Though team teaching may resolve some of these challenges, it is not always possible within institutional constraints.

Faculty members teaching in the departmental major, in other words, often find it necessary to play the role of master learner in their global learning classrooms—a situation more often seen in general education. While disciplinary expertise remains fundamental, such teachers are adopting the identity of generalists—modeling skills of inquiry and integration.
In fact, although AAC&U chose to focus on different parts of the curriculum in its two Shared Futures curriculum and faculty development projects—the first project centered on the major and the second centers on general education—global learning strategies cannot be contained in either the major or general education. Instead, global learning encourages students and educators alike to see the connections between these two parts of a liberal education. It is our hope that the Shared Futures initiative will help campuses view both together as a more coherent way for students to engage in the world's pressing problems and to gain deeper knowledge and experience in the world they are creating for the future.
APPENDIX:

A Model for General Education

Over the past decade, Drury University has created and sustained an interdisciplinary, general education core curriculum called Global Perspectives for the Twenty-first Century (GP21). GP21 helps students synthesize the perspectives and insights of many disciplines into a coherent understanding of the world and its peoples. It has achieved this by creating developmentally appropriate opportunities for students to visit and revisit key global issues. The curriculum’s coherence and breadth allow Drury University to award a minor in global studies to all students who graduate. See www.drury.edu for more information about GP21.

The Drury University Core (Global Perspectives for the Twenty-first Century)
Selected locations of global learning opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP21 CORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESHMAN</th>
<th>American Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This yearlong course explores the roots of American traditions and contemporary expressions of those traditions, with special emphasis on the experiences of minorities. This course is process-oriented, focusing upon the development of writing, speaking, and critical thinking abilities. Particular emphasis is given to the need for students to take responsibility for their own learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOPHOMORE</th>
<th>Global Awareness and Cultural Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Students develop cultural analysis skills by examining representative examples of the world's cultures. Students become familiar with specific cultures by examining (a) nonmaterial culture (religious beliefs, social values, and norms); (b) material cultures (arts, way of life, technology, etc.); and (c) specific cultural and social issues. This examination helps students cultivate an empathetic and thoughtful understanding of other cultures and peoples and develop active methods of promoting human equality at a personal and societal level. This course is required of all students and provides a framework for understanding cultures and peoples that will be further developed by in-depth studies under the category of "Minorities and Indigenous Cultures."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOPHOMORE</th>
<th>Science Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This course is designed for non-science majors. (Science majors take the more traditional introductory science surveys.) This is a six-hour course taught by one physicist, one chemist, and two biologists. A case-study approach is used, with topics related to real-world issues of science and technology, such as environmental issues and human health issues. The course will have a significant laboratory component that is open-ended to make use of the methods of science and experimentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNIOR</th>
<th>Global Futures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The capstone Global Futures course is designed to introduce students to the scenarios for a sustainable global future and is divided into four sections: imagining the good future; exploring the concepts of utopia and dystopia; envisioning our future on the basis of current realities; and imagining the good community. The course concludes with strategies to build good community on the local, national, and international levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNIOR</th>
<th>Undergraduate Science Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Teams of students will work on projects to solve problems in natural science that require them to collect empirical data using the methods of science. Students write up their research results in the form of a scientific publication and present their work in a campus-wide science poster session.
**GP21 ELECTIVES**

In addition to core global studies courses, students must choose one or two courses from each of these distribution requirements.

**Ideas and Events of Western Culture**
Courses in this category help students develop a comprehensive understanding of broad periods in Western cultural history by focusing on foundational ideas, events, and the diverse voices that have shaped Western cultures.

**Artifacts of Western Culture**
Courses in this category explore great ideas and significant artifacts of Western traditions in greater depth—thus complementing students’ broad understanding of Western cultural history with more detailed knowledge of specific artifacts and ideas.

**Creativity Explored (two courses from different departments)**
Courses that satisfy the requirements of creativity explored will enhance students’ abilities to use their imagination to find creative solutions. The courses develop the skills of conceptualization, synthesis, and expression. Courses must be completed in at least two departments.

**Human Behavior**
Human behavior courses offer a variety of approaches for analyzing and understanding human behavior. The principles of behavior are presented within the context of an interdisciplinary liberal arts program. Emphasis is on developing the skills and insights that characterize scientific perspectives. Attention is given to the relationship between theory and application in the study of human behavior.

**Political Science or Economics**
This category introduces students to the political and economic perspectives of contemporary societies. Current domestic and international problems receive special attention. All courses introduce students to fundamental political and economic issues of American society. Quantitative and qualitative reasoning skills are used to analyze the political and economic institutions that shape human behavior.

**Foreign Language**
Students are required to take a two-semester elementary language sequence.

**Minorities and Indigenous Cultures**
These courses involve students in a culture as far removed from their normal experience as possible. These are upper-level courses that apply the skills of cultural analysis to a disciplinary topic or area.
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A truly liberal education is one that prepares us to live responsible, productive, and creative lives in a dramatically changing world. It is an education that fosters a well-grounded intellectual resilience, a disposition toward lifelong learning, and an acceptance of responsibility for the ethical consequences of our ideas and actions. Liberal education requires that we understand the foundations of knowledge and inquiry about nature, culture, and society; that we master core skills of perception, analysis, and expression; that we cultivate a respect for truth; that we recognize the importance of historical and cultural context; and that we explore connections among formal learning, citizenship, and service to our communities.

We experience the benefits of liberal learning by pursuing intellectual work that is honest, challenging, and significant, and by preparing ourselves to use knowledge and power in responsible ways. Liberal learning is not confined to particular fields of study. What matters in liberal education is substantial content, rigorous methodology, and an active engagement with the societal, ethical, and practical implications of our learning. The spirit and value of liberal learning are equally relevant to all forms of higher education and to all students.

Because liberal learning aims to free us from the constraints of ignorance, sectarianism, and myopia, it prizes curiosity and seeks to expand the boundaries of human knowledge. By its nature, therefore, liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.

The ability to think, to learn, and to express oneself both rigorously and creatively, the capacity to understand ideas and issues in context, the commitment to live in society, and the yearning for truth are fundamental features of our humanity. In centering education upon these qualities, liberal learning is society’s best investment in our shared future.

*Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, October 1998. AAC&U encourages distribution, so long as attribution is given. Please address general inquiries to humphreys@aacu.org.*
About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,000 accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.