Global Learning Input from Yelkur, Anand and Sen

From: Sen, Asha  
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2012 11:34 AM  
To: Anand, Ari S.; Pratt, Jean A.; Yelkur, Rama  
Subject: RE: APC and Global Learning

Thanks Ari, for explaining the significant issues at stake so well. I just have a technical suggestion to Outcome #2, since that is the one we seem to be leaning towards. Since all students may not be able to have an immersion experience, could we substitute an extra 3 credits for those students. For instance, then students would be required to have a 3 credit global learning course and a global immersion experience. In the event of the latter not being available to them, could they take another 3 credits global learning class as a substitute for the immersion experience? Asha

From: Anand, Ari S.  
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2012 3:19 AM  
To: Pratt, Jean A.; Sen, Asha; Yelkur, Rama  
Subject: RE: APC and Global Learning

Dear Jean, Rama, and Asha,

Thanks, Jean, for your invitation to participate in this conversation. I spent some time trying to put some thoughts down, though of course Rama made things quite straightforward by laying out three clear options for us (thanks, Rama!), so perhaps it was all just an excessive and somewhat pointless exercise. But I thought I would share them with you to offer a sense of why I am thinking the way I am on Global Learning, because I think it might help us think about the relationships between our intended outcomes and requirements more thoroughly. I apologize in advance for the wordiness below. I’m cutting and pasting from a Word document I was working on:

Thanks to Dr. Yelkur and the GL committee who have been working for well over a year on the difficult and sometimes elusive issues related to Global Learning as part of the Liberal Education Reform processes. Here is an attempt to summarize some of this work and offer some thoughts that I hope will enrich our conversations without scuttling any prior work, all of which I believe has been extremely valuable in leading us much closer to a viable attempt at embedding Global Learning in our Liberal Education reforms.

THE OPTIONS

Current proposal: One global learning course or a study abroad experience.

Options proposed by Dr. Yelkur after the APC discussion of 10/23/2012:

1. OUTCOMES-BASED MODEL: A requirement that a student meet all four Global Learning outcomes at a Benchmark level of at least 2 exclusively through the student’s Liberal Education coursework or immersion experiences (IM). (Will require alignment with GL Outcomes and associated Benchmarks);
2. CREDIT-OUTCOMES BASED HYBRID MODEL: One 3 credit global learning course and a global learning immersion experience. (Will require alignment with GL Outcomes and associated Benchmarks);
3. CREDIT-BASED MODEL A student complete 9 credits of Race, Gender, Ethnicity and Global Learning through her/his Liberal Education coursework to include a minimum of 3 credits in Race, Gender, Ethnicity and a minimum of 3 credits in Global Learning. (Unviable for a variety of good reasons, including UW System policy, as well as prior APC approval for 6 credit requirement for Race, Gender and Ethnicity).

DISCUSSION OF WHAT WE WANT GLOBAL LEARNING TO ACCOMPLISH, AND WHICH SET OF REQUIREMENTS MIGHT BEST FIT OUR INTENTIONS:
In order to decide between the two options available (option 3 being a non-starter for a variety of reasons), I would suggest we draw on Dr. Yelkur’s *Global Learning Assessment Report 2011-12* to establish some useful criteria. These could be used as guiding principles that can be incorporated into the Outcomes and Benchmarks that Dr. Yelkur and the GL committee have already been developing, and can also provide us with a means to decide between options 1 & 2 above. Here I am summarizing some key dimensions of Global Learning that the report points (pp. 1-2; 4-5) to:

1. Distinguishing between multicultural and global competencies;
2. Recognizing connectedness on a global scale, including developing an awareness of relationships between people, social groups, places and processes on a global scale;
3. Developing critical skills for the acquisition of knowledge including avoiding ethnocentrism, developing appropriately sensitive forms in which to articulate both curiosity and acquired knowledge about differences in the context of global relatedness and forms of connectedness;
4. Emphasizing practice as key to developing global competencies; and
5. Developing cognitive (“how do I know?”), intrapersonal (“who am I?”) and interpersonal (“how do I want to relate with others?”) dispositions sensitive to the above dimensions of Global Learning that might be assessed as evidence of successful Global Learning.

Item 1 above is essential to our understanding that there are different “scales” of engagement with cultural difference that we and our students need to recognize; for instance, straight, male White students share a common, but very uneven, national history with people belonging to marginalized groups in the United States that they do not share with people from other countries. This shared history demands a level of knowledge and recognition of domestic social injustices and responsibilities that these same students do not need to develop in relation to people from other countries, people who do not share their common social histories. For this reason alone it is essential that we do not conflate domestic critical multiculturalism with global (“multicultural”) learning.

Items 2 and 3, however, complicate this narrative somewhat. It is true that the ways in which race and racism function in the USA demand attention that is not diluted by reducing those issues to mere matters of “difference” dispersed across the world that can be adequately addressed by doing “Global Learning”. On the other hand, any reasonable understanding of global connectedness would have to acknowledge global processes that produce unevenness and hierarchies exist at not just the domestic but the global scale, such as colonialism or capitalist political-economic transformations over the past five centuries. Global interconnectedness is no less fraught with unevenness, and competent and ethically astute global learners will have to learn to negotiate these issues. These are also matters of developing a critical awareness of the self as situated in a particular social group and social position, and not only matters of knowledge about the cultural practices of others. So while it is essential to emphasize the difference between critical domestic multiculturalism and global learning, I would suggest that we nevertheless would like that distinction to be made in the context of a broadly shared framework that takes into account the importance of developing critical awareness about social identity—about group formation in relation to shared (but often uneven or hierarchical) processes, about the location of the self in specific social formations in specific times and places, and so on.

Item 4, in its emphasis on practice, entails engaging with, and not just knowing about (or demonstrating an understanding of), cultural and social differences, as well as developing an awareness of how shared global processes might have produced cultural similarities, differences or hierarchies. This emphasis on personal engagement rather than on knowledge acquisition per se suggests that outcomes be geared to encourage students to embody a sense of awareness of themselves and how they are situated in the world (at a global scale) in which they live.

Item 5 above (articulated in the “Global Perspectives Inventory”) points to the impact we hope that Global Learning has on the social identity of our students, and to the transformative impact it can have on their dispositions as thoughtful global citizens as they graduate into the world beyond the university. It offers us a language of assessment that we can begin to use to think about the outcomes we want our students to embody, and not simply refer to, as Global Learners.
Given the ambitious nature of what we are trying to do, it seems to me that both coursework and some kind of practice (however that is defined—whether study-abroad or some kind of immersion) are probably essential to approaching our intended outcomes. It seems to me that the outcomes that the GL committee had in mind are more far-reaching than the current proposed Global Learning requirement is likely to be able to offer. It is clear that not all study abroad programs are adequate to our intended outcomes, for instance. In particular, it seems that the combination of knowledge acquisition and reflexive awareness that is required is likely to need the kind of mentoring or guidance that faculty are best equipped to provide through appropriate coursework—particularly if it is framed as preparatory to a practice-oriented experience. Of the two alternatives offered by Dr. Yelkur, the hybrid model seems most likely to achieve this, despite the fact that (at least in my understanding) we are trying to move away from credit counting toward a more purely outcome driven approach.

Thanks again for the opportunity to share these thoughts.

Best wishes,
Ari

From: Sen, Asha
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2012 2:22 PM
To: Pratt, Jean A.; Yelkur, Rama; Anand, Ari S.
Subject: RE: APC and Global Learning

Dear Jean,

I’m in favor of Option 2. I think a student should have both the classroom experience *and* the global learning immersion experience, preferably the first before the second.

Thanks, Rama, for laying the options out so clearly.

Asha

From: Yelkur, Rama
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2012 7:22 AM
To: Pratt, Jean A.; Sen, Asha; Anand, Ari S.
Subject: RE: APC and Global Learning

Dear Dr. Pratt,

Here are my thoughts on the Global Learning requirement for LE:

**Option 1: Outcomes-Based Model**

*The 4 Global Learning Outcomes and associated benchmarks need to be approved by APC before we can adopt an outcomes-based model.*

A requirement that a student meet all four Global Learning outcomes at a Benchmark level of at least 2 exclusively through the student’s Liberal Education coursework or immersion experiences (IM).

**Challenges:** Courses and immersion experiences have to be identified as meeting the Global Learning Outcomes and instructors will be responsible for certifying that a student has met a given outcome and at a given benchmark.

**Option 2: Credit-Outcomes Based Hybrid Model**
The requirement “One 3 credit global learning course or a study abroad experience,” be revised to “One 3 credit global learning course and a global learning immersion experience.”

A Global Learning immersion experience can include an experience that is approved as meeting two or more Global Learning outcomes and can include a study abroad experience, an internship, a capstone experience, a living learning community, and others.

_The 4 Global Learning Outcomes and associated benchmarks need to be approved by APC before we can adopt this credit-outcomes-based hybrid model._

**Challenges:** Immersion experiences have to be identified as meeting the Global Learning Outcomes and instructors/facilitators will be responsible for this.

**Option 3: Credit-Based Model**

The current LE proposal includes a 6 credit requirement of coursework in Race, Gender and Ethnicity and a 3 credit requirement for Global Learning.

A more flexible model would be “A student complete 9 credits of Race, Gender Ethnicity and Global Learning through her/his Liberal Education coursework to include a minimum of 3 credits in Race, Gender, Ethnicity and a minimum of 3 credits in Global Learning.”

**Challenges:** We have all invested in a variety of initiatives in Liberal Education reform and it will be a challenge to make compromises in order to allow for flexibility. And, the 6 credit requirement for Race, Gender, Ethnicity has already been voted on by APC.

---
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_“Life is not a matter of Milestones, but of Moments.”_
Dr.s Yelkur, Sen and Anand:

The Academic Policies Committee (APC) is scheduled to continue their discussion of Global Learning as it pertains to Liberal Education reform.

The current proposal from the University Liberal Education (http://www.uwec.edu/Undergrad/Liberal-Education-Reform.htm) contains the following requirement that will form the basis of our discussion:

One global learning course or a study abroad experience. Courses meeting this requirement are noted by “GL” in the catalog.

Would you be able to attend the APC meeting scheduled for on Tuesday, November 6, 2012 in the Ho-Chunk Room (Davies 320E) from 2-3 p.m. We will be discussing curriculum proposals prior to discussing Global Learning.

Dr. Anand, per your request in the last meeting for the proposal under discussion, please see the following document found at the above link under this bullet:

Review APC Action on the ULEC Liberal Education Reform Proposal
- ULEC Proposal with APC Edits - contains discussion/vote action on each component of the ULEC Liberal Education reform proposal. This document is updated weekly. Please see APC minutes for details.

As the Academic Policies Committee is likely to vote on the Global Learning requirement on November 6, would you please give some thought as to what you, the global experts on campus, would like to see that requirement look like? As was introduced in our October 23 meeting, we are moving towards aligning requirements with outcomes. If you three draft some particular verbiage that captures what you want to see in a global learning requirement, will you please email it to me by Wednesday, October 31, so that I can include it in the meeting materials to the Committee members?

Thank you for taking the campus lead on this important issue,

Jean

Dr. Jean A. Pratt
Chair, Academic Policies Committee
715.836.3155