

**Global Studies Open Forum Summary**  
**November 11-12, 2014**  
**3-4:30 p.m.**  
**Stevenson Hall Room 401**

Mark Temple, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee called the meetings to order at 3:05 p.m. in Stevenson Hall Room 401.

The senate-approved process for making changes to graduation requirements was discussed. Further information is available on the Provost's website.

Temple assured participants that this was indeed the beginning of the process where feedback from the campus community was being collected. The end result, if needed, would be a recommendation from UCC to the Provost and the Academic Senate.

The General Education Task Force (GETF) spoke frequently about infusing an international perspective across General Education. That remains more of a goal than a reality. The current Global Studies requirement was discussed with proponents for both maintaining the current requirement and those suggesting it might be broadened. However the Global studies requirement was beyond the scope of GETF. There was agreement that more conversation were needed.

In 2013-2014, Global Studies was discussed in both the Council on General Education (CGE) and at the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). There was enough interest in exploring additional options beyond the current course requirement that a list of options was developed for further discussion. Also developed was a sacrificial draft of learning outcomes for the expanded requirement:

“Meaningful engagement in an increasingly global society demands an appreciation of cultural differences. The international studies requirement is designed to allow students to demonstrate the ability to:

- Navigate and reflect upon a global city, workplace, or community;
- Make informed cultural comparisons;
- Analyze the forces that affect cultural change.”

A draft of a broader requirement was presented to those in attendance and can be found on the Provost's website:

“The international studies requirement may be satisfied by the completion of:

- A course examining the cultures and traditions of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, or Indigenous Peoples of the World (AMALI) at Illinois State University;
- An Illinois Articulation Initiative course examining “non-Western” culture designated by an “N” in the IAI numbering system;
- A foreign language course at the forth-semester level or above or equivalent proficiency;
- An approved credit-bearing study abroad experience at the college level;
- An approved international internship or service experience abroad sponsored by Illinois State University or other college or university;
- International student status or significant experience abroad as demonstrated by transcript or other evidence.”

Next Steps: “The University Curriculum Committee will conduct a review of the proposed change(s) and the subcommittee’s recommendations. Following its usual process, proposed change(s) will circulate to the University community for comment. The UCC may refer recommendations back to the subcommittee for further consideration. If any changes are approved, the UCC will then forward its recommendations to the Provost and the Academic Senate. The Provost will consider the merits of the recommendations and also the feasibility of implementation, including staffing implications and other costs. The Provost may refer recommendations back to the University Curriculum Committee for further consideration”

Comments from this open forum along with other feedback will be reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee to inform its discussion and eventual recommendations.

Concern was expressed regarding progress that may have already been made in broadening requirements. There have been notes in the minutes of UCC and other committees. The draft of broader requirements was questioned.

The General Education Task Force hoped to see a more international perspective in curriculum. It is hard to get an infused model in General Education and was not in the purview of General Education Task Force. However Jon Rosenthal was charged to take the conversation to other groups. He spoke about this at the Council for General Education and the University Curriculum Committee. The minutes that discuss global studies are in no way catalog copy and are merely a generated list to assist in moving the conversation along.

Questions regarding the need to continue the study of AMALI countries were posed and concern expressed that proposed revisions to global studies may allow some students to leave ISU having been exposed to only a Eurocentric perspective.

Concern was expressed that the list of possible requirements may actually be diluting global studies rather than strengthening it.

Concern was expressed that foreign language would fulfill the global studies requirement. Even though study of a foreign language is a benefit to students, there is concern that it is not enough.

Is there something wrong or a problem with the current global studies requirement that this is being brought up now? Some would encourage one course or more. There may be rigor lacking and would a trip abroad replace a 16 week course. There is a responsibility to provide a minimum of rigor. Some would like to include additional items on the list rather than having them as a replacement.

The importance of foreign language was expressed while noting that the two largest study abroad programs are England and Ireland which are English speaking. Not much meat on the bone for foreign language and study abroad.

A credit-bearing study abroad experience is not approved by the University Curriculum Committee. Who approves these? There is no curricular process involved. Would UCC be willing to delegate its power to International Studies?

Typically departments that are participating in study abroad programs are approving the courses. Even if there is a third party program, students have to secure syllabi and get approval from the department

for credit to be awarded. Sally Parry reviews syllabi for courses taken abroad for IAI credit. If they are taken as part of the General Education program, Jon Rosenthal looks at syllabi.

As part of the deployment of the International Strategic Plan there are conversations about what these global learning outcomes should be for the whole university. What do we want our students to have? We must look at dimensions of the university curriculum and co-curriculum. What outcomes do we want?

We do not have curricular outcomes common to all AMALI courses at this time. When we meet with specialized faculty in global studies outcomes would need to be developed.

The AMALI requirement seems lost in this draft. There should be a particular focus on countries not represented and that value reflected in the curriculum.

It is important to strengthen and not allow escape clauses/loopholes for the global studies requirement. A University-wide language requirement may help as a way to get students ready to go to other countries, but should not replace the global studies requirement.

Proposed outcomes are not really outcomes that are useful. We as a university need to decide what that means for us. AAC&U has developed literature and rubrics. This is more in tune with what individuals in today's societies need. Outcomes will help in preparing students. There should be more conversations about what that means for ISU.

International Strategic Plan Goals may help to clarify campus wide global learning goals.

Students are not well informed about other countries. Study of AMALI regions is important. More study abroad may not broaden student perspectives.

AMALI courses as described in the catalog are a place where "exploration of the culture(s) is developed in a comparative perspective which helps the student understand and appreciate differences between the culture(s) under consideration and cultures and traditions of America." It is important to keep these comparative.

Applied majors already have 120 hours. There is no question that it is good to have a global studies course and to study abroad. However there is not room for many students to be able to do this. What knowledge and skills do want students to acquire? These are difficult questions, and that is why it has become part of the public discussion and process.

A comparative approach has great value in cultural education. Educate students to appreciate their position in the world and to have appreciation for the global economy/ AMALI countries.

AMALI is being pitted against Europe. The concern is that students will choose Europe of AMALI if given the choice. It is unfortunate to pit the two against each other.

What does it mean to be a global citizen? How do we help our students?

It feels like it is study abroad versus AMALI course. Is it possible to provide courses that scale the entire globe such as a global course like world music or world film as a way of approaching the global studies requirement?

There are academic and experiential forms of learning. Can we guarantee a sustained academic focus? Imagine the study abroad purpose. Is it a semester long study abroad course? There are also some study abroad opportunities that should not go through or count. How can we decide what is acceptable? Would it be all or nothing?

GETF discussed an international path through Gen Ed that might culminate with study abroad. For students in many applied majors, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years are solidly booked with major requirements.

MCN has a very structured curriculum that has a transcultural program. Russia does not meet global requirement, but the program does expose students to vulnerable populations – not opposed to AMALI countries, but there are other countries that have poverty and oppression. AMALI limits courses that integrate Russia. Is there an avenue that allows a broadening definition? The Nursing program is an excellent example of a non-AMALI global experience.

There are 37 courses that meet the AMALI requirement. Some can be taken as Gen Ed. Study abroad should be encouraged as part of the major and not sacrifice the AMALI requirement.

Meeting the requirement within major, for example, in science, is problematic. Going abroad to take courses in the sciences science may not immerse the student in another culture.

Students in accounting avoid humanities classes. They need to see AMALI class. The College of Business is looking at Global experiences. However it does not meet this need. Feel we need to keep AMALI course.

I agree with MCN. We can get that experience from places other than AMALI. I would favor keeping it open.

The draft ideas may allow for so many ways to opt out.

It is no one's intention to weaken the Global requirement. Faculty and staff are passionate about outcomes.

Part of the confusion is that committees are unclear about outcomes. Outcomes could be established by experts and informed by international strategic plan.

Appreciation is not an either/or. What do we want our student to look like?

Institution has rich urban program that has been integrated into many programs.

Urban Education Model made no new courses, but made courses richer. Could we use this approach to bring in people that are interested from different areas?

What process will serve our university? What is the process for clarifying learning goals that will allow us to arrive there?

We need a procedure to be sure things are done effectively. Are we at the point where we need to have more dialog? This should be tabled.

There are other venues. We would rather see a broader discussion about what can be done.

When and why was the term global studies used? It was AMALI and now it is global studies. The answer is unclear at this point. The AMALI requirement was included in General Education in 1998, but then included as a graduation requirement in 1999. The term Global Studies was used at this point.

It was pointed out that "Global Studies" is misleading and the name may be at the root of the current proposal to become more "global" and less AMALI.

I would have a problem seeing a foreign language course or some kind of internship in a multinational center be substituted for an AMALI course. Those to me do not fulfill the requirement which is already thin, quite scandalous actually. A number of things on the list are quite problematic. They do not ask students to learn something about other cultures. Requirement needs to be about education and acquiring knowledge, then using that knowledge in engaged ways.

If a student goes to Canterbury they do not study AMALI. That is scandalous. I am a great promoter of study abroad, but not on the back of others particularly when our nation is at odds with much of the world. Are we telling our students that the middle-east is not important?

What is the purpose of this revision? What do we really want to accomplish?

If we chose to make an amendment are we saying that something was wrong?

It is not clear to me why this proposal came up. What is the logic or rationale for broadening the requirement?

There are competing goods. Many majors require 120 hours and there is not room for students to make choices. It was discussed in the General Education Task Force how to infuse international through the General Education Program. Global studies is a graduation requirement and outside of the GETF purview, hence the current process.

We started with an end product, and that was not the best way to proceed. We do not have common learning outcomes for global studies courses; because we do not have outcomes, we cannot assess the program. The senate process allows us to get specialists together to discuss common learning outcomes across all courses in the category. That would very much help to further the conversation.

The logic of broadening the requirement is to allow students to have more flexibility to study abroad.

Could we not make syllabi with common outcomes that are written broadly enough? Is it possible to review current syllabi for common outcomes? This would give us a start on understanding what is common to these courses.

We do not have any idea what type of learning this is supposed to be. Outcomes define learning. I am a proponent of learning outcomes. Then we have a way to assess. Outcomes also give instructors an idea if students are learning what they are supposed to.

The starting point of our conversation ought to be student learning.

I'm not going to sacrifice myself as the sole voice against learning outcomes. I, too, trust my colleagues. However, the root of "research" is "search" because you don't know what you are going to find. We must enable student to learn in the most productive way possible. We need to recognize what picture that gives us. This is an opportunity to think about curriculum and some structures.

Suppose that instead of learning outcomes, we discuss "first principles" in these courses?

How would we like our students' lives to be different?

We can call it first principles instead of outcomes. Our particular student body, we teach a very specific kind of student that probably do come in with some knowledge of European culture but are clueless about the rest of the world.

Globalization has changed the picture. There are very real borders and it is important to think about problems defined by borders. It is hasty to think that these borders have somehow disappeared.

We are not asking how we can make our students lives different. We are asking how we can make the world different. We need an affective curriculum that tries to make a better world.

Seems to me we are talking about three different things (Global, AMALI, Diversity) that overlap. What kind of requirement do we want our student to have in terms of international, AMALI, diversity. Outcomes would make clear to student and faculty.

If I remember correctly AMALI was established to keep students from a Eurocentric education. There is concern how these requirements assure a student can be exposed to non-western.

Why not Russia?

Why did AMALI change to Global? We should be deeply invested in non-western thought.

Indigenous peoples are the least known in that respect. The "I" in AMALI (indigenous peoples) is marginalized. It is not always possible to study abroad. Learning outcomes would be interesting. This focuses our attention on assessment. One theory is that as students spread and come back together, they are cross-pollinating. Routine assessment may not be appropriate.

The kinds of questions are much more specific - is it fair to have a common learning outcome for all courses? Lack of knowledge about Europe is an artifact from new Gen Ed from 97-98 - emptying out of European culture. It is the K-12 education that is Eurocentric. The AMALI part of our education in this country is lacking. If we have a problem with Europe lets deal with that.

How can we globalize all curriculum without diluting texts and artifacts from elsewhere in the world?

I prefer AMALI and object to the term non-western.

We are responding in fear that this proposal would take away AMALI.

It is unfortunate that there needs to be a proposal for change to promote discussion. This has been the case with both Writing Across the Curriculum and Global Studies.

We need to be careful about study abroad.

The last two days of conversation bring to bear what we want to teach our students. The dialog has been great.

Whatever we do the conversation has to be deep. We have to figure out a way that this happens and not just superficially without compromising the program.

We are trying to infuse global studies into the curriculum. One AMALI course is not enough. We need more than one.

This is a wonderful time to be gathering feedback and information. Cultural awareness is in the forefront and part of the goals of the university in *Educating Illinois*. Plenty of our students are aware and we are denigrating our students unduly. I would like to go back to digging around and identifying our students and then addressing those specific needs. More conversation with faculty members is needed. How do we really get around globalization so that it knitted into the fabric of ISU?

Should we broaden requirement? Seems to miss large point which is should we expand the requirement or not.

We need to better define AMALI before further discussion.

Many of our students are very intelligent. Headlines show that there is a reduction in cultural literacy. There is more than just east and west.

What are like minded institutions doing?

Can UCC use education data mining to identify and articulate learning outcome?

This is beyond the purview of the faculty on UCC. UCC could facilitate but not do this as a committee.

There needs to be money behind the effort. We need to increase our awareness by pieces of art on our walls, maps. It is a big world that we need to appreciate. It is about what difference it will make to children in the future.

As the director of Ethnic Studies, Susan Kalter, volunteered to work with assessment office.

Student affairs also creates opportunities for students. UCC cannot do all things. Do we have the will as a campus to raise awareness? This would not happen overnight. We must have the will and the expertise. International studies notes that it is not just about outcomes, but what happens to our students.

Fully support advocating multiple sites and modes of teaching. Too much talk of experience and attitudes makes me uncomfortable. This cannot be substituted for knowledge. Let us not take knowledge out of this component.

Does anybody know how other institutions deal with this?

There are plenty of models out there, some of which were shared as part of the committee discussion process.