

## I. Executive Summary

Duke University has a longstanding commitment to internationalization and to global education in general. In determining a focus for its Quality Enhancement Plan the institution took into account many possible topics; after eighteen months of discussion and debate, it determined that preparing its undergraduate students for lives as citizens of the world was a particularly salient feature of liberal learning in this century and hence a most appropriate topic for Duke. Therefore, our QEP centers on the theme “Global Duke: Enhancing Students’ Capacity for World Citizenship.”

The QEP is designed to increase Duke’s focused attention on global challenges and paths to meeting them, and to foster attitudes and values that will enable Duke graduates to learn and function most effectively in the world—to be “world citizens,” in other words. Taken as a whole, the QEP has three student learning outcomes: (1) Knowledge: an awareness of significant contemporary issues and their global scope, including the history, differences, and perspectives of and within regions and cultures; (2) Skills: the ability to engage positively with, and learn from, people of different backgrounds and in different environments; and (3) Attitudes: self-awareness as both national and global citizen. The overarching program objective is that activities associated with the QEP will contribute to the development of bonds within the student body through shared experiences, and in so doing will further strengthen the sense of Duke as a learning community.

We propose three paths to fulfill these outcomes. Two of them are new curricular initiatives: a Winter Forum and a Global Semester Abroad. The third path is infrastructural: a Global Advising Program. Each has particular learning outcomes tied to the large-scale ones noted above; assessment of achievement is built into the programs.

The **Winter Forum** is a 2.5-day immersive on-campus experience immediately before the start of classes in spring semester. Through lectures, workshops, group work, and service it will expose students to an important global issue, imparting knowledge, and enhancing skills in evaluating that issue from multiple viewpoints. The first Winter Forum will be held in January 2010.

The **Global Semester Abroad** offers a theme-based, two-country experience and focuses on comparing and contrasting a specific issue in different environments and cultures. The pilot program will be inaugurated in spring semester 2011 with a study of global health in both India and Singapore.

The **Global Advising Program** provides a team of specialized resource people to promote the many global opportunities already existing at Duke; help students tie together the various global initiatives in which they have engaged or have an interest in engaging; and work with other constituencies here and abroad to develop globally-focused programs and internships for undergraduates. The first two global advisors will be hired in spring 2010.

The five-year, \$3 M project (.5M covered by semester abroad tuition) officially begins in late spring 2009 with planning for the first Winter Forum.

A QEP concentration on enhancing our students’ capacity for global citizenship arises from Duke’s strategic planning, complements and strengthens our undergraduate curricula, better

integrates global opportunities with classroom and co-curricular programs, and focuses on well-established issues of importance to student learning.

## II. Process Used to Select and Develop the QEP Topic<sup>1</sup>

### A. Selecting the Focus

The process of selecting the focus of the Duke University QEP began in fall semester 2006 and concluded in spring 2008, when the leadership team of faculty, students, and senior administrators approved the QEP Committee's recommendation to focus on better preparing Duke's undergraduates for global citizenship. In the earliest stages, from September 2006 through mid-June of 2007, the Duke liaison to SACS, vice provost Judith Ruderman, made presentations around campus on the significance and requirements of the QEP while soliciting potential topics from a variety of constituencies. Appendix B provides the list of groups with whom these early discussions were held; Appendix C, a copy of vice provost Ruderman's March 2007 solicitation of reactions to QEP topics as of March 2007, includes the topics suggested through those discussions over the course of nine months. In addition to presentations, outreach was conducted through communications in Duke news vehicles and the provost's website.

The leadership team, from its inception in fall 2006, also discussed the components of educating our students for the world of the future, and several iterations of a draft "case statement" or explanatory narrative informed these discussions. (Appendix D, from June 2007, provides an example.) The provost held three "blue sky" conversations with students, faculty, and administrators in spring 2007 to get additional input into the key elements of such an education. (Summary minutes from one of these are included as Appendix E.) At its June 2007 meeting, after a review of the topics garnered from the campus-wide presentations, along with the summaries of the small-group conversations, the team determined that the overarching theme of "Re-Imagining Liberal Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century"—the title suggested by the undergraduate member of the leadership team—should provide direction for the QEP committee. It also determined that *undergraduate* education would be the focus although graduate and professional students would be folded into the plan as appropriate.

Committee co-chairs were then appointed from the faculty in July 2007: Professors Mary T. ("Tolly") Boatwright from Classical Studies and Prasad Kasibhatla from the Nicholas School of the Environment. Two chairs were chosen rather than just one in order to emphasize and encourage interdisciplinary and inter-school perspectives and integration. The QEP Committee itself was formed the following month. To reinforce the emphasis on interdisciplinarity and integration of the professional schools, the committee was intentionally a large one of 26 members from across the university, including faculty from the graduate and professional schools as well as from the ranks of the undergraduate faculty; current undergraduate and graduate/professional students; a young alumnus; academic deans from Trinity College; and an administrator from Student Affairs. Appendices F and G list the members of the leadership team and QEP committee, respectively.

Throughout the fall of 2007, the QEP committee met every three weeks to discuss the possibilities for creating a specific action plan from the broad theme. It reviewed and discussed literature on liberal education, such as the seminal 1998 *American Scholar* article, "Only Connect. . ." The Goals of a Liberal Education," and the more recent (2005) and provocative

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for summary timetable of this process.

“Liberal Education on the Ropes,” by Stanley Katz; debated the meaning of the term; and considered which elements of liberal education were most critical as the focus of undergraduate education and hence of Duke’s QEP. By the end of November 2007—after presentations by the co-chairs and SACS liaison to a variety of groups on campus, with additional informal discussions with non-committee colleagues and students—several foci emerged in the committee’s collective mind as important elements of liberal education. Foremost among these were critical thinking; interdisciplinarity; assessment of personal growth; preparation for post-Duke life; integration of undergraduate education with the graduate and professional schools; and global citizenship. After further discussion, the committee decided to break into four groups for more intensive work on possible foci for a QEP. Two of these groups examined key stages in an undergraduate’s career that had not yet received at Duke the same focused attention as year one (which is characterized by an all-freshmen campus and a program of interlocking seminars): these stages are transition from the first to the second years, and the interface between majors and the graduate and professional schools in the junior/senior years. A third subcommittee took an overview approach to all four years. A fourth group took up the topic of global citizenship because of its pertinence to the entirety of an undergraduate’s career.

Over continuing committee meetings in spring semester 2008, the QEP Committee determined that enhancing undergraduates’ capacity for global citizenship was the most appropriate focus for Duke’s QEP. Discussion made it clear that this topic is not only a critical element of liberal education for living, learning, and working in 21<sup>st</sup> century, but also a natural fit with Duke’s strategic planning over the last decade. For example, *Making a Difference* (2006) identifies five enduring themes that define Duke, one of which is internationalization. Here is the first paragraph of that theme’s description, which culminates with the need for all members of the Duke community to be “citizens of this world”:

The events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq changed the world, dramatizing the religious, political, economic, cultural, military, and intellectual challenges that confront the rapidly globalizing, post-cold war world. These challenges have prompted nations, peoples, and institutions to consider more closely how they define themselves, and they have forced universities to frame new paradigms for research and education. Seeking to understand and thrive in this complicated new environment, Duke has increasingly focused on developing a sensitivity to, and awareness of, the fact that we operate in an interdependent world, where what were once hard and fast borders are now permeable, where individuals are part of an increasingly global community, and where problems transcend traditional boundaries. To be citizens of this world, we must be knowledgeable about issues that impact that world, such as global warming, poverty and pandemics, and conflicting cultures, and proactive in using that knowledge to make a difference.  
(<http://stratplan.duke.edu/ch03/4.html>)

Duke is already doing much to promote global literacy and initiatives. Several undergraduate majors and certificate programs, most especially the major in International Comparative Studies, concentrate on language and culture studies in various parts of the world. The position of vice provost for international affairs was inaugurated in 1995; more recently, a senior advisor to the president and provost for international strategy was established as well. The vice provost oversees the internal internationalization of the university, while the senior advisor focuses on overseas initiatives. The Provost’s Office supports Duke’s seven international and foreign area centers, as well as seven signature interdisciplinary institutes, several of which have a global reach. We have 300 international exchange agreements. Trinity College supports study abroad

programs that enroll 45-50% of all undergraduates. The percentage of international students within the Graduate School has held steady at about 35 percent for several years, and the average among the professional programs is about the same; the percentage is much lower among the undergraduate student body but growing with greater financial aid resources for international students. Duke University's graduate and professional schools have for several years enjoyed a global reach, with projects and instruction in sites all over the world. Duke is now creating additional infrastructures overseas in five countries and is internationalizing all support service (payroll, HR, accounting, etc.) to function globally. DukeEngage (<http://dukeengage.duke.edu/>), inaugurated in 2007, will place roughly 300 students in 2009 in non-credit service learning projects in the United States and abroad, with a hundred more doing follow-up independent research projects for credit. Nonetheless, the QEP committee identified that, as much as this institution is already doing, there are gaps that a well-conceived Plan might fill to enhance undergraduate education at Duke. Section III below provides more detail on the gaps the QEP is designed to address.

## **B. Developing the focus**

The task for the QEP Committee at that stage was to determine the program or programs that would achieve the overarching goal of enhancing the capacity for global citizenship. Again, much discussion and debate took place around the table during spring semester 2008 as the committee parsed out aspects of global citizenship, scrutinized current Duke programs (see Appendix H of related programs), and identified gaps and possibilities for filling them. In May 2008, having developed a working rationale for the choice of focus, the co-chairs presented three possible components to the leadership team in late spring 2008: 1) a winter forum, 2) global advising program, and 3) better integration of international students into the fabric of Duke life. The leadership team encouraged the further development of these three themes over the summer. (The idea of a semester abroad program in which students would explore a global theme in two countries was briefly put on the table at that meeting but not approved by the leadership team at the time.)

During the summer of 2008, subcommittees worked to flesh out the three components. A fourth subcommittee took up the topic of a global semester abroad, because international initiatives at the professional level opened up new possibilities for undergraduates' engagement abroad and the Committee was energized about the prospects. Again, a draft case statement provided a central text around which the committee could organize its thinking. (See Appendix I, dated Sept. 2008.) At its first fall meeting in 2008, the QEP committee discussed all four possibilities and decided to recommend three components to the leadership team, two curricular and one infrastructural:

- 1) a winter forum;
- 2) a global semester abroad; and
- 3) a global advising program.

The integration of international students, it was decided, would play a role in each of these components rather than serve as a separate focus. At its September 2008 meeting the leadership team gave its blessing to this revised list of QEP components and sent the committee forth to develop the Plan further. Three subcommittees, consulting with pertinent groups and individuals across campus, including focus groups with undergraduates (report available on Provost's website, .....), further refined the components into the Plan that follows. The Fostering Global Citizenship in Higher Education conference in November 2008, at the University of Vermont and co-sponsored with World Learning/SIT and Middlebury College, also informed the final plan. Appendix J lists the presentations to individuals and units that helped to

shape the final product. Appendix K lists the Duke faculty and staff who served as consultants to the three subcommittees and usually attended subcommittee meetings as well.

### **III. The Topic—Global Duke: Enhancing Students’ Capacity for World Citizenship**

#### **A. Introduction to the Term**

That our early discussions of “education for the world of the future” (see Appendices A and E) led naturally into a focus on global citizenship is evidenced by salient points in those 2006/07 case statements: an emphasis on a world in which boundaries are more fluid and identities more nuanced; the need for co-existence and collaboration with diverse peoples; and the utility of interdisciplinary perspectives for fostering understanding of, and addressing, the complexities of societal challenges. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century world, a capacity for global citizenship is the sine qua non for a meaningful life.

We are mindful of the fact that, as one writer put it in a 2007 article on “Teaching for Global Literacy in Higher Education,” the concept of global citizenship is “nefariously overused” (Schuerholz-Lehr 182). That said, this is the concept, and the term, that best captures what Duke University wishes to enhance through its Quality Enhancement Plan. Having come to the topic organically, through an iterative process involving many different campus constituencies, this university became aware of other recent QEPs centered on the same topic—most notably Wake Forest’s and Georgia Tech’s—and often utilizing the same term. Whether this constitutes “nefarious overuse” we are not qualified to say; but it seems to us that if the term is in great circulation these days it is because it resonates with higher education’s awareness of the importance of preparing students to live as citizens of the world as well as of their individual countries. To avoid the charge of overuse of a buzzword, let us clarify the term: Duke’s QEP uses “global” to designate awareness of any issue’s largest contexts: spatial (local, national, international), temporal (past and future, as well as present), and cultural (social, political, religious, environmental, and artefactual, among others).

#### **B. Definition of World Citizenship and Expected Capacities of a World Citizen**

Broadly defined, world citizenship consists of a set of three key elements: knowledge, skills, and attitudes that equip a person to function effectively as a citizen in a globalized world (Burrows; Gibson, Rimmington, & Landwehr-Brown). Such a world is increasingly interdependent, interconnected, and culturally diverse as a result of interaction among contemporary economic, technological, sociocultural, and political forces (Anheier, Glasius, and Kaldor; Croucher; Oblinger and Verville; Rimmington). Such a world exposes all its peoples to major challenges particularly related to trade, health, peace, technology, and the environment.

The mission statement of Duke University begins with the goal of providing “a superior liberal education to undergraduate students, attending not only to their intellectual growth but also to their development as adults committed to high ethical standards and full participation as leaders in their communities” (<http://www.trustees.duke.edu/governing/mission.php>). Our QEP intends to enhance that education by emphasizing global challenges and paths to meeting them, and by fostering attitudes and values to enable Duke graduates to learn and function most effectively in the world—to be “world citizens,” in other words. According to Burrows, a world citizen should possess a well-developed set of cognitive abilities and sense of the self as a global self, and should engage with the contemporary world in an effective and ethical fashion. Specifically, a world citizen should have the ability to understand global forces that affect people’s lives, the ability to address global issues from a multidisciplinary perspective, the ability to understand the

diversity of human experience, and the ability to construct new ideas or plans to generate effective action in the contemporary world. A world citizen should develop a sense of a global identity, concern for global issues, and a respect for human difference. In addition, for active and effective engagement in a globalized world, a world citizen should have the ability to function effectively in a culture other than one's own, including the ability to adapt to new persons and new situations, the ability to make informed judgments about strengths and weaknesses in evaluating specific individuals, cultural practices, and specific problems or situations, the motivation to act on global issues, and the ability to act with effectiveness and ethical concern. Based on their review of recent literature on the topic, Gibson, Rimmington, and Landwehr-Brown have neatly summarized the knowledge, skills, and attitudes and values a world citizen should have, which is reproduced in Table 1 for easy reference.

**TABLE 1**  
Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes and Values of a World Citizen

Element	Details
Knowledge	Understanding of culture, diversity, globalization, interdependence, global irregularities, peace and conflict, nature and environment, sustainable development, possible future scenarios, social justice
Skills	Emphasize research and inquiry skills, theory testing, critical thinking, communication skills and political skills essential for civic engagement in a global society, ability to challenge injustice and inequalities, cooperation, and conflict resolution
Attitudes and values	Appreciation of human dignity, respect for people and things, belief that people can make a difference, empathy toward other cultures and viewpoints, respect for diversity, valuing justice and fairness, commitment to social justice and equity, curiosity about global issues and global conditions that shape one's life, concern for the environment, and commitment to sustainable development

Note: Fisher and Hicks and Oxfam provide more detail.

### **C. Filling Gaps at Duke**

We have noted above (pp. 2-3), and in Appendix H, the many Duke programs that help to enhance a student's capacity for global citizenship. Nonetheless, gaps exist that the three components of the QEP can help to fill.

Duke now lacks a common, broad-based learning experience highlighting global issues and bringing many different constituencies together into a learning community. Duke has been a pioneer in offering a rich undergraduate experience for first-year students called the Focus program (<http://www.trinity.duke.edu/academics/opps/focus.php>), which is a semester-long series (mostly in the fall semester) of interdisciplinary, theme-based seminars, with related out-of-class activities. Several of these themes have a global focus. About a quarter of first-year students engage in Focus; in the spring semester typically two Focus themes are offered and are open to both freshmen and sophomores. Upper class students, however, have no access to such clusters of related courses from different disciplines, unless they design their own interdisciplinary majors under Program II (<http://www.aas.duke.edu/program2/>), which only about 10 students do per year (less than one percent of the graduating class). In any case, the Focus program fosters a learning community in a way that we would like to replicate in a larger

group setting, with upper class students in the mix, and utilizing the talent across Duke's many schools.

As well, Duke is short on opportunities for students to explore, in one focused program, global issues in different parts of the world. Our robust study abroad program currently concentrates on immersive experiences in a single country or region that are not specifically focused on a global challenge (<http://studyabroad.duke.edu/home/Programs>).<sup>2</sup> In addition, these experiences have traditionally been weighted toward Western Europe and Australia. Finally, although more than 40% of Duke University undergraduates study abroad at some point in their Duke career, participation in study abroad is highest among humanities and social science students, and lowest among natural science and engineering students. Many of the engineering and science majors, especially those who are "pre-med," do not participate in study abroad at the same rate as the student body as a whole (25% of engineers and 30% of pre-meds as compared to 46% of the student body as a whole). We would like to "open up" our study abroad offerings.

Finally, precisely because we offer so many global education opportunities as Duke, many students either do not know about the range of possibilities or are confused about how to integrate them into a meaningful whole. Students report that information relevant to these activities is dispersed and therefore not easily accessible. (See report on the fall 2008 student focus groups for QEP, [web address].) Although globalization is a signature element of Duke University, advisors have not had the resources and mandate to know the "big picture," to help develop intercultural competencies, and to serve as the same kind of specialized resources as our pre-health professions, pre-law, and related focused advisors.

In these gaps we are not alone: Derek Bok, in *Our Underachieving Colleges*, laments that for all the strides that institutions of higher learning have made in seeking to build global citizenship, "still lacking on most campuses . . . is a thoughtful, comprehensive plan to combine these opportunities into well-integrated programs that can be fitted in with all the other legitimate aims of a rounded undergraduate education" (2006, 240). A QEP concentration on enhancing our students' capacity for global citizenship arises from Duke's strategic planning, complements and strengthens our current Trinity College curricular requirement of cross-cultural inquiry<sup>3</sup> (currently being re-examined in order to increase its effectiveness), better integrates global opportunities

---

<sup>2</sup> Study abroad at Duke has existed for several decades, beginning modestly with language courses in China, France and Germany. By 1992 24% of Duke's graduating seniors had studied abroad. In 1994 Duke adopted a plan for internationalization that called for expanding participation rates to 35% of each class. A centralized office (now known of as the Office of Study Abroad, <http://studyabroad.duke.edu/home>) centralized Duke's various study abroad initiatives, and a new policy allowed Duke undergraduates to use their financial aid to study abroad. Duke's Office of Study Abroad now administers 14 semester or full-year Duke-In programs in 11 countries, and 21 summer programs in 18 countries. The goals of Duke's Study Abroad have similarly grown, shifting from language to cultural immersion; programs now regularly include courses on the history, literature, and politics of the host country, among other subjects.

<sup>3</sup> Duke's definition of Cross Cultural Inquiry (CCI) is as follows: "In a world where globalization is reshaping politics and economics as well as social and cultural relations, Duke students need formal and academic experience in exploring differences among peoples and among social systems with national and international contexts. CCI seeks to provide students with the tools to identify culture and cultural difference across time or place. It encourages critical and responsible attention to issues of identity, diversity, globalization, and power, so that students may evaluate complex and difficult issues from multiple perspectives." (See <http://www.t-reqs.trinity.duke.edu/curriculum/modes.html>.)

with the core of undergraduates' curricular programs, and focuses on well-established issues of importance to student learning.

The **Winter Forum** addresses the fact that Duke has few large-scale activities that bring many undergraduate students together in a collective intellectual enterprise, much less with graduate and professional students in the same shared endeavor. Occasionally a particular large lecture course or professor proves so attractive that hundreds of students gather to explore a subject of compelling interest; the QEP committee, and especially the undergraduates on that committee, expressed a desire to have more such shared intellectual experiences. Moreover, success of the interdisciplinary Focus program suggests that expansion into another, related realm would be similarly rewarding.<sup>4</sup> Meetings with stakeholders within the Graduate and Professional Students Council underscored their desire for more intellectual interaction with undergrads. Finally, some undergraduates find it particularly hard to fit travel abroad into their schedules (e.g., athletes, scientists), and an on-campus forum provides another route to exploring global issues.

The **Global Semester Abroad** complements Duke's existing immersion study abroad opportunities with a program focused on a global challenge in two sites away from Duke. A few of the study abroad programs have a thematic focus but largely move around within the same country (in Rome and Sicily, for example). Focus program of interlocking seminars around a common theme (<http://www.trinity.duke.edu/academics/opps/focus.php>), primarily intended for first-year students, and the new travel courses offered through the Duke University Marine Lab in Beaufort, NC (<http://www.nicholas.duke.edu/marinelab/programs/signature.html>), are other Duke "relatives" of the Global Semester Abroad. The Global Semester Abroad builds on these programs, and others around the country (see Appendix L), to enhance the study abroad options at this university. Because the requirements of the science and engineering majors in particular make study abroad less likely for these students than for those in other majors, the first iterations of the Global Semester Abroad will target these populations.

The **Global Advising Program**, part of Duke's continuing efforts to improve advising at Duke, adds a team of specialized resource people to serve students in several ways: promoting the many global opportunities already existing at Duke; helping students tie together the various global initiatives in which they have engaged or have an interest in engaging; and working with other constituencies here and abroad to develop globally-focused programs and internships for undergraduates.

It is worth stressing here that Duke's QEP, Enhancing Students' Capacity for Global Citizenship, is not aimed at having every Duke student study, intern, or serve abroad. Rather, we firmly believe that the challenging 21<sup>st</sup> century calls upon all students to understand the

---

<sup>4</sup> Another, related Duke initiative in process through the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies is relevant in this context. The goal of Project PUTTI (Provost's Undergraduate Team-Teaching Initiative) is to develop a series of problem-focused, team-taught multidisciplinary courses that will exist in the larger context of a set of academic offerings that include the Certificate and Focus Programs, as well as the Winter Forum. The courses will be developed for undergraduate students, but should include faculty in the professional schools and interdisciplinary institutes as well. The courses should address pressing global societal challenges and approach the study of those challenges from multiple disciplines. The Office of the Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies has formed a working group that will develop a preliminary proposal by the end of January 2009.



interdependence of our fragile world, and we recognize that students can come to this understanding in multiple ways. Duke students exhibit great diversity in their backgrounds, interests, and plans; their one commonality is education at Duke to be leaders. Duke's QEP thus intends to make as accessible and transparent as possible those educational and co-curricular opportunities that build understanding of global issues, whether their impact is studied abroad, in the U.S., or at home in the classroom at Duke.

#### **D. Assessment**

Special attention to assessment was part of the first prong of reaffirmation of accreditation, the compliance certification, when an Assessment Working Group (AWG) was formed to help the compliance certification team address those requirements, standards, and regulations with assessment components. The co-conveners of AWG, Drs. David Jamieson-Drake, director of institutional research, Office of the Provost, and Matt Serra, director of the Trinity College of Arts and Sciences Office of Assessment, also began to work with the QEP committee when the theme of global citizenship was selected. They were joined by Dr. Jiali Luo, assistant director of institutional research. Each was assigned to one of the three subcommittees, to provide input into the articulation of need, of learning outcomes, of evaluation measures, and of an overall assessment plan. Overall guidance and assistance with assessment was provided to all three subcommittees by Dr. Darla Deardorff, executive director of the Association of International Education Administrators and adjunct professor in the Masters of International Studies program at North Carolina State University; Jess Thornton, higher education analyst within the Duke Office of Institutional Research; and QEP member Professor Harris Cooper, an educational psychologist at Duke and a member of the National Academy of Sciences Standing Committee on Social Science Evidence in Use. The assessment components of the QEP are addressed in Section X.

### **IV. Learning Goals and Objectives of the QEP**

#### **A. Overarching Objectives**

The overarching goal of Duke's QEP is to enhance our students' capacity for global citizenship. We define "capacity" as competence (knowing how to do something in theory) and capability (the ability to put the competence into practice). Taking our cue from the literature as summarized in table 1 (page 6) and elaborated in the literature review that follows in section V, and factoring in a realistic appraisal of our ability and resources to implement the plan, we set the following student learning objectives for the QEP as a whole:

- 1) Knowledge: an awareness of significant contemporary issues and their global scope, including the history, differences, and perspectives of and within regions and cultures;
- 2) Skills: the ability to engage positively with, and learn from, people of different backgrounds and in different environments; and
- 3) Attitudes: self-awareness as both national and global citizen.

In addition to these student learning objectives, we have identified an overarching program objective. Activities associated with the QEP will contribute to the development of bonds within the student body through shared experiences, and in so doing will further strengthen the sense of Duke as a learning community.

## **B. Specific Program Outcomes**

Each of the three components of the QEP has specific student learning outcomes that contribute to enhancing students' capacity for global citizenship.

### **1. Winter Forum**

The Winter Forum, a 2.5 day immersive on-campus experience, will expose students to an important global issue, imparting knowledge and enhancing skills in evaluating that issue from multiple viewpoints. The student learning outcomes are to enhance the abilities to:

- a) gain knowledge of the global issue that is the subject of that year's Winter Forum from perspectives of multiple disciplines;
- b) evaluate a global challenge from multiple cultural, economic, geographical, and historical perspectives;
- c) engage in collaborative group work; and
- d) relate the Winter Forum experience to classroom coursework and co-curricular experiences.

The Winter Forum will additionally contribute to the overarching program outcome by providing students the opportunity for intellectual engagement outside of the classroom in a shared, intense experience with peers as well as with faculty and graduate/professional students from within and outside their expected or declared area(s) of interest.

### **2. Global Semester Abroad**

The Global Semester Abroad offers a theme-based, two-country experience and focuses on comparing and contrasting a specific issue in different environments and cultures. Through this experience, participants will be expected to achieve a number of learning objectives. The student learning outcomes are to enhance:

- a) knowledge about the chosen global theme from a comparative perspective;
- b) ability to work and communicate successfully in multi-cultural settings and with diverse peoples;
- c) cultural self-awareness; and
- d) integration of the Global Semester Abroad experience into subsequent curricular and co-curricular activities.

### 3. Global Advising Program

The Global Advising Program (GAP) provides a team of advisors with expertise in global opportunities both on and off campus as well as in intercultural competencies. The program will serve as a resource for all constituents by reaching out to students not currently engaged in global programs while at the same time expanding the information and guidance for students already served by existing programs. The student learning outcomes are to enhance:

- a) knowledge about the opportunities at Duke and beyond to develop global awareness;
- b) understanding of the importance of an international perspective by integrating some form of internationalization experience in to the academic plan;
- c) exploration and decision making, in an intentional and informed way, about the many global opportunities offered at Duke and beyond; and
- d) preparation for taking full advantage of whatever global experiences students undertake.

## V. Literature Review and Best Practices<sup>5</sup>

### A. Liberal education and the global society

In a world that is becoming socially, economically, and politically interdependent, cultivating college students' international awareness and cross-cultural competence has become increasingly important (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimovicz; Laubscher; Pascarella & Terenzini). A central aspect of liberal education is challenging students to embrace a concept of world as well as local citizenship (Bok; Nussbaum). Derek Bok avers that our colleges are "underachieving" in part because they are not focused intentionally enough on what a chapter title calls "preparing for a global society" (Bok 225). The National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America's Promise (LEAP), an arm of the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), specifies in its report *College Learning for the New Global Century* that liberal education must embrace what it calls Personal and Social Responsibility. This includes civic knowledge and engagement (local and global), intercultural knowledge and competence, ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning. In sum, "intercultural learning is already one of the new basics in a contemporary liberal education, because it is essential for work, civil society, and social life" ("*College Learning for the New Global Century*" 15). In this century, we look to liberal education to impart "the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that specifically equip students to function in the global context" (Green 15). This connection between liberal education and the global society underpins our selection of the QEP topic and the development of the three QEP components.

### B. Necessary competencies for global citizenship

To provide students with opportunities to engage deeply with different cultures and to equip them to function effectively in diverse environments, cultivating certain competencies appears to be essential. The competencies necessary for, and strengthened by, becoming a world citizen (which are often termed "intercultural competencies") include sensitivity and empathy (Nussbaum), curiosity and respect (Deardorff and Hunter 2006), tolerance of risk and ambiguity

---

<sup>5</sup> See Bibliography.

(Deardorff and Hunter; Yershova, DeJaeghere, and Mestenhauser), adaptation and flexibility (Gacel-Avila), and the ability to think comparatively (Yershova et al.). The development of these competencies occurs in “the dynamic interaction of cognitive, affective, and behavioral changes in an individual” (Yershova et al. 45). The interplay of all three is critical (Deardorff 2004). Yershova et al. underscore the importance of these competencies in “correcting biases, stereotypes, and prejudices, as well as in producing tolerance, global understanding, and in the creation and sharing of knowledge” (65-66; Green 16).

According to Yershova, et al., the knowledge base of intercultural competence includes four aspects: cultural–general knowledge (an understanding of why and how cultures differ), cultural self-awareness (an understanding of an individual’s own cultural programming that defines his or her self-conception, colors perceptions of the world, and determines values, assumptions, and beliefs), culture-specific knowledge (an in-depth understanding of one or more cultures with which one is mostly dealing), and knowledge of another language. Researchers deem culture-general knowledge the cornerstone of intercultural competence. In their discussion of the development of cross-cultural competence (another term for intercultural competence and also known as 3C in army leaders), Abbe, Gulick, and Herman state that the acquisition of cross-cultural competence builds partly from personal experiences involving the intersection of two or more cultures. Hence culture-specific learning is likely to contribute to culture-general competence.

Opportunities for developing such competencies are manifold. As Ashwill puts it, “there are ways of developing intercultural competence that do not necessarily include language learning and education abroad” (21). One might have international students and those with international experiences sharing their knowledge with others (Ashwill), or create a group or cooperative project involving persons from different backgrounds (Yershova et al.). This concept informs both the Winter Forum and the Global Semester Abroad.

### **C. Interdisciplinary, issues-oriented approach**

“In a world of daunting complexity, all students need practice in integrating and applying their learning to challenging questions and real-world problems” (“College Learning for the New Global Century” 13). Indeed, the best way to analyze problems is from interdisciplinary perspectives (Sternberg). The emerging field of Global Studies revolves around an issues-oriented, interdisciplinary approach. Best practices suggest the importance of including the impact of globalization on developing countries in order to diminish Euro- or US-centrism. “The challenge is to conceptualize the world as a composite interconnected whole—in terms of issues, agencies, institutions, and histories. Therefore, a global approach needs to broaden the scope of world history, cultures, societies, agency and institutions” (Shrivastava 2). More, a truly global approach is informed by recognition of the complexity of forces shaping national responses to international challenges (Shrivastava 15; Green 15-16). These concepts are at the heart of the Winter Forum and the Global Semester Abroad.

### **D. Collaborative Learning**

In our interdependent world, students should be taught to interact cooperatively instead of competitively. Cooperative Learning, defined as “an instructional technique whereby students work in small groups on a structured task to maximize their own and other’s learning potential” (Thompson and Pledger 4), entails five elements: positive interdependence; face-to-face interaction; individual accountability; and social skills group processing. Studies show that cooperative learning helps students perform better than those in more traditional, individualistic

classes (Potthast). “Intellectual conflict” or “academic controversy” within group work is an example of effective cooperative learning (D. Johnson, R. Johnson, and Smith, “Academic Controversy”; D. Johnson et al., “Cooperative Learning Returns to College”). The workshop on “Teaching and Learning in a Globally-Engaged Classroom” led by Professor Luis Vivanco of the University of Vermont—part of the Fostering Global Citizenship conference in November 2008 (referred to above, p. 3)—demonstrated the effectiveness of intellectual conflict as part of cooperative learning: workshop participants attending the mock Kyoto Protocol session, called a “summit,” of Professor Vivanco’s class Introduction to Global Studies saw firsthand how much the students had gained from working in teams to research the topic; develop and present their positions; defend their positions against those of others; and modify them as warranted (QEP member’s observation). The Winter Forum will feature collaborative learning of this kind.

### **E. Study Abroad**

As noted by Bok, one way of learning to understand and adapt to other cultures is to study abroad, which can benefit undergraduate students in a number of ways. First, study abroad promotes greater intercultural awareness, tolerance, and an appreciation of the differing views and customs encountered in other nations (Bok; Gary, Murdock, and Stebbins; Kitsantas and Meyers; Laubscher; Pascarella and Terenzini; Ryan and Twibell). Second, study abroad promotes positive attitudes toward cultural pluralism and “world-mindedness” (Bates; Carlson and Widman; Geelhoed, Abe, and Talbot; McCabe). Third, study abroad fosters greater interest in international economic, political, and cross-cultural issues and greater commitment to peace and international cooperation (Carlson, Burn, Useem, and Yachimovicz, “Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates”; Carlson et al., “The Experience of American Undergraduates” in Western Europe and the United States”; Ryan and Twibell; Sachdev). Fourth, study abroad decreases use of stereotypes and negative myths (Sachdev) and increases friendliness for visiting foreign nationals (Nesdale and Todd). Fifth, study abroad promotes reflective thought and helps students gain self-reliance, self confidence, personal well being, and an ability to function in complex environments (Bok; Kuh and Kaufman). Sixth, study abroad positively affects students’ emotional resilience, openness and flexibility, perceptual acuity and personal autonomy as well as the magnitude of students’ global understanding and cross-cultural skills (Kitsantas). Finally, study abroad increases interest in travel, art, history, and architecture, as well as growth in career advantage (Carsello and Greaser; Gary, Murdock, and Stebbins).

The learning objectives described in two articles—“Assessing the Impact of Business Study Abroad Programs on Cultural Awareness and Personal Development,” by H. Tyrone Black and David L. Duhon, and “Assessing Study Abroad’s Effect on an International Mission,” by Kimberly S. Gray, Gwendolyn K. Murdock, and Chad D. Stebbins—have largely informed our statement of the Global Semester Abroad learning outcomes.

Nationally, the student population most likely to study abroad is white females in the humanities (Salisbury). Barriers to study abroad programs include lack of awareness, perceived unimportance, complexity, social obligations, inflexibility of curriculum. Using Perna’s model of choice, Salisbury further notes that study abroad decisions are made on the bases of predisposition, access to information about opportunities, and evaluating the possibilities. GAP advisors can play a key role in helping students in all these realms.

Based on the senior and alumni survey data, we examined study-abroad participants’ skill development in comparison to students who did not participate in study abroad programs. The results showed that students who participated in study abroad programs were far more likely to

report higher levels of development in their abilities in four areas over the years: (a) to read or speak a foreign language, (b) to appreciate art, literature, music, and drama, (c) to place current problems in historical/cultural/philosophical perspective, and (d) to acquire broad knowledge in the arts and sciences. In addition, the multiple regression results from the senior survey revealed that participation in study abroad was positively correlated with the development of the ability to acquire new skills independently, to relate well to diversity, to identify moral and ethical issues, and to develop an awareness of social problems. The report “College Outcomes and Career Achievements of Study Abroad Participants” provides the detailed results from the longitudinal Duke senior and alumni surveys.

A stay of substantial length, especially for a semester or more, in active contact with foreign nationals not only improves foreign language proficiency but also leads to a loss of parochialism, a greater realism about other societies, and an abiding sense of their complexity and the hazards of easy generalization (Bok; Gary, Murdock, and Stebbins). Short-term study-abroad programs, defined as less than a semester in length, are increasing in number at U. S. colleges and universities (Hulstrand). A study to test the value of long-term study abroad versus short-term study abroad concluded that long-term study abroad has a greater impact on student growth, but intensive short-term programs can achieve similar results. That is, programs of at least six weeks’ duration can be “enormously successful in achieving important academic, personal, career and intercultural development outcomes” (Dwyer 162) provided there is careful planning, expert implementation, sufficient resources, and reinforcement of the value of the program (Dwyer; Hulstrand). These studies justify the shorter-term stays of the Global Semester Abroad even as they underline the need for Duke’s GAP.

Multicountry study abroad programs allow students to stay in multiple countries and “give students greater opportunities to recognize their own views, perceptions, beliefs and ideals” (West 24). Though some argue that multicountry programs do not provide this full immersion experience that permits students to learn a language and a culture, “studying in a single country is no guarantee that immersion will actually occur” as foreign students often stay together and never interact with the local population (West 20). Multicountry study abroad can be successful in developing immersion if the program maximizes student interaction with the local population as well as having students compare the different cultures they meet (West 24). According to Sanson quoted in West, the advantages to multicountry education abroad include enhancing student learning through “contrasting experiences in different areas,” and visiting more than one area allows students to feel as though they have acquired more value from their abroad experience (23). Through multicountry study abroad, students are able “to deepen their knowledge of particular disciplines, to benefit from cross-cultural comparisons, and to learn the lessons of life on the road” (19). This article validates that studying in multiple countries can lead students to develop the cross-cultural immersion experience that Duke plans to achieve with the Global Semester Abroad.

Reviews of features of issue-oriented programs similar to the one Duke is proposing (see Appendix L) suggest several best practices. For example, the International Honors Program and St. Johns University utilize home stays, guest lecturers, local faculty, field experiences, and living in both urban and rural areas.

## **F. Advising**

“Encouraging students to take advantage of learning opportunities that are designed to challenge their intellectual and social development and add value to the college experience is central to good academic advising and at the heart of student engagement” (Campbell and Nutt

5). Advisors are in “unique positions to help prepare students for the changing world through recommended curricula, extracurricular activities, and international experience” (Church; Chow). Global advising focuses on the local and national levels as well as the international (Chow). It centers on several aspects of an undergraduate’s education: curricula (languages beyond the intermediate level; courses on international relations, macroeconomics, world religions, history, cultural anthropology, politics of a region); clubs and organizations (linguistic, cultural appreciation, political awareness); and international experiences (Church). Though even short-term experiences often lead to personal change, students in short-term study abroad programs may not have sufficient time to process their experiences while they are away; advisors are key persons for helping these students “make meaning” of their experiences (Larkin). Returning study abroad students need pathways to courses and co-curricular opportunities to help maintain their engagement; organized information flows; connections with outside organizations where they can continue to hone their interests and also present their knowledge (Weinberg and Mandle). Higher education’s need for multidisciplinary studies, globalized curriculum, and experiential learning affects the kinds of advisors that are needed in turn (Gordon). “With the global turn and the ever-increasing demands to produce informed and critically-aware citizens, the guiding question for twenty-first century advisors must be: how do we, as academic advisors, connect the need for producing responsible citizens and life-long learners to our global community?” (Chow). The GAP is designed to respond to that question.

### **G. Learning Theory, Including Reflection and Discussion**

Recognizing the multiplicity of student learning and development theories, we provide here a brief review only of Kolb’s “Experiential Learning Theory” and person-environment interaction theories developed by Sanford and Astin, which seem especially relevant to the QEP. According to Kolb, “knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (41). He views learning as a cycle which starts from “concrete experience” to “reflective observation” to “abstract conceptualization” to “active experimentation” and back to concrete experience. In this four-stage learning cycle, concrete experiences provide the basis for observations and reflections. In the stage of critical reflection, learners ask questions about the experience in terms of previous experiences, while in the stage of abstract conceptualization, learners seek answers for their questions, making generalizations, drawing conclusions, and forming hypotheses about the experience. In the last stage of active experimentation, learners engage in action, testing the hypotheses and trying them out.

As described by Sanford, learning is a process of challenge and response, and for development to occur, students must be presented with environmental challenges balanced by support. According to Astin, “Students learn by becoming involved” (133). The more actively students are engaged with their college environment, the more learning and growth will occur. Based on Allport’s contact theory, however, not all types of contact or activities can naturally produce positive results. According to Allport, casual or superficial contact does not dispel prejudice; only deep contact and collaborative activities under the conditions of equal status, purposeful pursuits, and institutional supports can reduce intergroup prejudice and lead to change in attitudes.

The literature suggests the centrality of reflective thinking for meaningful engagement in global experiences (Yershova et al. 56; Ashwill 24; “College Learning for the New Global Century” 23; Zemach-Bersin). “Reflection is defined as ‘the intentional consideration of an experience in light of particular learning objectives’” (Larkin). Reflectiveness is also a necessary component of the advising model—advisors do not tell students what to do but instead help guide them toward decisions based on reflection and conversation (Magolda and King; Larkin; Morano).

Discussions with peers as well as advisors also build on and facilitate reflection (Zemach-Bersin). Reflection is built into all three components of the QEP.

#### **H. Integration of activities**

Despite its demonstrated positive effects on student learning, study abroad in its current form, as noted by Bok, “achieves far less than it might in increasing the global understanding of undergraduates” (236). Most study-abroad participants choose European countries similar to the United States; “fewer than one-fifth of all study abroad participants go to non-Western nations where the cultural differences are greatest and the impact on parochial attitudes is likely to be most profound” (237). Also, most participants “have never studied the history, politics, or culture of the country they are visiting.” Due to lack of close coordination with other parts of the curriculum, most study abroad programs “often fail to give students a deep engagement with a different culture” and leave much to be desired in “teaching students about other cultures and societies.”

Several analysts note what one critic calls the “fragmented hodgepodge of programs and activities that are rarely sufficiently integrated to create maximum institutional impact or to advantage learning” (Green 13-14; Bok 240). Best practices create “synergy and connections among discrete activities” (Green 20). Good advisors help students see and make connections between the curricular and co-curricular realms, between the classroom and the world beyond (Rinck). One of the main functions of the Global Advising Program (GAP) is to narrow such gaps on an individual student and institutional level.

Once Global Advisers become adept at integrating and making accessible for students Duke's many existing curricular and co-curricular opportunities for intercultural understanding, which will probably take at least a year, they should turn their attention to broadening faculty's awareness of, and participation in, the Winter Forum, Global Semester Abroad, and other global initiatives at Duke.

#### **I. Assessment**

Best practices in assessment in general, and in the assessment of international education and intercultural competence in particular according to Deardorff, require a review of mission and goals before assessment, as goals determine the tools and methods to use; a clear definition of what is to be measured; a multi-year plan; multiple methods and tools, including direct (e.g., portfolios) and indirect (e.g., surveys) methods with detailed rubrics; training of staff and faculty in the application of assessment measures; integration of assessment into activities; feedback to students; communication of results to stakeholders (“A Matter of Logic”; “Identification and Assessment”; “Principles of International Education Assessment”). Several assessment tools exist to measure the effectiveness of global programs, including the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Black and Duhon) and the Internationalization at Home, which is geared toward on-campus activities and community involvement that give students an international perspective (Deardorff, “A Matter of Logic”). Setting objectives for students to achieve allows students to “have better sense of what is expected of them and what their learning adds up to as they pass carefully defined milestones” (Banta 17). Assessing if students reach these milestones would demonstrate whether programs such as Winter Forum, Global Advising, and Global Semester Abroad are effective in reaching student competency (Banta). In sum, “Effective assessment is a long-term commitment that involves time and resources, but can be well worth our efforts in ultimately improving international education and transforming lives” (Deardorff, “Principles of International Education Assessment”, 52).



## **VI. Actions for Implementation**

### **A. Winter Forum**

#### **1. Description**

The Winter Forum is the campus-based, non-credit curricular component of the QEP. In an intense, retreat-like setting, undergraduates will interact with graduate/professional students, alumni, and faculty to explore a major global issue from interdisciplinary and intercultural perspectives. The Winter Forum will be held over 2.5 days immediately before the start of the spring term and will be inaugurated in January 2010.

The Winter Forum is targeted especially at three student populations: undergraduates who are less likely to travel abroad (as noted above, athletes, engineers, and science majors), students who seek to integrate experiences abroad either in advance of or following those experiences, and Duke's international students (undergraduate and graduate) who seek opportunities for intellectual engagement with U.S. students. The Global Advisors, along with the Office of Undergraduate Education, International House, Athletics, and other units, will make special efforts to attract these individuals.

Graduate and professional students, perhaps as much as one-fifth of the total, are targeted for three primary reasons. International students make up a large percentage of the graduate/professional student bodies (see above, pp. 3-4). The Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC) has expressed a desire for greater interactions with undergraduates. The inclusion of graduate and professional students, and international students, as both leaders and participants will enrich the intellectual, interdisciplinary, and intercultural composition of the audience and provide vertical integration.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, we wish to link to the experiences of alumni in order to help our undergraduates make the transition into post-baccalaureate life and work, as well as to capitalize on the knowledge and expertise of alumni with experiences pertinent to the Forum's theme. The Office of Alumni Affairs and the Duke Career Center are developing a partnership that will assist in linking alumni to this initiative, and the Career Center is also in the process of building partnerships with the professional schools' career centers. All of these units will help identify appropriate alumni for engagement in the Forum, as panelists and speakers as well as participants, and also help develop relationships with potential internship and post-graduate employers. The involvement of alumni will be attractive to undergraduates, who expressed in the focus groups (and the experience of the Career Center supports this) their desire to forge connections and establish internships.

Faculty for the Winter Forum will be drawn primarily from Arts and Sciences, one or more of the professional schools, and/or interdisciplinary institutes and centers. The faculty-student ratio should be 1:10, at least in the initial three-year period of the program. To assure that student

---

<sup>6</sup> "Vertical integration," referring to close collaborations between and among undergraduates, graduate/professional students, and faculty, has been an objective at Duke for several years. For example, the Vertically Integrated Partners program—<http://howardhighes.trinity.duke.edu/research/vip>—places all three constituencies in a research project in biology.

participants are always afforded the most effective learning environment, in no instance should the ratio be higher than 1:15. Graduate and professional students will be added to the faculty to maintain the 1:10 to 1:15 ratio.

The target undergraduate participant number in year one of the program is 75. The target number in year two is 150. The target number in year three is 250. After the initial three-year period, the target participant number will be 400. This target helps to assure that the Winter Forum will reach a significant portion of the undergraduate student population. Student will apply for the Winter Forum using a one-page form that states their interest in the topic, their relevant background, and their commitment to full participation. The Advisory Committee (see section VIII, below) will select participants, giving priority to applicants whose schedules have made it difficult for them to participate in global experiences. At the same time, however, each year's selection committee will endeavor to ensure an optimal learning environment by including some students who *have* had such experiences.

Students who participate fully in the Winter Forum will receive certification of this fact, which to be reflected on their transcripts pending approval from the standards committee. Full participation includes not only attendance at all sessions of the Winter Forum but also satisfactory completion of the pre- and post-program assessments and programmatic requirements.

Many student participants will likely find the Winter Forum a launching pad for the development of an independent study or summer research project based in the thematic focus of a particular year's Forum. Others may engage the Forum after participation in DukeEngage (<http://dukeengage.duke.edu/>), to enlarge their understanding of the DukeEngage experience. And still others may benefit from the relationship between a Forum's thematic focus and their ongoing work with a Duke-community partnership and from the opportunity for subsequent work as a teaching or research assistant for a faculty member engaged in related work.

In general the Forum program will consist of structured and unstructured components:

- a) Approximately seven seminar sessions, each group meeting with a faculty-to-student ratio of approximately 1:10. For example, if the goal of 75 student participants is met in 2010, seminar session #1 would have approximately seven different meeting spaces and faculty teams; the faculty would repeat certain or all session topics during the 2.5-day program to meet student participant interest/demand.
- b) Some combination of enhancement experiences:
  - i) small group debriefing sessions at the end of each day in a "homeroom" setting, perhaps during a (non-alcoholic) cocktail hour;
  - ii) meeting and speaking individually with faculty and grad/professional students about mutual interests and opportunities for future collaborations, including independent studies;
  - iii) a poster session for student participants and grad/professional students in attendance as teaching assistants; and
  - iv) learning about global opportunities at Duke.

- c) Unstructured community meals (at lunchtime, except for the introductory lunch on Day 1 which is structured).
- d) Structured community meals (at dinnertime).
- e) Group work, collaborative learning project, and reflection.

## **2. General Design**

Day One of the Winter Forum begins at lunch, with introductions by the dean of undergraduate education and the faculty director. Seminars are held during the afternoon, and an inspirational speaker caps off the day.

As a “pre-forum” activity for those who may be interested, a service project is being considered for the morning of the first day, to bring the participants together in a way that intellectual dialogue may not—especially in integrating international and domestic students—and in turn to set the tone for the remainder of the conference. An activity of this sort would underscore the desire for engagement in the world.

Day Two includes a presentation by the Global Advisors on global opportunities at and through Duke, along with additional seminars and speakers.

Day Three includes meetings between undergraduates, faculty, grad/professional students, alumni, and Career Center personnel along with additional seminars, a poster session, and, at mid-day, a second speaker. The afternoon will be spent on collaborative work and reflection contributing to portfolios.

## **3. First Winter Forum**

The first Winter Forum will take place in January 2010 with the topic *The Green Economy*. This Forum will be co-directed by Tim Profeta, Director of the Nicholas Institute for the Environment Policy Solutions, and Brian Murray, Director of Economic Analysis of the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions.

The Forum on *The Green Economy* will be developed throughout 2009 by its director and co-sponsors under the supervision of the Winter Forum Advisory Committee. The faculty for this Forum will be drawn from the Nicholas Institute, the Fuqua School of Business, the Divinity School, and other relevant departments across the University. It is hoped, for example, that the following scholars will lead seminar sessions and be in residence throughout the program: Richard Newell, Dalia Patina-Echeverri and Lincoln Pratson of the Nicholas School; Dan Vermeer of the Corporate Sustainability Initiative; Lydia Olander and Bill Holman of the Nicholas Institute; Ellen Davis of Divinity; and Gary Gereffi of Sociology and the Social Science Research Institute, and head of the Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness. Examples of possible seminar sessions for the Forum on *The Green Economy* include: The Policy Landscape of the Green Economy, Ecosystem Markets, Financing the Green Economy, and Barriers to Green Technologies.

Although Winter Forum topic selections for 2011 and 2012 lie in the future, discussions with institute directors and deans in 2008 revealed substantial interest in developing Forums in the following areas:

partnering and parenting in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, contemporary global migrations, and corruption and ethical decision making.

If students and faculty involved note incoherence of approach or some other structural weakness in the first and second Winter Forums, the Winter Forum Advisory Committee will consult with the Global Advisors to develop a short experiential training program for Winter Forum faculty, focused on clearly articulated intercultural competence and associated dilemmas. Part of the advance preparation for the Forum, this training would be complemented by the development of common objectives and student learning outcomes for the coming Forum.

## **B. Global Semester Abroad**

### **1. Description**

The Global Semester Abroad aims to enhance knowledge, skills, and attitudes of Duke participants by means of the examination of a significant global theme, issue, or challenge in two different countries, regions, or parts of countries. The program will stimulate student learning and growth through opportunities for a focused, comparative understanding of a problem in local settings. Although the focus of the Global Semester Abroad is a comparative study of one issue in two different settings, students should understand something of the history, politics, and culture of those locales in order to appreciate the dimensions of that issue. Their academic investigation of an issue will be supplemented by contacts with local students and residents facilitated by seminars, cultural events, and collaborative academic and social activities. Enhancing students' ability to negotiate cultural differences and to understand, and respect, diverse perspectives will ultimately lead to stronger intercultural and intellectual competence. Both before and after this abroad experience, students will have several advising resources at their disposal about relevant courses in the history, politics, and culture of the countries/regions they visit: faculty advisors within the majors, within the Global Advising Program, and in the schools and institutes in charge of the Global Semester Abroad. Students and faculty will be advised by Duke's Counseling and Psychological Services, Student Health Services, and other health advisors in preparing for the program.

Global Semester Abroad programs with themes targeted especially to science and engineering majors will address two gaps simultaneously: the lower rate of participation by these students in study abroad and the relative lack of non-Western locales for study abroad programs. As well, the creation of small-group clusters focused on particular themes will attract not only Focus participants who wish to re-visit in a different setting a theme engaged early on in their careers, but also students who did not have the chance to participate in Focus.

Most Duke students study abroad in the fall term, the reverse of patterns at peer institutions, which disproportionately send students abroad in the spring term. The Global Semester Abroad is targeted primarily for spring semesters, in part to allow participants the opportunity to follow up their comparative academic work with internships, but also to redress the demographic imbalance of students abroad and on campus.

The Global Semester Abroad will be a "Duke-In" program: all courses offered during this program will count for Duke credit and will fulfill various graduation requirements. Application to this program will be through the Office of Study Abroad, using procedures already in place.

## 2. General Design/Template

- a) A Global Semester Abroad program centers on a theme, issue, or challenge with global implications. Students study the theme in two different countries, for approximately 6.5 weeks per country; these locations are chosen on the basis of relevance to the theme and suitability of the infrastructure for living and learning.
- b) The program takes place in two sites simultaneously. Half of the students are in Site A for the first 6.5 weeks of the program, while the other half of the students are in Site B. For the final six weeks of the program, each half switches to the other site. The ten days in between the two 6.5-week terms might include an organized learning activity. In addition, we want to remain open to the possibility that for a given program the delivery of course content may be best achieved by moving the entire group sequentially through the designated sites.
- c) Orientation to the cultures, and building of intercultural competencies [e.g., cultural knowledge and sociolinguistic awareness as well as positive attitudes (i.e., respect, openness, curiosity and discovery) toward other cultures and people from other cultures], are required for participants and will take place through seminars, local speakers, local tours and integration of foreign students into the class. On-site seminars given by locals will be integrated into the course contact. In addition, students must participate in a subset of cultural opportunities offered in the program.
- d) One of the two courses taught in each country/region will be a lower-level course to encourage broad participation. Each course meets for a minimum of 34 contact hours. All Global Semester Abroad courses will meet curriculum requirements of Trinity and Pratt; most courses in this program will satisfy the cross cultural inquiry mode of Duke's curriculum.
- e) Depending on the locations and facilities, distance-learning technologies can be used to supplement course material. Such technology is currently used daily to stream lectures from Duke to our sister medical school at the National University of Singapore.
- f) At maximum capacity the program size is limited to 120 students (60 Duke students at each location), with consideration of an additional 5-10 slots for local students. (This will probably require course transfer agreements with local universities.) We plan to start small (30 students maximum, with 15 in each location) in order to work out the details and issues associated with each course cluster and location. We expect to add two more thematic pairings over time, with all three pairings running simultaneously when the program is fully implemented.
- g) In each country, once the numbers reach critical mass, the students will divide into two sections. While one section takes one course, the other section will take the other course and then switch classes.
- h) The committee charged with developing and approving the themes and courses for a cluster (see section VIII, below) will, with assistance from on-site contacts, determine the actual scheduling of the courses in the foreign locations in a manner that best fits with the skills of the personnel and optimal delivery of the material. While we are suggesting that two courses be taught in the first 6.5 weeks and two courses in the last 6.5 weeks, it may be the case that certain courses are team-taught. In such a situation, it is

conceivable that one course could span both locations with one faculty member teaching cohort group one in the first location and then cohort group two in that same location, and the other team member delivering the other half of the course material to the different cohorts in the second location.

- i) Duke faculty in combination with local faculty and professionals (if possible) will serve as course instructors, with both Duke and local graduate student(s) serving as teaching assistants. Additionally, as we point out in #3 and #10, all classes will also include seminars given by local professionals and experts.
- j) One weekly seminar for program participants will be taught by local faculty, professionals, government officials, NGOs, and/or others. One of the assets of a program such as this is that we expect to build our relationships with the local community and leaders in such a way as to cultivate them as a resource for supplementing and deepening the knowledge that is being communicated in the classroom. The required seminars are a way to institutionalize this connection. Finally, as a way to give back to the local community in which we are operating, faculty participation in the program will require that the Duke faculty members present one public seminar or talk in each location where they are teaching.
- k) Participation of local students, through living and/or learning venues, is encouraged. We will evaluate our capacity to arrange home stays for our students in the pilot program (spring 2011) in summer/fall 2009.
- l) We anticipate that participation in this program will lay the foundation for a subset of students to undertake a DukeEngage project or internship following the student's completion of the semester. Connections forged at the Global Semester Abroad sites will add to the internship network database of Duke's Career Center (<http://studentaffairs.duke.edu/d/?p=7vex>), which is already planning to expand the range of internships abroad. These strengthened networks will be particularly advantageous for participants who wish to stay in one of the host countries for the summer and gain professional experience and exposure, but it will benefit the Duke student body as a whole.
- m) To get the most out of their experience, Global Semester Abroad participants will be required to undertake a multicultural team project, with appropriate training and support.
- n) To accommodate the high costs of living and working abroad, Duke is seeking to raise funds to defray, for students in financial need, the expenses associated with travel, follow-up internships, and other related program costs.

### **3. Pilot Program**

The Global Semester Abroad program will be piloted in spring 2011 with the theme of Global Health. The theme has been chosen for several reasons:

- a) Duke University has designated global health as one of its signature concerns and priority areas for research and teaching. Resources include the Schools of Medicine and Nursing, School of the Environment, expertise in multiple biomedical sciences (e.g., neuroscience, biomedical engineering, biology and cell biology, biochemistry,

microbiology), the recently created interdisciplinary Global Health Institute, and the Sanford Institute for Public Policy Studies (soon to become a school).

- b) Duke has several international health initiatives underway that can add value to the Global Semester Abroad program and inform its development.
- c) Many undergraduates who are interested in global health issues relevant to medicine and the environment do not study abroad because the certificate program(s) of interest are not offered abroad. The last three years of senior survey data reveal that only 30% of students who applied to medical school went on a study abroad program during their college career; this contrasts with 46% of those not applying to medical school.
- d) The Global Health Institute has taken a leadership position in working to design the pilot. These courses will count toward the certificate in global health.

**a. Target Students**

The pilot program is designed with the following groups of students in mind, in order of priority and feasibility:

- 1. Students in the Global Health Certificate Program;
- 2. Public Policy majors;
- 3. Pre-Health Professional Students;
- 4. Environment Sciences majors; and
- 5. Pratt students with an interest in environmental/biomedical sciences.

**b. First Global Semester Abroad Program: Global Health**

**i. Proposed Site Pairing**

TABLE 2  
Courses for Pilot Program in Singapore and India

<b>Site A: Singapore (National University of Singapore)</b>	<b>Site B: India (Public Health Foundation of India? Duke/Fuqua campus)</b>
Course 1: Comparative Health Systems: Singapore (new course, all students)	Course 3: Comparative Health Systems: India (new course, all students)
Course 2, Option One: Multidisciplinary Analysis of Global Health (PUBPOL154) <sup>7</sup> OR Course 2, Option Two: Globalization and Health (PUBPOL 264)	Course 4: Independent Research Project (all students)

<sup>7</sup> If we choose to target Environmental Sciences students, this course could be replaced by ENVIRO 247: Environmental Health (or another Environment and Health course being developed by Subhrendu Pattanayak), which would offer an ENVIRO course for the Environmental Sciences majors.

## **ii. Course Descriptions**

### Comparative Health Systems (new course)

This course, to be offered at both sites with a different local perspective, will introduce students to the health challenges that have local, national and global impact. The course will explore how health challenges are addressed differently in and by various populations. This course will count as an elective for the Global Health Certificate Program.

Sample topics to be covered in the Comparative Health Systems courses (modified from the International Honors Program, <http://www.ihp.edu/programs/hc/>):

- Causation and prevention of infectious diseases (HIV/AIDS, TB, malaria)
- Causation and prevention of chronic diseases (obesity, diabetes, hypertension)
- Family health and wellness across the life span, with special attention to women, children, youth, ethnic minorities, orphans, and the elderly

### Multidisciplinary Analysis of Global Health (PUBPOL 154)

Introduction to multidisciplinary theories and techniques for assessing and addressing global, infectious, chronic and behavioral health problems. Global health issues are addressed from perspectives such as: epidemiology, biology, engineering, environment, business, human rights, nursing, psychology, law public policy and economics.

### Globalization and Health (PUBPOL 264)

Globalization describes how goods, services, culture and ideas cross borders, and more specifically in the context of health, how disease-causing pathogens, the knowledge to care and cure these maladies, and the products to treat them do or do not cross these borders. Health inequities may result when there are asymmetries in what becomes globalized. In one case, the product—tobacco—readily crosses borders, but consumer protections lag behind. In another case, the expectations of life-saving treatment readily cross borders, but access to the essential drugs lag behind. Do the forces of globalization promise all people a fair shake for a healthy future or just a future of widening health disparity?

The course will investigate forces that shape this response—the emergence of public-private partnerships, efforts to chart a fairer course for intellectual property rights and innovation, and the measure of health inequities in hopes of holding stakeholders accountable. Recent efforts to improve access to medicines, to tackle the now perennial challenges of AIDS, TB, and malaria as well as emerging epidemics like avian flu, and to advance tobacco control in developing countries offer examples of how these debates are playing out.

This course counts as an elective for the Global Health Certificate Program as well as an elective for the Public Policy major.

### Independent Research Project

This course will give students the opportunity to design a research question and develop a methodology to address it. A faculty member (ideally a local faculty member) will provide the foundation in research methodology, guidance on IRB approval, and access to people, issues



and institutions to support the student projects. Students may work individually or in groups of two-three. All students will meet as a group with the faculty member once per week for lectures and seminars on research methodology, as well as small group discussion and peer review. This course will fulfill the methods requirement for the Global Health Certificate.

Optional Summer Extension

Students may apply to the appropriate program director to extend their Global Study Abroad experience into the summer to participate in a DukeEngage group program or individual program, or to complete their Public Policy internship or their fieldwork requirement for the Global Health Certificate. Funding for summer research is available through the Dean’s Summer Research fellowships, with funding from the Office of Study Abroad. As noted above (p. 21), Duke is seeking additional funds to help students in financial need engage in these optional extensions.

**4. Other Possible Thematic Clusters**

**a. Designing for the Developing World**

A potential themed focus for Pratt students is outlined below. The dean of the Pratt School of Engineering is committed to contributing to the Global Semester Abroad program. (See Appendix M, letter of support from Dean Katsouleas.)

TABLE 3  
Courses for Potential Engineering Program

<b>Site A: Singapore (National University of Singapore)</b>	<b>Site B: India (Public Health Foundation of India? Duke/Fuqua campus)</b>
Course 1: Medical device design – (capstone design class): Student teams on client-led projects; lectures from practitioners and community professionals	Course 3: Diagnostic device design (technical elective): Student teams on client-led projects related to the environment or health-care; lectures from practitioners and community professionals
Course 2, Option One (technical elective): Biomaterials or Drug Delivery, taught by Duke/Singapore faculty on-site (NUS faculty teach these courses already) <i>OR</i>  Course 2, Option Two (SS&H): Globalization and Health (PUBPOL 264)	Course 4, Option One <u>Managing Technology Development in a Global Setting</u> (technical elective) taught by Duke faculty on-site; lectures from business, public service, professionals in community <i>OR</i>  Course 4, Option Two (technical elective): EGR108: Professional Ethics

**b. Course Descriptions: Designing for the Developing World**

Capstone Design Class (Singapore)

Each degree within Pratt requires completion of a Capstone Design course. These senior projects focus on the synthesis and application of the basic science, mathematics, engineering

and design skills taught in earlier courses to develop a device or strategy for solving an engineering problem. For the Global Semester Abroad program, these engineering problems will be selected by local “clients” with needs in environmental systems (India) or healthcare delivery (Singapore). Called ‘Capstone’ courses, these culminating design classes give students a rigorously challenging, real-world, immersive engineering experience. Global Semester Abroad students will have the opportunity to gather necessary data locally to form the problem statement, analyze multiple design solutions in consultation with the local client, and construct and evaluate a prototype for achieving a design solution.

Biomaterials or Drug Delivery, taught by Duke/Singapore faculty on-site (NUS faculty teach these courses already)

#### Diagnostic Design Class (India)

Construction of a diagnostic device requires coordinated integration of reporting and sensing systems that may be applied to solve problems in environmental or medical toxicology, utilization of water or air resources, device systems failures, microbiology and more. This design course will focus on design of a device or strategy for diagnosing a chosen system. For the Global Semester Abroad program, these engineering problems will be selected by local “clients,” and students will work in teams to construct computational models and prototypes as design solutions.

Managing Technology Development in a Global Setting Description adapted from : Managing the Design Process and Controlling Risk with Innovative Technologies: Case Studies and Strategies for Engineers and Managers (BME-165-elective)

This interdisciplinary course introduces students to engineering and management principles involved in the development and commercialization of technology, with a special emphasis on healthcare and environmental systems applications and their legal and regulatory framework within the global context. Tools and techniques for managing technology development will be presented and a framework for the management of risk and crisis will be developed. Principles of risk and crisis management will be presented, including the identification, analysis, prioritization, resolution and monitoring of risk. Case studies will be used to expose students to the multiple dimensions of personal and professional challenge and ethical dilemmas involved in the design and commercialization of technologies across multicultural boundaries. Interdisciplinary teams of students will study real-world cases of product failure and/or recall relevant to the global context.

Professional Ethics. Adapted from EGR 108S.

Case study approach is used to introduce professional ethics. Topics include moral development, confidentiality, risk and safety, social responsibility, fraud and malpractice, legal aspects of professionalism, and environmental ethics in a global context.

In addition to the above engineering cluster, we are currently in the planning stages of a third theme centered on poverty, inequality and development. One of the features we are contemplating is having the students move between urban centers and rural areas within a single country or region. In this context it may be optimal to start all the students in the urban center and then move them into the rural regions in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the term.

## 5. Other Possible Sites and Resources for Use in International Pairings

- a) Duke's Fuqua School of Business is now developing campuses in various countries around the world: South Africa, England, Russia; India; China; Dubai. These will range from full-service conference centers, offering housing, meals, and classrooms, to those offering academic space only. The facility in New Delhi, India, for example—a full-service center with a management and medical infrastructure—is scheduled to open at the latest by summer 2010; others will certainly be available by 2012. The Fuqua School plans to use these facilities a third of the academic year; the dean has eagerly embraced their use by undergraduates.
- b) Duke Global Health Institute has facilities in Moshi, Tanzania (KCMC - Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center); Muhuru Bay, Kenya (WISER - Women's Institute of Secondary Education and Research, under development); and Kampala, Uganda (New Mulago Hospital); and Singapore (National University of Singapore); and it is exploring potential relationships in Haiti, Ghana, Honduras, Mexico and Indonesia, among others. At present, none of these sites with the exception of Singapore has the capacity to house large numbers of students.
- c) Duke is a member of the Venice International University (VIU) consortium in Venice, Italy. VIU has housing as well as classrooms.
- d) The Nicholas School of the Environment does not have facilities abroad, but they have close ties to the Organization for Tropical Studies (<http://www.ots.duke.edu/>), which maintains 3 biological field stations in Costa Rica. The OTS programs are operated by the Office of Study Abroad. Here again there is no capacity for boarding students at present.
- e) The Office of Study Abroad has ties to sites for its semester study abroad programs that might also accommodate the Global Semester Abroad.
- f) Some of the Focus program courses lend themselves to consideration as topics for a Global Semester Abroad: for example, a comparative politics program derived from the *Between Europe and Asia* Focus theme.

### C. Global Advising Program

#### 1. Description

The Global Advising Program will provide a team of advisors with expertise in global opportunities both on and off Duke's campus and in intercultural competencies. The Global Advising Program will be staffed ultimately by a cohort of between two and four specialized advisors. These "global" advisors will enhance Duke's current advising system for undergraduates, by supplementing and serving as a resource for the Academic Advising Center (<http://advising.trinity.duke.edu>), the academic deans in Trinity and Pratt, departmental advisors, pre-professions advisors, and advisors within Study Abroad, the Career Center, and other units. They will also interact with students in the ways noted on pages 27-28 below.

We use the acronym GAP for the Global Advising Program to underscore the primary responsibility of closing gaps between the myriad global opportunities offered at Duke and beyond: Although GAP advisors can and will advise individual students routinely as do other

advisors in Duke's system, the major duties of the GAP advisors include coordinating programs; devising various calendars and/or lists of offerings for different types of students (for example, athletes, Focus students, engineers, pre-Health); informing and training Peer Advisors, First-Year Advisory Counselors (FACs), and Advisors; and reaching out to various groups traditionally under-represented in Duke's global opportunities. The program also will narrow the gaps, in Duke's decentralized environment, among the various units with relevant responsibilities: the GAP will have close ties with other units and initiatives on campus, especially the Office of Study Abroad, International Comparative Studies, DukeEngage, Global Career Center, Pratt School of Engineering, and International House. It will work integrally with the Global Semester Abroad and the Winter Forum. It will allow us to reach student populations beyond those already receiving guidance from key global programs, while at the same time expanding the information and guidance for students already served by those programs.

The number and array of opportunities for various types of global experience offered to Duke undergraduates (see Appendix H) are large and increasing all the time, which makes it difficult—good communication notwithstanding—for students and others to keep up with them. Currently, undergraduates at Duke who have interests in global experiences get pieces of information from one or more programs, offices, or resources. Since each of these individual programs and offices has its own mission and objectives, none can meet the growing overall needs of the Duke undergraduate in regard to the globalization experience. As an example, in our pre-departure surveys of students studying abroad in the spring and fall of 2008, between eight and ten different resources are identified when students are asked where they found out about the program they have chosen. These sources vary from the Office of Study Abroad to classmates to faculty members to acquaintances, among others. Many students rely heavily on their current academic advisor, whether pre-major or within the major, for advice on finding and selecting globalization experiences and figuring out how best to fit them in to their current academic plan. These academic advisors are made up mostly of volunteer faculty members and administrators who, though excellent in dealing with a broad range of curricular and extracurricular issues, are not expert in advising on the many different types of global experiences available at Duke. Many students who are purposefully intending to study abroad through Duke's Office of Study Abroad (OSA) are directed to, or voluntarily meet, directors in OSA for advising purposes, individually and in groups. Similarly, students interested in DukeEngage will speak to individuals within that program, with the advice having a similar program-centered impetus.

However, as students' choices increase, so too does the potential for anxiety as students try to discern which program or experience is the "best" for them, or in what order they should structure their Duke career. Additionally, we risk graduating students who have had multiple co-curricular and international experiences during their time at Duke, but who are unable to articulate how these experiences have contributed to their intellectual accomplishments, and/or have complemented their program of study. We also risk failing to reach out to underrepresented populations whose particular needs or interests might not be satisfied by the programs most known to them, and thus who do not engage in a global experience that might enrich, even transform, their college careers and subsequent lives.

It is clear that there is a need for a centralized repository of information and a dissemination mechanism that undergraduates, faculty, advisors, and programs could use to retrieve information about the array of global opportunities that are available to undergraduates. Moreover, such a resource – if it existed – would be most effective if users could simultaneously consult with experts who would help them navigate and interpret the fit of different opportunities to their particular needs. Particularly important in this interaction would be a way for students

not only to learn of the possible opportunities but to do so in a way that would allow for the thoughtful integration of the experience into their academic plan and goals.

Thus, the Global Advising Program advisors will carry out their duties in the service of the following goals:

- a) ensuring that all applicable constituencies are informed about and have access to information about the various global opportunities at Duke and elsewhere;
- b) aiding in the integration of the range of possible global activities (international and non-international) into academics at Duke in a way that will allow for meaningful and thoughtful use of the experiences in students' academic plans;
- c) aiding in the preparation of students prior to any globalization experience in order to ensure that they get the most out of the experience (including making referrals to health professionals as appropriate);
- d) aiding in the integration of individual globalization experiences into the Duke community as a whole; and
- e) helping to assure that the entire Duke community can take full advantage of any and all globalization opportunities, especially those groups that may have special challenges in doing so.

To achieve these goals, the team of advisors will collectively possess knowledge of the following:

- a) Duke offerings (curricular and co-curricular) on undergraduate and graduate level, and especially those courses with a CCI (cross-cultural inquiry) designation;
- b) international and domestic issues as they relate to local, regional, national and world events and issues;
- c) international academic and non-academic opportunities, including course work, for Duke Students, both undergraduate and graduate at the local, regional, national and world level;
- d) intercultural competencies and how to build them; and
- e) Crisis management and available resources for effective, rapid intervention.

The Global Advisors will perform the following actions:

- a) Coordinating programs to make Duke's global opportunities more accessible;
- b) Devising various calendars and/or lists of offerings for different types of students (e.g., athletes, Focus students, engineers, pre-Health; see Appendix N for examples applicable to athletes);
- c) Informing and training Peer Advisors, FACs, other advisors;
- d) Reaching out to various groups traditionally under-represented in Duke's global opportunities;
- e) Serving as resources to directors of undergraduate studies and other faculty as they enhance the content of Cross Cultural Inquiry courses at Duke;
- f) Helping students understand the importance of a global perspective and integrating some form of global experience in their academic plan;
- g) Thinking through student needs, and matching individual students with possibilities on campus (both in and outside the classroom), in the local community, in the United States, and abroad;
- h) Serving as a resource to other academic advisors about these offerings;

- i) Helping students integrate their domestic and/or away/global experiences (esp. study abroad; DukeEngage; internships) with life plans and interests;
- j) Reaching out to Duke students to participate in extra-mural academic opportunities, and to incorporate them in life plans and interests;
- k) Serving as general as well as specialist advisors;
- l) Contributing as appropriate to pre- and post-experience workshops;
- m) Serving as liaison with offices and units around campus already engaged in global advising and/or activities, to ensure integration;
- n) Serving as liaison with the Career Center;
- o) Serving as liaison with the Pratt School of Engineering and with the Pratt Internship Director;
- p) Serving on appropriate university committees (e.g., the Committee on International Affairs); and
- q) Maintaining lists of students/faculty/alumni who have previously participated in a global experience as a reference for students considering the same option.

## **VII. Timeline [needs revision and standardization, with following draft chart expanded]**

### **A. Winter Forum**

- 1) The first Winter Forum will take place on January 10, 11, and 12, 2010.
- 2) Tim Profeta, Director of the Nicholas Institute for the Environment, will be the Director of this first Winter Forum entitled *The Green Economy*. He will collaborate in the development and administration of this Forum with relevant faculty from Fuqua and the Divinity School. Some details indicating how this Forum will develop are provided in the Resources section, below.
- 3) As set out in Resources, the Winter Forum Advisory Committee will meet in mid-spring semester, 2009, to decide on the topics and directors for the next two Winter Forums, i.e., 2011 and 2012. These will be selected from among proposals submitted to the Committee by the Institute Directors Council.
- 4) The Advisory Committee will meet again no later than late summer 2009 to evaluate the progress the Director of the 2010 Forum has made toward the development of the final program and to provide feedback on that progress.
- 5) This cycle will repeat itself in subsequent years with the following additions and changes: in the years beginning 2010, the spring meeting of the Advisory Committee will also include an evaluation of the success of the immediately preceding Forum in achieving the intended learning outcomes. Also in the years beginning 2010, the Advisory Committee will accept and consider proposals for future Forums from faculty who are unaffiliated with the seven signature institutes.
- 6) With input from first Winter Forum director, the QEP Implementation Committee will determine staffing needs for future Forums.

## **B. Global Semester Abroad**

The pilot program and location have been determined by Duke's existing ties in Singapore and India. The Medical School has ties with the National University of Singapore, while the Sanford Institute and the Nicholas School of the Environment both have associations with various constituencies in India. These institutional connections should support our expected pilot date of Spring 2011, although we need at least 18 months to fully develop the contacts, faculty, and courses to ensure that the program is a success. By the spring of 2012 the Engineering Global Semester Abroad, located in the same two countries, will come online and will be run concurrently with the second Global Health Global Semester Abroad. In 2013 we will add a third Global Semester Abroad, which may concentrate on issues related to energy. Such a program builds on the Nicholas-Pratt minor in energy and is again highly attractive to students interested in science. In 2014 we plan to have four themes fully developed and running. A fourth theme, currently under discussion, is Poverty, Inequality and Development; this theme is a response to the information gleaned from student focus groups (where the students indicated they would like to be offered an economics-related option).

Duke has recently announced a new initiative originating in the Fuqua School of Business that involves creating Duke owned and operated facilities around the world (see #1 above, p. 25, in Other Possible Sites and Resources). Ultimately it is our intention to "piggy-back" on the Fuqua initiative in the sense that the Global Semester Abroad program will utilize Fuqua facilities and contacts for program delivery. However, the first of these sites will not come online until 2012 at the earliest. Our timing is designed to align with the completion of Fuqua facilities abroad.

## **C. Global Advising Program**

Year One, 2010-2011

Summer-Fall 2010

- 1) The first two GAs are hired. They will be housed in the Smith Building between Duke's East and West Campuses.
- 2) The GAs review Duke's International House training program for Intercultural Competency currently taken by some but not all new Duke employees (<http://ihouse.studentaffairs.duke.edu/training/icc/intro.html>).<sup>8</sup>
- 3) GAs participate in training for intercultural competency
- 4) GAs inventory all existing global advising programs and services on the Duke campus and identify gaps where they exist; they prepare a report with recommendations for further programs/services by December 2009.
- 5) GAs meet and interact with all pertinent administrative and faculty units to determine what global opportunities for Duke undergraduates are available within the Duke community and beyond.
- 6) They establish a website with all such information.
- 7) They become familiar with the Duke curricula, Trinity College and Pratt School of Engineering.
- 8) They become familiar with Duke's advising protocols and systems and begin to advise students.

---

<sup>8</sup> This program is currently under revision, and will be significantly revamped by 2009-10. Among the changes under discussion are the creation of a training session specifically for faculty and the possibility of an ICC program or course for undergraduates in 2009-10.

Spring 2011

- 1) If deemed necessary by their inventory, GAs work with others on campus to develop an on-line tutorial, perhaps akin to that at the University of the Pacific, “What’s up with culture” (<http://www.pacific.edu/sis/culture/>). This would be comparable to Alcohol 101 and Plagiarism tutorials already here at Duke. If developed, the tutorial would be suggested for all first- and second-year students, as well as anyone intending to study abroad or engage in some other experience away from campus). Results would then be assessed; the GAs would make a recommendation about whether it should be made mandatory for students studying abroad, going on internships, in DukeEngage, in Spanish Service Learning, etc. After assessment of the value of the tutorial, in year three it could be extended to all Duke students.

Year two: Summer-Fall 2011

- 1) Third GA hired. See above for actions.  
[to be completed]

## **VIII. Organizational Structure**

Oversight responsibility for all three components of the QEP rests with the QEP Implementation Committee (QIC) chaired by the vice provost for academic affairs (the newly-designated SACS liaison as of July 1, 2009) and including the following or their designees: dean of undergraduate education, dean of academic affairs (Trinity College of Arts and Sciences), associate dean for undergraduate education (Pratt School of Engineering), vice president of student affairs, director of the Office of Study Abroad, director of the Academic Advising Center, and four of the assessment specialists who have been integral to the development of the QEP.

### **A. Winter Forum**

Responsibility for the selection of Winter Forum topics and directors resides with the Winter Forum Advisory Committee. The director of each year’s Winter Forum will be a signature institute director, a dean of a professional school or the Graduate School, or their designees. Faculty will be drawn from several schools. The dean of undergraduate education convenes bi-annual meetings of the Advisory Committee. The first annual meeting is held in the middle of the spring semester to establish a perpetual three-year cycle of Winter Forum themes and directors and to evaluate the success of the immediately preceding Forum in achieving the intended learning outcomes. The second annual meeting is held at the latest in the end of August to review and provide feedback on the current Director’s draft plan for the upcoming Forum. The Winter Forum Advisory Committee is composed of the dean of undergraduate education, a rotating administrator from among the graduate and professional schools deans, a representative from the Institute Directors’ Council, a student representative from the Graduate and Professional Student Council, two representatives from the undergraduate student population, a representative from Student Affairs, and an alumnus/a designated by the Office of Alumni Affairs in concert with the Career Center.

The specific format of the Winter Forum is expected to vary in its details from year to year based on the topic and structure that are most likely to achieve the intended learning outcomes in relation to that topic. Responsibility for developing the direction and format of the Winter Forum resides with the designated director. The director establishes the intellectual content and activities of the Forum in



collaboration with faculty and students, including providing for speakers and faculty. In selecting speakers and faculty, the director must assure that the Forum provides student participants with rich interdisciplinary and intercultural perspectives on the topic at issue. Thus, faculty should be selected from across the disciplines within the University with attention to their abilities to provide intercultural as well as interdisciplinary education. The first Winter Forum, *The Green Economy*, will be led by a team from the Nicholas Institute, the Divinity School, and the Fuqua School of Business; it will serve as an illustration and model for future Forum topics and interdisciplinary collaboration.

## **B. Global Semester Abroad**

The Duke Office of Study Abroad will house and operate this program. This office reports to the dean of academic affairs in Trinity College and, with a dotted line reporting relationship, to the vice provost for international affairs and development.

Course development in some cases will arise organically and in others will need to be stimulated with funding. The themes and courses will be determined by committee. This committee will include the designated person in the Study Abroad office, the vice provost for international affairs and development, the vice provost for Interdisciplinary studies, the dean for undergraduate education (or their representatives) and various faculty from the relevant academic units (one-four faculty members). It will consult with the relevant personnel and programs within the Graduate School and professional schools, such as the Fuqua administrator for the GATE Program.<sup>9</sup> Departments will also be able to suggest themes and courses, which will be vetted by the full committee. The Study Abroad Committee (<http://www.aas.duke.edu/admin/council/standing/sabroad.html>) will have final approval, as it does for all undergraduate study abroad programs. The first committee will include faculty and administrators from the Global Health Institute and will be constituted in the spring of 2009.

The committee will determine the optimal country pairings for future programs. Once the courses are outlined and the syllabi are formulated the courses will be approved by the Course Committee. This committee is also responsible for approving the curriculum codes for Trinity College requirements.

## **C. Global Advising Program**

The Global Advising Program will be housed in the Smith Building, the new home of Study Abroad, DukeEngage, the International House, and Duke Visa Services, in order to establish synergies; it will be under the supervision of the Trinity College dean for advising, Dr. Michele Rasmussen. There will be a lead Global Advisor (GA) with expertise in intercultural competencies. The GAs will work closely with the International House, Study Abroad, DukeEngage, Office of Undergraduate Education, vice provost for international affairs, advisory committees to the Winter Forum and Global Semester Abroad, and departments and programs to create linkages and help to enhance intercultural competencies within the undergraduate population as a whole.

---

<sup>9</sup> The GATE Program within the Fuqua School of Business is an intensive two-week living-learning experience in an array of regions across the globe (e.g. Russia, the Middle East, China, South East Asia, etc.). It includes significant cultural education as part of the program.

**IX. Resources and Budgets [need to put all in same format]**

**A. Introduction**

The Global Semester Abroad is the only income-generating program of the three QEP components. This income will defray most of the expenses of the GSA. The University commits to covering other expenses of the QEP, including assessment. Fundraising efforts may be initiated to help defray expenses of all programs. The current economic climate has necessitated our scaling down the program budgets and delaying full implementation. We intend to inaugurate the QEP with the first Winter Forum in January 2010. The search for the first global advisors will not take place until summer 2010 and the first Global Semester Abroad will be held in spring semester 2011.

A complete budget with all three programs by year is provided after the individual budgets.

**B. Winter Forum**

[ will insert prefatory language here]

Table 4  
Winter Forum Budget

**Table I: Winter Forum  
(in Dollars)**

Expense Categories	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
Staff Support		10,000	30000	35000	35,000	35,000	145000
Instruction		25,000	30000	30000	35,000	35,000	155000
Speakers		25,000	25000	25,000	30,000	30,000	135000
Materials		10,000	15000	15,000	20,000	20,000	80000
Food		15,000	20000	20000	25,000	25,000	105000
Publicity	2,000	2,000	2000	2000	2,000	2,000	12000
Misc; Field trips; tech spt		8,000	10000	10,000	15,000	15,000	58000
Assessment		5,000	7,000	10000	10,000	10,000	42000
<b>Total Year's Cost</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>100000</b>	<b>139000</b>	<b>147000</b>	<b>172000</b>	<b>172000</b>	<b>732000</b>

**C. Global Semester Abroad**

In Appendix O [may be placed instead on provost's website] we present a typical budget for 30 students studying in the Singapore-India locations. We have employed current (October 2008) price levels and State Department per diems to calculate our estimates of the costs of such a program for one term. Notice that we have not included any costs associated with a planned group excursion during the week of travel between locations. Primarily this omission is due to

the fact that we plan to solicit more student feedback regarding exactly what they would like before we commit to planning this piece of the program. Additional considerations include [the following will be adjusted—this is a placeholder]:

- 1) Faculty development money = \$3k per course and approx \$15k per theme x 3 themes = \$45k. Although we would envision that new themes would be continuously evolving, this expense should decline over time as some themes become established.
- 2) Will require at least 1 full time position in Study Abroad = \$60k. Will require stipend support for teaching assistants at \$10-13K per 4 ½ month semester plus interim health insurance (estimated \$1500). This is roughly \$13,500 per TA x 2 TAs (1 each site) per theme = \$27K minimum
- 3) Design supplies as an operating cost = \$6K
- 4) Salary support for local faculty teaching (honoraria) = \$4K
- 5) Ideally, we will establish and fund a Global University Scholars (GUS) Program which would provide qualified students with travel and support funds for this program = roughly \$5k per student x 12 students = \$50K per theme x 3 themes = \$150k. Note that this number may vary once we develop the planned excursion between the two locations.

[This budget will be adjusted to include all GSA expenses, since most are covered by income; right now is incomplete]

TABLE 5  
Global Semester Abroad Budget

**Table II: Global Semester Abroad (in Dollars)**

Expense Categories	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
Staff Support			60,000	62,000	64,000	64,000	250000
Faculty/Program Development		30,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	90000
Teaching Assts.			30,000	60,000	90,000	90,000	270000
Supplies & Equipment			6,000	12,000	18,000	18,000	54000
Honoraria, Local Faculty			5,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	45000
Total Year's Cost	0	35000	121000	169000	217000	217000	759000

#### D. Global Advising Program

The Global Advising Program will require the allocation of funding to conduct a national search for two global advisors (GAs), provide salary and fringe benefits for them once hired, and make resources available for office and IT set-up and support. Additionally, the program will need a dedicated programming budget as the GAs begin campus-wide outreach efforts and start seeing students.

The sections below break out these projected costs by category, culminating in a preliminary budget summary.

### **National Search & Recruitment for Global Advisors (GAs)**

The Global Advisor position announcement will be published in national print and electronic publications and up to five candidates for the two positions will be brought to Duke's campus for on-site interviews. The estimated cost of the search process given below is based on past national searches for academic dean and director positions in Trinity College.

Advertising:	\$500
Travel & Hotel:	\$2,100
Meals:	\$2,000
Miscellany:	\$400 (e.g., taxis, mileage)
<b>Total cost:</b>	<b>\$5,000 for 5 candidate on-campus interviews*</b>

\* This total assumes consideration of internal Duke candidates.

### **Salary for GAs**

The salary ranges below are based on current starting salaries for academic assistant dean positions in Trinity College. Fringe benefits derive from FY 2008 rates of 22.9% for monthly staff.

GA Salary Range:	\$45K to 55K + Fringe
Low end:	\$55,305 Includes fringe benefits
High end:	\$67,595

### **Office Space**

Available office space in proximity to the Office of Study Abroad and DukeEngage will be identified in the Smith Warehouse complex that can accommodate three-four Global Advisors.

### **Administrative Support**

Administrative support for the GAs will be provided by an assistant who will also help with the Winter Forum.

### **Programming & Advertising**

While there will be numerous opportunities for the GAP to partner with the Academic Advising Center on events and programs, there may be occasions when the GAP will want to sponsor its own events – if, for example, the GAP sponsors specific programs to raise student awareness of global opportunities.

### **Web & Tutorial Development**

The development and maintenance of a comprehensive and interactive website that will serve as a resource to students, advisors and faculty on the range of global opportunities offered through Duke is an important component of the Global Advising Program in Year One. Currently, the Academic Advising does not have the resources to take on this Web project, so

the site's initial development must be contracted either to the Blackwell Group in OIT or to an outside developer. Similarly, the creation of an online tutorial will require assistance from web developers, especially if it is to be a dynamic and interactive experience for students. While the GAs will be instrumental in developing the content of both online resources, the technical programming and support will require additional budgetary support.

**Supplies**

The addition of two GAs will require an increase to the Academic Advising Center's budget to cover the increased cost of office supplies and technology tools and resources (e.g., computers and printers).

Budget Allocation: \$1,200 per year for office supplies  
 \$1,500 per person for desktop and printer

**TABLE 6**  
 Global Advising Program Budget

**Table III Global Advising Program (in Dollars)**

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
Expense Categories							
Search		5,000	5,000	0	0	0	10000
Salaries & fringes, global advisors			134,000	201,000	201,000	201,000	737000
Staff support			55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	220000
Programming and Advertising			5,000	5,000	6,000	6,000	22000
Website & tutorial, dev. & maint.			10,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	17500
Computers and Printers			4,500	1,500	0	0	6000
Supplies			1,200	1,300	1,300	1,300	5100
Assessment			5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	20000
Total Year's Cost	0	5000	219700	271300	270800	270800	1037600

**TABLE 7**  
 All Programs Budget [will be adjusted to reflect increases in GSA budget]

**Table IV: All Categories (in Dollars)**

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
Expense Categories							
Instruction		25,000	30000	30000	35,000	35,000	155000
Speakers		25,000	25000	25,000	30,000	30,000	135000
Materials		10,000	15000	15,000	20,000	20,000	80000
Food		15,000	20000	20000	25,000	25,000	105000
Publicity	2,000	2,000	2000	2000	2,000	2,000	12000

Misc; Field trips; tech spt	8,000	10000	10,000	15,000	15,000	58000
Faculty/Program Development	30,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	90000
Teaching Assts.		30,000	60,000	90,000	90,000	270000
Honoraria, Local Faculty		5,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	45000
Search	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	10000
Salaries and Fringes @67,000		134,000	201,000	201,000	201,000	737000
Programming and Advertising		5,000	5,000	6,000	6,000	22000
Website & tutorial, dev. & maint.		10,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	17500
Computers and Printers		4,500	1,500	0	0	6000
Supplies		7,200	13,300	19,300	19,300	59100
Staff Support	10000	145000	152000	154000	154000	615000
Assessment	10000	17000	25000	30000	30000	112000
<b>Total Year's Cost</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>140000</b>	<b>479700</b>	<b>587300</b>	<b>659800</b>	<b>2528600</b>

## X. Assessment [still being worked on]

### A. Introduction

Assessment of the QEP will be both formative and summative and will make use of multiple methodologies and direct and indirect measures. In addition, control group design will also be employed where feasible and appropriate. The assessment plan allows for triangulation of methodologies whenever possible. The plan will be implemented in concert with and as dictated by the implementation of the QEP programming (See implementation timetable, section XI, below). Assessment activities will address implementation as well as program specific outcomes and student learning outcomes. Some assessment activities will be common to all three portions of the QEP, and some will be specific to an individual program or activity. A tabular representation of the planned assessment activities can be found in Appendix XX. All assessment activities will be overseen by the QEP Implementation Committee (QIC) which is composed of administrators, faculty, students, staff and university assessment personnel. The QIC will also review the entire assessment process on a regular basis and report to the university's Committee on Academic Assessment (CAA) and Committee on Assessment of Educational and Administrative Support (CAEAS), which are currently being formed to oversee assessment at Duke.

Below we present a restatement of the four main goals of the QEP followed by four other sections. The first section details the more generic assessment activities that will be used at various points across all three of the QEP components. The following three sections detail those activities directly related to the Winter Forum, Global Semester Abroad, and Global Advising Program. Each section includes a set of student learning outcomes, identification of what overarching QEP goal(s) each outcome relates to, and then specific assessment activities related to each outcome. As with all assessment plans in order to garner the most informative feedback possible components of this plan may be deleted and others added as the formative assessment of the implementation process dictates.

## B. Restatement of Goals

To reiterate the overarching goal of Duke's QEP, we aim ***to enhance our students' capacity for global citizenship***. In this context, we define "capacity" as competence (knowing how to do something in theory) and capability (the ability to put competence into practice). We set the following three student learning outcomes and one program objective for the QEP as a whole:

- 1) Knowledge: an awareness of significant contemporary issues and their scope, including the history, differences, and perspectives of different global regions and cultures;
- 2) Skill: the ability to engage positively with and learn from people of different backgrounds and in different environments;
- 3) Self-concept: an awareness of self as both national and global citizen.
- 4) Program Objective: Activities associated with the QEP will contribute to the development of bonds within the student body through shared experiences and in doing so will strengthen the sense of Duke as a learning community.

## C. Common Assessment Activities

We want to ensure that all facets of the Duke undergraduate population take advantage of the proposed programs; this includes those populations that traditionally take advantage of such opportunities as well as traditionally under-represented populations. It is important that each of the programs reach the proper cohorts so that the planned improvement of student learning can take place. In addition, Duke must maintain the quality of each program with regard to resources, materials, presentation, and so forth. To that end, the following formative and summative assessment activities will be undertaken where applicable across all the programs. The results of this assessment will be made available to program coordinators and the QIC at appropriate times prior to and during the programming as well as in summary form at the end of each program. This will allow the coordinators to determine if target populations are being included in specific programming as well as allow for the recommendation and implementation of any programmatic changes or additions that may need to be put in place prior to the next program event or activity to ensure the continued improvement of student learning. These assessment activities will be carried out by the individual program coordinators with support from the applicable university office (Office of Assessment, Student Affairs, Office of Institutional Research, Office of Assessment, Trinity College). To that end, output assessments include the following.

### 1. Output Assessment

- **Numbers of Students Applying and Participating** We will track the student cohorts participating in each of the programs as they matriculate through the university. This tracking will include breaking out trends using socio-demographic data as well as other institutional markers (ethnicity, gender, program, co-enrolled in other programs, graduation with distinction etc.).
- **Number of Faculty Involved:** We will track faculty participating in each of the programs and activities. This tracking will include socio- demographic and other markers (department, tenure-track versus non-tenure track, length of time at university, etc.).
- **Number of Departments and Programs Involved:** We will track the departments and other university/college programs participating in each of the QEP programs.
- **Qualitative assessment will be collected via self-report instruments listed below:**  
**Exit Interviews and Surveys:** Similar to our current course evaluation process, we will

gather data concerning the impact of the program components (e. g., Speakers, location, topic, activities, etc.) on the program participants perceptions of gains made in regard to the three general QEP student learning outcomes and program objective. In addition, we will collect data (such as clarity of materials and presentations, access to necessary computer facilities, adequate housing for GSA, etc.) to inform specific planning and program implementation and its possible impact on program specific student learning outcomes and objectives. Similar to what we now do for our Duke supported study abroad programs<sup>10</sup>, as part of the assessment we will conduct evaluations of program content, such as the faculty interaction/involvement, speakers, and the utility of materials. In addition we will assess the program on criteria such as the perceived efficiency of program administration, the effectiveness of communications, support staff, publications, advertising, logistics, etc. and relate these perceptions to perceived program effectiveness. This information will then be analyzed in concert with assessments of student learning to see what if any impact these variables are having on the programs success in improving student learning. For example, in the GAP, we would look at the relationship between student's perception of quality and applicability of information provided by the GAP advisors prior to any globalization experience and the students perceived gains in way of the program objectives.

## 2. Additions to Ongoing Assessment Activities:

- **Institutional Data and Currently Administered Instruments:** We will continue our standard practice of tracking and making use of existing institutional data on academic performance, co-curricular activities and existing college and university wide surveys (Enrolled student, Senior Exit, Advising, and Alumni surveys). The QIC, in collaboration with the survey administrators and program directors will regularly review these instruments and determine what, if any, new items should be added to university-wide surveys currently in use.
- **Standardized Psychometric Inventories:** To assess attainment of the overarching goal of Duke's QEP, *to enhance our students' capacity for global citizenship*, we will administer standardized psychometric inventories to all matriculating cohorts (or samples thereof) and follow these up with appropriate sub-group analyses. This will allow for a complete factorial comparison of all QEP program participants and appropriate control groups. The instruments used will assess some of the basic skills (critical reflection and ethical and moral reasoning) we feel are necessary to obtain the overarching goal as well as an assessment of aspects of our students' intercultural competence development, specifically their ability to see the world from others' perspectives. The tools used will be:
  - Critical Reflection = Reasoning about Current Issues Inventory (RCI)
  - Ethical and Moral Development = Defining Issues Test (DIT-2)
  - Cultural Perspective taking= Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI)

---

<sup>10</sup> It is our current practice to administer both pre- and post-program surveys to all students participating in a DUKE-IN study abroad program. In addition to feedback on programmatic issues the instruments gather data on perceived quality of program and courses. The instruments are currently under review by the Office of Assessment and the Office of Study Abroad Assessment Committee.



The use of these standardized instruments provide us with the ability to see the impact of the specific programming on our students but also allows for the comparison of our students to nationally (and in most cases internationally) normed results.

The tracking and reporting of institutional data as well as the administration of existing surveys will remain under the control of those offices in which it currently is housed (Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Assessment, Trinity College). Contextualized feedback will be given to students whenever appropriate so that they can continue to improve their own learning in these areas. It has been the practice at Duke for the last nine years to use assessment tools as not only information gathering tools but as educational/self reflection tools. Providing students with contextualized feedback allows students to self reflect on where they stand relative to the issues addressed by that instrument both when completing the assessment as well as when seeing the results. Duke students are exposed to this self reflection via assessment instrument process at many points in their time at Duke. For example, students fill out our course evaluation and advising assessment instruments, and participate in programmatic and college level assessment using several different standardized instruments (i. e., the Collegiate Learning Assessment, the RCI, the DIT-2, the GPI and the International Development Inventory). Annual reports will be provided to the QIC. These assessment efforts will complement and be enhanced by ongoing curricular and general education assessment activities underway at the university.

Duke is currently developing the use of Electronic Portfolios for our students. All student participants in QEP activities will be required to make use of electronic portfolios to deposit products developed during program activities. These products will be available for later assessment specific to individual QEP components as well as the three overall learning outcomes and program objective. These products will vary with program and be comprised of various formats and media such as thought papers, documentary films or photo studies, and research proposals and presentations. This will provide the opportunity to compare these products to similar products from portfolios of students who have not participated in the programming but who have been asked to respond to the same or similar prompts. In addition and where appropriate, observations of students' intercultural behavior will be included as part of the ePortfolio products collected.

Beginning in the upcoming academic year (2009- 2010), The QIC, in collaboration with QEP program coordinators, faculty and the Office of Assessment, Trinity College, will develop specific guidelines and prompts for what will be deposited for each of the program-specific outcomes and overall objectives. This same group will also develop requisite scoring rubrics and performance standards. The Office of Assessment, Trinity College, is currently compiling a library of existing rubrics and prompts from current literature to aid in this development process. The assessment activities themselves (scoring of deposited work) will be done by the specific trained program faculty or trained scorers, to ensure interrater reliability. To ensure proper prompt and rubric development and application, training workshops in the development and application of rubrics will be developed and administered by the Office of Assessment, Trinity College over the course of the next two academic years. These workshops will be open to all interested faculty and students. In addition, training on the use of the specific portfolio will be made available. We are currently piloting the use of ePortfolio-2 developed by Chalk and Wire in our Hart Leadership Program and in the Undergraduate Certificate in Latin American Studies in the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies.

Program coordinators will report findings to the QIC prior to the beginning of the next program event in order for feedback to be integrated in to the process. Also, summary reports of findings

and subsequent activities will be made available to program participants via the 'Duke Public' pages of the Office of Assessment, Trinity College website. Successful (to be determined by the program coordinators and Faculty) completion of the portfolio requirement will be factored in to the grade obtained in the Global Semester Abroad program and for Certification of Completion of the Winter Forum program. All program participants will receive an individual feedback report detailing their score(s) and contextualization thereof.

### **3. Program Specific Assessment Plans**

#### **a. Winter Forum Student Learning Objectives**

##### **i. Student Learning Objectives**

###### **Students will be able to:**

- a) Evaluate a global issue from perspectives of multiple disciplines.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 1 & 2
- b) Evaluate a global issue from multiple cultural, geographical, and historical perspectives.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 1 & 2
- c) Engage in collaborative group work centered on a global issue that, serves to deepen their understanding of that issue.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 2 & 4
- d) Relate the Winter Forum experience to classroom coursework and co-curricular experiences.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 2 & 4

##### **ii. Assessment**

The assessment of this program as well as the two that follow will include both direct and indirect measures of student learning. Also, pre-post and long-term follow-up study plans will be implemented.

- **Student Presentations:** At the end of the Winter Forum, students will be expected to complete a group presentation that demonstrates their knowledge of the material covered in the Forum both across disciplines and across cultures. To facilitate the cooperative learning aspects and to maximize the student learning from different disciplinary, cultural, geographic and historical perspectives, careful planning will go in to group constellation. We will use rubric-based scoring by designated 3 person committees for each presentation. At the beginning of the forum, students will be provided a set of topic relevant areas/issues (aligned with the four learning outcomes) that will need to be addressed in the End-of-Forum presentation. The rubric (still to be developed by program coordinators and faculty) will look at each of these general areas/issues for level of coverage, information brought to bear, etc. and in light of the specified learning objectives. Individual group performance standards as well as overall performance standards will be determined a priori. At the end of the forum each group will be provided with a composite performance report detailing strengths and weaknesses of the presentation in an effort to provide feedback on their learning about the topic.  
Relates to WF Outcomes: 1, 2 & 3

- **Students Surveys:** Prior to the WF students will be surveyed about expected gains in relation to the four learning outcomes as well as other topic-relevant issues. These surveys will be developed by the program coordinators in collaboration with the Office of Assessment, Trinity College. At the conclusion of the Winter Forum, students will be asked to assess their perceived gains. The surveys will be modeled on surveys used in existing programs at the university. This type of self-assessment of gains made is something that has been emphasized at Duke for the last decade. Students become practiced at this self-assessment via the course evaluation system as well as other programmatic surveys they complete. A summary of the overall pre and post survey results will be posted on the 'Duke Public' page of the Office of Assessment Website.  
Relates to WF Outcomes: 1, 2, 3 & 4
- **Test of Student Knowledge:** Administered and collected prior to participation in the WF. This test will include questions designed to elicit information about the state of the student's factual knowledge in relation to the global issue that is the topic of the Forum; the state of the student's sense of the interdisciplinary and intercultural complexity of the issue; and the state of the student's ability to engage in rigorous analytical thinking on the issue. To assure a high response rate, this pre- participation tests will be made part of the application for enrollment in the Forum. As a follow-up, two weeks after the end of the forum, the participants will be sent via the web a similar test. Completion of this post-test will be voluntary (although it could be modestly incentivized). It would be expected that students would show increased knowledge and awareness of the issue at hand post forum. This post-test would serve double duty. First, it would give the students immediate feedback concerning their level of knowledge etc. In addition it would be used by the program coordinators to assess impact on students and program issues. Again, a priori performance guidelines and targets would be developed.  
Relates to WF Outcomes: 1 & 2
- **Forum Activities assessed by Rubric:** Rubric-scored observation of event activities. Trained raters will attend randomly selected activities and score, using a standard rubric, the level to which the participants in the selected activity are actually integrating objectives 1 through 3 above in to the activity. Rubric development will be done by program coordinators and faculty based on the related learning objectives and forum topic. A priori performance standards will also be set. Training of raters will take place in the term leading up to the Forum. It is planned that a cohort of trained raters be developed and maintained (most likely interested Graduate Students). This would lend not only stability to the scoring over time but increase reliability of the scoring. In addition the graduate students would benefit from their training and participation.  
Relates to WF Outcomes: 1, 2 & 3
- **Six Month Follow Up:** Follow up to assess integration into larger Duke Community (i.e., house courses, class projects, presentations, instigation of global events and campus activities, Use of Cultural and University Fund monies etc.) via institutional data and self report. All current tracking of student activities will be used. At the end of the first term post forum, we will assess the completeness of the data collected and make appropriate additions if necessary. This tracking will be under the auspices of the QIC.  
Relates to WF Outcomes: 1, 2, 3 & 4
- **One year follow up:** same as six month.  
Relates to WF Outcomes: 1, 2, 3 & 4

At the mid-point of the spring term following the forum a report will be produced by the program coordinators and presented to the QIC. The report will detail each of the assessment activities findings and recommendations for the next forum.

## **b. Global Semester Abroad**

### **i. Student Learning Objectives**

#### **Students will demonstrate:**

- a) Knowledge about the chosen global theme from a comparative perspective: GSA participants will gain exposure to issues that reveal the increasing interdependence of the world as well as the existing global systems that foster or attempt to combat the unequal distribution of resources, power, and privilege. Students will become aware of influences on these issues internationally, across multiple cultures and in their own lives and will be able to examine the impact of these issues and cultural differences from an informed and comparative perspective.  
Relates to QEP Objective: 1
- b) Increased ability to work and communicate successfully in multi-cultural settings: The GSA program will help participants enhance our students' capacity for global citizenship (i.e., the ability to behave and communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural environments) via direct contact with local students and residents and active engagement in multicultural team projects. They will be better equipped to operate effectively and appropriately within diverse global setting and become more self-confident and be able to see the world from others' perspectives.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 2 & 3
- c) Greater cultural self-awareness as prerequisite for effective and appropriate interactions with diverse people: Through coursework, site visits, and cultural events, GSA participants will have a better understanding of the factors that influence the formation and existence of cultures and societies in a comparative context. They will be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the values and perspectives of other cultures as well as their own, seeking to become not only "culture learners" but also critical and comparative thinkers in culturally diverse environments.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 1, 2 & 3
- d) A disposition toward their lifelong roles in the global community as being engaged and interactive with respect to the development of solutions to improve their own lives and communities in their future endeavors.  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 3 & 4

### **ii. Assessment**

- **Test of Student Knowledge:** To assess student knowledge and understanding of global issues, a knowledge and skill diagnostic test will be designed by the program coordinator and faculty for administration to participants at the beginning and end of the program. The same test will be administered to a matched non-participant control group for comparison, to identify the program effects on student learning. The program

coordinators and faculty will also determine, a priori, expected success standards for both groups. Group and individual performance reports will be developed and given to participants.

Relates to GSA Outcomes: 1 & 3

- **Cultural Competence Inventories:** To assess students' intercultural competence development, specifically their ability to see the world from others' perspectives we will employ the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) developed by Dr. Larry Braskamp and colleagues at Loyola University. We are currently piloting the GPI as well as the Intercultural Development Inventory, (IDI) in a large assessment of our foreign language curricular requirement. Other possible instruments are the Cross- Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) and the Global Mindset Inventory (GMI). Currently we are leaning toward the use of the GPI but will make the final selection of the instruments that most closely align with the learning objectives after we review the findings of the ongoing Foreign Language Curriculum Requirement study. This is targeted for summer 2009. GSA participating students will be required to take the measure the week prior to beginning the semester abroad and again within 2 weeks of their return from the semester abroad. We will collect a match-sample control group to administer the instrument to as well. Because we will be sampling each incoming student cohort on this measure as the matriculate we will have three point-in-time measures with this instrument for at least a subset of the semester attendees. This will give us even richer data upon which to draw conclusions and to develop other control groups. The GPI administration will be run by the Office of Assessment, Trinity College in concert with Dr. Braskamp. All students who participate in the GPI receive an individualized report detailing and contextualizing their performance and are invited to have an individual session with Office of Assessment, Trinity College personnel if they wish to discuss their results. As with all results, summary information will be made available on the Office of Assessment, Trinity College 'Duke Public' web pages.

Relates to GSA Outcome/s: 1, 2 & 3

- **Global Semester Abroad Electronic Portfolio:** A repository for coursework and reflection pieces demonstrating the attainment of knowledge, skills and abilities as outlined in the program objective. This will also serve as a catalogue of the integration of the Global Semester Abroad experience into subsequent curricular and co-curricular activities. Students and faculty will actively collaborate on determining which components should be placed in the portfolio. Components could include reflective pieces in response to a standard prompt both at the beginning of the term and then at the end of the term to enable pre/post comparison. The guidelines established at the outset will be just that; the portfolio and its contents will be used in both formative and summative assessment activities. As stated above, ongoing workshops on rubric development and use will be available for all faculty and instructors. Also, training on the use of the portfolio will be available for both students and faculty.

Relates to GSA Outcome/s: 1, 2, 3 & 4

- **Students Surveys:** Prior to the GSA students will be surveyed about expected gains in relation to the four learning outcomes as well as other topic-relevant issues. In addition the survey will query the participants as to how they see themselves as part of a global community now and in the future. At the conclusion of the GSA, students will be asked to assess their perceived gains. The survey will be modeled on existing surveys used in the universities Study Abroad program and surveys developed for use in our recently completed FIPSE funded Research Service Learning initiative and ongoing Foreign Language Curriculum Requirement study. The web-based surveys will be administered

by the Office of Assessment, Trinity College and end of program reports will be provided by the office to the program coordinators. Overall summary pre and post survey results will be posted on the 'Duke Public' page of the Office of Assessment Website.

Relates to GSA Outcomes: 1, 2, 3 & 4

By the end of the mid-point of the semester following the semester abroad, the program coordinator will submit a report of all assessment activities and outcomes to the QIC. This report will include recommendations for program enhancements or changes that would aid in the attainment of the specified student learning outcomes to the QIC.

### **c. Global Advising Program**

#### **i. Student Learning Outcomes**

##### **Students will demonstrate:**

- a) Knowledge about global opportunities both on and off Duke's campus. Students will demonstrate an increased awareness of opportunities available to them to learn about and experience other countries and cultures.  
Relates to QEP Objective: 3
- b) Understanding of the importance of an international perspective by integrating one or more of Duke's international programs in their academic plan.  
Relates to QEP Objective: 1
- c) Exploration and decision making, in a more intentional and informed way, about the many global opportunities offered at within and beyond the confines of Duke  
Relates to QEP Objective: 3
- d) Preparation for taking full advantage of whatever global experience students undertake  
Relates to QEP Objectives: 1, 3

#### **ii. Assessment**

- **Globalization Integration on Student Plan:** All students who engage in one or more individual, face-to-face meetings with a GAP advisor will be tagged and tracked as a unique cohort by the office of assessment. As part of the normal college level assessment activity of tracking standard socio-demo and college assessment level benchmarking (GPA, Honors, Focus participation, Study Abroad participation, etc.) we will be able to do a matched sample of GAP and non-GAP participating students at various points in their tenure at Duke. Specifically we will pay particular attention to their academic plans and conduct a content analysis to determine if the number and constellation of activities such as study abroad, global semester abroad, winter forum, Duke Engage, cross cultural inquiry courses, etc. differs between groups. This analysis will be carried out by the GAP advisors in concert with the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Assessment, Trinity College. A report of the findings will be developed by the GAP coordinator and made available to the QIC as warranted.  
Relates to GAP Outcomes: 1, 2 & 3
- **Advising Survey Items:** Currently we have a cadre of advising surveys that are administered at various times during a student's tenure at Duke. These include a survey at the time of matriculation that is designed to get at student expectations of the

advising milieu and what the Duke experience will be like. The survey at the time of declaration is designed to see if the expectations are inline with the actual experience. Also students are asked about their progress towards academic and personal goals. A similar survey is given in the penultimate term of the student's tenure at Duke with a focus on the same type of information regarding advising in the Major. Finally, we administer an alumni advising survey at 1 and 3 years post graduation. This survey is currently under revision. We will add items regarding student perspective of other cultures and cultural experiences to existing Matriculation (expectations), Declaration and Major surveys. Also compile data from pertinent survey items from, and add appropriate comparison items to current Study Abroad program assessment surveys, DukeEngage program assessments, WF, GSA, etc. Of particular importance will be items regarding the participant's perception of how well they were prepared with respect to possible academic, emotional, intercultural, behavioral, and logistic challenges they may have encountered. This information will be reported to the GAP coordinator in tandem with the normal reporting schedule for these reports. This information will act in both a formative and summative way and allow the GAP program to get a snap shot of a student's perception of impact at multiple points in that student's tenure. We will also be able to perform contrasts between the responses of those students who have engaged a GAP advisor and those who have not. The surveys will be administered and reported to the GAP coordinator, as needed, by the same offices currently responsible for those duties. The GAP coordinator will make semi-annual reports to the QIC in the first year of the program and annual reports in subsequent years.

Relates to GAP Outcomes: 1, 2, 3 & 4

- **Rubric completed by Advisors/DUS's:** A rubric that assesses the students' globalized approach to academic planning to be completed by pre and major advisors, DUS's and GAP advisors. GAP advisors will participate in the proposed series of rubric development and use workshops. In concert with the Office of Assessment, Trinity College the GAP coordinator and advisors will outline what it is to demonstrate 'buy-in' to a globalized approach to academic planning. This rubric will be made available to all advisors (with concomitant training sessions added to the current series of advisor training session) for their use in advising sessions. Again, a GAP engaged versus non-GAP engaged comparison can be made. The GAP coordinator will report on the findings bi-annually to the QIC and factor the findings in to the practice of the GAP.

Relates to GAP Outcomes: 2, 3 & 4

## D. Reporting

In the first year of the implementation of the QEP the QEP Implementation Committee (see above, p. will produce a bi-annual report to the Provost and the requisite university assessment committee (Committee on Academic Assessment or the Committee on Assessment of Educational and Administrative Support) on the current state of QEP program implementation and any assessment findings as well as supply any recommendations' that they feel are necessary for future planning and implementation. In subsequent years, the QEP Insight Committee will provide bi-annual reports of program implementation and a yearly report on assessment findings. Each report will have recommendations for future implementation and assessment. Once all aspects of the QEP have been implemented yearly assessment reports will be submitted.

Sample Tabular form of Assessment Plan for Winter Forum:

	Specific Learning Outcomes/Objectives	Overall Program Objectives				Measures	Timeline				Implementation Details	
		Knowledge	Skill	Self Concept	Program Objective							
WINTER FORUM To be initiated January 2010, held annually	Evaluate a global issue from perspectives of multiple disciplines	X	X			Student Presentations	Annually, completed at Winter Forum					
						Student Surveys						
						Test of Student Knowledge						
						Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric	Annually, completed at Winter Forum					
						Six Month Follow Up						
						One Year Follow Up						
	Evaluate a global issue from multiple cultural, geographical and historical perspectives	X	X				Student Presentations	Annually, completed at Winter Forum				
							Student Surveys					
							Test of Student Knowledge					
							Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric					
							Six Month Follow Up					
							One Year Follow Up					
	Engage in collaborative group work centered on a global issue		X		X		Student Presentations					
							Student Surveys					
							Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric					
							Six Month					



							Follow Up																
							One Year Follow Up																
		Relate Winter Forum experience to classroom coursework and co-curricular activities		X		X	Student Surveys																
							Six Month Follow Up																
							One Year Follow Up																
		Specific Learning Outcomes/Objectives	Overall Program Objectives					Measures	Timeline						Implement Det								
			Knowledge	Skill	Self Concept	Program Objective																	
WINTER FORUM To be initiated January 2010, held annually	Evaluate a global issue from perspectives of multiple disciplines	X	X				Student Presentations	Annually, completed at Winter Forum															
							Student Surveys																
							Test of Student Knowledge																
							Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric	Annually, completed at Winter Forum															
							Six Month Follow Up																
							One Year Follow Up																
	Evaluate a global issue from multiple cultural, geographical and historical perspectives	X	X					Student Presentations	Annually, completed at Winter Forum														
								Student Surveys															
								Test of Student Knowledge															
								Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric															
								Six Month Follow Up															
								One Year Follow Up															
	Engage in collaborative group work centered on a global issue						X	Student Presentations															
								Student Surveys															
								Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric															
								Six Month Follow Up															
								One Year Follow Up															
	Relate Winter Forum experience to classroom coursework and co-curricular activities						X	Student Surveys															
Six Month Follow Up																							
One Year Follow Up																							

	Specific Learning Outcomes/Objectives	Overall Program Objectives				Measures	Timeline					Implementation Details		
		Knowledge	Skill	Self Concept	Program Objective									
<b>WINTER FORUM</b> To be initiated January 2010, held annually	Evaluate a global issue from perspectives of multiple disciplines	X	X			Student Presentations	Annually, completed at Winter Forum							
						Student Surveys								
						Test of Student Knowledge								
						Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric	Annually, completed at Winter Forum							
						Six Month Follow Up								
						One Year Follow Up								
	Evaluate a global issue from multiple cultural, geographical and historical perspectives	X	X				Student Presentations	Annually, completed at Winter Forum						
							Student Surveys							
							Test of Student Knowledge							
							Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric							
							Six Month Follow Up							
							One Year Follow Up							
	Engage in collaborative group work centered on a global issue		X			X	Student Presentations							
							Student Surveys							
							Forum Activities Assessed by Rubric							
							Six Month Follow Up							
							One Year Follow Up							
	Relate Winter Forum experience to classroom coursework and co-curricular activities		X			X	Student Surveys							
							Six Month Follow Up							
							One Year Follow Up							

**XI. Timetable: [to be filled in]**

**Time Line**

**Summer**

**Fall**

**Winter/Spring**

**2008/09**

- QEP Implementation Comm. meets
- Director of first WF begins to devise program
- WF Advisory Comm. constituted
- Community alerted about WF theme and dates
- Global Semester Abroad Comm. constituted
- GSA faculty/admin. meet with Study Abroad

**2009/10**

- WF director leads planning efforts
- WF Advisory Comm. meets with WF director
- Faculty visit pilot program sites for GSA
- QEP Implement. Comm. meets
- Search comm. formed For two Global Adv.
- Publicity intensifies For WF
- WF Advisory Comm. solicits proposals for 2001 and 2012 forums
- GSA faculty and administrators, with Study Abroad, meet with GSA Advisory Comm.
- Study Abroad Committee vets pilot program for 2011
- Search for global advisors begins
- First WF held
- WF Advisory Comm. evaluates WF

**2010/11**

- 2 global advisors hired
- Search begins for GAP staff asst.
- GAP asst. hired
- Global advisors continue inventories and reviews
- GAs establish website
- Search comm.. formed for third GA; search conducted
- GAs help

- GAs meet with relevant Duke personnel
- GAs begin to inventory global advising at Duke and identify gaps
- GAs review intercultural competency training prgms.
- GAs (if new to Duke) begin to familiarize themselves with Duke curricula
- Staff support person hired for WF
- GAs prepare report with recommendations for services needed
- GAs begin to advise students
- develop/promote intercultural competencies program(s)
- GAs assist in intercultural competency training
- GAs advise students
- First Global Semester Abroad program held in Singapore/India

**2011/12**

- Third Global Advisor hired
- Global Semester Abroad repeated in Singapore and India
- Engineering GSA is held

**2012/13**

**2013/14**

## XII. Conclusion/Summary ? [Tolly??]

## XIII. Bibliography

### Works Cited

#### Liberal Education

Bok, Derek. "Preparing for a Global Society." *Our Underachieving Colleges*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

"College Learning for the New Global Century," *Report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America's Promise (LEAP)*. Washington: AAC&U, 2007.

Cronon, William. "'Only Connect...': The Goals of a Liberal Education." *The American Scholar* (Autumn 1998): 73-80.

Katz, Stanley. "Liberal Education on the Ropes." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 51.30 (2005): B6.

Nussbaum, Martha C. "Citizens of the World" and "The 'New' Liberal Education." *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

#### Global Education

Abbe, A., L.M.V. Gulick, and J.L. Herman. "Cross-Cultural Competence in Army Leaders: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation." United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Oct. 2007.  
<[http://www.hqda.army.mil/ari/pdf/SR\\_2008-01.pdf](http://www.hqda.army.mil/ari/pdf/SR_2008-01.pdf)>.

Allport, G. W. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Anheier, H. K., Glasius, M., & Kaldor, M. "Introducing Global Civil Society." *Global Civil Society*. Ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Ashwill, Mark A. "Developing Intercultural Competence for the Masses." *International Educator* 13.2 (2004): 16-25.

Bloom, B. S., and D.R. Krathwohl. "Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of

- Educational Goals, by a Committee of College and University Examiners." *Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1956.
- Bloom, B.S., D.R. Krathwohl, and B.B. Masia. "Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals." *Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964.
- Braskamp, L. A., D. C. Braskamp, and K. C. Merrill. *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its Purpose, Construction, Potential Uses, and Psychometric Characteristics*. Chicago: Global Perspective Institute. Aug. 2008. <<http://gpi.central.edu/>>.
- Burrows, D. "World Citizenship." The American Council on Education Regional Conference on New Directions in International Education. Beloit, Wisconsin. October 2004. <[http://www.pkal.org/documents/World-citizenship\\_Burrows.pdf](http://www.pkal.org/documents/World-citizenship_Burrows.pdf)>.
- Croucher, S. L. *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity a Changing World*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.
- Deardorff, Darla. "Internationalization: In Search of Intercultural Competence." *International Educator* 13.2 (2004): 13-15.
- Deardorff, Darla, and William Hunter. "Educating Global-Ready Graduates." *International Educator* 3 (May-June 2006): 72-83.
- Gacel-Avila, Jocelyne. "The Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Paradigm for Global Citizenry." *Journal in International Education* 9 (2005): 121-136.
- Gibson, K. L., G.M. Rimmington, and M. Landwehr-Brown. "Developing Global Awareness and Responsible World Citizenship with Global Learning." *Roeper Review* 30 (2008): 11-23.
- Green, Madeleine F. "The Internationalized Campus: A Strategic Approach." *International Educator* 12.1 (2003): 13-21.
- Hunter, William D. "Got Global Competency?" *International Educator* 13.2 (2004): 6-12.
- Kolb, D. A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- Larsen, David. "The Future of International Education: What Will It Take?" *International Education* 34.1 (2004): 51-56.
- Lovett, Clara. "We Need a New Model of Global Education." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 54.31 (2008): A40.
- NAFSA: National Association of International Educators. *An International Education Policy for U.S. Leadership, Competitiveness, and Security*. Oct. 2007. 6 Nov. 2008 <[http://www.nafsa.org/public\\_policy.sec/united\\_states\\_international](http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/united_states_international)>.
- Nesdale, D., and P. Todd. "Internationalizing Australian Universities: The Intercultural Contact Issue." *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration* 15 (1993): 189-202.

Oblinger, D., and A. Verville. *Global Interdependence: What Business Wants from Higher Education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1998.

Pascarella, E. T., and P.T. Terenzini. *How College Affects Students (Vol. 2): A Third Decade of Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Rimmington, G. M. "Challenges for Education toward 2010." Empire of Interdependence Conference. Friends University, Wichita, KS. March 2005.

Sachdev, P. "Cultural Sensitivity Training through Experiential Learning: A Participatory Demonstration Field Education Project." *International Social Work* 40 (1997): 7-25.

Sanford, N. *Self and Society: Social Change and Individual Development*. New York: Atherton Press, 1966.

Schuerholz-Lehr, Sabine. "Teaching for Global Literacy in Higher Education: How Prepared Are the Educators?" *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11.2 (2007): 180-204.

Shrivastava, Meenal. "Globalizing 'Global Studies': Vehicles for Disciplinary and Regional Bridges." *New Global Studies* 2.3 (2008): 1-20.

Wikipedia. *Intercultural Competence*. Sep. 2007.  
<[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intercultural\\_competence](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intercultural_competence)>.

Yershova, Yelena, Joan DeJaeghere, and Josef Mestenhauser. "Thinking Not as Usual: Adding the Intercultural Perspective." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 4 (2000): 39-78.

Zemach-Bersin, Talya. "American Students Abroad Can't Be 'Global Citizens.'" *Chronicle of Higher Education* 54.26 (2008): A34

### **Winter Forum**

Cohen, Elizabeth G. *Designing Groupwork: Strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Ediger, M. "Learning Opportunities in the Higher Education Curriculum." *College Student Journal* 35.3 (2001): 410.

Forester, Anne D., and Margaret Reinhard. *On the Move: Teaching the Learner's Way in Grades 4-7*. Winnipeg, Canada: Peguis Publishers, 1989.

Forester, Anne D., and Margert Reinhard. *The Learner's Way*. Winnipeg, Canada: Peguis Publishers, 1989.

Forester, Anne D., and Margaret Reinhard. *The Teacher's Way: The Role of the Teacher in Today's Classroom*. Winnipeg, Canada: Penguin Publishers, 1989.

Henderson, Donald. "Retreat for Success: A Case History in Management Team Building."

*Journal of Management in Engineering* (1999).

Johnson, David W., and K. Smith. *Active Learning*. Edina, Minn.: Interaction Book Company, 1991.

Johnson, David W., and Roger T. Johnson. *Cooperation, Competition: Theory and Research*. Minneapolis, MN: Interaction Book Company, 1994.

Johnson, D. W., R.T. Johnson, and E.J. Holubec. *New Circles of Learning; Cooperation in the Classroom and School*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1994.

Johnson, D. W., R.T. Johnson, and K.A. Smith. "Academic Controversy: Enriching College Instruction through Intellectual Conflict." *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* 25.3 (1996).

Johnson, D. W., R.T. Johnson, and K.A. Smith. "Cooperative Learning Returns to College: What Evidence Is There That It Works?" *Change* 30.4 (1998): 10.

Kohn, Alfie. *Punished by Rewards: The Trouble with Gold Stars, Incentive Plans, A's, Praise and Other Bribes*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993.

Murry, J. P., and J.I. Murry. "How Do I Lecture Thee?" *College Teaching* 40.3 (1992).

Pledger, Linda and Marceline Thompson. "Cooperative Learning versus Traditional Lecture Format: A Preliminary Study." Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association. New York, NY. November 1998.

Potthast, M. "Outcomes of Using Small-Group Cooperative Learning Experiences in Introductory Statistics Courses." *College Student Journal* 33.1 (1999): 34.

Sternberg, Robert J. "Interdisciplinary Problem-Based Learning: An Alternative to Traditional Majors and Minors." *Liberal Education* (Winter 2008): 12-17.

### **Global Semester Abroad**

Astin, A. *Achieving Educational Excellence: A Critical Assessment of Priorities and Practices in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Bates, J. "The Effects of Study Abroad on Undergraduates in an Honors International Program." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 58 (1997): 4162A.

Black, H. T., and David L. Duhon. "Assessing the Impact of Business Study Abroad Programs on Cultural Awareness and Personal Development." *Journal of Education for Business* (2006): 140-144.

Carlson, J. S., and K.F. Widaman. "The Effects of Study Abroad during College on Attitudes toward other Cultures." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 12.1 (1988): 1-18.

Carlson, J., B. Burn, J. Useen, and D. Yachimovicz. *Study Abroad: The*



- Experience of American Undergraduates*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Carlson, J., B. Burn, J. Useen, and D. Yachimovicz. *The Experience of American Undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States*. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1991.
- Carsello, C., and J. Greaser. "How College Students Change during Study Abroad." *College Student Journal* 10 (1976): 276-278.
- Drew, D., L. Meyer, and P. Peregrine. "Effects of Study Abroad on Conceptualizations of National Groups." *College Student Journal* 30 (1996): 452-461.
- Dwyer, Mary M. "The Impact of Study Abroad Program Duration." *Frontier: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 10 (Fall 2004): 151-163.
- Geelhoed, R., J. Abe, and D. Talbot. "A Qualitative Study of Students' Experiences in an International Peer Program." *Journal of College Student Development* 44 (2003): 5-17.
- Gray, Kimberly S., Gwendolyn K. Murdock, and Chad D. Stebbins. "Assessing Study Abroad's Effect on an International Mission." *Change* (May-June 2002): 45-51.
- Hulstrand, Janet. "Education Abroad on the Fast Track." *International Educator* (2006): 46-55.
- International Honors Program. *International Honors Program: Comparative Study Around the World*. Sep. 2008. 25 Sep. 2008 <<http://www.ihp.edu>>.
- Kauffman, N.F., and G.K. Kuh. "The Impact of Study Abroad on Personal Development of College Students." Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA. April 1984.
- Kelly, K., and J. Meyers. *Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory, Self-Assessment*. Chicago: NCS Pearson, 1995.
- Kitsantas, A. "Studying Abroad: The Role of College Students' Goals on the Development of Cross-Cultural Skills and Global Understanding." *College Student Journal* 38 (2004): 441-452.
- Kitsantas, A., and J. Meyers. "Studying Abroad: Does it Enhance College Student Cross-Cultural Awareness?" Annual Meeting of San Diego State University and the U.S. Department of Education Centers for International Business Education and Research. San Diego, CA. March 2001.
- Laubscher, M. *Encounters with Difference: Student Perceptions of the Role of Out-of-Class Experiences in Education Abroad*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- McCabe, L. "The Development of a Global Perspective during Participation in Semester-at-Sea: A comparative Global Education Program." *Educational Review* 46 (1994): 275-286.
- Ryan, M., and R. Twibell. "Concerns, Values, Stress, Coping, Health, and Educational

Outcomes of College Students who Studied Abroad." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 24 (2000): 409-435.

Spencer, Sarah E., and Kathy Tuma. *The Guide to Successful Short-Term Programs Abroad*. Washington, DC: NAFSA, 2002.

St. John's University. *Discover the World*. Oct. 2008. 3 Oct. 2008  
<<http://www.stjohns.edu/academics/international/globalstudies/globalstudies.stj>>.

West, Charlotte. "When One is Not Enough: Multicountry Education Abroad." *International Educator* (Jan./Feb.2009): 19-26.

### **Global Advising Program**

Campbell, Susan M., and Charlie L. Nutt. "Academic Advising in the New Global Century: Supporting Student Engagement and Learning Outcomes Achievement." *Peer Review* (Winter 2008): 4-7.

Chow, Yung-Hwa Anna . "How to Promote Global Citizenry Outside of the Classrooms: At the Local, National, and International Levels." *Academic Advising Today* 31.4 (2008).

Church, Matthew. "Global Advising: Advising Students for a Globalized World." *The Mentor* 10.3 (2008).

Freeman, Lynn C. "Establishing Effective Advising Practices to Influence Student Learning and Success." *Peer Review* (Winter 2008): 12-14.

Gordon, Virginia. "New Horizons: Learning from the Past and Preparing for the Future." *NACADA Journal* 18.2 (1998): 5-12.

Gudep, Vijaya Kumar. "Issues and Challenges in Academic Advising: A Multivariate Study Of Students' Attitudes Towards Academic Advising in United Arab Emirates (UAE)." *Contemporary Management Research* 3.2 (2007): 151-171.

Jendraszak, Lindsey A. "Applying O'Banion's Model to Study Abroad Advising." *The Mentor* 9.1 (2008).

Laff, Ned Scott. "Teachable Moments: Advising as Liberal Learning." *Liberal Education* (Spring 2006).

Laird, Curt. "Managing the Advising Relationship: Three Common Sense Tips for Advising College Students." *The Mentor* 9.4 (October 2007).

Larkin, Megan. "Creating Reflection on International Experiences through Appreciative Advising." *The Mentor* 10.1 (2008).

Magolda, Marcia B., and Patricia M. King. "Toward Reflective Conversations: An Advising Approach That Promotes Self-Authorship." *Peer Review* (Winter 2008): 8-11.

Mandle, Joan, and Adam Weinberg. "Capturing the Passion: Engaging Returning Abroad

Students in Local Communities.” Workshop Proceedings from the 2007 Fostering Global Citizenship in Higher Education Conference: Strategies for Campus-Wide Collaboration. University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont. 2007.

Morano, Matthew. “Challenges Encountered by New Advisers: Honest Answers, Practical Solutions.” *The Mentor* 1.1 (1999).

Rinck, Christiane N. “Student Engagement and Academic Advising.” *The Mentor* 8.2 (2006)

Salisbury, Mark H. et al. "Going Global: Understanding the Choice Process of the Intent to Study Abroad." *Research in Higher Education* (2008).

### **Assessment**

Banta, Trudy W. “Student Competence as the Basis for Designing Curricula, Instruction, and Assessment.” *Assessing Student Learning in the Disciplines*. CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2007.

Deardorff, Darla K. “A Matter of Logic?” *International Educator* (May-June 2005): 26-31.

Deardorff, Darla K. “Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization.” *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10 (2006): 241-266.

Deardorff, Darla K. "Principles of International Education Assessment." *IIE Networker* (Spring 2007): 51-52.

Deardorff, Darla K. *The Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States*. Diss. North Carolina State University, 2004.  
<<http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/theses/available/etd-06162004-000223/unrestricted/etd.pdf>>.

### **Duke University Resources**

Duke University. *Academic Programs: Duke University Marine Lab*. 2008  
<<http://www.nicholas.duke.edu/marinelab/programs/signature.html>>.

Duke University. *Duke Engage: Challenge Yourself. Change Your World*. 2009.  
<<http://dukeengage.duke.edu/>>.

Duke University. *Duke University Study Abroad*. 2008.  
<<http://studyabroad.duke.edu/home/Programs>>.

Duke University. *Making a Difference*. 2006.  
<<http://stratplan.duke.edu/plan.html>>.

Duke University. *Mission Statement*. 2001.  
<<http://www.trustees.duke.edu/governing/mission.php>>.

Duke University. *Program II: A Self-Designed Interdisciplinary Degree Program*. 2008.  
<<http://www.aas.duke.edu/program2/>>.

Duke University. *The Focus Program*. 2008.

<<http://www.trinity.duke.edu/academics/opps/focus.php>>.

<http://studentaffairs.duke.edu/d/?p=7vex>

<http://www.ots.duke.edu>

<http://advising.trinity.duke.edu>

<http://ihouse.studentaffairs.duke.edu/training/icc/intro.htm>

<http://www.pacific.edu/sis/culture/>

<http://www.aas.duke.edu/admin/council/standing/sabroad.html>

**XIV. Appendices [missing Sikorski and need to insert Riley multi-page budget unless we put in narrative or on the website. I'll try to do the latter]**

**Appendix A: Summary timetable**

- Fall 2006—leadership team constituted
- December 2006—first meeting of leadership team
- Fall 2006-spring 2007—presentations around campus to explain QEP and solicit topics; leadership team discusses “educating students for the world of the future”; case statements drafted; “blue sky conversations” held with students and faculty
- June 2007—accreditation orientation in Atlanta
- June 2007—topic selected by leadership team from among the 20-30 suggested: “Re-Imagining Liberal Arts Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” (the topic suggested by the undergraduate member)
- July 2007—selection of QEP committee co-chairs

- August 2007—formation of QEP committee, in consultation with ECAC and approval of President and Provost
- Fall semester 2007—QEP committee meets every 3 weeks
  - Through October 2007, discussion of various articles on liberal education
  - Presentations by co-chairs and liaison to exec comm. of graduate faculty, GPSC, DSG, Library Council, plus informal discussions with non-committee colleagues and students
  - By end November 2007, 4 or 5 foci emerged as important for liberal education: critical thinking, interdisciplinarity, assessment of personal growth, post-Duke life, integration of undergrad and graduate/professional schools; global citizenship. four subcommittees formed: transition beyond the first year; junior/senior years including integration with grad/prof schools; four year overview; global citizenship.
- Spring semester 2008—QEP committee reviews subcommittee work and narrows focus to global citizenship as (1) important element of liberal education for living, learning, and working in 21<sup>st</sup> century; (2) aspects of “global citizenship” discussed and parsed out. Rationale for plan developed. Subcommittees formed to investigate possible components of preparing Duke undergraduates for global citizenship. All subcommittees to include consideration of elements deemed important: better integration of professional schools; vertical integration; co-curricular integration; fit with undergraduate majors
- May 2008—Three possibilities presented to leadership team: winter forum, global advising program, and better integration of international students. Global semester abroad mentioned at that time but not approved.
- September 2008—Leadership team approves three components of the global citizenship focus for QEP: winter forum, global semester abroad, and global advising program.
- Fall 2008—subcommittees work on fleshing out the three components, consulting with individuals and groups around campus; student focus groups held.
- Winter 2008/09—Drafts created and circulated; revisions made on basis of feedback.

**Appendix B:** List of groups with whom preliminary QEP discussions were held, Sept. 2006-June 2007

**University Input Into Proposal and Selection of QEP Topics**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Date</b>
Provost's Staff	9/18/2006
Leadership Team	12/18/2006
Provost's Staff	1/8/2007
Deans Cabinet	1/8/2007
Academic Programs Committee	1/10/2007
Pratt School of Engineering: Directors of Undergraduate Studies	1/18/2007
Assessment Working Group	1/23/2007
Graduate and Professional Student Council	1/23/2007
Duke Student Government	1/24/2007
Compliance Certification Team	1/30/2007
Student Affairs Senior Leadership Team	1/31/2007
Arts and Sciences Council	2/8/2007
Alumni Board	2/10/2007
Provost's Staff	2/13/2007
Academic Council	2/22/2007

Board of Trustees, Faculty, Graduate, and Professional School Affairs Committee	2/23/2007
Board of Trustees, Undergraduate Affairs Committee	2/23/2007
Engineering Faculty Council	2/23/2007
Administrators of Continuing Education and Outreach Programs	2/26/2007
Law School Faculty	2/27/2007
Directors of Undergraduate Studies I	2/27/2007
Directors of Undergraduate Studies II	2/28/2007
Student Administrative Services:	3/9/2007
Office of Undergraduate Financial Aid and Student Loans	
Student Accounts/University Cashiering Office	
Office of the University Registrar	
SISS Office	
DukeCard Office	
Student Service Center	
Office of Undergraduate Admissions	
Financial aid, admissions and records staff from all graduate and professional schools	
Provost's Staff	3/19/2007
Provost's Staff	3/26/2007
Provost's Staff	4/2/2007
Provost's Staff	4/9/2007
Leadership Team	4/27/2007
Provost's Staff	4/30/2007
Provost's Staff	5/5/2007
Provost's Staff	5/7/2007
Provost's Staff	5/14/2007
Dean of Students Office	5/15/2007
Provost's Staff	5/21/2007
“Blue Sky” conversation with faculty, students, staff	5/25/2007
“Blue Sky Conversation” #2, other faculty, students, staff	5/30/2007
Provost's Staff	6/4/2007
“Blue Sky Conversation” #3, graduate and undergraduate students	6/8/2007
Leadership Team	6/13/2007

**Appendix C: Early University-Wide solicitation of QEP Topics as of March 2007**

**Reaffirmation of Accreditation by the Commission on Colleges  
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools:  
Getting Started**

Every decade, Duke University undergoes the process of re-affirming its accreditation by SACS, its regional accrediting body. The process is rigorous and lengthy, taking more than two years and involving all university constituencies.

In this, the first, re-accreditation of the twenty-first century, a noteworthy development on both the federal and state levels is an increased emphasis on assessment and accountability, especially of student learning outcomes. This emphasis is present in both prongs of SACS re-accreditation, the Compliance Certification Report and the Quality Enhancement Plan.

The latter, a self-study of no more than 75 pages of narrative, will center on student learning in whatever ways we seek to define and analyze it. Input on possible topics is now being solicited across Duke. *Your* feedback is valued and will be solicited at the upcoming meeting. Here are the topics proposed to date.

### **Quality Enhancement Plan Topics Proposed to Date**

#### **Transitions**

- Making the Most of the Final Educational Year
  - Capstones
  - Career advising
  - Central Campus
  
- Educating Students for the Work World of the Future
  - Education and “pre-professionalism”: mutually exclusive?
  - Making a difference for self and society
  - Work world needs skills built through
    - interdisciplinarity
    - internships
    - study abroad
  - liberal arts as “practical”
  - vocations and avocation; vocation vs. avocation
  - non-linear career paths

#### **Education in/for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

- Knowledge in service to society
  - Knowledge and Society—definitions, issues, and challenges
  - Faculty and translational research
  - Students and civic engagement
  
- Advancing Interdisciplinarity to Innovation
  - Interdisciplinarity as the engine of innovation
  - Inculcating in students the power to create
  - Mentorship and vertical innovation as vehicles for idea realization
  - Bringing ideas to the service of society
  
- The Research University and the Millennial Student
  - Changing demographics
  - Media-exposed modes of learning
  - Enhancing the “fit” between undergraduates today and the environment we create for them
    - Ways we teach
    - How we house
    - How we create faculty-student interactions
  
- Liberal Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

#### **Student development**

- Educating the Whole Student
  - Integrating ethics education
  - Attending to mental and physical health
  - Building leadership skills
  - Central Campus and other residential components

- Career services
- Service to society
- Lifelong learning
  
- Enhancing Interactions Between Graduate Students and Undergraduates
  - Classroom teaching and learning
  - Research teams
  - Residential life
  - Career preparation
  
- Campus community as it Affects Student Learning

**Infrastructure Issues:**

- Creating a More Adequate Infrastructure for Research and Teaching (facilities, etc.)
- Maximizing the Effectiveness of Central Campus as a Living and Learning Environment
- “Urban planning” for Campus as a Whole

**Topics suggested as stand alones that could be part of any final choice**

- Student engagement in learning (critical piece)
- Best practice teaching
- Globalization
- The arts
- Diversity: How to think about it in the 21<sup>st</sup> century
- Integrating disciplinary and interdisciplinary learning

**Miscellaneous**

- Cross-Institutional Partnerships
- Balancing Academics and Athletics

Thank you for considering these topics, for providing your thoughts about their suitability, and for proposing additional topics as you see fit.

Judith Ruderman, Vice Provost for Academic and Administrative Services, Liaison to SACS

**Appendix D: Example of a Draft Case Statement Proposed to Leadership Team, fall 2006**

Quality Enhancement Plan for Duke University  
June 7, 2007—draft #5

**Educating Students for the World of the Future: A Case Statement**

**The Topic (Not the Title).** The topic is on its face a puzzling one: What else *could* we be educating our students for if not the “the future”? That said, perhaps it is not a given that we are, in fact, preparing our students for the world of the future—maybe we are doing a better job, in some ways, at preparing them for the world of the present (or even the past). That is to say, perhaps we are not intentionally and holistically considering the extent to which we are grounding our entire educational experience—curricular and co-curricular alike—in the enhancement of the skills and qualities necessary for our students’ productive lives over the course of their life span.

The topic is also a bold one: the “world of the future” is uncertain, and we do not have a crystal ball. Yet certain trends apparent in the here and now will certainly accelerate, and thus we do have a blueprint of sorts for planning purposes. Re-accreditation—with its attendant requirement of a self-study focused on



student learning and deriving from ongoing planning and data collection—provides the opportunity for us to ask ourselves these pointed questions: how well are we preparing our students for their future as citizens, community members, and workers in a more intensely global environment, and what plans must we set in place to improve the educational experiences we now provide?

**Charting the Territory.** In a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* essay, Lee Bollinger, the president of Columbia, touched on several aspects of the obligation that universities have toward their students:

Universities understand that to remain competitive, their most important obligation is to determine — and then deliver — what future graduates will need to know about their world and how to gain that knowledge. While the last century witnessed a new demand for specialized research, prizing the expert's vertical mastery of a single field, the emerging global reality calls for new specialists who can synthesize a diversity of fields and draw quick connections among them. In reordering our sense of the earth's interdependence, that global reality also cries out for a new age of exploration, with students displaying the daring, curiosity, and mettle to discover and learn entirely new areas of knowledge.

The experience of arriving on a campus to live and study with classmates from a diverse range of backgrounds is essential to students' training for this new world, nurturing in them an instinct to reach out instead of clinging to the comforts of what seems natural or familiar. We know that connecting with people very — or even slightly — different from ourselves stimulates the imagination; and when we learn to see the world through a multiplicity of eyes, we only make ourselves more nimble in mastering — and integrating — the diverse fields of knowledge awaiting us (“Why Diversity Matters”, CHE, *The Chronicle Review*, June 1, 2007, p. B20) .

Bollinger describes several of the skills, habits of thinking, qualities, and experiences that are critical for navigating the world now and into the future: the ability to synthesize, to discover, to go out of one's comfort zone.

We at Duke need, before all else, to examine and define these qualities and skills for ourselves. Once we define them, justify them, and spell them out, we will have created a kind of blueprint for integrating and improving various aspects of our students' curricular and co-curricular lives. We will more compellingly articulate what we want to happen to students during their time at Duke (“learning outcomes”). We will be better able to differentiate between programs essential for our students' success and mere “bells and whistles.” We will be able to develop assessment mechanisms based on Duke's stated educational aims, reviewing our current programs on those bases as well as developing new programs. Such a blueprint will prove useful across campus, on the macro and micro levels.

**People, Places, and Things.** Three interlocking aspects of “the world of the future” are salient for our discussions now at Duke: in shorthand they are “people, places, and things.” One of our goals should be the development of our students' propensity to encounter people, contexts, and ideas different from their own—that is, to enlarge their sense of self so that they become “bigger,” as it were, from having attended Duke.

**The people.** Working and living collaboratively with diverse peoples will undoubtedly continue to be not only a hallmark of our students' lives after graduation but a necessity if we are to co-exist on this shrinking planet.

“Diversity” has been a buzzword for a long time in higher education and the work force as American institutions have sought to be more inclusive for reasons of both equity and excellence. But what does “diversity” really mean for and at Duke in this period, and what will it mean as our students graduate and move on? The term, it seems to us, is more and more subtly nuanced and broadly defined.

Duke University is more diverse in *numbers* of different kinds of people than ever before in our history—the same might be said of the American workforce and, to some degree, communities. But what would we say at Duke about meaningful opportunities for connections between and among diverse groups? How would “meaningful” be best described? As definitions of groups have become more complicated (both looser and tighter), and boundaries between people more fluid, have we reached an optimal level of boundary crossing and community building? Navigating the often slippery and tricky boundaries between identities within the self and between the self and others is an art that we should be helping students to learn while they are at Duke.

**The places.** In the future, students will live and work in a different place both literally and figuratively. On the literal level, many of them will enter careers that take them to far-flung sites around the globe— sometimes several different locations over the course of a lifetime. On the figurative level, the American workforce has become more diversified as boundaries between countries and their workers have become more fluid; whether in the American workplace or through technology, our students will increasingly interact physically and virtually with workers from other countries.

At the same time, only one of two workers in this country has been employed at his or her present company for more than five years<sup>11</sup>, and trends suggest that our students will switch careers in the future more often than their parents and certainly their grandparents did—another kind of place change.

This movement from place to place requires the ability to navigate successfully the different environments in which one finds oneself. This successful navigation requires attention to our potential negative as well as positive effects on the communities we enter when we move across boundaries with our different values, positions, economic status, and backgrounds. We do not wish for our students or our graduates to travel too “lightly” from place to place without meaningful engagement. Thus, we need to ensure that we are preparing our students optimally for embracing mobility as both a necessity and a good.

**The things.** By this term we refer to *information and knowledge*. The world of modern information is one in which the sheer amount of data to which we have access is ever growing; with so much information competing for our attention, how do we focus on what is important and determine what is relevant and true? The challenge for our students today and into the future is how to appropriately access information, sort it, assess it, put it together in meaningful ways, and work with others to use it.

Information is necessary but not sufficient for knowledge. Knowledge entails analysis, understanding, and meaning, and the discovery and dissemination of knowledge by faculty and students alike is what a research university like Duke is all about. Since the *content* of future knowledge itself is unknown, it is imperative that we facilitate “learning how to learn.”

Increasingly, knowledge is gained by interdisciplinary study and teaching, whether through collaboration between disciplines, expansion of disciplinary self-definition, or emerging interdisciplinary programs. Experiential education, a hands-on approach to knowledge, is also of increasing importance outside the laboratory setting; in essence, education writ large is looked upon more and more as a laboratory, with connections drawn more overtly between the classroom and the rest of a student’s world (in the smallest and largest senses). Research; service learning; internships; study abroad; DukeEngage—these and more constitute experiential learning.

All three aspects of “the world of the future”—people, places, and things—are concerned in important ways with *boundary crossings*. In some ways, therefore, the topic would build upon, and expand, the 1988 self-study topic: “Crossing Boundaries” (subtitled “Interdisciplinary Planning for the Nineties”).

#### **Potential Foci for the QEP:**

**What changes do we need for the curriculum/a? Revisiting the meaning and content of “the liberal arts.”**The term “liberal arts” goes back to classical antiquity and refers to the seven “arts and

---

<sup>11</sup> See [glumbert.com/media/shift](http://glumbert.com/media/shift) for an interesting presentation on the future entitled “Shift Happens.”

sciences.”<sup>12</sup> (A more-or-less synonymous term in the Renaissance referred entirely to the wisdom and achievements of the past.) What do we mean *today* by this term and how does the definition play into the ways in which we provide educational opportunities for all our undergraduate students? Aside from subject matters, such modes of inquiry and pedagogy as team work and experiential learning did not play an integral role in the liberal arts in the past. What are the defining characteristics of a “liberal” education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? What is the role for the past—and for books themselves—in this education? What is the role for direct experience (in its many forms)? What aspects of education are timeless and what dated? Where should our emphases lie?

We would also ask about the connection between “the liberal arts” and pre-professionalism.” One question is, How can “the liberal arts” at Duke play more of a role in the education of our engineering students, thus helping to make Pratt a unique engineering school? How can “professional” coursework and other experiences—whether in Pratt or the graduate and professional schools—enrich and even transform “the liberal arts”?

**What changes do we need for the curriculum/a? Rethinking the majors.** Curriculum 2000 concentrated on changes in general education within Trinity College. The time is ripe for a hard look at all our undergraduate majors in light of the renewed emphasis on “preparing our students for the world of the future.” This review would include the numbers and kinds of courses needed for the major, and the frequency of the evaluation cycle. It would examine interdisciplinary and experiential education, potentially reducing the boundaries between curricular and co-curricular activities and thereby making the Duke education more of a piece.

If we can define what our students need in order to be prepared for their futures as citizens and workers (and family members), how would we go about developing these qualities and abilities in the classroom? It is important for us to articulate these desired outcomes in such a way that each department can relate to the overall rubric and adapt itself accordingly. As one example, we might wish to help faculty become more knowledgeable about and comfortable with incorporating collaboration in their syllabi and pedagogy.

**What changes do we need for the curriculum/a? Revisiting Curriculum 2000 including rethinking whether the Trinity College modes of inquiry actually help to facilitate the development of the habits and values we think necessary for thriving in the world of the future.** The CCI already questioned how the cross-cultural inquiry requirement plays out in reality; the same could be said about the ethical inquiry requirement, and how we inculcate scientific and technological literacy.

## **Appendix E: Summary of One of Three “Blue Sky” conversations, spring 2007**

### **Educating Students for the World of the Future** “Blue Sky” Conversation – May 30, 2007

Present: Leslie Collins, Al Crumbliss, Tom Ferraro, Peter Haff, Peter Lange (convener), Lynne O’Brien, Gautham Pandyan, Louise Roth, Judith Ruderman, Suzanne Shanahan, Paul Slattery

The second and equally stimulating “blue sky” conversation among students (graduate and undergraduate), faculty (Pratt, Arts & Sciences, and Nicholas) and administrators took off from both the draft case statement and the summary of last week’s meeting. Several ideas were reinforced and new emphases added. This summary of the discussion will supplement the case statement<sup>13</sup> and the document produced after the May 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

---

<sup>12</sup> The arts: grammar, rhetoric, logic; the mathematical sciences: arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy.

<sup>13</sup> The case statement, draft #4, remains a useful corollary to this document as to the summary of the May 25<sup>th</sup> “blue sky” conversation and should be reviewed in tandem with them.

**The undergraduate focus of the conversation.** Like the discussion on May 25, this one was undergraduate-centric. This may be a function of the persons assembled around the table and/or the more compelling need to address issues of undergraduate education in the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The verdict is still out on this question. The students asked that a third conversation be held, with students only (graduate, professional, and undergraduate), and the hope is that this will happen next week.

**What skills, attributes, and experiences do we need to facilitate for the world of the future?** On May 25<sup>th</sup>, the attributes mentioned as being crucial for the future were leadership, entrepreneurialism, innovation, and openness. Other (sometimes related) qualities were added on May 30<sup>th</sup>: among them, creativity, versatility, risk-taking, judgment, perspective, reflection, introspection. Because we do not know exactly what the future holds, our students need to acquire the skills that might not even be apparent now—thus, we need to foster “learning how to learn.” In consideration of how to do this, we need to keep in mind what is actually core and what is a mere “bell and whistle.”

The word “balance” was brought into the conversation in different ways from its typical use when referring to Duke undergraduates: instead of a balance between curricular and co-curricular (as in “work hard, play hard”), the suggestion was made that our students need to slow down, to stop engaging in a frenzy of co-curricular activities, and instead to balance the mastery of a subject with the willingness to entertain the new; the analytic with the synthetic; their sense of personal importance with their place in the larger world(s); thinking with doing; respect with judgment; working by oneself with working in teams.

Learning how to work with and learn from diverse peoples—diversity defined in socio-economic, intellectual, national terms, among others—is a critical component of the educational experience. This is more than a question of mere “interaction”; rather, it is a matter of encountering ideas that cause us to rethink our own (a quality similar to that of “openness,” mentioned by the May 25<sup>th</sup> group), which can lead to a change of ideas or a reaffirmation of them. What aspects of Duke encourage such meaningful encounters and what are the obstacles that the University (or society) puts in their path? Can such encounters be imposed from the top down, for example through housing policies? How does one balance the need for comfort with the necessity for encountering different people and ideas? Can living and learning with others different from ourselves (in the classroom and out) be both stimulating/enlarging *and* safe?

**Revisiting the meaning and content of “the liberal arts.** The characteristics of a liberal arts education are important but they are not necessarily the same characteristics that defined the term in earlier ages. Team work, for example, was not hitherto considered to play an integral role, nor what we call “experiential” learning. What are the defining characteristics of a “liberal” education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? What is the role for the past—and for books themselves—in this education? What is the role for direct experience (in its many forms)? What aspects of education are timeless and what dated? Where should our emphases lie?

**Revisiting the meaning of “intellectualism.”** Are many Duke undergraduates anti-intellectual? Is it possible that the meaning of the term “intellectual” has changed and they are intellectual in different ways? Some would call them “fiercely intelligent”—what does that mean? What “should” it mean? What role does “pre-professionalism” play in our thinking about these questions? How “pre-professional” can we say our undergraduates really are when Teach for America is their largest employer, and when a large percentage of these students changes career paths within five years of graduation?

**What changes do we need for the curriculum/a? Rethinking the majors.** Stepping back from, and reevaluating, the majors is a good idea at this juncture. Are there outdated elements and new elements we should be considering? How can we make the majors more “relevant” in the best sense? If we can define what our students need in order to be prepared for their futures as citizens and workers (and family members), how would we go about developing these qualities and abilities in the classroom? It is important for us to articulate these desired outcomes in such a way that each department can relate to the overall rubric and adapt itself accordingly.

**What salient issues about teamwork inform pedagogy?** How can the faculty incorporate collaboration in their syllabi and pedagogy? This includes finding a way to allow students to team with others in research projects instead of slotting them handily into the faculty member's ongoing research interests. What is the balance between traditional and experiential education? In Pratt, for example, the professional accrediting body (ABET) dictates certain aspects of the engineering education that limit the amount of experiential experiences; yet Pratt students want to do, to build. How to resolve this dilemma?

**Do structural elements impede change?** Do we encourage a "local" perspective by the way we feature sports or Greek life, or even by the way that international graduate students often remain in their laboratory silos? (Do we over-compartmentalize graduate students from undergraduates?) Have we made the most of internationalization? Could interdisciplinarity be better fostered if departmental structures were more fluid? How can we take the focus away from the customary (and often self-serving) and turn our structures "inside out"?

#### **Appendix F: Membership of Duke's Leadership Team**

Richard H. Brodhead, president, chair

Lee Baker, dean of academic affairs, Trinity College (added fall 2008)

James Bettman, faculty, Fuqua School of Business

Mary T. Boatwright, faculty in classical studies, Arts and Sciences, and co-chair of QEP committee

Sally Deutsch, dean for social sciences, Arts and Sciences and faculty in history

Peter Lange, provost

Linda Franzoni, associate dean for undergraduate education, Pratt School of Engineering (replaced Laursen, [date])

Tod Laursen, [title], Pratt School of Engineering (stepped down from position and committee [date])

Hof Milam, vice president for finance

Larry Moneta, vice president for student affairs

Stephen Nowicki, dean of undergraduate education and faculty in biology (replaced Thompson, July 1, 2008)

Gautham Pandiyan, graduate student in molecular cancer biology

Jim Roberts, executive vice provost for finance and administration

Judith Ruderman, vice provost for academic and administrative services and liaison to SACS

Robert Thompson, dean of Trinity College and vice provost for undergraduate education (left position and committee, June 30, 2008)

Kevin Troy, Trinity College '09

**Appendix G: QEP Committee Membership**

Owen Astrachan, faculty, computer science, Arts and Sciences

Lee Baker, dean of academic affairs, Trinity College (replaced Thompson, summer 2008)

John Board, faculty, electrical and computer engineering, Pratt School of Engineering

Mary (Tolly) Boatwright (co-chair), faculty, classical studies, Arts and Sciences

Crystal Brown, chair of Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSC) and student, School of Law (graduated May 2008; replaced by Duncan)

Dona Chikaraishi, faculty in neurobiology, School of Medicine

Doriane Coleman, faculty in School of Law

John Coleman, faculty in Fuqua School of Business

Harris Cooper, faculty in education and psychology, Arts and Sciences

Alvin Crumbliss, dean of sciences, Arts and Sciences, and faculty in chemistry

Sheila Curran, director, Career Center (left Duke June 2008)

Alethea Duncan, chair of Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSC) and graduate student, chemistry (replaced Brown, spring 2008)

Thomas Ferraro, faculty in English, Arts and Sciences (off campus summer-fall 2008)

Curtis Freeman, faculty in Divinity School

Judith Hays, faculty, Center for the Study of Aging & Human Development and School of Nursing (on leave as of spring 2008)

Elizabeth Holmberg, Duke alumna and graduate student in psychology, Arts and Sciences

Matthew Hurst, student, School of Law

Susan M. Jones (assistant to the committee), Office of the Provost

Prasad Kasibhatla (co-chair), faculty, Nicholas School of the Environment and Pratt School of Engineering

Daniel Kimberg, Duke alumnus (T '06), director of Student U. (local non-profit)

Lori Leachman, faculty in economics, Arts and Sciences

Stephen Nowicki, dean of undergraduate education and faculty in biology

Awo Nur, undergraduate, Trinity College '10 (abroad fall 2008)

Judith Ruderman, Duke University liaison to SACS, vice provost for academic and administrative services, and adjunct faculty in English

Lori Setton, faculty in biomedical engineering

Suzanne Shanahan, chair of Arts and Sciences Council, associate director of Kenan Institute for Ethics, and faculty in sociology, Arts and Sciences

Robert Thompson, dean of Trinity College and vice provost for undergraduate education (left position and committee, June 30, 2008)

Kevin Troy, undergraduate, Trinity College '09

Erika Weinthal, faculty, Nicholas School of the Environment

**Appendix H:** “Global” Opportunities at Duke University [Sikorski to provide as a table]

**Appendix I:** Sample Draft Case Statement, September 2008

**Joining Worlds:  
Enhancing our Students' Capacity for Global Citizenship  
Duke University Quality Enhancement Plan**

**Rationale for Plan**

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, a citizen of any one country actually has dual citizenship with the world. Working and living collaboratively with people from diverse cultures will be a characteristic of Duke students' lives after graduation. It will also be a necessity if they are to co-exist with others on this shrinking planet. Further, students—whether citizens of the United States or other countries—need to understand their place in, and their obligations to, the world in which they live.

Duke University must prepare its students to live and work with people from countries with varying customs, laws, geographies, and beliefs, not only in communities within the United States but across the globe. Duke students will live in a world in which the United States is both competing and cooperating with other nations to increase human capital in intellectual, economic and other domains. They will live in a world of heterogeneous environments requiring that they understand other peoples' histories and cultures. They will need to have empathy for others, to possess the skills needed for communication with individuals and groups of different languages, customs, and backgrounds.

Duke graduates will live and work in places dramatically different from where they grew up and went to school. Many of them will enter careers that take them to locations around the globe or involve them in work with national and/or international ramifications. In addition, the United States workforce has become more diverse as boundaries between countries and their workers become more fluid. Whether in the local workplace or through technology, Duke students will increasingly interact physically and virtually with others from around the world.

The present and foreseeable future requires that Duke students refine their abilities to engage successfully with the different peoples and situations of the world. They must be attentive to the potential

negative and positive effects people can cause by moving across boundaries with different values, social structures, economic systems, and cultural mores. Duke University should prepare its students to travel from place to place neither too “lightly,” without meaningful engagement, nor too “heavily,” with fixed assumptions about the rightness of the perspectives they bring to unfamiliar circumstances. In short, Duke University needs to ensure that it prepares its students to embrace mobility and flexibility as both a necessity and a good, for both themselves and others.

Finally, knowledge is increasingly gained by interdisciplinary study and teaching. This can be accomplished through collaboration between disciplines, expansion of disciplinary self-definition, and/or emerging interdisciplinary programs. Part of the impetus for these interdisciplinary approaches comes from the complexity of the challenges facing the globe and the variety of approaches needed to address these challenges. Duke University needs to ensure that it is creating the opportunities and building the skills to enable its students to access, generate, and transmit knowledge in this complex future, and must recognize that these opportunities occur in settings within and outside the traditional classroom.

The time is right for Duke University to undertake a global citizenship initiative on a broad scale, through its Quality Enhancement Plan. Duke’s strategic plan, “Making a Difference” (2006), articulated goals involving internationalization, interdisciplinary studies, experiential learning, and knowledge in service to society. Duke is invested in many global initiatives across the institution—including, most recently, DukeEngage<sup>14</sup>—and enjoys many international partnerships that could be used to enhance its efforts. Duke has increased its number of international students in recent years, especially on the undergraduate level, and its number of international faculty as well. Over 40% of Duke students already study abroad. Duke offers International Comparative Studies and other internationally focused majors—some that emerged from language and literature programs like AMES and some discipline based like Cultural Anthropology. Thus, many of the elements for a global citizenship initiative are already in place. *However, Duke now lacks both a common, broad-based learning experience highlighting global issues and the opportunity to explore such issues in different parts of the world in one integrated, focused program; in addition, the elements currently in place are not well enough integrated to maximize their benefits for students or to take advantage of the talent across Duke’s many schools.* Efforts at greater focus and integration will deepen students’ preparation for studying, working and researching abroad. These efforts will help students integrate their time abroad with on-campus or in-Durham experiences. Duke will more fully emphasize and utilize the vertical integration of teachers and learners, and will create more horizontal integration of curricular and co-curricular learning. Finally, Duke will strengthen its “brand” as an institution intentionally preparing its undergraduate students for global citizenship.

In these gaps we are not alone: Derek Bok, in *Our Underachieving Colleges* (2006), laments that for all the strides that institutions of higher learning have made in seeking to build global citizenship, “still lacking on most campuses . . . is a thoughtful, comprehensive plan to combine these opportunities into well-integrated programs that can be fitted in with all the other legitimate aims of a rounded undergraduate education” (pg. 240). A QEP concentration on enhancing our students’ capacity for global citizenship arises from and complements Duke’s strategic planning and focuses on well-established issues of importance to student learning. This is what SACS requires of the QEP; it is what we require for ourselves.

### **Components of Global Citizenship**

The **outcomes** of a globalization initiative should result in Duke students developing:

- Awareness of significant contemporary issues and their global scope;

---

<sup>14</sup> The DukeEngage program provides funding for Duke undergraduates who wish to pursue an intensive (minimum of eight weeks) civic engagement experience anywhere in the world. Through DukeEngage, students apply what they have learned in the classroom to address societal issues at home or abroad. Not only do students tackle real-world problems, but they develop the valuable skills and self-knowledge that evolve from spending time in an immersive service experience.



- Appreciation for the history, values and priorities of individuals and groups in other regions and cultures, and the factors that influence these perspectives;
- Empathy for people from different backgrounds;
- Adaptive communication skills across regions and cultures;
- The ability to work and live interdependently within other cultures and with those of other cultures;
- Appreciation for the impact that their study abroad has had on their perspectives, values and goals;
- A view of themselves as both a national and a world citizen;
- Bonds within the student body through shared experiences in these domains.

The **skills** students will develop or enhance through this initiative include:

- Language
- Listening
- Sensitivity to other cultures
- Teamwork
- Resourcefulness
- Ethics/values/attitudes

### **Components of the QEP: Curriculum, Co-Curriculum, and Integrative Infrastructures**

To achieve these outcomes, Duke University proposes a three-component QEP: two of the components are curricular, addressing relevant content areas in the form of (1) a new academic winter forum and (2) a globally diverse study abroad opportunity, and the other is an infrastructure improvement, addressing the need for more holistic advising. Synergies will be achieved through all three aspects of the QEP.

Both the curricular and infrastructure aspects of the QEP contain components deemed critical by the QEP committee: creating common experiences around “big ideas”; integrating the professional schools more firmly into undergraduate life; capitalizing on the interdisciplinary initiatives at Duke University to address real-world challenges; fostering “vertical integration” of faculty, graduate and professional students, and undergraduates, and weaving international students more tightly into the fabric of university life. The QEP will take Duke to the next level in its international and global outreach both by creating a new, shared forum and by seeking to integrate already-existing pieces more effectively.

### **Curriculum: Enhancing the Global Knowledge Base Through a Winter Forum**

The curricular element of the QEP is a 2.5 day forum to be held immediately before the January start of the spring semester, to educate students, through learning in a variety of formats, around an important global challenge and to help prepare students during the subsequent semester to do related travel and project work if they wish. Inspiration for such a conference model derives from such events as the Renaissance Weekend<sup>15</sup> and the Duke Forum on Faith<sup>16</sup>—events designed to provide intellectual content, stimulation, and a forum for debate. Holding such an event in the inter-term period is an entirely new experience for Duke University; if successful it could grow into a true winter term.

The forum will feature three keynote speakers related to the content of the forum (see below for content), perhaps one from outside the University and the other two from among Duke’s notable faculty, including from the graduate and professional schools. In each of the three full-days of the program, students will attend two smaller sessions/workshops led by relevant faculty. Social events will provide further informal opportunities for interaction and collaboration between students and faculty. On the model of “Visible

---

<sup>15</sup> For a description of this event, its history and goals, see <http://www.renaissanceweekend.org/>

<sup>16</sup> The Forum on Faith, a program of the Duke Divinity School, is a yearly retreat described as a “learning community for study, reflection, and conversation. . . . provid[ing] the basis for ongoing relationships, study, growth and reflection. . . .” on questions of faith and Christian practice.

Thinking,”<sup>17</sup> the forum for collective presentation of undergraduate research, this global forum might contain poster sessions on students’ global experiences. These sessions will help presenting students reflect upon their experiences, integrate students actively into the forum, and encourage forum attendees to engage in their own global (ad)ventures. When relevant, students’ co-curricular experiences will be integrated into the forum as a whole, including DukeEngage, interest groups, and others.

All Duke students—undergraduate, graduate, and professional—may apply for enrollment in this program.<sup>18</sup> Undergraduates may earn a half-credit for the forum provided that the curriculum and format are approved by the Trinity College Curriculum Committee; some may pursue independent study in the subsequent semester, and/or participate in the Global Issues study abroad program. (See following section.) A non-credit possibility will be considered as well. Graduate and professional students may also serve as TAs in the sessions. In addition to the faculty actively involved in planning and presentation, faculty and staff from the University will be encouraged to attend and to share their expertise.

This forum constitutes a “university curriculum” in three senses: it will not be based in a particular department; it is “vertically integrated” in including participants who are faculty, students on all levels, and staff; and it intentionally employs the talents of Duke’s graduate and professional faculty regardless of their school or departmental affiliation.

[Further details/process are being developed; see additional document.]

### **Content Areas and Sample Topics for In-Depth Examination of Contemporary Global Issues**

- Environment
  - Threats to the global environment
  - Creating sustainability in a developing world
- Health
  - Health care in developed, developing, and undeveloped nations
  - The spread and cure of disease
- Social and Economic Development
  - The changing roles of rich and emerging markets in the global economy
  - Technology and its impact within and between societies
- Difference and Identity:
  - Mass media
  - Maintaining cultural and regional identity in a shrinking world

Each content area includes at least these common elements:

- Ethics
  - The clash of ethics across cultures, and the impetus toward global ethical standards (e.g., human rights)
  - Law and custom in varying societies
- Technology
  - As a medium for exchange
  - As a change agent

We propose a different topic or emphasis each year, or perhaps two topics per year, so that students may “cycle” through them during their four years as undergraduates.

### **Curriculum: Enhancing the Global Knowledge Base Through a Global Issues Study Abroad Program**

As a follow-up to the winter forum, or as a stand-alone program, Duke will develop a new study abroad program in spring semester to enhance the global experience of our undergraduates. Utilizing the

---

<sup>17</sup> See <http://www.aas.duke.edu/trinity/research/VisibleThinkingInformation.html> for information on “Visible Thinking.”

<sup>18</sup> Participation in this forum as a prerequisite for the global issues study abroad program, is under consideration.

planned state-of-the-art conference centers under development by the Fuqua School of Business—with classrooms, sleeping accommodations with 180 beds, and a working library—this program will focus on a particular complex issue (as noted in the previous section) in three or four different areas of the world. The Fuqua School’s planned facilities in China (Shanghai or close to Shanghai), India (New Dehli), Russia (St. Petersburg), and the Middle East (Dubai) will serve as the program’s sites, thereby offering a diverse set of locations for the study of global challenges. Infrastructure support will be provided by the permanent employees located at these Centers; “local talent” now being nurtured as associates of the Centers will add teaching and co-curricular dimensions. A cadre of Duke faculty will serve as directors of the issues-based undergraduate program and will develop the curriculum and related activities as well as accompany the students. Graduate and professional students will also be involved. The Centers will open in June 2009.

Students will spend six weeks or so at each of two Centers, studying a global theme in comparative perspective. The program will develop participants’ understanding of the particular contexts in which countries and regions experience world challenges, and deepen their understanding of interdisciplinary approaches to addressing these challenges.

[details to be fleshed out; see additional document]

### **Integrative Infrastructures: Closing Gaps Through a Global Advising Program**

Duke University offers a rich array of global experiences to its undergraduates: for example, a sizeable percentage of our students study abroad; a new and popular program, DukeEngage, supports service work around global issues, both domestically and internationally; the first- and second-year Focus program contains many global themes and sometimes includes a travel component; majors like international comparative studies, cultural anthropology, and Asian and Middle Eastern studies are intentionally international in focus; and such interdisciplinary initiatives as global health engage undergraduates in formal and informal programs.

As with most institutions around the country, however, Duke does not have a holistic approach to its global opportunities. As Derek Bok puts it,

[s]pecialists call for more of everything—more international courses, more education abroad, more language training, more foreign students. Still lacking on most campuses, however, is a thoughtful, comprehensive plan to combine these opportunities into well-integrated programs that can be fitted in with all the other legitimate aims of a rounded undergraduate education (Derek Bok, *Our Underachieving Colleges*, 240).

### **The Global Advising Program:**

The QEP proposes the creation of a Global Advising Program (GAP, as in “minding the gap” or “closing the gap”) to promote the many global opportunities already existing at Duke; to help students tie together the various initiatives in which they have engaged or have an interest in engaging; and to work with other constituencies here and abroad to develop globally-focused internships for undergraduates.

GAP will involve a cadre of five to ten professional advisors specially trained to be knowledgeable about global opportunities developed on and by this campus as well as those offered by venues beyond Duke. These opportunities include *programs*, the most obvious at Duke being DukeEngage and study abroad but running the gamut to include those offered by the professional schools as well, through such offices as the School of Nursing’s Office of Global and Community Health Initiatives (OGACHI). These opportunities also include *services*, like those provided by Career Services and the Alumni Office’s international coordinator.

The Global Advisors will investigate and publicize global study, service, and internship opportunities. They will work closely with advisors of students before the declaration of the major and help to train Directors of Undergraduate Studies to be more effective in tying global experiences to the department

and the major. They will be proactive in promoting the development of new programs, especially internships. And they will work one-on-one with students over multiple years as a stable set of advisors and mentors, to guide students in accessing resources, deciding on goals and plans, and tying together their curricular and co-curricular activities in a meaningful way.

The GAP program will be housed in the Advising Center.

### **Incorporation of International Students into Campus Life and Culture:**

Though not a separate component of the QEP per se, the integration of international students is an area for attention and will be addressed in each of the three major components of the Plan. Duke has an ever-growing number of undergraduate international students and a large cadre of graduate and professional students from abroad. These students are at present not well enough integrated into campus life and culture, to the detriment of domestic and international students alike. They play few mainstream leadership roles at Duke and their voices often go unheard. Domestic students typically do not consider that International House activities are for them. As a means of enhancing global citizenship for all, the QEP committee considered a more intentional approach to closing this gap. Some of the possibilities noted below might be incorporated into the Plan:

- Create a mentoring program connecting domestic and international students
  - Could be done through the language courses, with official ties:
    - a “co-curricular cultural coordinator” – an international student who discusses course material, takes class to films followed by discussion, and engages in similar activities enriching the curriculum and course.
    - one-on-one mentoring around countries or areas of study.
- Utilize international students to help prepare domestic students for study abroad and DukeEngage (Int’l House has approached Mlyn)
- Consider a residential dimension to diminish segregation of international students and encourage exchange:
  - attend to housing segregation that occurs after first year
  - Consider random housing on new campus.
- Enhance social interactions
  - Create an international center near the global advising center, with coffee shop and programs (on model of Mary Lou Williams Center)
- Develop teams of domestic and international students that work together on projects.
- Involve international students in the Winter Forum by having them fill special roles.
- Consider ways in which to have international families serve as leads to internships, host guides for study abroad students, etc.

### **Appendix J: Presentations to units helping in development of selected QEP topic, July 2007-December 2008**

#### **University Input Into Development of the QEP Topic**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Date</b>
Provost's Staff	7/9/2007
	7/23/2007
	9/12/2007
Board of Trustees, Faculty, Graduate, and Professional Affairs Committee	9/28/2007
Student Affairs, senior leadership	10/10/2007
Executive Committee, Graduate School	10/16/2007
Graduate and Professional Student Council	10/30/2007
Duke Student Government	11/7/2007
Library Advisory Board	11/9/2007

InterCampus Council	11/26/2007
Leadership Team	11/26/2007
Board of Trustees, Faculty, Graduate, and Profession School Affairs	12/7/2007
Leadership Team	2/1/2008
Arts and Sciences Council	2/14/2008
Executive Committee, Academic Council	2/20/2008
Academic Council	2/21/2008
Board of Trustees, Faculty, Graduate, and Professional School Affairs	2/29/2008
Board of Trustees, Undergraduate Affairs	2/29/2008
Leadership Team	3/4/2008
International Affairs Committee	4/16/2008
Leadership Team	9/15/2008
Deans Cabinet	9/29/2008
Directors' Council for University Institutes and Centers	10/6/2008
Arts and Sciences Council	10/16/2008
Duke Student Government	10/22/2008
Engineering Undergrads, Study Abroad Session	10/22/2008
Arts & Sciences Council Study Abroad Committee	10/30/2008
Directors' Council for University Institutes and Centers	11/3/2008
Student Affairs, Senior Leadership	11/5/2008
Academic Programs Committee	11/5/2008
Undergraduate Focus Groups	11/5/2008
	11/6/2008
	11/7/2008
	11/10/2008
Academic Council	11/20/2008
Board of Trustees, Joint Meeting of Committees	12/5/2008
Academic Council Committee on Undergraduate Education	12/8/2008

**Appendix K:** Duke faculty and staff who served as consultants to the QEP subcommittees in development of Winter Forum, Global Semester Abroad, and Global Advising Program

Todd Adams - associate dean of students  
Ed Buckley - vice dean for medical education, School of Medicine  
Li-Chen Chin - director, International House  
Lisa Croucher - assistant director, Global Health Institute  
Rachel Davies - assistant director, Alumni Lifelong L&T  
Darla Deardorff - manager, International Programs  
Linda Franzoni - professor, Medical Engineering  
John Gallagher - professor, Fuqua School of Business  
Jehanne Gheith – associate professor, Slavic and Eurasian Studies, director International Comparative Area Studies  
Joe Gonzalez - associate dean, Residential Life  
Marianne Hassan - associate dean, Engineering  
Eddie Hull - director, Residential Life & Housing Services  
David Jamieson-Drake - director, Institutional Research, Provost's Office  
Jiali Luo - higher education analyst, Provost's Office  
Amanda Kelso - associate director, Study Abroad  
Anirudh Krishna - associate professor, Public Policy Studies

Bruce Kuniholm - professor, Public Policy Studies  
David Lapinski - associate director, external relations, Career Center  
Marcy Little – co-director, International Comparative Area Studies major  
Elaine Madison - director, Community Service Center  
Robert Malkin - professor, Biomedical Engineering  
Mike Merson - director, Global Health Institute  
Gil Merx - vice provost, international affairs, Provost's Office  
Eric Mlyn - director, Duke Engage  
Larry Moneta - vice president, Student Affairs  
Phil Morgan, director, Social Sciences Research Institute  
Seun Olamosu - assistant director of training and outreach, International House  
Tim Profeta – director, Nicholas Institute  
Michele Rasmussen – associate dean, Trinity College  
Margaret Riley – director, Study Abroad  
Susan Roth – vice provost for interdisciplinary studies, Provost's Office  
Blair Sheppard – dean, Fuqua School of Business  
Sterly Wilder – executive director, Alumni Affairs  
Lee Willard – sr. associate dean for academic planning, Arts & Sciences  
R. Sanders Williams – sr. vice chancellor and sr. advisor for international strategy, Medical Ctr  
William Wright-Swadel, director, Career Center

**Appendix L:** Comparative global issues study abroad programs around the country

**Appendix M:** Letter of Support from Pratt for the Global Semester Abroad

Peter Lange, Ph.D  
Provost  
122 Allen Building  
Duke University

Dear Peter:

It is my pleasure to provide you with this letter of support and participation in Duke's new initiative to develop and implement a comparative global study abroad program (GSA). The Pratt School will commit to the development of a GSA that is aimed at enrolling engineering undergraduates. In a world of increasing social, economic, and ecological interdependence, few educational opportunities could have a more profound impact than increasing global literacy, cultural awareness, and foreign language skills of US students. The Pratt School of Engineering fully endorses the concept of our students studying abroad. While the curriculum for engineering majors is demanding and full of required sequential courses, our students and faculty have found a variety of mechanisms for studying abroad; in fact, you'll find that each of our four engineering departments routinely sends its students abroad and actively works with its students to develop study abroad plans. As a result, Duke is one of only a handful of engineering schools realizing significant success in fostering international study. More than 27% of our engineering students study abroad, compared to the national average of 2.2%. This trend is steadily increasing each year.

The nation, now more than ever, needs engineers who are dynamic thinkers, skilled problem solvers, and capable of taking the lead in helping resolve some of society's most pressing problems. Our goal at Pratt is to educate world class engineers who have an understanding of the global context for technical work, put into practice through service learning, outreach, and study abroad. International study is an important step to improving our students' ability to thrive in today's international economy.

In the last four years, the largest numbers of Pratt students studying abroad went to the United Kingdom and Australia. We have had students study in other countries such as Turkey, Spain, Italy, and Germany. In the spring of 2007, a new offering in the Duke in Berlin program was launched that is specifically targeted for engineers, featuring intensive language training and the opportunity to study engineering in the Technical University of Berlin. This effort represents the sort of initiatives we are pursuing to further expand our offerings in non-English speaking countries, and to integrate engineering study with broad-based cultural and liberal education. I challenge Pratt faculty and students to explore other cultures and countries that make sense to their interests and personal goals for the future. The University's GSA initiative will provide an opportunity for us to add a comparative component to the students' experiences which will make for a valuable lifetime experience. Toward this end, I am pleased to have the leadership talents of Lori Setton, Linda Franzoni, and Marianne Hassan who will form a working group of faculty to brainstorm over the Spring term.

On behalf of the Pratt School faculty, we look forward to participating in this effort.

Sincerely,



Thomas Katsouleas  
Professor and Dean

**Appendix N: Potential Undergraduate Schedules for Representative Student-Athletes Engaging in Global Experiences (highlighted in blue)**

**Schedule 1:** Varsity soccer player (fall sport)

Varsity soccer players have no athletic obligations to Duke over the summer, although they do return to campus 1-2 weeks before the start of the fall semester to begin preseason training. Some players who aspire to play professionally after they graduate will participate in the Professional Development League in the United States, and they also have the option of participating in preseason training with a professional club overseas. This athletic experience can follow a 4-5 week term of summer study abroad.

Year	Term	Courses (four per semester, up to two in the summer)			
First-Year	Fall	Writing 20	elective	elective	elective
	Spring	Freshman seminar	elective	elective	elective
	Summer	Summer session, Term 1 (up to two courses) Pre-season training			
Sophomore	Fall	Foreign Language	Major course	elective	elective
	Spring	Foreign Language	Major course	elective	elective
	Summer	<b>Summer study abroad, Term 1 (4 weeks)</b> Train/play with European football (=soccer) club Pre-season training			
Junior	Fall	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	Spring	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	Summer	Professional Development League (USA) Pre-season training			
Senior	Fall	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	Spring	Major course	Major course	elective	elective

**Schedule 2:** Varsity baseball player (spring/summer sport)

Because post-season play extends well beyond the end of the spring semester, baseball players are typically restricted in the scope of their summer activities, especially in May and June. Players who do not plan on playing professionally could participate in a summer term 2 study abroad program of 4-5 weeks. Many players, however, will opt to play in a semi-pro league during their undergraduate summers. These students could have a global experience through participation in the Winter Forum, at the midpoint of their sophomore, junior or senior year.

Year	Term	Courses (four per semester, up to two in the summer)			
First-Year	<i>Fall</i>	Writing 20	Foreign Language	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	Freshman seminar	Foreign Language	elective	elective
	<i>Summer</i>	Post-season play Semi-professional baseball leagues			
Sophomore	<i>Fall</i>	Major Course	Foreign Language	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	Major Course	elective	elective	elective
	<i>Summer</i>	Post-season play Semi-professional baseball leagues			
Junior	<i>Fall</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	<b>Winter Break</b>	<b>Winter Forum (2.5 days)</b>			
	<i>Spring</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	<i>Summer</i>	Post-season play Semi-professional baseball leagues			
Senior	<i>Fall</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective

**Schedule 3:** Varsity football player (fall sport)

First-year football players typically matriculate as Duke students during summer term 2 and complete two courses before the traditional beginning of the freshman year in August. Student-athletes on the football teams usually attend Duke summer session and take up to 4 courses after their first and second years. They could include a global experience like DukeEngage, study abroad or an internship during the first 5-8 weeks of the summer after their sophomore or junior years.

Year	Term	Courses (four per semester, up to two in the summer)			
First-Year	<i>Summer</i>	Writing 10	Freshman seminar		
	<i>Fall</i>	Writing 20	elective	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	elective	elective	elective	elective
	<i>Summer</i>	Summer session, Term 1 (Foreign Language + elective) Summer session, Term 2 (Foreign Language + elective) Pre-season training			



Sophomore	<i>Fall</i>	Foreign Language	Major Course	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	Major Course	elective	elective	elective
	<i>Summer</i>	Summer session, Term 1 (up to two courses) Summer session, Term 2 (up to two courses) Pre-season training			
Junior	<i>Fall</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	<i>Summer</i>	<b>DukeEngage</b> Preseason training			
Senior	<i>Fall</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective
	<i>Spring</i>	Major course	Major course	elective	elective

**Appendix O:** typical budget for 30 students studying at Singapore-India locations [?put it on Provost's website?]

**Appendix P:** tabular representation of the planned assessment activities