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What are the Global Brandeis Symposia?

Created in 2008, the Global Brandeis Symposia are a series of dialogues on the global dimensions of higher education. These dialogues attempt to bring scholarly inquiry in many disciplines to bear on higher education. In this way, the Symposia seek to tackle issues such as study abroad or the idea of an international curriculum via renewed dialogue between faculty, administrators, and students.

This report covers the first two years of the series, encompassing three events. The first, “The Global: Implications for Research and the Curriculum”, was held on April 8 and 9, 2008. This inaugural event featured Arjun Appadurai (New York University), a distinguished anthropologist, Brandeis University class of 1970, and former Brandeis Wien International Scholar. On November 2 and 3, 2009, we hosted “New Knowledge Spaces and Places,” with Kris Olds (University of Wisconsin-Madison). The event drew upon Prof. Olds’ research in human and cultural geography. Most recently, “Developing an Intercultural Mindset,” held on March 4 and 5, 2010, brought intercultural competence expert Darla Deardorff (Duke University/Association of International Education Administrators) to Brandeis for a series of conversations and workshops. In total, more than 250 faculty, staff, students, and guests from the Boston area participated in these events.

We hope that this report captures the main ideas of these scholars and these discussions. We also hope that it is useful not only for the Brandeis University community, but for the higher education community at large.
Higher Education in the Global Age: A Conversation

Every university is currently grappling with the impact of two related trends: the forces known as globalization on the one hand; and the expansion of the purpose and scope of higher education on the other.

These trends might be described as external and internal drivers of organizational change – although that would be simplifying what is, in practice, a dynamic and complex process. Institutions around the world are seeking to “internationalize” – or strategically infuse a global perspective into their *modus operandi* – and are putting new demands on students, faculty, and stakeholders.

The American research university, while it has always had its international dimensions, is thus branching out. It is branching out physically by creating new links around the world – in the form of actual new campuses and by means of partnerships and influence. It is also branching out internally; while the financial crisis has necessitated cuts, there is no shortage of attempted curricular innovations that aim to bring the world into the core of the undergraduate experience. These curricular innovations coincide with the movements for civic education, experiential learning, student-centered pedagogies, and defined learning outcomes.

Goals of the Global Brandeis Symposia

1: Examining the links between “the global” and university life – teaching, research, and service – by inviting leading scholars of global thought and education into dialogue with the Brandeis community;

2: Connecting these conversations to ongoing efforts to shape Brandeis University as a global institution, and to the conception and theory of global/international education in the 21st century;

3: Exploring issues that showcase existing Brandeis University programs and curricular innovations, foregrounding our strengths in interdisciplinary thinking, social justice, and a strong research ethic. At the same time, these discussions should challenge the community to think in new ways about their work.
Above, guest Darla Deardorff (left) shares an intercultural training exercise with Ruth Brigham, advisor for the Brandeis University International Students and Scholars Office (ISSO). Below, participants in the exercise complete the activity.
Summary of Key Topics

Our three symposia helped raise a rich set of issues facing universities in the 21st century. Some of the key topics and ideas are outlined here, and will be explored further in the report.

The challenge to American academic traditions: The global age is causing us to reconsider some of our most cherished and unquestioned traditions. What exactly is academic freedom? Is it a timeless value, or a means to an end? Is it an American value, or a global value? What are the liberal arts, and why do they still matter? Do we ourselves understand the unique combination of liberal arts, advanced research, and professional training? New global trends of cross-border collaboration are starting to reshape those traditions in interesting ways.

The changing nature of academic research: “Research has escaped its container,” said Appadurai in his keynote address. It is no longer exclusively conducted in or by the “ivory tower.” Let loose, the research enterprise encompasses a complex set of methodologies and practices. Academic research now competes with research by interest groups, churches, corporations, think tanks, and government bodies. On a global scale, new forms of collaboration across nations and space create unique questions about research as a human activity. The globalization of research is not only creating entirely new forms of cooperation around major issues like climate change and health, but also new challenges of culture, time, funding, space, and control.

The complex history of engagement with the “Other” in the American curriculum: In the post post-modern age, how do we construct a curriculum – and related experiential learning programs – that deals intelligently with cultural difference? Is there a method of teaching students ideas of cultural relativity without committing ourselves to moral relativity? And is there a way to provide educational guidance to students who undertake study abroad, service learning, travel, and internship programs overseas? The discussion here revolved around efforts by Deardorff and others to define “intercultural” or “global” competence. These global competencies might include the interplay of cultural sensitivity and knowledge, new curricular requirements (or new forms of curricular choice), better integration of professional training, and the synthesis of learning outside the classroom. In addition, discussants asked whether universities should define and commit to certain global competencies as they re-craft their strategies and missions.
The Unsettling of Higher Education

The globalization of higher education is not new. Universities have long strived for universal ideas, and their explicit international dimensions have existed since at least the early 20th century. However, there is clearly something different about the last two decades beyond a rapid acceleration of activity. The landscape outside the U.S. has changed; we can now speak of a global higher education system that is no longer exclusive to U.S. dominance.

In addition, the forces of “the global” (economy, culture, politics, etc.) are changing the way we look at knowledge itself, and further integration demands a new, collaborative approach to world challenges of environmental change, health, development, and coexistence, to name only a few. “The new dimension of the global is having a profound impact on how we think, what we know, what we aspire to teach,” summarized Daniel Terris, Brandeis Vice President for Global Affairs, in his welcoming comments for the first symposium.

Guest scholar Kris Olds termed these developments “the unsettling of higher education.” As institutions stretch themselves into new areas, both physically and otherwise, they encounter challenges to the status quo and to entrenched academic traditions. Combined with this institutional stretching out are other pressures: Arjun Appadurai argued that the contemporary American university has lost its sense of how research, liberal arts, and professional training intertwine. The university, he said, is mired in conflict over funding, state and local support, and tensions between practical and speculative knowledge.

This is not to suggest permanent cynicism; in fact, all of our guest scholars saw opportunity. “Globalization and global civil society offer unique opportunities for the reinvention of the modern research university, and a genuinely global case for why universities, however expensive, are not merely places for branding, networking, and talent triage,” continued Appadurai.
The decline of the American research university and the rise of the rest?

While the American university is still considered the gold standard, our discussants suggested that we are suffering from a crisis of confidence. Countries outside the U.S. are growing their higher education capacity at record rates. Globalization is causing universities to become what Appadurai termed “hybrid organizations,” in which “the lines between market and non-market, state, and non-state, public and private, independent and regulated activities have become deeply blurred.” And, at the same time that the American model is being exported around the world, it is being challenged.

At stake in these debates is, according to Appadurai, the relationship between the liberal arts, research, and the professional schools. As universities attempt to pursue them together, often in separate silos, they risk “mission creep.” They have suddenly become contributors to urban development, local educational policy, high-tech and business, and major policy debates all at once. Entities outside the university, including corporations and the government, are creating their own training and education programs and are conducting their own research. The current financial crisis is making this pressure more problematic for universities.

Closely related to these trends is the fact that American universities have not figured out a way to maintain this special relationship between liberal arts, research, and professional work in a global way. This challenge is happening while civil society has become more “agitated, active, and divided” around the world. Appadurai argued that no university has found a way to integrate both “the global” and the professional schools/training into the core of university life – something that students and stakeholders (including financial supporters) see clearly from the first day of orientation until the caps are off at graduation.

American universities are also part of a global education system that, discussants suggested, is undergoing a “highly overdue reworking.” For years the dominance of the American system, and the relative unimportance attached to education by foreign governments, meant that a global approach was often taken for granted. Now, governments around the world are making changes. Higher education is seen as integral to development – or even considered an import/export industry in itself. Kris Olds’ work shows how the state has become intimately involved with higher education in ways unforeseen even two decades ago. Olds noted that many world leaders received their education in the U.S. and now seek to import the central ideas of U.S. higher education – and, sometimes, the institutions themselves.

Branching out

The global higher education landscape is changing rapidly. Olds highlighted a number of key differences that will shape 21st century higher education:

- **Education is moving from a public good to a branding tool and an industry through “cross-border” initiatives.** Governments are increasingly viewing education as a service industry, on par with any other import or export. For example, in New Zealand higher education is the third largest export industry, topping its wine industry. New regulations within the WTO (under the General Agreement on Trade in Services, or GATS) are helping, for better or worse, to erode borders and govern education by free market principles. Suddenly, government officials of foreign affairs or trade, not previously involved in outlining educational objectives, are highly active in this realm.

- **We are witnessing a staggering growth of partnerships, networks, consortiums, and regionalization.** In order to leverage global reach and, in some cases, share resources, we are seeing the birth of the “network” era. Consortia and groups are on the rise, including entities like Universitas21, the Worldwide Universities Network, the International Alliance of Research Universities, and the Global University Network for Innovation. At a grander level are regional hubs and systems like the European Union’s Bologna Process. Olds argued that despite the rhetoric on globalization, most higher education cooperation activity is increasingly regional.

- **Education is viewed as a geopolitical tool.** It is not uncommon for governments to view students and faculty members as agents of public or citizen diplomacy. The U.S. government’s exchange programs supported by the State Department’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs have long considered this aspect of diplomacy. In another example provided by Olds, the U.S. Department of Defense is involved in “mapping” the research output of other countries by measuring the quantity of articles written by foreign scholars. We can now speak of “knowledge footprints” that may be used by governments and military leaders to make key decisions or to assess potential competition.
Strategies and obstacles – The move to deep partnerships and integrative learning

In the face of this “unsettling” of higher education, how are institutions creating and reshaping their global strategies? Many institutions are “pursuing aggressive expansion strategies,” said Olds. “They are becoming more mobile – both virtually and physically.” Olds highlighted a number of strategic models, showing that institutions are moving towards a more flexible, open, “networked” approach to their growth, not unlike that of corporations. Not surprisingly, some of the most innovative approaches to internationalization strategies are coming from business schools. Still, our conversations revealed that many international strategies are too generic. When university leaders make broad leadership statements about globalization, universities actually risk having too many flowers bloom at the same time. That can create confusion and duplication. Some of these long-term risks include:

- **Lack of prioritization** – “Cheerleading” internationalization can often lead to biting off more than one institution can chew. Regional, programmatic, and thematic priorities need to be set based on the strengths and character of the institution.
- **Exciting partnerships fizzle out** – Partnerships require significant effort to launch but often lose energy and become dormant without long-term plans for sustainability.
- **A widening risk profile** – While faculty and student interest in locations outside Europe is an encouraging sign for breadth and growth, it means that they spend more time studying, traveling, and doing research in riskier areas. Institutions must balance academic and experiential goals with solid risk assessments.
- **Lack of direct faculty leadership** – Strong faculty interest and regional expertise is key to the success of partnerships and initiatives. However, faculty excitement and leadership can easily wax and wane. Some kind of long-term structure needs to be considered for engaging multiple faculty in global projects. There is no way to conceive such structure without at least thinking about new ways to build faculty positions, contracts, and incentives.

A Look Back: The Founding of Brandeis University

Brandeis University was founded in 1948, at a time of rapid global change not unlike the present period. Engagement with the world defined the University from the beginning – it was not a strategy so much as an ethos. In its first decade, scholars in flight from the ravages of war and the Holocaust in Europe found a home at Brandeis and helped shape an academic culture that was cosmopolitan, tolerant, and deeply intellectual. Here are some other highlights from the global history of Brandeis University:

**General Education-S** was an innovative, required seminar for graduating seniors that sought to integrate academic learning with real-world problems. Various world figures like Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, anthropologist Margaret Mead, and Hungarian physicist (and father of the atomic bomb) Leo Szilard gave guest lectures, followed by faculty and student discussion.

**The Wien International Scholarship Program**, established in 1958, was one of the first major U.S. scholarship programs for degree-seeking international students, with a strong focus on the developing world. Funded with a generous endowment by the American philanthropist Lawrence A. Wien, the program won early recognition from the U.S. State Department. Then-Senator and future president John F. Kennedy helped inaugurate the first class. Over 50 years, the Wien program has brought over 800 students from more than 100 countries to Brandeis – many on full scholarship.

**The Peace Corps** has always had a prominent place at Brandeis, and the campus served as a training ground for some of the first volunteers. With grants from the State Department, Brandeis was the location of training programs for Peace Corps programs in Latin America.

**Brandeis’ Jacob Hiatt Institute in Jerusalem** was one of the first U.S. study abroad programs in Israel, running from 1961 - 1983. Located on Ethiopia Street near the Hebrew University, it combined coursework on Israeli culture and history with experiential learning opportunities. More than 600 students from approximately 150 U.S. colleges and universities participated.

Eleanor Roosevelt taught international relations at Brandeis, and even hosted her own TV show called “Prospects of Mankind” (above) – three episodes featured John F. Kennedy.
• **Islands of information** – Data on international efforts and connections is often housed in silos across campus, with little knowledge flow between offices. Building a database system that is integrative with campus systems – and not a separate system – is essential.

“Integrative,” not additive, is also the way Darla Deardorff approached internationalization during her visit to Brandeis. She argued for an ethos of intercultural competence being integrated into the fabric of the institution – in everything from curricular to financial planning. This would mean looking at internationalization from both the ground up and the top down, and creating or modifying training programs that teach students, staff, faculty, and the university community at large.

Arjun Appadurai predicted that universities in the 21st century will tackle this “unsettling” of higher education in three basic ways. “We are at a crossroads for global higher education, and the American research university faces some difficult choices,” he said. Some institutions will be conservative, maintaining the more traditional role of universities as “impartial referees.” But few can afford to be that passive. The majority, he suggested, will pursue a middle ground that is familiar to most institutions: they will compete actively in finding global talent, send some defined population of their students and faculty abroad, and stay competitive in global research.

A few ambitious universities will pursue a third and bolder strategy, he said. This “third way” would be to fully integrate the global into the core of the university, pushing its physical, virtual, and cognitive boundaries beyond that of largely national/local institutions. This bolder strategy has no real blueprint, however.

**Three core challenges**

Our discussions raised a number of issues and choices facing Brandeis and other universities in the coming years. We have divided these into three core areas being challenged:

- academic traditions
- the anatomy of research
- learning and understanding

---

Challenge One: Academic Traditions

Brandeis University is part and parcel of a long American educational history with rich traditions. These traditions include ideas about shared university governance, disciplinary foundations, academic freedom, relationship with church and state, liberal education vs. professional training, and many others. Our guests noted that globalization is causing these traditions to be reconfigured, blended with other values and ideals across the world. Sometimes, it is not clear who is controlling the makeup of new traditions as they enter the transnational and global space. Here are just some of the key topics and notes that arose during discussions:

Academic Freedom

When institutions stretch themselves into new territories, notions of academic freedom are often taken for granted. Said Olds: “In the process, the stewards of academic freedom – the people who protect it, who help us realize it, who legitimize it – the process of unsettling has left that area and those roles vacant for other people to come in.” The issue is most obvious when academics move around from location to location, seemingly in a post-national way. Yet the institutions they arrive at are not quite post-national, and in fact are often subject to direct state control and governance.

Some institutions have decided not to pursue overseas branches or other cross-border educational arrangements because of concerns for academic freedom in the host country. Strong internal deliberation as well as dialogue with hosts is key to good decision making, said Olds. Appadurai further suggested that academic freedom will become a major intellectual and practical issue as the globalization of higher education continues.

International organizations devoted to higher education are not paying enough attention to issues of academic freedom in a global context. This failure is helping to create a vacuum where agreements between institutions are being made in isolation, behind closed doors, continued Olds.

Key Question:
Is academic freedom a timeless value or simply a “means to an end”? The answer might impact what trade-offs are considered when negotiating academic freedom issues with other universities and governments.

The Liberal Arts

In our emerging global knowledge economy, science, engineering, and information technology are the obvious focus fields. Professional training has been emphasized as necessary for countries to quickly grow their human capital. In this “great brain race,” as it has sometimes been called, the traditional liberal arts education – teaching for how to live – has sometimes felt lost. A liberal arts education is a uniquely American tradition, although with some historical connection to the residential colleges of the U.K. It will be interesting to see how this tradition plays out abroad as well as in an increasingly science-focused U.S. environment.

At the same time, experts in a variety of professions have called for graduates who can think independently, apply their learning to a number of scenarios and fields, and who can work well in diverse and complex team environments. There is some evidence that the appeal of a liberal arts education is growing abroad through the establishment of new liberal arts campuses in the Middle East, Russia, and the states of the former Soviet Union.

Appadurai argued that universities must participate in the “central debates about human development.” The liberal arts are absolutely key to approaching these debates in a civil and thoughtful manner.

Key Questions:
How should we define the liberal arts in the 21st century? Does it mean simply an education that is broad-based and interdisciplinary, or is something else required to be liberally educated? Are the liberal arts a uniquely American development? And if it is not American, in what way is liberal education global?

Service to society

U.S. universities are accustomed to forming partnerships with civil society sectors, and with government. Yet, we also maintain a historical separation between public and private spheres, and even public institutions have a complicated relationship with the state. If this blurring is complex here, it is even more fuzzy abroad, where different societal and cultural norms apply.

The global nature of higher education is causing everyone to re-think the nature of “service to society,” and to re-think global partnerships. On the one hand, government is playing an increasing role in dictating the nature of this relationship. On the other, funding for higher education across many states and countries is declining. In regions of the world where higher education was once free, student fees are being introduced and
financing is increasingly moving to embrace free market principles.

**Key Questions:**

What do we mean when we say that universities should "serve society?" What society should they serve? Local communities, the nation, or some notion of global society? And how do they best serve it? Through universities adapting to societal needs, or through universities guiding societal needs? Or some combination of both? What do we make of the increasing technological bent of the "service to society" idea, whereby universities are becoming breeding grounds for technological production?

**Focus on partnerships**

Historically, U.S. institutions have approached their global operations in a fairly isolated, ad-hoc, one-dimensional way. Few universities have attempted major, transformative partnerships with institutions/entities abroad.

Yet, we know that global partnerships in other sectors (government, business, non-governmental) are increasing rapidly, and higher education has a chance to provide some intellectual framework and leadership to forming such partnerships. It has been recognized that major global challenges like environmental change, health, poverty, and population growth can only be solved by cooperative effort.

Universities are slow to change, and eager to maintain a sense of identity and mission. A major partnership or true merger between two universities in different countries would be unprecedented in higher education history. But even at smaller scales, we lack the mechanisms and structures to make global partnerships work.

New global partnerships might reflect social justice concerns as well (see inset). University partnerships created only between like-minded institutions might not lead to the kind of transformative change we seek. In the global higher education era to come, it might be necessary to consider partnerships in which institutions do not always see eye-to-eye or in which intercultural communication between institutions might serve as a model for larger geopolitical or civil society cooperation. At an even smaller scale, too, the relationship between research and activism is increasing. "Community-engaged learning" is a new buzzword that raises questions about community engagement when taken on a global scale.

**Key Questions:**

What partnership models are currently available, and what models might imagined in the future? How should these partnerships “fit” into the current governance and operational structure of higher education? How can we make sure that such partnerships are mutual, and not initiated or controlled by only one side? Who funds partnerships, and how might funding mechanisms be created or arranged? At a small scale, how can we adapt some of our learning strategies and curricula to best take advantage of partnerships, especially at the local community level (wherever that community may be)?

---

**Partnerships for Social Justice**

In the article “Transforming Internationalization Through Partnerships” (International Educator magazine, Jan/Feb 2010) Susan Buck Sutton observes that American higher education is slowly moving from having “transactional” relationships to creating “transformational” partnerships based on mutually-beneficial goals. She argues that previous international relationships were scattered and inward-looking, while new ones are deliberate, outward-looking, and aimed at creating multi-dimensional global networks.

Several recent efforts have applied this idea to global issues of justice and equality. The new United Nations Academic Impact is a group of universities committed to the Millennium Development Goals, while the Talloires Network is an international association of universities working to strengthen the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education. Other higher education partnerships designed for mutual and balanced exchange have been formed by U.S. institutions and universities in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

Brandeis University is also committed to these types of sustained global commitments. In 2003, the University formed a partnership with Al-Quds University (pictured above) a Palestinian institution in Jerusalem. In addition to cultural exchange, the partnership is focused on administrative exchange, and teaching and mentoring. More information and an eight-minute film can be found at www.brandeis.edu/aqu
Big Bang: The CERN Project

Deep underground in a 17-mile circular tunnel straddling France and Switzerland, more than 7,000 scientists and engineers from more than 80 countries have collaborated to re-create the early conditions of the universe. The CERN project (pictured right) is the world’s largest particle physics laboratory. Brandeis University professors Craig Blocker, Larry Kirsch, Hermann Wellenstein, and Jim Bensinger are among the scientists working on the project.

Challenge Two: The Anatomy of Research

There is no greater tradition in higher education than research – although it is also one of the least analyzed human practices. Research itself is a “highly under-researched word,” said Appadurai. But it is certainly the “special” thing that American universities do, combined with the liberal arts and professional training. Even those institutions that do not have graduate programs typically have faculty who are engaged in research or who have research training.

For doctoral institutions, obviously, research is the lifeblood. One could argue that the transformation of the research enterprise in the 20th century was the primary reason for the meteoric rise of American higher education – and the dominance of the U.S. as global superpower.

The theory and practice of research in the U.S. has shifted through the generations – perhaps most notably after World War II or after the publication of major works of like Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859) or Thomas Kuhn’s *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) – but its essential components have, arguably, not really changed much since the formation of modern society. We may be a long way from the image of the lone academic in the “ivory tower” conducting research in isolation, but basic ideas about scientific methods, research design, interdisciplinary collaboration, publishing standards, and broader trends in new knowledge creation are only now being tested in fundamental ways.

We may be now seeing a revolution in how research is conducted, on a global scale. For instance, the CERN physics project in Europe has involved some 8,000 visiting scientists (half of the world’s particle physicists!) from 580 universities and 85 nationalities. This is a massive undertaking with implications for how we understand research. The globalization of research is not only creating entirely new forms of cooperation around major issues, but also new challenges of culture, time, funding, space, and scale. Managing a research enterprise in one lab or in one institution is complicated enough. Managing a cooperative research project on a global scale is a different matter entirely, and possibly one that no one institution, organization, or government can manage on its own.

“Science is rational. Scientists are not.”

Brandeis University Prof.
James Bensinger (Physics)

Globalization might also be changing how we think about research, about the full breadth of its “anatomy” as an academic, human, and social enterprise. Some key topics and notes from our discussions included:
The globalization of research and knowledge production

Research has “escaped its container,” according to Appadurai. It is no longer conducted in isolation from society; and it is no longer conducted or disseminated exclusively by universities. In the U.S., research is under “considerable threat” from other institutions that sometimes belong to special interest groups – churches, think tanks, policy groups, corporations, school boards. Noted Appadurai, “One of the deep challenges is whether we [American research universities] have anything distinctive to offer in terms of combining research with professional training and the liberal arts.”

These shifts are part and parcel of the globalization of knowledge generally. Older revolutions involved knowledge, of course. But “knowledge in the age of the digital revolution has special characteristics of which we are all aware, notably its rapid tendency to obsolesce, its high degree of storability, its lightning speed of dissemination, and its sheer volume,” said Appadurai.

There is also a “darker side” to the globalization of research and knowledge, said Brandeis physicist James Bensinger. Some corporations are forming their own research institutes with the goal of refuting particular pieces of science, often connected to specific ideological frameworks or special interests. This threatens the university’s traditional role as arbiter of knowledge.

Some major research universities are beginning to re-tool their research operations into more ambiguous “global networks” that have direct relationships to the university consortia and networks mentioned above. For example, Columbia University recently announced the opening of several new “Global Centers” in India, France, China, and Jordan. These centers will provide “flexible regional hubs” for a variety of cross-disciplinary research and academic activity, according to Columbia. Similarly, Kris Olds discussed the potential impact of the new King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) in Saudi Arabia. KAUST is already the 6th wealthiest institution in the world with an initial $10 billion endowment. The research model for KAUST involves a central “compound” – the home campus – but research will take place virtually and physically through research partnerships being formed with major universities, including Stanford and Cambridge.

Framing research studies

Universities must take part in the major debates and issues of our time. But our discussants agreed that deciding what to research and how to research it raises major questions about the place of “the global” in research topic and design. Appadurai noted that one might consider “the global” a subset of general research issues. However, doing this might ignore more innovative methods and even run the risk of doing research “too locally.”

“The global” is so new, said Appadurai, that it is difficult to even grasp while we are in the midst of it. One strategy might be to take up those aspects of globalization that look “most different from those things which preceded it – for example the volatility of financial markets or the problems of global pandemics and disease.”

At the same time, noted Prof. Karen Hansen (Brandeis University, Sociology), we need to historicize “the global” in ways that wrestle with earlier transnational flows, perhaps especially in the late 19th and early 20th centuries during periods of massive immigration, world war, disease, and colonialism.

Framing the world as “flat” could risk masking social and cultural inequities that we care deeply about, argued Prof. Catherine Mann (Brandeis International Business School, Economics). She said that “the world is not flat, it’s not going to be flat, and it shouldn’t be flat.” She made a persuasive case that “global” sometimes masks local and regional realities by focusing its lens exclusively on certain aspects of an issue or simplifying complex problems.

The question of “global” often surrounds the speed, intensity, and elasticity of knowledge. One question is whether these factors, when combined with historical change, create new problems or new ways of understanding.

Questions also arise regarding the urgency and nature of global research. Can global research only be conducted
around urgent global problems, like climate change? Or can it only be conducted around foundational or structural knowledge, as in the CERN project? There are inherent “tensions between the urgent and the important,” said Appadurai. In addition, who makes these decisions – individual researchers, research teams, governments, foundations? Prof. Angela Gutchess (Brandeis University, Psychology) asked, “How long-term is long-term?” Research replication in the global era is especially difficult.

**Methods and Collaboration**

Collaborative research is the order of the day. Of course, many faculty members in the sciences have been doing collaborative research all their lives, but in other fields it is still not standard procedure.

Appadurai suggested that one strategy of doing “global research in a global way” would be to allow colleagues in other places to help pose research questions and be involved in the research process, since questions and answers might differ depending on the context. These colleagues might be drawn from existing constituencies like alumni, current students, partners, friends of the university, etc.

There is a growing trend towards participatory-research methods in fields such as anthropology, sociology, public health and international development. Participatory research methods are a cornerstone of the Sustainable International Development Programs of the Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis. Appadurai calls this shift to participatory research methods part of an emerging “right to research” (see a list of publications, pg. 23).

Large-scale collaborations bring up new issues of funding (one source vs. many sources), management (who’s the boss?), setting common goals (long and frequent meetings!), and navigating different cultural ideas of safety, design, and testing. One result of large-scale global research is that “funds are not always distributed in a way that makes scientific sense,” said Prof. Bensinger.

Global research collaboration is also riskier; it is perhaps more likely that the whole doesn’t add up to the sum of its parts, as noted by both Prof. Caren Irr (Brandeis University, English and American Literature) and Apparudai. We need to document and understand what does not work, since collaborative research is more fragile, given economic, social-psychological, and cross-cultural factors.

Further, interdisciplinary research does not mean the result will be interdisciplinary – it may be only multidisciplinary. Prof. Irr cautioned that complex topics become bogged down in terminology and assumptions when examined across disciplines. Often the result is only surface-level knowledge.

In a structural sense, Olds reminded us that research, while now being framed globally, is still heavily dependent on current national, regional, and local funding structures and policies.
Challenge Three: Learning and Understanding

“Global competence” has been called a requisite of personal and professional success in the 21st century. However the term remains controversial and largely undefined. Even if we could agree on a basic definition, there are still myriad questions involving implementation and institutional change.

Like the rest of higher education, Brandeis University is still struggling with questions of breadth vs. depth (e.g. a little knowledge of the world versus deep knowledge of one place); the integration of global issues and especially experiences into the curriculum (e.g. study abroad or internship experiences), requirements in the curriculum vs. elective choice, and the assessment of global learning and understanding. While a significant number of our students major, or take courses, in global topics, and complete a study abroad program, we do not have a comprehensive way of tracking, analyzing, and evaluating the true extent of a students’ global learning throughout their college career.

There are also questions about how institutional mission coincides with global learning. For places like Brandeis University that place strong emphasis on “social justice” and activism, how does this commitment translate meaningfully to a global context? Does the emphasis on “social justice” potentially exclude some students who have more practical career aims, such as in the sciences – where students have historically not been heavily engaged in global experiences?

Over the course of the three symposia in the last few years, we’ve had a number of sessions dealing with the topic of student learning and the curriculum. Most recently, we invited Dr. Darla Deardorff to spend a few days with us. Dr. Deardorff is an internationally-recognized expert on “intercultural competence” and the Executive Director of the Association of International Education Administrators, based at Duke University. She is the editor of The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence (2009), an acclaimed volume that brings together thinking on intercultural competence from a variety of fields and disciplines. Dr. Deardorff was instrumental in catalyzing our approach to these issues in tandem with a new committee on global learning at Brandeis (see above). What follows are highlights from those discussions.

Institutional Commitment

A university-wide global competency strategy is now a key part of the emerging global higher education landscape, said Olds. While always important, global competency strategies are now being defined and made explicit with help from associations like the American Council on Education (ACE), the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and others. Universities are attempting to quickly define, market, assess,
and in some cases brand “global competence” or “global citizenship” in their own particular ways.

This effort to create a global competence strategy is a major shift in higher education since at least the early 1990s. But internationalization is not just a buzzword; it can also be a true paradigm shift. Sound efforts to define global competence go way beyond having students take an internationally-themed course or participate in a study abroad program; they involve wide institutional commitment and faculty engagement.

“Ideally, internationalization would be woven into the fabric of an institution, of an institution’s identity,” said Deardorff. “So, it’s not seeing it as just ‘that office over there’ or something extra...but really the very essence of what we’re trying to achieve as educators.”

This way of internationalizing a university brings up some more deep-seated tensions within academia – tensions, for instance, between traditional academic knowledge and knowledge gained by experience. And it brings up tensions between those faculty members who tend to view their discipline as a search for universal tendencies, versus those who tend to side more with relativistic or particularistic ideas of knowledge. It is also somewhat counterintuitive in the context of the current drive in higher education toward data and measurable outcomes. Said Deardorff: “Oftentimes when institutions say whether they’re internationalized or not, they will cite numbers [international students, study abroad percentages, number of partnerships] as the evidence...But it doesn’t stop there...[we need to go] beyond that to look at the outcomes. What’s the meaning behind the numbers, and then, ultimately, what’s the impact?” Deardorff called for institutions to spend a lot of deliberative time thinking about and defining exactly what it is that they are hoping to understand. She suggested that institutions are eager to rush into the implementation of global competence programs, when they might benefit from more deliberation at the beginning stages.

The Battleground of the Curriculum

The curriculum is at the heart of this discussion. Appadurai argued that few institutions have found a way to truly incorporate “the global” within the core of the curriculum, finding a meaningful connection between pre-professional, experiential, and academic learning.

Reforming the general education part of the curriculum, and the associated “distribution requirements” at many colleges continues to be a hotly debated topic. Terris noted that Brandeis and other institutions have “been going in the opposite direction. We’ve been giving [students] a very big menu and telling them to find their way. And, ironically, this

[move towards choice] was in response to the huge amount of knowledge, the diffusion of knowledge that we’ve been talking about.” Participants generally agreed that reforming requirements would be a good thing, but that few can agree on what these requirements should be.

Another continuing tension is between area versus. global studies, and how the two fields interrelate. This is a topic of particular sensitivity, challenge, and opportunity for smaller research universities like Brandeis. Even large institutions struggle with “holes and gaps [that] are stunning,” said Appadurai. Given the increasing blur between the local and the global, how do we prepare all students for achieving some baseline level of global knowledge, while not ignoring in-depth knowledge of the local or regional?

During our discussions, some faculty were worried that the emphasis on “the global” makes “the local” less important. Leigh Swigart, Director of International Justice Programs at Brandeis University’s International Center for Ethics, Justice, and Public Life, said that the tendency toward global studies might “give [students] permission” to ignore deep learning of another culture. “It’s hard work; it takes time,” she said. “You need to go someplace more than one semester.” Participants agreed that both global and local dimensions are needed, and that we need some creative solutions to solving the problem that go beyond simple requirements.

In the face of major global challenges and inequalities, other faculty members argued for a more penetrating curricular approach to social justice, and to questioning the status quo. “We need to move beyond the assumption that we are in a more or less permanent social, economic, and political context,” said David Gil of the Heller School at Brandeis. “We need to inject into our education an examination of the sources of injustice.”

Several faculty also suggested that we need to foster a different way of thinking, one that faces issues of culture, time, location, and space intelligently and meaningfully.

Defining Global Competence

In order to fully analyze their curriculum, co-curriculum, and experiential learning efforts, universities could benefit from some kind of comprehensive statement on what global and/or intercultural learning means at their institution. And, they need to be able to assess it meaningfully, or at least understand how the learning process happens.

Deardorff noted that despite “five decades of research on the subject,” there is no real consensus among experts on the definition of intercultural competence. Deardorff’s research and work by ACE and AACU have tried to create consensus-
building rubrics on intercultural competence. *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, Deardorff's edited volume, also includes scholarship from contributors outside the U.S.

According to Deardorff's research, cultural self-awareness is the “essence of cross-cultural understanding.” Experts in her research agreed that understanding others’ views on a particular issue is key, and that this understanding is best preceded by a comprehension of one’s own cultural views. This process often involves stepping out of one’s own comfort zone, either by traveling abroad or by entering a community in the U.S. that is very different from one’s own. The most sophisticated rubrics of intercultural and global learning define it as a process, one of continuous integration and reflection. Guided critical reflection makes a huge difference, including reflection on co-curricular and global/intercultural experiences (e.g., study abroad, research, community volunteering, etc.).

During our discussions, faculty members also argued that any kind of intercultural learning needs to be carefully constructed to face issues of belief, value, and attitude. Some faculty worried that an overemphasis on cultural relativity might lead down the path to moral relativity – and that students might throw up their hands in defeat or enthusiasm, saying “it’s all relative!” Students need to learn how to withhold immediate judgement and assumption when appropriate, and to think interculturally about knowledge and knowledge production. But, they also need to learn how to make rational decisions and important, ethical choices that do not contradict all beliefs. An overemphasis on ethnonrelativism, faculty worried, might be dangerous – it might see culture as a fixed concept rather than one that is fluid and historically constructed.

There is also a danger of global learning becoming simply another “trend to accomplish” in higher education, joining others like diversity, experiential learning, interdisciplinary teaching, and others. Faculty are increasingly on trend overload and are being asked to accomplish many large-scale changes at once, without a real examination into the links between these various trends.

**Integration and Synthesis**

Like many institutions, Brandeis University has many different curricular and co-curricular paths to global and intercultural learning, but we struggle with synthesis. We have had committees that have looked at issues of re-entry from study abroad and issues of integration of international student experiences, but little substantive progress has been made – especially across types of programs (study abroad, research, internships, short-term trips, volunteering, etc.).

Our discussants suggested that global experiences might be better integrated by foregrounding interdisciplinary capstone projects such as artistic works, theater performances, and other creative ways of integrating knowledge. Some institutions have experimented with a series of one-credit courses before, during, and after the experience. New educational research shows that simply dealing with “re-entry” after global experiences isn’t transformational without advanced preparation. Students benefit from having pre-learned frameworks that allow them to articulate learning that occurred on a study abroad experience. Said Appadurai: “The experiences are only as rewarding as the educational trajectory in which they’re placed.” Creative use of alumni abroad, more extensive involvement of faculty, and integration of course and major/minor requirements are key.

Of course, global learning occurs not only in the classroom or through study abroad, but through everyday life. “Students’ exposure to other cultures [through media and networks] is increasing,” observed Deardorff. “Students are exposed to other cultures regardless of whether they travel or not. They’re also more mobile, so many have traveled quite a bit [even before they enter college]. . .Sometimes this exposure leads to a sense of confidence of knowing information and knowledge that may not be substantiated. . .That would be a caution that just because there’s exposure to different cultures, that’s a start, but you need to go deeper beyond just ‘tip of the iceberg’-type understanding.”

**Assessing Global Learning**

Assessment of intercultural and global learning depends on what an institution wants to know, how intercultural competence is defined, and how it will be applied. Learning goals need to be very specific in order to assess them accurately. Assessment of intercultural and global learning is a complex and multi-dimensional process – a multi-measure approach is key. Self-reporting assessments are important but obviously not as accurate. Deardorff noted that at least 100 different instruments currently exist, and most institutions and organizations use self-reporting assessments.

Assessment of intercultural and global learning is a process. Prof. Andrew Molinsky (Brandeis International Business School), who teaches an innovative course on managing across cultures, asked whether assessments are conducted as absolute, or as relative to a person’s baseline. There was general agreement that assessment needs to be cyclical, done throughout the college experience.
Looking Forward

The first three Global Brandeis Symposia provide starting points to a longer and sustained discussion – both at Brandeis and hopefully within higher education more broadly. While focused on identifying some of the major themes and issues, these events were by design concerned with breadth rather than depth. The challenge now is to maintain an eye on the big picture while reaching a level of more probing analysis on some of the key questions identified earlier. Here are some general ideas on future directions that emerged from our conversations and subsequent work.

Sustained Commitments

Recognizing the interconnected challenges of the 21st century, higher education institutions are shifting their global commitments to more deliberate and focused partnerships while at the same time racing to build new and more varied relationships that cover the globe. How this tension plays out over the next 15 to 20 years is one of the more fascinating questions in higher education today. However, a small subset of institutions seems to be sticking to the idea that fewer, more robust partnerships that address questions of global equality and civil society are preferable to a large portfolio of projects. These few partnerships might be termed “sustained global commitments” – a set of multi-dimensional hubs or networks that link a campus with another institution, community, or organization abroad, based around common questions of learning and understanding. By nature, these sustained commitments must be fluid, since they would depend on input and direction from partners abroad. Yet, they can still be strategic, in the sense that they involve long-term thinking and multi-dimensional outcomes. To facilitate such commitments, we might:

- Involve regional experts from the faculty in the commitment-forming process, to help deliberate issues like academic freedom, government relations, and common research projects.
- Integrate international students and alumni networks into the fabric of our strategies, taking advantage of their knowledge and background.
- Re-frame study abroad as less of a “perk” and more of an integral part of a university’s global commitments.

Research Models and Topics

Research is another balancing act: we need to walk the fine line between collaboration and free, decentralized inquiry. Our faculty expressed some excitement about a large-scale project that might unite natural scientists, social scientists, and humanists with their colleagues abroad. Some expressed skepticism that such a model would be possible or productive. On a pilot or experimental scale, we might:

- Develop a faculty seminar framed around an existing global research project, such as the CERN physics project. Faculty from different disciplines might analyze the project for its impacts on the world, on societies, and individuals involved.
- Faculty at Brandeis are working on a follow-up symposium on research, which might explore questions like: Is a global culture emerging? If so, what roles do universities and scholars play in it? Can one produce honest and rigorous scholarship from within one intellectual tradition, or is all scholarship by its very nature “global?”
- Discussants expressed interest in bringing in more consultation to the research process, including the possibility of creating some kind of global research council that draws its membership from alumni (such as our Wien Scholar alumni) or prominent academics and leaders.

The Global Liberal Arts

Incoming Brandeis University President Fred Lawrence has called Brandeis a “global liberal arts university,” and his March 2011 inauguration will focus on the very questions of melding “the global” with the liberal arts. The tensions here are perhaps even more challenging than those of university mission and its research activities. They are the tensions between the historic purpose of the liberal arts – teaching students how to think freely about the world around them – and the methods and content by which liberal education has so far been conducted in American higher education. They are also the tensions between breadth and depth, especially given the sheer volume of available knowledge to be gained. These challenges are perhaps best met by looking at the sequencing of our liberal arts program and exploring stages of student growth. We must also find some way to help students synthesize the knowledge they gain from different components of their undergraduate experience.

Future Directions for the Symposia

We are eager to hear your thoughts about the future of the Global Brandeis Symposia series and other ways to continue these dialogues. Should we continue to invite prominent speakers in for big-picture conversation, or perhaps begin to formulate a more cohesive faculty project? What are your ideas for major themes and issues to explore? You can write to us at oga@brandeis.edu.
Ideas of Justice

In 2010, Brandeis University launched “Brandeis in The Hague,” a new academic program in cooperation with the University of Leiden in The Netherlands.

It offers an intensive, six-week summer seminar; a semester-length study abroad program is also in development. Students study the history and structure of the international legal system and its application to questions of global and local justice. They visit international courts, meet with judges and lawyers, and research topics ranging from crimes against humanity to regional gender issues.

Part of the Brandeis University’s dedication to “sustained global commitments,” this new program is grounded in both the liberal arts and institutional history: U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, the University’s namesake, was a strong advocate of international law. The program also takes advantage of relationships between Brandeis’ International Center for Ethics, Justice, and Public Life and judges around the world.
Session 1
"The Global": Implications for Research
9:00 - 11:00 a.m., April 9, 2008, Alumni Lounge, Usdan
Discussants:
Arjun Appadurai, The New School; Jim Bensinger, Physics; Angela Gutchess, Psychology; Caren Irr, English & American Lit.; Catherine Mann, IBS/Economics; Rick Parmentier, Anthropology/IGS

Scholarly research from a variety of disciplines has deepened our understanding of institutions, ideas, and forces that cross national boundaries. In turn, new facets of "the global" (and related concepts of the international, the transnational, and the intercultural) have forced scholars to rethink fundamental assumptions, and to chart new lines of theory and inquiry. This session featured brief accounts of current research undertaken by Professor Appadurai and selected Brandeis faculty members.

Lunch Discussion
"Community-Based Engagement and Research"
12:00 - 1:30 p.m., April 9, 2008, Alumni Lounge, Usdan
Discussants: Arjun Appadurai, The New School; Panther Alier, MA candidate, SID program, Heller; Mark Auslander, Cultural Production/Anthropology; Jane Hale, Romance Studies

During lunch, Professor Appadurai and faculty, students and staff at Brandeis talked about their work in community-based research and learning, including projects from Africa to India to Waltham. As an extension of his work as a scholar, Professor Appadurai has been a principal in founding a non-governmental organization called PUKAR [Partners for Urban Knowledge, Action and Research] in Mumbai, India. He argues for a fresh approach that he calls “documentation as intervention” - developing mutual links between community, research, and activism. The discussion centered on similar projects at Brandeis and future possibilities for faculty, student, and community interaction.

Session 2
"The Global": Implications for the Curriculum
2:00 - 3:30 p.m., April 9, 2008, Shapiro Campus Center Room 313
Discussants: Arjun Appadurai, The New School; David Gil, Heller; Judith Herzfield, Chemistry; Bob Lange, Physics/Education/Coex; Andrew Molinsky, IBS/Psychology

What do students need to know, and what skills do they need, to lead productive, fulfilling lives in the era of globalization? Does the current Brandeis undergraduate curriculum meet those needs? Is there an inherent conflict between knowledge, values, and skills, given the time constraints of an undergraduate career? Do we wish to ensure that all students acquire greater global knowledge and skills, or is it sufficient that we provide opportunities for those students who want broader and deeper study in relevant fields? Professor Appadurai offered some initial thoughts, drawing on his experience at several institutions of higher education; selected Brandeis faculty also presented brief remarks about what we currently offer, and where we might go.
Profesor Arjun Appadurai is the Goddard Professor of Media, Culture, and Communication at New York University. Formerly, he was Senior Advisor for Global Initiatives as well as the Provost at the New School in New York City, where he also held a Distinguished Professorship as the John Dewey Professor in the Social Sciences. He has held professorial chairs at Yale University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania.


He is the founder of PUKAR (Partners for Urban Knowledge Action and Research), a non-profit organization based in and oriented to the city Mumbai (India).

More information on Arjun Appadurai’s work and life is available at www.appadurai.com.

Appadurai’s connections with Brandeis University trace back to the late 1960s, when Appadurai was awarded a Wien International Scholarship to study at Brandeis from his native India. The Wien program celebrated its 50th anniversary a few days after this symposium.

Other selected works and resources of relevance to the symposium:

The Globalization of the American University (video of keynote talk)
Arjun Appadurai, keynote speaker

“The Right to Research”, Globalisation, Societies and Education
Arjun Appadurai
Volume 4, Issue 2, July 2006, pages 167-177
Symposium Two


November 2 & 3, 2009

On November 2 and 3, 2009, the Office of Global Affairs hosted a University-wide symposium featuring Professor Kris Olds from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, who delivered the keynote lecture: “Cross-Border Higher Education, Authoritarianism, and the Global Governance of Academic Freedom.” The symposium featured the multi-dimensional work of Olds, whose expertise is in global cities, urban planning, and knowledge industries. The two-day series of events covered a range of topics on these issues. The program drew attention to the creation of new knowledge “spaces” – both physical and virtual – including global cities, education zones, branch campuses, and other forms of transnational and regional collaboration. This symposium also helped launch the new graduate program in Global Studies. The inaugural matriculating class attended a student and faculty response session to continue discussion of Prof. Olds’ keynote talk. The second session included a group of faculty members from various departments across the University who discussed the connection between institutional configurations and forms of cultural production generated in transnational, diasporic, and global places.


Prof. Olds launched the symposium with a plenary talk intended for the broader Brandeis community to think about higher education, authoritarianism, and the global governance of academic freedom in an international context.

Student and Faculty Responses

Moderated by Prof. Chandler Rosenberger (Sociology, International and Global Studies), the first session provided an opportunity for students and faculty to continue the discussion of Prof. Olds' Monday lecture and to broaden the discussion by considering several of his recent papers on related themes. These papers were distributed in advance to students and faculty who participated.

Students and faculty discussed the complications of academic freedom in new knowledge spaces developing around the world. As Singapore expands its relationships through partnerships with American universities, interconnected issues arise between politics, economics, and academia. To compete with knowledge hubs in the United States, Singapore tries to establish an identity as a global resource in higher education to become the “Boston of the East.” Discussants focused on strategies important to Brandeis as a global institution. Both rising global knowledge hubs and American universities continue to compete strategically, changing the landscape of higher education across the globe.

Places of Knowledge, Forms of Knowledge

This session was moderated by Prof. Richard Parmentier (Anthropology). Participants discussed the connection between institutional configurations (spatial, regional, architectural, etc.) and forms of cultural production (discourse, texts, images, etc.) generated in these transnational, diasporic, and global places. Faculty presenters included Mark Auslander, Elizabeth Ferry, Talinn Grigor, and Ulka Anjaria.

Faculty presentations covered a variety of critical global issues from many different disciplines. Prof. Auslander discussed the identity of globalization by determining where the global emerges as being visible. Prof. Ferry’s expertise in economic anthropology and Mexico & Latin America provided a unique perspective on “Mineralogical Species,” discussing the role of Aguilarite and its influence and intellectual contribution. Prof. Grigor discussed the Persian Past in the British Raj, and Prof. Anjaria highlighted the importance of novels as a form of multiple voices and influences in global communication.

Discussants learned about issues in relation to key formative moments: how things get brought into being, how modernity is organized, and how to craft models relevant to ‘the global.’ Higher education has become a global industry that requires a multidisciplinary approach.
Kris Olds

Professor Kris Olds is a professor of human geography at the Department of Geography, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Prior to this, he taught at the Department of Geography, National University of Singapore and at the School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol. Kris was a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Postdoctoral Fellow at the Department of Geography, University of British Columbia. Apart from academia, he has worked in the planning department for the City of Vancouver, researching at the UBC Centre for Human Settlements, and with Joe Wai’s architectural firm in Vancouver. His current research primarily focuses on the geographical organization of power in relation to contemporary socio-economic and spatial transformations. The geographic context for his research is the broad Asia-Pacific/Pacific Rim region, and the interdependent skein of global cities spread around the globe. His topical interests range from global city formation processes to urban governance and planning.

Selected Publications:


GlobalHigherEd

A Blog Surveying the Construction of Global Knowledge/Spaces for the ‘Knowledge Economy’

The GlobalHigherEd weblog is edited by Kris Olds and Susan Robertson (Professor, University of Bristol).

The blog and Twitter feed are both designed to highlight and then archive information about new developments (e.g., a new policy or development project), resources (e.g., reports, websites), analytical networks, and so on, so as to better track what is happening with respect to the construction of new globalized knowledge/spaces.

Prof. Olds and Prof. Robertson are interested in how and why new knowledge and new spaces (including socio-technical networks) are being developed in association with the emergence of the ‘knowledge economy’, and what the implications of this complex development process are, especially for global public affairs.

Visit the blog at: http://globalhighered.wordpress.com
Symposium Three

The Global: Developing an Intercultural Mindset

March 4 & 5, 2010

On March 4 and 5, 2010, the Office of Global Affairs hosted the third symposium featuring Professor Darla Deardorff from Duke University, who collaborated with the Global Learning Committee and led an Intercultural Teaching and Learning Workshop for faculty and staff. This visit highlighted the current emphasis on "global" or "intercultural" competence in higher education.

Global Learning Goals for Brandeis Undergraduates

This first session matched Dr. Deardorff in conversation with the new Global Learning Committee at Brandeis, a sub-group of the large Brandeis Assessment efforts. Members of the Advisory Committee of the Office of Global Affairs also joined the discussion. The Committee is charged with thinking about "global learning goals" for all Brandeis undergraduates, in conjunction with the new Brandeis Assessment framework. Dr. Deardorff provided an overview of similar efforts at other institutions, followed by a conversation about efforts so far at Brandeis.

"Improvised Conversations"

The next session, "Improvised Conversations" - MusicUnitesUS Intercultural Residency Series - provided an opportunity to hear about the life and work of Azerbaijani father and daughter vocalists Fargana and Alim Qasimov. This unique session was cosponsored by Slifka Program in Intercommunal Coexistence, Aga Khan Trust for Culture, and the Brandeis Council on the Arts. Dr. Deardorff joined the participants in this open conversation.

Fargana and Alim Qasimov held an informal gathering for guests. Together, they shared stories about their lives and their experiences in Azerbaijan. They also painted beautiful pictures about their travels around the world through their music. Guests were also treated to a few songs by the ensemble, drawing from the repertoire of Azerbaijani ashiqs-singer-songwriters whose songs portray, often with humor and irony, the power of love and the pain of separation.

Student responses to global problems and disasters

Prof. Deardorff also met with student leaders to discuss campus involvement in addressing global issues on and off campus. The student-oriented dinner had topics of discussion primarily focusing on the collaborative efforts between student groups around major global problems, such as the Haiti Relief initiative, the Revive Mumbai efforts, relationships with Al-Quds and the Middle East, and other similar projects around the local and global community.

Student leaders from the Student Union, Brandeis University – Al-Quds University Partnership, Wien Scholars, South Asian Studies Association, Haiti Relief Effort, and STAND were just a few of the representatives present at the dinner. Students, staff, and faculty members reflected on the challenges student organizations face regularly on campus. Some key points of discussion were about 'international experiences' on campus, recruitment and membership, and the relationships between organizations and their faculty advisors.

Intercultural Teaching and Learning Workshop

The Intercultural Teaching and Learning Workshop was the last session that provided attendees an interactive and hands-on approach for faculty and staff members. Increasing, whether in courses, advising, or program development, our work with students involves an intercultural or global approach. This interactive, intermediate-level workshop provided those leading and teaching student programs with an opportunity to explore ways in which intercultural competence development can be practically addressed in orientations, experiential learning and community programs, retreats, and in the classroom.

Faculty and staff members gathered together to participate in an interactive and hands-on workshop aimed at improving intercultural competencies. Attendees also shared with each other different activities targeted at understanding cultural relativism, drawing upon their own experiences and how effective and important it is in and out of the classroom.
Bringing together leading experts and scholars from around the world, this handbook provides a comprehensive overview of the latest theories and research on intercultural competence. It is an invaluable resource to administrators, faculty members researchers, and students.

Key Features:
- Covers intercultural competence from a variety of cultural perspectives (including Arab, Chinese, and Indian).
- Applies intercultural competence to different fields such as business, health care, and education.
- Provides guidance on researching and assessing intercultural competence.

Prof. Deardorff’s dissertation research has drawn national and international attention. She was recently nominated as a "Rising Star in Academia" for the Chronicle of Higher Education and is editor of The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence (see right).
Further Resources

For access to web material and video, visit the symposia web site at:
http://www.brandeis.edu/globalbrandeis/office/symposia.html

Further resources and readings on the internationalization of higher education are collected at:
http://www.brandeis.edu/globalbrandeis/office/resources/index.html

Associations and organizations working on international higher education include:

NAFSA: Association of International Educators
http://nafsa.org/

AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators
http://www.aieaworld.org/

AAC&U: Association of American Colleges and Universities
“Global Learning” and “Shared Futures” projects
http://www.aacu.org/resources/globallearning/index.cfm

ACE: American Council on Education
Center for International Initiatives
http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/cii/index.htm

APLU: Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities
International Issues

The Forum on Education Abroad
http://www.forumea.org/

IIE: Institute of International Education
http://www.iie.org/

IAU: International Association of Universities
http://www.iau-aiu.net/

Academic Cooperation Association
http://www.aca-secretariat.be/

Observatory on Borderless Higher Education
http://www.obhe.ac.uk/home

Several of these associations have collaborated to produce INCI: The Common Portal of the Inter-Association Network on Internationalization, located at http://campusinternationalization.org/
Research institutes working on international higher education include:

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education
http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe.html

The Center for Studies in Higher Education at the Univ of California, Berkeley http://cshe.berkeley.edu/

The Center for Global Education
http://www.globaled.us/

Within the academy, projects that examine the internationalization of disciplines and knowledge include:

Social Science Research Council
http://www.ssrc.org/

The Organization of American Historians
La Pietra Project on Re-thinking American History in a Global Age
http://www.oah.org/activities/lapietra/index.html

National Science Foundation
Office of International Science and Engineering

American Academy of Arts and Sciences
http://www.amacad.org/

Alyssa Grinberg (left), program manager of the Justice Brandeis Semester, compares notes with Elaine Wong, senior associate dean of arts and sciences, during an intercultural training workshop.

The Office of Global Affairs

The Office of Global Affairs (OGA) develops and advances the strategic vision for Global Brandeis. The OGA builds connections between the university’s many ongoing activities in the international arena, strengthens its public profile, identifies new resources for international projects, and cultivates partnerships with organizations and institutions worldwide.
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Office of Global Affairs
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Waltham, MA 02454-9110 USA
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Fax: 781-736-8561
Email: oga@brandeis.edu
Website: brandeis.edu/oga
Characterized by academic excellence since its founding in 1948, Brandeis is one of the youngest private research universities, as well as the only nonsectarian Jewish-sponsored college or university in the United States. From the start, Brandeis was internationalized; many of its early faculty were leading European academics who escaped from totalitarian regimes during World War II and its aftermath.

Named for the late Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis of the U.S. Supreme Court, Brandeis University combines the faculty and resources of a world-class research institution with the intimacy and personal attention of a small liberal arts college.

For students, that means unsurpassed access — both in and out of the classroom — to a faculty renowned for groundbreaking research, scholarship and artistic output. At Brandeis, professors bring newly minted knowledge straight from the field or lab to the graduate and undergraduate classrooms.

Brandeis supports an innovative and exciting program of learning that emphasizes an interdisciplinary approach to knowledge and the solution of real-life problems. Undergraduates, from the very first year, enjoy leadership positions and research opportunities typically available only to upperclass and graduate students.

Located in Waltham, Mass., on 235 attractive suburban acres, Brandeis is in an ideal location just nine miles west of Boston.

Brandeis is ranked in the top tier of U.S. universities. Our graduates depart to pursue careers in a wide array of fields, and advanced studies in leading graduate and professional schools around the world.

On January 1, 2011, Frederick M. Lawrence (right) took office as the eighth president of Brandeis. An accomplished scholar, teacher, and attorney, Lawrence is one of America’s leading experts on civil rights, free expression, and bias crimes. Prior to Brandeis, Lawrence was dean and Robert Kramer Research Professor of Law at George Washington University Law School from 2005 to 2010.

At George Washington Law, President Lawrence significantly expanded international partnerships and connections. He traveled frequently to India and formed a program in The Hague, Netherlands. Since coming to Brandeis, he has described the University as a “global liberal arts university” and has promised to continue its deep commitment to global understanding.