THE FARAWAY NEARBY

Putting the Local in Global Education
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The inclusion of an off-campus experience as a part of a twenty-first-century undergraduate education is a recognized and firmly established principle on the campuses of most U.S. colleges and universities. This is almost exclusively understood to be an overseas experience, or study abroad. However, off-campus study need not be exclusively an overseas experience. Many undergraduates have been participating in a range of lesser-known but just as significant off-campus programs offered here in the United States. Still others have been earning academic credit on well-established, community-based education programs that also offer students a similar off-campus experience. The position taken in this volume is that domestic off-campus study can be just as powerful a transformative learning experience as overseas study. Including such globally minded and locally focused programs as part of a rich set of off-campus offerings will result in many new potential opportunities, which had been previously overlooked. Domestic programs can also expand students’ horizons, their knowledge of global issues and processes, their familiarity and experience with cultural diversity, their intercultural skills, and their sense of citizenship.

Further, when the impact of globalization, a process that has and will only continue to shape the world economically, politically, and culturally, is coupled with the makeup of the United States—regionally, demographically, culturally, socioeconomically—it is our contention that all students, regardless of where they study off campus, are engaged in global learning.

At the same time it is important to recognize that off-campus study is but one component in a set of educational experiences that leads to students becoming increasingly globally competent. Students also learn on campus to be global learners—in class, through cocurriculum programs and activities, and from interacting with international, multicultural, and multilingual student peers.

However, in focusing on the role of off-campus programs in the preparation of globally competent citizens, today’s raison d’être of these endeavors, it is helpful to recognize that off-campus study has two equal aspects: one overseas (study abroad) and one domestic. With both broadly meeting similar educational goals, this complementarity is most advantageously expressed as “study away” (Sobania & Braskamp, 2009). Further, when one recognizes that this same goal of effectively preparing students to be globally competent citizens can also be met through academic community-based education programs (including academic service-learning and internships), and that community-based education can also take place either overseas or in the United States, then “study away” becomes an inclusive concept as well as an educational strategy that integrates a broad range of off-campus programs. As Engberg asserts, “Despite the resource challenges and other barriers to implementation, institutions may face, it is essential to think about an integrated approach to global learning that encompasses the full range of domestic and international off-campus experiences embodied in the terminology of study away” (2013, p. 478).

To demonstrate this, Figure 1.1 illustrates the way in which community-based education programs overlap with both domestic and overseas off-campus programs and together constitute the inclusivity found in study away programs.

In the very near future, if not already, it may be instructive to add a fourth overlapping circle within the larger study away sphere to represent online education and the many variations this is likely to take. It is in this arena, the world of online connectivity, that classrooms and community groups in different parts of the world are learning collaboratively from lectures and presentations, group discussions, and research, albeit, so far, without the daily encounters, sounds, and smells that come with being on-site. This point is recognized in Figure 1.2, with each sphere connecting to at least some degree with each of the others. Further, as institutions connect with institutions in other countries in collaborative courses and even degrees, it is the expertise U.S. faculty members have about the multiculturalism and pluralism of the United States that these overseas partners will want for their students.

The new paradigm of study away challenges the privileged position study abroad has had on campuses across the country. Historically, however,
this has not always been the case. Not all that long ago an overseas experience was thought of as an “add on”—something of value to a student’s education acknowledged by only a minority of committed faculty and administrators. Today, however, study abroad can be said to have come of age; it has been professionalized—from national and international organizations with meetings and annual conferences and journals reporting on the latest research, to the promoting of a set of standardized best practices and the availability of MA programs in international education. At the same time, campuses are full of initiatives designed to increase global learning by internationalizing both campus and curriculum. These efforts have been further supported by the federal government through commissions and most recently with initiatives to significantly increase the numbers of students studying overseas in China and Latin America.3

From the ship-aerogarage-poste restante era, when students typically studied overseas for at least a semester—and often a full year—to focus on language learning and taking courses with international content in hope of meeting general education and major course requirements, study abroad has evolved to today’s 850-plus-seat airplanes, digital-social media era. One outcome has been an ever-increasing number of students studying overseas, albeit with the majority of today’s sojourners traveling on short-term programs of as few as 7 to 10 days. In fact, many of today’s students arrive on campus having already been overseas on one or more service projects with their local church or organizations such as Habitat for Humanity. Another outcome has been that even though the actual time students spend overseas has lessened, the expectations of what they are to acquire from such experiences have evolved to include the almost contradictory expectations that they will learn increasingly complex skills and dispositions to operate more effectively in a globally interdependent world. But again, these expectations are not unique to overseas study programs and also apply to domestic ones.

Thus, the next stage in this evolutionary development is study away, a position that embraces all off-campus study opportunities, or what Richard Slimbach has characterized as “doorstep to planet” (2012). By seeking points of complementarity from learning goals to program design, students can be provided with the most appropriate opportunity(ies) that best match their individual academic objectives and needs.

There are also a number of advantages to be gained from expanding off-campus study opportunities to include domestic programs. These programs can make an off-campus opportunity available to greater numbers of students who might not otherwise consider such an option, whether due to real or perceived obstacles. This is particularly relevant for the increasing number of today’s students who are first generation and nontraditional. Domestic
study away programs can also expand the range of on-campus partners in support of off-campus programming by creating opportunities for faculty whose teaching and research focus is in the United States; who have not lived, worked, or done research in overseas locations; and who have therefore not thought of themselves as being particularly relevant to campus internationalization efforts. Further, there is the potential for building bridges to better integrate professionals in multicultural life and community-based learning/service-learning who share many of the same commitments as study abroad professionals and who also have extensive knowledge about programming that these same professionals ignore to their own detriment.

The title of this chapter, “The Faraway Nearby,” is taken from the letter closing used by Georgia O’Keeffe when she wrote to her friends in New York from New Mexico, where she moved in 1929. O’Keeffe also produced a painting in 1938 with the title From the Faraway, Nearby in which she juxtaposed images that were very close with others very far away, asking viewers, as Jennifer Sinor (2013) has written in The American Scholar, “to see, really see, what would normally be passed over—a flower, a broken skull, a shell from the shore—and to frame that attention with the possibilities of the horizon.”

With the principal focus on study abroad, students are looking at what is very far away to the neglect of what is so very close and are thus missing the possibilities inherent in both. Although “from the faraway nearby” has been characterized as a “striking oxymoron” (Warner, 2013), one has to question such a label in light of how easy it is, even in many rural locations, to travel only a few blocks from home or campus and have a cross-cultural experience—hear another language spoken, meet people from different cultural traditions, or discover religious practices different from one’s own. That there is value in “really seeing” what is in one’s own backyard, and considering it more closely, seems beyond doubt.

With the United States increasingly no longer a majority population with historic minorities, but a nation inclusive of diverse minorities and significant numbers of “new” Americans, as well as immigrant and refugee populations, what constitutes a majority is rapidly changing. In this the United States is, like so many other countries around the world, a multicultural country made up of many different nations, each with its own history and languages that have shaped and continue to shape its cultural traditions and values (Blatt, 2014). The national narrative of a melting pot continues to find expression, yet our reality is much more that of a salad bowl. In the same way, the belief that there is anything like a single culture, even within a single state, is long past. As Woodard (2012) delineates in American Nations, since the United States is a country with mostly arbitrary state borders, it is more helpful to consider the United States as consisting of 11 rival regional cultures, the development of which has been driven by each region's diverse historical circumstances. Since there are few countries made up of a single ethnic group of people, the United States is in fact like most other countries in terms of its demographic makeup, cultural traditions, and values. Thus, placing a premium on study overseas suggests our vision is too narrow and we are limiting our students’ opportunities to also learn locally and regionally. Just as overseas programs can provide important educational experiences and be an effective means of fostering the development of desired learning outcomes and developmental skills, mind-sets, and behaviors, so too can domestic off-campus programs.

It has often been noted that you can live in another culture all your life and never completely understand it, but you will come to understand your own. Or as Paul Theroux (1967/1997) neatly summarized in the title of one of his earliest musings on travel, “Tarzan is an expatriate.” But what part of your own culture will you understand? As the contributions to this volume will make clear, the multicultural diversity in the United States, which few students understand, appreciate, or are even acquainted with (really no different from what they actually know and understand of societies and cultures overseas), is wide open for the development of domestic study away programs that can meet, and in some instances even exceed, the global learning opportunities available through study overseas. The vast majority of students who participate in study away are not disadvantaged, do not consider or think much about themselves being privileged, and regard their place in society as normal. They may understand race and class as theoretical perspectives with textbook examples, but their lived experience is with people who resemble themselves. If they don’t even know the names of these neighbors across town or in nearby locales or have not heard them express firsthand the challenges they face or their aspirations for the future, much less know anything of their traditions, history, or language, how can students come to fully appreciate that class and race are different dimensions of disadvantage, or begin to understand the stark divides that economic inequality, housing, and material goods impose on others’ lives? How do students begin to understand or appreciate the complexity and heterogeneity of the group called “Latinos”; to comprehend the resonance that continues to exist in the memory of Chinese Americans or Japanese Americans and their historical experiences in America; to understand that African American and African immigrants who are new Americans have different understandings of slavery, Jim Crow, and the civil rights movement; or to appreciate the significant value Native Americans attach in their daily lives to traditional knowledge and how they rightfully view themselves as members of two nations—their tribe and the United States?
The representations of people different from one's self are often framed as "the other." Typically "the other" is thought to be geographically distant—especially for example, in Africa or Asia (think National Geographic or coffee table books by persons such as Carol Beckwith and Angela Fisher). As a result we do not talk about those who live in the United States and are different from ourselves as "the other." A recent study of social networks in America (Jones, 2014) found that the social networks of White Americans demonstrate a significantly higher degree of homogeneity (91%) than those of Black Americans (65%) or Hispanic Americans (46%). What this suggests is that Americans don't know each other outside of the relatively narrow confines of racial boundaries, and that we have a long way to go in recognizing people as individuals even when, in the broadest sense of the word, they are neighbors. Clearly there are borders that divide here from there and self from other, and these can prevent recognizing that even with different histories, religions, and values, others are not so different after all. If there is any positive in this, it is that the 2013 American Values Survey, from which these statistics are taken, does not distinguish age. Positive because there is evidence that Millennials—and especially the post-Millennials, also sometimes referred to as the Plurals—have broader social circles than those older than themselves, circles that are much more inclusive of individuals of diverse ethnicities, religions, and races (Hais & Winograd, 2012). It is this trend and the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that come from global learning that can move students toward a better understanding and appreciation of the multicultural world in which they will live and work.

Braskamp and Engberg (2011) speak of this desired transformation as the acquiring of a global perspective. This perspective draws on decades of research on holistic learning that categorize student learning as consisting of three dimensions: cognitive, intrapersonal/affective, and interpersonal/behavior (e.g., see Chen & Storosta, 1994; Kegan, 1994). My own preference is to characterize these three dimensions of global learning as awareness or disposition, knowledge, and skills, suggesting a learning process in which students must first become aware of difference, then become acquainted with the background knowledge (cultural, geopolitical, economic) that clarifies the implications of such historically embedded difference to the point that they can move skillfully from the new knowledge they have acquired to positive interactions across difference(s). Looked at this way, global learning becomes a journey.

Managing the Global Learning Journey

Global learning constitutes a number of knowledge areas, and exactly what this includes will undoubtedly continue to be contested on campuses, at conferences, and in publications. What should be obvious is that one does not acquire global knowledge (that one should have or needs) through a single experience, whether that experience is in the United States or overseas. Howland (2014) defines global learning in five domains of overlapping capacities. These capacities are skills that students “will need to thrive in the world as we understand it today and imagine it in the future” (AAC&U, 2014):

1. Global Knowledge: Students understand multiple worldviews, experiences, histories, and power structures.
2. Global Challenges: Students apply knowledge and skills gained through general education, the major, and cocurricular experiences that address complex, contemporary global issues (problems and opportunities).
3. Global Systems and Organizations: Students gain and apply deep knowledge of the differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems.
4. Global Civic Engagement: Students initiate meaningful interaction with people from other cultures and take informed and responsible action to address ethical, social, and environmental challenges.
5. Global Identities: Students articulate their own values as global citizens in the context of personal identities and recognize diverse and potentially conflicting positions vis-à-vis complex social and civic problems.

What are encapsulated in these five domains are the knowledge and the complex skills and dispositions that we desire for all graduates. They are not acquired from a single experience on or off campus, but rather over the journey we call the undergraduate experience. One could in fact go so far as to suggest that global learning is just the latest wave of talking about the education that needs to be imparted to all students as part of the undergraduate experience, and soon, as the globalization of the world takes further root, global learning will be simply learning.

None of this is about the place, it is about the journey. It is less about London, Prague, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Accra, Cape Town, Delhi, Beijing, Tokyo, New York, or Los Angeles than it is about the expectation that students will change through the experience of studying away. Thus, the emphasis ought to be on the themes around which learning can focus, themes such as the environment, urbanization, refugees and immigrants, treaties, survival of traditional ways, and so on. Aspects of each of these themes can be found in the United States and overseas.

Thus, place can be seen as a contact zone where one crosses not just a geographic border, but physical, social, mental, intellectual, and emotional
outcomes of such programs, including offering students integrated learning experiences in a cross-cultural context, the separation appears increasingly artificial. This seems especially so as diversity and cross-cultural course requirements have been added to the curriculum and academic credit has been awarded for service-learning and internships. The continued separation also makes less sense when, as Chickering and Braskamp (2009) argue, developing and internalizing a global perspective is an essential part of a holistic development paradigm well-grounded in sound student development theory.

It is assumed that every study away program or course has its own learning outcomes. A further presumption is that these learning outcomes must be different if the program is offered domestically or overseas, yet there is often considerable similarity and overlap. More importantly to the argument being made here, it is not always obvious which is a learning outcome for an overseas study away program or one in the United States. Consider a few examples from my campus, Pacific Lutheran University: “to identify similarities and differences in cultural values,” “to recognize ethnocentric reactions that inhibit the cultivation of cross-cultural understanding,” and “to challenge one’s own stereotypes and myths about people” are not all that dissimilar. Or the following: “to understand the complexities of changing patterns of urban and rural life, environmental challenges and the minority experience”; “to be able to distinguish cultural myths from cultural content”; “to broaden students’ knowledge of approaches to and strategies for social change, and the values placed on the processes by diverse groups.” The first set are learning outcomes from intensive, month-long study away programs that range from Makah Culture: Past and Present at Neah Bay, among a Northwest Coast Native American community some 120 miles from the PLU campus, to The Hilltop in Tacoma, which explores issues of poverty and homelessness only 15 minutes from campus. In the latter group, the first is from Continuity and Change in a New World Power in Sichuan, China; the second from Contemporary Global Issues: The Norwegian Approach to Development, Conflict Mediation and Peace Building in Norway; and the third from Development, Change and Social Development in Oaxaca, Mexico. Each of these programs, regardless of duration, has additional learning outcomes specific to its location, including important language learning outcomes for the last three. However, when global learning outcomes are looked at in their broadest sense and without country or regional specificity, they contain many overlapping goals that do not require great leaps of faith or academic gyrations to identify points of commonality that can be met either internationally or locally. In fact, the faculty at Susquehanna University has recently adopted an agreed set of learning outcomes that must be met by a program regardless of whether it is offered overseas or in the United States.10
Expressed another way, where once there was a focus on the local and the global, with each being distinctive, it is increasingly clear that this is a false dichotomy: local is global. As Cornwall and Stoddard (1999) already noted, "The nature of the world is such that national and global realities, whether economic, cultural, political, environmental or social, interpenetrate and mutually define each other to the degree that isolating U.S. studies from international studies is increasingly impractical."(viii).

When programs overseas address issues surrounding resettlement of immigrants and refugees or diaspora communities, how is this different from a local program that examines these same issues? Whether in the United States or overseas, immigrants or refugees are not the "same" as members of the same ethnic group or nationality of people in their own country or region of origin, but then how representative of the "people" of country X, Y, or Z are those students they study with, if they indeed actually study with the students of the country? How are the conditions under which American students live while studying overseas representative of the way the majority of the people in the country live? The list of subject matter that has a global context is nearly endless. Why are people hungry, why are people sick, how are international treaties observed and enforced, what is the impact of geographic boundaries on national identity, what are possible solutions to the shortage of water? All of these involve global issues that can be addressed either overseas or here. If students are engaged in globally contextualized learning, the location may be less a critical factor than with whom they are learning and from whom, and how they integrate what they learn in their own life.

Does a premed student or one in nursing, pharmacy, public health, or physical therapy need to go abroad to examine the impact of global health issues on populations in so-called developing countries? Or can they, as University of Wisconsin students do through the global certificate program, take a short-term course titled Communicable Diseases & Environmental Health in Humans: Detection, Monitoring and Control right in Madison, Wisconsin? By working with local partner agencies in the Madison area, students are introduced to and become familiar with methods of detecting, monitoring, and controlling communicable diseases. And as a result of international travel coupled with immigrant and refugee communities in and around urban centers, the nature of the communicable diseases that appear in our neighborhoods goes far beyond the flu, mumps, and chickenpox, but can also include malaria, TB, and typhoid (personal communication, Robin Wittenthal, September 9, 2013; Lori DiPette Brown, October 2, 2013). Similarly, one can go overseas to observe the impact of international treaties on communities' rights and obligations, for example, in Northern Ireland, Rwanda, or the

former Yugoslavia, but these same issues can be studied in the United States among Native Americans, on the border with Mexico, or even between individual states and Canada over water usage and other natural resources.

By recognizing that students can also engage in diverse cultures in the United States, a new set of off-campus opportunities and experiences is unlocked that can also foster global learning. As with study overseas, these can also enable students to develop holistically, including their cognitive development, their disposition, and their relationships with others unlike them. Moreover, study away greatly expands the range of opportunities that can assist students in working and living effectively in multicultural and intercultural situations, as well as learning about who they are and what they want to be. Such an expanded range of options provides students with multiple entry points to such learning. For some students the entry point will be an on-campus course and an internship or volunteer activity; for others it will be a short- or long-term study away program. For some that program will be overseas; for others it will be here in the United States. At the same time, domestic program options can provide opportunities for students returning from overseas study away programs to use knowledge they acquired in a comparative way, or try out what they learned abroad in a different cultural setting that happens to be local.11 Again, this is not about substituting domestic programs for programs overseas—it's about offering both types to expand student opportunity and global learning.

Expanding Global Learning Through Study Away

Once we recognize and accept that the expansion of study away options through the creation and development of domestic off-campus study programs can also be a valuable tool for expanding students' understanding of the global world, we may well discover that there are other advantages as well. A more robust study away program, with an expanded range of domestic off-campus study programs, may also be helpful in addressing issues of access, finance, participation, health and safety, and faculty and staff support.

Access

Making study away more widely available involves financial concerns (for students and the institution), as well as expanding the number of participants. Since study away in the United States is generally less expensive than study overseas, it can prove more cost-effective for more students. Even when a student wants to take advantage of an institution that treats the cost of study abroad the same as if the student were on campus, and also allows the
export of his institutional aid, or full credit for a tuition scholarship offered by a third-party provider, the out-of-pocket costs can prove prohibitive and make the cost of such a program out of reach. The costs of a passport, a visa, and inoculations add up to a significant sum that is not necessary for study at home. And on top of these incidentals, international airfare must be paid.

The finances associated with study away also have serious implications. After all, what college or university today, and especially in the competitive environment for new students, can afford not to offer study abroad programs to indicate they are internationalizing? No matter what financial model a campus uses for operating its study abroad program (and the models are numerous and diverse), significant costs are involved when a student makes a choice to study overseas. It is not all about tuition, but also lost income from housing and dining services. Whereas programs run by the student's own college or university may involve only a partial loss of tuition, students in third-party-provided programs always cause the loss of tuition. This loss of revenue may be still greater if the institution additionally allows a student to carry her institutional aid with her to such programs. Institutions that charge home school tuition (and sometimes room and board) may keep some revenue in-house, but this rarely offsets the total cost to a university when sending a student abroad.

A domestic off-campus program is certainly not cost free. For example, when a faculty member directs such a program and does not teach on campus for a term or a semester, this programmatic cost may be the same as for a study abroad program. However, campus-run programs that are based more locally should be less costly than those offered overseas, although this may not be as true for those based in certain metropolitan centers. In this case, established consortia programs may prove a better option than a campus running its own. However, an unintended financial impact of a domestic off-campus program is that it brings real financial resources into the local community where the program is based and with whose members it is actively engaged. Another consequence, whether intended or not, may be an increase in interest among the youth of these communities in higher education, and potentially the campus from where a program originates.

Participation is another facet of access in which domestic programming may offer a positive advantage. Its impact can range from increasing the participation of students of color to attracting students from disciplines underrepresented in off-campus study, such as STEM majors. The issues that inhibit greater participation by certain groups, which also include athletes and males, revolve around obstacles—obstacles that may be real, imagined, personal, or institutional. Although the study abroad field has been working diligently to change the limited range of student demographic characteristics and to accommodate a broader range of students, the majority of study abroad students are female—65.3% in the latest Open Doors (2014) survey of 2012/2013 participants—and the vast majority are White students (76.3% male and female). Although Open Doors does not include this statistic in its annual survey, the cost of participating in a study abroad program likely means that students are often upper-middle class.

Just as colleges and universities struggle with increasing the diversity of the student body, so too does study abroad, and cost is but one variable that impacts participation. For many students, especially those who are first-generation attendees without a college-going tradition in their family, just going to college is an important achievement. For other students, depending on where home is, traveling to the college's location may already require a significant cultural adaptation and adjustment. When these students are also faced with academic requirements for some intended majors, which can require setting up a course plan from the first semester, the idea of studying somewhere in Africa, Asia, Europe, or Latin America is the furthest thing from their mind. Foremost is succeeding in class, costs, and the sacrifices their family is making for them to be there. They must also adjust to campus cultural life, which may not include the traditions they practice at home where English may not even be the main language of communication. College for such students is primarily about graduating and getting a well-paying job. For nontraditional students with jobs, families, or both, the thought of studying abroad may not even enter their minds, much less be seen as a realistic possibility.

The homogeneity of gender; race/ethnicity; and, one suspects, age (Open Doors does not survey this factor) that characterizes study abroad participants also carries over into fields of study. Students in the social sciences and humanities, along with business, dominate: 22.1%, 10.4%, and 20.4%, respectively. Certain majors with specific course requirements and course sequencing also set up barriers to study abroad. This is reflected in the percentage of students in those degree fields: STEM (physical and life sciences, 8.8%; health professions, 6.4%; engineering, 4.1%; and math, 1.9%), and education, 4.0% (Open Doors, 2014). One way to expand participation is to increase domestic study away opportunities that are more appropriate for students in these underrepresented disciplines.

Another aspect of participation that is rarely discussed but should not be ignored: What if the number of students studying abroad has actually peaked? Is it possible there is a more or less finite number of students who can or will study abroad? The total number of students who study abroad each year continues to rise but only by small annual increments: according to Open Doors (2014), 1.2% for 2010–2011, 3.4% for 2011–2012, and 2.1%
of those colleagues who teach international content courses to be included. In fact, I would go so far as to suggest that those interested in internationalization ignore the domestic at their own peril. For example, when budget cuts come, and we know they do, international programming is seen and regularly identified as expensive; it can become an easy target. This is especially true at institutions with tuition-driven budgets. Instead of viewing domestic and community-engagement programs as a threat to study abroad, they need to be seen as partners.

Further, campus partners should also include all those campus constituencies that increasingly have initiatives focused on diversity, multiculturalism, community-based learning, and internship in their unit. The addition of domestic programs to off-campus opportunities for students makes it possible to better align the work of these professionals with that of those whose initiatives are presently understood to be explicitly international or global. Working together with a shared vision and a common understanding of the multidimensional nature of study away can allow different academic and administrative units to construct meaningful outcomes and build stronger partnerships across what are too often seen as institutional boundaries.

**Health and Safety or World Order Disorder**

Another factor that is inevitably front and center in conversations about off-campus programming is health and safety. Indeed, given its growing prominence, the field of education abroad has itself spun off organizations that are focused exclusively on risk and liability issues. The realities of a chaotic and increasingly multipolar—some would argue asymmetrical—world make concerns for students’ physical safety a top priority. On any morning of the week, a scan of OSAC’s (Overseas Security Advisory Council) Crime and Safety Report (n.d.), a valuable tool that a study abroad office is prudent to follow, demonstrates this. In fact, it can easily lead one to wonder if there is any safe place for students to study overseas. Woe unto the international education administrator who cannot respond to a call or an e-mail from the college’s or university’s president as to how many students are in New Zealand and are they all accounted for when CNN or NPR first reports an earthquake in Christchurch. Or when the office of the risk manager calls to find out if the students in Shanghai are all safe since a shooting at the railway station in Urumqi just occurred, unaware the two locations are nearly 2,500 miles apart. This is, in part, why professional positions exist to stay on top of all the world’s happenings (and occasionally to teach geography). Add the television media to this disservice, flitting from one world crisis to another with their so-called “in-depth” coverage, and is it any surprise that parents have concerns about sending their undergraduate overseas? In this light the United

---

**Allies and Partners: Building a Stronger Campus Constituency**

While many faculty members are avid supporters of study abroad, and perhaps this is increasingly so as the professorial ranks are being filled by a younger generation of faculty who themselves studied overseas as undergraduates or graduate students, study abroad professionals often lament that they do not find more support for their efforts on campus. Yet in addition to those faculty members who teach subject matter with a strong or even exclusively international focus, there are perhaps as many if not more on every campus whose expertise is the United States. Might some of these colleagues be open to and even support having an off-campus option or two that is more appropriate for majors in their disciplines whose focus is the United States? Just as those faculty who support study abroad programs as a way to enrich their students’ knowledge, would faculty whose teaching and research focus on the United States not be supportive of programs that do the same for their students—programs that engage students in the curriculum in ways that cannot easily be duplicated in a classroom setting, are supportive of different learning styles, and provide an extended range of opportunities for hands-on learning? Some may even be interested in offering their own off-campus program.

Where study abroad does not involve these faculty members, study-away can and should include them. Not only is this logical, it is in the self-interest...
States looks a lot less threatening. As pressure continues to build for more students to have an off-campus study experience, there seems little doubt that study abroad will continue to wrestle with issues of safety in various locations around the world. In this environment, why would one ignore the rich range of possibilities offered by study away programs in the United States?

To ignore the potential advantages that can accrue from expanding study away opportunities seems shortsighted from an educational perspective, even if one does not take into account the significant issues of cost (from sending tuition dollars off campus and keeping residence halls filled to the impact on financial aid), the risk and liability issues that keep administrators and parents and guardians awake at night, and the numbers games played with signed partnership agreements and Open Doors totals.

Moving Forward

In 2012 Elliot Gerson wrote an article in The Atlantic that has been heartily embraced by study abroad professionals. In “To Make America Great Again, We Need to Leave the Country,” he argued that all Americans, but especially young Americans, must travel outside the United States to learn about other countries and people to make the United States a stronger country. “Value will come not just from the greater global consciousness, but from the direct experience that many nations simply do many things far better than we do.” He goes on to suggest that when students compare and benchmark the way Americans provide health care, public transportation, energy policy, and rational political discourse against other nations, they will return home “no less patriotic than when they left” but “with an openness about the world that many of their parents lack.” I would certainly argue against this possible outcome, but would suggest that the various chapters in this volume demonstrate that one can also traverse borders—state borders, cultural borders, ethnic borders, linguistic borders, religious borders—all right here, right in the United States. Further, doing so may provide a stronger background that will make benchmarking more meaningful and more patriotic in the sense that Kwame Anthony Appiah writes about when he speaks of cosmopolitanism: “The cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone [emphasis added] is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of one’s own, with its own cultural peculiarities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people” (1997, p. 618). In sum, I prefer the image of Appiah’s cosmopolitan patriot to that of Gerson’s vision of American greatness. The celebration of difference, rather than seeking a form of global homogeneity, is more in line with what I understand global competence to be about.

Notes

1. On many campuses today, globalization and internationalization are being used interchangeably. There is a distinction. For the purposes of this chapter I follow Knight (2003), who defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2) while ensuring that an international dimension is central, and not marginal. This is distinct from globalization, which belongs more to the domain of economics and politics: “the process of increasing connectedness and interdependence of relationships across the world, in which cultural, moral, political, and economic activities in one part of the world have significant effects in other parts of the world” (Dower, 2013). A useful introduction to the key debates about globalization can be found at the Global Policy Forum, “Defining Globalization,” www.globalpolicy.org/globalization/defining-globalization.html.

2. As the Harvard Planism Project makes clear, pluralism is not the sheer fact of diversity alone, but active engagement with that diversity. One can be an observer of diversity. One can “celebrate diversity” as the cliché goes. One can be critical of it or threatened by it. But pluralism requires participation and engagement” (Eich, 2013).

3. See, for example, the Lincoln Commission’s report (Commission, 2005) and U.S. Department of State’s (n.d.) 100,000 Strong Educational Exchange Initiatives, www.state.gov/100k/.

4. Today, community-based learning and service-learning are being used somewhat interchangeably. Increasingly community-based learning is seen as a broader term and service-learning fits under it. The preference for community-based learning is, on one hand, to steer away from the various connotations attached to “service” and, on the other hand, to recognize who is providing the instruction and who is learning.

5. An image of this painting can be found at www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/59.204.2.

6. The U.S. White majority will be gone by 2043. In 2012, the population younger than 5 years old stood at 49.9% minority: the projection is that in 55 years minorities will make up more than half of children under the age of 18. Today, about 40% of Whites 25-29 years old graduate from college, compared with 15% of Latinos and 25% of Blacks. Retrieved from http://sanimvideo.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/06/13/18341111-census-white-majority-in-us-gone-by-2043lite

7. Somalia is one of only a few countries in the world with an ethnically homogeneous population—consider the commonality found there today.

8. This concept of Native Americans belonging to two nations is perhaps made clearer in Canada, where the reference is not to “tribes” but “First Nations.”

9. Others express this transformation as intercultural competence or multicultural competence. While useful terms, the heavy emphasis this places on communication and behavior as the principal competency, for me at least, places too little emphasis on the acquisition of awareness and knowledge that are foundational to changing patterns of communication and behavior. In reality, it is awareness and knowledge that are fundamental to why students, parents, and campuses think about and support off-campus study/study away, rather than making students more interculturally competent.

10. See www.usu.edu/academic/52062.asp and chapter 13 in this volume.

11. As part of an ACE Internationalization Workshop, Pacific Lutheran University articulated a global education continuum that outlined four stages of development: introductory, exploratory, participatory, and integrative, more or less corresponding to the four years of
an undergraduate degree program to suggest such a sequence (Kelleher, 2005). The reality is that I am not aware of any good evidence or research that suggests what, if any, sequence of experiences is better than another for increasing global competence.

12. The list of 84 different languages taught by NASILP institutions as of June 2014 can be found at www.nasilp.net/index.php/languages
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