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Outline of Today’s Session

- Introductions, overview, and brainstorm
- Student learning and development
- Break
- Group discussion
- Implications and challenges for faculty development for education abroad
- Debrief
Significance of the Topic

- Faculty control the curriculum
- Good for faculty members’ professional development
- Need to confront the ‘naysayers’
- Gaps in faculty development
Initial Brainstorm

1. What are the critical issues in terms of working with students before/during/after study abroad?

2. What knowledge, attitudes, and skills do faculty need to successfully engage with education abroad programming?

3. What tools exist to give them this competence?
Holistic Student Development

For this presentation, holistic education abroad student learning and development is practice that encompasses:

- Various ways of learning
- Various of being in the world
- All aspects and parts of the study abroad experience
  - Before, during and after travel
  - Curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular components
Faculty Engagement Defined

Engagement refers to the intentionality and dispositions about curricular content, teaching and learning contexts, instructional approaches, and assessment practices...the educational experiences that faculty design for students, influence students' educational experiences and influence the learning outcomes through those experiences.

(Chen, Lattuca, & Hamilton, 2008)
Faculty Development Defined

Focus on the individual faculty member’s role:

- Scholar/researcher
- Professional/administrator
- Teacher
- Person

Focus on instructional design

- Course-specific
- Curriculum
- Improving student learning
Faculty and Education Abroad

Faculty engagement
An engaged education abroad faculty member will be actively involved in, and committed to designing and facilitating learning abroad experiences that consider the whole student and the whole experience (all aspects before, during, and after). He or she will actively seek out opportunities to learn about the relationship between program design and student learning and development.

Faculty development
Intentionality and quality of efforts to challenge, support, and reward faculty to begin or continue their engagement in designing and facilitating education abroad learning experiences that aim to bring about holistic student learning and development.
We work from these premises

- Most existing faculty preparation for EA is reductionist
- EA should consider students’ overall development as persons
- Intentionality in program design facilitates student learning
- Many faculty are unfamiliar with student development theory and research
- Many faculty are unfamiliar with the range of ways in which they can engage with EA
- Not all faculty are convinced of the value of EA
Understanding Students: Implications for Practice
Education Abroad Narratives

**Positivist**
- Observation
- Language
- Learning is a Given

**Relativist**
- Intercultural
- Immersion
- Transformation

**Constructivist**
- Intervention
- Design the experience
- Multi-layered
Today’s students

This generation requires a different brand of education that will enable them to attain their personal dreams and to serve the society they must lead. The education we offered to previous generations, whether successful or not, will not work for these students.
Today’s students...

**Strengths**
- Digital natives
- Self-confidence
- Optimism about self
- Good with diversity and team work (surface and mediated)
- Interested in global issues
- Pragmatic
- Driven by earning money and securing future

**Limitations**
- Pessimistic about future of country
- Entitled
- Dependant on adults
- Don’t cope well with adversity
- Struggle with face-to-face interactions
- Less interested in following interests, identifying values, learning people skills
Assumptions I

Common Assumption

• Students sign up for my program because they are interested in the material and/or the culture.

Common Reality

• Students want to have fun, visit the locale, make friends, and earn some credit.
• Cultural learning may or may not be high on their list.

Don’t assume your students share your motivations for the content, culture, or destination. Intrinsic valuation tends to come after experience.
Assumptions II

Common Assumption

- Students should just know about these expectations, and I should not need to spell them out to them so directly.

Common Reality

- Students do not have your experience with academics or travel.

You’ve been abroad a lot, maybe your students have not, and what you think about as a common expectation (e.g., sharing a room or making a bibliography) may be new to these students.
Assumptions III

Common Assumption

- Growth and cultural learning happen naturally while abroad.
- Students who want to go abroad are prepared to go abroad.

Common Reality

- Students seek out familiar environments and overlook cultural nuances.
- Negative experiences can reinforce stereotypes.
- Students can experience difficult cultural adjustment and homesickness.
- Students don’t know what they don’t know.

Intervention is needed. Preparing students to navigate a different culture/travel is important. Students are adjusting to many new things, some as simple as doing laundry.
Student Development/Learning

- Cognitive
- Interpersonal
- Intrapersonal
Cognitive Development
## Cognitive Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Absolute Knowing (dualist)</th>
<th>Transitional Knowing (duplicity)</th>
<th>Independent Knowing (relativist)</th>
<th>Contextual Knowing (commitment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Role</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge from instructor</td>
<td>Understands knowledge</td>
<td>Thinks for self</td>
<td>Thinks through problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shares views with others</td>
<td>Integrates and applies knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creates own perspective</td>
<td>Exchanges and compares ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor Role</strong></td>
<td>Communicates knowledge Ensures student understanding</td>
<td>Uses methods aimed at understanding Employs methods that help students apply knowledge</td>
<td>Promotes independent thinking Promotes the exchange of opinions</td>
<td>Application of knowledge in a context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of discussion about perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critique back and forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Certain, absolute Right vs. wrong</td>
<td>Partially certain and partially uncertain Multiple understandings, but lack ability to evaluate amongst them</td>
<td>Everyone has own beliefs Things are relative</td>
<td>Knowledge is contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Able to judge based on evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expanding our theories

- Perry is an iconic, but dated cognitive theory
- Transformative learning (Kegan, 1994; Mezirow, 1996; Cranton, 1996; Taylor, 2006)
  - the process of effecting change in a frame of reference
  - A process of letting go of old ways of being and accepting new ones
  - Understanding what happens to move students between levels of development
  - Much higher bar that we associate with it
  - **Requires new forms of intervention**
Substantive Change

- Not about new information or ideas
- About learning as growth than changes one’s worldviews, identity, and sense of the world (meaning making) in substantive ways qualitatively and quantitatively
  - Instructional design
  - Attention to student development
  - Good, active, experiential pedagogy
  - Intentional interactions and exposure to difference
  - Cannot rely on happenstance
Experiential Learning Theory
(Kolb, 1984)
Strengths and Limitations

- ELT suggests that the experience itself is not educative and offers ways to think holistically about learning
- Reflection and testing help students consider their experience in “transformative ways”
- Considers the notion of learning flexibility and learning space
- Is starting with the experience always the best place on the model?
- Students often come to us with diverse backgrounds in terms of their ability to process and reflect
- All programs do not offer the same learning spaces
- Faculty roles and experiences as teacher play an important role
Newer Insights

- Students KLSI fell on the conceptualization/experimentation zones (Passarelli & Kolb, 2012)
  - Culture of Higher Education
  - Student Expectations
- Conceptualization might be a vital first step (Roark & Norling, 2010)
  - Students need some scaffolding on which to “hang” their experiences
  - Starting with abstract conceptualization or prompting reflection is more valuable than starting with experience
  - FIPSE study and the connection with motivation and prior knowledge
- Planned happenstance (Krumboltz, 1999)
Personal Development
Interpersonal development

- Students most salient goal during this period of life is fitting in and making friends
  - Poses a challenge to dealing with diversity
- Mediated by other forces – technology
  - Poses a challenge to disconnecting from home
- Might not understand how to effectively work (even though they think they do)
  - In teams
  - With you respectfully
  - With the host culture
- Or how to
  - Make their own decisions
  - Ask for and seek out help
Intrapersonal Development

- How people define themselves
- Regression occurs when you push someone beyond their ability
  - Stress and hostility
- Disputed
  - Stage and linearity
  - Holistic or partial?
  - Single or multiple identities
  - Relation to other areas
Generic identity development schema

1. **Denial or pre-encounter**: lack of acknowledgement or identification with difference
2. **Encounter**: student faces adversity related to identity, signaling an awareness shift
3. **Immersion**: Student seeks to immerse self in “other” culture and preferences interactions with that group
4. **Internalization**: acceptance of identity and belief system
5. **Synthesis**: integrates identity into various aspects of life
Newer research

- Hovey (2007) research on “American” identity development abroad
- Multiple identities
- Atom-model of identity (see image)
Adding a Global Perspective

Chickering & Braskamp, *Developing a Global Perspective for Personal and Social Responsibility* (Peer Review, 11,4, Fall 2009, pp. 27-30)

- Mapping a global perspective onto four key dimensions of students’ psychosocial development:
  1. Moving through autonomy toward interdependence
  2. Establishing identity
  3. Developing purpose
  4. Managing emotions
Head – Heart - Hands

- Cognitive development: knowing and knowledge
- Intrapersonal development: identity and affect
- Interpersonal development: social responsibility and interactions

Educators must...

- ...help students develop intercultural, interpersonal skills
- ...help students develop purpose and meaning
- ...help students name and respect their emotions and those of others

Experiences for integrated learning

- sustained person-to-person contact
- active learning opportunities
- interdisciplinary readings/assignments
- reflection

PRAXIS: Application of Theory & Implications for Practice
What we know.....

- Students’ cognitive development
  - Either / or thinkers
  - Received knowers
  - Socialized to be passive learners
  - Not adept at evaluating or using evidence
  - Not experienced with analysis, reflection
  - Rely on rote memorization, standard operating procedures, clear and step-by-step directions
What we know.....

- Students’ interpersonal development
  - Technologically-mediated
  - Not used to group-living, sharing, and certain public etiquette (respectful)
  - Connected to family and friends back home; used to having adults as “friends”
  - Accepting of diversity, but may not have internalized value for it (surface)
  - Fitting in is very important, almost primary for them
What we know.....

- Students’ intrapersonal development
  - Limited in depth and sophistication
  - Has not thought about their entitlements, privileges or value deeply
  - May readily accept the values of ideals of others (as with cognitive)
  - May have difficulty questioning ideas because of embedded values and identities
  - Low sense of “Americanness”
Instructional Design

Backward Design (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998)

1. Identify desired results.
2. Determine acceptable evidence.
3. Plan learning experiences and instruction.
Challenge and Support

- **Challenge**: motivates exploration, reflection, and risk-taking
  - Too much challenge and student may withdraw from potential growth experiences
- **Support**: helps in times of vulnerability, uncertainty, and failure
  - Too much support may cause student to stagnate
- **Disequilibrium**: an experience that disrupts one’s prior understanding or beliefs
- **Dissonance**: allows growth by unsettling the old beliefs and integrating them with the new

(Sanford, 1966)
Scaffolding

- Sufficient support is initially provided and gradually removed
  - Other- to self-regulated
- Teacher changes from:
  - Directive → Suggestive →
  - Encouragement → Observation

(Sawyer, 2006)
Applications I

- When applying theory to program planning, make sure the theory you select fits your goals and context
  - Learning goals
  - Faculty and staff preparedness
  - Student readiness
  - Learning space and context

- Acknowledge that authentic learning, especially transformative learning, is a “high” bar
  - Authentic reflection is difficult (Social Desirability Bias)
  - Pre-packing might be needed
  - You might need to construct your own interventions and not rely on happenstance
Applications II

- Students need interventions to learn effectively abroad
- Intersectionality between students’ developmental realms and learning must be considered
- Assessment should relate to program goals
- Moving beyond the “iconic” or foundational theories is critical to respond to student learning needs
Questions for Individual Reflection

1. How do you (your institution) define faculty engagement and development?

2. How are you (your institution) engaging and preparing faculty for education abroad?

3. Who are you (your colleagues) partnering with to facilitate faculty engagement and development in education abroad?
Institutional Constraints

- Factors that can inhibit faculty engagement and development efforts:
  - Disciplinary nature of their work
  - Culture of ‘knowing’
  - Motivational challenges, rewards, and incentives
  - Unfamiliarity with pedagogy, teaching and learning, and education abroad
  - Mismatch with institutional/college/departmental priorities
  - Time, opportunities, and lack of participation
Five I’s in Faculty Engagement in Internationalization

- Intentionality
- Investments
- Infrastructure
- Institutional Networks
- Individual Support
Strategies, Structures, & Models

- Professional Development Events
- Cross-Unit Collaborations
- Communication and Discourse
- Rewards and Incentives
- Research Connections
- Recourses and Toolkits
- Institutional Structures
Collegial Dialogue

1. What **strategies and models** have been effective on your campus preparing faculty for education abroad?

2. Who are you **partnering** with on these efforts?

3. What **challenges** have you encountered and how have you overcome them?
Questions and Discussion