

Brian Whalen
Forum on Education Abroad Conference Session
Forum 10th Annual Conference

In the past couple of years I have had the opportunity to represent the Forum as part of U.S. diplomatic efforts abroad. Last summer I was part of Secretary John Kerry's delegation at the India-U.S. Higher Education Summit. And two years ago I served as a State Department expert giving presentations at conferences and attending meetings at universities in Brazil. In both cases I was well aware of my responsibility to represent the aims of the U.S. Department of State but also to represent the Forum's 700 member institutions and organizations, 25% of which are located outside of the

U.S. I began to think about how, and if, the goals of our Forum member universities and education abroad organizations align with the foreign policy goals of the of the U.S. government. So when Bahereh asked me to be part of this panel, it was an ideal time for me to think more about this topic in more depth and to share some thoughts and, I hope, generate discussion.

Bahareh has already outlined the U.S. government's foreign policy priorities for education abroad. I took a look at two specific U.S. government initiatives related to U.S. education abroad (the 100,000 Strong Initiatives for China and for Latin America), to see how the goals for those programs are described, and I think the descriptions

provide some further detail. Essentially, the desired outcomes that the U.S. government wants to achieve are:

1. To strengthen National Security through strengthening bi-national relations. The idea here is that by educating students about the world and fostering their global competence, US national security is enhanced.

2. A second goal that appears in the descriptions is to prepare students for the global workforce to enhance US global competitiveness. The notion here is that students who study abroad become better able to function in the global marketplace because they acquire the necessary global knowledge and skills, and contribute to keeping the US economy strong on the world stage.

3. And, finally, a third goal that is stated explicitly in the 100,000 strong initiatives relates to leadership. This goal is to create future leaders who are able to reach across borders in effective ways to represent US interests effectively.

Now, what are University and Program Provider Goals for Education Abroad? Through the Forum's State of the Field surveys we know that 60% of Forum member institutions include international education in their mission statements, while 50-60% of Forum member institutions have identified specific learning outcomes for their education abroad programs. The typical examples relate to student learning outcomes such as the development of a global perspective, global competence,

global and intercultural understanding, and students being engaged, active contributors to global society. Many institutions report that goals exist at different levels, from student, to course, to education abroad program, to education abroad office, to academic departments, and to the institution as a whole.

The various levels of goals and outcomes are often aligned within institutions, but just as often appear to be disparate. How do these various institutional and student goals align with the U.S. government's goals? It appears that sometimes they do, and sometimes they do not.

Whether they should or should not more closely align we hope will be a topic for our roundtable discussions.

For now, let me offer what I think are some opportunities and challenges for fostering this alignment. For the U.S. government, especially with the creation of a new study abroad division within the Department of State, there is the opportunity to deepen the US government's stated goals in more precise and compelling ways. For example, it is one thing to espouse "economic competitiveness" as a goal for education abroad. But it is another thing to cite more specific goals related to the knowledge, skills and attitudes developed as part of education abroad that will make students successful in the global work force. The U.S. government naturally expresses the goals for education abroad on a much broader scale. But I would suggest that the

persuasiveness of the government's vision would be greatly enhanced if it incorporated the specific university, program, and student-level goals that form the building blocks of these broader national goals. There is much to cite in terms of the results of specific assessment of outcomes, for example, that would strengthen the value of the government's goals for education abroad. Let me make mention here that the Forum's latest State of the Field Survey reveals that approximately half the number of member institutions that have identified outcomes or goals have an assessment plan in place to assess these goals. While this may seem a low number, it may actually reflect more assessment than in other areas of higher education. And here I would point to the Forum's new

Outcomes Assessment Toolbox, a resource that includes a bibliography of research studies, assessment tools, as well as institutional case studies that provide specific details of results of outcomes studies.

On the other side, institutions could consider that their missions and goals for education abroad contribute to something greater within national and global contexts. Some already do this in citing the goal of creating “global citizens” through education abroad. But is this realistic? And how does this goal compare and contrast with national foreign policy goals? Should institutions think about expanding the meaning and purpose of education abroad as part of national goals? Is this desirable? Should our institutional and organizational goals for education

abroad be aligned with government goals? Why? Why not?

Something that happened last week brought this topic to widespread attention in the U.S. All of you I am sure are aware that during her trip to China, First Lady Michelle Obama spoke about the importance of study abroad. She stated in her talk delivered to U.S. and Chinese students at the Stanford University Center in Beijing, "...we view study abroad programs not just as an educational opportunity for students, but also as a vital part of America's foreign policy." "...we are in "A new era of citizen diplomacy...(in which)... ordinary citizens are reaching out to the world." Study abroad means

“shaping the future of your countries and of the world we all share.”

This is an interesting view of how study abroad might contribute to U.S. government goals, expressed here as being consistent with the goals that are shared with the community of nations. Is this an expectation that we should have of our students? If so, how would it impact our program goals, designs, curricula, and assessment of outcomes?

In her recent article on “Diplomacy and Education: A Changing Global Landscape,” Patti McGill-Peterson probes the way in which higher education is used as “soft power diplomacy,” and she raises a caution regarding “soft power” relationships:

Soft power relationships, informed by enlightened self-interest, often signal unequal relationships. This issue has been raised particularly with regard to East-West and North-South cooperation. Given the demand for higher education in developing countries, they are unwilling to discourage those who wish to help either through scholarships or assistance with the formation of institutions. In the best of all possible worlds, these offers can create development for the receiving country as a way to build human capacity. However, countries that are recipients of educational diplomacy need to understand the motivations of those wishing to build relationships.

McGill-Peterson's caution is addressed in the Forum's *Code of Ethics* through the principle of reciprocity, the idea that relationships should be mutually beneficial, and of course other associations and organizations advocate for the same principle. And this signals what can be a key difference between the approach of governments and the approach of universities. The mission of the U.S. government is to further foreign policy aims through soft diplomacy while institutions will have other goals in mind. In fact, as McGill-Peterson points out, universities often act

independently of government goals as they seek to realize their own, distinctive missions and goals for international education:

As we enter a period of accelerated global engagement, country-to-country educational diplomacy is being overtaken by institution-to-institution relationships and a broad array of actors. This makes the educational diplomacy scenario even more complicated for those on the receiving end. It also means that governments are not the prime actors. While governments may view college and university cross-border activity as an important part of their diplomatic efforts, institutions are increasingly operating beyond sovereignty, based on their own strategies and motivations.

In conclusion, the relationship between U.S. foreign policy goals and the goals of universities and organizations is complex, yet ripe with opportunities.

Having discussions such as this one today will help us to consider these opportunities to advance the field of international education by defining its scope. Ultimately this work will help to clarify our institutional missions

and goals, as well as the place of higher education in the context of government programs and foreign policy goals.