

The internationalization of higher education is in a state of chaos. It is heralded as the next step in the evolution of higher education, yet, it has been present in university life from the very beginning centuries ago. Internationalization has become a term without meaning; or alternatively a term with perhaps too many meanings to be useful. Every University president speaks about internationalization, but few present it coherently and strategically. At present, internationalization is both “an actor and reactor” to the realities of globalization and the turbulent state of higher education. It is seen by some institutions as a necessary *means* in the process of educating students for the 21st Century, but it is also mis-perceived as an *end* by other institutions, that present an array of potentially disparate international activities without a common purpose or rationale as proof that they are offering a quality “globalized” education.

Internationalization is nearly everything, and nearly every institution currently claims to be in some state of internationalization. As Jane Knight has presented in her works, each institution has become its own definition of an internationalization entity. From sending students on study abroad, to recruiting and hosting international students and scholars, to curriculum integration, to faculty-driven coursework, to campus climate, as well as including an “international chapter” at the end of a unit; all of this has been held up as signs of internationalization.

Even within an institution, there is seldom a common understanding amongst the administration and faculty about the purpose or approach to internationalization. Debates are common on campuses about the meaning of international and global—are they the same thing? As well as international and intercultural, and the intersections that they may have with diversity. Is internationalization about the trade of students, scholars, research and curricula or does it have a conceptual and instructional role. Is it something institutions “do”, or something that one “learns”? Is it measurable, or is it like Supreme Court Justice Potter’s comment on pornography that “I’ll know it when I see it”.

It's very easy to see how one could characterize internationalization in the field of higher education, as well as its implementation within each of our institutions as being "in a state of chaos".

But perhaps that's not all bad. Differing approaches and the competition of ideas and agendas are a hallmark of the academy. So there are many good and practical reasons for our chaos. But it does beg the question on how one then determines quality.

And it is that question of determining quality, which is really what we are here today to discuss—for in addition to internationalization, the other buzzword that is thrown around with equal abandon is assessment. And for this, Jane Knight's chapter on cross-border accreditation and quality assurance sets the context. For Knight presents in rather a rather humbling way, I think, the dual challenge, that traditional institutions and accrediting bodies have not adequately responded to the growth of cross-border programming, resulting in a "gap", that other regional and private groups are looking to fill; referring to these groups as "bona fides" and "rogue"—which I think is particularly amusing. In reading Knight, I am struck again by this notion of chaos as it relates to cross-border accreditation and quality assurance. It's clear that internationalization needs to be accountable, identifiable and measureable, but Knight's work leads one to the question "accountable to who"?

I think that particular question is one that each institution must begin asking, and answering. And it is most certainly that question which we've been asking at Arcadia and which fundamentally has led us here today.

It is within this context that The College of Global Studies offers its Arcadia Atlas™ initiative: Assessment, Teaching, Learning and Scholarship; a comprehensive process that intends to assess all aspects of international education and internationalization in the same manner as every other aspect of the institution. It hopefully is not just a tool for assessment, but also a way of thinking and vision for international higher education.

From the chaos, perhaps we can find a sliver of order and intentionality.

The first and most critical element in the development of any assessment plan is a well constructed and clearly articulated mission statement from the institution. It is that mission statement which provides the principles of purpose that should guide all work and effort emanating from the institution. A well-crafted mission and accompanying goal-set describes with some clarity the type of person that the institution intends to develop and mold. It is that vision of an educated and learned person contributing in positive ways that establishes the end goal for the educators as they develop curricula and programming intended to produce a student that reflects the institution's values.

From that articulated goal, the rest of the institution goes to work. Faculty and administrators build curricula, pedagogies and academic programs that lead the student through an educational process in order to place them in reach of becoming the institution's goal; the student service-focused administrators develop co-curricular programming and support services that assist the student in navigating through the developmental, educational and social aspects of the academic experience to support the articulated ideal; others within the institutional structure play similar roles supporting the mission to produce the institution's student. And those charged with assessment keep as their nearly singular focus the notion that all aspects of the institution's work should be efficiently, intentionally and consistently driving toward the creation of the student learning ideal. Institutions exist to achieve their mission. Faculty and administrators exist to realize the institutional mission. And assessment is the means by which these processes are known to be happening.

Let me share with you, three potential pitfalls in the way some institutions address, or fail to address the development of a clear mission:

- The mission statement provides the roadmap for any assessment plan. And the less that the mission is articulated and specific, the more problematic it may be. Mission statements that attempt to be comprehensive and without boundary are equally as vague and unstructured in the production of their outcomes. If one intend to be all things to all people, then all measures, methods and outcomes must be equally as acceptable. The lack of purpose and focus makes assessment an impossible task. Having no particular goal produces no particular outcome.

- Equally as problematic is the development of competing, definitions for the same institutional goals. Perhaps the institution has a well-articulated mission, but does not have equally strong articulated goals. When learning goals are not clearly articulated, or specifically defined, institutions run the risk of having multiple interpretations of the same concept, which may lead to having competing or contradictory implementations of that same concept. For example, perhaps one office interprets “global-engagement” as being measureable through intercultural development theory, while another office rejects intercultural development and builds their programming with another model. These types of challenges are common within many institutions who do not communicate the theory and model effectively across the institution.
- Thirdly, and perhaps most common within study abroad is the development of a measure looking for a concept. More often than not, the practical problem is that good-intentioned individuals are charged to “do assessment” without much guidance or clarity. In many of these instances, the assessment work is then motivated to produce a result—preferably quantitative in nature—and is not framed within the institution’s mission, nor has a particular goal in mind. They simply are driven to provide outcomes, regardless of what they are. Often the offices purchase access to reputable inventories or means-tested surveys that produce what can appear as impressive and empirical results, but they may or may not relate back to the work and mission of the institution; and so may not be of any particular use with planning and future decision-making.

The Role of Assessment

Institutional missions, are an articulation of community goals, and are intended to be lofty, idealistic and comprehensive. They serve to provide the vision to those who are part of the institutional community. Well-constructed mission statements and the equally critical student goal articulation are also conceptually descriptive in terms of who the ideal student is, as well as how the institution broadly intends to produce such a student.

The assessment process, shared by all in the community, then begins with the operationalization of the mission concepts into measureable and actionable components. Concepts such as ‘globally-engaged’, and ‘social responsibility’ are given

meaning and clarity by the institutional community. Inevitably, error is introduced in the efforts to provide definition and methods of measurement on such lofty concepts. Nonetheless, learning models and curricula emerge that begin the process of describing the 'how' and 'what' questions. Programs and structures are developed to give a method to the learning and development process; and assessment processes exist to connect and ensure that the particular structures and processes are in fact producing the kind of conceptual student described in the institutions mission.

Differing institutions, will likely address this issue differently, but The College of Global Studies at Arcadia University has taken the initial approach to assess its Centers and programs as well as assess the student learning that occurs within those programs. The assessment of student learning and the curricula and pedagogies of particular programs are too often confused and infused into one concept. The act of assessing student learning and how it is impacted by program design and curricular model are distinct.

Developing a clear mission with articulated and specific goals is at the backbone of any assessment plan.

So let's now turn our attention to the two major pillars of the Arcadia Atlas™ initiative: Program Review and Student Learning. It is in these two areas that we will spend the majority of our time and resources within The Center for Research and Assessment. So let me present now some of the theoretical underpinnings:

Program Review

Over the years, The College of Global Studies and before it, the Center for Education Abroad has always maintained a system of program review. For many years we participated in traditional kinds of "site reviews" consisting primarily of a group of external study abroad professionals providing an on-site review that included an inspection of faculty, facilities and coursework. At that time, these reviews were conducted under the auspices of our National Advisory Board. The findings of the review team were presented in both written report and in a formal presentation given at the annual Advisory Board meeting. We—remain—deeply appreciative of the good and committed work of those review teams. However, despite the expertise and talent of the review committee as a method and vehicle for assessment these reports often were

5

validating documents, confirming quality, while not necessarily driving for change. This weakness, I think were ones that were built upon our lack of direction and structure provided to the committees. Further, the reviews lacked an ability to be sustainable and repeatable practice. Each review, within this model, was responsive to the individual interests and areas of focus of the committee, and not driven by a central frame or plan. Primarily, their strengths and weaknesses often depended on the personnel of the particular committee.

Various attempts were made over the years to modify this model into something more useful. On two occasions, these reviews included more thematic focuses that attempted to explore deeper more relevant issues for the field. Additionally, one review attempted to put the FORUM Standards to use, with the review team tasked to explore the program through the lens of the individual standards. Once again, our review committee struggled with the structure. In our particular example, while the FORUM standards were helpful in indentifying the presence of particular programmatic elements, the review team found it challenging to move from the weeds into something more substantial.

So we had a bit of a conundrum—we believed strongly in the process of program review, but hadn't yet identified the right method that would help us meaningfully assess our programs. And let me add, that as impolite as this may be, our primary interest was in identifying a program review process that meaningfully reviewed programs, and not simply was another vehicle for marketing and familiarization.

So, when the Board of Trustees of Arcadia University approved the formation of The College of Global Studies in 2009, we began to explore whether a new approach to program review could be developed. Simultaneously, at this time Arcadia University was undergoing the process of re-accreditation by the Middle States Commission of Higher Education. The College—like all other units on campus-- was invited to participate in the institution-wide process, but we soon discovered that there wasn't much asked of us. Study abroad as a practice and pedagogy was not given much consideration within the Middle States Standards. Middle States, for example, considers study abroad activities solely under *Standard 13: Related Educational Activities*.

So, despite our being one of the three colleges of the university, and despite our significant role in driving internationalization at the University, we were only required to submit two or three paragraphs describing who we were and what we did. For those of you who know our good Dean Dutschke, you can imagine his reactions. So, in a strategic decision, the founding Dean of the College, Dennis Dutschke argued that The College had a responsibility to subject itself to the full complement of Middle States standards, and not limit itself to the area identified by Middle States. That, if international education was ever going to be seen as central to the University experience, then we had an obligation to demonstrate how integrated and central we truly were. Therefore, The College of Global Studies opted *on its own initiative* to participate fully in the process, and not be limited to Standard 13. This included the development of a full report responding to all 14 standards, a site visit to the London Center with the chair of our Middle States review committee, as well as representation of the College's staff on various Middle States committees. This decision to participate fully in the review is not the standard in U.S. higher education, as accreditation practices in the U.S. do not consider education abroad activities in the core of their review.

In essence, we inserted ourselves right in the middle of the Middle States review; Dennis—inserted himself, in a determined and robust way—and by extension, international education was inserted.

The College's approach was viewed favorably by Middle States, and in their final report, they suggested that Arcadia University was uniquely positioned to be a leader in this area. Indeed, The College dedicates itself to ensuring that accrediting bodies in the U.S. fully consider the critical role of education abroad in a University context, and develop standards and criteria to identify quality accordingly.

Further to the re-accreditation exercise, The College found that the process of self-review and the application of the standards provided a level of clarity and thoroughness in regard to strategic planning and change that our previous program review models never had. From that point, The College began a consideration of the accreditation standards as the appropriate template for program review.

It was like a light bulb going off. Here we were struggling to identify a review structure that was thorough, consistent, could drive toward change, and that could be identifiable

and recognizable to others in the academy. What better tool than that which governs the university system.

And so we started with the Middle States standards and began to adapt them to our particular context. Some of the standards fit very cleanly, and others needed to be shaped a bit. Let me mention two in particular.

Standard VI—Integrity. As it's written in Middle States, this standard refers to having a fair and judicious process in place for its various constituents, with protections for academic freedom, etc. Initially, when we adapting these standards for our program review process we left this one out. In fact, my first reaction was to omit those standards that didn't quite fit in our work; and I think I had two or three that fell into this category. Dennis, however, kept challenging me to keep them all—he wanted all 14 standards represented. In the end, it became clear that we needed a standard to address legal compliance, labor laws, ethical behaviors and responsible community engagement in our overseas centers. This standard then became the place to discuss our conduct overseas; adhering to proper labor laws, when in some cases it's much easier and cheaper to act otherwise, to ensure that our presence in the local overseas communities is positive and sustainable. These are important values to us, and we needed a process that included these elements in any review of programming.

The second standard that I think is worth highlighting is Standard XII: Co-Curricular Offerings. In fact, this standard is one that we completely manufactured. There's no such standard in the Middle States structure. Standard XII in their structure addresses general education requirements; the institutions core curriculum. Co-Curricular doesn't as an entity receive much prominence within Middle States; it's relegated to the student support standard and perhaps the related educational activities standard as well. Given the significant role that co-curricular programming plays, we needed a standard to specifically address this area.

Once we had our standards developed and articulated we sought to test them in a review process. And for that we chose Spain. Just as in the accreditation process, we developed a rather hefty self-report that responded and addressed each standard, compiled as much data as we had, and assembled a review committee to conduct the in-country review.

The make-up of the review committee was yet another critical discussion. We concluded that the review committees would be composed of three equal parts—one third of our committee made up of external reviewers representing institutions from across the U.S.; one-third from the faculty of Arcadia University; and one-third from The College of Global Studies. The committee sizes have varied from about 6 to 9 individuals depending on the size and scope of the programs being reviewed. In selecting the committee, we have sought senior level individuals with a diversity of experiences and backgrounds; including faculty members from theatre, business and sociology; a librarian and director of instructional technology; senior study abroad leaders from large and small institutions, public and private such as Lisa Donatelli, the Deputy Director and Director of Global Strategies at Georgetown University, Jack Zerbe, Director of Study Abroad at Guilford College, Marne Ausec the Director of the Center for Global Engagement at Kenyon College and Lynn Anderson the Dean of International Education at the University of California at San Diego.

We have included Dr. John Noakes, the Associate Provost of Arcadia University who is responsible for Academic Improvement and Institutional Effectiveness throughout the University. Dr. Noakes is also the individual responsible for review of academic programs within Arcadia University. The linkages between his office and The College continue to be a very important one, and we foresee his presence on these reviews as being a permanent one.

From The College, the representation has been limited to the Academic Dean of The College, Dennis Dutschke, the Chief Operating Officer, Colleen Burke and me, the Director of Research and Assessment.

Let me address openly, the potential criticism that the program review process is weighted toward internal representation and does not adequately address the need for external review. This has been a critical factor in our discussions in The College and might be worth exploring in this conversation. One of the principles on which Middle States and other accrediting agencies operate is that the review committee is wholly external—and yet The College’s review committee while most certainly including external reviewers also includes internal College officials.

I think this particular balancing point between the need for in-depth examination and the need for an objective external review marks one of the most challenging aspects of this kind of work. I don’t want to suggest that education abroad programming is necessarily more complex and nuanced than any other aspect of the university structure, but I think

9

that it is quite fair to say that education abroad programming is quite complex and nuanced. And that complexity often makes it quite challenging for a wholly external team to grasp the full picture of the program under review and ultimately drive toward change. In fact, if I may offer a small critique of many of the program review processes that I have previously seen it is that they all come back too positive.

Generally this is not a comment on the diligent and hard work of the review committee, but rather simply a reality of trying to review complex and interwoven programs in the span of a very short period of time. In order to effectively drill down to the critical issues in the review, there's a need for internal transparency and inclusion. As Lorna has said on other occasions, only you know where you've hidden the bodies, and shoved the clutter before the dinner party.

As paradoxical as it might initially appear, the inclusion of internal committee members is intended to add transparency and seek change to the program review process and not the opposite.

However with that said, those of us who work within The College do feel it's important to extricate ourselves from certain conversations—such as those with the program staff and with students—to allow for transparent and open conversations. We remove ourselves entirely from the final deliberations, have no vote in the decisions on whether The College has met the particular standard, and play a secondary, supportive role in the writing of the final report.

In sum, we believe it is necessary to participate actively in the committee throughout the information gathering period in order to best identify the areas that we suspect are in need of change or improvement, but we greatly respect the tradition of external review and seek ways of facilitation. It is a balancing act that may need recalibration at some point, however, thus far the review process has produced some wonderfully specific and focused recommendations of our programs.

So with our standards and committee structure in place, we sought to ensure the usability and efficacy of The College of Global Studies' program review standards, with two contrasting countries: Spain and Scotland. These two countries presented two very different program landscapes by which we could test the standards and program review process, and thus became referred to as the *beta-tests*.

In Spain, The College had two centers operating semester and summer programs with multiple tracks, as well as a long-standing partner program that operates as an independent academic center. With direct control over the faculty, curriculum, co-curricular activities, facilities and other program features, the review would in fact be examining issues directly controlled by The College. Spain offered the added dimensions of language learning, home stays and curricular and co-curricular connections with sites outside of Spain. Further, both the Granada and Barcelona Centers were at critical junctures in their own development, as so the program review process was seen as providing an opportunity to further consider the future directions of those centers.

The Scottish program portfolio represented a significant contrast to the program models in place in Spain. The College's presence in Scotland is a historical and long-standing one, collaborating with eight of some of the oldest and most prestigious institutions in the world. The dominant program model has been one of integration, where the student integrates fully into the curricular and social aspects of the institution; traditionally referred to as the direct enroll model. Historically, The College's role has therefore been one of co-curricular and pastoral support, centered out of the Edinburgh Center, which had functioned primarily as the administrative and support center of our Scottish programs. More over, The College is moving to develop its centers to more centrally reflect the various curricular and pedagogical models that are in place.

Hence, both sites offered a rich array of program models and other programmatic components that The College felt broadly represented those likely to be encountered globally.

Working within the frame of the accreditation standards allows The College to articulate the activities surrounding study abroad within the language and structure of higher education—which is more readily understood and respected amongst faculty and administration. To this point, study abroad is perhaps at a critical point in its development. Will it continue to professionalize by developing standards and codes that are recognizable primarily by its practitioners, or will it look toward the frames that govern the academic realms of the institution? While both approaches have their merits and may lead to quality review, The College firmly positions itself as one that sees the work of assessment as aligning with the standards and outcomes that govern the academic entities of the institution.

And while I've limited my comments here to the Middle States Accrediting Standards, I think our model is one that allows us to develop and articulate the evaluative criteria for each accrediting region within the United States. Our College is one that works in collaboration with institutions across the country, and so I can see the utility in having a program review process that assists those partners in their own review and accreditation processes.

In closing this section, I also want to recognize that the accrediting bodies and the standard and processes by which they govern institutions is by no means beyond critique. There are most certainly some strong arguments that could be made that the accrediting system in the U.S. is a deeply flawed one. But, at present it is the system that we've got. It reminds me of Winston Churchill's views on democracy. "Democracy...he said...is the worst form of government...except for all those others". And so perhaps it is with the accrediting agencies and their standards.

Moving on to student learning:

Student Learning

The study abroad experience is often described as being transformative. What transforms? How does that process occur? Is the opposite possible—is it possible not to transform?

It's the word "transformative" which I think is really indicative of one of the problems in education abroad. "Transformed!" –the word makes it sound like something impressive and important is happening. Of course the process is transformative; if it wasn't it would be quite an expensive and useless process.

Being transformed is not proof of success and nor does it require all of the resources and power of the academy to make happen. Cruise ships, backpacking and death are also deeply transformative.

The word "transformative" as I hear it being used seems to suggest that we as educators have no real clue how the student is changing, in what direction, and whether it has any linkage to the curriculum that we've put in place. It seems satisfied to suggest that something happens—we don't know what, we don't know how, and we aren't sure whether the academy had anything to do with it.

I present the idea that we hang on to the word transformational, because we have no confidence that we have the theory, practice or measures to talk about learning. Consider how much personal transformation occurs during a four-year undergraduate experience; and yet the institution talks about, measures and celebrates learning. And so should we. The developmental and transformational aspects of education—whether they be local or abroad—are very good indeed, but they are secondary to the intentional learning that the program and the curriculum are designed to produce.

And so, one of the principles of our work, one of the goals of our programming is to fundamentally address the learning that occurs in an education abroad setting. The College of Global Studies is interested in exploring the idea that intentional programming and intentional, meaningful engagement enhances student learning, and not simply in a particular content area or about a particular locale. But that there's something inherently unique in the pedagogical style of this kind of learning environment that changes the way students cognitively process information. That in fact, the experiential elements of the opportunity present a more sophisticated model of learning. Certainly, there will be outcomes related to student maturity and development. But in a collegiate setting, the primary function of this kind of programming and pedagogy—for us, and I suspect for others as well—is learning.

Which brings us to the next critical element—and that is the development of a learning model. It's rather remarkable how the majority of education abroad seems to operate without the presence of a learning model. What is it, in fact, that we think happens when a student studies in an international context? How do they learn? Why is it important? Is it different from the learning that occurs on the home campus?

And so I offer the following thoughts on the development of a learning model that may underpin our curricular, programmatic and pedagogical development. I present this model, not as something radical or unique—versions of this have existed in the academy, as well as in other institutions like the military for centuries, but rather as an articulation of how we in The College conceive of the learning process. Simply the articulation of a theoretical model is an important first step that greatly informs our work in other areas. Our approach to program development, curricula, co-curricular experiences, pedagogy, student services, student engagement, student admissions and program and learning assessment ultimately are based on the basic frame of this

model. Without it we would lack the central rationale—the mission and goal if you will—of how we build, teach and assess programming.

We do not present this model here today in any absolute terms. It is simply our first approach which we will test and inevitably change as we learn more about the student learning experience. Other institutions may in fact envision this process quite differently and work from models that are radically different, or perhaps not so different at all.

The critical component for us—is not whether one model is superior to another, nor is it a detailed examination of the relationship between the various concepts—it is simply that it is critical in education abroad to have a learning frame that guides our work, aligns with our institutional mission, and purposefully intends to interact with the student toward the achievement of goals. I daresay that we are at the beginning of this work and there is much more that we don't know than we do.

It's important at this point to offer a quick comment on the definition of learning; of course we could devote most of this week to discussing and debating a working definition of such a complex and abstract term, but since we're using the term so frequently in this discussion, it's important we give a nod to how we're approaching it.

And as much as I so desperately wish for the behaviorists to get it right because it would just make the lives of us social scientists so much damn easier, I think we need to borrow from the cognitivists, and specifically from Ormrod's work on *Human Learning* for our approach. Her definition which is similar to others states that "Learning is a relatively permanent change in mental associations due to experiences. This definition focuses on a change in mental associations, an internal change that we cannot observe."

To take this a bit further, because I think it is the key point, which is worth emphasizing, learning is about the creation and the changes of conceptual associations; it's about choosing the inputs to consider and then building associations that one makes with those inputs. It's the mental mapping of what to consider, what to ignore and how those various concepts interrelate. And from those mental associations, the human person manifests that learning into attitudes and behaviors.

Learning as a concept is not measureable; because at its root it is not observable. However learning is inferred in a number of ways including, changes in behavior,

changes in attitude; it is inferred from changes in memory, and in the demonstration of information processing (think of Bloom, for example.)

Our model also deals rather directly with the concept of “motivation”, and by this I’m referring to the degree to which the student is motivated to accept new information, new skills or new experiences. In the field of psychology, motivation is commonly referred to as a temporary internal state or condition that tends to activate behaviors. In the education abroad context, and in our particular learning model, understanding the student’s level of motivation and then affecting changes within it becomes part of the curricular and learning processes.

To this end, learners are motivated by what is familiar, accessible and personally relevant. Therefore the skill in the education process is to introduce difference in intentional and impactful ways that leave the student motivated for more information. Exposing the student to difference through experientially-rich curricular, co-curricular and experiential elements both destabilizes their existing goal and mental paradigms and — hopefully increases the student’s motivation to intake new or different information. We as educators then through our own reactions in formal and informal processes reward preferred behaviors and attitudes throughout the educational process.

We work under the assumption that students are in fact incomplete. That their individual lens’ and goals are not fully developed. In this context, students are not fully-informed consumers and thinkers, they are by their nature, not fully developed. We are in fact charged with shifting, clarifying, or at least providing an additional perspective on their goals. Our mission and goals again provide us with the map on where we would like to student to move. The institution has as its mission to re-align the student’s goals to be more in accordance with the mission and goals of the institution. In order to do this, the institution has an interest in deconstructing the student goals—this doesn’t necessarily mean changing the student goals—it means creating a context where the student self-analyses their learning, professional and personal goals and perhaps is given new information (learning) that allows them to change, amend, re-interpret, or perhaps better articulate and clarify their goals in association with their chosen institution.

In order to create the environment for goal shifting, the institution needs to create a pedagogy and a curriculum that challenges the student on their goals. The institution needs to assist in breaking down and deconstructing the student goals; to in fact, destabilize the student. This process may not feel comfortable for the student. To have their goals, identity and sense of self and the world altered often creates a sort of dissonance. While, potentially uncomfortable for the student, this is in fact one of the most critical goals and purposes of the institution. The institution needs to be supportive through this process, but it has no interest in otherwise avoiding the student process of destabilization.

How does the institution create a curriculum or pedagogy that potentially destabilizes the student? Well, it could be in many different ways, but largely it is through the intentional and intelligent introduction of difference. Different ideas, different experiences, different viewpoints, different lifestyles, different learning contexts, different cultures, different communication methods, different food and recreational comforts. These differences are in fact the method—the tool—being used by the institution to destabilize the student. [Footnote: the destabilization and exposure to difference also fosters risk taking. Students are no longer tethered to their traditional sense of goals and identities, and in fact may increase their risk taking.] These kinds of differences can occur in a variety of traditional and non-traditional contexts. In the study abroad world, institutions are able to introduce striking differences across the board on a variety of different areas in a short space of time. Study abroad then is simply an intensive learning environment. It's a controlled (or perhaps less-controlled) environment that permits institutions to introduce curricula and pedagogies that intend to move the student forward in quick, impactful ways.

In this model, our goals for education abroad may be quite different from the others that have been created—our goal is not necessarily language and culture, nor intercultural sensitivity, but perhaps destabilization. We want to create the destabilized place that allows the student to be open to new information, and new methods on processing information.

Another way of approaching this idea is that perhaps study abroad isn't about creating a new way of thinking, but simply destabilizing the old ones. It's after the study abroad experience that an institution can then have the greatest impact by filling that destabilized space with new methods of learning, new goals, etc.

Destabilization is not simply the result of difference; since in many cases the student may simply disregard or reject the difference. Instead a destabilized student has had their thinking challenged by the intelligent and intentional introduction of new information or experiences that they had never encountered or considered. This is where our curriculum and co-curricular work is most critical. Through our curricula we are introducing topics, themes or experiences that challenge the student's goals, paradigms and cognitive frames. We do more than change their worldview, we potentially change their thinking.

To demonstrate whether this particular learning model is effective or accurate we need to continue the development of measures for student goal formation, student motivations, level of engagement, destabilizing forces, changing goals and curricular effectiveness. The interactions between these concepts then form the testing and assessment of our student learning model.

And with that, I thank you greatly for indulging this rather long presentation and hope we can now open this colloquium for questions and discussion. Thank you.