Chapter 2

The Diversification of Education Abroad Across the Curriculum

Urbain J. DeWinter
Laura E. Rumbley

Introduction

Over the centuries the word curriculum has been used and adapted by higher education to describe the path or course of studies that must be followed by students seeking a liberal education. But the word curriculum was first used to refer to the chariot races that took place in the Circus Maximus of Rome. It was later mentioned by Cicero in conjunction with the word vitae as a metaphor for one’s journey through life, what today we call the C.V. or resume. Thus the word curriculum originally suggested a fixed, circumscribed trajectory, road, path, or way leading from one point to another, from beginning to end, that followed a desired objective. What precisely is the path of a liberal education and an appropriate curriculum, however, has been the subject of vigorous debate for centuries.

From the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century, universities and other institutions of higher learning have attempted to prescribe the essential components of an education by means of a curriculum that was relevant to the society at a particular time. In the Middle Ages, the curriculum prescribed for a well educated person consisted of the seven liberal arts — the trivium (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic) and the quadrivium (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy) — producing an elite cadre of theologians, lawyers, or civil servants to meet the needs of the Church and the State. This curriculum and the intellectual tradition of classical learning have had a profound influence on higher education to this day, not only in Europe but in the United States and other parts of the world, as well.

In the United States the debate over control of the curriculum has been vigorous and at times contentious. As Frederick Rudolph (1977) and other historians of American higher education have pointed out, there have been consistently different opinions as to whether higher education should be elite or democratic, general or specialized, subject based or competency based, cultural or utilitarian, and prescriptive or elective — suggesting that, at least in America, the curriculum
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1 The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Nancy Downey of Colby College in the early stages of this chapter and that of numerous colleagues who responded to our requests for information.
debate has long been a complex, continually evolving, and sometimes messy process that has reflected the needs and aspirations of people living in a dynamic society and a growing nation. The curriculum would never be permanently fixed nor would it guarantee a fixed product. As William Cronin (1999), University of Wisconsin Professor of History, Geography and Environmental Studies pointed out,

it is much easier to itemize the requirements of a curriculum than to describe the qualities of the human beings we would like that curriculum to produce. All the required courses in the world will fail to give us a liberal education if, in the act of requiring them, we forget that their purpose is to nurture human freedom and growth (p. 75–76).

It was not until the mid-1960s that the study abroad curriculum would enter into the mainstream of higher education and be more widely appreciated for its contribution to the education of American undergraduates, nurturing their “human freedom and growth.” An analysis of college bulletins published from approximately 1965 to the present shows that in the debate over curricular reform in post-secondary education, study abroad evolved from being largely neglected, except at privileged liberal arts colleges with a tradition of sending students on the Grand European Tour, to becoming a significant component of the college curriculum. For example, the Boston University (BU) academic bulletins from 1965 to the present—choosing one example out of hundreds of institutions—reflect the shift in educational philosophy that supported the curriculum during this period and the evolving role of study abroad as a legitimate component of undergraduate education. The 1965 BU Bulletin contained the usual references to “the interrelation of broad fields of knowledge with the beginning of special competence in some subject field,” but not one single mention is made of study abroad under general information or in sections related to individual colleges and departments. By 2008, the Bulletin and additional publications dedicated considerable space to the need to be prepared for life and work in a global society and included much information on specific study abroad programs under both general information sections and specific academic departments. Moreover, at BU, as has been the case at other colleges and universities, leadership for study abroad began to move away from guidance offices and administrative offices responsible for extracurricular programs and student services to offices reporting to academic department chairs, deans, and provosts. This administrative shift contributed to the fuller integration of study abroad into the academic life of the institution and eventually to the broader diversification of the study abroad curriculum.

In this chapter we will discuss the liberal arts and sciences curriculum and study abroad in the decades since 1965, including the role of foreign languages
and the increasing diversification of the study abroad curriculum; the place of the experiential learning movement and the rise of international internships, service learning, and fieldwork; the expansion of the study abroad curriculum into previously underrepresented areas, such as business, science, engineering, health, and education, in addition to the development of comparative and thematic curricula; and, finally, the necessary involvement and impact of the faculty.

**The Liberal Arts and Sciences Curriculum and Study Abroad**

Greatly influenced by the curricular reforms of James Bryant Conant’s famous *Red Book*, published at Harvard in 1945, the liberal arts and sciences flourished after WWII. They emphasized the combination of breadth and depth and especially the “core” and “foundation courses” that focused on “ways of knowing” and “modes of inquiry” to develop students’ skills in critical thinking. Study abroad at this time was still a relatively marginal academic activity reserved primarily for those who studied modern foreign languages and literatures, especially of France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. In the mid-1960s, studying foreign languages, literature, and the arts, was still one of the major reasons, if not the principal reason, for studying abroad, supported by foreign language and literature departments that sent their majors abroad for an academic year or semester, almost exclusively to Europe. Students who had completed the intermediate or advanced levels of a foreign language typically took courses in foreign languages and literatures abroad to increase their language proficiency, in addition to taking one or two courses in the history, art, and civilization of their target country.

Beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s, however, there were profound changes occurring in the encompassing society that would have significant implications for the American curriculum in general and study abroad in particular. These included the great expansion of knowledge; the expanded awareness of the global context of knowledge in all fields, especially in the humanities and social sciences; the growth of science and technology as dominant themes of our time; the professionalization of learning and the experiential learning movement; the increasing heterogeneity on American campuses, including the burgeoning presence of international students; the introduction of ethnic and gender studies; the rising appreciation for global multiculturalism and the need for global understanding in an ever shrinking world; and the greater openness to non-Western cultures. These enormous changes were reflected in the 1975–1976 Annual Report written by Harvard University Dean Henry Rosovsky, who, along with Harvard
President Derek Bok, attempted to state what it means to be an educated person in the latter part of the twentieth century, at a time when the Harvard student constituency was considerably broader and more complex than the one considered by Conant in his *Red Book* of just 30 years earlier.

Together Rosovsky and Bok proposed a core curriculum that included five areas of study including Literature and the Arts, Historical Study, Social Analysis and Moral Reasoning, Science and, fifth, Foreign Cultures. The latter requirement was described in the following terms:

> an educated American, in the last third of this century, cannot be provincial in the sense of being ignorant of other cultures and other times. It is no longer possible to conduct our lives without reference to the wider world within which we live. A crucial difference between the educated and the uneducated is the extent to which one’s life experience is viewed in a wider context (p. 175).

It can be fairly stated that in the late 1960s and in the 1970s “a quiet revolution” was taking place in American higher education. Humanities and social sciences departments increasingly included greater international content in their courses, and colleges and universities developed minors and certificate programs that covered studies of various areas of the world. Majors or minors in European Studies, Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, African Studies, or more generally International Studies, were rapidly established in response to students’ international interests, and increasing numbers of undergraduates decided to study abroad as a way of focusing a semester or year on the language, history, culture, and society of the particular country or area of the world they wished to engage. Registration as an “independent major” also became a viable option for many students at this time, allowing them to shape their own curriculum by choosing a number of courses that dealt with international studies and included a period of study abroad. Arguably it was anything but “The Closing of the American Mind,” as Allan Bloom (1987) famously declared in his polemical book, but rather the opening of a new era in higher education in which students and faculty began to respond to the rapidly changing world by demanding greater exposure to international studies in an effort to understand firsthand the complex world in which they lived.

By the mid-1980s, calls for curricular reform were heard throughout the United States, ushering in a period of vitality for international studies, with study abroad as an important component thereof. In the words of Goodwin and Nacht (1988), in 1986 we discovered that study abroad is a hot topic—perhaps too hot for its own good... Study abroad is a subject of great importance to American higher education today, not only because it affords valuable opportunities for students and faculty and because it will bubble and boil whether or not it is attended thoughtfully, but because it involves many fundamental issues in higher education that are reflected here in magnified form” (p. vii, ix).

Presidents, provosts, deans, chairs, directors, and faculty at major institutions, both public and private, became increasingly vocal about the need for a revamped curriculum that would better prepare students to live, work, and compete in a global environment. In his book on Higher Learning (1986), Derek Bok once again affirmed that “as faculties respond to the student body with increasingly global interests, they will inevitably wish to strengthen their international curriculum,” and he noted that

in order to combat longstanding parochial and monolingual tendencies on the part of undergraduates, colleges needed to persist not only in offering courses on other cultures but on searching for ways to encourage more students to spend a period of time studying or working abroad (p. 170).

The urgent need for curriculum reform that would incorporate international studies and study abroad was echoed by many college and university presidents, even if faculty did not universally share the enthusiasm for an international curriculum. Cornell President Frank H.T. Rhodes (2001), who succeeded in creating a university-wide Cornell Abroad Program with several study abroad sites in Europe in the 1980s — over objections of some of the faculty — called for universities “to be rooted on campus but internationally oriented,” and suggested “recapturing the curriculum,” that students might gain “a sense of proportion and context in the worlds of nature and society” (p. 104). Rhodes sought to ensure that the contemporary curriculum provide

some understanding of a time and culture other than our own, [which] is one of the components of any balanced view and any sense of proportion. [...] The presence of international students on the campus benefits

Peter Graumann of KQED in San Francisco on the McNeil/Lehrer NewsHour of U.S. Secretary of Education William Bennett and Stanford University President Donald Kennedy on “The Proposals to Change the Program at Stanford University.”
everyone in this respect, and the option of a junior year abroad or a summer research or service project abroad offers rich opportunities (p. 106).

When Larry Summers became president of Harvard in 2003, he too regarded the undergraduate curriculum as “lacking in rigor and inadequate to the challenges of a new globalizing era.” His call for curricular reform, which included the need for greater study of the global society, reverberated throughout the higher education landscape, even if at Harvard its success was limited by the lack of support of some of the faculty. His stance on this subject may even have contributed to the early demise of Summers himself as Harvard’s president.

A similar call for curricular reform with a strong international dimension across the disciplines came from Columbia University, under the leadership of president Lee Bollinger, who established a Committee on Global Thought, charged with creating a more global curriculum that went well beyond what departments traditionally associated with international studies could offer. As Carol Gluck, a member of Columbia University’s Committee on Global Thought remarked in 2005,

the key to globalizing the curriculum lies not in creating isolated courses with global content—which tend to reach self-selected audiences—but in transforming what Columbia already offers by incorporating more global units or gearing assignments to be more globally focused, across departments... We want to take major cultures out of their ghettos (Columbia Spectator, October 8, 2007).

As a result of strong student demand and accompanying curricular reforms, study abroad programs for liberal arts students proliferated in the last 20 to 30 years, seeing enrollments soar—from approximately 60,000 students abroad in 1987 to 225,000 in 2007. Most of the programs focused on the humanities and social sciences, with increasing focus on international relations (APSA, 2008). The unexpected and far reaching events of September 11, 2001, added a sense of urgency to curricular reform on campuses and the expansion of opportunities for study abroad, giving international education new meaning and momentum. By the early years of the new millennium, students had at their disposal an array of study abroad programs incorporating a broad and diverse curriculum. The April 2004 conference on “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” (Anderson, 2005) held at the University of Minnesota, demonstrated how far colleges and universities had come in internationalizing and diversifying the curriculum of study abroad programs,
and integrating study abroad programs into regular degree programs. At the same time, international education organizations like NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), CIEE, Institute of International Education (IIE), and more recently the Forum on Education Abroad, made special efforts to single out successful curricular initiatives that might encourage institutions to consider new models of curricular reform that were consistent with their respective missions.

**Foreign Languages**

The mid-1960s ushered in a number of important changes in the study of foreign languages that would have a considerable impact on the study abroad curriculum in the years ahead.

First, there began a slow but steady decline in the study of European languages, especially French and German, even as they have continued to account for a substantial percentage of all foreign language teaching today. Secondly, there came an emerging interest in less commonly taught languages. Enrollments in so-called critical languages—Arabic, Chinese, Farsi, Hebrew, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Turkish, Urdu, and others—have slowly risen, particularly at large research institutions that have the resources to offer these languages as a complement to their area studies majors. It should be noted that smaller institutions have been less able to offer the same range of non-European languages available at research institutions and therefore have been more inclined to offer the traditional European languages. A recent study on Enrollments in Languages Other than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2007) conducted by the Modern Language Association (MLA) indicated that, as a percentage of total modern language enrollments, French, German, and even Spanish have lost ground; French has fallen from 34.4% in 1968 to 13.1% in 2006, and German from 19.2% to 6.0% in the same
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3 Begun in the late 1990s, the Minnesota project began as a collaboration between the university’s study abroad office and its Institute of Technology and led to an increase in study abroad participation by science and technology students. This, in turn, led to funding by FIPSE and the Bush Foundation to further develop the model and share it with other institutions at the 2004 conference.

4 For example, a 1990 report released by the NAFSA/CIEE/IIE National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad made several recommendations, including that “Study abroad must be integrated into regular degree programs,” and “Campus-based attitudes and policies that inhibit study abroad must be addressed.” See also their Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities series begun in 2003.
period. Spanish rose from 32.4% in 1968 to 50% in 1995, but has remained there ever since (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2007). The popularity of Spanish is not surprising, given that the United States is the second most populous Spanish-speaking country in the world, behind Mexico and ahead of Spain, and Spanish is practically a second language in many parts of this country.

The study of foreign languages would remain an important component of the curriculum at many colleges and universities in the 1960s, and thereafter, and many institutions successfully managed to resist the strong pressure at that time to abolish the language requirement altogether. However, it is clear that there has been an overall decline of foreign language study relative to the total number of students enrolled in higher education. Again, the Modern Language Association recently reported that since the high 1960–1965 period, total enrollments in foreign languages have fallen substantially in proportion to the expanding number of students engaged in higher education institutions, from 16.1 language enrollments per 100 enrollments in 1960 to 8.6 in 2006. Moreover, the same study reported that retaining students in upper-level language courses was a significant challenge for departments of modern languages (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2007). It should also be noted that beginning in the early 1970s, some foreign language departments began to teach literature courses in English, rather than in the foreign language as was commonly done in prior years, spurred in part by intense discussions of literary theory and comparative literature prevalent at that time. In 2008 the University of Southern California announced it would close its Department of German, and weeks thereafter Duke University and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill decided to merge their respective German departments. Finally, the College Board announced it would eliminate the Italian Advanced Placement Test after the 2008–2009 academic year along with the exams in French and Latin Literature due to lack of demand, further signs of changing priorities in foreign language learning.

There are still large numbers of American students studying in a foreign language in countries where English is not the dominant or official language, but they do so to pursue diverse curricular interests and gain exposure to another culture. In this regard, foreign language study has ceased to be an end in itself but rather a means of acquiring a more exact and useful knowledge of the cultures in which students will live and compete. A study of Boston University enrollments in non-English speaking countries, for example, showed that the vast majority of students studying in such countries were not language or literature majors but students from a wide variety of liberal arts and professional majors who were pursuing their academic interests in cultural settings of their choice. Thus, languages
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no longer provide the principal reason for studying abroad, as was largely the case prior to the mid-1960s, although they do continue to play a useful role in supporting other fields of the curriculum (de Winter, 2007).

Finally, it is important to note that in the 1980s and 1990s undergraduates increasingly had available to them programs in English-speaking countries—notably in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand—or in countries where English was not the official language but where the curriculum was delivered in English. In the period between 1991–1992 and 2005–2006, for example, the U.S. student presence in the United Kingdom grew from 16,610 to 32,109, an increase of more than 93 percent. During this same time frame, the American study abroad population in Ireland increased by 388 percent, in Australia it grew by 453 percent, and in New Zealand growth in U.S. student numbers registered a staggering 1,328 percent jump, all of which had a significant impact on the curriculum available to students going abroad (IIE, 2007a).

Interestingly, however, the share of these countries as destinations for U.S. students abroad during this period has fallen from nearly 28 percent in 1991–1992 to just below 23 percent in 2005–2006. Some of the decrease in U.S. students heading off to the English-speaking world may be explained by the fact that many other countries around the world where English is not traditionally spoken have introduced academic programming in English. Altbach (2007) notes that there has been a widespread adoption of English in higher education institutions around the world, ranging from Asia, to Europe, to Latin America. This has been the case in many home-grown institutions across the globe, but has also been complemented by the establishment of overseas branch campuses coming out of such places as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia, as well as the development of regional hubs for higher education in such places as the Middle East and Singapore.

That proficiency in a foreign language is no longer the major consideration in choosing a program abroad that it was in the 1960s and earlier is succinctly illustrated by a notice on the CIEE website indicating that “54 out of 97 study abroad programs don’t have a language pre-requisite” (CIEE, n.d., n.p.).

Specialization and Diversification of the Curriculum

Speaking of curricular reform at Columbia University and higher education in general, Daniel Bell pointed out in 1966 that

…the graduate school has become central within the university... It has encouraged the trend toward intensive specialization in the undergraduate colleges. It has drained away teachers from the colleges and reinforced
a status distinction between those who teach in the graduate school and those who teach only in college (Bell, 1966, p. 170). Undergraduates would increasingly experience both the considerable advantages of specialization—principally by being introduced by faculty to the excitement of discovering new knowledge—as well some of the challenges that came with it, particularly the need to place their majors in the broader context of their studies and their lives, thus balancing general and specialized education, theory and practice.

The trend toward specialization in both research and teaching, with in-depth analysis starting to outpace synthesis in the mid-1960s, would have a considerable impact on the study abroad curriculum as well, opening a wealth of opportunities from which students could choose to pursue both their diverse majors abroad and simultaneously gain a broader perspective not only on their studies but on their lives and potential careers.

As a first step, during this period the study abroad curriculum was greatly expanded in the humanities and social sciences. Already well established study abroad providers—such as Beaver College (later renamed Arcadia University), the Butler Institute for Foreign Study, the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), and the Institute for International Education of Students (IES), among others—began to offer an expanded curriculum of courses across many different disciplines. Working frequently in partnership with foreign institutions and centers abroad, they provided study options in areas ranging from anthropology to archaeology, economics, film, history, literature, political science, photography, sociology and others, initially in Europe and, beginning in the mid-1980s, in other regions of the world. Other study abroad providers, like the Danish Institute for Study Abroad (DIS) in Denmark, first established in 1959, also significantly expanded the curriculum in the 1970s, inviting students to “build your own curriculum from 120 courses taught in English across a great spectrum of majors,” (DIS, n.d.) from architecture to European business, history, politics and society — thus enabling students to remain on track with both major and general education requirements.

Students eagerly made use of these and other study abroad programs, flocking to the United Kingdom, Italy, France and Spain, viewed as major centers for art, architecture, drama and music, and
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5Frank Newman et al also lamented the excessive professionalization of learning in their 1971 task force Report on Higher Education: “The organization of the college curriculum into the mold of academic specialties has been accompanied by a strong faculty bias toward the acquisition of theoretical knowledge” (p. 41).

6Several DIS courses are regular University of Copenhagen (KU), Roskilde University (RUC), Denmark’s Technical University (DTU) and Copenhagen Business School (CBS) courses, taught in English for Danish and international students.
especially in the case of London, for its growing reputation as a global financial and business center.

In more recent decades, however, a growing number of colleges and research universities—outside of the traditional liberal arts colleges already known for their study abroad programs and independently of third-party providers—became more directly invested in study abroad programs, further diversifying and expanding the humanities and social sciences curriculum abroad by means of creating their own programs or developing consortial arrangements through which they jointly offered academic programs overseas. The consortia had a significant impact on the curriculum. They were designed to assist U.S. students in attending foreign universities, create special courses, and monitor the quality and diversity of the courses in which students directly enrolled in a host university. They played an important role, especially in Europe, which did not have a tradition of providing students with accurate and timely information on curriculum, faculty, and syllabi prior to the start of the semester, often leaving U.S. students scrambling for appropriate courses at the start of the semester.

In addition, the pedagogical traditions of U.S. and European institutions were still radically different in this period. There was in effect a clash of expectations that made it difficult for many U.S. undergraduates to successfully enroll directly in foreign universities. It is fair to say that European students expected faculty to provide them with recommended lists of readings in specialized areas of study and “magister” lectures, but arguably little more except for the results of the exam at the end of the term, frequently an oral exam; grades were secondary to successfully passing the course. By contrast, U.S. students expected an interactive mode of teaching and learning and critical feedback on their studies on an on-going basis, and to be rewarded with high grades. While this clash of pedagogical approaches existed before 1965 — and still exists to one degree or another today — the intensified movement of students across the Atlantic forced many U.S. universities committed to international education to become directly involved in the curriculum abroad, and consortia were an effective way of doing precisely that. When the even greater movement of students began to take place within Europe itself, as a result of the launch of the Erasmus Program in the 1980s, the need for better and timelier information regarding the curriculum, including course descriptions and syllabi, was increasingly felt by both sending and receiving European universities as a way of facilitating student learning and obtaining the appropriate transfer of credit.

A notable example illustrating the academic advantages of U.S. consortia in the 1960s is the Bologna Consortial Studies Program (BCSP), which was
founded by Indiana University in 1964, and now includes seven universities that jointly offer qualified undergraduate students an opportunity to study for a full academic year or spring semester at the University of Bologna for U.S. college credit. Participating students benefit from a so-called “hybrid program.” This includes a four-week, three-credit pre-session language course; enrollment in one or two regular University of Bologna courses with Italian students; detailed information about the curriculum including a description of special BCSP-designed and taught courses in Italian literature, language, art history, film studies, civilization, and contemporary politics; and a list of University of Bologna courses that students have taken in the past. The consortium also provides regular advising about the Italian university system and more generally about Italian life and culture to facilitate greater intercultural knowledge and communication.

Several other examples deserve mention: the Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies (ICCS), established in 1965 by representatives of ten American colleges and universities, which has now grown to 90 member institutions. It provides undergraduate students with an opportunity to study in Rome and focus on ancient history and archaeology, Greek and Latin literature, and ancient art. The Cornell University and Michigan University (and later the University of Pennsylvania) consortium was established in 1985 in Seville, Spain. The Cornell, Brown University, and University of Pennsylvania center in London, was founded in 1987, and assists students in enrolling at University College London, Kings College, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London School of Economics, and other universities in the United Kingdom. The Cornell, Duke University (and subsequently Emory University) center in Paris, was also established in 1987. The Kyoto Center for Japanese Studies (KCJS), established in 1987 under the leadership of Stanford University, eventually included 12 U.S. universities, including Boston University, Brown University, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Cornell University, Emory University, Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University, Washington University of St. Louis, and Yale University, along with two associate members, University of Michigan and University of Virginia. Finally, mention

The BCSP member institutions are Indiana University, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Minnesota, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Indiana University’s Office of Overseas Study is responsible for administering the program on behalf of the consortium. Seven other institutions—Barnard College, Bryn Mawr College, Columbia University, Cornell University, Mt. Holyoke College, Northwestern University, and Notre Dame University—are associate members of BCSP, whose students receive preferential access among non-consortium applicants.
must be made of the cluster of U.S. institutions that have occupied the historic International Institute in Madrid, founded in 1871. Since 1930, the Institute has hosted hundreds of students from several U.S. colleges and universities, who at various times have not only shared some of the courses offered by participating programs but have had access to a unique library in Spain.

To a greater or lesser extent these consortia have given faculty representatives on their respective campuses a voice in the design of the curriculum, the appointment of faculty on site, the responsibility to set criteria for eligibility and, not insignificantly, the opportunity to occasionally teach in the program, thereby refreshing themselves with new insights and discovering and cultivating new or unknown skills as well. Not to be underestimated as a successful pedagogical technique, these programs could integrate the historical and cultural resources of the site through excursions, field trips, and guest lectures in ways that could never or were rarely achieved on the home campus, adding an important visual and tactile dimension to student and even faculty understanding of the subject matter.

A variation on the consortium involving several colleges and/or universities is the study abroad program managed by only one institution, as is the case for example of Boston University, New York University, and Syracuse University. At most of their overseas sites, these three universities offer a wide curriculum, taught largely in their own facilities by local faculty for their own students and others from participating U.S. colleges and universities, with opportunities for enrollment in local institutions, internships in a wide array of areas (see below), and a host of intercultural experiences. The overseas curriculum and faculty are approved in advance by the standard academic committees on the home campus, thereby exerting institutional control over the curriculum; also these universities are able to foster contacts between faculty at home and abroad, increasingly providing opportunities for faculty exchange and other forms of faculty participation that ultimately benefit the curriculum at home and abroad.

The development of multi-site programs has also contributed to the diversification of the study abroad curriculum. To enhance students’ perspective on the world, study abroad providers and institutions have created a variety of innovative programs that expose participants to different sites and cultures over the course of one semester or a summer. These programs are necessarily taught in English. Two well-known examples are the International Honors Program (IHP) and Semester at Sea (SAS), founded in 1958 and 1963 respectively, though it must be noted that their pedagogical methods are substantially different. The IHP curriculum is designed around particular themes, such as “Rethinking Globalization,” “Cities in the 21st Century,” or “Health and Community.” Students compare and contrast
various aspects of these topics over the course of their travels to developed and developing countries with the help of accompanying faculty and staff, as well as local experts, artists, educators, community leaders, and others in each country visited. Participation in each program is normally restricted to about 30 students to facilitate group travel and, more importantly, to allow for interactive learning. In remaining approximately four or more weeks in each country, the program ensures that students have an opportunity to test their assumptions, deepen their knowledge of the issues, and reflect on the kaleidoscopic of experiences to which they have been exposed. The programs normally include several days at the end of the journey to further reflect on some of the insights and perspectives they have gained during their travels and complete their final papers (IHP, n.d.). Semester at Sea (SAS), on the other hand, sponsored by the University of Virginia, offers a “floating classroom” of over 700 students and 65 faculty and staff, that makes briefer stops at various port cities around the world over the course of a semester, with all courses taught aboard ship (Semester at Sea, n.d.). Unlike IHP, which follows a consistent thematic approach and typically four courses each semester, SAS offers a required Global Studies course that weaves in changing themes and a curriculum of approximately 75 courses — from anthropology to women’s studies— that are supplemented by a series of guided visits, lectures, and other activities designed to foster international awareness and global competence.

Multi-site programs have evolved since these two models were established, in some cases becoming even shorter in duration—typically 3 to 5 weeks, sometimes even less. Several institutions have adopted this multi-site option—among them Ball State University, Brigham Young University, Long Island University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, St John’s University (New York)—arguing that such programming allows students to better concentrate on a particular theme or topic, comparing and contrasting across different sites more effectively than if they had travelled to only one site even for a longer period of time.

Yet another notable manifestation of the growth of study abroad is the growing popularity of freshmen programs abroad. These have been established in recent years by an increasing number of institutions, typically for the fall semester and sometimes for the entire freshman year (Athavaley, 2008; Connell, 2007a). However, this trend seems generally less driven by curricular considerations, and more by the need to alleviate crowded dorm space in the fall or provide deferred or conditional admission to less qualified students. This is particularly the case at small institutions like Arcadia University, and Colby, Hamilton, Middlebury, and Wheaton Colleges, where students are advised about such options at the time that admissions decisions are communicated. For other institutions, like Syracuse University and New York
University (NYU), freshman programs are part of a strategy to use surplus capacity abroad and to increase overall institutional enrollment; starting in fall 2009, for example, NYU will provide an option for students to apply simultaneously for the Washington Square campus in New York and one of its sites in Florence, London, and Paris. Other colleges and universities have resisted this approach as pedagogically unsound, regarding the freshman year as an especially important time for new students to be on the home campus (Redden, 2007), where they can be exposed to a broad curriculum of unfamiliar disciplines and new approaches to learning, while coming into contact with a diversity of faculty, students, and staff that foster their intellectual and personal growth in unprecedented ways.

So-called January-term programs, or short-term capstone programs that challenge students to focus on a particular topic or theme that they have been studying on campus, often in the company of a faculty member, are considered by many institutions as academically rigorous ways of studying abroad. These and other short term modules have become increasingly popular in the study abroad curriculum. Indeed, many educators have argued that short-term programming provides a critically important opportunity to fit international experience into the academic programs of students with no prior international experience, or with limited budgets, restricted abilities to be absent from family or professional responsibilities, and/or few options for interrupting tightly sequenced courses. Others flatly assert that “this category of [short-term] programming blurs the distinction between education abroad and educational tourism” (Woolf, 2007, p. 503). Indeed, Woolf (2007) takes the position that while

there may be an academic case for some selected short-term programme [sic] provision... the primary response within our field should be one of skepticism [sic]. It behooves us to ask awkward questions about content and purpose. In many cases, content will be of marginal validity, and the purpose may well have more to do with finance and publicity than with learning and teaching (p. 503).

Nevertheless, short-term programs have been embraced as an effective component of the curriculum of many professional programs, particularly in business education. In their work on overseas travel as a component of North American M.B.A. programs, Currie, Matulich, and Gilbert (2004) found that almost half of their survey respondents in Canada and the United States offered
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8In 2004–2005 8% of American students abroad participated in programs of fewer than 8 weeks (IIE, 2006). One decade earlier, in 1994–1995, just 2.5% of American students abroad participated in programs of fewer than 8 weeks (IIE, 1996).
some sort of short-term international experience as a part of their programming. While most of these business schools' overseas travel components are not required, they are securing decent levels of participation. On average, 16.5% of students in the full-time programs surveyed participated in such elective study-travel, while an average of 9.5% of students in the part-time programs surveyed also did so. According to Currie, Matulich, and Gilbert (2004), “many graduate schools [also] commit faculty resources to, and grant academic credit for, foreign travel” (p. 58). However, like Woolf (2007), Currie et al (2004) note that there is incomplete information about the skills and knowledge acquired by students who participate in these short-term programs (sometimes of less than two weeks’ duration). Certainly, curricular considerations must address questions of program design, student support, and learning outcomes assessment (Vande Berg, 2007) in new ways, as the U.S. study abroad landscape moves to accommodate an increasing percentage of short-term programs.

In more recent years, universities in the United States and abroad, as well as U.S. third-party providers, have created academic pathways to the study of a wide variety of fields taught abroad, initially in English-speaking countries but also in other countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, where the curriculum is delivered in English. Students can just as easily converge on Barcelona to pursue their interests in economics and international relations, without prior knowledge of Spanish, much less of Catalan, as in Shanghai without prior knowledge of Chinese. Indeed, the proliferation of programs conducted in English worldwide, many of which were designed to attract American students, enormously expanded the study abroad curriculum.

**International Science and Mathematics Education**

The curriculum has been further diversified in recent decades through the integration of underrepresented disciplines—such as the so-called STEM disciplines of science, mathematics, engineering, and medicine, which are widely considered the core underpinnings of advanced societies. Of the approximately 100,000 U.S. students who studied abroad in 1997, fewer than 15 percent were majors in the STEM disciplines (IIE, 2006b). Students majoring in these fields typically faced a number of obstacles to their participation in study abroad: the vertical structure of the curriculum, U.S. sequencing requirements and appropriate science classes abroad — for example, organic chemistry is often taught as a single, two-semester class in the United States but in Europe it may be separated into modules that are incorporated into other chemistry classes — the lack of
foreign language preparation, limited faculty interest, rigid academic calendars, credit transfer policies, and cost (de Winter, 1997). However, beginning in the 1980s and even more in recent years the international context of STEM disciplines has gained considerable prominence in the undergraduate curriculum.

The case of chemistry illustrates the growing integration of STEM disciplines in the study abroad curriculum. The American Chemical Society (ACS)\(^9\) testified on July 26, 2007 before the U.S. House of Representatives’ Committee on Science & Technology, on the subject of “Globalization and Undergraduate Chemistry Curricula.” The organization observed that “while globalization does not affect the chemical principles or scientific process that undergraduate chemistry students must master, it does impact the world that students must be prepared to work and live in when they finish their degree” (p. 1). Furthermore,

in response to globalization, chemical-sciences undergraduate education is changing in several ways, through the addition of international themes to domestic chemistry programs, support for chemistry student participation in study-abroad programs, and provision of international research opportunities in chemical-science disciplines” (ACS, 2007, p.1).

The ACS further noted that

studying abroad can have a profound influence on student lives. When students interact with people from other cultures and build their STEM knowledge in a foreign environment, they stretch their abilities and gain new perspective—perspective that only comes from leaving the place where they grew up (ACS, 2007, p. 2).

The association acknowledged the traditional obstacles faced by students, but reported that some U.S. institutions were finding appropriate solutions.\(^{10}\) Successful examples of such initiatives could be found at the University of Maryland College Park (UMD), which integrated East Asian themes into some undergraduate STEM courses by forming the East Asia Science and Technology

\(^9\) The American Chemical Society (ACS) is the world’s largest association of individual chemical scientists and engineers, with 160,000 members, almost 21,000 are international members. Of 415,000 U.S. science and engineering bachelor’s degrees granted in 2002, 9,448 were in chemistry.

\(^{10}\) The globalization of science had previously been raised by the ACS with regard to graduate education at its 2005 annual meeting, which focused on the “lack of international expertise by graduate students in chemistry at a time when their profession increasingly requires a perspective that extends beyond the United States” (InsideHigherEd.com, August 29, 2005).
(EAST) program;\textsuperscript{11} the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which beginning in 1999, allowed worldwide open access to their electronic course materials on the Web;\textsuperscript{12} and Boston University’s science program in Germany, which successfully addressed language, course requirements, and cost challenges through a collaborative program with the Technical University of Dresden. In the BU program, students take chemistry and other science classes in English that meet major and graduation requirements, plus intensive German language and a course on aspects of German culture. Also cited by the ACS (2007) was The Trans-Atlantic Science Student Exchange Program (TASSEP), run by science faculty involving 11 American, 6 Canadian, and 18 European universities. The program addresses specific requirements by having science faculty advisors at each institution handle course selection and credit transfer on a student-by-student basis.

Several opportunities for undergraduates in the fields of mathematics and computer science were developed as early as the mid-1980s. Noteworthy examples are the Budapest Semesters in Mathematics (BSM) and the Math in Moscow Program (MIM), which added considerable value to the American curriculum. The former was founded in 1985 for American and Canadian undergraduates who wished to spend a semester or two in Hungary, a preeminent center for the study of mathematics. The BSM program has attracted about 50 to 60 U.S. students each semester. It is sponsored by St. Olaf College on the American side and by Eotvos University and the Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Hungary. As described on the BSM website, courses offered include number theory, combinatorics, analysis, topology, graph theory, geometry, as well as Conjecture and Proof and many others, covering basically all the most well-known areas of mathematics, in addition to courses like theory of computing, set theory, and logic. All classes are taught in English and most weeks feature a colloquium lecture by a prominent Hungarian or American mathematician (BSM, n.d.).\textsuperscript{13} For its part, the MIM Program is hosted by the Independent University of Moscow (IUM). Founded in 1991, it offers a rigorous 15-week semester in which

\textsuperscript{11} With a $2 million grant from the Freeman Foundation, the thirteen faculty and staff of EAST added modules to existing classes or developed entirely new classes in STEM education. Robert Yuan, a founder of the EAST program, estimated the program has reshaped 18 courses and impacted 1,700 undergraduates at UMD since its inception in 2000.

\textsuperscript{12} MIT Open Course Ware (http://web.mit.edu/ocw) contains an archive of class syllabi, lecture notes, homework problems, and reading lists from past classes. As of 2007, the electronic materials for 35 chemistry classes have been available at no cost to students and educators throughout the world.

\textsuperscript{13}
participants conduct mathematics research with English-speaking professors and have available a curriculum of 21 math courses and two theoretical computer science courses also taught in English. As noted on their website, scholarships are available from the American Mathematical Society (IUM, n.d.).

While the number of students participating in study abroad programs designed for students of the natural and physical sciences, mathematics, and computer science is still relatively small, they do reflect a growing trend in the breadth and quality of the study abroad curriculum.

Undergraduate Research Abroad

A promising development in the diversification of the study abroad curriculum, especially for liberal arts and sciences students, is the growing attention to undergraduate research, an echo of a movement that started on American campuses in the 1970s, reflecting once again the trend toward specialization in higher education. While isolated examples of undergraduate research abroad can be found even before the 1970s, it was not until the 1990s that it gained wider attention as a valuable component of the curriculum. The Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR) Quarterly, for example, devoted its December 1995 issue to “Global Issues and International Linkages in UGR,” while the 1998 Boyer Commission report on Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America’s Research Universities, which recommended undergraduate research as a way of bridging graduate and undergraduate research, added luster to research as part of an undergraduate education. In recent years Frontiers: the Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad has devoted three special issues to undergraduate research abroad, providing compelling examples of students’ research in different fields of study.

Undergraduate research has been broadly defined as “an inquiry that is conducted independently by the student, involves several weeks of intensive and self-driven data collection, analysis and writing, and in the end represents individual student achievement” (Streitwieser and Sobania, p. 2). At many if not most institutions, student research is faculty-mentored and supported by modest grants

14 The Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR), founded in 1978, is a national organization of individual and institutional members representing over 900 colleges and universities. Its mission is to support and promote high quality undergraduate student-faculty research and scholarship, primarily at predominantly undergraduate teaching institutions.

15 Including Frontiers Volume XII November (2005) and Volume XVI Spring (2008). These publications emanate from the Forum on Education Abroad’s own Undergraduate Research Awards initiative, in itself a clear example of the growth of interest in and commitment to expanded opportunities for undergraduate research abroad in recent years.
for summer research fellowships, academic year stipends, research supplies, and travel for research or to attend professional meetings. Sometimes the research is conducted in coordination with a senior project to be presented by students on their return to the home institution.

In keeping with the momentum to add depth, variety, academic rigor, and a combination of both practical and academic dimensions to overseas study, a number of colleges and universities are increasingly developing research-oriented programs for students abroad, especially during the summer months. The University of Pittsburgh’s Research Abroad Program (RAP), an initiative jointly sponsored by its University Center for International Studies and the University Honors Program, offers an example of programming abroad with an undergraduate research focus. RAP provides undergraduates with a focused academic experience overseas by allowing them to serve on a faculty-led research project outside of the United States. Faculty-student collaboration is mutually advantageous in the context of this arrangement, given that “faculty benefit from the research insights, skills, and assistance students bring, as well as the opportunity to pursue their own research during the summer. And students benefit from the hands-on, research-related experience in a real-world situation that has an impact on the direction of their career path” (Brustein, 2007, p. 387).

The incorporation of undergraduate research options into the study abroad curriculum allows for a deeper penetration of study abroad across academic disciplines, not simply those with an overtly international focus, such as international or area studies, but also in underrepresented disciplines, such as science, mathematics, and engineering.

Examples of successful independent research programs abroad have multiplied in recent years. The National Science Foundation (NSF) supports international research as part of the Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) program. With support from NSF and in coordination with the Deutscher Akademischer Austauch Dienst (DAAD), the American Chemical Society began a pilot program in 2007 for ten U.S. students to exchange with ten German students for summer research. The U.S. students went to nine German universities and received a research stipend. No prior knowledge of German was required; however, students received compensation for language instruction. Four U.S. universities also hosted summer REU programs for students to engage in chemistry research abroad. They provide student stipends and do not require a foreign language. Syracuse University has a partnership with the University of Technology in Graz, Austria, for research in many chemistry sub-disciplines. Texas A&M University sends students to two Taiwanese institutions (Academia
Sinica in Taipei and National Cheng Kung University Medical School in Tainan) for biochemistry research, and the University of California at Santa Cruz sends students to three institutes in Thailand (Chulalongkorn University, Mahidol University, and the Chulabhorn Research Institute) for organic chemistry research. The University of Florida also hosts a summer research exchange program with several French universities, including the newly merged University of Strasbourg, France.

The Research Internships in Science and Engineering, known as the RISE Program, gives students in the fields of biology, chemistry, earth sciences, engineering, and physics the chance to spend a summer working with German doctoral students on serious research projects. The doctoral students help integrate undergraduates directly into the lab work and serve as personal and professional mentors. The current internship database contains 484 research internships, including 98 biology projects, 118 in chemistry, 21 in earth science, 169 in engineering, and 78 in physics. All participants receive stipends from the DAAD to help cover living expenses, and the partner universities and research institutions provide housing assistance. The DAAD also offers approximately 30 scholarships to students with no previous German language background to attend a 2-week intensive language course prior to the start of the program.\(^\text{16}\) In 2007, a group of 12 European universities, under the leadership of the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, launched the Euro Scholars-European Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program—specifically targeted to attract some of the brightest students on American campuses to spend a semester of study and research in Europe. The participating institutions\(^\text{17}\) offer research opportunities in a variety of fields, comprising arts and humanities, performing arts, biology, chemistry, engineering, mathematics, physics, astronomy, computer science, medicine, biomedical sciences, law, economics, management, politics and social studies.

\(^\text{16}\) For additional information, see http://www.daad.de/rise-pro. Research opportunities for graduate students in chemistry have also been on the rise in the last decade. Chemical and Engineering News (2006, p. 98) included an article outlining the goals of the Global Science Corp, the brainchild of Harold Varmus, president of Memorial-Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center. Varmus’ idea, slated to launch in 2007-08, would create fellowships to “place established scientists from developed countries in universities and institutions in developing countries.”

\(^\text{17}\) The institutions are: University of Geneva University of Helsinki, Lund University, Ruprecht Karls University Leiden University, Universita degli Study di Milano, Leuven University, University of Zurich, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Karolinska Institute, Utrecht University, and Universiteit van Amsterdam. See http://www.euroscholars.eu/ for additional information.
Students are required to sign a Learning Agreement stipulating the arrangements on the research project are agreed upon by the host as well as the home institution. Students are awarded 30 ECTS (European Credits) for a full semester, including 6 credits for the language and culture component and 24 ECTS for the research part. The research can consist of a literature review, the research itself, and the final presentation and/or paper.

It is still too early to assess the success of these and similar kinds of undergraduate research programs and their impact on the internationalization of the curriculum on the home campus and abroad. However these examples attest to the growing seriousness of academic programs abroad and the continued shift from a general study abroad experience to more rigorous and focused academic study across many disciplines.

**Experiential Learning: International Internships, Service Learning, and Fieldwork**

Experiential learning, described as a “process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 38), has been a characteristic of much American education for many decades and of study abroad in particular; indeed, some even define study abroad itself as a form of experiential education (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999). In the contemporary context, this pedagogical approach is viewed more comprehensively as “a philosophy and methodology in which educators purposefully engage with learners in direct experience and focused reflection in order to increase knowledge, develop skills and clarify values” (Association for Experiential Education, n.d.).

The commitment to the “expanded classroom approach” (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999) can be seen in the extraordinary growth in study abroad programs since the mid-1960s that combine academic and practical elements with hands-on experience. These are considered by career-minded and service-oriented students alike as ways of gaining a broader perspective on the world and integrating more effectively into the local community. The experiential learning dimension of study abroad has remained highly relevant in the intervening decades, with increasing student interest and expanding program offerings noted at campuses across the country in recent years.\(^\text{18}\)

---

\(^{18}\)Volume VIII Winter (2002) of *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* is devoted to the topic of experiential learning in education abroad.
Internships

Organizations such as the School for International Training (SIT) pioneered this approach to international education and cross-cultural training by incorporating community service, field research, and professional practica into many of their study abroad programs. Today, international internships and service-learning activities are primary examples of this trend. It would not be until the 1980s, however, that internship opportunities would be provided in a systematic way, becoming a visible component of the curriculum. In prior years, entrepreneurial students had managed to find volunteer internships largely on their own through connections with faculty, alumni, parents, and friends, but these were not considered a formal part of the college curriculum. Indeed until quite recently most schools were adamant that they would not grant credit for internships, which were commonly viewed not as an academic experience but rather as a practical job experience.

Northeastern University has been known for its co-op programs with industries since WWII, originally placing students in paid jobs for three to six months in commercial firms or other organizations. As early as 1984, it also began to offer a small number of volunteer internships abroad. Beaver College (now Arcadia University), AIFS, and a handful of other institutions, also had a few volunteer placements in Europe at that time, especially in London. Unlike the co-op semesters, internships were part-time, unpaid work placements through which students could dedicate a reasonable number of hours each week to learn about a particular area of work, which they might or might not pursue after graduation, and do it in tandem with academic work in the classroom. By 1987, in response to the keen interest of career-minded students and the availability of internships conducted in English, Boston University had developed the largest academic internship program for credit in London, hosting hundreds of students each year.

While initial resistance to internships as a component of the curriculum was strong, especially at traditional liberal arts colleges in the Northeast, a large number of American institutions gradually acknowledged the educational value of internships and began to grant academic credit for the experience. This shift came with the understanding that credit would be granted not for the experience but rather for the academic work accompanying it, including the submission of a log documenting the workplace experience, a traditional academic paper reflecting on the context of the placement, and frequently an oral classroom presentation, supervised and ultimately graded by a member of the faculty. Today, a host of institutions and third-party providers routinely offer internships as part of study abroad and many colleges and universities even require them for the completion
of a specific degree, as is the case for example at Arizona State University, which requires an international internship for the successful completion of the Global Studies major. Some institutions, like Northeastern University (NU), have persistently argued that rigorous, hands-on learning experiences provide an optimal way for “students to develop the knowledge, awareness, perspective, and confidence to feel at home anywhere in the world” (Northeastern University, 2007) in their given professions, particularly (but not limited to) the areas of business, technology, communications, and international relations. In an article entitled “The Third Way,” former NU President Richard Freedland (2004) claimed that higher education is evolving a new paradigm for undergraduate study that erodes the long-standing divide between liberal and professional education. Gradually taking shape is a curricular ‘third way’ that systematically integrates liberal education, professional education, and off-campus experience to produce college graduates who are both well-educated and well-prepared for the workplace (n.p.).

While Freedland acknowledged that this trend had not yet grown into a movement with a clear identity, he suggested it was time to recognize the pattern and give it a name—his own suggestion being “practice-oriented education.” Indeed, in recent years the international internship approach has been examined and used by many American schools of business (Currie, Matulich, and Gilbert, 2004), education (Cushner and Mahon, 2002), nursing (Tabi and Mukherjee, 2003), engineering, and other professional programs, to introduce and expand education abroad within their academic programs. There is no longer any doubt that international internships have permeated the U.S. academic mainstream and that they are used effectively across a variety of academic fields and disciplines with positive outcomes. As recently reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, in the U.S. itself, internships are now firmly rooted in the academic landscape: “an internship used to be optional, an added bonus. But for many of today’s over-programmed college students, it has become a critical career move—and a rite of passage” (Lipka, 2008, A18).

**International Service Learning**

In contrast to internships, international service learning (ISL) is defined as “a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection” (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, n.d.). It too grew out of the experiential learning movement of the 1960s and 1970s (Tonkin, 2004) and, like internships, took on a new dynamism in the 1980s, with
the emergence of such organizations as the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) in 1984; the Campus Compact, co-founded by University of Rhode Island President Frank Newman and Brown University President Howard R. Swearer in 1985; Youth Service America, incorporated in 1986; and other organizations (Gökçe-Pariolá and Smith-Pariolá, 2006). In terms of service-learning’s international front, the International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership (IPSL), founded in 1982, is one of the better known educational organizations that successfully links volunteer service in the community to academic study at both undergraduate and graduate levels, embodying the curricular ambitions of many study abroad programs.¹⁹ In its 2004 self-study and report to the Ford Foundation, IPSL noted that the expanding ranks of U.S. study abroad students “are seeking out a greater range of experiences” (Tonkin, p. 2). Students enrolled in the Partnership’s programs are hosted by overseas universities, taught by local faculty, engage in nearly equal parts classroom work and community service, uniting theory and practice through international academic experience and voluntary service. IPSL’s service-learning approach to education abroad is grounded on several key premises that resonate with many U.S. institutions engaged in similar activities, including IPSL’s “Distinguished Partner Institutions” like Middlebury College, Montcalm Community College, and the University of North Texas (IPSL, 2006). These premises include the notions that

Students must learn to understand, appreciate, and work cooperatively with those of different beliefs and values. Second, academic institutions are recognizing that there are many sources of information, methodologies, and epistemologies that must and should be incorporated in academic learning. Books and lectures remain the bedrock of formal study, but experience, especially experience as rich as serving those in need in another country, is a powerful source of knowledge that can be examined critically and reflected upon just as are the sources of traditional study in higher education (Tonkin, 2004, p. x).

Evidence suggests that service-learning abroad has provided new ways for American students overseas to engage their host culture and deepen their

¹⁹ As indicated on their website, “Today, IPSL offers 13 undergraduate service-learning programs in 11 nations—programs in which nearly 3,000 students from more than 400 universities or colleges in the U.S. and 25 other nations have participated. The IPSL Master of Arts in International Service program, developed in cooperation with partner universities in Jamaica, Mexico, and the United Kingdom, prepares graduates for careers in international non-governmental relief and development agencies. Other special programs are designed and managed to fit the needs of particular institutions and organizations.” For a list of affiliated universities abroad see their website, http://www.ipsl.org/.
understanding of both the practical and theoretical components of their academic activities abroad. This can be a complex intellectual and emotional process. In her analysis of a University of Wyoming initiative to engage student teachers in a service-learning program in Costa Rica, Amy Roberts (2003) noted that “efforts to raise participants’ international perspectives and consciousness without engaging them in social action may have the unintended effect of fostering helplessness and cynicism” (p. 258). Students may be further alienated when their overseas sojourns occur in “economically disadvantaged countries” (p. 258), where American students may find it possible to ‘tune out’ the challenges inherent in the local context, courtesy of the all-inclusive nature of their study-abroad programs. Even when engaging in service-learning abroad, the lack of effective faculty guidance may limit students’ personal and academic development (Gökê-Pariolá and Smith-Pariolá, 2006).

Service-learning has gained currency in a context of growing student interest in both non-traditional destinations and short-term sojourns abroad. However, as outlined by Gökê-Pariolá and Smith-Pariolá (2006) there are many challenges in terms of developing and sustaining quality programming in this area. Service-learning abroad requires significant amounts of preparation on the part of faculty and students, as well as increased degrees of risk-taking by all concerned. Faculty must take special care to bring to light and confront both their own and their students’ preconceived notions of the place where they are studying and the people they find there and to replace those notions with more respectful and accurate understandings. The literature on service learning demonstrates that this is no easy task, particularly in the context of a short-term program (Gökê-Pariolá and Smith-Pariolá, 2006, p. 76).

**Fieldwork**

Fieldwork, as a regular component of the study abroad curriculum, especially in the fields of biology, environmental studies, and sustainable development, also came into its own in recent decades. The School for Field Studies, for example, founded in 1980, launched its first summer program for environmental fieldwork abroad in 1981 and its first semester-long programs in 1985. While it initially offered a course-based curriculum, by 1993 it had shifted to a case-studies approach to learning “which involved looking at an actual environmental issue and coming up with a solution for the partner organization/community involved” (SFS, 2008, n.p.). Other well-known programs of this kind are the Organization for Tropical Studies (OTS), founded in 1963 but considerably expanded in the 1980s as a consortium of 63 universities and research institutions from the United States, operating three biological stations.
The Diversification of Education Abroad Across the Curriculum

in Costa Rica; and Boston University’s Tropical Ecology Program, founded in 1996, with support of the National Science Foundation and the Universidad San Francisco de Quito in Ecuador. The BU program consists of four ecology courses based on field research in the mountains, tropical rainforest, and coastal regions, as well as an intensive Spanish course.

Experiential learning, whether through internships, service learning programs or fieldwork, has become an important component of the undergraduate curriculum. This phenomenon is likely to continue growing in the years ahead, as is the intensification of efforts to better understand student outcomes in this area, and to strengthen the academic impact of these kinds of programs. Princeton University’s announcement in 2008 of a new “Bridge Year Program” abroad, with a focus on community service and the goal of enabling “students to begin their formal academic training with eyes that see differently, with greater breadth and depth” (Quinones, 2008, n.p.) is yet another example of momentum in this area.

The Professional and Vocational Curriculum and Study Abroad

In the mid-1960s liberal arts students routinely transferred credit from study abroad programs in the humanities and social sciences to fulfill both general education requirements and various majors and minors. By contrast, non-humanities and/or non-social science students, especially in technical and other career oriented programs, often had to “torture the curriculum” abroad, taking courses in non-scientific and technical fields, transferring a limited number of credits toward graduation or distribution requirements to their home institution, frequently losing part of or an entire semester’s work, and suffering significant academic and financial consequences.

Already in the late 1960s, however, statistical analyses indicate that students increasingly opted for professional studies and/or other non-liberal arts degrees. As Sarah Turner and William G. Bowen pointed out in a study entitled The Flight from the Arts and Sciences: Trends in Degrees Conferred, between 1968 and 1986, the number of BA degrees awarded to students who concentrated in one of the fields within the arts and sciences (humanities, social sciences, mathematics, physical sciences, biological sciences and psychology) plummeted from 47% of all BA degrees to about 26%. This rapid decline followed a steady increase in the arts and sciences share during the earlier post World War II years (p. 517). 20

20 Turner and Bowen correctly predicted in 1990 that “We do not expect the flight from the arts and sciences to continue, and one implication is that the demand for faculty in these fields may be greater in the years ahead than recent projections suggest.”
Career minded pre-professional and professional students increasingly recognized that they too would be living, working, and competing in a global environment, and sought opportunities to study abroad in combination with their majors in business, communications, education, science and engineering, health, medicine, and the environment, and various other disciplines. Joseph Mestenhauser and Brenda Ellingboe, the authors of *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus* (1998), remarked on this trend, warning that

the complacency of universities in addressing the larger issues [of internationalization] ignores the fact that all our graduates will work in a global setting, that professional people will have to be prepared to practice their professions in any country of the world, and that the main involvement in international affairs will not be by ‘international affairs specialists’ but by scientists, engineers, agriculturalists, network builders and information specialists.

As professional careers became ever more globalized, colleges and universities as well as third party providers began to include non-humanities and non-social sciences students in programs overseas, at first in single-digit numbers but by the 1980s in more organized and scalable ways. This movement was increasingly debated by representative associations, which began to support internationalization and diversification of the curriculum as required components of the accreditation process. The American Chemical Society (ACS), the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the American Association of Schools and Colleges of Business (AACSB), the American Association of Colleges of Teachers of Education (AACTE), the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, and other professional associations gradually advocated for providing students with a broader cultural context and stepped up their international education efforts in collaboration with colleges and universities. While today the number of students in these non-humanities and non-social sciences disciplines is still relatively modest as a proportion of all students going abroad, totaling perhaps no more than 20% (IIE, 2007c), this trend represents an exciting and promising development in the study abroad curriculum. As Michael Vande Berg recently noted “During the past ten years or so, CIEE has, in opening new programs (and this has been the case with a lot of programs) done so with traditionally underrepresented majors in mind. This is particularly the case with direct enrollment and hybrid programs, where different tracks are identified for different majors—humanities and social science students, yes, but also for business students, for example, as well as science and engineering majors.” (Vande Berg, personal communication, July 3, 2008).
Below are notable examples of curricular reform in a variety of pre-professional and professional fields that are having a significant impact on the study abroad curriculum and higher education more broadly.

**Engineering Education**

The need for curricular reform in engineering education had become a topic of discussion by university leaders and industry professionals as early as the 1970s. They had seen a clear need to both broaden and internationalize engineering education. Today, in part as a response to the changing nature of work and the “flat world” paradigm introduced by Thomas Friedman (2005), there is a growing consensus among the engineering community that international engineering education is a high priority. Nevertheless, curricular integration in engineering education has remained a controversial topic in U.S. colleges and universities. For example, James J. Duderstadt, President Emeritus and University Professor of Science and Engineering at the University of Michigan asserted in a major report entitled, *Engineering for a Changing World: A Roadmap to the Future of Engineering Practice, Research, and Education* (2008), that “engineering education remains predominantly dependent upon narrow, discipline focused undergraduate programs” (p. iii). “In fact,” he noted,

most engineering educators are ill informed about new pedagogies based on learning research in areas such as cognitive science. They also tend to be very conservative with regard to pedagogy, curriculum, and institutional attitudes, most comfortable in teaching in the way that they learned years earlier. This conservatism produces a degree of stability (perhaps inflexibility is a more apt term) that results in a relatively slow response to external pressures (Duderstadt, 2008, p. 40).

Duderstadt argues that for engineers to live, work, and compete in the more competitive global, knowledge-driven economy of the twenty-first century, they too must have “a broad liberal arts baccalaureate education as a prerequisite for professional education at the graduate level” (p. iv), and he suggests that undergraduate engineering should be reconfigured as an academic discipline, similar to other liberal arts disciplines in the sciences, arts and humanities, thereby providing students with more flexibility to benefit from the broader educational opportunities offered by the comprehensive American university with the goal of preparing them for a lifetime of further learning rather than professional practice (Duderstadt, 2008, p. v).
To that end, he adds, engineering must be established as a true liberal arts discipline, similar to the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities (and the trivium, quadrivium, and natural philosophy of earlier times), by imbedding it in the general education requirements of a college graduate for an increasingly technology-driven and dependent society of the century ahead (Duderstadt, 2008, p. v).

Among the earlier attempts to provide engineering students with a broader perspective through study abroad was a program pioneered by the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) in the early 1970s when the traditional course-based technical curriculum was replaced with a project-based program emphasizing teamwork, communication, and the integration of technical and societal concerns. Students enrolled in the Global Perspectives Program (GPP), as it is known, are accompanied abroad by WPI faculty members. While overseas—typically for two-month sojourns—the students “are not taking courses but are earning academic credit through project work, and they are working on real problem-solving projects originated and coordinated by local hosts” (DiBiasio & Mello, 2004, p. 238). Destinations currently include Australia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy, Namibia, Switzerland, Thailand, and the United Kingdom (DiBiasio & Mello, 2004). WPI now sends more engineering students abroad than any other U.S. university, approximately 60% of its graduating class in 2005–2006 (Mello, DiBiasio, & Vaz, 2007).

Beginning in the 1980s, universities began to create their own programs in partnership with one or more universities abroad, in an attempt to make the process less labor intensive for students, faculty, and staff, and to exert greater control over the curriculum. In 1987, the University of Rhode Island (URI), which has become a National Center for Engineering Education supported by NSF, developed a five-year International Engineering Program (IEP) in which students combine their engineering major with a year abroad in Germany for a dual BS and BA degree in Engineering and German; in most cases students must take an additional semester or year for graduation or an internship. The program was expanded to France in the 1990s, to Spain and Mexico in 1998, and to China in 2004. All four language tracks are compatible with all the engineering majors (8 disciplines), and in all some 50 curricular combinations are now available, attracting growing numbers of students (Maher, personal communication, July 3, 2008).²¹

²¹That this dual degree curriculum has resonated with students is evident from the growing enrollments. As of May 2008, 222 students were enrolled in the 5-year/dual degree...
Other institutions have followed suit, establishing various models of study abroad, ranging from one-to-one student exchanges, to hybrid programs in collaboration with overseas partners, and/or branch campuses abroad. At the time of this writing, the URI website identified 18 universities that have made a commitment to international engineering education with active study abroad programs. Among this group, Georgia Tech stands out for the various ways in which it has recently developed its curriculum through their International Plan, which requires students to complete at least 26 weeks of study, internships, and research in another country and to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language. Students must also take three courses examining international relations, global economics, and a specific country or region, followed by a capstone seminar designed to tie the coursework and international experiences together with the student’s major and future profession (Connell, 2007b, p. 40).

Boston University introduced a “seamless pedagogical model” in 2001 when it began to offer overseas a curriculum that nearly all fourth-semester engineering majors are required to take prior to majoring in one of several engineering fields. The overseas technical courses are taught in English by partner university faculty and are functionally equivalent to courses taught on campus; and, while there is no language requirement for admission to the program, all students must take a foreign language on site and a course on the culture and society of the host country. Some of the technical courses are also open to qualified local students, who are proficient in English (for example in Mexico), thus broadening the curriculum at the host university as well. This seamlessly integrated curriculum allows U.S. students to fulfill all their technical and general education requirements, without losing time, credits or money.  

program (a 49% increase from May 2000). A total of 253 students had graduated with a joint BS/BA degree and completed a 6-month internship abroad. In fall 2008, 38 students were expected to participate in the IEP program abroad, 35 of whom will spend 11 or 12 months overseas and 3 of whom will spend 6 months. There have been 342 total internship placements to date (including placements projected for spring 2009).

They include Boston University, University of Cincinnati, Clemson University, University of Connecticut, Georgia Tech, University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, MIT, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Milwaukee School of Engineering, University of Minnesota, University of Pittsburgh, University of Rhode Island, Syracuse University, Virginia Tech, Wayne State University, and Worcester Polytechnic Institute. See http://www.uri.edu/iep/nrc/who_usa.htm.

For assessments of this program, see Eisenberg, Murray, & DeWinter (2007) and Eisenberg, Murray, & DeWinter (2003).
Another noteworthy initiative is the IIE’s Global Engineering Education Exchange Program, known as the Global E3 Program. Founded in 1994 with 21 universities (11 in the United States and 10 in Europe), 30 students were exchanged in the first year, principally with France and Germany. Today almost 90 institutions in 18 countries participate in the program, with approximately 35 universities in the United States and 40 in Europe, and another 10 throughout Asia, Oceania, Latin America, and the Middle East. The majority of students do one semester abroad and about half of the students remain in the host country for a full year to complete an internship. Approximately 225 to 250 students are exchanged annually. Students enrolled in the Global E3 Program require the substantial support of a faculty member on campus to advise them and approve their curriculum abroad, which can be a challenging assignment and an occasional drawback, given that courses offered abroad by partner universities are not always deemed commensurable with those taught on the student’s home campus.

A landmark in engineering education was the ABET 2000 initiative (ABET was formerly known as the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology), which declared that engineers “must be able to work in multidisciplinary teams and communicate well” and be prepared for work in a global environment. Today a growing number of institutions strive to meet these criteria and have created study pathways for their students to incorporate a semester abroad as part of their curriculum in science and engineering, among them, Arcadia University, Boston University, Emory University, Harvard University, Harvey Mudd College, Middlebury College, and others. An indication of how far engineering education has advanced since the early 1970s is the announcement by Rensselaer

24 The U.S. institutions which have seen the most benefit from the program are the ones that have been in the program the longest and have the largest student populations. SUNY Buffalo and RPI, as founding members, have seen significant exchange numbers. Some members (such as SUNY Buffalo, UT Austin, and Rice University) have had bilateral programs grow out of Global E3 relationships. In recent years, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and Penn State University, Drexel University and Colorado School of Mines have had the highest exchange numbers.

25 See “Engineering the World,” by Darlene Bremer, International Educator, November/December 2007, which reinforced the need to prepare future engineers for their profession by giving them a more “intercultural collaborative education (Bremer, IE, Vol. 16, no.6, p.31). Her article may be slightly optimistic, as was an article entitled “Passport to Science” published by Chemical and Engineering News (September 2006), stating that “undergraduate science students are now studying abroad in force.”

26 See article by Linda Wang in Chemical and Engineering News, September 4, 2006, Volume 84, Number 36, pp. 96–98. “Passport to Science: Once outnumbered by humanities majors, science students are now studying abroad in force.” Her assessment
Polytechnic Institute (RPI), a co-founder of the Global E3 program, of a mandatory international experience for all its engineering undergraduates—the first such initiative in the United States. As indicated on their website, the requirement of a recorded experience that is both international and educational before graduation will take effect for a percentage of students in the spring of 2009. To achieve this goal, RPI is building on its existing partnerships and creating new affiliations with European and Asian institutions that offer classes taught in English. The model will be based on one-semester, student-exchange programs that allow for an internship or a variety of other experiences to credit the requirement. These will include, but are not limited to, such programs as Engineers Without Borders (EWB), Semester at Sea, or the Peace Corps. Potential options for students include engaging in service projects, conducting research, or taking coursework abroad for an extended period of time.

Thus there is growing agreement within the engineering field about the desirability of including a study abroad experience as a more normative part of engineering training. It is anticipated that study abroad programs will continue to grow as a regular component of the engineering curriculum and that institutions and third-party providers alike will further develop innovative curricular models in the years ahead.

**Business Education**

The undergraduate business curriculum experienced significant changes over the last four decades, reflecting some of the persistent tensions previously mentioned between cultural versus utilitarian or general versus professional education and, most significantly, the pressures of the encompassing society. The new interdependent global economy, the expansion of knowledge and business through advanced technology, political volatility, and more recently ethical scandals in the business world, have all contributed new urgency to the debate of what constitutes a proper business education in the last third of the twentieth century and the early years of the new millennium. As Paul S. Hugstad suggested in his book, *The Business School in the 1980s: Liberalism Versus Vocationalism* (1983) — an historical overview of the birth and reformation of business schools and their curricula — significant curricular reforms started to take place in the 1960s as more business faculty were drawn from a wider range of disciplines such as law, history, and economics. The 1970s and 1980s were typically characterized as the period of the “new vocationalism,” when more specialized, career-oriented programs began

---

may be somewhat optimistic, in view of the fact that Open Doors statistics show that engineering students accounted for 2.1% in 1995–1996 and 2.9% in 2005–2006.
to flourish. Another factor to consider in the evolution of the business curriculum and eventually in the participation of business majors in study abroad programs, is, as reported by Turner and Bowen (1990) in their research of degrees awarded in the United States, “beginning in the early 1970s, there was an extraordinary increase in the relative number of women majoring in business as a direct consequence, presumably, of the marked improvement in professional employment opportunities for women in related occupations” (p. 201).

In the 1980s, with the pendulum swinging more towards vocationalism, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), renamed as the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business in 2000, began to exert greater influence on the definition of business education. While deans of business schools generally advocated a more broad-based curriculum, with as much as half of the major focused on general education requirements, corporate sectors still emphasized a true business major with a liberal arts minor. By 1992, the AACSB International issued standards that emphasized the liberal arts and a decade later, in 2003, it again revised the standards to include communication and analytical skills, information technology, multicultural awareness, and ethics. The following year, the Chronicle of Higher Education Review concluded that

business students will be asked to cope with cultural, technological, economic, and ethical complexities undreamed of in the mid-century age of the finite business skill set. In teaching the next generations of managers, liberal arts and business faculties must learn their own management lesson: that their key to success is imaginative integration (Sharpe & Pritchett, 2004, p. 319).

Study abroad did not become a high priority for undergraduate business majors until the 1990s, when the numbers of participating students began to rise and institutions increasingly added an international experience to address the global multicultural awareness component of the AACSB standards. The University of Minnesota and New York University, among others, have begun to consider study abroad as a required component of a bachelor’s degree in business and adopt various strategies for internationalizing the curriculum and their students’ overall academic experience. Starting in fall 2008, students at the University of Minnesota will be required to have an international experience before they can graduate with a business degree. Students will have several ways to fulfill the requirement. Alison Davis-Blake, Dean of the Carlson School of Management, noted that their “intent is that students will have some substantive experiences abroad... and hopefully put them in context with business abroad in some way” (Guess, 2007, n.p.). Though not required, the ideal curriculum for
business majors at Boston University’s School of Management (SMG) includes a semester of direct enrollment in a foreign institution and direct immersion into the culture with an internship experience. As Elisa Vincent, one of the school’s student advisors points out, “this model exposes students to different approaches to management education. It takes them out of their comfort zone and forces them to experience new things, develop new perspectives, and think outside the box” (Vincent, personal communication, July 24, 2008).

Louis Lataif, Dean of the BU School of Management, underscores the importance of international field experiences for the university’s business students:

SMG’s internationalization of our curriculum revolves around our international field seminars. They are currently conducted in Brazil, Asia, Europe, and India. These are courses that are very popular with our professors who desire to teach them and with students who want international exposure. The courses are offered in an intensive format (two to three week modules) and include visits to local business and government organizations. This academic year, we will offer four such seminars and next year, six will be offered. They are growing rapidly in popularity (Lataif, personal communication, September 10, 2008).

A common strategy at the University of Minnesota, Babson College, Bentley College, the University of Southern California, and other institutions committed to international education is to incorporate short-term study abroad programs into their curriculum, often at the end of the semester or for a few weeks between semesters or during the summer. Business faculty increasingly offer courses that start in the United States but might end with an international experience, taking students to multiple sites in order to “open their eyes to things they hadn’t thought about.” Professor Kevin Upton, who takes his Minnesota accounting and marketing students for two weeks to France and Argentina says that his students “were embarrassed to discover that executives and every young marketing person that they talked to spoke at least three languages” (KARE 11 TV News, November 26, 2007). These short trips have been very popular with graduate business programs for many years but there is a growing trend towards incorporating them into undergraduate studies as well.

An important component of international business education is the internship, which bridges the cultural and the vocational, preparing students for careers in the global marketplace. As business faculty and advisors have pointed out,

an internship or any hands-on work experience abroad is crucial to our students’ educational and ethical development. Experiential learning provides business students with the skills necessary to gain a competitive advantage in a global market. It allows them to compare and contrast business practices in the U.S. to those abroad, as well as develop an understanding of the socio-economic factors that influence management strategy and policy around the world. The business world has gone global and this has in many ways intensified the ethics debate, specifically regarding trade and foreign investment (Vincent, personal communication, July 24, 2008).

According to *Open Doors*, some 13.9% of American students abroad were business and management majors in 1995–96; by 2005–06, this group represented 17.7% of the total number of Americans abroad (IIE, 2007c). Given the growing support for international business education, the number of students going abroad will likely increase in the years ahead.

**International Health Education**

In response to major public health issues around the world, such as HIV-AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, SARS, avian flu, bioterrorism, not to mention related factors such as poverty, global warming, the deterioration of the environment, and the lack of adequate health insurance and appropriate care, global health programs have been on the rise. As recently reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, between 1995 and 2006, applications to global-health programs in the United States increased from 1,319 to 2,506, according to the Association of Schools of Public Health (ASPH). The number of public-health schools grew from 27 to 39 during the same time, while the number of students graduating with master’s degrees in international health soared 69 percent. Applications to the international-health department at the Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, which awards one sixth of all public-health degrees worldwide, for example, have roughly doubled over the past six years, to around 300 (Mangan, 2007, p. A25).

Enrollment in the Department of International Health at Boston University’s School of Public Health has grown by two thirds in four years, from 139 in 2003 to 211 students in 2007 and is by far the largest department in the school.

This extraordinary growth in graduate student enrollment in public health is mirrored in undergraduate student interest in this field. For example, Boston

---

28 Other examples of undergraduate public health programs can be found at Johns Hopkins University, University of California at Berkeley, Southern Connecticut State
University's new undergraduate Health Science major, a program that accepted its first intra-university transfer students in fall 2004 and its first freshmen in fall 2005, has experienced dramatic growth over the past three years, from 31 students in spring 2005 to 186 students in spring 2008, graduating 62 students in 2008. Likewise, offerings such as the undergraduate public health minor at BU have experienced positive student responses as has the combined degree from the undergraduate Sargent School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences and the graduate level School of Public Health.

Much of the undergraduate student interest in public health is in the area of international health. This topic permeates the curriculum, including in courses such as “Organization and Delivery of Health Care,” and “Topics in Public Health.” The public health minor curriculum also includes an “Introduction to International Health” course. In tandem with these majors, BU’s International Programs office has developed health internship programs in Geneva in partnership with the World Health Organization (WHO) and other organizations, and in Dublin; additional internships programs are under development in China and other developing countries. Moreover, students have independently taken the initiative on international health issues, for example developing a BU chapter of Global Medical Brigade (GMB), a network of university clubs and volunteer organizations that travel to developing countries to perform health care in communities otherwise lacking access to medical resources.29

There is ample evidence that among American students there is a deep hunger for health related programs that combine education with practical experiences in both developed and developing countries. 30 Duke University’s Engineering World Heath Summer Institute offers a two-month program that starts with one month of intensive study in Costa Rica or Tanzania, where participants spend mornings learning Spanish or Swahili and afternoons with hands-on training in the operation and repair of medical instruments and equipment. By the second month, students are ready to work in a developing world hospital, installing and repairing instruments, taking inventory, calibrating equipment, training the nurses or technical staff.

University, Rutgers University and Temple University.

29 For more details, see http://www.globalmedicalbrigades.org and http://www.bu.edu/today/world/2008/02/25/cas-student-mobilizes-health-care-volunteers-honduras

30 The legendary medical and public health work of Dr. Paul Farmer and his associates in developing countries, which was vividly described in Tracy Kidder’s (2004) Mountains Beyond Mountains, a best-seller among students, has contributed to the greater internationalization of the health curriculum and inspired students to study and conduct internships and practica abroad. Student response to invited speakers on international health issues—e.g. Dr. Jim Kim from Partners in Health and economist Jeffrey Sachs—has been remarkable.
to use or maintain equipment, and other biomedical engineering tasks.\textsuperscript{31} Indeed, a search of popular study abroad program clearinghouse sites, such as Studyabroad.com, GoAbroad.com and IIEPassport.org, call up literally hundreds of program options for students interested in these fields, many of which are located in developing countries, and include practical and service components in their curricula.\textsuperscript{32}

As in other professional fields, the number of health-related majors going abroad is still modest — in 1995–1996, health sciences students accounted for about 2.3\% of the American study abroad population, expanding to just under 4\% in 2005–2006 (IIE, 2007c). But as the number of health programs expands, concerns about global healthcare crises continue to grow, and international migrations of people increasingly produce multicultural societies, the health sciences fields, including nursing, pre-medical, and medical training are promoting further changes in the curriculum both on and off-campus. For example, the 2007 draft of the revised edition of “The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice” (American Association of Colleges of Nursing [AACN], 1998) states unequivocally that “today’s professional nurse must practice in a multicultural environment and possess the skills needed to provide culturally competent care” (AACN, 2007, p. 2). The document further asserts that, in the context of a solid liberal education for nurses, “competence in a second language facilitates the development of an appreciation for cultural and ethnic diversity” (p. 6). Ultimately, the AACN does not speak specifically to the role that education abroad may play in this process. However, the keen interest expressed in developing cultural awareness and competence among nursing and other health professionals clearly suggests that the curriculum will continue to evolve in this area and further growth in international programs for students in health majors and related areas is highly probable.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{International Teacher Education}

As early as the mid-1960s, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) recognized a need to train teachers with a more global perspective, and to do so specifically through education abroad. AACTE executive

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} See http://www.ewh.org for additional information.
\item \textsuperscript{32} They include such diverse schools as Boston University, Florida Atlantic University, Georgetown University, Georgia Southern University, Michigan State University, Pennsylvania State University, San Francisco State University, University of Michigan, University of Northern Iowa, University of Pennsylvania, University of San Francisco and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
\item \textsuperscript{33} The internationalization of medical schools is beyond the scope of this chapter. However, there is at least sufficient anecdotal evidence to suggest that demand for international education and practice are rapidly growing in this sector as well.
\end{itemize}
secretary Edward C. Pomeroy articulated this position quite clearly in 1963, in his foreword to the AACTE *Handbook of International Education Programs*:

Underlying these issues has been a conviction that, only if teachers know the world in which they live, will those they teach have an informed understanding of other cultures and international problems.

The teacher, knowledgeable and articulate, is the keystone. The best way to create such world-minded teachers is to provide them with opportunities to study, travel, and teach in other countries and at the same time to provide opportunities in American institutions of higher education to receive faculties and students from other countries (AACTE, 1963, p. iii).

Today, the AACTE continues to foster the notion that international engagement is critical for teacher education in the United States. This is facilitated in a general sense through the AACTE’s “Global and International” program initiative, and on a very pragmatic level by the organization’s “Global and International Teacher Education Special Study Group” (AACTE, n.d.). The special study group website indicates that its membership consists of 50 teacher education colleges across the United States, ranging from Baylor University in Texas, to the College of New Jersey, Southeast Missouri State University, Kent State University in Ohio, and the University of the Pacific in California (Southeast Missouri State University, n.d.-a).

A glance at a number of international student teaching programs indicates that study abroad options in English-speaking environments appear to be especially common. Southeast Missouri State University provides study abroad programming for student teachers in Swansea, Wales and Belfast, Northern Ireland, although its participation in the so-called Renaissance Partnership Program opens up other potential destinations throughout Europe (Southeast Missouri State University, n.d.-b). Baylor University offers its curriculum and instruction students the option to spend a semester either at Edge Hill College in Ormskirk, England or Hong Kong Baptist University. Baylor students may also engage in short-term teaching internships of two to three weeks in Brisbane, Australia or Kingston-upon-Thames, England (Baylor University, n.d.). Boston University’s School of Education encourages its majors to do a semester-long practicum in close collaboration with foreign institutions in the United Kingdom, Australia, and Ecuador, which counts toward both graduation and teacher certification in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Despite the obvious interest in internationalizing the teacher education curriculum, and the growing numbers of education students pursuing study abroad opportunities, education majors continue to represent a small percentage
of the total number of American students abroad. During the period 1995–1996 through 2005–2006, education students abroad accounted for anywhere from just 3.7% to 4.5% of the U.S. study abroad population overseas (IIE, 2007b).

In *Internationalizing Teacher Education: What can Be Done?—*a research report on the undergraduate training of high school teachers—education consultant Ann Imlah Schneider (2003) concludes that education students preparing for careers in public or private school secondary teaching face many of the same obstacles encountered by students in other professional programs. These include lack of adequate advising, the need to include in the curriculum more international courses and/or more international content to existing courses, more opportunities for the study of foreign language, a semester or year abroad, and observational internships overseas. She notes “The internationalization of teacher education has long been an interest of the American Association of Colleges of Teachers of Education, and it has commissioned several surveys of its members to learn the current state of things, beginning in the early 1970s. Like previous studies, the most recent shows that three strategies most followed in the teacher training community are encouraging faculty travel abroad, admitting foreign students, and sending students on study or internship abroad programs. It reports that very few of the respondents — only 5% — favor curriculum revision to include international content in the preparation of teachers. The AACTE does not have data showing how many Education faculty or students actually do go abroad.” (Schneider, 2003, p. 8).

Despite the well-publicized need to produce teachers who are better equipped to educate U.S. citizens for a global society, progress in internationalizing the teacher education curriculum and providing students with opportunities for broadening their horizons through direct experience abroad has been less successful than in other professional fields. As Cushner and Mahon (2002) have noted, American schools of education “give scant attention to this reality” (p. 44).

Nevertheless, there are a number of institutions and organizations that have developed successful programs to provide aspiring teachers with useful practical experiences abroad. Since 1973, for example, the Consortium for Overseas Student Teaching (COST), housed at the University of Alabama, has placed more than 600 American undergraduate student teachers in overseas student-teaching positions around the world (COST, n.d.). While abroad, participants are supervised by local teacher education institutions, with which COST has cooperative agreements. Growth in terms of the program’s focus and reach over the last three and a half decades is evidenced by the fact that “Placement opportunities arranged by COST have expanded from the original schools in Latin
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America to national and international schools throughout most of the world” (COST, n.d., n.p.). In one small study on the effects of such overseas student teaching experiences, Cushner and Mahon (2002) found that an international practicum of this sort “has immense benefits for the student teacher,” including “increased cultural awareness, improved self-efficacy and self-awareness, and... global mindedness,” “improvements in learning style and work habits,” and a “new understanding of one’s own role and improved ability to interact and teach in diverse cultural settings” (p. 49).

Community Colleges

Study abroad in American community colleges is a relatively new but increasingly common phenomenon (Blum, 2006). The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) recently identified “global awareness” as one of its top twelve major “hot issues” of concern, noting that “community colleges have a responsibility to prepare students to live and work in a global setting. They also have the ability play an important role in developing their communities and participating in the creation of this global society” (AACC, n.d.-a, n.p.). In a national survey conducted by the AACC, over 60 percent of its 307 institutional respondents from across the United States indicated that they had established “exchange and study abroad programs” or promoted multicultural activities on campus (Blair, Phinney, and Phillippe, 2001, p. 3). However, wide disparities in participation rates across institutions have been noted at different times and in different contexts (New York State Task Force on International Education, 1997), and levels of organization and engagement vary significantly by region, state, and/or community college system.

California has played a prominent role in this area. With its California Colleges for International Education (CCIE) consortium, founded in 1985, the community colleges of this state benefit from organized access to information and resources that support all manner of international education activity, including study abroad opportunities. Resources include statistical data, financing information, and best practices details for launching education abroad programs. CCIE’s membership includes 72 of the state’s 111 community colleges (Raby, 2005). Although “since 1967, community colleges have offered education abroad programs” (Raby, 2007, p. 62), it is only in recent years that “dozens of two-year institutions have begun concerted efforts to increase opportunities for overseas course work” (Blum, 2006, p. B10).

Other states, such as Maryland, have developed international exchanges and partnerships that are consistent with their institutional mission of
providing education and training for the local community. For example, Howard Community College’s (HCC) articulation agreement with three Danish institutes—Neilsbrock Copenhagen Business College, Odense Technical College, and Tietgen Business College—allows Danish students to spend their third semester at Howard, and Howard Information Technology (IT) majors to spend a semester in Denmark, giving both sides ample time to compare and contrast their respective curricula. As Ron Roberson, Howard’s Vice President for Academic Affairs, explained,

They [the Danes] design programs very differently. They have a holistic design. We offer a menu list and students pick from that menu. Their holistic approach was very interesting to us, the fact that they taught business and marketing and entrepreneurship as part of their IT programs. What IT program in the United States does that? (Connell, 2006, p. 40).

The semester abroad is followed by an internship in industry that enables students to learn “not only the abstractions of the education program, but... understand how it works in the real world” (Connell, 2006). Similar programs are in the works in China and Turkey.

These developments are increasingly thrusting community colleges into the global educational marketplace, with a curriculum that focuses heavily on their core mission — “the vital area of workforce training and adult education” (New York State Task Force on International Education, 1997, p. 2). By “branching out to include programs in academic areas, like nursing, not usually included in study-abroad curricula” (Blum, 2006, p. B10), as well as promoting institutional linkages designed around other vocationally-oriented training activities—such as so-called “first responder” training (Smith, 2007)—community colleges are injecting unique new elements into the American study abroad curriculum. Indeed, Raby (2007) notes that the community college education abroad offerings represent not only all standard academic fields, but “agricultural, occupational, technical, and vocational” studies, as well (p. 62). Meanwhile, the transferability of credit—important in almost all discussions of the education abroad curriculum—is an especially key element in the community college context, given that students’ abilities to transfer on to four-year higher education institutions is such an important aspect of the community college mission (Raby, 2007).

Since 1995–1996, associate’s degree students have never accounted for more than 2.7 percent of the annual total of U.S. students abroad, even dipping as low as 0.9 percent in both 1999–2000 and 2000–2001 (IIE, 2007b). Therefore the overall impact of community college activities on the evolving study abroad
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curriculum has been limited so far. Even in California’s CCIE institutions, “which lead the country in community college education abroad” (Raby, 2007, p. 62), just 0.06 of the student population studies overseas. Nevertheless, this may be an important sector to watch. Two-year colleges in the United States serve “close to half of the undergraduate students in the United States,” as well as a majority of the nation’s Black and Hispanic students (AACC, n.d.-b). The rising national policy interest in promoting study abroad across a greater variety of institutional contexts, and among a wider range of students, may result in larger numbers of community college study abroad participants in the coming years. To achieve this goal, community colleges will require special kinds of support, specifically to enable the participation of non-traditional learners, to allow for the candid recognition and alleviation of institutional constraints, and to facilitate the professionalization of staff critical to the study abroad enterprise (Raby, 2008). Ultimately, the unique curricular needs and interests of community colleges will surely add a different dimension to the American study abroad curriculum.

**Pre-departure Orientation and Re-entry Programs**

Study abroad as an integral component of the curriculum has fostered pre-departure and re-entry programs emphasizing student reflection on the application of experience to theory and vice versa. Formal coursework at both ends of the experience, designed to guide students through a comprehensive cycle of learning associated with studying abroad, has become increasingly popular. While most pre-departure orientations merely focus on providing a framework for dealing with practical matters associated with international travel, some pre-departure orientations have gone further in providing a forum in which to build cognitive skills, expand intellectual analysis, and encourage meaningful personal reflection in order to extract the maximum amount of learning from the experience abroad. That such courses are sometimes given academic credit by a growing number of institutions suggests the seriousness with which some colleges and universities are taking the study abroad experience as an academic element within the curricular mainstream. It also highlights the academic needs of students moving through complex and multi-faceted international and intercultural learning processes that transcend the defined framework of the time spent abroad.

A sampling of pre-departure and re-entry courses offered at many institutions across the country—including Duke University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Oklahoma State University, Juniata College, Carleton College, Northwestern University, University of Notre Dame, Northern Arizona University, Loyola Marymount University, Saint Louis University, and others
— shows a wide variety of approaches to this kind of programming. For many pre-departure courses, the focus is on logistical considerations and sometimes more general topics related to cross-cultural awareness and competence in an overseas context. Others focus more on intercultural communication, a recognized field of inquiry that has grown dramatically over the last couple of decades (Fantini, 1997). Discussions of both theoretical and practical considerations relevant to international experience, individual growth, and cognitive development, appear to have penetrated pre-departure programming at many institutions across the country. Courses like Azusa Pacific University’s “People and Places,” a required three-credit pre-departure class in Azusa’s Global Studies Program, provides an example of a comprehensive approach to pre-departure programming. Students in this course are expected to survey the cultural realities of their destination countries and/or communities, actively take part in setting up their field internships, and compile materials that will support their academic work in the core courses of the Global Studies Program.

Courses designed to address the expanded personal, professional, and intellectual perspectives of study abroad returnees have also become increasingly prevalent. In many ways, this is in keeping with the circular nature of the experiential learning cycle that many argue sits at the heart of the study abroad enterprise. At the same time, the rise in interest in re-entry programming speaks to the notion that faculty have come to appreciate the academic value added through education abroad. Indeed, many of the re-entry courses examined for this discussion are taught by faculty, not administrative staff. For example, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s post-international service learning course, “Connections,” is taught by a clinical professor of health policy and administration. At Duke University, a professor of anthropology teaches the “Crossing Cultures” course, designed for students who have returned from at least one semester of study abroad; and at Saint Mary’s College in Indiana, an assistant professor of education (who is also the director of the Center for Women’s Intercultural Leadership), is responsible for the aptly titled “Analysis of Study Abroad Learning” for returnees. One to three units of credit are awarded in each of these three re-entry courses. Some pre-departure and re-entry courses are delivered or enhanced by the expanded use of technology. The School of International Studies at the University of the Pacific features an online cultural training resource for study abroad that is openly accessible on the Internet. Meanwhile, PLATO (Project for Learning Abroad, Training, and Outreach) is developing an online curriculum to address topics critical to the study abroad experience, including pre-departure and re-entry course materials.
The fact that this kind of programming is resonating with a variety of academic fields and disciplines on campus —from anthropology, to healthcare policy or women’s studies — indicates its broad appeal to both students and faculty. It also shows the extent to which these developments have infiltrated the American study abroad curriculum, marking another step in the evolution of education abroad as a component of the undergraduate curriculum.

**Exchanges, Dual Degrees and Foreign Degrees, and the Curriculum**

Beginning in the 1960s, American colleges and universities began to develop institutional linkages that have also opened new academic opportunities for American students overseas. A range of collaborative arrangements—bilateral and multilateral exchanges, joint degree programs, consortial arrangements, and participation in overseas educational hub initiatives—have further contributed to the diversification of the curriculum.

It is difficult to estimate the number of memoranda of exchange signed by U.S. institutions with foreign partners in the last half century, but it is undoubtedly extensive — the University of Oklahoma alone boasts of 300 exchanges with partner institutions — though it is well known that at many institutions around the world, exchanges are never implemented or soon became dormant. Successful exchanges, however, have opened up new opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students alike to pursue a wide range of disciplines abroad, thus playing an important role in the diversification of the curriculum.

Dual degrees have been common in the United States since at least the mid-1980s, particularly for post-baccalaureate students completing a wide array of professional degrees—in law, management, medicine, public health, international relations, public policy, international development, and other fields. They have generally been conferred as intra-institutional degrees, rarely as joint programs between two or more institutions, and have usually been restricted to graduate programs. A good example is the MBA/M.A. Lauder Program in management and international relations, founded as the first U.S. dual degree in 1983. This was designed to prepare future business leaders with foreign language skills by integrating the Wharton MBA program with an M.A. program in international studies from the University of Pennsylvania’s School of Arts and Sciences. The M.A. in international studies emphasizes cross-cultural competency and advanced language competency and allows students to concentrate in one of eight languages—Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), French, German, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish — and select a regional focus. Today, intra-university dual degrees at the graduate level are widely available.
The same has generally been true for undergraduate dual degrees, which combine liberal arts and professional degrees within the same institution, typically BA/BS degrees in fields such as business, engineering, computer sciences, and information technology. Student demand for such dual degrees, combining majors within the arts and sciences and/or the liberal arts and sciences and professional degrees at the undergraduate and master’s levels, represents a growing trend in the United States.

However, unlike exchanges, dual degrees offered jointly by two or more institutions, either within the United States or between a U.S. and an international partner university, had not been part of the American education landscape until recently. The partnership between the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania and The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) is an early example of an inter-institutional dual degree. It was designed to prepare students for careers in business and the international political environment. Another example is the Wharton/Kennedy School of Government dual degree combining an MBA at the University of Pennsylvania with a Harvard University Master’s in Public Administration, International Development, or Public Policy. Venturing abroad in the 1980s, Cornell Law School began to offer a J.D./Master en Droit with the Université de Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne, a J.D./M.LL.P with Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, and a J.D./Master in Global Business Law with Sciences Po and Université de Paris I.

As reflected in Open Doors statistics, American universities are eager to welcome large numbers of international students for U.S. degrees, and send their own students for a semester or year of study abroad, but rarely with the intent for the Americans to receive an overseas degree. Also, they have thus far shown little enthusiasm to award dual degrees and have been less sensitive to the career potential of candidates with dual degrees who must work under varying government laws and regulations (Tobenkin, 2008). Still, there is growing evidence that interest in international dual degrees is developing in the United States, often in response to initiatives from foreign universities—especially in Europe and Asia, which actively promote them—, and that they will likely have an impact on the curriculum.

A promising initiative was launched by the State University of New York (SUNY) system in 2003 in collaboration with several Turkish universities, enabling students enrolled in the dual-diploma program to fulfill the academic requirements of both their SUNY and Turkish institution and as a result receive a diploma from each school. Students typically spend freshman and junior years at their home campus and their sophomore and senior years abroad thereby allowing for greater curricular interpenetration. In addition, students utilize distance
learning technology to take some of their courses. As Kavita Pandit, Vice Provost for International Affairs at SUNY Albany indicated,

Students are immersed in two cultural and educational environments resulting in a richer education than either university alone can provide. Faculty in both universities are brought together to work out equivalencies in each other’s courses and curriculum, deepening international relationships between programs. Ultimately, by keeping students, faculty, and the integrity of academic programs in sharp focus, dual degree/diploma programs ensure that a university’s engagement in the international sphere never deviates from the core mission of higher education (Pandit, 2008, n.p.).

The program is available to both American and Turkish students, although only Turkish students have enrolled during the initial years.34

Other examples of dual degrees can be found among institutions that have linked with European universities through the Atlantis Program, especially in professional areas, such as Clemson University’s joint degree in international economics with the Université Catholique de Louvain. There is the joint law degree program offered by the Universidad Alfonso X El Sabio in Spain in conjunction with the Washington College of Law at American University. Other examples are the University of Rhode Island (URI) and the University of Braunschweig in Germany, which recently agreed to offer joint degrees at both the masters and doctoral levels after many years of joint study abroad activity; and the University of Texas at Austin, which offers a joint MBA with the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK). The Texas-Hong Kong program allows students to pursue studies at each of the schools resulting in MBA degrees from both; each institution honors core MBA classes that are completed at the other institution and requires participating students to fulfill the in-residence class requirements of both institutions to obtain the degree. Graduates of the program are eligible for alumni status and have access to career services at both schools. In this hemisphere, UT-Austin also offers a joint Executive Management Degree with the Tecnológico de Monterrey in Mexico leading to an MBA from The University of Texas at Austin and a Master’s of Administration from the Tecnológico de Monterrey-Campus Santa Fe.

34 Participating Turkish institutions of higher education include Anadolu University, Bahçeşehir University, Bilkent University, Ege University, Hacettepe University, İstik University, Istanbul Technical University, İzmir Economics University, Middle East Technical University, and University of the Bosphorus, In 2007, Turkish students were enrolled at the Universities at Binghamton and Buffalo, as well as the Colleges at Cortland, New Paltz, the Maritime College, the Fashion Institute of Technology and Empire State College.
While dual degree programs require considerable time and effort on the part of faculty and administration, it is anticipated that some of the U.S. institutions that have had successful exchanges and study abroad programs with partner institutions overseas will in the future take a step further in their relationship and pursue joint degrees or diplomas on a larger scale, creating additional options in the curriculum at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Overseas trends along these lines, especially in Europe and Asia, are encouraging these kinds of developments in the U.S. context. Dual degree engagement with China is a particularly interesting area to watch for future developments (Redden, 2008).

While most American students study abroad only as a part of their home degree program and not in an effort to obtain a foreign degree or credential, a relatively small but growing number do go overseas for a full course of study. UNESCO figures indicate that over the last 40 years, the number of U.S. students going abroad to obtain degrees has grown by about 15,000—evolving from 26,248 in 1965 to 41,181 more recently (Cummings, 1993: UNESCO, 1991, 1996, 1997, 2006).

In the current context, U.S. degree-seekers abroad gravitate toward English-speaking environments, particularly the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. Germany and France are also popular destinations (UNESCO, 2006). Very little research appears to have been done about this trend—which is complicated significantly by the absence of means to identify and track these highly independent students. This makes it exceptionally difficult to determine what curricular choices they are making and how these may have evolved over time. Although full degree-seekers overseas sit largely outside the limits of this analysis, it is interesting to consider the potential growth of this phenomenon. Indeed, “given the increasing internationalization of higher education globally, it is not out of the question that more American students may find more permanent homes at universities overseas” (De Wit & Rumbley, 2008, p. 221), and evidence suggests this is already happening (Lewin, 2008). Depending on their motivations and experiences, this may exert some influence on the future development of the curriculum in the more traditional study abroad environment.

**Academic Standards and Faculty Participation**

The expansion of programs and the growing diversification of the curriculum is reflected in the proliferation of directories of study abroad programs. Examples of such directories include *Peterson’s Guides*, the Institute of International Education’s IIE Passport.org, Studyabroad.com, Goabroad.com, and other search engines. These resources are organized by country, city,
The diversification of the curriculum across many disciplines and the substantial increase in the number of study abroad programs available today have required greater involvement on the part of the faculty in the design, management, and assessment of the programs. Small liberal arts colleges with a long tradition of study abroad typically have been better prepared than large public and private research universities to set appropriate policies and procedures, and provide adequate guidance and advice to undergraduates interested in gaining international context and experience. This has been even more evident in the vertically integrated science and engineering course loads requiring more than the usual careful planning for study abroad. Faculty have increasingly acknowledged the need to advise students regarding appropriate study abroad options and a host of related academic issues as early as the freshman year, including eligibility for admission, required versus optional study abroad, duration of the program and, more than ever, the approval of the transfer of grades and credits, an issue that goes back many years in the history of study abroad (Hoffa, 2007, p. 214).

Indeed, planning has become the current watchword of faculty and advisors. In the same way that students are advised upon matriculation to think carefully about their general education and major requirements, students are generally advised that they can study abroad in practically any major, if only they make intelligent plans ahead of time. This includes pre-med and other pre-professional students who must adhere to strict requirements for admission to medical school and other graduate programs. For example, Professor Glen Zamansky, Boston University’s Assistant Dean for Pre-medical Studies, stresses the importance of early planning and advises that: “(1) The program does not have to be science or health-related, as any study abroad experience will hopefully lead to personal growth. This need not interfere with students staying “on track” (as too many people believe); (2) Liberal Arts programs with clinical/public health internships
provide wonderful opportunities for students to expand their horizons and learn about the cultural/social context of health care delivery; (3) understanding the cultural/social context of healthcare delivery is very important in our American society; and (4) in programs in which students take core science requirements it is very important to assure that the courses are identical to those taught at the home institution. It is imperative that the grades (not just credit) for the science courses appear on an American university’s transcript, as grades on international transcripts are generally not evaluated in the application process.” (Zamansky, personal communication, July 25, 2008).

Similarly, Northwestern University’s Academic Advising Center encourages all its students to study abroad, including its pre-med and pre-health students. They emphasize “The Importance of Planning Ahead” (Northwestern University, 2008), advising students to work closely with their advisors and to choose a program that can provide an enriching dimension to their undergraduate education, not simply a program they think will help them get into graduate school.

Some colleges have demanded a high grade point average for admission to study abroad programs and, where appropriate, auditions and portfolios; others have argued that if students are in good standing on the home campus they should also be allowed to study abroad. In short, for some institutions study abroad is regarded as a privilege, for others it is considered a student’s right. Students enrolling in the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Arts or at the Royal College of Music in London through Boston University, for example, must satisfy stringent departmental requirements for admission and close monitoring by the faculty; similar policies and practices can be found at other institutions as well. At New York University and Syracuse, which offer courses abroad taught both in the foreign language and in English, criteria for eligibility vary according to the track. As a consequence of the close involvement of the faculty in the study abroad curriculum, some academic departments can now plan their course offerings and teaching assignments in conjunction with the semester abroad, allowing for better academic planning of the curriculum and resources on campus.

The approval process for participation in academic programs abroad has varied considerably by institution. Most colleges, especially small liberal arts colleges, have advisory committees composed of faculty, administrators, and students whose task is to set and enforce policy on what types of programs are approved for credit. Often, there is a petition process for programs not on the approved list, in which case the onus is on the student to present information demonstrating that a particular program meets the criteria established by the committee. The criteria commonly considered are length and duration of
The program, number of class contact hours, profile of the faculty, opportunities for cultural immersion and language study, and options or requirements for direct enrollment in a local institution. Transfer of credit varies, even within a single institution. For example, a language department may allow students to participate only in direct enrollment or "integrated" programs, whereas biology departments may have no such requirement. However, most institutions have in recent years set policies regarding what they will approve, how the credit will be awarded, and how many credits students will be allowed to earn abroad. There is a growing consensus among the faculty that the experience abroad—the curriculum—should be consistent in purpose and quality with the educational experience offered on the home campus.

Conclusions

The evolution of the study abroad curriculum in the last half century has been an exciting development, a period during which study abroad emerged from its status as a worthy but nonetheless relatively marginal academic activity to enter into the mainstream of higher education, increasingly gaining the attention of students, faculty, administrators, government officials, and the public at large. Prior to 1965, the study abroad curriculum consisted to a considerable extent of courses in the humanities and some of the social sciences, with a focus on the study of foreign languages, literatures, and the arts. To be sure, there were examples of a wider curriculum prior to 1965, as Hoffa (2007) has shown, and of the need to successfully bridge theory and practice. But it was during the late 1960s and 1970s, and above all in the 1980s, that the study abroad curriculum evolved from a relatively narrow path for a select few to a broad avenue for many more students pursuing a much wider variety of disciplines. In response to major forces shaping the global society in which we now live—the expansion of knowledge and with it the expanded awareness of a global context, the growing heterogeneity of campuses, the global mobility of students and the rising appreciation for global multiculturalism, the impact of science and technology as dominant themes of our time, the professionalization of learning, and the concomitant rise of experiential learning—the American curriculum was greatly diversified, first at home and increasingly abroad.

Independent program providers had long offered opportunities for American students to study abroad for a semester or a year, usually as juniors. In the 1980s, however, a growing number of colleges and universities began to take the study abroad curriculum into their own hands, creating new academic programs, either alone or in partnership with other like-minded institutions in the United States.
and abroad. In doing so, they increasingly integrated the study abroad curriculum into the academic programs of the home campus, involving home institution faculty more directly, and more closely monitoring the quality and diversity of study abroad. As a result, the study abroad curriculum has been viewed with greater seriousness by both faculty and students alike. Some departments, and even colleges and universities as a whole, have even begun to consider study abroad as a requirement for particular majors or a prerequisite for graduation.

Study abroad, including undergraduate research, comparative thematic studies, introductory or capstone courses abroad, and pre-departure or post-study abroad courses, have become integral components of the curriculum at a growing number of institutions, public and private, small and large. Many programs initiated in the 1980s successfully expanded upon the experiential learning movement inherited from the 1960s, giving it a new dynamism that would have a substantial impact on the curriculum of the 1990s and the first decade of the new millennium. Pre-professional, professional, and vocational programs in business, science, engineering, health, and education increasingly incorporate an international dimension into their curriculum, both on campus and abroad. The number of participating students in “underrepresented disciplines” is still relatively small compared to students in the humanities, arts and social sciences, but their growing involvement in study abroad is an exciting and promising development. Quality, diversity, and relevance have become in recent decades key factors in the expansion of the study abroad curriculum and the greater participation of students, faculty, and staff in this enriching experience. Admittedly, much remains to be done, especially in the area of faculty development, so crucial for the continued diversification of the study abroad curriculum. There is no doubt, however, that since 1965 there has emerged a growing consensus in higher education that study abroad is a worthy activity that must become an integral component of the American curriculum.
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