

Internationalizing University Honors Programs

David S. Harrison

*University of South Carolina Aiken
Aiken, South Carolina, USA*

C. Michael Ritchie

*University of South Carolina Aiken
Aiken, South Carolina, USA*

Abstract

Renewed efforts are taking place to internationalize university curricula. Traditional approaches through exchange, study abroad, and academics are valuable and continue. Complementing these programs are varied other approaches, including an integrative effort we put forward through the Honors Program at our university. Working to develop a more actively participative program – one that would leave the confines of lecture formats, reach across disciplines, and engage students in critical exploration of international issues – we found a perfect structure within a program of the American Associations of State Colleges and Universities (AASC&U). The program, “Global Challenges,” offers the advantage of a variety of research approaches supporting an exploration of seven major global issues. This blended perfectly with our university’s recent focus on critical thinking and desire to reach better levels of campus internationalization. Using the AASC&U program as a platform, we developed a two semester program within our honors program to combine an active exploration of world issues (AASC&U) with critical inquiry methods in a cross-disciplinary approach that culminated in a creative, student-directed, study abroad program.

Introduction

Business schools have worked to internationalize curriculums with varying degrees of success (Glen, 2007). Most business programs offer – indeed require – courses that broadly cover international business. In addition, many programs offer more specialized international courses within the majors. These courses and programs are, however, often offered as independent courses that are not integrated within a comprehensive program linking business disciplines, or taking advantage of the inherent natural linkage international business offers. While we in the academic community hardly need reminders of the drawbacks of distributive learning educational approaches, those dreaded silos of education, international business often stands clearly as a missed opportunity (Desai and Pitre, 2009). International business is cross-discipline, yet is usually offered up in dissected form, discipline by discipline.

This observation is by no means meant to be further criticism of the lack of progress in integrating curricular disciplines. That is not productive, and these authors are certainly not beyond reproach. Looking at international business as segmented, by discipline, follows our natural instincts, and is not without some academic justification. It works. Finding an alternative approach while keeping the relevant rigor of depth within discipline, although seemingly elusive, is worth the pursuit as we are reminded that the secrets to lasting learning lies within interdisciplinary, active learning approaches.

Working with our university honors department we put together a program that explores global business issues, draws on the separate disciplines within international business, applies our university's recent prioritization of critical thinking skills, and does it all in an active learning environment, including a culminating in a study abroad experience. It is an ambitious undertaking; not absent sizeable risk of failure. A 'partial' risk mitigating factor is that the program is designed for honors students, having the interest, determination, and desire to achieve. The attraction for honors students, other than the study abroad segment, is the exact same "risky" part in terms of academic success: that the program is cross-discipline, breaching new territory, involving active and experiential learning, and all in an unstructured, creatively inspired environment.

The desire to put this all together led us, as well as colleagues, along the following path. We wanted a global studies program that would balance business and outside disciplines in a meaningful, integrative, successive series of courses. We wanted the program to build on investigative and analytic skills, initially exploratory in nature, then center on cross-discipline global issues, all working toward discovery and resolution. We began with identifying foundation skills, such as critical thinking, communication, and writing. Our approach was not to rely on these as support areas, but to bring them forward as a program foundation. The idea was to reverse their typical supporting roles, make them the "main events." The business disciplines became the linked, support areas, using critical thinking as the driver. Communications and writing were the tools, with critical thinking as the top of the pyramid – the primary, integrating force. We wanted to build the pyramid using the rigor of directed critical thinking, linking the various business areas to one another around a chosen theme. The theme [a chosen global issue] would guide the research, discovery, analysis, and resolutions. We believed the program of courses could integrate, work effectively, and drive the curiosity and interest of students if we centered everything on a major global issue.

That international business being cross-disciplinary in itself, is the natural home for such a program. Sufficient interesting and compelling issues pervade our world, most having cross-disciplinary elements. We wanted to use the issues as a vehicle to leave the structured, passive, discipline-based course approaches, arriving at an active exploration of important issues. Critical thinking research methods would guide the students as they applied discipline theories and practices to seek insights, analyses, and resolutions of the issues. The program would be largely student self-guided, with an on-site, student-designed study abroad segment culminating the program. The study abroad segment provides the capstone. It was to demonstrate, by being on-site with an issue, what the problems, constraints, alternatives, and resolutions were. It is designed to be a hands-on demonstration rather than an abstract presentation. For example, if the issue is natural resource depletion, the students would choose a location where the situation, effects, and resolutions can be seen first-hand.

Over the course of some months our program became more focused. We called it a "Critical Inquiry Exploration of Global Challenges;" to be housed within our Honors Program, including the culminating, student-designed study abroad experience. An ambitious mouthful, yes, but then, we never thought it would be easy or without missteps. We did want it to be challenging and engaging; and we implied that as being fun. We wanted the students to enjoy the process, enjoy the pursuit, enjoy the learning.

As our pursuit progressed I had the good fortune to attend an AASCU (American Association of State Colleges & Universities) program on global challenges. It turned out this program matched exceptionally well with our envisioned honors program. The AASCU

program (called, fittingly enough, Global Challenges) had been in process for a number of years, and was itself entering a critical development point. Where previously the program provided a loose framework of alternative approaches to student involvement in global issues, an effort was underway to offer more a more standardized approach for those that wanted it. New academic adopters were sought New technology and resources were added and more steps were made for closer communications within the community of approaches, successes, and failures. No one had yet used the program to build a series of courses around a culminating study abroad program as we had proposed. So we ended up with some much welcomed structure and resource, while still having the gratification of feeling we were breaking somewhat new ground. It seemed an affable solution.

Literature Review

Active learning approaches are seen as fundamental for optimal learning (Zapatero, Maheswari, and Chen, 2012). In addressing the lack of active learning approaches in higher education, Ken Bain points out that (2004) “A lot of traditional education does in fact foster a very strategic or surface approach to learning rather than that deep approach.” Appreciation for value of active and deep learning is not new. In 1899 William James, (credited by some with shaping American higher education methods), delivered a now famous treatise on effective teaching to the Harvard faculty. He ended with the following, more active-based university instruction: “Teachers must employ flexible and creative techniques if they are to stimulate those flexible and creative responses in the student that are essential for genuine education. Active learning --- [as the] vital connection of expression and impression”

In the context of First Year University programs, Bain [2004] cites engaged learning as key to any effective program of instruction. While Business School programs frequently call for group learning projects, the faculty are not often engaged in the process, and the exercise often becomes nothing more than splitting an assignment into pieces to be separately completed, with about the only group interaction involving a “cut-and-paste” undertaking as the project concludes (Schamber and Mahoney, 2006). At worst, group learning is often discouraged in the classroom and considered an academic offense. Talk about cross methods!

As discussed in the introduction, the lack of direct program attention to developing critical thinking skills remains a significant higher education weakness. Armunc and Roksa [2011] showed that higher education has focused on content and areas of concentration, technical and memory-based skills, rather than analytic reasoning, disciplined exploration, and thinking skills. In recent years, however, there has been some progress in developing critical thinking skills at the university level [Mulnix, 2012]. Still, educational funding heads evermore in data-driven, quantifiable directions (Schmidt, 1999). The data and testing outcomes, (largely demographics tied to standardized content-driven, multiple choice tests), are distancing programs yet further from integrative, and analytic pedagogical approaches.

Approximately forty years ago, Mintzberg (1975) reported that specialist type skills were emphasized in most business curricula at the expense of a manager’s skills. Similarly, ten years later Cheit (1985) criticized the focus on undergraduate specializations, noting that programs were too technical and narrowly based. More recently Mintzberg (2004) and Pfeffer & Fong (2002) repeated these very same program deficiencies. Baker and Prenshaw (2007) argue compellingly in the summer 2007 *Journal of the Academy of Business Education* on the merits of liberal education in business programs and the need to move from disproportionately teaching technical skills in passive learning environments, to active, critical thinking models of education,

focused on deeper conceptual understanding, communication skills, and interactive exercises. In fact, other research has shown that employers in general do not show a concern or preference for a specialized MBA degree (Gupta, Saunders, and Smith, 2007). In spite of a history of consensual and supportive rhetoric, however, Baker and Prenshaw (2007) cite, at best, mixed messaged results, noting that “There is little integration of courses, with most general education courses taken during the first half of a students’ career, and most business courses taken during the second half.” This approach may ‘check the box’ for including ample liberal education and integrative, cross-discipline curricula, but fails to use truly integrative approaches. They further conclude that “Business faculty and administrators do their students a disservice if the vast majority of the courses they offer are narrow and technical in focus...”. Business Week special report (2005) suggested that the most significant business skill needed today is creativity; not necessarily the haven of skills acquisition, content driven discipline courses.

Funding is another obstacle in moving toward integrative, active, thinking skills based programs. Funding trends for primary and secondary education are defined by the test outcomes of largely discipline-based tests. While higher education generally enjoys independence from national or state mandated testing, this safe haven may be short lived. Programs for higher education testing/standards/funding have gained momentum [Resmovitz, 2012]. President Obama is now personally leading a new, major initiative to have higher education funding (grants & student loans) tied to performance standards. This is in the name of “affordable education,” with little emphasis placed on the quality of education.

The key to lasting integrative education that fosters a true understanding of challenging theories and concepts as well as derives enjoyment in the learning process is active engagement and interaction [Lambert, 2012]. Umble et al. [2008] found that active group learning experiences, when guided and monitored effectively, are effective in improving critical thinking skills and encourage students toward further study. They become interested and engaged. Cox, et al. [2005] found that collaborative learning itself promulgates increased social and academic student interchange and networks, which itself furthers the learning process. Johnson et al. [1991] reported that collaborative group learning not only moves those involved to higher levels of critical thinking and analytic reasoning, but attributes higher overall academic achievement and psychological adjustment to success collaborative, active experiences.

Furthering that notion, Armunc and Roksa [2011] report that higher education has focused on content and areas of concentration, technical and memory-based skills, rather than analytic reasoning, disciplined exploration, and thinking skills. In recent years, however, there has been some progress in developing critical thinking skills at the university level [Mulnix, 2012]. Contrary to these small, but positive developments, educational funding heads evermore toward data-driven, quantifiable directions. The data and testing outcomes, (largely demographics tied to standardized content-driven, multiple choice tests), are distancing programs yet further from integrative, and analytic pedagogical approaches.

As educators we recognize the [severe] limitations of lecture as a primary form of transmitting knowledge and understanding. This is supported by many studies, including Kolikant, et al. [2010] that lately showed further the limitations of one-way, non-engaged student learning. Adding reflective learning, through collaborative processes, moves the learning frontiers further, [Asselin and Cullen, 2011; Bolton, 2010; Linden, 2010].

With this in mind, and following our university’s and our own desire to move our critical inquiry, honors, active learning methods, and study abroad programs forward, we found our way

to what we feel will result in valuable and lasting learning experiences. The following sections describe the design of our program.

Critical Inquiries ~ Global Challenges, Our Program:

Critical Inquiry is the process of gathering and evaluating information, ideas, and assumptions from multiple perspectives to produce well-reasoned analysis and understanding, and lead to new ideas, applications and questions.

Global Challenges is a structured program of study designed to investigate important, challenging global trends and issues likely to impact the world over the next thirty years. This embodies both opportunities and risks in working to transform the way the global community will live and impact others. More simply, the goal is to educate globally competent citizens. The underlying goal being that inquiry, discovery, and research are greater than thinking

The Global Challenges movement is a partnership between the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington DC, the New York Times Knowledge Network, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities American Democracy Project, and participating AASCU Seven Revolutions Scholars. The Seven Revolutions curriculum has been offered with wide-ranging approaches across leading global universities for several years.

Overview of the Planned Program:

Students apply critical inquiry skills to explore evocative global issues from multiple perspectives, culminating in on-site, international, active-based learning experiences. Learning “how to learn,” in pursuit of “answers” to the broad global issues facing the world community, students plan an analytic investigation centered on a common theme of global issues, work toward their research objectives, and present their findings on-location, internationally. Although the course is designed to allow for creative exploration and discovery, the learning process is very purposefully directed.

As originally planned our program had three consecutive segments, (Spring semester, Maymester, Summer), comprising six credits of electives offered every other year. It is a business honors course, open to other aspiring students by application, and team taught by two business professors. After some frustrations, self-examination, and our own phase of internal ‘critical inquiry,’ we stepped back and settled for a two segment, four credit program. We scaled back the spring semester to two credits, and moved directly to the study abroad portion of the program, deleting the Maymester segment, which was originally designed to be a phase of intensive research, analysis, and report producing. The program was simply too ambitious and too demanding as designed. We believe we cut some of the depth but maintained the intensity, challenge, spirit of exploration, and fun of learning.

The program is seminar-based in format, relying on active student intercourse. Spring semester begins with an intensive critical thinking, skill building segment, forming the course keystone. Subsequently, each of seven global issues are introduced biweekly, one per class. Each are critically examined and explored by the entire class. Recall, these are

honors students. Given proper course design, they relish the opportunity to work. Our motto is: if you make it interesting and they will come. Early on in the introduction of the seven global challenges the class selects a common research theme, with student groups choosing sub-projects within the common theme. The groups then each make formal group project proposal presentations to their peers, integrating their work within the common, chosen global theme. Meanwhile the professor works the groups linking their investigation toward building their own, study abroad, on-site plan.

Students critique their colleagues' proposals, providing enrichment opportunities. As spring semester closes students finalize their research plan, complete their study, and prepare written reports for their on-site, international presentations. During three weeks in summer the class travels to the selected international sites, actively demonstrating the intricacies and challenges of their investigation to their peers. The class culminates with formal presentations at an academic, international conference.

Program Outcomes: The program sharpens critical thinking and analytic reasoning skills, improves oral and written communications, develops interactive group skills, provides an introduction to the academic research community, strengthens leadership abilities, forces recognition of practical limitations, inspires curiosity, seeks to further a delight in learning, and, of course, provides extraordinary, first-hand, international, cultural and academic experiences. Business specialties will be linked through the common theme (global issues), grounded in the discipline of critical inquiry.

Why Critical Inquiry?

We chose critical inquiry as the structural link in the program for several reasons. First, faculty members are naturally aware of the importance of critical thinking. Most feel critical thinking is of paramount importance, embedded in their discipline area, and requisite for success (Cotter and Tally, 2009). The process of 'thinking,' however, is seldom directly addressed and taught using purposeful, planned methods. Critical thinking is generally assumed to be a byproduct of education rather than an end in itself. While critical thinking skills, exploratory learning methods, and cognitive abilities are considered essential to higher education success, and prerequisites to satisfactory course progression, these skills are often not directly addressed before or during college. Even in the more objective and quantitative disciplines (such as math, science, finance, and operations management) the inquiry, exploration, questioning, and decision processes (critical inquiry) are ordinarily secondary to achieving the "correct" answers. Sadly, with the recent, absolute prioritization of K-12 test scores, learning to think may well be even more sidelined in favor of "answer-driven test outcomes." We are no better in higher education. Students learn, all too frequently, what to do rather than why they are doing it. We feed the "is that going to be on the test?" mentality. In spite of all the pedagogical discourse to the contrary, students continue to learn their outcomes, learning them in the traditional, non-integrated "silos" of teaching disciplines, seeking the test answers rather than the questions. Change is difficult.

Program Details... How It Works:

An outline of the program is in the appendix.

Spring Semester >> "Just Thinking": A three credit course initiates the program and is its foundation. The class begins with a formal, in-depth study of the process of critical thinking. The class uses a lecture/discussion format exploring the stages and process of thinking. A text on critical thinking guides the formal part of the process, with active learning exercises

to hone the explorative thinking skills as they are covered. Writing and presentation skills are refreshed during a one-week segment, led by USCA English and Communications faculty. Next comes the “Global Challenges.” Using a seminar format the class critically examines each of the global trends and issues, one per week. As the semester nears completion an overall global theme is selected, designed to bind student group projects with a common research thread. Concurrently, students form groups choosing individual research projects and begin working on project objectives, a research plan, proposed methodologies, and ideas for their culminating international, on-site presentation day. Class concludes with formal project proposals, which the class critiques to incorporate feedback into the next phase of the class. Project review includes emphasis on inclusion of the critical thinking process steps.

Maymester >> “It’s A Wrap ~ It’s Showtime!”: Research projects are completed early in Maymester. Students complete research projects early in Maymester. Working from the class-critiqued proposals, groups work intensely to finalize their research plan, ensure critical thinking steps are fully developed, report progress and problems to the class interactively, finalize their research, and complete their written work. It’s the class’s job to respond with critical, productive dialogue, and creative suggestions. Concurrently, the class monitors progress on the central CI plan, making improvements and adaptations, jointly evaluating deviations from their planned CI path – have they strayed too far from the central topic? Group reports are finalized with detailed, on-site presentation day plans solidified. There is a lot going on during this segment.

We designed on-site presentations to take place during the study abroad and final, segment of the program. These are the culminating program segments. The entire program builds to this. Ideally it is fun. The goal is to learn, engage, and enjoy.

Once on location abroad, each group will take a full day finding resourceful, creative, entertaining, and meaningful ways to package and present their project to their colleagues. The goal is to use the resources and elements of their location to underscore, dramatize, and to “teach” their findings and conclusions. This will include preparing: (1) on-site learning goals, (2) detailed lesson plans and annotated scripts, (3) plans to integrate tours, speakers, and events relevant to their research conclusions into their presentation day, and (4) engaging presentation vehicles. The goal is for to achieve enlightening, active presentations, using creatively planned medium. Engaged learning for all is the objective. Stand-up lectures are not desired. During the process research logistics, practical limitations, and academic goals meld. Students wrestle with issues of academic compromise as their plans develop. Meaningful on-site visitations and presentations – supporting the basic research questions, inquiry goals, and findings – are the desired result.

Student groups each have their “day” on location – their time to report, on-site, demonstratively. Other students learn from what becomes the featured group’s performance. With the next day, the next group is on. Groups take advantage of location resources as they apply. Creative, resourceful, engaging, and enlightening performances: that is the goal. This might include on-site talks, events, tours, speakers, hands-on observations, thoughtful activities, amusements, or creative applications. It is up to the students. <<< ***It’s Showtime!*** >>> Everything culminates with academic conference attendance and presentations.

Other Course Elements:

On-Campus International Preparations: Groups will present reports covering location demographics, histories, issues, culture, politics, and language studies during spring and Maymester, supplementing the main, global issue related project work. The student side of trip organization, scheduling, touring, and daily event planning will be finalized in Maymester. Students may decide to supplement class preparations by providing speakers, films, or other outside resources relevant to their topic to the class prior to departure. This will primarily be done during Maymester, but may include spring semester as well. Foreign films, providing cultural, political, and historical background are encouraged. Weekly Friday afternoon movies, which students select will be shown and discussed during April and May.

Guest Speakers: Students will arrange to have guest speakers present relevant areas of their expertise. This includes on-campus Aiken speakers, virtual appearances utilizing state-of-the-art telepresencing equipment, and on-site location speakers in Europe. The professor will handle some logistics, but selections and initial arrangements are student-driven.

Role of the Professor: The professor will guide the class, (ideally just subtle touches) keeping the class on target, focused, working within the critical inquiry framework, and productively working toward their goals. The professor will be responsible for travel logistics, accommodations, meals, and extraneous trip items, and will support the students on the academic and cultural visitations, the on-site presentation logistics, guest speakers, and other academic factors integral to successful completion of the research topics. The more the students accomplish on their own, the more successful the course. The professor has ultimate responsibility for accomplishing the learning objectives, and for the safety of the students during the travel portion of the course.

Global Challenges: A Global Challenges blended learning course is available as a core program model, as desired. It offers a formal structure that leads students through seven identified major global trends and issues, issues likely to be of major significance during coming decades. Of course, more or less than these seven issues may be tagged, with which the Institute readily agrees. It is not the number or even the issue itself that drives the work, but the work itself. The goal is productive thought on important issues and educating globally competent citizens.

The Global Challenges Institute is made up of faculty and other scholars that have taught the course at their universities, commencing in 2003. The New York Times Knowledge Network supports the initiative, with general oversight and other support provided by the Center Strategic and International Studies, and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities American Democracy Project. Seven Revolution scholars hold periodic meetings, and offer a selection of program resources. This includes a learning community, alternative syllabi, lesson modules, exams, assignments, learning activities, assessment tools, teaching toolkits, student guides, archived *New York Times* resources, videos relevant to each revolution area, bibliographies, and an extensive resource guide with web links and other resources. The Epsilon Course Management System has been tailored to provide Global Challenges course materials as well. A program synthesizing varied approaches to running course alternatives commenced spring 2013. These results will be available at the next Institute meeting (fall 2013).

We provide an “Outline & Overview” in our appendix that delineates more specifically some of the logistics, planning, and course content (3 semesters) in a week-by-week overview. It concludes with an estimate of program (& student) costs for the study abroad segment. We have ambitious plans for outside fund raising, but have not included that other than to say that significant outside funding would both greatly enhance the availability of the program across our student body and also add to the options available for study and program permanence. Our plan was to have short-term, community-based fund raising efforts, including the students, to raise money in the short-term to get the program off the ground in the first year or two. Longer term, we hoped to raise sufficient funds (about \$2,000,000) for two endowments: (1) to support and subsidize student program costs, and (2) to fund a Global Challenges Chair for the faculty member running the program. Ambitious perhaps, but we consider them both realistic and necessary in the end.

Conclusion

Part of winning is failing. Or so some of us teach anyway. Successful business-people often tell of their failures as a prelude to success. We failed in our first attempt at the program. We were ambitious. How could we not be when we offered such an incredible program eager honors students? Of our 42 honor students only five committed to the program (some where graduation, others had prior commitments). We were looking for a 25% enrollment (10 students). We shall try again in 2015. We have twice the number of honors students. The honors director tells us they are more academically committed. We are told that our “odds” are better because our students are better. Our original program may have been too demanding: spring semester, full Maymester, and full summer one courses. We have scaled it back to spring and an extended Maymester. This should appeal to more students not desiring the commitment required in our prior planning.

We are optimistic that we have a valuable innovative program that is attractive to eager students willing to embrace academic exploration and challenges. The structure provided by the AAC&S Global Challenges Program to ground our approach to critical inquiry skill development combined with our university’s desire to concentrate on developing critical thinking skills and internationalization of our campus was good fortune; as was the concurrent strengthening and building of our honors program. It all seems to come together. Anchoring the program with a dynamic, student-run study abroad capstone is perfect. We are very excited to move the program forward.

Given the strong evidence and research supporting collaborative, cross-disciplinary, reflective, active directed education, we are very pleased with our Global Challenges Critical Inquiry Honors Study Abroad Program. Our title alone, although a bit long, implies the interaction of these areas. Hopefully effectively directing all involved toward achieving the ultimate goal of all education: learning. Regardless of how elusive, undefinable, and “un-measurable” that learning may be. Perhaps learning is like other things that are simply hard to define. One cannot describe it, but knows it when one has it. Similar to a piece of art, an opus, love, a lecture or simply the feel of the bat as that home run makes its way toward the stands, it is hard to define explicitly, yet easy to know when it is right. We feel our program is analogous to such a situation. The learning may be hard to quantify and all the program specifics may be hard to objectively support, but nevertheless, the ball is on its way out of the park. We just know it.

References

- Arum, R. and Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on Campus*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bain, Ken. (2004). *What Best Colleges Do*. Harvard University Press
- Baker, D.F., & Prenshaw, P.J. (2007). Enhancing business education through liberal studies. *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*. Vol. 8, Summer, 1-16.
- Cheit, E.F. (1985). Business schools and their critics. *California Management Review*, 27, 43-62.
- Cotter, Ellen, M. and Tally, Carrie, S. (2009). Do Critical Thinking Exercises Improve Critical Thinking Skills? *Education Research Quarterly*. 33(2), 3-14.
- Dasai, Mayur and Pitre, Richard. (2009). Developing a Curriculum for On-line International Business Degree: An Integrated Approach Using Systems and ERP Concepts. *Education*. 130(2), 184-194.
- Glen, Joanne. (2007). Internationalizing the Business Curriculum. *Business Education Forum*. 61(4), 8-15.
- Gupta, Pola, B., Saunders, Paula, M., and Smith, Jeremy. (2007). Traditional Master of Business Administration (MBA) Versus the MBA With Specialization: A Disconnect Between What Business Schools Offer and What Employers Seek. *Journal of Education for Business*. 82(6), 307-312.
- James, William (1899) *Talks to Teachers on Psychology: and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*. Dover Publications 2001: ISBN 0-486-41964-9, IndyPublish.com 2005: ISBN 1-4219-5806-6.
- Mintzberg, H. (1975) The manager's job: folklore and fact. *Harvard Business Review*, July/August, 49-61.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Mulnix, J.W. 2012. Thinking Critically about Critical Thinking. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 44(5), 464-479.
- Pfeffer, J. & Fong, C.T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1(1), 78-95.
- Resmovitz, J. 2012. *Test Scores Often Misused in Policy Decisions*. Huff Post, August 6.
- Schamber, Jon, F. and Mahoney, Sandra, L. (2006). Assessing and Improving the Quality of Group Critical Thinking Exhibited in the Final Projects of Collaborative Learning Groups. *The Journal of General Education*. 55(2), 103-137.
- Schmidt, Peter. (1999). A State Transforms Colleges with "Performance Funding". *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 45(43), 26-28.
- Schneider, Carol Geary. April 21, 2013. *Higher Learning and the Accountability Debates*. Association of American Colleges and Universities. www.aacu.org/leap/accountability_Debates.cfm

Zapatero, Enrique, G., Maheshwari, Sharad, K., and Chen, Jim. (2012). The Effectiveness of Active

Learning Environment: Should Testing Methods Be Modified? *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*. V 16, I 4, 101-114.

Appendix

Honors CI Global Rendezvous ~ Outline & Overview:

Program Structure: Ten to fifteen honors students >> Five to six student groups;

One professor* ^{see costs} (For first offering, spring 2015, course will be team-taught, 2 professors)

- Academics: Critical Inquiry, Global Studies, Study Abroad
- Honors students, with other aspiring students by application
- Program covers three, sequentially linked courses (see program description for details):
 - Spring Semester, 3 credits
 - Maymester “Plus”, 3 credits
- Travel >>> Three European destinations (Non-European destinations considered for later years)
 - Two locations for group reporting & presentations. Three groups have one day each per location to present their findings & conclusions to the class. This will be an active exercise, taking advantage of the on-site location to demonstrate, dramatize, and engage the class with what they’ve learned. – Additional unstructured time to discover, explore, enjoy...
 - Third location at an academic European conference. Groups will attend presentations and formally present their findings at conference sessions.
 - Total Days Abroad, 20: 10 reporting/presentation days; 6 travel days; 4 days at conference
- Destination Plans:
 - First >> Developing & Transitional Central European Economy: Slovakia
 - ✓ “The Magic Kingdom” >> Stara Lubovna; High Tatra Mountains (Alps of Central Europe) for initial introductory, “feet-on-the-ground”
 - ✓ Capital City: Bratislava (USCA has valuable political connections with Slovak government; meeting with the Prime Minister is planned)
 - ✓ Possible Seven Revolution Applicable Global Issues: Natural Resources & Climate Change, Economics, Governance
 - Second Destination: Developed, Mature Economy >> Paris: “The Land of Oz”
 - ✓ Paris: City of the Past, Present, And Future(?) >>> All Seven Issues Apply
 - ✓ To include participation at International Academic Conference. The Clute Institute offers several academic tracks. Students will present and attend sessions. Policy, Engineering Education, and Health Sciences.
 - Third Location to be selected later: Consider Orvieto, Italy – Special relationship with USC A and Aiken; some good initial connections

- ☞ **The Course:** All of this, our course planning, is a thorough, thoughtful, structured, and detailed plan. Good plans allow for change; our surely will.
 - The program is purposefully starting with European locations, but will move outside of Europe with later offerings.
 - The program, with study abroad, critical thinking, and the global issues content, will position USCA with an Honors Program that is unique to our region.

Schedule Planning: Spring Semester, Parts 1 & 2 (3 credits)

- ✓ **Weeks 1-4: Critical Inquiry, with Text >> foundation for Global Studies Segment**
 - Advanced Topical Study in Critical Thinking: Review of CI processes, core domains of thinking, and learning outcomes. Format includes lecture / discussion, text, readings, assignments, active-based exercises.
 - Text: "Critical Thinking," Richard Paul & Linda Elder -- (*this could change*)
 - All course work will employ CI as its foundation, including continuous feedback opportunities, revisions, rework
- ✓ **Week 5: Written and Presentation Skill Review**
 - USCA English & Communication faculty review essential skills
- ✓ **Weeks 6-14: Global Challenges >> Global Studies:**
 - Introductory, & 1 Area Per Week: (*Population; Resource Management / Climate Change; Technology; Information/Knowledge Dissemination; Economics; Security; Governance*)
 - Seminar format, readings, discussions, papers
 - Groups choose specialization areas, begin research; class chooses mutual theme
 - Last 2 to 3 Weeks: Group Presentations
 - Present preliminary research plans, group feedback, review for CI process
 - Plan includes specific critical inquiry steps; project goals, research strategy & related objectives, all building creative approaches to on-site presentations
 - Concurrent with Global Challenges, European location discovery & learning:
 - Location history, politics, issues, culture
 - Reading & Web assignments, reports to class, discussions
 - Weekly movies in April & May (outside of class)
 - Guest lectures on country, culture & history

Maymester & Into June (3 credits): Groups complete research, finalize papers, prepare presentations, plan onsite presentation performances, logistical needs finalized

Phase One: Completing the Project:

- Class meets daily, self-reporting of project planning & progress, group analysis & feedback is major component of class; complete projects
- Interaction with professor, planning logistics, developing onsite details

Phase Two: On Location >> Slovakia, Paris & Culminating Academic Conference

- More location learning, guest speakers, web-info, movies...

- Groups present projects: creatively leading others through discovery, implications, alternatives, conclusions... It's Showtime! Interactive, engaging, enlightening.
- Groups attend & present papers at academic conference

Here's a final thought on the course; let's call it course outcomes...

This course will change your life!

(If it doesn't, we screwed up)

Program Costs, Student Costs for Summer (Maymester > Summer) Segment:

- Spring semester 3 credit course is taken in student's normal program of study as fulltime student; no additional tuition or other costs. (Overload credits are at \$80 per credit.)
- Summer / Maymester tuition @ \$400 per credit, 3 summer credits: \$1200- (instate)
- Trip Expenses, Student Travel Fees:
 - Students travel fees cover travel expenses, expenses for one professor, and tuition.
 - ✓ First Year (2015): Two professors will team-teach the courses, (only one "teacher of record). Students will pay trip expenses for one professor. The other professor's expenses will be covered by the "teacher of record's" summer school salary.
 - Student travel fees cover: airfare, European transportation, overnight accommodations, some but not all meals, cost of speakers, tours, cultural and other events.
 - Estimated total costs to students:
 - ✓ Keep travel fees to students below \$3000*.
 - ✓ Total: Summer tuition (\$1200), student travel fees (\$3000), personal spending @ \$500 to \$1000 (\$25 to \$50 per day); the total student cost under \$5000. That is far below comparable student study abroad costs.
 - Some overnights in [selected] hostels; discount airfares, trains, local transportation
 - HAS travel conference funds for professor; EVCAA funds for students:
 - ✓ Pays airfare and several days of expenses for professors
 - ✓ USCA EVCAA partial funding for students presenting at conferences
 - ✓ Clute Institute June European Conference negotiated student discount
- *Note on Travel Costs >>> Actual student direct travel costs will be above \$3000, perhaps well above. Airfares alone are approaching \$1500-, add travel within Europe, overnights, some meals, cultural events, speakers, conference registration, professor's expenses, and incidentals, and is way over \$3000. Supplementing the student fees will be HAS and EVCAA conference funds, local student fund raising efforts, USCA fund raising, and USCA policy on study abroad partial tuition reimbursement. Detailed budgets will be prepared as the program moves forward.
- Fund Raising: (1) Goal of \$10,000 per year to defray current expenses; (2) Honors Global Studies Endowments proposed for future, but unlikely at this point. We have proposed working with our Development Office to raise endowments sufficient for (a) a \$10,000

supporting annual student trip expenses and (b) \$10,000 for Chair in Honors Global Trends. To date there has been no progress on that.

- Other Funds: USCA Study Abroad Tuition Reimbursement Policy provides 50% of tuition “profits” (tuition less professor’s salary) as reimbursable to the program. (Est. around \$2000). In addition, we raised \$2000- in “Family Fund” money during our first year’s attempt at the program; those funds should be still available. With those monies, plus conservatively another \$1000 we have about \$5000- for our first year. Not what we wanted, but enough to defer costs of about \$500 per student.

