



# NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

**Faculty Advisory Committee on the Global Network**  
**Tuesday, October 20, 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**  
**Bobst Library, Room 1135**

~

## ***Meeting Notes***

### **MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN MEETING**

**Eliot Borenstein**, FAS (Russian & Slavic Studies) *Co-Chair*  
**Una Chaudhuri**, FAS (English) and Tisch (Drama) *Co-Chair*  
**Sylvain Cappell**, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences  
**Kevin Coffey**, NYU Abu Dhabi  
**Guido Gerig**, NYU Tandon School of Engineering (Computer Science and Engineering)  
**Liliana Goldin**, **Silver School of Social Work**  
**Peter Gollwitzer**, Provost's Council on Science and Technology  
**Dale Hudson**, NYU Abu Dhabi  
**Matt Kleban**, FAS (Physics)  
**Ann Kurth**, College of Global Public Health  
**Peter Loomer**, College of Dentistry  
**Vicki Morwitz**, Leonard N. Stern School of Business  
**Madeline Naegle**, College of Nursing  
**Christopher Packard**, Liberal Studies  
**Marianne Petit**, NYU Shanghai  
**Vincent Renzi**, C-FSC  
**Ron Robin**, Provost's Advisory Group  
**Matthew Santirocco**, Liaison with University Administration  
**Mal Semple**, Global Sites  
**Paul Smoke**, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service  
**Joshua Tucker**, FAS (Politics)  
**Hirokazu Yoshikawa**, Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities

## **Discussion of Global Learning Outcomes Research Project**

Matthew Santirocco presented to the committee on a proposed research project, which would focus on Global Learning Outcomes and metrics. He began by summarizing NYU's history in this area, from the establishment of its first international sites, to the eventual creation of a global network and the increasing role of faculty through departments and various committees in developing this important feature of the University.

Santirocco explained that the time is right to examine the effects of study away experiences on students, i.e. the ways in which studying abroad makes a difference in their lives and academic experiences. The larger goal would be to articulate a set of global learning outcomes (especially but not exclusively academic) and to devise ways to measure how well they are being achieved. Santirocco invited members of the committee to provide initial input and then to engage in this project.

Members discussed the various ways in which students benefit from studying abroad, including:

### **1) “Global Citizenship”**

One frequently cited benefit of studying abroad is “global citizenship.” What this means, however, is not often defined. Co-chair Una Chaudhuri questioned whether this outcome can truly be achieved through traditional papers and seminars.

### **2) Appeal to potential employers**

A committee member described his personal experience with employers who had very positive impressions of students who had spent time abroad. This raised the question of whether students who had studied abroad found jobs more easily than those who had not, whether they found better jobs, whether they had more opportunities to work in international settings than other students, and what their long-term professional trajectories might be. There is evidence from NYU's Wasserman Center that NYU students enjoy greater success in this regard than students from academically comparable institutions.

### **3) Increased academic opportunities**

Another member asked about study abroad's effect on students' eventual academic accomplishments (e.g., Fulbright applications and graduate school matriculation) and career choices.

### **4) Inclination to give**

A committee member asked whether those who study abroad are more likely to donate to NYU when reminded of their experience.

### **5) Student wellness**

Another member suggested that there may be sufficient data to use student wellness as another measure of the effects of study abroad.

A committee member articulated many faculty members' concern that students who studied abroad returned less prepared to write senior theses. While this may or may not be correct, finding the answer to that question might illuminate a proactive way to improve global learning outcomes. Data could be collected from faculty on this question.

Eliot Borenstein expressed that many faculty in the humanities are skeptical of outcomes assessment, especially in a purely quantitative form. Another member replied that a mixed method approach would best answer questions about the benefit of study away, including surveys, quantitative means, and feedback groups. Faculty need to drive this effort.

One individual described ongoing attempts to assess its program in the Buenos Aires academic center. Another described the competency systems used by Nursing and by Global Public Health, which help assess students' progress while abroad. Santirocco cited the work of several additional professional organizations to establish more general global academic competencies and metrics, and agreed that we could learn from them.

Faculty suggested various questions to guide the process and discussed various challenges of assessing Global Learning Outcomes:

- Chaudhuri suggested that the most important aspect of these efforts must be to distinguish how NYU can do global education better, rather than simply document the effects of what NYU is currently doing.
- A member asked that faculty consider what we will do with the information that is eventually collected and how it will be used to implement change; this will help guide the questions we ask.
- A member described how many Stern School of Business students take core requirements abroad and elective courses in New York, and noted that this may not be the best way to organize their study away. Members discussed alleged instances of students choosing to study abroad because international standards are perceived as "easier."

A member described the results of a European study away program, which improved students' social competencies and career options. Those students who spent time in other countries developed better research and presentation skills. Their experiences also influenced their choices of career and desire for higher education. Another committee member asked about the role that language immersion played in this European program. All agreed that outcomes for European students were different due to students' greater facility with the host country's language. American students, by comparison, often find themselves in an "English cocoon" while abroad, limiting their cultural exposure and the positive effects of such exposure.

This led to a discussion of the current state of Global's language requirement, which is that students who study for a term at non-Anglophone sites must take the local language. There are, however, potential limitations of the current Arts and Science model of language instruction, which presupposes several semesters of study and the growth of proficiency in all four areas (speaking, listening, writing, and reading). For students in other schools, especially those with professional certification requirements, there isn't often enough time for this sort of study. A member asked whether NYU has a moral obligation to offer courses that will be more useful to students in the context of study away. As an example, a committee member described NYU Shanghai's effort to address the challenges faced by students from New York (or Abu Dhabi), who arrive for study away and are required to take Chinese. Many students resent this global language requirement and worry about the effect on their GPAs. As a result, Shanghai is currently

experimenting with different ways of meeting the needs of these students including a 2-point course in “Practical Chinese.” Other sites like Buenos Aires have pursued a different practical approach by devising applied language courses (e.g., “Spanish for Health Professions”).

### **Faculty Forum in Shanghai**

Borenstein and Chaudhuri reported to the committee on their recent trip to NYU Shanghai, where they conducted a faculty forum, intended to gather input from and gain insight into the experience that Shanghai colleagues are having both at their portal and in relation to the global network. Approximately 20 NYU Shanghai faculty members attended the forum, including NYU Shanghai committee representative Professor Jian Chen. Borenstein and Chaudhuri were very pleased with the forum and gratified by the openness of NYU Shanghai faculty to collaboration and interaction with the Square and enthusiasm for developments at the portal.

The committee discussed NYU Shanghai’s changing demographics. When NYU Shanghai opened its doors, 51% of students were Chinese, predominantly from Shanghai, and 49% were international (mostly American). Currently, the Chinese students are coming to Shanghai from more and more diverse provinces, while Americans make up only 17% of international students. A member remarked that when NYU Shanghai was first discussed, Chinese undergraduates studying in New York were against the idea, as they felt it reduced the value of their degrees. That concern seems to have already been allayed by the increasing confidence in the quality and distinctiveness of the NYU Shanghai program.

Much of the discussion focused on the disproportionate number of business majors at NYU Shanghai; they total 47% of the student population. A committee member explained that in Shanghai, as at NYU Abu Dhabi and CAS in NYU New York, students apply to the school as a whole rather than to a specific department (the latter is the model used at our professional schools in NYU New York). Thus it is hard to calibrate the number of majors that the students will declare in their sophomore year. Although the NYU Shanghai program begins by giving students a broad introduction to the Liberal Arts, their eventual choice of major is believed to be heavily influenced by the many Chinese parents who regard the study of business as the safest path to a secure career after graduation. The large number of business majors is problematic for several reasons, not least the fact that business has thus far proved to be a very difficult field for faculty recruitment.

The committee discussed the hiring process at NYU Shanghai. A member explained that the process moves more slowly in Shanghai than in NYU Abu Dhabi. The member stated that in the past, it has taken a couple of years for the process to pick up momentum, and that they expect to receive a large number of excellent applications within the next few years.

Currently, they welcome distinguished visitors to the campus who teach and establish networks. The junior faculty in Shanghai would benefit from greater depth of perspective; another member feels this could be remedied by bringing more affiliated faculty to Shanghai. Another member explained that doing so is more complicated in Shanghai than in Abu Dhabi, but that they hope to increase the number of distinguished visiting scholars.

Chaudhuri noted that the task of developing a curriculum is particularly challenging for junior faculty, and that this challenge would be mitigated by greater connectivity between Shanghai faculty and their departmental counterparts in New York. It was noted that certain departments interface with NYU Shanghai very well, while others hardly do so at all. Borenstein and Chaudhuri showed NYU Shanghai faculty the [Faculty in the Global Network website](#). Members discussed using the website to highlight global network curricular and research collaborations across portals and sites.

It was noted that NYU Shanghai struggles with the requirement that juniors at the portal study abroad. It is hoped that students from other portals will study abroad in Shanghai to maintain the campus' numbers. This would require an increased effort to develop Shanghai as a study abroad site and not just a portal. Members asked whether this could be done in partnership with NYU New York. Borenstein questioned whether NYU New York could accommodate more students visiting from other portals.

A member asked whether there has been any discussion or developments in China with regards to freedom of speech or academic freedom. Chaudhuri responded that it did not come up in the faculty forum, and no one mentioned having trouble in private conversation. Issues of censorship and academic freedom are discussed with NYU Shanghai students, but these problems do not manifest in the classroom.

Both Borenstein and Chaudhuri expressed their appreciation of this valuable experience, and emphasized the fact that the NYU Shanghai faculty is appreciative and desirous of increased contact and collaboration with NYU New York faculty.

The meeting concluded at 10:30 am.