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The symposium sought to discuss and critically examine efforts to educate for “global citizenship” and “global competence”, concepts that are gaining increasing currency among Australian higher education institutions and governments. The research evidence suggests that the conceptual and practical issues around the notions of global citizenship and global competence for higher education students are complex, in conceptualisation and practice, and to a degree contentious.

The contextual issues – including responses of higher education institutions to globalisation, the ambiguity of the terms global citizen and global competence, the value issues surrounding them, the expectations and aspirations of young people, the perceptions of employers and the public policy landscape – were discussed. A number of key messages emerged from the discussion.

The ambiguity associated with the term global citizenship can probably be tolerated. The important thing is to achieve ‘substantive global mindedness’ among higher education students. For practical purposes, the student as global citizen might most usefully be conceived as the ‘ideal global graduate’.

While recognising that the expectations and aspirations of young people are central to the issue of teaching for global citizenship and global competence, the question of how young people interpret and see their role in relation to the wider world tends to be ignored in the framing of programs for global citizenship within universities.

The interests and objectives of employers and higher education institutions in educating for global citizenship are closely intertwined; the potential for better outcomes is likely to be strengthened by closer collaboration between the two groups.

In addition, clear and supportive public policy is needed if education for global citizenship is to succeed.

Some of the greatest challenges are internal to education institutions. While increasing numbers of Australian universities aspire to the goals of global citizenship and global competence for their students, the organisational frameworks and programs to achieve these goals – and evaluations of success or otherwise – are for the most part lacking.

There are identifiable organisational constraints and enablers requiring closer consideration and, in the case of enablers, their most effective use. Issues of leadership, governance, student and parent expectations of learning, curriculum and pedagogy, diversity of the student body, inequalities of student experience and resource allocation need to be addressed.

Finally, if education for global citizenship and global competence is to proceed effectively, critical future research on which to base sound and effective decision-making is needed. These key symposium outcomes reflect the considered views of the major stakeholder groups and are a clear pointer to future action. The task is a joint responsibility of governments, education institutions and employers. Clear and consistent messages, as well as practical programs, are needed.

An agreed framework for future action is the top priority and should be the focus of follow-up to the symposium. Such effort should be comprehensive, but should not be too ambitious. The task is to perceptively identify and work on critical, touchstone issues for all stakeholders.
INTRODUCTION

Background
The concepts of global citizenship and global competence have gained currency over the past 20 years. The term global citizenship especially is now routinely used in a wide range of political, social, cultural, economic, diplomatic and educational contexts.

There is now significant government interest in deepening Australia’s global engagement – particularly in Asia – through the business, industry, science, education and research sectors, and through Australia’s political and public diplomacy. This outward looking focus is increasingly being reflected in national policy.

However, it is not altogether clear what the programs should be to best express and embed global citizenship in various national enterprises – including education. This national symposium sought to bring focus to the discussion and to critically examine what is meant by and how to foster global citizenship and global competence among Australian higher education students.

Aim
The symposium aimed to, clarify the concepts of global citizenship and global competence within the higher education context; begin to identify and disseminate good practice; accelerate the momentum and to facilitate innovative policy, programs and practice by government, higher education institutions and employers.

Participants
116 participants from 52 organisations, including universities, VET institutes, schools, education peak bodies, industry and business groups, student organisations and Commonwealth and State Government authorities.

Discussion papers
Recognising that the issues surrounding the notions of global citizenship and global competence for higher education students are complex and to some extent contentious, IEAA commissioned three discussion papers as background resources for the symposium.

The discussion papers were prepared by topic experts and brought together current research about the issues, with a view to enabling evidence-based discussion of these issues:

- Paper 1 | Coming to terms with cosmopolitanism, global citizenship and global competence (Professor Zlatko Skrbiš)
- Paper 2 | Generation G, global connectedness & global responsibility (Associate Professor Anita Harris)
- Paper 3 | Educating global citizens: translating the ‘idea’ into university organisational practice (Dr Kathleen Lilley)

The discussion papers examined current knowledge and gaps in knowledge about global citizenship education drawing on Australian and international research; discussed implications for Australian policy and practice in this area; and identified critical issues for consideration.

Advance copies were provided to symposium participants. The papers should be read in conjunction with this Outcomes Report and are available at www.ieaa.org.au/global-citizenship.

Symposium program
The Symposium program is given in Appendix 1 (p.33).

Evaluation
Formal evaluation of participants’ response to the symposium was undertaken. Participants were overwhelmingly satisfied by the symposium, its content and presentation.
The symposium was conceived as a first step in attempting to comprehend and, if possible, enhance Australian universities’ efforts to foster global citizenship and global competence as graduate outcomes for Australian higher education students.

The issues involved are complex. They reside at both the conceptual and practical level and operate in the educational, public policy and commercial domains. It is by no means clear who owns the issues. And even if global citizenship and global competence were shared goals of education institutions, governments and employers, how exactly can those goals be actualised?

Importantly, the symposium did not seek to resolve the issues; nor did it strive to identify detailed actions around which future public or institutional policy and practice should be framed. All that is premature.

Rather, it attempted to identify and delineate what were perceived as the most significant issues and to take account of research evidence throwing light on these issues. Conceptual and practical matters were addressed (informed in each case by the three discussion papers) and elucidated by the views of the business and higher education panellists and by the other participants.

The wide-ranging discussion is summarised below under issues focussed headings. Issues are clarified and, so far as seems reasonable at this stage, some suggestions are made towards the end of the report. Possible actions that governments, research organisations or education institutions might like to consider so as to help progress our knowledge and practice in this increasingly significant area are suggested.

**RESPONDING TO GLOBAL FORCES**

Accelerating globalisation is producing forces that societies cannot ignore. Increased global engagement involves complex operations in an increasingly interconnected world. Societies everywhere – their governments, communities, institutions and individuals – are attempting to navigate these engagements in a wide range of ways. Discourse is increasingly focused on how best to prepare young people for more globally linked and less certain futures.

Among governments and education institutions, two dominant themes have emerged almost everywhere: (i) preparing young people for the global economy and (ii) developing their global social awareness and capacities. These two themes have become prominent in education agendas from school curriculum policy to the United Nations (UN), where these dual aims dominated the agenda of the International Year of Youth in 2010 (Sobe, 2012:100).

Universities, particularly those in the developed world, are becoming increasingly active participants in the discourse of global citizenship and global competence. Schattle (2009) points out “since the late 1990s the ‘global citizen’ has been adopted by higher education institutions in the developed west as a key strategic principle”. An increasing number of Australian universities are attempting to come to grips with global citizenship through attempts to embed it as a graduate outcome, to teach global citizenship as part of a formal award course or incorporate it as part of extra-curricular activities.

This emerging discourse is one response to the imperatives of globalisation. Preparing for a global economy and developing global social awareness and capacity may appear compatible, but experience shows they do not necessarily sit comfortably together.
Whether therefore the current discourse and its practical manifestations are in fact meaningful, sensible or effective is by no means clear. In important respects, these were the central questions addressed through the symposium.

CONCEPTS AND TERMS

The terms global citizen and global citizenship are increasingly used in Australian universities. Much of the terminology and the related research emerged initially in universities as it relates to outbound student mobility (Killick, 2012; Tarrant, 2010; Morales and Ogden, 2011). More recently, the concepts are gradually being adopted by universities in relation to all students – including the great majority of whom never travel abroad for part of their studies. They now appear in university strategies and discourse around learning and teaching generally and around internationalisation of the curriculum in particular.

In some cases they have emerged in the context of whole courses/programs devoted to teaching about global citizenship (Deakin University, University of New South Wales). The relationship between the concepts global citizenship and global competence is also an area of investigation.

Moras and Ogden (2011) describe global competence, global civic engagement and global social responsibility as dimensions within the broader notion of global citizenship.

Nevertheless for the most part, these terms are vaguely understood, and even tend to attract a deal of skepticism or criticism. Green (2012) believes that the term will always provoke ardent opposition underpinned by broader academic, political, and philosophical debate.

Criticisms tend to gravitate around real or imagined specific dimensions of global citizenship, in particular:

1. Its sense of impractical, utopian ideals; that it is a “shibboleth”; that it lacks groundedness
2. Its pseudo-political connotations (one can’t really be a citizen of the world; one can only be a citizen of a nation state)
3. Its vagueness and ambiguity. Depending on our level of identity, do we mean empathy with others; partnering with others through global cooperation; feeling at home in operating in different contexts; or some or all of these?

4. The connotation of being a higher form of identity and obligation, conflicting with “the national identity”, producing a potentially ideological and divisive “rootless cosmopolitanism”. On the other hand, we could note that in fact many nation states formally allow for dual national citizenship that might be said to have the same potential for divisiveness.

5. Its value-laden, ideological character, producing conflict between universal values and those of particular cultures or national states, with the danger of domestic ideological polarisation.

6. Its potential to extend domestic conflicts to the global level to produce dangerous “global cleavages”, a potentially dangerous straw man to attract the attention of radical politics.

7. Its elitist character – a phenomenon confined to a small percentage of the population in conflict with the mass of the population.

8. Adherence to global citizenship is a form of bad faith; being good citizens starts at home. There are fundamental questions about how we each perceive our own identities. The priority should be to understand the local better (e.g. aboriginal identity and situatedness). Being focused on global citizenship to the exclusion of the local could be viewed as a form of hypocrisy.

Clearly, the notion of global citizenship (if not global competence as much) elicits strong feelings. There is a danger of idealisation of the concept. The symposium did not attempt to answer what are to some extent understandable questions about the concept and the practices associated with it. However, in a more positive vein, it might be noted that dual identities are in fact quite common, and without necessarily divisive social outcomes.

However, one lesson the symposium did draw from comments made by the keynote speaker was that if global citizenship is a positive notion to be actively pursued in universities, and in society generally, it will be essential to ensure that it is well understood and that its acquisition be both deep and wide throughout society. This implies the need for mass education programs at scale, starting in the school system and maintained through into to higher education.
Within universities, efforts to promote global citizenship to a certain extent have been paralysed by the terminological debate, with little constructive discourse about how to effectively progress the underlying intention of the global citizen as a curriculum outcome (Lilley, 2014).

On the other hand, when higher education experts explain their version of the ideal global graduate, their descriptions tend to be highly comparable regardless of their preferred term (global citizen, cosmopolitan, cross-cultural capabilities and global perspectives or intercultural competence) (Lilley, Barker and Harris, 2014). Similarly, other research suggests that global perspectives could equally be considered as ‘Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) by another name’, being underpinned by the same principles as global perspectives, global citizenship, internationalisation, employability, diversity, and equality (Shiel, 2011).

The symposium noted a number of other perspectives about the terminology in common use within the university sector: that global citizenship is a disposition for critical and ethically thinking graduates and that global citizenship can mean simply recognising or attending to the global and might be better expressed as “global mindedness”.

A broad range of other research demonstrates that global citizen learning can be conceptualised as being consistent with ‘intercultural learning’ (Marginson and Sawir, 2011), ‘cosmopolitan learning’ (Rizvi, 2009), border pedagogy (Giroux, 1988), dialogic pedagogy (Friere, 1973), liberal learning (Schneider, 2004), and transformative learning, (Daloz, 2000).

While there may be disagreements around the terms and their use, universities will continue to be impelled to respond to rapidly changing local and global workplaces and to diverse communities and societies.

In attempting to resolve the matter of various interpretations of global citizenship there was a strong sense among participants that it is important to move beyond the terminology. There was an acceptance that while language and the task of clarification of concepts is important, language is inescapably loaded and that some ambiguity associated with the various terms within the discussion of global citizenship can be tolerated.

The important thing, according to Rizvi, is to achieve “substantive global mindedness”. The deepest possible engagement is a crucial element. Terminological differences can then be put to bed.

---

**THE ‘IDEAL GLOBAL GRADUATE’**

- An attitude or disposition towards others and the world
- Underpinned by moral and transformative cosmopolitanism and liberal values (openness, tolerance, respect and responsibility for self, others and the planet)
- More than a technical efficiency or competence
- A mindset for mature, critical, ethical and interconnected thinking
- Underpinned by ethical capacities that cannot be easily captured by surveys or quantitative measurement
- Positioned along a continuum of development
- A non-prescriptive and variable concept.

Dr Kathleen Lilley et al. (2014)
One means to approach the issue in practice – and possibly to ease any concerns within the academy – is to view global citizenship as a multi-level construct that, in the words of Lilley (2014), represents the “ideal global graduate”.

In Lilley’s view, the behaviours of such an ideal graduate are underpinned by moral and transformative cosmopolitanism, the principles and approaches of liberal learning, and closely aligned with pragmatic and well-accepted Australian university aims for workforce preparedness and Asian capabilities.

KEY MESSAGES

1. If global citizenship is a positive notion to be actively pursued in universities, and in society generally, it will be essential to ensure that global citizenship is well understood and that its acquisition be both deep and wide throughout society.

2. While language is important, some of the ambiguity associated with the various terms used within the discussion of global citizenship can be tolerated.

3. The important thing is to achieve “substantive global mindedness” among our students. The deepest possible engagement is a crucial element.

4. For practical purposes within universities the student as global citizen might most usefully be conceived as ‘the ideal global graduate.’
VALUES

One of the issues faced by any discussion of global citizenship and, to possibly a lesser extent, global competence is the fraught issue of values.

The notion of global citizenship is deeply value-laden and, as mentioned earlier, potentially conflictive. The intersection of facts and values is endemic in education generally, but particularly so in this case. The idea of global citizenship is normative. It posits how things are and how things should be. As one symposium speaker, Fazal Rizvi, pointed out, facts are not self-evident. “What the facts mean – for example how ‘interconnectivity’ is experienced by Indian women – must be viewed through a prism of values”. It is our understanding of facts that steers us towards what should be done.

The notion of educating for global citizenship and a cosmopolitan future – stressing as it does values such as responsibility, openness, commitment and compassion – does not always go down smoothly, even in parts of the academy. Practically everyone working within universities agrees that universities have a social purpose. However, what this social purpose is exactly remains ambiguous. Further, whether universities as such have a global social responsibility is sometimes questioned (Riordan, 2011), or at least it is pointed out that the contradictions and compromises that sometimes have to be made in engaging in internationalisation need to be faced up to by universities. These contradictions and compromises do not necessarily negate or undermine core university values, but possibly they are the price universities pay for putting their values into practice (Riordan, 2011).

Leaving aside the fraught issue of whether universities should take a value stance when it comes to globalisation, research evidence confirms that members of the academy are comfortable with universities having an important role and responsibility to provide students with the conditions of learning that enable them to think, but not what to think, about ethical matters (Lilley et al., 2014).

But it is not as clean cut in practice as all that. There are challenges to be faced. While universities frequently do not articulate what global values students are gaining through their programs, values are implicit. For strategic and for practical reasons it would be prudent for universities to be conscious of this.

The practical reasons are clear. The research evidence in relation to education for global citizenship shows that an explicit objective of education institutions teaching for global citizenship (schools and universities) are aiming to help students to think differently and move beyond their comfort zones. Thinking differently requires social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality, criticality and cosmopolitan role models, as well as a wealth of other capacities and examples. All these entail value dispositions and judgements.

Finally, and as mentioned earlier, a further values issue is the danger of global citizenship being an elitist construct, confined to a small percentage of the population.

Values cannot be ignored in educating for global citizenship. It would be wise for education institutions to acknowledge this honestly and to explicitly articulate the value elements in their programs.

The task of course, and the challenge posed, is how to do this.

KEY MESSAGES

1. The notion of global citizenship is deeply value-laden.
2. The notion of educating for global citizenship and a cosmopolitan future stresses values such as responsibility, openness, commitment and compassion.
3. There is a danger in teaching what to think, not how to think, when it comes to education for global citizenship.
4. In educating for global citizenship it would be prudent for universities to articulate the values implicit in their programs.
The expectations and aspirations of young people are central to the issues of teaching for global citizenship and global competence. Yet, as we will see below when the discussion focuses on curriculum issues, research shows that discussion of global citizenship education has focused rather narrowly on what this means for specific local curriculum needs from the perspective of governments, organisations and educators, while the broader question of “how young people interpret and see their role and relationship to the wider world tends to be ignored” (Bourn, 2013:ix).

The symposium, in particular through two of the discussion papers (Skrbiš; Harris), recognised the need for universities and governments to better understand the expectations and aspirations of young people if the issues of educating for global citizenship and global competence are to be effectively addressed.

Harris points out that young people’s circumstances and aspirations in regard to global citizenship are set against the backdrop of generationally distinctive social change. A wide range of research demonstrates how the current generation of youth is facing unique socio-economic conditions that have a direct impact on their capacity for and dispositions towards global connectedness and responsibility.

A body of Australian and international research demonstrates that young people more than older people tend to be those who are creating new hybrid and transnational identities that can move across national borders and between the global and the local (see Harris, 2013; Dolby and Rizvi, 2008; Hoerder, Hébert and Schmitt, 2005).

Both Australian and international research such as the World Values Survey show that cosmopolitan beliefs and practices are more evident among younger generations (Norris, 2001; Phillips and Smith, 2008). Many young Australians, especially those of migrant background, exhibit considerable intercultural competencies, often learned informally through experiences of ‘everyday multiculturalism’ in their culturally mixed neighbourhoods, schools, workplaces and leisure activities (Ang et al, 2006; Collins et al, 2011; Harris, 2013).

Such young people hold multiple identities and are increasingly knowledgeable about different cultures and have personal connections with other nations and places around the globe owing to their own cultural heritages. Thus global interconnectedness and responsibility are not simply abstract ideas but can have personal and practical meanings for many youth in Australia today.

**YOUTH ARE BEING IMPACTED BY AND ARE RESPONDING TO:**

- New transitions resulting in less structured pathways towards adulthood and citizenship (‘new adulthood’)
- Economic and cultural globalisation and increased movement of people and information, and
- Changing opportunities and practices regarding civic engagement and social action on a global scale, especially influenced by new media, in particular the internet.

Anita Harris (2014)
At the same time, factors such as place, education, social background, gender and age shape global outlooks for youth everywhere, and scholars warn against uncritical celebrations of young people’s ability to be cosmopolitan (Hörschelmann and Schäfer, 2007).

In the Australian context particularly, geographical location is an important element affecting how youth are able to position themselves as global citizens and develop intercultural competencies (Farrugia et al, 2014; Skrbiš et al, 2014).

Life stage is also critical to understanding dispositions to global citizenship. Research shows that as young people move from early adolescence into their 20s, they place less importance on feeling connected to their local communities or their nations and develop a more outward-looking view towards the global (Skrbiš and Western, 2014). Growing up is associated with mobility and being connected to a wider world beyond their immediate environs (O’Connor, 2005; Thomson and Taylor, 2005).

A number of studies have been undertaken that explore the dispositions of the current generation of youth towards specific global issues – global insecurity, injustice and environmental damage, war, terrorism, the environment and poverty, and global social well-being generally – issues that cross the traditional lines of party politics. Research with young Australians has found that while they are most personally concerned about doing well in their studies and getting a good job, their highest rated national and international concerns are war, terrorism, the environment and poverty. And global well-being generally (Harris and Wyn, 2009).

There are strong suggestions that we are now witnessing a broader shift on the part of youth away from engagement with the state and other formal sites of traditional citizenship activity and towards network-building and issues-driven political or civic action on a global scale (Bang, 2004).

In summary, young people understand the need to prepare for work in a global economy, are savvy about building their CVs and have a propensity to participate in global citizenship training for “self-improvement, the development of leadership skills or simply having fun” (Andreotti, 2006:40).

While many young people are concerned about global issues such as environmental degradation, poverty, social and economic injustice and violence they do not always see straightforward ways to translate their concerns into action.

This is where education institutions might best play a role. Civics and citizenship education in schools and educating for global citizenship and global competence in universities can better capitalise on developments in youth expectations and aspirations if existent curricula and programs are comprehensively conceived, reviewed and evaluated.
There was a view among participants that educators are not listening to students around issues of global citizenship learning. It will be important to do so. It will be important also to articulate and not shy away from being explicit about core university values if students are to successfully engage with the idea of global citizenship.

KEY MESSAGES

1. A body of Australian and international research demonstrates that young people, more than older people, tend to be those who are creating new hybrid and transnational identities that can move across national borders and between the global and the local.

2. Research also shows that cosmopolitan beliefs and practices are more evident among younger generations.

3. There are strong suggestions that we are witnessing a broad shift on the part of youth towards network-building and issues-driven political or civic action on a global scale.

4. At the same time young people understand the need to prepare for work in a global economy, are savvy about building their CVs and have a propensity to participate in global citizenship training for ‘self-improvement’ and career advancement.

5. The expectations and aspirations of young people are central to the issue of teaching for global citizenship and global competence. Yet, the question of how young people interpret and see their role in relation to the wider world tends to be ignored in the framing of programs for global citizenship.
PUBLIC POLICY

Despite having an open, borderless dimension derived from their ancient pasts in Asia and Europe, contemporary universities are the products and the instruments of the national state. Public policy frameworks set by governments are the contexts within which universities everywhere must operate.

In the Australian context especially, the dominant model of internationalisation has been the international student program. Australian politicians have frequently mistaken attracting large numbers of international students to Australia as the alpha and omega of internationalisation of Australian education.

Only recently has the role played by the international mobility of students begun to be acknowledged and reflected in Australian public policy. Support for outbound student mobility has begun to be provided through the AsiaBound and the New Colombo Plan schemes\(^1\).

These efforts sit within a broader public policy context. Historically, Australia has had a long history of promoting internationally in education at the school level. The 1990s saw a dramatic increase in research, policy, curricula and professional development initiatives to foster young people’s knowledge of civics and citizenship. Past programs such as the Commonwealth Government school-based program, Discovering Democracy, was implemented during this time to develop curricula and teacher training across Australian states and territories (funded through to 2004).

More recently, there has been a new emphasis on the role of schools in cultivating students to become global citizens. For example, the most recent statement on national goals for schooling, the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians, specifically nominates ‘the need to nurture global citizenship’ and the development of young Australians as responsible global citizens as a goal (MCEETYA, 2008:5-9).

The symposium’s keynote speaker, Don Markwell, stressed that the current Australian Government remains committed to language learning in schools, a review of citizenship education and the implementation of the New Colombo Plan to enhance undergraduates’ international experience in the Asia-Pacific. Markwell also indicated that development of the new national curriculum is also a platform where global citizenship education “can be revitalised”.

According to Markwell, in the current Australian Government’s mind the New Colombo Plan “is more about international engagement, not about global citizenship”. Public policy support for global citizenship learning is therefore absent, or at least not explicit. However, it is a potential within public policy settings such as the New Colombo Plan. It falls to those in universities to take advantage of the settings provided.

How much public policy might be improved to better address issues of global citizenship learning is a moot point. The symposium participants were informed that the current Australian Government has clear views about what higher education initiatives it considers reasonable to support through public funds. Moreover, it was clear the current Government believes public funds should not be used to support values that it regards as “at variance to the values of the nation state or national identity”.

That having been said, the symposium was advised that current Australian public policy is interested in global citizenship because the Australian Government believes it:

- Promotes international harmony and peace
- Leads to solution of global problems
- Produces more enlightened domestic policies
- Contributes to domestic harmony
- Enables Australia to be a more effective partner in trade through globally literate citizens
- Enables Australian citizens to more readily work and live elsewhere.

---

1 Other important elements – the international mobility of teaching and research talent, the global engagement of Australian research, and the global responsibilities of education institutions, particularly universities, to help solve the grand challenges facing human societies have yet to be acknowledged and integrated coherently into national policy.
The focus of current public policy in this area is:

- Curricula and learning and teaching
- Foreign language policy
- Australia as an international study destination
- International student experience, including enhanced interaction between international and Australian students
- Mobility of staff and students
- Extra-curricula activities and volunteering
- International research engagement
- International alumni connections.

Currently, Australian Government priorities are:

- the New Colombo Plan, involving international internships and mentoring
- Foreign language study at all levels
- Australia as a study destination (a new national strategy will be announced in October 2014).

Finally, public policy efforts were said to include better alignment of initiatives across the schools and the post school education sectors.

While education institutions are able to make decisions about education priorities, including for global citizenship education, the public policy settings are important. At the very least public policy should not be a hindrance, it should also be consistent. It would be useful if it were actively enabling and supportive. But it would be prudent for universities to consider what they might want in these terms before approaching governments.

KEY MESSAGES

1. Education institutions are able to make decisions about education priorities, including for global citizenship education. However, public policy frameworks are also important.

2. Public policy should at least not hinder. It should be consistent. It would be useful if it were actively enabling and supportive.

3. Current Australian public policy is focused on identified Government priorities and is unlikely to focus directly on education for global citizenship.

4. How much public policy might be enhanced to better support issues of global citizenship learning in universities needs to be addressed by the education sector.

5. It would be prudent for universities to consider what they might want in these terms before approaching governments.
EMPLOYER PERCEPTIONS

A panel discussion involving employer representatives highlighted the focus of employer interest in the topic. There is a particular need for the Australian workforce to possess global competency skills. The domestic market is small, so an international orientation is needed for business broadly to succeed. Australian businesses have to compete with many international competitors, many of which are envious of Australia’s proximity to Asian markets. There are advantages for Australian companies to selectively and strategically to partner with some of our international competitors.

A particular workforce capability that Australian employers increasingly seek is resilience, especially in the international context. This entails a combination of values, behaviours, attitudes, knowledge, experience and exposure that demonstrate an employee’s ability to live outside their comfort zone. Evidence of ‘out of comfort zone’ experience in potential employees meshes well with curriculum aims of education institutions (discussed later in this report) to facilitate behavioural change and foster the ability to think and act outside the box.

There is a desire among Australian employers to see step change rather than incremental change in this area, and to be able to access greater numbers of workforce talent having these skills.

Employers also value other soft skills in graduates: in particular, trust, respect and the ability to build and maintain relationships. Employer interest in these skills in the international context reinforces and meshes well with the desire of education institutions to foster intercultural capabilities in their students.

However, global citizenship in some senses of the term is not at the forefront of employer thinking. The directions from which employers come at this issue will not be the same as the directions universities might approach the matter. Nevertheless, there is potential to achieve common ground, depending on how the matter is framed by the education sector, and to enhance better understanding by business and industry groups.

It is likely that business might need guidance in terms of directions that should be taken to achieve the shared objectives of students, their education institutions and employers.

One possible way forward is for researchers and educators in this field to partner with forward looking international businesses to investigate desirable curriculum – including work-integrated learning (WIL) and internships – and co-curricula initiatives that might be of benefit.

In sum, employers and universities have a nested interest in fostering world class capabilities in graduates that not only relate to high quality technical skills but also culturally informed abilities to function in a global context. The potential for better outcomes is likely to be strengthened by closer collaboration between the two stakeholder groups.

KEY MESSAGES

1. A particular workforce capability that Australian employers increasingly seek is resilience. This entails a combination of values, behaviours, attitudes, knowledge, experience and exposure that demonstrate an employee’s ability to live outside their comfort zone.

2. Evidence of ‘out of comfort zone’ experience and resilience in potential employees meshes well with curriculum aims of education institutions.

3. There is a desire among Australian employers to see step change rather than incremental change in this area.

4. Employers also value other soft skills in graduates, in particular intercultural skills that identify, build and maintain business relationships.

5. The directions from which employers come on this issue are not the same as those of universities. Nevertheless there is potential to achieve common ground in practice, depending on how the matter is framed.

6. The interests and objectives of employers and universities in this matter are closely intertwined. The potential for better outcomes is likely to be strengthened by closer collaboration between the two stakeholder groups.

---

1 The recent Erasmus Impact Study (http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/study/2014/erasmus-impact_en.pdf) demonstrates that a number of the perspectives identified as relevant to Australian employers apply also in the European context.
INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The greatest challenges are not ones of public policy, but rather internal to education institutions. While increasing numbers of Australian universities are explicitly setting global citizenship as a goal they aspire to for their students, the organisational frameworks and programs to achieve the goal, and evaluations of success or otherwise are for the most part lacking.

As Lilley (2014) remarks, “there has been limited discourse about the university’s role and responsibility for translating global citizenship into organisational strategies and pedagogical practices”. There are few examples where the notion of global citizenship features specifically as an infused principle across university processes and practice.

GOVERNANCE, MANAGEMENT AND THE ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT WITHIN UNIVERSITIES

Organisationally, universities could adopt and institute the notion of global citizenship in a way that aligns with their organisational ethos. Some are beginning to do so. However, according to Lilley, “there are significant organisational challenges that would need to be addressed before the global citizen can be effectively enacted as an organisational and educational principle in universities”.

There are significant organisational constraints but there are also significant organisational enablers.

CONSTRAINTS FALL INTO AT LEAST SEVEN CATEGORIES:

Leadership / commitment / governance

While not seeking to be exhaustive, a number of issues require consideration. At a very general level, there is sometimes a tension between university corporate responsibilities, managerial imperatives and the social purposes of universities. This tension is normal and university leaders and governing bodies are generally alert to and profess to manage the balance between the public good and the exigencies of running and maintaining a complex organisation.

The desire for values neutrality

As mentioned above, the issue of core university values – in the guise of wanting to teach how to think, rather than what to think – might occasionally become a barrier in the minds of some in the academy in coming to grips with educating for global citizenship. On the other hand, the benefits of global citizenship are generally understood and accepted by most in the academy and issues of potential conflict of values are likely for the most part to be surmounted.

Student and parent expectations of learning

Higher education is often perceived instrumentally by parents and students as a means to achieve a desired career and employment (i.e. a private rather than a public good).
The issue of persuading parents and students about the importance of broadening student-learning expectations in preparation for global complexity would need to be addressed.

Curriculum overload, staff workload and teacher capabilities
Curricula are already perceived to be full and the inclusion of, or requirement to include, topics addressing issues of global citizenship may be resisted by some in the academy. More fundamentally, some academic staff may be unprepared for and lack confidence in teaching controversial issues (Davis, 2006).

Pedagogy
In teaching for global citizenship there is sometimes a tendency to focus on learning about what a global citizen is and/or learning how to become one rather than understanding that young people are already global citizens in important respects. Orthodox pedagogy may be a barrier to students learning through their experience as global citizens (Guevara, 2013:238).

Depth of academic understanding/ownership
While increasingly universities are adopting global citizenship as a graduate attribute, it is by no means clear that academic staff generally understand what this means, or act appropriately in terms of their teaching and curricula. Moreover, there is real doubt whether many academic staff are even aware of the institutional rhetoric.

This raises multiple issues, in particular how to engage academics to understand, accept and engage with the notion of global citizenship learning. This might be easier in some disciplines such as the humanities and social sciences where the idea of the global is already in existence to some extent.

But it will be a greater challenge in other disciplines, possibly mostly so in the technical fields, less so possibly in health, the sciences and agriculture. There will be a challenge to educate the educators about global citizenship. Many in fact may not care or simply believe it’s someone else’s responsibility.

Resource constraints
It may be that significant efforts by universities to broaden, deepen and accelerate programs for global citizenship and global competence will have substantial resource implications. Competing priorities mean that a strategic decision may need to be taken by university leaders for an institution to raise global citizenship up in the order of institutional priorities. On the other hand, the extent to which a university’s goals in this space could be achieved without too many additional resources could not be considered by the symposium and would warrant a closer investigation.

ENABLERS ARE LIKELY TO INCLUDE:

A reflexive, cosmopolitan leadership
University thought leaders who are able to mediate reflexively between cosmopolitan ideals and narrower managerial responsibilities hold the key to promoting and supporting global citizen education across university strategic and operational processes and practices.

Recognising the global citizen
Some research suggests that it might be possible to develop an “identikit” of the global citizen to make the concept more accessible to students and to educators (Lilley, 2014). See Figure 4 (p.24). Learning activities could be based on the congruent aims espoused in the identikit. This issue is discussed below in the following section relating to curricula, learning and teaching.

Reframing the global citizen as the employee in demand
As indicated previously, Asian capabilities and employer identified soft skills (including resilience) are consistent with the global citizen markers and manifestations identified by Lilley, et. al (2014). Again, time did not allow for deeper consideration of this important issue. Further investigation and discourse are required in order to chart a way forward and to successfully synthesise the twin goals of global citizenship and employability.

Socially embedding the global citizen
Social embeddedness is a systemic process that spans the university ethos and practice. For example, it filters into human resource strategies for recruitment, performance management and promotion.

1 As Lilley points out, introducing new approaches to student learning could be a challenge. “In an environment where students are the ‘consumer’ and teaching quality is measured on student satisfaction, students’ expectations of learning may need to be reframed before they would embrace alternative approaches to teaching and learning. Similarly, public policy that promotes student satisfaction as an indicator of teaching quality may need to be reviewed in this situation. Out of the comfort zone learning may not always meet students’ immediate satisfaction. Changing students’ and parents’ expectations is an important enabler of global citizen learning” (Lilley 2014: 5).
“In this situation all university actors are accountable in some way for their contribution to the university ethos of social responsibility and global citizenship” (Lilley, 2014).

An example at a discipline level of how global citizenship learning could be integrated into an organisational framework, as well as a teaching and learning plan, was provided to symposium participants but not explicitly discussed. The framework example warrants testing for its validity, usability and effectiveness and, if warranted, replicated in due course for other disciplines.
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1. There are significant organisational challenges that would need to be addressed before the global citizen could be effectively enacted as an organisational and educational principle in universities.

2. There are identifiable organisational constraints and enablers requiring closer consideration and analysis to determine their role and, in the case of enablers, their most effective use.

“There is no escaping that we live in a highly globalised world. Some people talk about the world which is highly compressed, others talk about a world in which geography is dead.”

Zlatko Skrbiš (2014)
Without underestimating the leadership and governance issues for education institutions, global citizenship education is at heart a curriculum, learning and teaching issue.

Research on which decisions about global citizenship and global competence education are being made is growing. But, as Wierenga (2013:2) notes in relation to schools, “given the prominence of global citizenship in national and state education policies ... surprisingly few models of effective programs for global citizenship education are being published for educators to draw on”.

At one level, the abstract nature of the concept of global citizenship makes it difficult to clearly drive curriculum policy (Davies, 2006). This is as true for higher education as it is of schools, although the conditions (constraints and enablers) are different in important respects.

Issues in development of global citizenship curricula vary of courses across disciplines, as they do in the case, for example, of internationalisation of the curriculum (IOC). This needs to be taken into account in making progress with global citizenship education.

The symposium noted a range of other questions and issues that need to be taken into account in curriculum development of curricula for global citizenship learning:

1. What should the content of curricula be? What exactly is to be taught?
2. Related to this, what qualities exactly are to be expected of graduates? If both hard and soft skills, what exactly?
3. What exactly are the desired curricula outcomes? How would we know if curricula have achieved the desired objectives?
4. How important would changes in behavioural outcomes be? How would we know about these? When would we know? How would we measure what are likely to be a variety and possibly a spectrum of outcomes? When should measures be applied? Short term? Long term?
5. What curriculum initiatives are needed to better integrate outbound student mobility experiences and global citizenship and global competence learning?
6. Is an overseas mobility experience necessary to foster global citizenship among students, or can global citizenship education succeed by providing curriculum based mobility-like experiences?
7. How far might it be possible for students gain global experience through new communications technologies?
8. Global citizenship may be viewed by some in the academy as a personal value, an extraneous objective beyond the province or responsibility of curricula.

Analysis of a wide range of research presented in the symposium discussion papers throws light on some of these questions and issues. However, the symposium discussion did not analyse in any detailed manner the points of view that emerge from the research, and certainly did not attempt to agree a position on them. However, a number of possible future directions for addressing the curriculum, learning and teaching issues are apparent.

It is clearly a challenge to translate such an abstract notion as global citizenship into deliverable curricula and to assess learning outcomes. Traditionally, research has tended to focus on the use of validated scales in the attempt to measure change in behaviours. However, an increasing number of researchers are describing global citizenship as a learning process (Jones, 2013; Lilley, Barker, & Harris, 2014; Savicki & Selby, 2008; Schattle, 2008). See also Figure 1 (p.22). If learning for global citizenship is a process, global citizens can develop and present in many different ways. This perspective is consistent with Rizvi (2009), who explains cosmopolitan learning as an ongoing process of ‘becoming’ and throws the issue of measurement of change in a different light.

---

1 ‘Education for global citizenship’ and the ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ (IoC) overlap but are not the same thing. IoC may be one vehicle for developing global citizenship but it is not the only way.
Global citizen learning is depicted as a cell, and represents the unified way that the facilitators of change (on the left) and manifestations of change (on the right) feed into and are fed by the nucleus of the global mindset. Ongoing feedback loops and spirals integrally link the segments of this model. The capacities of the global mindset (social imaginary, reflexivity, relationality and criticality) can be thought of as the ‘tools and fuel’ for the process of global citizen learning. Lilley, et. al. (2014)

In respect of the issue of soft and hard (“critical”) global citizenship education, Andreotti (2006:47) schematises some key differences between the two (Figure 2). Andreotti goes on to suggest that soft frameworks can be important starting points for learning but that critical conceptualisations are also likely to be necessary “to enable young people in an interconnected world to more fully comprehend the point of global citizenship education rather than simply to access leadership and personal development training”.

With respect to the issue of the necessity of travel, Lilley suggests that student transformation need not be ‘a once in a lifetime event’, contingent on physical mobility. According to Lilley, there is potential to develop global citizens in universities by providing mobility comparable experiences. Research offers insight to (1) the types of learning that could foster global citizen learning ‘at home’ (2) the student mindset and (3) how particular global citizen markers could be recognised in higher education students (Lilley, Barker and Harris).

According to Lilley, the conditions for learning that provide students with repetitions of intercultural and ‘out of the comfort zone’ experiences ‘at home’ could be designed. Integrating global citizen capacities into learning would involve curriculum designers taking account of four thinking tools outlined in Figure 3 (p.23) – social imaginary, criticality, reflexivity and relationality – all capacities of ‘a global mindset’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soft global citizenship education</th>
<th>Critical global citizenship education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Poverty, helplessness</td>
<td>Inequality, injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for caring</td>
<td>Common humanity / being good</td>
<td>Justice / complicity in harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds for action</td>
<td>Humanitarian / moral</td>
<td>Political / ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Andreotti, 2006:47)
**Figure 3 Integrating global citizen capacities into learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINKING TOOLS</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social imaginary</td>
<td>Way to mentally deal with intercultural challenges, ambiguity and complexity. Encourage students to imagine what it is like to be the ‘other’. Be able to imagine and consider other possibilities and perspectives beyond the way things have always been socially, locally and globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticality</td>
<td>Critically reflecting on our own perspectives and reflecting on the assumptions of others. Learn to critically understand difference. Be comfortable challenging the ‘known’. Be able to ask ‘why’, ‘what for’ and the ‘what if’ of ‘change’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>Be able to challenge our own assumptions. Be able to embrace and learn from engagement with different others. Be open to critically explore the thoughts and actions of different others and diverse contexts in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationality</td>
<td>Think about others in relation to ourselves rather than completely separate. Be able to walk in their shoes. Think about how they may see us. How does this new line of thinking challenge our understanding of the ‘known’?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from: Rizvi (2009) and Marginson and Sawir (2011)

Research suggests that the learning capacities of the global citizen could be fostered in existing curricula through contextual learning activities. Central to global citizen learning is a student engaging with their ongoing ‘sense of self’ (Killick, 2012) and identity self-formation (Marginson, 2013), as they grapple with increasingly complex and contested concepts, constructs, and situations. The aim would be for global citizen learning to become a ‘way of thinking’ and ‘habit of mind’ for students to engage locally and globally (Lilley, et.al, 2014).

This is particularly relevant as the benefits of such a mindset are linked to the soft skills that employers desire (Jones, 2013). The identikit markers devised by Lilley for the global citizen (Figure 4, p.24) overlap significantly with the soft skills employers seek.

Clearly, the aspirations of universities to educate global citizens and to prepare work ready graduates are congruent in important ways.
Figure 4  AN ‘IDENTIKIT’ OF MARKERS FOR THE GLOBAL CITIZEN: BROAD MARKERS FOR THE GLOBAL CITIZEN

Leaves comfort zone
- Shows courage to go on a mobility experience
- Shows courage by taking on challenges locally
- Mixes beyond social peers
- Engages and works with different ‘others’
- Engages in learning activities ‘out of the comfort zone’

Thinks differently
- Uses moral and ethical reasoning in problem solving
  - Questions assumptions
- Imagines other perspectives and possibilities
- Shows awareness of self and others
- Makes the interconnections of knowledge across complex local /global constructs
- Recognises common humanity and environmental sustainability

Engages beyond immediate circle of peers, family and friends
- Engages with social and cultural others
- Shows ‘language pain tolerance’ (patience, empathy and willingness to understand different accents and limited language skills)
- Assists others (cosmopolitan hospitality)

Shows a mature attitude and initiative
- Volunteers in, serves and participates in community activities

Considers self, life, others and career, and the world beyond narrow expectations
- Has life and career goals
- Takes positive steps towards achieving goals.

The Lilley identikit of global citizenship markers has the potential of making the concept accessible, understandable, achievable and measurable for academics and students.

A number of researchers have identified good practice examples and key principles of effective global citizenship education initiatives in schools and to a lesser extent to date in higher education.

These include:

1. The Global Connections program, with its focus on youth-led learning, sustained connections between young people through meaningful relationships, cultivated shared ownership of issues, enabled purposeful action and duration and endurance over time (Wierenga, 2013).


3. The role both ‘formal and non-formal education channels play in exposing young people to global issues’, and the interplay between them that warrants further exploration (ACFID 2012:5)

4. The suggestion that approaches to teaching global interconnectivity should begin with the local, help students come to terms with their situatedness in the world, aim to develop transcultural collaborations and emphasise criticality, reflexivity and relationality (Rizvi (2011).

Clearly, there is a need for a comprehensive and critical analysis of current good practice examples in schools and universities and the key principles underpinning them. Such an analysis is fundamental to properly informing future curriculum design and future learning and teaching for global citizenship and global competence.

Source: Lilley (2014)
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1. The research base on which decisions about global citizenship and global competence education might be made is growing.

2. However, surprisingly few models of effective programs for global citizenship education are being published and disseminated for educators to draw on.

3. Useful conceptualisations and models of global citizenship learning and teaching are beginning to emerge from the research. Some shows promise of linking the aspirations and goals of universities, students and employers.

4. The symposium did not analyse in any detailed manner the points of view that emerge from the research, and certainly did not attempt to agree a position on them. However, a number of possible future directions for addressing the curriculum, learning and teaching issues are apparent.

5. There is a need for a comprehensive and critical analysis of current good practice examples in schools and universities and the key principles underpinning them.

DIVERSITY OF THE STUDENT BODY AND INEQUALITIES OF STUDENT EXPERIENCE

It is problematic to assume that global citizenship is a single, simple objective applicable to all students. Australian university students are not a homogenous group. There are significant socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, religious, linguistic, geographical/locational differences, not overlooking the additional fact that international students make up over 20 per cent of the undergraduate student cohort in Australian universities (in some universities the proportion exceeds 30 per cent).

Moreover, there are sure to be significant inequalities in student experience of the global. Inequality of student prior exposure to the global will be determined by values, family income, educational background, expectations of parents and prior overseas travel experience.

These differences, especially in terms of student identity and circumstance, imply that the notion of global citizenship will be received by different students in quite different ways. Attentiveness and receptivity to the notion will vary. And this is only the starting point. The shaping of global citizenship education must take this into account.

More positively, the differences also have important implications for the potential conversion of different past experiences into the fuel for global citizen learning for all students. This is especially true of the global and cultural capital that international students bring to the classroom. International students should be seen as co-constructors of knowledge and skills in the classroom.
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1. Differences in student circumstance and experience all impact on how education for global citizenship and global competence should be shaped and delivered.
While the symposium sought to identify and understand the issues, it also sought to take the matter forward by identifying possible future actions. The symposium rapporteur, Professor Richard James, offered a number of possible action points for consideration.

While the notions of global citizenship and global competence for higher education students are increasingly reflected in university languages, there is still a sense that they may be perceived as superficial, parenthood statement. Given the complex exigencies faced universities they are not top priorities. If there is a desire, as there clearly is, to accelerate the momentum towards these desired academic goals, to make them inescapable and to gain real traction, they need to be brought much closer to the central structural (management and business) concerns and operations of universities.

One way of doing so would be to embed them within institutional KPIs, especially academic leaders and units (especially deans of faculties and heads of schools). It will be important not to become too conflicted by the meaning of terms. Higher order intellectual skills, such as the notion of global citizenship entails, are much harder to define than other skills universities seek to impart to students.

Obsessive focus on the terminology is likely to result in diminishing returns. We should live with the uncertainties and have a higher tolerance of the ambiguities at the discipline level where the task of dealing with these ideas is fundamentally located.

At the same time, to succeed it will be necessary to try to impart global citizenship and global competence for students in much more experiential and diverse ways, “to facilitate multiple forms of wallowing by our students”.

The skills and values involved cannot be taught or assessed in a conventional sense and can only be acquired and demonstrated as attained over time. Ideas such as global citizenship are best seen as colonising other areas of academic endeavour, insinuating their way in. That does not mean however that we shouldn’t attempt to devise pedagogical models that best suit the task.

In the real world of universities there are clear resource implications, in terms of money, time, effort and patience. The task might best be framed in terms of “what might we do to improve the trajectory of our attempts to facilitate our students becoming global citizens with global skills?”

The next steps obviate mapping out a logical way forward towards innovative policy, programs and practices in higher education institutions, government and business and industry.

There is clearly a difficulty inherent in describing, teaching, reporting on and assessing global citizenship and global competence initiatives in universities. It will be difficult to come to grips with and tackle the large number of issues located as they across the provinces of university life – governance, leadership, management, teaching, learning and pedagogy and student experience – without some agreed framework for action1.

---

1 The UK Higher Education Academy in 2014 released an Internationalisation Framework that although not exactly suitable is analogous to and offers pointers to the type of framework that could be developed within the Australian context [https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/workstreams-research/themes/internationalisation/internationalisationframework].
ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF AN ACTION FRAMEWORK FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITIES
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1. A student centred approach. Student identity should be the starting point, recognising and building on what students already believe and do. The locus for action would involve multiple challenges, not least being the curricula, including the weight of curriculum expectations within courses and on students.

2. Supportive signals for government in terms of public policy.

3. Sound and supportive institutional strategy and policy without which practice will not be affected.


5. Agreement to facilitate and support student led initiatives as the key to success.

6. The successful engagement of academic staff to support and help drive initiatives.

7. The effective engagement of business and industry in the task.

8. An inbuilt measurement/audit mechanism aligned to the variety of initiatives that are likely to be required, to measure outputs and, critically, outcomes.

There are multiple issues to be taken into account in formulating any action program (see below). The effort should be comprehensive, but should not be too ambitious. The task is to perceptively identify and work on critical, touchstone issues for all stakeholders. Timeliness of particular actions must also be assessed.

Some fundamental issues to be taken into account in formulating any action program:

- Is it realistic to propose that universities will be prepared to move beyond terminological differences and engage with a cosmopolitan global citizen agenda?

- How realistic is it for the disciplines to utilise ‘out of the comfort zone’ and intercultural encounters and relationships in learning activities?

- Would it be possible for university leaders: a) to map a way forward for balancing corporate responsibilities and cosmopolitan aims and b) to promote and organisationally support the translation of the global citizen aim into a curricula outcome?

- Could universities set the relativism of values aside and take a more explicit approach to values-based education?

- Could parent and student expectations of learning be re-framed to accommodate global citizen learning? Would alternative approaches to promotion and marketing work?

- How could we build on the scattered examples of existent, successful initiatives such as those that focus on youth-led learning, or that account for informal as well as formal environments and techniques, for developing critical global citizenship education?

- What policy and program initiatives would best build from young people’s needs to balance the two implicit agendas in global citizenship education: preparation for the global economy and global social action? Relatedly, how can we draw on young people’s interest in both self-achievement (of global competencies) and social commitment (to global issues) as parallel drivers for global citizenship?

- How can programs best serve the range of young people who are coming into higher education, given differences and inequalities in experiences of the global?

- How can we develop better understandings of where the ‘global’ is for youth, encompassing the idea that the global is not simply ‘out there’ but also ‘at home’, and how can relationality (and criticality) be better taught in this context?

- In Australia, there is growing recognition that we need to partner with educators and organisations in the Asia-Pacific region to construct co-learning experiences, but how is this best done?

- We need to facilitate a cultural transition amongst university staff on global citizenship

- If young Australians are already globally aware and active, what role is there for education? Perhaps the focus should be not on developing but on fostering the existing global citizenship in youth. How do we do this?

- Achieving global citizenship for students should be built into the KPIs of faculties and faculty leaders, so that it becomes inescapable in higher education.

- There is a need to achieve step change, not incremental change. At the same time, change needs to be at scale.

- In order to drive change in universities, it is important to integrate the commercial social dimensions (hard and soft skills) of global citizenship and global competence learning.
CRITICAL RESEARCH NEEDS

The identification and interrogation of the research evidence on which sound and effective decision making must be based was a focus of the symposium. The evidence base is clear in some regards, but patchy and does not link idea and practice.

There is especially a lack of research on how to embed global citizenship in education practice (curriculum and pedagogy). One significant outcome of the symposium was the identification of critical future research needs:

1. A comprehensive review and evaluation of global citizenship education programs that are available internationally and locally, to ascertain what is in place and what is successful. Some possible case examples include the Oxford University Resource Centre, “the Shed”; the Boston University “The Societal Engineer” course.

2. Further research on young people’s own views and practices regarding global citizenship and their own principles for global citizenship education.

3. Research to develop a comprehensive understanding of the market for global citizenship education in the Australian higher education context, including both domestic students and the international student cohort.

4. Research on the behaviours various stakeholders (education institutions, governments, employers) might want to see in global citizens and how these might be measured.

5. Research to explore learning experiences that take students ‘out of their comfort zone’, away from their social peers and begin effectively to engage in intercultural learning ‘at home’, to foster transformative learning, critical and ethical thinking, and a global citizen disposition.
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The existing research base needs to be improved and a set of priority future research agreed and undertaken if education for global citizenship and global competence among Australian higher education students and associated public policy is to be sound and effective.
### SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ACTIONS

A number of key messages and outcomes emerged from the symposium. These reflect the considered views of industry about how policy and practice reflecting how education for global citizenship and global competence should be viewed and further enhanced. For the most part, they are widely and strongly supported and are a clear pointer to future action, at institutional, sector and industry-wide levels.

The symposium’s key messages are contained in the three discussion papers and this Outcomes Report. These resources should be read in conjunction with one another and are available at www.ieaa.org.au/global-citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY ACTION</th>
<th>HOW?</th>
<th>WHO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop a framework for thinking and action about global citizenship and global competence education</td>
<td>Action-oriented project, drawing on international examples</td>
<td>Higher education leaders in concert with other stakeholders. Of possible interest to the Office for Learning and Teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Identify good practice in educating for global citizenship and global competence | Critical evaluation of Australian and international higher education practices and exemplars covering such matters as:  
- Curricula/pedagogy and the informal curriculum  
- Combined soft and hard skills  
- Institutional governance  
- ‘Light house’ projects  
- Step change success  
- Student-centred, student-led approaches  
- Success in deepening the partnerships between higher education and business | Research leader and team. Of possible interest to the Office for Learning and Teaching. |
| 3. Maintain professional interest and momentum in development of global citizenship and global competence education. | IEAA Special Interest Groups (Internationalisation of the Curriculum and Student Mobility) could consider the possibility of establishing an interest network in this field.  
Professional Development initiatives  
The International Education Research Network (IERN) involvement in future priority research (see below). | IEAA, possibly in conjunction with Australian Department of Education. |
| 4. Commission and undertake priority research | See Critical Research Needs (p.28) | Research leaders in conjunction with Australian and State government agencies and funding bodies |
CONCLUSION

Higher education institutions will continue to be impelled to respond to global forces that include increasing interaction and interdependence between countries and regions, diverse communities and societies, as well as to rapidly changing local and global workforce needs.

Fresh ideas and innovative approaches to higher education are needed to develop universities’ organisational capacity for educating professionals and citizens with the knowledge, disposition and capabilities for intelligent and interconnected thinking – that is to produce ‘ideal global graduates’.

The task is a joint responsibility of governments, education institutions, employers and the broader generally. Recognition of this and clear and consistent messages, as well as practical programs of action are needed involving governments, employers and universities.

An agreed framework for future action is the top priority and should be the focus of follow up to the symposium. Such effort should be comprehensive, but should not be too ambitious. The task is to perceptively identify and work on critical, touchstone issues for all stakeholders. The timeliness of particular actions must also be assessed.
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FOSTERING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND GLOBAL COMPETENCE: A NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
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RACV Club, Melbourne
The concepts of “global citizenship” and “global competence” have gained increasing currency over the past 20 years. The term global citizenship, especially, is now routinely used in a wide range of political, social, cultural, economic, diplomatic and educational contexts.

There is also significant government interest in deepening Australia’s global engagement – particularly in the Asian region – through the business, industry, science, education and research sectors.

This outward focus is increasingly reflected in national policy and Australia’s political and public diplomacy. However, it is not altogether clear how best to express and embed global citizenship in various national enterprises – including education.

This one-day national symposium will bring focus to the discussion and critically examine what we mean by global citizenship and global competence for Australian higher education students.

IEAA acknowledges the financial and other support provided by the Australian Government Department of Education. The event is also supported by the Office for Learning and Teaching and the Victorian Department of State Development, Business and Innovation.
PROGRAM THEMES

- Coming to terms with cosmopolitanism, global citizenship and global competence
- Generation G – global connectedness and global responsibility
- Public policy and the global search for the global citizen
- Preparing students for global citizenship
- Fostering global citizenship and global competence among Australian higher education students – current practice and future directions.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

A number of discussion papers have been commissioned especially for the symposium to assist discussion.

AIMS

- Clarify the concepts of global citizenship and global competency within the higher education context
- Identify and disseminate current good practice
- Identify gaps in knowledge and future priority research
- Accelerate the momentum and facilitate innovative policy, programs and practice by government and higher education institutions.

TARGET AUDIENCE

Participants include higher education teaching and research staff, executive managers, students, government policy makers, education peak bodies and business and industry representatives.
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## PART A:
**WHAT DO WE UNDERSTAND BY GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND GLOBAL COMPETENCE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>REGISTRATION</td>
<td>TEA / COFFEE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.00am  | INTRODUCTION                                                            | MR. DENNIS MURRAY  
Director, MG International;  
Senior Honorary Fellow, LH Martin Institute,  
The University of Melbourne |
| 9.05am  | WELCOME                                                                 | MR. BRETT BLACKER  
Vice-President, IEAA;  
Director International,  
The University of Newcastle |
| 9.10am  | AIMS & OBJECTIVES                                                        | PROFESSOR FAZAL RIZVI  
Melbourne Graduate School of Education,  
The University of Melbourne |
| 9.15am  | PROMOTING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INITIATIVES             | DR. DON MARKWELL  
Senior Advisor on Higher Education  
to the Australian Minister of Education |
| 9.45am  | DISCUSSION PAPER 1: Coming to Terms with Cosmopolitanism, Global Citizenship and Global Competence  
Followed by Q&A | PROFESSOR ZLATKO SKRIBI  
Professor of Sociology and Vice-Provost (Graduate Education), Monash University |
| 10.30am | MORNING TEA                                                              |                                                                         |
| 11.00am | DISCUSSION PAPER 2: Generation G, Global Connectedness & Global Responsibility  
Followed by Q&A | ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR ANITA HARRIS  
Australian Research Council (ARC) Future Fellow,  
School of Social Sciences, Monash University  
MR. ROB LAWRENCE – DISCUSSANT  
Director, Prospect Research & Marketing |
| 11.45am | PANEL DISCUSSION: Work & the Search for Global Competence               | MR. ANDREW SMITH – FACILITATOR  
Vice President (Engagement),  
Swinburne University of Technology  
MS. SALLY CAPP  
Head of Markets, Victoria, KPMG  
MR. DEBNATH GUHAROY  
Victorian Chair,  
Australia-Indonesia Business Council  
DR. SHARON WINOCUR  
Executive Director,  
Business Higher Education Round Table |
| 12.30pm | LUNCH                                                                   |                                                                         |
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PART B:  
FOSTERING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AMONG  
AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.30pm| DISCUSSION PAPER 3: Educating Global Citizens: Translating the ‘idea’ into University Organisational Practice | DR. KATHLEEN LILLEY  
Contract Researcher, Griffith University |
|       | Followed by Q&A                                                          |                                                                          |
| 2.15pm| PANEL DISCUSSION: Current Practice and Future Directions: Views of Higher Education Institutions | PROFESSOR PREM RAMBURUTH – FACILITATOR  
President, Academic Board, The University of New South Wales  
PROFESSOR RICHARD BAKER  
Pro-Vice Chancellor (Student Experience), Australian National University  
EMERITUS PROFESSOR JOAN COOPER  
Higher Education Consultant  
EMERITUS PROFESSOR HELMUT LUECKENHAUSEN  
Executive Dean, Faculty of Design, Think Education Group, Laureate International Universities  
MR. DANNY ONG  
PhD Student, Monash University  
MS. DEANNA TAYLOR  
President, National Union of Students  
DR. LY TRAN  
Senior Lecturer, School of Education, Deakin University |
| 3.30pm| AFTERNOON TEA                                                            |                                                                          |
| 4.00pm| RAPPORTEUR                                                               | PROFESSOR RICHARD JAMES  
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Equity and Student Engagement) and Director Centre for Studies of Higher Education (CSHE), The University of Melbourne |
| 4.30pm| CONCLUSION: WHERE TO FROM HERE?                                           | MR. DENNIS MURRAY                                                       |
| 5.00pm| NETWORKING DRINKS                                                        |                                                                          |
| 6.00pm| FINISH                                                                   |                                                                          |
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Contact us

IEAA Secretariat
P.O. Box 12917
A’Beckett Street
Melbourne VIC 8006
Australia
+61 3 9925 4579
admin@ieaa.org.au