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INTRODUCTION

"Internationalization" has moved from higher education buzzword to headline news. No longer are universities making incremental steps toward building their campuses for the 21st century. Some, report the New York Times and Newsweek, are building ambitious global franchises, with a "network" of scattered campuses and satellite hubs.

These ventures are decidedly West to East. Duke University in Kunshan, China; Yale University in Singapore; New York University in Abu Dhabi. The proposed and realized "education cities" in Dubai, Qatar, South Korea, and Hong Kong are other examples.

While this branching out is no doubt important, it does not represent the only blueprint for internationalization – even within those institutions. There are many definitions of internationalization, and a tremendous variety of approaches. The system of internationalization in the U.S. reflects, in some ways, its system of higher education – diverse, fairly independent, and stratified in terms of human and physical resources.

This report summarizes a gathering of senior administrators from smaller liberal arts colleges and universities, convened under the auspices of the Association of International Education Administrators (www.aieaworld.org). Together, the group examined alternative approaches to "sustained global commitments." Brandeis University, a small private research university in Waltham, Massachusetts, hosted the event. Twenty-two senior international officers (SIOs), deans, directors, associate directors and faculty joined us for one and a half days of intensive plenary sessions. Sessions were divided into topics chosen by participants during the application stage.

SESSION SUMMARIES

The Forum was set up as a set of five plenary sessions, each led by a facilitator from one of the planning institutions. Each session featured three to four initial comments from participants, followed by open discussion.

Session One: Defining sustained global commitments

During the opening session, facilitated by Daniel Terris (Brandeis University), it was quickly evident that "sustained global commitments" has meaning beyond a physical presence abroad. For many smaller colleges and universities, it means an interconnected web of relationships both on the home campus and beyond. Since smaller institutions tend to be decentralized, participants repeatedly noted how much "relationships matter." Several participating institutions have been successful by cultivating partnerships between offices, units, and schools, and by working patiently with overseas partners. April Burriss (Endicott College), Jenifer Cushman (Juniata College), and Joel Harrington (Vanderbilt University) served as commenters, offering three different models from their institutions.

Session Two: The special role of the liberal arts

This wide-ranging session, facilitated by Joseph Tullbane (St. Norbert College), set the tone for the Forum. The liberal arts model of higher education is based on interactive teaching and critical thinking, with the lofty goal of instilling knowledge and changing attitudes in students. In essence, liberal arts colleges seek to transform their students into morally-conscious adults. This is similar to the ideal goal of internationalization, which also pushes students to think critically about the world around them – yet the two concepts are not always linked structurally or intellectually.

Commenters Rebecca Howe (Smith College) and Bernd Widdig (Boston College) offered examples of these tensions, synergies, and discussions from their own institutions.

Participants thus pushed for a greater link between global and liberal education, hoping that the former could help rejuvenate the latter. When aligning these two areas, it is crucial to have developed networks of cross-campus partnership – especially between offices of international education, diversity, experiential learning and civic engagement, and between academic departments and curriculum committees. While some participants have a rich history of such collaboration (such as at Juniata College), others are often hampered by the history of how different offices and structural reporting lines have traditionally related to one another. The result is a faculty and key players who are often divorced from each other – exactly where and when synergies are most needed. While there are obvious benefits to incorporating international aspects into the liberal arts...
mission and vision

"is it our job to internationalize the campus or to americanize the world?"
- forum participant

curriculum, significant challenges also arise. Universities are notoriously conservative and slow to change, and thus to some an “opening up” of the liberal arts—both in form and content—can seem threatening or overwhelming. At one participating institution, a faculty and trustee retreat that examined the future of higher education led some faculty to renounce distance-learning and virtual partnership models (often associated with internationalization) in favor of traditional classroom teaching.

In addition to these reactions there are difficult questions of assessment and student learning: what proof do we have that students are really learning more or more effectively when the liberal arts curriculum is internationalized, and what do we want them to learn? Despite exploding research on internationalization and study abroad, these are core questions that have been largely unaddressed by the field.

For some participants, the liberal arts also mean a more practical commitment—to educational access, diversity, and equality. Commenter Skye Stephenson (Keene State College) challenged the group to think in terms of local populations, and the needs of local students. This sometimes produces “creative tensions” in the liberal arts—tensions between internationalism and “the many years of struggle for racial diversity at home,” between global and local civic engagement, and between traditional notions of assessment. Carlos Vega (Wellesley College) reiterated the ideal of equality and access. “The greatest concern is money,” he said, pointing to the common belief that global education costs more. He urged participants to focus on how to align the demographics of international education with the new demographics of higher education in general. This means focusing on reducing costs, but also on bridging the “significant gaps” in knowledge of international education practice between internationalization leaders and the faculty.

Session Three: Partnering with overseas institutions

It is easy to lose focus on the big picture when pursuing an aggressive internationalization strategy. Committee meetings and internal politics can dictate actions. Meetings with potential partners often seem like “dating” rather than a dialogue about mutual university and societal benefits. The Forum participants were concerned with seeing the forest for the trees. By and large, they have pursued more focused partnership strategies in recent years, centering efforts on a smaller number of core partnerships rather than large databases and file drawers of meaningless university-to-university agreements. Led by facilitator April Burris (Endicott College), participants identified four key challenges to forming sustainable partnerships: the desire to follow trends that have worked for other institutions and keep up with peers; choosing partners for prestige rather than institutional fit; differing support and academic expectations at partner institutions; and the legal and practical challenges of partnering.

Commenters Joel Harrington (Vanderbilt University), George Generas (University of Hartford), and Burris focused on these issues, explaining how their respective institutions have tried to tackle these problems by focusing on core relationships, and by combining “top-down” leadership with “bottom-up” support. Commenters Diana Davies (Princeton University) and Bryan McAllister-Grande (Brandeis University), meanwhile, focused on issues of equity and mission, outlining how higher education leaders might reposition partnerships to embody the very values that we want students to learn.

Participants outlined a number of adjustments that might be made to address these issues:

- Tie partnerships to institutional history, mission, and values, and make sure partnerships are tied to the both institutions’ central activities.
- Establish and follow a proposal, pilot, and evaluation process to ascertain the probable success of programs before developing full partnerships.
- Give priority to those partnerships that are built in bilateral and exchange fashion, and which have the greatest likelihood of “equal” exchange.
- Create a dialogue, centered in both institutions and between them, about how the partnership can build capacity and growth for core activities: teaching, research, service, and strong institutional culture.
- Invite senior leadership to actually visit the sites and engage with students. This includes not only presidents but also deans, staff members, faculty, and even trustees.
- Guide faculty to participate by showing how partnership opportunities can positively affect their teaching and research.
- Utilize global alumni connections to the partner and partner communities to create a buzz around campus, utilize local knowledge, and develop alumni leadership in new ways.
Session Four: Challenges of senior international officers, from vision to bottom line

This session, facilitated by Rebecca Hovey (Smith College), examined the senior international officer’s (SIO) job description. The job description in small colleges and universities is difficult to nail down – depending on the institution, the “senior international officer” may also be the director of study abroad, a member of the senior administration or administrative team, a dean, or a faculty member. Reporting lines are often blurred, characterized by “dots” and informal collaborations more than rigid “lines” and structures. To effectively internationalize, good SIOs must often cross departmental and office lines, sometimes bumping up against traditional structures. Our participants noted that the day-to-day reality of their jobs defies neat description; in reality, they are often “cheerleaders,” “opportunists,” and “facilitators” rolled into one. Because there is seldom an established blueprint for internationalization, SIOs at small colleges and universities are constantly inventing new ideas or pushing colleagues to think in new ways. The cycle seems never-ending, a characteristic that leads to excitement and rejuvenation as well as overwork and exhaustion.

SIOs help define and explain internationalization. Rarely are they explicitly told what it is and what it should be. As such, our discussion ranged from job descriptions to the proper place of internationalization as a force in higher education. SIOs operate within a kind of microcosm of the entire campus, what one participant called a “shadow operation.” They must generate and sustain interest and cooperation from the president, senior administration, deans, faculty, student affairs staff, alumni, trustees, students, and many other constituents. And they must be quick on their feet – a definition of internationalization delivered to one faculty member may not be exactly the same as that delivered to another.

Commenters Daniel Terris (Brandeis University), Joseph Tullbane (St. Norbert College), and Robin Melavain (Colleges of the Fenway) shared their thoughts on their role and institutional structures. One common tension was that of when and if to “declare victory.” If internationalization is an initiative within higher education, when does it end? While SIOs may strive to ensure it never ends, others may want to reach specific targets. Global dimensions can then be taken for granted, or seen as competing with other initiatives and priorities. The irony is that even success can sometimes lead to the very marginalization SIOs are hoping to avoid – “we’ve done that” is sometimes a refrain heard from senior administrators and faculty.

Commenters and participants offered creative methods for navigating these challenges and sustaining progress. At the Colleges of the Fenway, Princeton University, and Vanderbilt University, interactive databases are being created to allow faculty members to build their own online profiles, lists of international connections, and travel abroad plans. At Endicott College, April Burriss has successfully lobbied to sit on search committees for new faculty members; questions regarding global teaching and research are now more engrained in the search and review process, even when she can’t be present.

Funding and financial models were also discussed, and deserved their own session or entire seminar. Financial models at smaller colleges and universities are as diverse as the colleges themselves. Some institutions have experimented with new, self-funding, “enterprise” models typically associated with larger universities, while others have relied on historic exchange programs as a way of limiting costs. The following general trends might be observed:

- Study abroad and international education offices have increasingly moved to direct enrollment, consortia, and to some extent reciprocal exchanges, as ways of cutting costs. Third-party providers are then used primarily for specialty programs such as field experiences in developing countries. However, this model depends on numerous factors of quality control, institutional history, risk management, partnership development, etc. It also can increase the work and staff-load of the office.

- Some participating institutions have experimented with incentives and disincentives to drive students to lower-cost, high-quality programs. While most participating institutions use the “home-school tuition model” (students pay regular university tuition and usually carry their financial aid with them), they are experimenting by shifting the amount and type of financial aid that “travels” depending on the program selected. Institutions have also experimented with other types of incentives, like small grants to travel in the fall semester instead of spring.

- While fully self-funded models are still rare amongst smaller institutions, some kind of partial or creative funding movement has begun. Consortia agreements amongst like-minded institutions are increasing, which can allow for sharing on everything from staffing to marketing. Fundraising for international education has evolved, although it is still largely in the infant stages. Some offices successfully collaborated with the development office, while others have a dedicated staff member or staff liaison for development. One participating institution operates...
a self-funded international programs office, drawing some incoming funds from an ESL and cultural training institute that serves the local community.

Session Five: Creating and maintaining a strategy
The final session, facilitated by Joel Harrington (Vanderbilt University), served as a space for reflection. One participant commented that the event served as a kind of support group, that it was “energizing and inspiring to be with professionals who shared the same ideas.” While the discussion highlighted the need for shared sensibilities and principles, it also revealed the incredible range of topics and models available.

Commenter Sean Kaylor (Marist College) and Harrington summarized these developments as a kind of re-positioning of internationalization from its historically marginalized to central role in higher education. Although the strategy for that re-positioning may take different forms, they reiterated the importance of institutional mission, relationship-building, and methodical planning. “‘Sustainable’ programs must be financially viable, and they must be built piece by piece. SIOs sometimes best serve as interpreters, translating the various meanings of internationalization into a coherent set of goals and business plans. Here they must make difficult choices between opportunism and pure strategic planning, since universities are more risk-adverse and cash-strapped than ever before.

One experiment in bold programming, detailed by commenter Daniel Norton (Goucher College) provided an interesting case study. Goucher College is well-known for instituting a study abroad requirement for all of its students. While this strategic move has resulted in a positive shift in institutional culture, as well as benefits to admissions, it has also caused tensions for other related goals: integrating these experiences into the curriculum, decreasing costs, and encouraging sustained reflection. While one participant claimed that “internationalization is the answer” to every problem in higher education, others argued that we need to stop assuming it always is – and begin committing to niches and pathways that are truly sustainable.

OUTCOMES
Universities face a handful of choices when considering their internationalization strategy. The first option is to be parochial, which almost no university or college wants to be. A second choice focuses largely on the home campus and curriculum, in a set of initiatives sometimes called “internationalization at home” or “campus internationalization,” which eschew much focus on overseas partnerships and ventures. A third choice usually adopts some mix of campus internationalization and promising partnerships abroad. Finally, a fourth option, typically reserved for larger universities, includes large-scale overseas campuses, degree programs, and a large number of partnerships and exchanges. While simplistic, this classification also gives more weight than usual to the middle approaches, where a good deal of the variance and innovation is being generated.

What sustains our global commitments?
“The key question seems to be what commitments get internalized. Those of us around this table have, individually, internalized a commitment to global knowledge; now we’re trying to explore how to internalize it in our institutions.”
- Forum participant
While the AIEA Forum group did not reach conclusions about the “right” type of strategy, they focused on the similarities and synergies between two kinds of “sustained commitments” – those at home and those abroad. Although different, there were surprising overlaps in strategic thinking between these two kinds of commitments. This may be due to the particular nature of liberal arts colleges and universities, which were highly represented in our group. Do institutions with historic commitments to the liberal arts – and to the kind of thinking the liberal arts foster – share any similar experiences or a set of unified principles?

NEW DEFINITIONS OF THE LIBERAL ARTS

Liberal arts colleges and universities might have a special role to play in synthesizing commitments at home and those abroad, moving internationalization to the core of higher education.

But should international education move to the core? Participants noted a paradox: as global education moves from buzzword to commonplace, it becomes less exceptional. Is internationalization, instead, merely a part of what we do everyday as educators? International educators have always pushed for more recognition, more money, and more advancement of our field. Now that the importance of international education has been widely recognized, how do we plan for the future? The group thus wrestled with the exact place of the “global” in the trajectory of higher education. Key strategic questions included:

1. Should “global” be permeated throughout an institution, making it almost indistinguishable from teaching, research, and service? Or should it be distinct, specialized, and initiative-based, focusing on key ideas and learning opportunities? Should all students be exposed to global education, or just the select few who might be most affected?

2. Can global education “rejuvenate the idea of liberal arts,” as one of our participants hoped for? The group leaned toward the idea that it can, provided that the liberal arts be re-imagined as focusing on critical thinking, moral reasoning, and lifelong curiosity rather than on specific disciplines or knowledge of particular issues and content. Study abroad, these experts said, is only at its best when it asks students to shed expectations and to love learning for the sake of learning.

3. Is it now time to discard the old boundaries between “multicultural” and “global”? Participants raised a major challenge to sustaining our commitments: the sometimes conflicting missions of offices of diversity and offices of international education, or of offices of experiential/service learning and offices of international education. Several universities have experimented with unified centers, while others have succeeded by opening up dialogue and building relationships between these offices – recognizing that each office still serves a specific need of their student population.

Although the group did not have answers to these questions, they pushed for answering them from the organizing and intellectual framework of the liberal arts. Such a dialogue might allow for new, creative conceptions of older categories. As just one example, the traditional “junior year abroad” is now devolving into varied experiences throughout a college career, as well as exciting experimentation with pre-enrollment (gap year) and first-year general education courses. And at some participating institutions, university leaders and faculty have begun incorporating international students and exchange participants actively into courses, themed dorms, orientations, and integrative programming.

CHANGING DYNAMICS OF GLOBAL FLOWS

International partnerships were another major focus of the conversations in many of the sessions. The group attempted to tackle questions of university partnerships in relation to larger questions of global networks, knowledge flows, and mutuality. They drew upon their institutions’ historic commitments to social justice and civic engagement, asking how these older commitments can inform new projects.

While many institutions still have strong ties to Europe, global flows of knowledge and students are clearly moving West to East, with a strong focus on the Middle East and Asia. The group noted especially the rise of China as a source of international students and potential partnerships – in some cases creating entirely new student life dynamics on our campuses. Are other regions being left out in this process? What about sustained commitments in Africa or Latin America?

Forum participants posited that the pressure to internationalize sometimes dictate strategies, at the expense of larger societal concerns. Such strategies, ironically, might be moving us away from our core missions.
University leaders might address these concerns by:

- Developing a set of principles for international partnerships that draw upon institutional missions. These principles might include parameters for choosing regional strategies, partners, and projects based on internal and external factors.

- Focusing on a handful of core partnerships, each with multiple goals. This is the strategy being pursued by Vanderbilt University, with a strong emphasis on interdisciplinary research collaborations as well as broader university engagement. Endicott College also has key partnerships in Mexico and Spain that serve as sites for study abroad, degree-granting programs, and professional development.

- Considering geographic and academic diversity. When choosing partners, again refer back to the framework of the liberal arts. Ask: how will this partnership benefit the curriculum, and how will the partner institution’s curriculum and academic program benefit? Should we always choose partners based on prestige, trends, and market gain, or should other goals be considered?

Core partnerships might be complemented by broader regional, inter-regional, and global strategies. Of course, institutions should not ignore other beneficial, more informal relationships being formed for research, internships, study or other kinds of projects.

Several participants made the case that the advantages of more methodical, mission-based partnership strategy can trickle down to the entire campus, with the potential to transform core practices of the liberal arts. For example, sustained partnerships might allow for deeper student learning, especially if students visit the partnership site multiple times or experience the partner culture through courses and visits to the home campus.

**FINAL REFLECTIONS**

University leaders at small and medium sized institutions face unique challenges. Operating at a much different scale than their large university peers, they need to find ways to build a network for their global commitments that goes beyond the senior international officer, study abroad director, and a few faculty members. This network should take advantage of the expertise of those in the field, but likely cannot survive on their goodwill, hard work, and multitasking abilities alone.

Building this network takes time and energy, creativity, and willingness to do things differently – to try new ways of organizing and managing things, while staying true to institutional mission and vision. The comments of the participants demonstrated how important a culture of collaboration and cross-fertilization is. That culture can take years to build – or be catalyzed by the influx of new leadership and energy.

Given the range of challenges and opportunities that will be faced in the coming years – from large-scale global challenges and the astonishing growth of collaborative technologies to the increasing global/local connections – small and medium sized institutions must rely on the people in this network to build the liberal arts and small research universities of the future.

And, our participants suggested, they would do well to think beyond themselves, to step out of the confines of committee and board meetings and experience the world around them. This is the world that their students are experiencing and the world that institutions, too, are hoping to shape.
in a yearlong learning sequence devoted to issues
Marist College formed a comprehensive partner-
ship with Istituto Lorenzo de Medici in Florence,
Vanderbilt University’s International Office, its
At Smith College, a professor of Chinese poetry
The McGillycuddy-Logue Center for Undergraduate
Global Studies at Boston College was established
funding for faculty who want to form a collaborative
research project with one of their international core
partners. See http://www.vanderbilt.edu/vio/core-
partnersnew. They also provide grants for curricular
development, and are building a new database for
tracking overseas relationships and partnerships.

Princeton University’s Council for International
Teaching and Research provides multi-year seed
funding for faculty to create major global research
networks. The latest winners include a research
network in analytic philosophy that connects Princ-
eton’s philosophy department with similar depart-
ments at the Australian National University, Univer-
See http://www.princeton.edu/international/

Juniata College has partnered on several regional
initiatives with like-minded liberal arts colleges in
central Pennsylvania. Their latest effort is the Key-
stone Study Abroad Consortium, which will share
faculty and academic programming. They are also
exploring collaborative efforts to recruit international
students to the region.

College sports and internationalization rarely mix,
except for the occasional overseas trip. At St. Nor-
bert College, staff used the football team as a way
to teach international students about American life,
and vice versa. Other teams around campus fol-
lowed suit, and athletes and international students
now say hello to each between classes and invite
other each to events and games.

Wellesley College shuts down the entire campus
for a day to celebrate and reflect upon experiential
learning, featuring a high percentage of overseas
experiences. The annual “Tanner Conference,”
supported by a University trustee, is a mixture of in-
tensive events, poster sessions, and panel discus-
sions. See http://www.wellesley.edu/cws/Tanner/
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writes about family changes and economic conditions in rural communities in the United States. Committed to experiential learning in all of its forms, Walsh brings undergraduate students into the field by nurturing service-learning partnerships in local agencies, participating in research conferences, and designing faculty-led study away programs.

BERND WIDDIG is Director of the Office of International Programs and Director of the McGillycuddy-Logue Center for Undergraduate Global Studies at Boston College. Before joining the College, he served as Director of the MIT-Germany Program and Associate Director of the MIT International Science and Technology Initiative. He is deeply involved in questions of international education. In recognition of his achievements in fostering German-American relations, Widdig received the Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany in 2008.

FURTHER RESOURCES

Links to readings and resources used for the Forum are located at: http://www.brandeis.edu/globalbrandeis/offices/aieaforum/

More information on the Association for International Education Administrators can be found at http://www.aieaworld.org/

of that organization, Kaylor has presented and moderated at regional and national conferences on all topics related to enrollment management.

BRYAN MCALLISTER-GRANDE was Associate Director of the Office of Global Affairs at Brandeis University from 2007 - 2011, where he assisted in developing global strategy as well as new "commitments" in India, The Hague, and Israel. He will be a doctoral candidate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education in fall 2011, while continuing to serve as advisor for global initiatives at Brandeis. He has also served on the national and regional leadership teams for NAFAA: Association of International Educators.

ROBIN MELAVALIN is Director of the Global Education Opportunities Center at the Colleges of the Fenway. In this capacity, she is an 'internal consultant' to the six Colleges of the Fenway schools. She focuses on education abroad, which includes working with faculty and administrators as they prepare to take students abroad, streamlining procedures and policies, and working with the campuses to develop their strategic vision for internationalization. An anthropologist, photographer and teacher, she has been in the field of international education for over 20 years and has led student groups to Cuba, Cape Verde, and other countries.

DANIEL NORTON is currently the Associate Dean of International Studies at Goucher College. His focus has been on implementing and refining Goucher’s universal study abroad requirement. During the 2009-10 academic year, Goucher’s study abroad rate was equivalent to 120% of the graduating class since approximately 20% of these students studied abroad more than once during their undergraduate studies. Over the last 18 months, Goucher has added 20 new semester abroad partner programs and implemented new cost-saving measures to simultaneously diversify study abroad offerings and reduce annual study abroad costs. Working closely with the Development Office, the Office of International Studies now oversees 12 endowed scholarship and development accounts and 22 restricted accounts, awarding more than $250,000 per year in student study abroad scholarships and faculty development grants. Previously, Norton was the Director of International Programs at Stephen F. Austin State University in Texas.

SKYE STEPHENSON is Director of Global Education at Keene State College. She has spent three decades involved in international education and study abroad in many different capacities. She is passionate about the transformative possibilities of intercultural encounters, and how the growth and learning that comes from moving beyond one’s "comfort zone" can contribute to a more just world. Stephenson is currently on the Board of Directors of Living Routes, and is Head of the U.S. Donors Board for the Intercultural University Amavatay in Ecuador.

DANIEL TERRIS is Vice President for Global Affairs at Brandeis University. He develops the strategy for "Global Brandeis" and its partnerships and programs. He is also Director of the International Center for Ethics, Justice and Public Life at Brandeis. Terris received his Ph.D. in the history of American civilization from Harvard University, and he has written on 20th century history, literature, and religion. He is the author of Ethics at Work: Creating Virtue in an American Corporation (University Press of New England, 2005) and the co-author of The International Judge: An Introduction to the Men and Women Who Decide the World's Cases (with Leigh Savigart and Cesare Romano, University Press of New England, 2007).

JOSEPH TULLBANE is Associate Dean for International Education and Outreach and Director of the Center for International Education at St. Norbert College. Prior to his current position, he served as a civilian consultant to the Department of the Army on Russian Political/Military Affairs, and in the military as an Eastern European and Eurasian political specialist for 23 years. He has lived and traveled extensively in Europe, Latin America, and Asia. He has been active in AIEA since 1999, serving five years as the Co-Chair of the Professional Development Committee and chairing the AIEA Awards Committee last year. He has participated as an AIEA delegate to two Transatlantic Dialogue conferences. He is currently serving as an AIEA E-Board member.

J. SCOTT VAN DER MEID is Assistant Dean of Academic Services and Director of Study Abroad at Brandeis University. He has directed the study abroad program at Brandeis University since 1999. He has traveled to more than 45 countries on every continent except Antarctica. Professionally Van Der Meid has served on several national advisory boards in the field of international education including Arcadia University’s National Advisory Board and the School for International Training’s Study Abroad Partnership Council. He currently serves on the IFSA-Butler Executive Council of the National Advisory Council and is a member of the Advisory Board for the NAFAA Rainbow Special Interest Group.

CARLOS VEGA is Professor and Chair of Spanish at Wellesley College, where he also chairs the International Studies Committee. Vega has published books and articles in the fields of Spanish literature, religious narrative, and popular verse. He is currently working on mixed gender identities among medieval Spanish saints. Vega is fascinated by “popular” religiosity and culture – both medieval and modern – and how constructions of gender and sexuality intersect with religious narrative traditions. He has a long-standing interest in study abroad. He is immediately past president of APUNE (Association of Accredited US University Programs in Spain) [www.apune.org] and is currently the U.S. representative for that organization. He serves as consultant for various universities in Spain and Latin America in the field of internationalization.

MARGARET WALSH is Professor of Sociology at Keene State College. She has taught sociology for fifteen years and is currently the director of Keene State College’s honors program. Her academic research interests have focused on social stratification, family, and gender. She writes about family changes and economic conditions in rural communities in the United States. Committed to experiential learning in all of its forms, Walsh brings undergraduate students into the field by nurturing service-learning partnerships in local agencies, participating in research conferences, and designing faculty-led study away programs.