Like many other institutions in the United States, Emory University has seen an increasingly internationally diverse campus community take shape in the last decade. The number of non-domestic students at Emory has grown nearly one and a half times from 960 in 2003 to 2,403 in 2012. The number of international scholars has grown at a similar rate (see charts page 3). And nationwide, according to the U.S. State Department website, F-1 visa issuances—the visa by which most international students come to this country—grew from around 300,000 in 2007 to nearly 500,000 in 2012.

The impact of such a transformation on the culture and character of an institution is both obvious and subtle. It can be seen in classrooms and pedagogies, in dormitories and food services, in student support structures and research programs. As much as Emory’s intentions for a global identity a few years ago were expressed through notions of export—"points of presence" in other parts of the world (see the university’s 2005 Strategic Plan)—today that identity is shaped by the imprints of multiple cultures on Emory itself.

This issue of the Academic Exchange examines both the recent evolution of Emory as an international campus as well as its future, beginning with an essay from Philip Wainwright, recently appointed to the role of vice provost for international affairs, who provides some perspective on Emory’s trajectory as an international institution, as well as the questions ahead. Two faculty members, Tom Remington of political science and Frank Maddox of economics at Oxford College, offer first-person views on how the growing presence of international students in their classrooms has changed their teaching and their understanding of their own roles as professors.
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Two professors from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Karen Stolley and Donald Tuten, explore more deeply that conversation about shifting professorial perspectives with their essay on translational and transcultural competence and an interdisciplinary University Course they will be leading in Spring 2014 on these questions. Then Valerie Molyneux, director of international programs in the Goizueta Business School, offers a thoughtful set of "actionable suggestions" toward enriching the international community at Emory and providing better support for students. Molyneux's essay is followed by a Q&A with Natalie Cruz, brought to Emory last summer as the new coordinator of international student life in the Division of Campus Life to help international students settle more holistically into living and learning at Emory. A second Q&A, with public health scholar Carlos Del Rio, directs our view outward, to a program that brings young researchers to Emory from around the world for advanced training in the field of HIV/AIDS study. As Del Rio observes, those researchers who return to their home countries are Emory alumni, and they carry the university's identity with them.

Kristi Hubbard, director of the Center for International Programs Abroad in Emory College, then discusses the ways that the study abroad experiences of Emory undergraduates are tailored to five particular learning goals within the liberal arts. Sita Rancho-Nilsson, director of the Institute for Developing Nations, follows by examining the relationship between Emory and The Carter Center and the opportunities that still await the two institutions for building a community of scholarship and practice with a distinctive and global impact.

To close this issue, recently appointed Center for Faculty Development and Excellence director Pamela Scully, professor of women's, gender, and sexuality studies and African studies, reflects on her own experiences as a "naturalized" American academic—South African born, U.S. trained. The questions of internationalization are so complex and nuanced that this issue cannot begin to identify them all. Even the ever-broadening phenomenon of open, online education raises related topics, with its emerging communities of learners all over the world connecting with one another. These topical global networks are creating an entirely new kind of social geography within the realm of the academy.

In the spring semester, the Center for Faculty Development Excellence will be hosting an Academic Learning Community for further discussions on "Teaching International Students" (see sidebar page 4 for details). Please consider joining the conversations. —A.O.A.

The International as Fundamental:
Emory's Path Forward in the World

Recently, a visiting representative from a prominent Australian university explained to me why Australians have so quickly internationalized their educational system. In the early 1990s, the number of domestic Australians of college age peaked then went into decline. The Australian Ministry of Education intentionally pursued a policy of internationalization, attracting study abroad students from the United States and international degree-seeking students from neighboring countries in Asia.

This effort was highly organized and effective. Today, approximately 30 percent of students enrolled in Australian institutions are foreign. Australia had built an excellent system of higher education and research infrastructure that would have been significantly weakened if there had not been a willingness to broaden perspective and open up to new and growing populations. Students around the world, particularly in countries with growing middle classes, were hungry for access to the opportunities that Australian universities could provide.

In the United States, we do not have a Ministry of Education providing us with such clear directives. It is up to individual institutions or state systems to set their own priorities and to decide how to position themselves globally. But the pressures of declining enrollments and increased competition for top students are similar, and U.S. universities must respond.

Since I first came to Emory to work at the Center for International Programs Abroad seventeen years ago, internationalization has been one of Emory's strategic priorities. In the early 1990s, few students studied abroad, and most of the international students were in graduate and professional programs. But as Emory focused on internationalization, the university put important elements into place. In 1993 Emory created the Office of International Affairs to provide strategic guidance for internationalization, and in 1997 the Claus M. Halle Institute for Global Learning was founded to promote global awareness and programming at Emory. By 1996, Emory's undergraduate schools were committed to internationalizing their student populations through study abroad. At that point, study abroad was a growing phenomenon nationwide, and Emory had fulfilled its potential to be a leader in this area. Emory students were very interested in studying abroad, but the lack of services and curriculum to support it held them back.

Once supportive structures were put in place, the percentage of Emory undergraduates studying abroad almost tripled as Emory College, Goizueta Business School, and other schools expanded programming and support. The educational and intellectual rationale behind study abroad centered on the broadening of perspective it provided for students—both for themselves and also for the entire student population as they returned to classrooms on campus and shared their new viewpoints on important issues.

In the 2005 strategic plan, internationalization was included as one of the framing principles, since "the international dimensions of Emory's community should be manifested in every new initiative." Emory is international, to be sure—the numbers confirm as much. Over the last ten years, the numbers of international students and scholars have increased and diversified across schools, with numbers in both categories increasing substantially. Growing numbers of Emory students and faculty are active overseas, and the rise of Emory's international population has affected all units of the university. It is easy to see the parallels between Emory's increased international engagement and the rise of globalization more generally. This growth can also be seen as part of Emory's story of evolution from a regional, to a national, to an international university.

Emory has considerable strengths as a center for international scholarship and an institution that engages with issues of global importance. Clear areas of existing strength with broad impact for students include flourishing undergraduate study abroad, an array of courses and degree programs that relate to international and global issues, and a rich set of student organizations engaged in activities related to Emory's and Atlanta's international communities and to serving abroad.

Many of Emory's formal programs and partnerships have an international focus—for example, the Global Health Institute, The Carter Center and the Institute for Developing Nations, the Halle Institute for Global Learning, the international studies major, the Master's in Development Practice program, the Lillian Carter Center for Global Health and Social Responsibility, and the language and area studies departments and programs, to name a few. Even in areas that are not explicitly international, faculty across the university are globally engaged and are internationally known. Emory is also increasingly attracting scholars of global renown to our campus.

So I would argue that we are not so much confronted with how to make Emory more international as we are with what role Emory should play internationally, or globally. How can Emory take greatest advantage of being an international university? How can the university incorporate its international elements into its core identity? What should Emory look like as a global university, as part of a global network, and as a hub of higher education and research? These are the principal questions that we
face as Emory begins a new round of planning to determine its global
strategy and works to strengthen its international presence and the inter-
national nature of its community at home.

As I write this, the planning process is just getting off the ground, and
I am reflecting on Emory’s successful and sometimes not-so-successful
efforts to create a stronger and more coherent international identity. Sift-
ing through the details and metrics of internationalization, I have come
to believe that the most immediate challenge facing Emory is the need to
move beyond viewing “international” as something outside the realm of “normal.”

The most immediate challenge facing Emory is the need to move beyond viewing “international” as something outside the realm of “normal.” This is true in our classrooms, in our research facilities, in our patient care settings, in our residence halls—even in our eating facilities.

Those of us who host international visitors or support and educate international students know that there are some things that we do very well. We provide an excellent education and superb research facilities, and Emory can be a very welcoming community. We have added support over the past few years, including in ESL programming, visa support, and campus life staff. There are significant gaps, however, in how we serve international populations at Emory, and we can do better. We have administrative systems that are not particularly friendly to international visitors and, as an institution, we are not always fully sympathetic to the challenges that international students and scholars face. We must create a supportive environment that promotes the success and acknowledges the value of the international members of our community, and that ensures that Emory enjoys the benefits of an internationally diverse campus.

To understand the reasons for thinking about the international as a fundamental part of our community, we can look back to the arguments that supported the expansion of study abroad and also those to the value diversity in general brings to an intellectual community. Diversity fosters new perspectives and enriches our educational and research missions. But we can also look to how global trends are shaping education and research now and in the future. In other countries, systems of higher education under government leadership are using global engagement to maintain and strengthen their institutions by breaking down national boundaries. With college-aged populations now in decline in many countries with highly developed systems of higher education, and with a rapidly expanding demand for excellent education in countries with growing middle classes, the opportunity—even the necessity—for established universities to think globally is clear.

Emory has great assets and great opportunities. By strengthening our global-mindedness at home, we can expand our impact abroad. The path to fulfilling our educational and research missions in the coming decades is through growing global connections and partnerships. To this end, I hope that Emory can continue to foster faculty and student activity abroad, take full advantage of the internationally diverse populations within the Emory community, and build and maintain systems and infrastructure that support Emory’s stature as a global university.

Twenty years ago, internationalization seemed like a desirable option. Now it is clearly an essential part of the path forward.
Emory and Globalized Education

Teaching in the internationalized classroom

When I first started teaching at Emory in 1978, students from outside the U.S. were rare. With time, the number of international students has grown rapidly and the range of countries they represent has grown as well. Like most U.S. universities (and, increasingly, high schools), Emory College has rapidly expanded the number of students from China. We also continue to see a substantial stream of students from other parts of Asia, with large numbers coming from Korea and India.

Thomas Remington
Professor of Political Science

This change in the composition of the Emory College student population has challenged me and other faculty members to reconsider the effectiveness of our teaching methods, since much of what we might take for granted in dealing with an all-U.S. student body in a class does not hold when a sizable portion of the students come from countries with substantially different educational and political cultures. In an introductory comparative politics class, for example, we cannot assume that students are familiar with basic facts or concepts that U.S. students learn in high school civics classes.

For me, in my classes, these changes have been bracing and salutary. A senior seminar I taught in fall 2011 stands out as the high point of my teaching career at Emory. In this seminar, which developed as an outgrowth of my research interests, the class focused on comparing the transition experiences of Russia and China as they have undergone market reforms. The makeup of the students was unusually heterogeneous, with participants from Turkey, Colombia, Ukraine, China, Korea, and Taiwan, as well as the U.S. The students were particularly good and lively; and they often shared personal experiences bearing on the issues we were discussing. As in the best courses, I learned a lot from their questions and comments.

One of our sessions was devoted to a meeting with a group of students from Nanjing University in China. My students came prepared with questions based on our readings and the research they were doing for their research papers. The Chinese group was led by a faculty member who let his students ask and answer questions without interference. The Nanjing students all knew English, but frequently the concepts we wanted to address were abstract and rooted in social science literature, so the one Chinese student in the seminar, who had been at Emory for three years, was able to step in and elaborate on questions and answers in both directions. The result was a substantive discussion on matters such as the quality of democracy in the U.S. and the extent of corruption in China.

In spring 2013, I taught an upper-division course on the political system of China, a topic I have grown increasingly interested in. Roughly half the students in the class were Chinese, whether born in China or American-born of Chinese parentage. Other members of the class had backgrounds from Korea, Cuba, and Russia—as well as a large contingent of students from the U.S. Often, one or another of the students had personal knowledge of a place or organization we were discussing, or they brought in experiences related by their parents. Sometimes a student would follow up on a particular issue by phoning a parent or grandparent back in China to get a personal reminiscence or to check a factual point. A professional journalist from China spending the semester at Emory, sat in on the class at my invitation. Sometimes I would ask her to explain a particular ideological concept or informal political institution, and, with the help of the Chinese students in the class whose English was better, she would give us authoritative and insightful accounts.

I continue to feel a certain self-consciousness when I teach Chinese students about their home country. The advantage I bring is the wealth of literature available in the West on Chinese history and politics and the social science conceptual frameworks that help us make sense of the flow of events. My role is still as a teaching objective than particular facts and concepts is the premise that students in the social sciences must learn to examine evidence rigorously and draw their own conclusions about how and why particular outcomes occurred. There is always a normative side to empirical questions in the social sciences—is this particular institution good or bad from the standpoint of some set of values—but the point of the educational experience is to enable students to analyze material on their own and understand how to weigh alternative explanations for outcomes. This is hard enough for many American students to learn, but harder still for students who come from cultures where the assumption is that there is a right answer, a right way; that the teacher knows it; and that the student’s job is to master it. That way of learning is antithetical to a liberal arts education, which prizes disciplined, rigorous, analytical, and individual reasoning.

With respect to China, it remains the case that the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989 is not publicly discussed in China, and the information about Mao Zedong transmitted in Chinese schools is highly selective. The spear memory of the Cultural Revolution is largely suppressed. Often Chinese parents are reluctant to discuss painful and sensitive parts of their country’s past with their children. So when Chinese students take classes at Emory, they are able to explore freely issues related not only to their nation’s history, but also to their own families—and draw their own conclusions. In many cases they ask to write their research papers on topics that they cannot study at home. As one student observed to me, Chinese students study English in order to learn about China. At the same time, they generally take a refreshingly candid and open-minded view of the United States. Some are intrigued by the importance of religion in American society, and others wonder why democracy can produce the severe polarization and deadlock we are observing in U.S. politics in recent years. How culture and politics interact and how universal are democratic political institutions—enduring questions in the social sciences—are fresh and topical for many of our international students. The questions that the international students bring to my political science classes allow me and other students to see our own country in a new light.

Like most American universities, Emory has benefitted from the confluence of several factors: growing affluence in much of Asia, a hunger for the benefits of education in Asia and elsewhere, and the quality of American higher educational institutions. The U.S. model of the research university, in which faculty members treat both teaching and scholarship as core missions, has proven to have international appeal. So Emory and other universities enjoy the American comparative advantage in the global market for higher education. Over the next few decades, though, this particular comparative advantage will diminish. The quality of the universities in other countries—particularly those from whom we have grown accustomed to drawing students—is rising steadily. Like other U.S. universities, Emory will need to invest in those attributes that have given American higher education its international edge: an unflagging commitment to scholarly excellence, a spirit of open-mindedness and inquiry, and a faith in the American model of the liberal arts education. I believe that this model, still a distinctly American innovation based on the partnership of individual inquiry and civic responsibility, has enduring value in a world of globalized education.
The New Normal
A professor adjusts to the changing demographics of his classroom

During my twenty-three years teaching economics Oxford College I have always benefited from the presence of international students. Their perspectives facilitate my efforts to incorporate topics on the global economy. During most of this time, my expectations of and attitude toward these students and their academic performance was this: they had chosen to study abroad in the U.S., so they needed to modify/adjust in order to succeed in my classroom.

Then came the fall of 2010. On the first day of class I assumed there was some mistake when I reviewed the class roster—I walked into the class and realized there was no mistake. More than half of the students were F-1 visa Chinese students. As I struggled to call the roll, a few students helped out by offering “English” names—most did not. I was somewhat mortified.

We Oxford faculty had been told there would be a marked increase in the number of F-1 visa students. This phenomenon is not unique to Oxford and Emory Colleges. The mounting domestic student demand for financial aid has forced the academy to augment revenues by enrolling students who pay full tuition. What I hadn’t envisioned was that most of these students would be interested in the business curriculum—at Oxford that meant they would most all take economics. What I’m really trying to say is that what I encountered the first day of class that semester is my “new normal.” I expect for the rest of my career I will be teaching classes with a large percentage, and often a vast majority, of F-1 visa students.

Suddenly my old attitude—that they had chosen to study abroad so they needed to adjust—was clearly inappropriate. My joy and reward over the years at Oxford had been sustained relationships with former students lasting for years after their graduation. For me, that joy felt threatened. I realized it was now my job to make adjustments, so that these students, who as a group appeared so very different from me, would not be seen by me as other. I was sincerely concerned about whether I could make the adjustments. I wrote in my annual report to my dean after that first year, “I feel strongly that the impact of the changing student demographic is adversely affecting the classroom in my discipline more than most disciplines.”

So let’s look at how I got into the solution—how I started the legwork to alter my view of these students as other. And I’m not alone in this effort; currently Oxford College is stepping up its efforts to be responsible to the larger cohort of international students. This October I joined a team of faculty and staff to attend the Association of American Col-

All foreign students who wish to attend a full-time degree or academic program at a U.S. school, college, or university require an F-1 student visa. The educational institution must be approved by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. An F-1 visa is a non-immigrant visa, meaning it is issued to individuals who do not intend to stay in the U.S. permanently. (Students attending vocational or other non-academic programs require an M-1 student visa.) F-1 visas are valid for as long as it takes a student to finish their studies. They also allow students to work on campus and, in some situations, off campus. In addition, F-1 visa students are eligible to apply for employment-authorized practical training after they complete their academic program. The additional training can range from twelve months to as many as twenty-nine months for students pursuing degrees in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics. F-1 visa students are able to transfer schools and change their focus of study while pursuing their studies. Once students have completed their studies, they have sixty days in which to depart the U.S. In fiscal year 2012, the United States issued 486,900 F-1 visas, compared with 292,333 issuances in 2007—a jump of more than 63 percent. —S.F.

Source: U.S. Department of State
Translating “America,” Translating the “Other”
Cross-cultural (mis)communications in an age of globalization

During the past decade—after 9/11 and in the context of a continuing global financial crisis and multiple instances of global conflict—many in the United States have sought to understand its position in the world alternately through reaffirmations of American exceptionalism or through a discourse of decline, articulating a global narrative with the U.S. at its center.

In effect, these pursuits are ways of answering the question, How do Americans imagine the U.S. and themselves? But rarely are other questions posed, such as: How do others in the world understand the U.S.? How do Americans imagine “Others” in the world, and how do those “Others” imagine the U.S. in turn? These questions then lead to another, broader one: How do you have to do with how societies imagine and represent themselves vis-à-vis other societies in a process that might be described as inverse complementarity (“we are what they are not”).

In order to appreciate this process and begin to answer these questions, we take translingual and transcultural competency as a point of departure. What do we mean by this? Our fields have seen a great deal of discussion recently of the problems implicit in what have been called "monolingual internationals," that is, those who aspire to engage a global world with a limited degree of cultural or linguistic competence. As our Emory colleague Hazel Gold has noted in a forthcoming piece in the bulletin of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, the "monolingual international" is still common, even on "campuses paying lip service in their mission statements to the increasing demands placed on an educated citizenry by globalization." Indeed, the "monolingual international" has been celebrated more publicly by Larry Summers in a notorious 2012 New York Times editorial titled "What You (Really) Need to Know." In a section in which he emphasizes the need for students to have more international experiences in order to "bread cosmopolitanism," Summers calls into question the value of language study and predicts that it will become "less essential in doing business in Asia, treating patients in Africa or helping resolve conflicts in the Middle East," given the predominance of English as a global language.

Even at Emory, as at other Research 1 universities, despite a commitment to promoting study abroad and sponsoring increasing numbers of international students, the study of languages and cultures is often viewed in a narrow, instrumentalist fashion (as reflected in Summers' comments) as something leading to multilingual, and perhaps multicultural, competence. Multilingual and multicultural competence, however, assumes that one is "merely" replicating the competence of an educated native speaker (even if one were to accept that as an achievable goal).

In contrast, translingual and transcultural competence assumes the ability to operate between languages and cultures. People with this kind of competence are able "to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture. They learn to comprehend speakers of the target language [the language being learned] as members of foreign societies and to grasp themselves... as members of a society that is foreign to others," as described in a 2007 report from the Modern Language Association on "Foreign Languages and Higher Education." They also understand that perfect translation from one language to another is never possible. Consider, for instance, the positive connotations of English individualism and the traditionally negative connotations of Spanish individualismo, which are listed as exact equivalents in any bilingual dictionary or Google Translate.

How does one acquire this sort of competence? Immersive experience in other languages and cultures forms a foundation. It is not enough, however. Critical reflection on such immersive experiences is equally important. It is the union of action and reflection that is the hallmark of translingual and transcultural competence.

Meetings last year of the chairs of language and culture departments in Emory College of Arts and Sciences (Classics, French and Italian, German Studies, Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies, Russian and East Asian Languages and Culture, Spanish and Portuguese), convened by Hiram Maxim, Director of the Emory College Language Center, led to a proposal for a spring 2014 University Course that would engage faculty and students from across the university in a critical reflection upon these issues through an interdisciplinary and—to the degree possible—translingual/transcultural exploration.

We will begin the course by reading selected chapters of Ron and Suzanne Wong Scollon's Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach. These readings provide concrete examples of cross-cultural communication in conversation and writing in order to explore the difficulty of trying to understand and communicate with "others"—in both directions. This will serve to establish a foundational critical reflection on how cultural norms are read and misread, respected, and challenged across cultural and linguistic boundaries. For example, what are the cultural assumptions and communicative consequences of addressing someone by a first name rather than by last name and title? What are the cultural assumptions and communicative consequences of "getting right to the point" (deductive rhetorical organization) versus working one's way indirectly toward an argument or request (inductive rhetorical organization)? Given such considerations, how can we ever know if we are understanding each other?

Further discussions and readings will be organized around the following cartographies: the Islamic world, Latin America, and Europe (with particular emphasis on Germany). Of course there are other countries and regions—most notably, China, India, Brazil, the African nations—that could be included in the seminar and which will certainly come up in our discussions. In addition to the three regional foci, we have chosen three topical concentrations: empire and power; gender and sexuality; and consumer culture and the global economy. These three "umbrella" questions will enable us to consider and compare specific instances to which our guest presenters—from Oxford College, Goizueta School of Business, the Rollins School of Public Health, the Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing, Candler School of Theology, Emory Law School, the Laney Graduate School, and Emory College of Arts and Sciences—will speak.

FURTHER READING


Enriching the International Community
Suggestions and steps for Emory

For the past six years, I have served as director of undergraduate international programs at Goizueta Business School, preparing both domestic and international students for the educational environments they will encounter while studying abroad. Prior to that, I worked for five years in the Division of Campus Life with thousands of undergraduate students, both domestic and international. International students encounter a litany of challenges: under-use of health and counseling services, overuse of academic support services, over-representation in conduct and honor code violations, clustering in specific accommodation leading to "ghettoization," dissatisfaction with dietary choices, insufficient resources for religious observance, lower rates of engagement and leadership, not enough classroom participation, increased difficulty securing post-graduation job offers.

While some progress has been made recently to address some of these issues, every day I see opportunities to enrich the international community at Emory. What can we do, individually and collectively? We can tackle internationalization at Emory with new resources, common purpose, and intentional orchestration. Here is a list of actionable suggestions, an open memorandum to our great university.

1. Increase support services for English language mastery. While we have flourishing pockets of English as a Second Language (ESL) services on campus, we could offer additional opportunities to encourage improvement in the written and spoken English skills of our international students, the majority of whom hail from countries with vastly different grammar and syntax systems. We could use leadership and engagement activities, as well as professional development and research projects, to provide safe venues for language practice.

2. Formally explain and demonstrate American academic culture. During my mandatory orientation for undergraduate business exchange students, I attempt to demystify the American classroom. "Faculty members care whether or not you understand the material. They expect participation. They notice absences," I explain. In many countries, only the instructor speaks during class. In countries with Confucian cultural legacies, asking questions in class implicitly challenges the authority of the professor, who is both elder and expert.

We could make videos and presentations about American classrooms. We could hold mock classroom events to allow international students to practice the skills domestic students began learning as preschoolers. We could coach international students on how to approach faculty members during office hours.

3. Offer culturally attuned academic advice. Most of our undergraduate international population hails from China and South Korea, whose outcomes far surpass our own when it comes to science, technology, engineering, and math education. Asian international students tend to show high pietsy by following parental advice rather closely. Many families of international students do not readily associate significant earnings potential with liberal arts or social sciences majors. Add to this Emory's tuition and living costs, which international students must show as cash-on-hand to obtain visa authorization to enter the US. Taken together, these factors result in concentration of international students into several fields: science, economics, mathematics, and business.

International students deserve concrete suggestions about how to distinguish themselves among similar candidates aspiring to jobs or graduate school placements. They could benefit from culturally sensitive advice about how to select alternative majors if necessary. We could counsel international students toward professional and extracurricular activities to supplement these crucial skill sets. Domestic students with dreams of working abroad merit the same.

4. Explain work benefits for international students and the transition to employer-hosted visas. The visas held by most international students entitle them to work in the United States in fields related to their majors, both during college and immediately following. Directors of academic programs in all departments, as well as advisors, could learn more about these options. Industry function nights, career events, and alumni spotlights could emphasize ways for students to pursue international work. Of course, not all students wish to work in the United States. In light of this, subject matter experts in international affairs, ISSS, career management offices, and relevant academic departments (economics, Russian and East Asian languages, and culture, and international studies, for example) could educate the Emory community about economic conditions and jobs forecasts in China, South Korea, and more.

5. Offset the cost of attendance with additional scholarship funds reserved for international students. After years of economic doldrums, cuts, and belt-tightening, devotion of special funds to support a population already well represented at Emory is no easy sell. Less than 10 percent of grants and scholarships are awarded for merit, which until 2013 was the only criterion by which international undergraduates might be evaluated for financial assistance. Recently, the Office of Undergraduate Admission announced a new scholarship program for international students that prioritizes those who might otherwise be unable to attend due to cost. We could expand this program with support for students in later years of undergraduate study and those with altered family circumstances.

6. Assist in the management of cultural dissonance, acculturation, and assimilation. Journals of psychology, international education, and student affairs are filled with questions of identity. Emory's undergraduate internationals live these questions every day. Leave behind the old culture to embrace today's? Hold fast to the culture of origin, despite its uneven coupling with the adopted one? Behave one way when at home and another when at school?

We could learn whether students prefer to assimilate, acculturate, or aim for biculturalism. We could listen without judgment. We could offer advice only when it is welcome. We could provide opportunities to assimilate, teaching our international undergraduates the ways of American education, culture, and business. We could capitalize on what our internationals can teach us, with culture nights, language exchanges, and more. Just as we assume a student's gender or race might inform her experiences, we could learn to similarly consider a student's nationality.

7. Provide culturally sensitive health, counseling, and social services. International students are under intense pressure: away from their families, in unfamiliar circumstances, and with high stakes. It will come as no surprise that countries approach matters of mental health in vastly different ways. While the practitioners in Student Health Services are conversant with international students' special needs, it is often "lay" people—resident assistants, faculty members, academic department and student services staffs—who first encounter student distress. We could improve our ability to recognize such distress, the various forms it takes, and how best to offer assistance. We could advocate for students who may find it difficult to voice their own concerns or needs. We could learn how to pronounce names correctly and call students by their preferred names.

8. Leverage existing resources. We have a number of higher education administration specialists among our faculty and staff ranks. Such specialists are conversant with student support and adult education research on English language learning, identity development, residential education, counseling, engagement, and much more. We also have hundreds of international undergraduates themselves. We could call upon these subject matter experts to inform and improve our practices.

Emory has a long, vibrant tradition of internationalism, starting with our first Korean graduate (Yun Chiu-ho 1895G, 1908G). We have also shown great strength in planning, from acceptance of land for the Atlanta campus in 1855 to wise expenditure of the Woodruff's 1979 gift to our recently concluded capital campaign. Now is the time to combine these assets. Let us define how we will support, engage, educate, and inspire our international community, and then shape our vision into powerful reality.
There is a fine balance between helping these students adjust to the culture of the American classroom but also being respectful of where they are coming from as well.”

Natalie Cruz
Coordinator of International Student Life

Natalie Cruz came to Emory in July 2007 to accept this newly created position in the Division of Campus Life. A Clemson University graduate, Cruz completed a master’s degree in higher education student affairs at the University of South Carolina, where she worked in international student services and in a two-year learning community of high-achieving students before coming to Emory.

Carlos Del Rio
Hubert Professor and Chair of the Hubert Department of Global Health and Professor of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health

Carlos Del Rio is also Professor of Medicine in the Division of Infectious Diseases, Emory University School of Medicine. He is principal investigator and program director of the Emory AIDS International Training and Research Program, which brings young researchers in the HIV/AIDS field from other parts of the world to Emory for advanced training.

The Academic Exchange: What is the Emory AIDS International Training and Research Program?

Carlos Del Rio: AITRP is a program funded by the NIH through the Fogarty International Center. It’s designed to take young, talented people from low- and middle-income countries and provide them with advanced training for HIV/AIDS research, so that they can return to their countries and make a difference in HIV/AIDS prevention and care. Some of our trainees come to Emory for degree programs, such as a master’s in public health (MPH) or a master’s of science in clinical research (MSCR). Others do their degree training through distance learning, remaining in their countries, and some participate in non-degree programs that offer laboratory training or other types of short-term training. The type of training we provide is based on the needs we identify with our collaborators in partner countries.

Emory began participating in AITRP after our application to the NIH was successful in 1998. In that first cycle, Mexico, Georgia, Armenia, and Vietnam were our collaborating countries. In 2002 we added Ethiopia. In the first competitive renewal in 2003 we added Zambia and Rwanda. Overall, about 170 trainees have participated in the AITRP program, with forty-one of them having already graduated from Emory with an MPH or an MSCR degree. The program is now coming to an end because NIH is ending this program and replacing it with the Fogarty HIV Research program, which Emory will also be applying to. Our hope is that we will be successful and be selected to participate.

The Academic Exchange: How do you describe your role?

Natalie Cruz: I view my role as helping international students holistically. It’s uncommon to see a position like this in campus life specifically for international students. I am not specifically focused on academic support or immigration issues, but focused on cultural adjustments such as social issues, living in Atlanta, and connecting with the Emory community. I’m fortunate to be located here in the DUC, where I should be accessible and convenient for students to stop by.

AE: What are your priorities?

NC: My first priority is to get to know students and their needs. I’ve done a lot of research on what other schools are doing, but I really want to know what the unique needs are at Emory. I also want to let students know that I’m here and get to know faculty. I also want to be integrated with academic life as well. International students don’t come here specifically for campus life, but rather for academics. So I want to be very intentional in what I do, so that my office offers things students really need. For example, this year I’m going to partner with the Career Center to support international students in areas like job searches and networking, and with the Counseling Center to provide some continuing orientation sessions for international students.

Longer term, revamping international student orientation is a big priority. As it stands this year, it’s basically only one extra day of important immigration information before the regular orientation. I think a critical component of international students feeling supported here is their experience in the first few days. That really sets the tone for their experience here.

Another long-term plan is to offer a language partner program. Many students who come have a strong command of English, but they are always still learning. Language partner programs look different at all schools, but they pair native and non-native English speakers. The weekly coffee hour at Emory would be a good place to start. Beyond that, I will encourage the students to meet regularly and just sit down and chat and get to know each other. And it can be reciprocal—if a domestic student is learning French, they might request a French-speaking partner.

We should not forget that these people are Emory alumni; they’ve gone back to their countries and taken the Emory name with them, which enhances our international presence.”
It also provides an automatic connection with an American student. That can be a real challenge for international students. There’s been a lot of research about how international students tend to hang out with other international students, particularly among Chinese students because of the large quantity of students at most U.S. institutions. A lot of those students report that they want to have American friends but don’t know where to start or have difficulties with language. That is one thing that I really want to focus on, providing intentional opportunities for international and domestic students to get to know one another.

In addition, I want to create a global student organization, work with international student organizations, and create more campus-wide international events.

AE: What are some things that faculty can keep in mind as the number of international students in their classes rises?

NC: Two-thirds of the international students come here from three countries—China, Korea, and India—but there are more than a hundred other countries represented. Keep that in mind. I’d love to work with faculty to support their experience teaching international students. There is a fine balance between helping these students adjust to the culture of the American classroom but also being respectful of where they are coming from as well. In many cultures, it’s not appropriate to challenge your professor or speak up in class. So faculty could explain, “This is what is typically expected of you as a student, and if you’re not comfortable or don’t understand, please come talk to me.” That would be a great start in the right direction to support international students in the classroom.

Even something as simple as a grading rubric that addresses participation expectations in class discussion is helpful for international students. International students may not feel as comfortable because of language or just because of their background and the classroom culture where they grew up. Are there some other ways you can assess participation, maybe written or one-on-one talking with other students? Those might be some things to think about.

I encourage faculty to reach out to me with any questions, challenges, or success stories they may have regarding international students.

AE: Do all of the trainees travel to Emory?

CDR: The great majority of AITRP trainees come to Emory, but not all of them. For example, our trainees in Rwanda and Zambia don’t come here but remain in their countries and do their degree training through distance learning at the London School of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.

AE: How do you identify AITRP trainees?

CDR: It differs by country. Most of the time, each country has a selection committee that chooses candidates they present to us. I don’t go into a country and say, ‘I want this or that person.’ I rely on our partners there. Some are people in their ministries of health. Some are at universities. This program is focused on building collaboration and partnerships. Many of the people selected as AITRP trainees have already been involved in research in their countries but lack advanced training and skills.

AE: What impact has the program had?

CDR: There are many examples of AITRP trainees who have gone back to their countries, established programs that have improved prevention and care for HIV/AIDS, and contributed to advancing the science of HIV. I recently was in Vietnam visiting our former trainees. It was incredibly gratifying to see the people we have trained playing key roles in public health. For example, one is in the CDC Global Aids Program Office, another is a department head at the Hanoi School of Public Health, and another is a department head at a major teaching hospital. They’re seen now as the young leaders in Vietnam’s national AIDS program. Another example was a student who got an MSCR degree some years ago. During the 2009 swine influenza outbreak in Mexico he played a critical role. Even though he was trained in AIDS, his knowledge and skills allowed him to be on the response team during a public health emergency.

AE: What does Emory offer AITRP researchers that other institutions do not?

CDR: What they learn here in the classroom they could have learned at other institutions, but our partnership with the CDC and with the Emory Center for AIDS Research is unique and makes us strong compared to other programs. The word Emory means something in those countries, because people have degrees on their walls that say Emory. We should not forget that these people are Emory alumni; they’ve gone back to their countries and taken the Emory name with them, which enhances our international presence. The trainees also leave with a greater appreciation of America and of team science. During last year’s reception for international fellows, one from Saudi Arabia came up to me and said, “Now I realize why the United States is such a great country: Here we are in this room with people from all over the world and we’re all talking to each other, and we’re all friends with each other. This would never happen in any other country I’ve been to.”

I think that is part of the incredible value of a program like this. Not only does it contribute to the culture here, it also contributes to long-term international relationships and makes people realize that a lot of long-standing grudges and enemies we have developed over the years result because we really don’t know those people.
Study Abroad in the Liberal Arts Experience

Going global with CIPA

I strongly believe that studying abroad is one of the best learning experiences possible and that it allows you to grow as a person in a way which you could never do by staying in your own country and comfort zone.”
— Fiona O’Carroll, Emory College Class of 2014

Nearly 50 percent of Emory College students have an experience abroad before graduation. Their overseas experiences are coordinated through the Center for International Programs Abroad (CIPA), the study abroad office for the Emory College of Arts and Sciences. It is CIPA’s philosophy that international experience is an integral part of a liberal arts education. How does the rich variety of those experiences play out in the context of an Emory education?

With that question in mind, the Education Abroad Committee, a new standing faculty committee of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, recently endorsed five learning goals for the Emory study abroad experience:

1. To facilitate students’ academic development and intellectual growth.
2. To foster students’ global perspectives.
3. To contribute to students’ professional development.
4. To accelerate students’ personal growth.
5. To contribute to the internationalization of students’ home departments, college, and university.

Through its programs, CIPA interacts with nearly eight hundred students each academic year. The majority of those students participate in traditional study abroad programs for academic credit—typically a semester overseas or a summer program with Emory faculty members studying a particular subject, language, or culture in context. Additionally, CIPA offers other types of experiences, such as UPGRADE (Undergraduate Program in Global Research and Development), through which students participate in non-credit-bearing service-learning experiences in a developing nation. The accounts below highlight real-life manifestations of those goals established by the Education Abroad Committee and how students’ international experiences have shaped their lives.

Does study abroad foster students’ global perspectives? Laura Manor, linguistics major, Class of 2014, spent a year abroad on Emory’s full immersion program in Paris, taking classes through the program’s French university partners. She stumbled upon a class called “Langue et Ordinateur” (Language and Computer), which led her to discover a new field of study not often emphasized at Emory: computational linguistics. During the second half of her experience in Paris, she continued to take classes in this department and subsequently started a minor in computer science upon her return to Emory. As a direct result of her study abroad experience and exposure to a field that she might not otherwise have had the opportunity to encounter, she now plans to apply to graduate school in France in the field of computational linguistics.

Does study abroad actually facilitate students’ academic development and intellectual growth? Amrit Dhir, international studies major, Class of 2006, participated in several CIPA summer programs, and it was his freshman summer experience abroad in the Russian Studies program in St. Petersburg that first instilled in him a curiosity and an openness that has compelled him ever since to try “to live abroad rather than travel abroad, to ask rather than to seek but not always conclude, to adventure and immerse and not just go or be.” Amrit also spent a summer abroad on Emory’s German Studies program in Vienna as a student and two summers as the assistant to the program, a year pursuing a master’s in Maastricht, a year completing a volunteer fellowship in Delhi, a year starting up an office for a Dutch university in Bangalore, a semester studying in Hong Kong during law school, a month researching on the Burma-Thai border, and most recently, two months living and learning Spanish in Valencia. He said it is “difficult to overstate how much those experiences abroad have informed his daily life since: “Where I choose to live today, what I prioritize in my career, how I think about music, how I think about artistic expression generally, what the international headlines tell me, how I understand history’s flirtation with the present, and how I talk to people and engage socially are all influenced deeply by the places I have called home.”

Can study abroad meaningfully contribute to students’ professional development? “It is my ultimate goal,” he continues, “to have a career in public health and community development. I want to be able to gain an understanding of the political climate, social ethos, and environments that shape

The Office of International Student Life (http://ois.emory.edu/) aims to connect international students to “meaningful campus life opportunities” and facilitates events and programs for both domestic and international students, from excursions around Atlanta to international coffee hours on campus. It especially emphasizes campus engagement for students. The site includes a “Resources” section intended to link international students to wider activities in the Atlanta area.

International Student and Scholar Services (http://www.emory.edu/iss/) has the stated goal of “providing positive international educational exchange through all our services.” To that end, the ISSS takes care of the "nuts and bolts" of international engagement, helping to arrange and facilitate the employment of international faculty and staff and working to ensure compliance with all appropriate regulations. The ISSS also provides support to newly transplanted international faculty, staff, and scholars, addressing issues from banking and housing to driving and language assistance.

The Claus M. Halle Institute for Global Learning (http://hal-leinstitute.emory.edu) is the main point of contact at Emory for visits by heads of state, distinguished policymakers, and influential international public intellectuals. The institute hosts several public events throughout the year. It also sponsors the Halle Study Trip Program, which brings Emory faculty and students other parts of the world, as well as the Halle Research Program, which helps facilitate and sponsor faculty-led meetings, conferences, projects, and initiatives.

The Office of International Affairs (http://www.international.emory.edu/index.html) describes itself as “Emory University’s central hub for International partnerships, communications, and initiatives.” It works with deans, directors, and faculty to develop and support projects and initiatives of an international nature, and it works closely with the Development and Alumni Relations offices. The Fulbright Scholar Program, the Claus M. Halle Institute for Global Learning, the Confucius Institute in Atlanta, and the International Student and Scholar Services office are all under the purview of the Office of International Affairs.

Center for International Programs Abroad (http://cipa.emory.edu/index.html). See article on this page.

The Institute for Developing Nations (http://www.idn.emory.edu) See article opposite page. — M.S.
The Carter Center: A window on the world at Emory

like most great research universities, Emory interacts with the global community in numerous ways, through international faculty and students, through research on global issues and problems, and through relationships with global partners, organizations, and alumni. But Emory also has one unique link to the world: our relationship with The Carter Center, a non-governmental organization addressing some of the most pressing and complex issues of our time in the areas of democracy building, conflict resolution, human rights, mental health, and neglected tropical diseases in countries disproportionately associated with poverty.

Built from the vision and reputation of former President and First Lady Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter, The Carter Center provides Emory with exceptional opportunities to understand and engage global challenges, such as strengthening rule of law in Liberia, establishing foundations for long-term peace in the Sudan, and fighting diseases like malaria and Guinea worm disease. Our institutional partnership is realized through President Carter and through strong bonds between programs and individuals. As director of the Institute for Developing Nations, a key link between these institutional partners, I believe we can expand and deepen connections between the hands-on work of The Carter Center and our academic community at Emory in ways that not only enhance the work of both institutions, but also build a community of scholarship and practice—an action-oriented think tank, if you will—that will have an impact far beyond our institutions.

In 1981 President James T. Laney agreed that Emory University would partner with President and Mrs. Carter in launching The Carter Center, an agreement that was enthusiastically endorsed by Emory’s Board of Trustees. In the early years, key individuals connected the work of The Carter Center to academic life at Emory. For example, William H. Foege was appointed the first executive director of The Carter Center in 1986 and was instrumental in the creation of the Rollins School of Public Health, all the while serving as a member of the Emory faculty. Richard Joseph was director of the African Governance Program at The Carter Center and also a political science professor at Emory. In the 1990s, Ambassador Marion Creekmore concurrently served as director of programs at The Carter Center and Emory’s first vice provost for international affairs. From 1996 to 2010 Creekmore focused exclusively on his administrative role at Emory. These individuals and others established direct connections between the Center’s humanitarian work and scholarship at Emory.

Today, Emory and The Carter Center are connected in a number of ways. The most visible connection involves President Carter himself. Since 1982 he has been University Distinguished Professor, and in this capacity he participates in academic life at least once a month during the school year. Last year he gave presentations on “public health, religion and ethics,” the expansion of democracy,” and “fairness,” addressed a forum organized by the Emory Student Nurses Association, addressed international students at a forum at the law school, lectured in a class on “Race and the American Presidency,” and opened the school year with his annual “Town Hall Meeting,” a thirty-two-year tradition for first-year undergraduate students. His visits to campus are highly anticipated events. It is difficult to overestimate the impact on a student when you have an opportunity to ask this former president about historical events that he had a direct hand in shaping, or get his views about the development-related research project you did while on a study abroad program in Uganda.

There are also numerous connections between programs at The Carter Center and Emory. Benjamin Druss works closely with the Center’s Mental Health Program and holds the Rosalynn Carter Chair in Mental Health in the Department of Health Policy and Management at the Rollins School of Public Health. The Center for Global Safe Water at Emory regularly works with the Center’s Trachoma Control Program. Faculty in the Laney Graduate School doctoral program in religion who study conflict resolution, religion, and peacebuilding have worked with the Center’s conflict resolution efforts in Liberia. Students pursuing MPH degrees in the Hubert Department of Global Health and those in the Laney Graduate School Master’s in Development Practice gain valuable practical experience with the Center’s Peace and Health Programs. Last year Emory students held, on average, 17 percent of the Center’s highly competitive internships. These are just a few of numerous examples.

In 2006, President Carter and Emory President James Wagner founded the Institute for Developing Nations (IDN) to foster stronger ties between Emory faculty and Carter Center programs. Between 2007 and 2010, IDN provided seed funding on a competitive basis to faculty engaged in development related research aligned with principles that shape The Carter Center’s work: valuing local knowledge, working with in-country partners, and applying knowledge to solve problems and build capacity. Although small, the program helped launch pioneering projects that have gone on to leverage more than three million dollars in external funding. IDN also promotes connections between Emory faculty and graduate students and Carter Center programs to help understand and solve complex problems such as the persistence of gender-based violence in post-conflict societies, the role of elections in transitional contexts, and the gap between theory and practice in disease elimination and eradication.

These connections enhance the missions of both institutions. But there is always the sense that we can and should do more together. At Emory and The Carter Center, colleagues often tell me that they don’t understand why we don’t do more together. Having worked at the intersection of these two institutions, I see that while the language of connecting “academics, practitioners, and policymakers” is ubiquitous, there are challenges in building and maintaining these connections, particularly on a long term basis. One challenge that can limit collaboration is that universities and NGOs operate on very different time tables. Visiting dignitaries, election observation missions, and funding for specific projects often have time horizons that seem very short in a university context. Similarly, timelines for research and funding at universities can feel impossibly slow to an organization that must engage real world events in real time. Faculty teaching on a semester schedule are not always free to stop what they are doing to respond to unfolding events in foreign countries.

Emory and The Carter Center share a commitment to the role that knowledge plays in bringing about lasting social change. There are, however, differences in our institutional cultures that must be taken into account in efforts to work together. At Emory, research and teaching are paramount, whereas Carter Center program staff prioritize to programmatic goals—whether that involves monitoring an election, advancing conflict resolution processes, or eradicating Guinea worm disease. While these goals are not diametrically opposed, it is a challenge to help them fit together. Faculty are interested in gaining access to data, research opportunities, and internships for their students. While Emory students compete for internships and undertake special projects and research opportunities, there are limits to the time Center staff can devote to learning and mentoring, as well as the number of students that an NGO of this size can work with.

What is the way forward? How can partnership between The Carter Center and Emory University be leveraged to do even more to support our missions? One important connection recognizes that universities provide an increasingly rare space for open, civil, and critical exchange of ideas—across disciplinary, institutional, and national boundaries. IDN conferences and workshops have demonstrated how this space
The New Normal (continued from page 3)

beamed and said, "Then you will never forget my name—I'm Suxi (pronounced "Sushi."). I loved Nanjing and promised the students to take them to see my hometown one day.

When I returned from China to Oxford, Stacy Bell (an English faculty member who made a similar faculty trip to China the year before) and I decided to call upon the Oxford faculty to form an international student advocacy committee. That committee convened in fall 2012. It comprises twenty stakeholders on campus who recognize the importance of being intentional with regard to the assimilation of international students. Representatives from admissions, student life, the counseling center, and the development office currently complement the faculty membership.

My experience is that most F-1 students are eager for opportunities to delve into an experience of our Southern culture. Last fall I invited "Sushi" into my office and asked her help to gather Nanjing students for the promised trip to my hometown of Madison. Madison is a historic town sixty miles east of Atlanta—famous for Sherman's stay and refusal to burn the beautiful homes. I took them on a walking tour of the historic districts and wound up at the Cultural Center—an old brick schoolhouse now a lovely museum and auditorium. The docent allowed these Chinese students to ring the old school bell; this was a thrill for me since I knew my dad had been in charge of ringing the very same school bell when he was a little boy attending one of the state's first graded schools. The adage that most education happens outside the classroom is probably even truer for international students. When Suxi and I took another group of Chinese students to hike Stone Mountain, the students were eager to talk about seeing a few people waving Confederate flags in front of the mountain's carving of Confederate generals, juxtaposed with a predominantly African-American crowd of park visitors probably from nearby neighborhoods enjoying the park for exercise. What a rich conversation!

A surprising result I had from spending time with the students was an eagerness to learn some Mandarin. During the first session of summer school Sushi met with me regularly to practice my efforts. I have had fun this fall interjecting a phrase or two of Mandarin during class—the Chinese students often stay after class to help me learn something new or talk economics. My efforts to learn Mandarin seem to have invited the Chinese students to approach me more readily than before. For faculty interested in learning some Mandarin, the Confucius Institute at Emory is a great resource (http://confucius.emory.edu).

At Oxford, faculty members are integrated into the international students' orientation. This fall international mentors (sophomore F-1 visa student leaders) paired with Oxford faculty to talk with the incoming students on the "ethos of liberal education," the classroom culture, and the creating of maps for personal success during their Emory experience. The orientation, crafted by Jennifer Knupp, who directs our Office of International Affairs, represents an intentional effort by the Oxford community to insure success as we integrate larger numbers of international student into the college experience.

The increased presence of F-1 visa students has enriched my economics classroom and the campus climate in general. The increasing diversity is helping Oxford College attract a student body eager to shed parochial perspectives for broader mindsets. This shift yields students interested in research projects with a global bend. I'm currently directing a senior's project focusing on how perceptions and understanding of what it means to be "middle class" in the U.S. compares to the socioeconomic construct of "middle class" in China. I doubt that topic would have been broached as a student project twenty-three years ago.

I now see the presence of a larger cohort of international students as yielding a happy result. The efforts of F-1 visa students to earn a U.S. college diploma clearly provide beneficial spillover effects for domestic faculty, staff, and students as we open ourselves to engagement with these remarkable young people and the myriad perspectives they bring to campus.

Translating "America" (continued from page 4)

With the help of these guest lecturers, we will read and discuss a wide range of texts—literary, linguistic, anthropological, cinematographic, political, economic, marketing, and media—as evidence of communicative border crossing, analyzing discourse (ways of thinking and talking/writing) in a way that subsumes methods of literary, cultural, and linguistic analysis and is widely applicable to diverse kinds of cultural evidence. Course participants, each with a particular set of cultural assumptions and experiences, will be asked to respond to these texts and analyze their responses, as well as those of others, in order to approximate the action and reflection that make up translingual and transcultural competence.

We are also planning to organize a co-curricular film festival related to the topic that will expand the conversation to include a broader audience. We will select films in various languages that deal with issues of cross-cultural communication and miscommunication, understanding and misunderstanding (including views of the U.S. as "Other"); such as the very obvious choice Lost in Translation or others such as Paris, Texas, and Y También la lluvia. Campus screenings will be followed by discussions led by participants in the University Course who will themselves reflect various sorts of translingual and transcultural experience. Even though much of the work of the course will necessarily take place in English, these discussions will open up a space for the practice of and critical reflection on the nature of translingual and transcultural competence.

As Emory becomes more international, and as its faculty and students commit to "doing business in Asia, treating patients in Africa or helping resolve conflicts in the Middle East," among many other worthwhile initiatives, that commitment must reflect an understanding that a U.S-centric and English-only approach will not, in the end, serve these goals.

The Carter Center (continued from page 11)

can be used to solve problems and advance programmatic goals at The Carter Center. This space can be further developed both by increasing the number of conferences and by expanding our capacity to follow up with research, publications, and curriculum. Both institutions would also benefit from having scholars and practitioners in residence at Emory. Carter Center programs would gain from having scholars working with the Center in residence, as well as from having the capacity to bring key field staff to Atlanta for a period of debriefing and reflection. While in residence these scholars and practitioners could also contribute to academic programs and research at Emory. The value of these residences would be even greater if they were organized on the basis of cross-cutting themes connecting academic programs at Emory with Carter Center programs. Finally, more could be done to create opportunities for research and learning connected to the Center’s programs. Increased interactions would allow for opportunities to align programmatic challenges with research agendas, and The Carter Center’s efforts over the past thirty-two years would be a treasure trove of data and teaching cases.

The partnership between Emory University and The Carter Center is now in its thirty-second year. During that time it has evolved and changed in response to institutional growth, transformed landscapes of higher education and non-governmental organizations, complex global problems, and new technologies and understandings for addressing them. Despite the challenges that can and do arise when working together, the partnership remains a distinctive way in which Emory is linked to the world and an opportunity to connect scholarship and practice for even greater impact.
The Americanization of a Scholar
On being an academic born elsewhere

When I get together with my academic friends and colleagues who grew up in the British Commonwealth (a conglomeration of very different countries bound by shared histories of empire and yet strange affiliations for things British nonetheless), we often talk about how much we love living and working here, but also how we have had to acculturate to American norms.

I came to America when I was 25, having completed my undergraduate and master's degrees in history at The University of Cape Town. I lived for some two years in the United States before embarking on graduate school. I felt almost foreign the day I went off to the University of Michigan for my Ph.D. as I did the day I arrived in the U.S. I had, of course, by then gained an appreciation for bagels, maple syrup, pancakes (and bacon—at the same time)? Who knew?, apple butter, and hot apple cider, all served up with great love in Gambier, the home of Kenyon College, where I lived for the few years. But I did not feel American.

Graduate school changed that. After my first day in the history program I realized things were not going to go well if I heedled the gender (and no doubt race and class) injunctions of my South African upbringing: be very modest; don't be too clever for a woman; don't try too hard because it will look like you are being too serious or thinking you are better than others. And if you actually liked fashion, you had to hide it if you had any hope of being taken seriously: sackcloth and ashes were the only proper dress for a female academic.

It soon became clear to me that at the University of Michigan, which truly changed my life, things were very different. I was actually expected to show that I had thought deeply and was expected to put myself out there in prose and in person in ways that were very new to me. And I could even wear interesting clothes (I bought with Becky Comkin, author of the recent biography Lee Miller in Fashion, who also loves clothes and has a much more fashion forward sense than I do: I aspire).

In talking to my female friends from India, Australia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Kenya, and South Africa, I saw that I was not alone in graduate school finding myself lacking in the assertiveness department. While many women report similar feelings, we seem to have experienced multiple challenges as we wrestled with both different cultural expectations relating to extraversion as well as more universal issues relating to women's experiences of entry into male-dominated professions. We all seemed to struggle with writing proposals and grant applications and applying for jobs. Did we really have to say that what we were writing was a major contribution? Did we even dare think it? While we have all to some extent embraced our new American academic identities, there are still things that seem odd, even though there is much that we love.

We all seem to appreciate the ability to just do our job for the most part without being reminded that we are "clever for a woman." (Although the October 3, 2013, New York Times piece on why there are so few women scientists in the U.S. gives one major pause: maybe it really is better to be in the humanities, except perhaps for philosophy—see the September 4, 2013, New York Times article on women in philosophy.) We also like the fact that most American academics have a wide sense of the world. This might be because academics travel to conferences all around the world and talk to people who see the United States from a variety of perspectives.

But there are things that still strike at least some of us as very odd, perhaps the oddest being the American tradition of the recommendation. Do we really have to write pages and pages citing our dear students' accomplishments, even though they might not yet have navigated Saturn? What happened to that nice little paragraph written by our professors back home, which went something like, "Dear Professor X, I recommend Dr. Y. Her work is solid. She is trustworthy and honorable, and I hope you will consider her application. Yours sincerely..."? Short, sweet and accurate. I have come to think that there are only two sentences that are really worth reading in American letters of recommendation: "I [highly, very highly, most enthusiastically or not] recommend Dr. Y." and in conclusion, "Dr. Y is in the top [percent, 2 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent—it never seems to go below] of all the students I have taught." Seriously, can we just all cut to the chase?

I write this with great affection for my life in the United States. I have now been here for decades, and it is my home. When people ask me where I am from and I say Atlanta, it takes me a while to figure out that that is an unsatisfactory answer; then I say South Africa, and people often go, "Oh, really? I thought you were from England/Australia/Denmark." Of course, I now think I sound right at home, right here. People ask me if I like living in the U.S., and I always reply with some version of, "I don't know if I really live in the U.S., exactly, but I do live in American academia, and I love it!"

Study Abroad continued from page 10

an area's outlook and challenges that affect the state of their health care," said Erin Swearing, anthropology major, Class of 2011. She approached CIPA, knowing that she wanted to study public health, but it was her CIPA study abroad adviser who encouraged her to consider an experience in Africa instead of a more traditional European program. Inspired by this advice, Erin took a class focused on the environment and ecology of Africa before her participation in a program in Ghana where she was able to witness water sanitation issues in action. She also took "Popular Culture of Ghana" with local Ghanaian students who provided their own interpretation of their culture, which motivated Erin to add an African studies minor to her academic credentials upon her return to Emory.

Today, she is studying in the Global Environmental Health Department of the Rollins School of Public Health and continuing her research into water sanitation and hygiene.

Can study abroad accelerate students' personal growth? Shreyas Shreenath, Class of 2011, began his academic career as an economics major. As he participated in a variety of non-traditional experiences abroad in developing nations—service learning in India, independent research in Kenya, and a semester in Uganda—he realized he didn't want to take a traditional economics major path. Instead, he wanted to work toward a career with government, a university, or a non-governmental organization. "Although theoretical knowledge forms the backbone of any field, there is something to be said about building theory from the field, from an empirical basis." After graduating from Emory, Shreyas received a Fulbright Research Grant to Bangladesh and is now in the Laney Graduate School studying for a Ph.D. in anthropology.

Does study abroad contribute to the internationalization of students' home departments, college, and university? The Department of Spanish and Portuguese has a long history of supporting study abroad and currently offers two summer programs. First, the Iberian Studies in Seville and Salamanca, Spain, provides Spanish language instruction at all levels. Second, Argentine Studies in Buenos Aires focuses on literature, politics, and history. Through these programs, the Emory faculty directors have identified a need to better incorporate the study abroad experience with the on-campus experience. Argentine Professor Hernan Feldman said the department is considering the creation of a capstone seminar course for seniors who have studied abroad. While students learn through exposure and immersion into the local culture during study abroad, there is generally not a lot of time or structure devoted to serious reflection on the experience. "Throughout this seminar, students would have the opportunity to discuss their experiences, be guided through reflection exercises, gain discursive tools, discover (or re-discover) what they learned, and articulate their experiences in a meaningful way. While most Emory College departments wholeheartedly support study abroad, few departments as yet provide formal opportunities for integration of study abroad with on-campus curriculum after the experience. The Department of Spanish and Portuguese will set a positive example for this integration and internationalization for other departments.

Ultimately, it is CIPA's goal to provide a wide range of international opportunities that appeal to students of all disciplines and that contribute seamlessly to their Emory education, while also augmenting their personal and intellectual growth. With more than a hundred opportunities in more than forty countries, CIPA offers an international experience for every student!
Endnotes

The Urban Heat Island Effect

George Luber
Associate Director for Climate Change
and Health Program, CDC

Urban areas are a location of increased risk for a number of reasons. You’ve heard of the urban island heat effect. This is the phenomenon where energy is captured during the day, slightly raising daytime temperatures but really raising nighttime temperatures, allowing almost no cooling at night. That’s important for a number of reasons. First of all, cooling of an urban area at night is important for energy usage. Those areas that demand lots of energy need much more of it throughout the night, making delivery of that power much more difficult. The transmission of energy through power lines is diminished as temperatures go up. Also, physiological, a little bit of exposure to a cool environment during the day if it’s a very hot day and you don’t have air conditioning—even a couple of hours— helps you survive a heat wave. A couple or three hours has been shown to reduce the risk of death. It gives your body back a little bit of time to cool off, to reset, to get a respite from the heat.

The Purpose of Education

Andrew Delbanco
Director of American Studies at Columbia University, from his talk “What is College For?” September 10, 2013, presented by the Emory Williams Lectures at the Provost’s Office Luminaries Series

Regardless of where you are on the political spectrum—from right to left—I think we could probably all agree that our society could use some more of those qualities: civility, respect, the differentiation between opinion and argument. I don’t need to remind you that we are saturated all the time by messages from one interest group or another telling us stuff like, for instance, health reform is a rip-off that will bankrupt the country, or health reform is an overdue act of justice for people who couldn’t afford quality healthcare, abortion is the work of the devil, or denying the right to terminate her pregnancy is a form of abuse. . . . We could go on and on with such a list. My point is a simple one: the only chance we have to maintain a functioning democracy is if we have citizens who are capable of listening to and making rational arguments about these questions, some of which are very difficult and not easy to resolve. A succinct way of putting this, which I like, came from a professor at Oxford, where he welcomed the incoming class at the beginning of the twentieth century. He says, “Gentlemen”—they were all men, of course, in those days—“nothing that you will learn in the course of your studies will be of the slightest possible use to you in afterlife.” I’m dubious that’s going to be the rhetoric provided to the parents of the incoming class of Emory students: “Thank you for sending your children here; nothing they learn here is going to be of the slightest use to them in their afterlife, and we’re proud of it!” Then he modifies the statement: “Except only this: that if you work hard and intelligently, you should be able to detect when a man is talking rot.” That, in my view, is the main—if not the sole—purpose of education.

Constructing the Best Society

Darryl Neill
Goodrich C. White Professor of Psychology, Emory University, from his talk at the celebration of 50 years of psychology at Emory, part of the Annual Psychology Research Festival, September 9, 2013

I was in high school during the Cuban missile crisis . . . and of course there was a stare-down between President Kennedy and the Russians to see who would blink first. The Russians blinked first, and they withdrew their missiles from Cuba. At that time I remember (jet fighters) going over my house two hundred feet up, heading south. So I wanted to know, why are people like this? The big argument was between capitalism—actually called Americanism—and communism. I had to take a high school course in Americanism. The only problem is they could never tell us what it was. They told us what communism was. At the end, they were different views of human nature. That is, what is the best society that fits the way people are constructed? I said to myself, You know, if they just went and looked at how people are constructed, we’d be able to figure out what’s the best society.