

## 1



## GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AT A LOCAL LEVEL: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FOUR U.S. URBAN DISTRICTS

---

*Educación para la Ciudadanía Global a nivel local: un  
análisis comparado de cuatro distritos urbanos  
estadounidenses*

Laura C. Engel, Jessica Fundalinski, and Tess Cannon \*

### ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on exploring how education for global citizenship and competence is being defined and practiced within the U.S. education policy landscape, with a specific focus on the local primary and secondary school level. Against a framework of the multiple conceptions and forms of global citizenship education, including “at home,” “abroad,” and “comprehensive” approaches, the paper explores some select ways in which global citizenship education is developing in select local initiatives. We specifically examine the definitions and practices of global citizenship education in four urban school districts: Boston, Chicago, Seattle, and Washington, DC. Findings show a focus on global citizenship and global competency in local initiatives, but also illustrate multiple

---

\* George Washington University (Estados Unidos).

approaches to global citizenship education, revealing diverse system ecologies within the national system.

**KEY WORDS:** Education Policy, Globalization, Global Citizenship, Local Level, Urban Area, United States.

## **RESUMEN**

Este artículo se centra en explorar cómo se está definiendo y practicando la educación para la ciudadanía global dentro del panorama de la política educativa de los Estados Unidos, con un enfoque específico en el nivel local de educación primaria y secundaria. En el marco de las múltiples concepciones y formas de educación para la ciudadanía global, incluidos los enfoques “en el hogar”, “en el extranjero” y “el comprensivo”, el trabajo explora algunas maneras en las que se desarrolla la educación para la ciudadanía global a través de una selección de iniciativas locales. Examinamos específicamente las definiciones y prácticas de la educación para la ciudadanía global en cuatro distritos escolares urbanos: Boston, Chicago, Seattle y Washington D.C. Los hallazgos muestran un enfoque para la ciudadanía global y la competencia global en iniciativas locales, pero también ilustran múltiples enfoques de la educación para la ciudadanía global, revelando diversas ecologías de sistemas dentro del sistema nacional.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Política Educativa, Globalización, Ciudadanía Global, Nivel Local, Zonas Urbana, Estados Unidos.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Recent policy initiatives focused on global citizenship education at international levels point to the growing energy and commitment to advancing global learning priorities (UNESCO, 2015). Despite the increasing promotion and study of these ideas, it is not clear that there is a common understanding of what global citizenship education involves and necessitates in different educational contexts. In the federal U.S. context, known to be “fragmented” with respect to global education (ORTLOFF and SHONIA, 2015), there have been several significant national initiatives to advance global competence education in U.S. schools, including the first ever U.S. Department of Education (2012) international strategy and the U.S. Department of Education 2016 draft framework for cultural and global competencies. Likewise, there have been numerous U.S. state initiatives in global education, such as Wisconsin’s Global Education Achievement Certificate and North Carolina’s state-wide Task Force on Global Education. Yet, one of the crucial and

understudied areas of global citizenship education is whether, how, and to what extent global citizenship education is advanced locally in different systems.

In the decentralized U.S. education system, where close to 90% of students are educated in public school systems and where local systems possess considerable autonomy over education, it remains particularly unclear how ideas and initiatives related to global citizenship education are being advanced locally, if at all (WARREN, 2005). With an interest in both the definitions of global citizenship education being adopted in the U.S. and the mechanisms by which global citizenship education is brought into local systems, our paper focuses on the following question: How, and under what strategies, do select urban, public school districts in the U.S. advance global citizenship education? We specifically examine four local school systems in urban environments: Boston, Chicago, Seattle, and Washington, DC. These districts represent diverse geographic locations and demographic populations, high minority enrollment—concentrated differently in each of the school districts—and are all housed in major cities and centers for education and commerce.

## **2. GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND GLOBAL COMPETENCE: ORIENTATIONS AND PRACTICES**

The growing body of literature on global citizenship education reveals a “decoupling” of citizenship formation from the exclusive purposes and goals of the nation-state (SOYSAL, 1994). One indicator of this “decoupling” is the multitude of descriptors now added to citizenship and citizenship education, such as, for example, cosmopolitan citizenship (RIZVI, 2009), active citizenship (WOOD, 2014), digital citizenship (FRAILLON Et al., 2014), and global citizenship (see ANDREOTTI, 2006; TORRES, 2015; UNESCO, 2015). Underpinning these shifts is the idea that education is no longer focused *solely* at or on national citizen formation. Rather, education must prepare citizens to be able to respond to and take part in an interconnected and interdependent global world.

The literature on global citizenship education often points to vagueness in terminology, a multitude of associated meanings, and several notable tensions (RAPOPORT, 2010). For example, scholars have debated whether global citizenship education is simply a mechanism for spreading neoliberal ideas of competitiveness (TORRES, 2015), a form of masked neocolonialism spreading U.S. values to other contexts (ZEMACH-BERSIN, 2007), a domestic response to the perceived “threats” (ORTLOFF and SHONIA, 2015), simple rhetoric (DAVIES, 2006), or whether global citizenship education is indeed a meaningful, action-based educational approach underscoring values of global solidarity, empathy, care, understanding, respect and/or tolerance for diversity (ANDREOTTI, 2006; NODDINGS, 2005; PASHBY, 2008; TORRES, 2015; TRUONG-WHITE and MCLEAN, 2015). Some scholars have argued that despite these debates, there are several recognized components associated with global citizenship education including:

“pushing beyond an exclusively national perspective of world affairs, avoiding reducing civics and global studies to social studies topics, and breaking from tokenizing and exoticizing foreign places and peoples” (EIDOO, INGRAM, MACDONALD, NABAVI, PASHBY, AND STILLE, 2011: 61).

In addition to the rise in scholarly attention to global citizenship education, recent international initiatives have focused on advancing global citizenship education, including the development of clear and measurable targets for global citizenship. For example, the United Nations 2030 Sustainable Development Goals include global citizenship in Target 4.7 of the education goal. Linked with this initiative, the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has launched a major mandate of work in global citizenship education, which

“aims to empower learners to engage and assume active roles both locally and globally to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world” (UNESCO, 2014:15).

UNESCO organizes global citizenship education into three dimensions:

1. Cognitive: To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations.
2. Socio-emotional: To have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.
3. Behavioral: To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world. (UNESCO, 2015:15).

While UNESCO’s (2015) work on global citizenship education is inclusive of skills, it also encompasses identity building and a collective peaceful global community.

Alongside the growing body of literature on global citizenship education, there is also an increasing focus on global competence education. Reimers (2009) defined global competency as the combination of three dimensions, or the “three A’s of globalization”: the affective dimension (“a positive disposition toward cultural difference and a framework of global values to engage in difference”); the action dimension (“an ability to speak, understand, and think in languages in addition to the dominant language in the country in which people are born”); and the academic dimension (“deep knowledge and understanding of world history, geography, [and] the global dimensions of topics”)” (REIMERS, 2009: 185). Characteristics of educating for global competence generally fall into three academic domains (cross-cultural studies, geography, world languages) in which students can achieve content-specific knowledge and skills. Highlighting the individual learner, education for global competence emphasizes teachable and measurable skills associated with success in an increasingly global world (WATKINS & CSEH, 2009).

In the U.S., a number of educational initiatives have underscored the importance of education for global competence. For example, the Asia Society, which provides research, assessment frameworks, and lesson plans related to global competence education, along with the U.S. Council of Chief State School Officers, developed a framework for education for global competence, defined as “the capacity and disposition to understand and act upon issues of global significance” (BOIX MANSILLA and JACKSON, 2009: xiii). There are four components associated with the Asia Society’s framework: Investigate the world (students investigate their world beyond their immediate environment); recognize perspectives (students recognize their own and others’ perspectives); communicate ideas (students communicate their ideas effectively with diverse audiences); and take action (students translate their ideas and findings into appropriate actions to improve conditions).

Table 1 provides a synthesis of the components of global citizenship education, as framed by UNESCO, and global competence education, as framed by the Asia Society. Much is common across these two frameworks. Both, for example, focus on skills, values, and dispositions necessary for the global world. Moreover, both frameworks emphasize diversity and effective skills for living and working in diverse environments: Globally competent individuals learn to communicate with diverse audiences and to recognize others’ perspectives; global citizens understand the interconnectedness of different contexts and individuals. Likewise, both definitions highlight action: global competence education has a specific “take action” component to “translate their ideas and findings into appropriate actions” (BOIX MANSILLA & JACKSON, 2009), while global citizenship education’s behavioral component also discusses “taking necessary actions” (UNESCO, 2015).

**Table 1 Frameworks for education for global citizenship and education for global competence**

	Definition	Main Components			
<b>Education for Global Citizenship</b> (UNESCO, 2015)	<i>“be transformative, building the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that learners need to be able to contribute to a more inclusive, just and peaceful world” (UNESCO, 2015: 15).</i>	<b>Cognitive:</b> Learners acquire knowledge and understanding of specific global issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations; Learners develop skills for critical thinking and analysis	<b>Socio-emotional:</b> Learners experience a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, based on human rights; Learners develop attitudes of empathy, solidarity and respect for difference and diversity	<b>Behavioral:</b> Learners act effectively and responsibly at local, national, and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world; Learners develop motivation and willingness to take necessary actions	
<b>Education for</b>	<i>“the capacity and</i>	<b>Investigate the</b>	<b>Recognize</b>	<b>Communicate</b>	<b>Take Action:</b>

<b>Global Competence</b> (BOIX MANSILLA & JACKSON, 2009)	<i>disposition to understand and act upon issues of global significance</i> " (BOIX MANSILLA and JACKSON, 2009: xiii)	<b>World:</b> Students investigate the world beyond their immediate environment.	<b>Perspectives:</b> Students recognize their own and others' perspective.	<b>Ideas:</b> Students communicate their ideas effectively with diverse audiences.	Students translate their ideas and findings into appropriate actions to improve conditions.
---	---	---	---	---	---

Some important distinctions can also be found. First, the Asia Society highlights students as the main focus, whereas UNESCO focuses on learners. This choice of terms is significant as education for global competence is concentrated on compulsory education, whereas global citizenship education for UNESCO is envisioned as a lifelong learning process and for those outside of the formal education system:

"it is not only for children and youth for also for adults" [and entails] "formal and informal approaches, curricular and extracurricular interventions and conventional and unconventional pathways to participation" (UNESCO, 2015: 16).

In addition, one of the biggest distinctions between these two conceptions relates to UNESCO's emphasis on a set of normative values related to the global community, as illustrated by its focus on "a sense of belonging," "common humanity," "shared values," "attitudes of empathy, solidarity and respect," and a "peaceful and sustainable world" (UNESCO, 2015). Reflective of UNESCO's earlier 1972 Faure report (*Learning to Be*) and its 1996 Delors' report (*Learning: The Treasure Within*), there is an emphasis on how "to be" in a global world, with an emphasis on belonging and contribution to a larger global community (UNESCO, 1972, 1996). This contrasts with the conception of education for global competence, which instead seems to highlight a skills-orientation of the individual student, much more of a focus on "doing" than "being."

Against the rise of these multiple initiatives in what might generally be referred to as global education, our paper is motivated by several broad questions: how do these rationales for global citizenship and competence penetrate or get reflected within local system level policy initiatives? How do local, urban systems develop and advance global learning priorities? What discourses and approaches are adopted as primary ways in which to advance global citizenship? We are particularly interested in the diverse, decentralized, and "fragmented" context of the U.S. where there has been a flurry of new initiatives related to global education (ORTLOFF and SHONIA, 2015).

### **2.1. Advancing global education in the U.S. policy context**

Over the last 15 years, a growing number of U.S. scholars and organizations have emphasized the lack of a robust global focus within U.S. education. As early as 2000, the Carnegie Foundation convened a meeting on how to enhance young people's global

understanding with a primary focus on the work of schools (BARKER, 2000). Attendees, including representatives of associations, agencies, foundations, and scholars, focused on whether schools and universities were preparing students effectively for the interconnected global world. The participants concluded that U.S. students' global knowledge remained limited and that both approaches to global learning and implementation of global learning in U.S. schools were not yet in existence.

There have been repeated concerns about the lack of globally relevant skills among students, along with policy recommendations to enhance global education in the U.S. For example, the National Research Council argued:

“A pervasive lack of knowledge about foreign cultures and foreign languages in this country threatens the security of the United States as well as its ability to compete in the global marketplace and produce an informed citizenry” (NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, 2007: 1).

Similar statements have been made in favor of global education, including by the Committee for Economic Development (2006), the National Education Association (2010), and the Council of Foreign Affairs (2012). The Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills (2007) cited “global awareness” as among the six core skills that all U.S. students must have.

In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education released its first-ever international education strategy, entitled *Succeeding Globally through International Education and Engagement*, which had three objectives: Increase global competencies, learn from other countries, and engage in education diplomacy. The strategy focused on education for global competence, articulated as “21<sup>st</sup> century skills applied to the world.” Global competencies were framed as encompassing skills and knowledge for understanding and action, with emphasis that “global competencies are not a luxury for a select few, but rather, are essential skills for all individuals” (U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 2012: 5). In 2016, the U.S. Department of Education launched a new draft framework for cultural and global competences, hosting a convening of teachers, policy-makers, administrators, international education leaders, and university representatives.

In addition, the U.S. policy context includes a range of active organizations, including for-profit organizations, which help shape U.S. global education and which utilize conceptions both of global citizenship education and global competence education. Among the advocacy organizations, several have developed recent strategies and partnerships to promote education for global citizenship and global competence across the U.S. system. For example, in addition to the Asia Society's work in global competence education, the Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, a leading advocacy organization that aims to build 21<sup>st</sup> century learning through partnerships across education, business, community, and government, helped inspire the reestablishment of the bipartisan Congressional 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Caucus, working to advance the skills of learners for the global world

(PARTNERSHIP FOR 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY SKILLS, 2016). Given the growing focus in the U.S. system on globally relevant forms of education, it is important to examine how local levels define and practice education for global citizenship. This examination is particularly significant in a decentralized context like the the U.S., where local districts have significant autonomy over education policy-making.

To help frame our study, we borrow from Knight's (2008) dual concepts of "internationalization at home" and "internationalization abroad" to examine "at home" and "abroad" forms of global citizenship education at local system levels. We understand "at home" global citizenship education as school-level strategies, and "abroad" or "outbound" forms of global citizenship education to entail cross-border mobility. "At home" global citizenship education, for example, may include a focus on curriculum, standards, extracurricular programming, and pedagogy. Although the U.S. does not have a national curriculum, enabling teachers and local school systems to have considerable autonomy over what is taught in schools, 42 U.S. states and the District of Columbia currently have adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English language arts and mathematics (COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS INITIATIVE, 2016). CCSS intersects with the matrix of skills needed for global competence, and leaves room for educators to determine how best to embed and align these skills with the standards. The global competence matrix and the CCSS:

"complement... [and] directly overlaps with the expectations set forth for students... In concert with clear expectations for reading, writing, speaking, listening [in] language and mathematics... the CCSS include the development of students' abilities to think critically, reason, communicate effectively, and solve problems that arise in everyday life, society and the workplace" (MILLAR, 2016).

Moreover, throughout the U.S. system and often linked with global education initiatives, schools have targeted the expansion of foreign language programs, including the teaching of critical languages that are considered essential to the nation's competitiveness and national security (EDWARDS, ANDER and HERDA, 2015; NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 2010). Additionally, pilot programs—which may center on specific coursework or create a specific school ethos, such as the International Baccalaureate (IB) program—are being implemented in numerous contexts, including as a way to enhance educational achievement among socio-economically disadvantaged students.

In terms of pedagogical approaches that enhance global citizenship education, the internationalization of teacher education, as well as the on-going professional development of in-service teachers is considered essential (NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 2010). Existing research has highlighted the need for enhanced training and professional development (RAPOPORT, 2010). U.S. organizations, such as Global Teacher Education,



World Savvy, and Longview Foundation, among others, have described the importance of providing teachers with professional development programs that have a global focus; yet, targeted professional development opportunities are often among the more neglected areas of school-level global education initiatives.

As a form of “abroad” global citizenship education, schools and a growing number of educational providers offer opportunities for international exchanges and study abroad (NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 2010; HOWE, 2008). According to the Council on Standards for International Educational Travel (2016), there was a 31% growth in the number of U.S. students participating in semester and year-long exchange programs between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016; however, similar to other countries, these kinds of semester and year-long abroad opportunities are still rare. For example, in 2015-2016, fewer than 2,000 students (roughly 0.002% of U.S. primary/secondary school students) took part in a semester or yearlong academic exchange abroad (CSIET, 2016). Although data are not available for shorter duration abroad programs, these types of programs are often seen as the most viable for schools, and have increased in popularity, as evidenced by the growing number of districts and schools, as well as private companies like the American Field Service and Youth for Understanding, that now offer short-term abroad experiences.

Scholars have argued in favor of select components for deepening “comprehensive internationalization,” including:

the development of skills, competences, attitudes, and values; a culture to support international/intercultural perspectives; Attention to the link between internationalisation and overall educational quality; Integration of reflexivity into everyday school life; Greater access of all students to internationalization (DE WIT AND ENGEL, 2014: 201).

In a context of advancing global citizenship in U.S. schools, these components suggest that more than an “add-on” program or curriculum, comprehensive forms of global citizenship education seek to infuse globally-relevant pedagogy and a global ethos of inclusion and belonging at a system-level. Moreover, comprehensive global citizenship education does not target only the most socio-economically advantaged students and schools, but rather is practiced in a systematic and intentional way to advance equity and inclusion.

Although only 13% of the 16,330 U.S. school districts are housed in cities, many of the U.S. urban public school districts serve well over 50,000 students, particularly those in major metropolitan areas, which also often include a large majority of low-income, minority students (ARITOMI and COOPERSMITH, 2009). Given that ensuring equity in access to global citizenship education is one of the leading concerns raised by global

educators, it is therefore crucial to understand whether and to what extent the systems that serve students in urban areas are developing global education initiatives.

### **3. METHODS**

This research is a guided by qualitative case-study analysis, using exploratory and individual case-study analyses in order to examine the “how” and “why” of individual systems. Each of the four districts is explored as a distinct case, examining how the districts operationalize the goal of creating globally competent citizens. These school districts are housed in major educational hubs and centers for global activities and practices. Further, we were interested in a global city, like Chicago, to understand their approach to building global education (SASSEN, 2005). Chicago’s student enrollment of close to 400,000 students is an outlier among the sample of districts, as DC, Boston and Seattle have enrollments closer to 50,000. However, all four districts represent large, urban school systems. Table 2 summarizes enrollment, budget and demographic information for each of the four districts.

**Table 2. Summary of background information on four urban districts**

	<b>DC Public Schools</b> SY: 2015-16	<b>Boston</b> <b>Schools</b> SY: 2015-16	<b>Public</b> <b>Seattle</b> <b>Schools</b> SY: 2015-16	<b>Public</b> <b>Chicago</b> <b>Schools</b> SY: 2014-15	<b>Public</b>
City Population	672,228	667,137	684,541	2.72 million	
Student Enrollment	48,439	53,530	53,872	396,683	
Number of Schools	113	128	98	517	
Budget (\$)	701.3 million	1.013 billion	753.08 million	5.69 billion (FY2016)	
Race (%)					
Black	64	32.4	16.4	39.3	
Hispanic	18	41.5	12	45.6	
White	13	14.2	45.6	9.4	
Asian		8.7	15.8	3.6	
Other	4	3.3	9.8	2.2	
English Language Learner (%)	11	30	11.4	16.7	
Free/Reduced Lunch (%)	76*	78*	38.9	84*	
4-Year Cohort	64.4	70.7	76.7	69.9	

Graduation Rate  
2015 (%)

---

\*District offers Community Eligibility Provision. All students can eat meals for free.

In addition to being the U.S. capital and center for political activity, DC is home to 176 foreign embassies and remains a hub for international activity with various organizations, research and cultural centers, and non-profit organizations focusing efforts on global matters. The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) serves about 55% of the public school population. According to 2014-2015 figures, its enrollment is 48,439 in 113 schools, including 64% Black, 18% Hispanic, 13% white, and 4% other ethnicity and 11% English Language Learner. The operating budget for DCPS was \$701.3 million, the lowest of the four districts being compared. Nearly 76% of the student enrollment are eligible for free and reduced lunch; however, as DCPS is involved with the Community Eligibility Provision, all students can eat for free. The graduation rate for a 4-year cohort hovers at 64.4%, the lowest graduation rate in the four-district comparison. DCPS has persistent achievement gaps, with African American students' 2015 graduation rates (61.7%) significantly lower than white students (85.6%). A 2016 Stanford study indicated that along with having one of the largest black-white achievement gaps, DC also has a wide Hispanic-white achievement gap (REARDON, KALOGRIDES AND SHORES, 2016).

Boston, Massachusetts is home to some of the most prestigious research institutions in the world, as well as being in one of the most educated large metropolitan cities (STRAUSS, 2016). In 2015-2016, Boston Public Schools (BPS) enrolled 53,530 students in 128 schools. Within this population, demographically 32.4% are Black, 8.7% Asian, 41.5% Hispanic, 0.3% Native American, 14.2% white, 0.2% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 2.8% are multi-racial. Roughly 30% of students are considered English language learners, representing 85 different languages and 100 countries. BPS' fiscal budget for the same school year was \$1.013 billion, the second highest of the districts. Like DCPS, Boston offers all students free meals through the Community Eligibility Provision—previous statistics indicate that roughly 78% of students were eligible for free and reduced lunch and 49.5% of students are economically disadvantaged. The graduation rate for BPS in the 2014-2015 4-year cohort was 70.7% (MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 2016).

Seattle, Washington, located in the Northwest of the U.S., has often been touted as having the most “diverse” zip code in America, with 17.3% foreign-born residents, 21.3% speakers of other languages in the Seattle metropolitan area, along with a growing Asian and Hispanic population (SEATTLE.GOV, n.d.). Seattle Public Schools (SPS) enrolls 53,872 students in 98 schools, according to 2014-2015 data. Within these schools, 16.4% are Black, 15.8% Asian, 12% Hispanic, 0.8% Native American, 45.6% white, 0.5% Native Hawaiian, 0.5% multiracial and 11% are ELLs. SPS had the third largest operating budget of \$753.08 million. Of the selected school districts in this study, SPS has the lowest

percentage of students taking part in free and reduced lunch (38.9%), while having the highest 4-year cohort graduation rate at 76.7%. However, like DCPS, there are notable achievement gaps between demographics: 85.4% of white students graduate, while American Indian (53.1%), Hispanic (57.9%) and Black (65.7%) graduate at much lower rates (MYSPS, n.d.).

While significantly larger than the other districts, we selected Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to develop a perspective on global citizenship education initiatives in one of the country's largest urban school systems. In 2014-2015, CPS enrolled 396,683 students in 517 schools (CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 2015). CPS enrollment is comprised of 39.3% Black, 3.6% Asian, 45.6% Hispanic, .3% Native American, 9.4% white, .2% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and 1.1% are multi-racial. English language learners make up 16.7% of the student population, along with roughly 17% of the students able to speak in more than one language. Chicago's operating budget for in the same school year was \$5.69 billion, more than twice as much as all three of the aforementioned school districts combined. Nearly 84% of students in the district are eligible for free and reduced lunch, though CPS, too, offers the Community Eligibility Provision. Finally, for the 4-year cohort of 2015 school year, the graduation rate was 69.9%, the second lowest of the four districts. Although graduation rates for all students have increased in the last three years, there are still noticeable differences with graduation rates among black (62.6%), Hispanic (74.8%), and white (77.7%) students.

Findings in the study are based on qualitative content analysis of publically available documentation, including published strategies, websites, reports, and mission statements by each of the four districts, in order to explore recent global citizenship education initiatives. We focused primarily on public records associated with each district, selected in order to provide official accounts of local level plans and policies. In selecting documents, we first searched district level background data, as shown above in Table 2, providing us with a profile of each district. We then took an open and exploratory approach to the selection of documents pertaining to the district approach to global citizenship education. This included any documents with terminology relevant to the study: global education, global learning, international education, 21st century skills, global citizenship, and global competence. We looked at the context of the document (who published it and for what purpose) and its content (what is the approach to global education, who works on this approach, who is it targeting, how is it positioned within the district itself). In order to provide a recent account, we selected current documents published since 2010.

As a secondary source of data, four informational interviews were conducted with representatives of the selected districts in order to verify, triangulate information, or gain access to additional publicly available documentation. These included one representative from Seattle contacted by telephone, one from Boston with contact by e-mail, and two in

person interviews with representatives from DC. We were unable to speak with a representative from Chicago. The focus of the informational interviews was on the district's approach to global citizenship education, a historical context for the approach, and primary initiatives and practices. Questions did not pertain to the district representatives' own personal assessment or interpretation of the district's approach, but rather focused on fact checking data gathered via public records and gaining access to further documentation. As a final step, we shared Tables 2 and 3 with the contacted district representatives, as well as an expert in global education in the U.S. context, in order to review and verify the compiled data for each district.

Analysis focused on text, discourses, and methodologies of building global learning into the selected local districts. With the central aim to explore the rationales and developing frameworks for global citizenship education in local, urban districts, analysis was focused on discourses of global citizenship education (or associated terminology), as well as questions of *how* and *in what ways* the districts were approaching internationalization, including main initiatives and practices. For example, key questions were posed, such as: in what ways are the selected districts utilizing global learning? For what purposes? How are these initiatives being developed and how are they organized? Who is leading these initiatives within the districts?

#### **4. FINDINGS: LOCAL SYSTEM INITIATIVES TO PROMOTE GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

In the sections that follow, we focus on select findings related to local initiatives aimed at promoting global citizenship education, including the mission statements for global citizenship education, whether and how global citizenship education has developed in each of the districts, and approaches to global citizenship education. Table 3 provides an overview of key components related to global citizenship education.

**Table 3. Key indicators of global citizenship education in four local, urban districts**

	DC Public Schools	Boston Public Schools	Seattle Public Schools	Chicago Public Schools
Mission statements include Global Competency/Citizenship	✓	✓	✓	✓
Global Education office/unit	✓	✓	✓	
Established	2014	2010	2006	
Number of Staff	6	1	1*	

Terminology Used	Global citizenship Global competency	Global citizenship Global competency Global ambassadorship	Global citizenship Global competency	Global citizenship	
Influences: Asia Society Global Competency Matrix	✓	✓	✓		
Standards-Based Curriculum					
CCSS	✓	✓	✓	✓	
ACTFL	✓	✓	✓		
Approaches to global education within district					
Study abroad	✓	✓	✓***		
World languages	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Service learning	✓	✓		✓	
IB Programme	✓	✓		✓	
Partnerships**	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Languages offered	American Language, French, Latin, Chinese, Spanish	Sign Arabic, Italian, Mandarin and	American Language, Chinese (Mandarin), French, Greek, Japanese, Spanish	Sign Arabic, German, Italian, Latin,	American Language, Chinese (Mandarin), French, Italian, Korean, Polish, Spanish, Urdu
Other approaches	Embassy adoption; Global Studies Schools; DCPS International Food Days; Seal of Biliteracy; Model UN	Sister-School Initiative	Technology; Seal of Biliteracy, Competency-Based Credits for World Languages	Model UN, Sister- Schools Abroad; Seal of Biliteracy	

\*Only 1 staff member listed on website

\*\*Partnerships play an important role within each of the school districts; however, it is difficult to decipher in what capacity these partnerships, including universities, are related specifically to global education.

\*\*\*Study abroad through AFS and shorter trips through school programs and nonprofits – not directly linked to International Education office.

#### **4.1. District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)**

*Global Access World Readiness: We provide the resources, expertise and opportunities necessary to ensure that every DCPS graduate is an inquisitive, informed and active world citizen, prepared for success in college, career and life in an increasingly diverse international community.*

In 2014, under the leadership of Chancellor Kaya Henderson, DCPS formed the Global Education program, currently with a staff of six. DCPS Global Education, housed within the Office of Teaching and Learning, states its primary goals as:

“At DCPS, we believe that all students, regardless of background or circumstance, will graduate prepared for success in college, career and life. A key component of this success demands that DCPS students graduate as globally competent individuals; the goals of DCPS Global Education program is to cultivate this global competence in all students. A globally competent DCPS graduate is an inquisitive, informed and active global citizen who investigates the world, recognizes perspectives, communicates ideas, and takes action” (<http://dcpsglobaled.org/what/>).

The statement of goals articulates a vision for active global citizenship, with frequent mention of global competency. Evidence of the Asia Society’s 2009 *Global Competency Matrix* is noted, for example with the mention of all four components: investigation of the world, recognition of perspectives, communication of ideas, and taking action. Its central mission statement, displayed prominently on the DCPS global education website, describes its purpose to support the development of the DCPS graduate as “an inquisitive, informed and active world citizen” (DCPS GLOBAL EDUCATION, n.d.). A comprehensive form of global citizenship is articulated: “all students can be global citizens” and “all teachers can be global educators” (DCPS GLOBAL EDUCATION, n.d.).

DCPS global education main components include: Global Studies and Programs, World Languages, and Study Abroad. The Global Studies and Programs include the IB program, in which there are 10 programs educating approximately 3,700 pre-K-grade 12 students. Moreover, in 2016-2017, one of the DCPS high schools will reopen with a global education focus, offering high school dual language and coursework focused on global competence. In addition, unique among the four districts studied, DCPS Global Education organizes four DCPS International Food Days per year, which through local partnerships with embassies, introduces all DCPS students to cultural perspectives through cuisine. Past year’s food days have featured Ethiopia, Fiji, and the Ukraine. One of the older global education programs unique to DCPS is the Embassy Adoption Program, established in 1974 to “expose DCPS [5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade] students to international perspectives and cross-cultural lessons” via communication with diplomats. As shown in Table 3, DCPS also offers world languages to all elementary, middle, and high school students with a direct goal to “prepare [students] to become global citizens who effectively communicate and collaborate with diverse audiences” (DCPS GLOBAL EDUCATION, n.d.). A diverse array

of languages are offered (American Sign Language, Arabic, French, Italian, Latin, Mandarin and Spanish), which is aligned to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). The standards outlined by ACTFL are specifically designed to promote global competency and are aligned with the Common Core State Standards, College and Career Readiness, as well as 21<sup>st</sup> century skills (ACTFL, n.d.).

One of the most unique initiatives developed recently by DCPS Global Education is its Study Abroad Initiative. Launched in 2015-2016, DCPS articulates its vision that global education is for every student: “DCPS Study Abroad helps ensure that our global citizens have access to global experiences, so that travel becomes the expectation rather than the exception for students” (DCPS GLOBAL EDUCATION, n.d.). The short-term Study Abroad program is fully funded (with funding from the DC Public Education Fund, roughly \$2 million) for all eighth and eleventh grade students studying a world language (level 2 at grade 11). There is access to study abroad opportunities in three areas: Global Leadership (DCPS students working with peer students in host countries on global challenges); Language Immersion (DCPS students participating in immersive language experiences overseas); and Service Learning (DCPS students engaging in service learning programs alongside other students). Each opportunity is administered through a third party provider, with a study abroad professional as the primary leader and several DCPS teachers/staff members (Travel Ambassadors) accompanying. There are curricular components to the study abroad experiences, where students are required to complete a Global/Local project, to be shared publicly; however, the pre-departure and in country experiences differ from trip to trip. In the future, DCPS seeks to develop a more formal associated curriculum. In the 2015-2016 school year, 380 DCPS students and 44 educators went abroad on short (9-20 day) abroad experiences on one of 18 trips involving 14 different countries. Plans for 2016-2017 are underway, with the goal of 500 students abroad. DCPS Global Education’s planned five-year strategic plan indicates an aim for all eighth and eleventh graders to have access to a fully-funded study abroad experience.

#### **4.2. Boston Public Schools (BPS)**

*The Department of Global Education seeks to increase the quality and number of international experiences for all BPS students. To that end, the department takes a comprehensive approach to promoting global citizenship through eight key program areas.*

The BPS Department of Global Education was formed in 2010 by then Superintendent, Carol R. Johnson, after witnessing an inspirational student exchange between BPS students and students from Ghana. This exchange prompted the formation of the department, currently with a staff of one, with the stated goal to “expand options for global learning so that all students can become culturally competent adults prepared to compete and collaborate on an international scale” (BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, n.d.).



BPS aims to infuse global education both inside and outside of the classroom, “at every school, at every grade level, in every classroom”. In order to ensure that students can participate fully and positively shape a shared future, the Department of Global Education seeks to ensure that BPS students can communicate cross-culturally, think critically about global issues, are culturally responsive and learn about new cultures (BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, n.d.). Additional goals within the Department of Global Education include creating opportunities for students to be introduced to other cultures and perspectives, promoting mutual understandings cross-culturally, and ensuring global literacy.

Boston Public Schools frame their global education initiatives through global citizenship, global competency, and global ambassadorship. Unique strategies to globalize BPS are found in the Department of Global Education, the World Languages Department, the History Department and the Art Department, as well as the Acceleration Agenda, a strategic plan for 2009-2014. According to BPS, both the Asia Society’s 2009 *Global Competency Matrix*, as well as Model UN has influenced decision-making and components of the department.

Several components make up global education initiatives within BPS, though certain departments (i.e., history, art) were not explored. The BPS Department of Global Education implements International Programs, which include “student exchanges, study tours [to at least 20 countries], language immersion programs, and service learning” (BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, n.d.). With these international travel programs, BPS has an intentional focus to prepare students to be Global Ambassadors, a term unique to Boston. These are students who can engage in a meaningful global experience as well as articulate those experiences with others. Global Ambassadors are prepared through conversations on cultural respect and competency. While abroad, these students engage in reflective journaling and consider probing, open-ended questions, so as to have a structured and intentional experience abroad. Students then articulate those experiences with their peers upon their return through various projects. These projects may include delegate visits, panel events, and students as consultants and acting as spokesperson for Global Education department presentations. The department supports—though not necessarily financially—opportunities for teachers and students to go abroad. Currently, only 1.3% of travel-age students (less than 1,000 of the district’s 53,530 students) study abroad, and the students often come from a small number of schools. Thus, one of the stated goals within the Department of Global Education is to not only increase the number travel opportunities (both number of students and schools from which the students come), as well as increase the narrative of travel through students’ sharing of their experiences.

Outside of the domain of the Department of Global Education are other components that reflect moves towards more comprehensive forms of global citizenship education. BPS uses the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards, the

Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for Foreign languages to implement their world language programs. BPS has also adopted an IB program, with a future goal of expanding these programs. Furthermore, BPS teachers are connected with international educators and schools through school visits of BPS and sister-school initiatives.

#### **4.3. Seattle Public Schools (SPS)**

*Seattle's International Schools provide students with linguistic skills, higher-order thinking skills, and a global perspective that will help them to contribute to, and succeed in, a 21st century world. Our vision is to prepare students, in partnership with families and communities, for global citizenship in an increasingly interdependent world.*

In 2006, the International Education office in SPS, currently with a staff of one, was formed—nearly six years after Seattle's first international school, The John Stanford International School, was founded. In the late 1990's, John Stanford, then superintendent of SPS, saw the capacity of the nearly 110 distinct languages within the school district to become a force multiplier of learning languages and cultivating an international scope within students. As a result, this school became the first in the district to use dual language and language immersion programs as a model for language learning and to foster international perspectives. This model has continued to serve as the standard for Seattle's expanding International Education programs, with the stated goal to "prepare students, in partnership with families and communities, for global citizenship in an increasingly interdependent world" (SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, n.d.).

SPS approaches International Education through global citizenship and global competence, with influences coming from the Longview Foundation, Wagner, the Asia Society's *Global Competency Matrix*, and Seattle based non-profit Global Visionaries. The International Education mission statement specifically references 21<sup>st</sup> century skills that are often found throughout the Asia Society's 2009 matrix. Although the office of International Education has one full time staff member, there is an additional 1.2 staff that is funded to support international education in SPS through teacher leadership. Teacher leaders are thus allowed 20-40% of their scheduled work hours to work alongside the director of International Education, thus allowing for a decentralized approach to supporting programs.

The International Education division harnesses the international schools, as a main component, to foster global/cultural competencies and global perspectives. Students in international schools:

"investigate the world beyond their immediate environment, recognize perspectives, develop critical and creative thinking skills, enhance communication and collaboration skills, [and] translate their ideas into action" (SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, n.d.).

Students thus gain global perspectives, world language skills—through dual language and immersion—as well as cultural and global competency. These skills were developed using the Asia Society matrix; 21<sup>st</sup> century skills from Seattle’s Strategic Plan; and, Components of International Education by the Seattle School Board.

The international schools comprise around 10% of the 98 schools within the district, housing nearly 14% of student enrollment. Within each of the three locales of the district, SPS is working toward two elementary schools offering one of the world languages, feeding into one middle school and finally one high school.

“Dual Language Immersion (also known as Dual Language or Immersion) programs in all the international elementary schools teach language through content-based instruction in Japanese, Mandarin Chinese, or Spanish 50% of the day. Immersion Continuation programs in international middle and high schools offer one to two periods per day of enhanced language instruction, depending on the school.” (SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, n.d.)

Other components in the school district to enhance the mission of the International Education office include the World Language Credit program, the Seal of Biliteracy, enacted in 2015, as well as study abroad opportunities. Although study abroad is not a directly or centrally overseen by International Education, some select opportunities are available to students who wish to travel with local non-profit partners, including Global Visionaries and One World Now. There are also select school-sponsored trips to sister schools in China and Mexico, for example. The district also plans to set up strategic partnerships and expand the international school pathways.

#### **4.4. Chicago Public Schools (CPS)**

Unlike the other sample school districts, CPS does not have a specific department or strategic plan specific to global education. Rather, the internationalization of CPS appears to be dispersed throughout different departments and strategic plans—both within the district itself as well as in the city’s plan to expand its efforts to achieve top global city status. Linkages to global citizenship and global competency are found within The Office of Language and Cultural Education (OLCE) and The Department of Literacy: Civic Engagement and Service Learning. An explicitly stated initiative within the OCLE office is to “promote global citizenry for all students” through the teaching of world languages and promotion of bilingual and English language learning programs. The rationale is stated as follows: “Language education is critical to learning and success in college, career, and life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 2015). In the latter department, there is a specific Global Citizenship Initiative (GCI), which seeks to ensure high quality civic education and engagement to promote active and engaged participation in our democratic system.

Within CPS's *The Next Generation: Chicago's Children, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Preparation for Success in College, Career and Life 2013-2018* action plan, patterns are found that promote global competencies and considered part of its global education initiatives. This document acknowledges that the global economy requires problem solvers, effective communicators and collaborators. Thus, the action plan strategically develops a pillar that ensures "children become critical thinkers, effective communicators and *responsible global citizens*" (CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 2013: 9; our emphasis). The district promotes this through standards, curriculum and instruction.

Of the 517 CPS schools, there are 351 schools that offer world language programs to approximately 108,000 students (roughly ¼ of the CPS student population). The languages taught are those that are traditionally offered, as well as critical languages (see Table 3). In 2010, CPS convened a Commission of Bilingual Education and World Language (BEWL) to strategize and envision the future of CPS language education programs. Within the commissioned report, findings reveal that:

"there is no clear path for sequential world language education and world language and international studies resources are housed in multiple district offices... [as a result] there are no common standards for programs across the district and no clear paths of world language programs" (CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS: LANGUAGE EDUCATION, 2010: 4).

However, according to Mapping the Nation data (a partnership between Asia Society, Longview Foundation and SAS), Chicago is regarded as among the most successful U.S. cities in engaging students in Chinese language study (ASIA SOCIETY, n.d.). There are also efforts to expand language study opportunities in Arabic, involving a partnership with the Center for Arabic Language and Culture to provide 12 schools and 3,000 students with Arabic learning opportunities, with the hopes of expanding these opportunities to more students and schools in the future (EDWARDS, ANDER and HERDA, 2015).

The Global Citizenship Initiative (GCI), in the Department of Literacy, offers select high schools in pilot programs a high school civics course aligned to the CCSS to explore how people effect change in their community. Other high schools require a service learning graduation requirement, equal to 3 projects or 40 hours of curriculum based service learning. Students in 37 schools are also offered opportunities to take part in the Student Voice Committee, a "school based student governance body, which empower students to lead meaningful school improvement initiatives in collaboration with school administration" (CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 2015; MARSHALL, 2014). The Global Citizenship Initiative also provides outlets for voter engagement, service learning, as well as through global learning in programs like Model UN, and have partnerships with University of Chicago, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Facing History and Ourselves, as well as the Mkva Challenge to further contribute to civic learning

(MARSHALL, 2014). The McCormick Foundation, who has partnered with the MacArthur Foundation and the Spencer Foundation, funds the Global Citizenship Initiative.

Outside of the realm of either department mentioned previously are other initiatives that promote global citizenship, including Sister Schools Abroad (SSA), which connects CPS and international sister city students, teachers, and administrators. The goals of Chicago SSA and Chicago Public Schools are to:

“facilitate relationships... encourage a global classroom environment where students develop skills in language, diplomacy and international affairs; develop a desire and confidence to learn foreign languages while being exposed to different cultures; [and] enable teachers and principals to share “best practice method” in their classrooms and schools” (SSA, n.d.).

Furthermore, CPS offers the IB Diploma Programme at 15 high schools, with 7 elementary schools and 22 high schools offering access to the IB curriculum.

## **5. DISCUSSION**

The literature on global citizenship education highlights a multitude of different meanings, orientations, including “being” (e.g., normative values of solidarity and belonging) and “doing” (e.g., skills needed for success in the global economy), and a wide array of associated practices. Despite some notable debates and tensions found within these orientations (ORTLOFF AND SHONIA, 2015; TORRES, 2015), there is a growth in international initiatives, including an effort to create measureable targets, for the advancement of global citizenship education in multiple contexts (UNESCO, 2015). And yet, little is known about whether and how local level systems approach and organize the practice of global citizenship education, such as whether school systems tend to embrace “at home,” “abroad,” or “comprehensive” forms of global citizenship education. Motivated to explore the ways in which global citizenship education is both defined and operationalized in local, urban systems, we examined four urban school systems in diverse geographical areas of the U.S. (DC, Boston, Seattle, Chicago).

Our findings reveal the wide range of terminology used: global citizenship, global competency, global ambassadorship, world citizenship, global education, and international education. Our findings also suggest the growing popularity of global competency within the U.S. context, though often terms of global citizenship and global competency are used interchangeably in policy discourse. Reflected in several of the district’s mission statements and framing of global citizenship education is the Asia Society global competency matrix’s four central components (see Table 1 above). The influence of the Asia Society’s work is revealing about the unique U.S. policy environment, which involves a range of influential non-profit and for-profit advocacy organizations that may shape the definitions and practices of global education developed in local systems.

Our findings also show that some of the local systems draw upon language of global citizenship and competency education as rationales for strategic action (e.g, Chicago). Interestingly, in several of the district's messaging about global citizenship education are explicit statements about equity or global education being for "all students," as reflected in DC, Boston, and Seattle. For example, Boston positions its approach as comprehensive – for all schools, all levels, and all classes – while DC expresses global education as an avenue for enhancing equity across the District. These approaches linking equity with global citizenship education stand in contrast to the general assumptions that global citizenship education is solely an "elitist" practice for the most socio-economically advantaged students.

Additionally, findings from the sample of local systems' discourses on global citizenship education suggest the presence of the dual orientations of "being" and "doing" described within the literature. For instance, among the districts, there is an explicit focus on "doing," exemplified in the linkages between global education and college/career readiness, the globally-competent DCPS graduate, Seattle's mention of the higher order thinking, and Chicago's framing of the skills that the global economy necessitates. Yet, more normative concepts of the "inquisitive and informed" citizen (DC), the importance of cross-cultural understanding (Boston), and the "responsible global citizen" (Chicago) are also included, underscoring more of a "being," values-based orientation.

Beyond discourse, our study reveals distinct ways in which global education gets organized, suggestive of the diverse system ecologies present within the decentralized U.S. education system. Research focused on school districts as systems define four types of general network structures in local school systems: centralized, distributed, decentralized, and fragmented (DAVIS, SUMARA AND D'AMOUR, 2012). Interestingly, we see different evidence of these models within the sample districts' approaches to global citizenship education. For instance, although three of the districts (DC, Boston, Seattle) have a specific unit or department dedicated to global education, there are a diverse set of examples in how global education is both interpreted and operationalized. Seattle appears to have a decentralized system level approach to global citizenship education with its staff of one in its International Education office, assisted by teacher leaders in individual schools, who spend 20-40% of their time developing international education priorities. In contrast, DC is by far the most robust in terms of its centralized approach, as exemplified in its staffing of six full-time Global Education program employees. In contrast, the large district of Chicago has a more diffuse approach to global citizenship education, drawing upon global citizenship rhetorically to drive some of its strategic planning and embedding global citizenship initiatives in several of its areas and departments of work. We might therefore consider Chicago's system-level approach to global citizenship education as fragmented global citizenship education.

All four local systems appear to adopt “at home” forms of global citizenship, with a focus on world languages, curricular and extracurricular programming, not atypical for compulsory education where such small percentages of students participate in study abroad. Yet, each district, to differing extents, also embraces the “abroad” approach. While for most of the districts, these are more diffuse opportunities, DCPS’s new Study Abroad initiative is the largest system-level approach to an “abroad” form of global citizenship. For DCPS, which clearly embarks upon both “at home” and “abroad” programming, one of the key areas in creating a comprehensive approach of global citizenship education will be the extent to which curricular opportunities are available for participating study abroad students to link “abroad” experiences with “at home” global citizenship education. For all of the districts, the extent to which there are professional development opportunities for teachers to both develop teacher global competency and build skills in enhancing student global competence remains a critical area in developing comprehensive global citizenship education.

Our study’s findings are undoubtedly limited in the focus on what select local districts say that they do, rather than on what they do in practice or the impact of these initiatives. Our limited sample of urban districts also excludes both other urban systems embarking on innovative approaches (e.g., Houston, Texas), as well as rural and suburban districts. Future research is needed to explore how districts practice internationalization and the impact of such initiatives, as well as explore larger samples of local systems, particularly as new strategic action and frameworks for cultural and global competencies are being developed at the national level in the U.S. system.

Nonetheless, from our examination of articulated goals, missions, and stated practices in four urban systems in the decentralized U.S. educational context, our study’s findings offer a glimpse into the diverse organization of global citizenship education. Our findings point to the conceptual significance of reaching beyond methodological nationalism and moving *inside* national systems, particularly federal ones (ENGEL, 2016), revealing multiple approaches to global citizenship education within a single system. At a practical level, our study offers an opportunity for U.S. practitioners and policy-makers to compare and share innovative practices in global citizenship education across local levels. In the U.S., despite important initiatives to share practices, such as Mapping the Nation, it is often challenging to maintain active channels for sharing up-to-date information about global education initiatives across districts and states, and across various global education stakeholders, particularly given the dearth of local-level studies of internationalization and global citizenship education at the primary and secondary level. By providing background and data on how, and to what extent, select local systems within the U.S. system (from the more fragmented Chicago system to the more centralized and comprehensive DC approach) seek to advance global citizenship education, we therefore add to the literature on the

manifestation of global citizenship education at the local level, also therefore offering practical insights into programmatic approaches undertaken in different local contexts.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This research is associated with the Internationalizing Education at GW (IE@GW) Collaborative project, funded by the Longview Foundation and the GW UNESCO Chair in International Education for Development. We would like to thank Jennifer Manise and representatives of the selected districts for their assistance with this research, as well as anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

## **REFERENCES**

- ACTFL (n/d): World-readiness standards for learning languages, (<http://www.actfl.org>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- ANDREOTTI, V. (2006): Soft versus critical global citizenship education, *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review* 3(4), pp. 40-51.
- ARITOMI, P. and COOPERSMITH, J. (2009): Characteristics of public school districts in the United States: Results from the 2007-08 schools and staffing survey (NCES 2009-320), National Center for Educational Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences (Washington, DC, U.S. Department of Education) (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009320.pdf>).
- ASIA SOCIETY (n.d.): Mapping the nation: Illinois (<http://asiasociety.org/mapping-nation/illinois>), consultada el 17 de agosto de 2016.
- BARKER, C. (2000): Education for international understanding and global competence: Report of a meeting convened by Carnegie Corporation of New York ([https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer\\_public/6d/b0/6db0fdc1-f2b1-4eea-982a-a313cea6822c/ccny\\_meeting\\_2000\\_competence.pdf](https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/6d/b0/6db0fdc1-f2b1-4eea-982a-a313cea6822c/ccny_meeting_2000_competence.pdf)), consultado el 1 de febrero de 2016
- BOIX MANSILLA, V. and JACKSON, A. (2011): Educating for global competence: Preparing our youth to engage the world (New York, Asia Society)
- BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS (n.d.): Department of Global Education flyer (<http://www.bostonpublicschools.org/Domain/242>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS (n.d.): Global Education (<http://www.bostonpublicschools.org/Domain/242>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (2013): The next generation: Chicago's children, 21<sup>st</sup> century preparation for success in college, career and life, Chicago Public Schools 2013-2018 Action Plan (<http://cps.edu/ScriptLibrary/ActionPlan/docs/CPSActionPlan.pdf>).



- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (2015): Department of literacy: Civic engagement and service learning (cps.edu), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (2015): Office of language and cultural education (cps.edu), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (2015): Stats and facts ([http://cps.edu/About\\_CPS/At-a-glance/Pages/Stats\\_and\\_facts.aspx](http://cps.edu/About_CPS/At-a-glance/Pages/Stats_and_facts.aspx)), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS: LANGUAGE EDUCATION (2010): Preparing Chicago public schools for a global community: A report of the bilingual education and world language commission (<http://www.generationallchicago.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Language-Education-Preparing-Chicago-Public-School-Students-for-a-Global-Community.pdf>), consultado el 27 de junio de 2016.
- COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (2006): Education for global leadership: The importance of international studies and foreign language education for US economic and national security (<http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/Finalreport.pdf>), consultado el 10 de junio de 2016.
- COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS INITIATIVE (2016): Frequently asked questions (<http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/FAQs.pdf>) consultada el 21, de junio de 2016.
- COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS (2012): U.S. education reform and national security (Washington, DC, Council on Foreign Relations Press)
- COUNCIL ON STANDARDS FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION TRAVEL (CSIET) (2016): 2015-2016 International youth exchange statistics: 2015-2016 academic year.
- DAVIES, L. (2006): Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action?, *Educational Review*, (58)1, pp. 5-25.
- DAVIS, B, SUMARA, D. and D'AMOUR, L. (2012): Understanding school districts as learning systems: Some lessons from three cases of complex transformation, *Journal of Educational Change*, 13, pp. 373-399.
- DCPS GLOBAL EDUCATION (n.d.): <http://dcpsglobaled.org>.
- DE WIT, H. and ENGEL, L. C. (2015): Building and deepening a comprehensive strategy to internationalise Romanian higher education, in J. SALMI, E. EGRON-POLAK, R. PRICOPIE, A. CURAJ and L. DECA, *Romania: Between the Bologna Process and National Challenges/Priorities* (New York: Springer)
- EDWARDS, B. T., ANDER R. and HERDA, S. (2015): Teaching Arabic in our schools: Globalizing education for Chicago's next generation, *The Chicago Council on Global Affairs* ([http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/sites/default/files/EL%202015%20ArabicReport\\_v5.pdf](http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/sites/default/files/EL%202015%20ArabicReport_v5.pdf)), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- EIDOO, S., INGRAM, L-A., MACDONALD, A., NABAVI, M., PASHBY, K. and STILLE, S. (2011): "Through the kaleidoscope": Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education, *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34 (4), pp. 59-85.
- EMERGING LEADERS PERSPECTIVES (2012): ELP ventures: Supporting innovation in public education for Chicago's Global Future, *The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*.

- ENGEL, L. C. (2016): Defining and debating the common “we”: Analyses of citizen formation beyond the nation-state mold, in J. WILLIAMS and W. BOKHORTHENG, (Re)building Memory: Textbooks, Identity, and The Pedagogies and Politics of Imagining Community. (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers)
- FRAILLON, J., AINLEY, J., SCHULZ, W., FREIDMAN, T. and GEBHARDT, E. (2014): Preparing for life in a digital age: The IEA international computer and information literacy study international report (Amsterdam, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement)
- HOWE, D. (2008): Ten strategies to internationalize schools: Governments respond to globalization (<http://asiasociety.org/ten-strategies-internationalize-schools>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016
- KNIGHT, J. (2008): Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalisation (Rotterdam, Sense Publishers)
- MARSHALL, J. (2014, 22 December): Learning about and practicing democracy, Chicago Tribune (<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/letters/chi-letters-learning-about-and-practicing-democracy-20141222-story.html>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2016): School and district profiles (<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00350000&orgtypecode=5&fycode=2016>) consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- MILLAR, R. M. (2016): What’s global about the common core standards, Asia Society (<http://asiasociety.org/education/whats-global-about-common-core-standards>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016.
- MYSPTS (n.d.): District summary reporting: Student educational status (<https://mysps.seattleschools.org/>) consultada el 11 de agosto de 2016.
- NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (2010): Global competence is a 21<sup>st</sup> century imperative ([http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/PB28A\\_Global\\_Competence11.pdf](http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/PB28A_Global_Competence11.pdf)) consultado en el 1 de febrero de 2016.
- NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (2007): International education and foreign languages: Keys to securing America’s future, Report of the Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hayes International Education Programs (Washington, DC, National Academies Press).
- NODDINGS, N. (2005): Global citizenship: Promises and problems, in N. NODDINGS, Educating Citizens for Global Awareness, pp. 1-21 (New York and London, Teachers College Press)
- ORTLOFF, D. H. and SHONIA, O. N. (2015): Teacher conceptualizations of global citizenship: Global immersion experiences and implications for the empathy/threat dialectic, in B. M. MAGUTH and J. HILBURN, The State of Global Education: Learning with the World and its People (New York, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Friends Group)
- PARTNERSHIP FOR 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY SKILLS (2007): Beyond the three Rs: Voter attitudes toward 21<sup>st</sup> century skills (Tuscon, Author).
- PARTNERSHIP FOR 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY SKILLS (2016, January 25): P21 applauds congressmen Loeb sack and Costello for bipartisan congressional 21<sup>st</sup> century skills caucus (<http://www.p21.org/news-events/press-releases/1837-p21-applauds->

- congressmen-loebsack-and-costello-for-bipartisan-congressional-21st-century-skills-caucus), consultado el 1 de febrero de 2016.
- PASHBY, K. (2008): Demands on and of citizenship and schooling: 'Belonging' and 'diversity' in the global imperative, in M. O'SULLIVAN and K. PASHBY (Eds.), *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives* (Rotterdam, Sense Publishers)
- RAPOPORT, A. (2010): We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education, *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 5(3), pp. 179-190.
- REARDON, S. F., KALOGRIDES, D. and SHORES, K. (2016): The geography of racial/ethnic test score gaps (CEPA Working Paper No. 16-10), Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis (<http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10>), consultada el 9 de agosto de 2016.
- REIMERS, F. (2009): Global competency: Educating the world, *Harvard International Review*, pp. 24-27.
- RIZVI, F. (2009): Towards cosmopolitan learning, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(3), pp. 253-268.
- SASSEN, S. (2005): The global city: Introducing a concept, *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 11(2), pp. 27-43.
- SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (n.d.): International Education ([http://www.seattleschools.org/students/academics/international\\_education/](http://www.seattleschools.org/students/academics/international_education/)), consultada el 9 de agosto de 2016.
- SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (2016): International schools / Dual language immersion task force: Background and issues ([http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_543/File/Intl-DLI\\_Task\\_Force\\_Background\\_and\\_Issues.pdf](http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/Intl-DLI_Task_Force_Background_and_Issues.pdf)).
- SISTER SCHOOLS ABROAD (SSA) (n.d.): (<http://cis.uchicago.edu/oldsite/sites/cis.uchicago.edu/files/resources/SISTER%20SCHOOLS%20ABROAD.pdf>), consultada el 21 de junio de 2016
- SOYSAL, Y. (1994): *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).
- STRAUSS, V. (2016, January 20): Most educated city in U.S.? Data says it's Washington, DC, *The Washington Post* (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2016/01/20/most-educated-city-in-u-s-data-says-its-washington-d-c/>).
- TORRES, C. A. (2015): Solidarity and competitiveness in a global context: comparable concepts in global citizenship education?, *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 14(2), pp. 22-29.
- TRUONG-WHITE, H. and MCLEAN, L. (2015): Digital storytelling for transformative global citizenship education, *Canadian Journal of Education*, 38(2), pp. 1-28.
- UNESCO (1972): *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. (Paris, UNESCO), (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000018/001801e.pdf>)
- UNESCO (1996): *Learning: The treasure within* (Paris, UNESCO) (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001095/109590eo.pdf>)
- UNESCO (2014): *Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (Paris, UNESCO)

- UNESCO (2015): Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives (Paris, UNESCO)
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2012): Succeeding globally through international education and engagement (Washington, DC, US Department of Education), (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/international/international-strategy-2012-16.pdf>)
- WARREN, M. (2005): Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform, *Educational Review*, 75(2), pp. 133-173
- WATKINS, K. E. and CSEH, M. (2009): Competence development in the United States of America: Limiting expectations or unleashing global capacities, en K. ILLERIS (Ed.), *Competence development*, pp. 16-40 (London, Routledge)
- WOOD, B.E. (2014): Participatory capita: Bourdieu and citizenship education in diverse school communities, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(4), pp. 578-597.
- ZEMACH-BERSIN, T. (2007): Global citizenship and study abroad: It's all about US, *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 1(2), pp. 16-28

## **PROFESIOGRAFÍA**

### ***Laura C. Engel***

Assistant professor of international education and international affairs at the George Washington University in Washington, DC, USA, where she serves as Director of the International Education Program. Her research examines globalization, citizenship, and education policy in federal systems with a focus on the policy uses of international assessments in national and sub-national systems and the contribution of education to global citizenship and social cohesion. She holds a PhD in Education Policy Studies from the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. **Datos de contacto:** 2134 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20052. E-mail: [Lce@gwu.edu](mailto:Lce@gwu.edu)

### ***Jessica Fundalinski***

Graduate student at the George Washington University in the International Education MA program and a current public school teacher in Northern Virginia. Her interests include equity in globalization initiatives for primary and secondary schools and fostering digital citizenship in students. **Datos de contacto:** 218 E. Mason Ave., Apt. # 10, Alexandria, VA 22301. E-mail: [jessica.fundalinski@gmail.com](mailto:jessica.fundalinski@gmail.com)

### ***Tess Canon***

Program Coordinator for Partnerships and International Relations in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development at The George Washington University. Her

research interests include global education, international curriculum integration and program evaluation. Tess earned a Master's in International Education at the George Washington University in 2016. **Datos de contacto:** 1701 Park Rd. NW, Apt 108, Washington, DC, 20010. E-mail: [cannont@gwu.edu](mailto:cannont@gwu.edu)

**Fecha de recepción:** 19 de agosto de 2016.

**Fecha de aceptación:** 22 de diciembre de 2016.