Fair Trade Learning Course Planning Worksheet

Education Partner (Name of university):	
Community Partner (Name of local partner):	
Third-party Provider (If applicable):	
Program Theme/Focus:	

Directions: Reflect on each core principle of FTL as it relates to your course/program. Consider what it currently looks like (document that in the middle column) and then imagine what actions could to be taken to move towards a more ideal situation (document that in the right column).

Fair Trade Learning Indicators	What does it look like?	Actions to be taken
Core principles 1. Dual Purposes. 2. Community Voice and Direction. 3. Commitment and Sustainability. 4. Transparency. 5. Environmental Sustainability and Footprint Reduction. 6. Economic Sustainability. 7. Deliberate Diversity, Intercultural Contact, and Reflection. 8. Global Community Building.		

AMIZADE
Global Service-Learning

Fair Trade Learning Indicators	What does it look like?	Actions to be taken
Community-centered standards 1. Purpose. 2. Community preparation. 3. Timing, duration, and repetition. 4. Group size. 5. Local sourcing. 6. Direct service, advocacy, education, project management, and organization building. 7. Reciprocity.		

Fair Trade Learning Indicators	What does it look like?	Actions to be taken
Student-centered standards 1. Purpose. 2. Student preparation. 3. Connect context to coursework and learning. 4. Challenge and support. 5. Program length. 6. Instruction and mentoring. 7. Communicative skills and language learning. 8. Preparation for healthy return to home communities.		

> Fair Trade Learning Principles

These standards are intended as aspirational guidelines, not as limiting proscriptions. While our strongest aspiration is that all programs would achieve the standards indicated here, we also recognize that program building and institutional change are most frequently characterized as journeys rather than revolutions. These guidelines are intended to help draw attention to key issues and thereby suggest a robust way forward.

Core principles

These core principles provide the overall FTL standards that require buy-in from all stakeholders.

1.1 Dual Purposes. Programs are organized with community and student outcomes in mind. The ethics of integrating community development with student learning necessitates that as much attention is paid to community outcomes as to student learning. One purpose is therefore never primary. Rather, community-driven outcomes and student learning about ethical global engagement must be held in balance with one another.

1.2 Community Voice and Direction. Drawing on best practices in community development, service-learning, and public health, community-based efforts must be community driven. Community engagement, learning, program design, and budgeting should all include significant community direction, feedback, and opportunities for iterative improvements. Attention to the best practices referenced above suggests practitioners should triangulate community voice, actively seek the voices of the marginalized, and otherwise be systematic about inclusion of broad community perspective and multiple stakeholders regarding direction and goals. While student outcomes are certainly important and we point to dual purposes above, the typical bias of universities to serving students and organizations to serving customers requires a special focus on and attention to community voice and direction.

1.3 Commitment and Sustainability. International education programming should only be undertaken within a robust understanding of how the programming relates to the continuous learning of the student and community-defined goals of the host community. For students, this translates as a relationship between the program, preparatory courses, and re-entry programming. Such programming should support the development of the individual student and/or continuous connection to the community partnership or ethical question addressed after returning to campus. Ideally, on-campus faculty, activities, and programs support students' efforts to engage in ongoing global civic engagement and social change programming related to their immersion experiences. For community partners, this means clarity regarding the nature of the commitment with the university or international education provider, as well as a clear vision of likely developments in the partnership and community-driven goals for

the next year, three years forward, and even as many as five years in the future.

1.4 Transparency. Students and community partners should be aware of how program funds are spent and why. Decision making regarding program fund expenditures should be transparent. Lines of authority should be clear. Transparency should extend throughout GSL relationships, from the university to and through and to the community.

1.5 Environmental Sustainability and Footprint Reduction. Program administrators should dialogue with community partners about environmental impacts of the program and the balance of those impacts with program benefits. Together, partnership leaders must consider strategies for impact mediation, including supporting local environmental initiatives and/or opportunities for participants to travel to and from their program site "carbon neutral" (e.g. by purchasing "passes" or "green tags").

1.6 Economic Sustainability. Program costs and contributions should be aligned with local economies or social dynamics within the community. Donations or project support should reflect a sustainability perspective, thereby taking into account and/or developing the capacity of the community partner to manage funding effectively and ethically. University-based practitioners may also need to cooperate with their development and finance offices to create the capacity to responsibly manage funds targeted toward these specific initiatives.

1.7 Deliberate Diversity, Intercultural Contact, and Reflection. The processes that enhance intercultural learning and acceptance involve deliberate intercultural contact and structured reflective processes by trusted mentors. This is true whether groups are multi-ethnic and situated domestically, comprised of international participants, only students, or community members and students. Program administrators and community partners should work to enhance diversity of participants at all points of entry, and should nurture structured reflective intercultural learning and acceptance within all programs.

1.8 Global Community Building. The program should point toward better future possibilities for students and community members. With community members, the program should encourage multidirectional exchange to support learning opportunities for individuals from the receiving communities, as well as continuous contact and commitment regarding local development and/or advocacy goals. With students, the program should facilitate a return process whereby learners have reflective opportunities and resources to explore growth in their understandings of themselves as individuals capable of responsible and ethical behavior in global context.

Community-centered standards

These standards elucidate the areas of focus by all stakeholders to ensure a fair and positive impact of programs on communities in which they operate.

2.1 Purpose. Program administrators should engage in continuous dialogue with community partners regarding the partnership's potential to contribute to community-driven efforts that advance human flourishing in the context of environmental, economic, and social sustainability. Continuous dialogue should include minimally annual evaluation and assessment of the partnership and its purposes.

2.2 Community preparation. Community organizations and partners should receive clear pre-program clarity regarding expectations, partnership parameters through formal or informal memoranda of understanding, and sensitization that includes visitors' customs and patterns, and fullest possible awareness of possible ramifications (both positive and negative) of hosting.

2.3 Timing, duration, and repetition. Program administrators should cooperate with community members to arrive at acceptable program timing, lengths, and repetition of student groups in communities. Different communities have demonstrated varying degrees of interest in timing of programs, their duration, and their regularity of repetition. This, like all such Hartman et al., 2015 conversations, must be highly contextualized within particular communities and partnerships.

2.4 Group size. Program administrators must discuss ideal group size with community members and arrange program accordingly. Large groups of visiting students can have positive and negative effects on local communities, including undermining traditional cultural knowledge and distorting the local economy.

2.5 Local sourcing. The program should maximize the economic benefits to local residents by cooperating with community members to ensure program participant needs are addressed through indigenous sources. Community-engaged programs should categorically not parallel the economic structures of enclave tourism. Maximum local ownership and economic benefit is central to the ethos of community partnership. For example:

> 2.5.1 Transparently reimbursed host families offer stronger local economic development than hotels or hostels that are frequently owned by distant corporate organizations.
>
> 2.5.2 Local eateries, host families, and/or local cooks should be contracted to support local economic development and offer opportunities to learn about locally available foods.
>
> 2.5.3 Local guides and educators should be contracted to the fullest extent possible, including contracting with professionalized/credentialed as well as

non-professionalized and non-credentialed educators who hold and understand local knowledge, history, traditions, and worldview.

2.6 Direct service, advocacy, education, project management, and organization building . To the extent desired by the community, the program involves students as service-learners, interns, and researchers in locally accountable organizations. Students learn from, contribute skills or knowledge to, and otherwise support local capacity through community improvement actions over a continuous period of time. Ideally, community members or organizations should have a direct role in preparing or training students to maximize their contributions to community work.

2.7 Reciprocity . Consistent with stated best practices in service-learning, public health, and development, efforts are made to move toward reciprocal relationships with community partners. These efforts should include opportunities for locals to participate in accredited courses, chances to engage in multi-directional exchange, and clear leadership positions, authority, and autonomy consistent with the ideals articulated in "Community Voice and Direction" above. Outcomes for communities should be as important as student outcomes; if this balance is not clear, program design adjustments should be made.

Student-centered standards

The student-centered standards are focused on maximizing students' learning and experiences before, during, and after their participation in the programs.

1.9 Purpose. The program leaders instill an ethical vision of human flourishing by systematically encouraging student reflection and growth regarding responsible and ethical behavior in global context.

1.10 Student preparation. Robust learning in international education is clearly predicated upon careful preparation for participating students. Student preparation should include pre-or-in-field training that equips learners with the basic conceptual

and experiential "tools" to optimize field learning, with greater or less attention given to the concepts mentioned here based on program design, community desires, and student learning goals. Programs may expect students to acquire a working knowledge of the host country's political history and its relationship to global trends and pressures, current events, group customs and household patterns, ethnographic skills, service ethics, and research methods, as well as culturally appropriate project design, participatory methods, and other community-based approaches and tools. This may require transdisciplinary courses and multidisciplinary cooperation among faculty members.

1.11 Connect context to coursework and learning. The program leaders engage documented best practices in international education, service-learning, and experiential education broadly by systematically using reflection to connect experiential program components with course goals, global civic engagement goals, and intercultural learning goals.

1.12 Challenge and support. Program leaders embrace lessons learned regarding reflection in experiential education and intercultural learning by ensuring the living and learning environment is characterized by "challenge and support" for students.

> 1.12.1 Student housing opportunities encourage sustained intercultural contact, opportunities for reflection, and connection to intercultural learning.
>
> 1.12.2 Students are systematically encouraged to engage in contact with the local population that deliberately moves students out of "group cocoons" and into interpersonal relationships with a variety of local individuals.
>
> 1.12.3 Service projects or community programs are conducted collaboratively, with students working alongside community members to maximize cultural understanding and local context knowledge.

1.13 Program length. Program design decisions recognize the strengths and limitations of different lengths of programming, and learning outcomes and educative processes are specifically calibrated to achieve outcomes consistent with program length.

1.14 Instruction and mentoring. The program provides the necessary external facilitation and supervision to keep students focused, active, and reflective in their learning. The field support system includes "mentor-advisors" drawn from the host community (e.g. host family members, service supervisors, language coaches, and research guides).

1.15 Communicative skills and language learning. Based on the length of the program and consultation with community partners, the program leaders choose the best possible strategy to improve current language and communication skills and spark interest in future language learning. The growth in short-term study abroad should in this light be seen as an opportunity to entice students toward language learning, rather than an excuse to avoid significant language development. More and deeper language learning is always optimal for improved communication and community partnership.

1.16 Preparation for healthy return to home communities. Before and after return, program leadership offers guidance, information, reflective opportunities, and exposure to networks intended to support students' growth as globally engaged, interested, and active individuals. This is part of both course planning and institutional support, as it should extend from the course into student programming and organizations as well as career services and academic career opportunities.

Source: Fair Trade Learning: Ethical standards for community-engaged international volunteer tourism

AMIZADE
Global Service-Learning