Global Responsibility and Sustainable Development: tailoring the concepts to business programmes.

ABSTRACT

The Jo' burg summit (or Jamboree, as some might suggest) has once again put the spotlight on the global responsibility and sustainability agenda. Yet for all the column inches that the summit has attracted, a survey of UK Business Schools suggests that rarely do such matters merit more than a footnote in the curriculum. The lack of coverage is almost in inverse proportion to government policy directives, which date back to the early nineties. The macro policy issues are disturbing but are not the direct concerns of this paper, though it is tempting to enjoin with Adler (2002) in commenting that *'it is easier to fight for your principles, rather than to live by them.'* After all, 'living by them', entails a commitment of resources and as other papers in this conference eloquently document, learning and teaching in HE, is severely compromised by ever competing pressures for increasingly scarce resources. This predicament on a much smaller scale mimics the dilemmas that dogged the Jo'burg summit. However, the purpose of this paper is not to bemoan this predicament but rather to suggest a way forward which works from the inside out.

The paper starts by tracing the emergence of sustainable development, in terms of the national educational policy agenda and the response of business schools. The focus then shifts to the institutional level and documents how Bournemouth University has sought to address global perspectives and sustainable development issues. A summary is presented of how the agenda has been tackled at the institutional level, the involvement of an external party DEED (Development Education in Dorset) and the developments within the Business School; the experience under-lines the importance of engaging key internal and external stakeholders, in securing institutional approval and resources. A key 'product' of this development strategy, a Level H unit entitled 'Global Responsibility and Sustainable Business Practice', is presented as a case-study. Reflecting on experience thus far, a summary is presented of the lessons learned (some bitter, some not so) and the importance of the agenda is confirmed. An 'insider's rationale' for the further extension of this agenda within the curriculum, is set out.

THE EMERGENCE OF NATIONAL POLICY AND THE RESPONSE OF BUSINESS SCHOOLS

In the decades post WWII there has been an increasing awareness of environmental issues, the concomitant social implications, and the role of business in their causation and re-mediation. Just a few examples might include: mercury bio-accumulation at Minamata Bay, Japan in the 50's; organochloride pesticides in the 60's; toxic waste at Love Canal, USA, 'Save the Whale' and over-fishing in the 70's; the 'ozone hole', acid rain and deforestation in the 80's and; 'Global Warming' in the 90's and 00's. Underlining the issues is the suggestion that there is, perhaps, a fundamental problem in the way business is done, at least from a societal perspective.

In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development, commonly referred to as the Brundtland Commission, published *Our Common Future*. Much of the report focused on issues of population, food security, loss of biodiversity, energy, industry, and human settlements, emphasising that these issues are intertwined and must be addressed holistically, as an integrated global strategy.

The term *sustainable development* was coined by the Brundtland Commission report, and defined as "*development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*"

To achieve the recommendations considered necessary to preserve and restore the environment of our planet, the Commission recommended the development of a United Nations program on sustainable development. The discussions and recommendations that emanated from the Commission provided the central impetus for the organisation of the United Nations' Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in June 1992. At this conference, debate focused on significant world environmental and development issues such as climate change, biodiversity, desertification, and sustainability. 'Agenda 21', with its central mantra of "think globally act locally", emerged from this conference as the new mind set, for an environmentally sustainable future.

In the UK, the Government's Sustainable Education Panel was set up in 1998, as a response to the Government's Environmental Responsibility Review Report (Environmental Responsibility: an Agenda for Further and Higher Education, Toyne, 1993), to enable the implementation of the following recommendations:

'That
▪   *Enabling responsible citizenship be recognised as core business of (all) learning institutions and a legitimate purpose of lifetime learning*

▪   *All FE/HE institutions should have developed the capacity (to provide all students with the opportunity to develop defined levels of competence relating to responsible global citizenship)*

▪   *All those responsible for defining national standards relating to professional practice should ensure that their standards make appropriate reference to sustainable development issues.*'

The Toyne Report, albeit from a largely environmental and ecological perspective, established the national agenda for environmental education but provided little clarification of what 'global citizenship' entails (Dower et al 1999). Ali Khan (in her follow up to Toyne, 1996) added further impetus to the agenda and proffered 'core themes' that should be part of the 'learning agenda for responsible global citizenship' in FHE. She suggested that learning for sustainability and responsible citizenship should include: sustainable development seen as a 'cornerstone' of learning for global citizenship; a holistic viewing and systems thinking; an interdisciplinary perspective combining natural and social science; responsible citizenship developed through experience of community;

and understanding of the management of change (precautionary principle, futures thinking, commitment to lifelong learning).

Subsequently, Forum to the Future, a member organisation/thinktank of the Educational Panel (working in the field of sustainable development facilitation) was commissioned to undertake the 'HE 21 Project' (1998) as part of the Panel's work programme. Three key subject areas were identified: Business, Design and Education.

A survey of 104 business schools was conducted, to evaluate the state of sustainable development education in business programmes. Of the 30% of Schools responding, not one had specified a learning agenda relevant to the needs of students, which embraced the concepts and themes of sustainable development. While some business curricula included some elements, the results of the survey demonstrated that coverage was limited. The respondents revealed that the main barriers to development were cited as 'lack of time' (and linked to that a perception that the issues were of marginal importance) and 'lack of staff expertise'. Some respondents suggested that the terminology associated with the concepts was unfamiliar and confusing.

The Secretary of State for Education, in response, emphasised the centrality of the government's 'citizenship' agenda suggesting that *business educators can do more*'. The support of organisations such as BAA, B&Q, J.Sainsbury, London Transport and many others was sought to back the initiative. In all, over thirty companies signed a statement that asked for '*a higher priority to be made of sustainable development education, in all UK business schools/Higher education business departments*'. Theses organisations emphasised that Business Schools must '*play their part*' in helping students acquire that '*crucial knowledge and aptitude*'. The paper, 'A Sustainable Development Education: Business Specification', was published by the HE21 project, on behalf of the DETR (Department for Environment, Transport and Regions), to facilitate Business Schools engagement.

It is now almost ten years since Toyne. How many business schools recognise citizenship and sustainable development as 'core' business? Experience suggests that little has changed across the sector and very few business schools have taken these issues seriously.

And yet what is clear from the Johannesburg Earth Summit, 2002, is that globalisation, with the increasing prevalence of the 'liberal capitalist' consumerist system, and an emphasis on 'small government' and self-regulation, means that business is central to delivering sustainability. But how many business managers fully comprehend the issues and have the skills and willingness to take action? Many businesses continue to view sustainable development and social responsibility as a cost rather than a strategic objective (despite examples of successful companies such as such as IKEA). Is it any wonder when the business and management curricula are largely silent on such critical matters?

This paper presents a case for why global responsibility and sustainable development should be an important part of business and management education. The paper then provides a case study that sets out the developments at Bournemouth University and in particular, how the Business School has embraced the agenda to develop the learning and teaching experience of students. The School curriculum has been developed to encompass issues of citizenship, global citizenship and sustainability. The HE 21 Project has informed

specifically, the development of a Level H, on-line unit, titled 'Global Responsibility and Sustainable Business Practice'.

The paper then identifies both factors that have been instrumental in the success of the project and the potential constraints and barriers that need to be addressed, if the agenda is to move forward.

In conclusion the paper reinforces the rationale for the implementation of the HE 21 Project. It is suggested that the agenda will not move forward without project champions, resources and time, to think through the issues and develop staff. Opportunities to work with colleagues in Development Education also provide for different perspectives to be considered. It is suggested that innovation is predicated on 'pump-priming', and is always in danger of being 'squeezed out' by the demands of an entrenched curriculum.

WHY DO THIS?

It would seem important before proceeding further to ask the question, why do this? Do we not face enough pressures already within higher education (HE) delivering the curriculum? Are there not sufficient challenges associated with a mass system, widening participation, QAA bureaucracy, professional accreditation etc. to occupy our time? The list is endless. It might be argued that the compliance framework in which we now operate results in a more instrumental attitude and that for many staff, surviving HE leaves little time and energy, to care about the role that HE might play in educating future generations, in the wider sense. So why should we encourage staff to think otherwise?

Perhaps a useful starting point for reflection starts with the words of Oxfam:

'*Young people today will grow up to be citizens in a world which holds enormous potential either for eradicating absolute poverty and creating an equitable and sustainable world, or for increasing inequality between the rich and the poor with the consequent social insecurity and ecological disintegration*' (Oxfam, 1997 p2). Oxfam goes on to say that education that includes a focus on equity and social justice '*with the development of the global Citizen at its heart, is the key to a sustainable future.*'

Powerful stuff, but how do we persuade our beleaguered colleagues? In the course of our deliberations we identified five rationales.

Enlightened self-interest

We could argue from an 'enlightened self-interest' or utilitarian perspective, that we stand to gain. This operates on two levels. The fact that we all live in the 'global' environment is uncontested, and thus, a potential Hardinesque Tragic Common (Hardin, 1968). If our students are better prepared to address the issues then we can sit back hoping that they will exercise good stewardship. At another level encouraging students to appreciate diversity, become more aware of ethical dilemmas and act as more socially responsible citizens enhances the learning and teaching environment. This, in turn, is good PR and makes the University more attractive to international students. It also improves the perception of the

University within the local community (where thinking global, results in action at a local level).

Moral

We might also argue on moral grounds, that education that fails to take account of our global inter-dependence fails to give students a fully rounded understanding of whatever subject they are studying. This is perhaps confusing the 'moral' argument with the educational but it is not the intention to open up the problematic debate about morality and 'moral duty', in the personal sense.

Educational principles

Sustainable business development requires individuals to challenge assumptions and ways of working; to take a polycentric view of subjects; to critique orthodoxy and to develop more integrated and creative ways of working. These qualities would seem to match the view of education as a transforming experience, which writers such as Mezirow (1997) and Barnett (2000) suggest, are critical to learning and teaching in the 21st century.

The role of education in a democratic society

'Any democratic society worthy of the name must ensure that its citizens have the intellectual tools and cultural space to meaningfully interrogate the validity claims of powerful individuals and institutions' (Blewitt 2002).

It could be argued that the very role of HE is to develop students who interrogate conventional wisdom. Can educators claim to have fulfilled this function if they do not address the global issues?

Business principles

From a business and management education perspective, it could also be argued that failing to address the global perspectives and the ethical dilemmas that are intrinsically tied with business management and sustainable development, means that business students are presented with an impoverished knowledge base and skill set. It could be argued that the 'traditional' curriculum does not prepare students to handle super-complexity (Barnett 2000), and that students generally, lack the transferable skills required to resolve ethical dilemmas. Many business programmes leave them with a limited appreciation of cultural diversity, a limited understanding of the political implications of globalisation, and an inability to challenge 'the west is best', and 'globalisation is neutral', assumptions.

Responsive business criticism

One might argue, more controversially, that part of the reason why we face such social insecurity and ecological disintegration is because business schools and other educators have failed in their responsibility to address such issues. It is instructive in this regard to note the comments of a North American colleague (following discussion by the Critical Management Studies Interest Group), in the wake of Enron and corporate scandals. Paul Adler (2002) reflects on the seriousness of the issues and urges business schools to engage in 'critical self-reflection'.

It is suggested that schools need to review their approach to ensure that ethical behaviour is encouraged. The theories business schools 'propagate' need to be challenged to ensure that they are '*defensible in the light of recent events*'.

Academics should ask themselves whether their classrooms have become '*pulpits for the ideological celebration of the invisible hand of the market*', where government regulation is perceived as unwelcome and even an '*intrusion into the world of business*'.

We must also ask: "*Are we fulfilling our highest mission in helping our students acquire the skills needed to participate in on-going debates on the direction of our society?*"

This 'call' for '*reflection on business schools' policies*', (Adler 2002) seems particularly appropriate in the light of this project.

The next section describes Bournemouth University's response to 'global perspectives' at the institutional level, before focusing on the work that has taken place within the Business School.

WHAT HAVE WE DONE AT BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY?

The 'trigger' for developments at Bournemouth, was the initiation of a two-year funded DFID (Department for International Development) 'mini-project' in 1998, called 'University Links'. A relationship was established with DEED (Development Education in East Dorset), with the aim of exploring the potential for Global Perspectives across the University.

Staff and student volunteers, with an interest in 'global' issues, met regularly with DEED staff and formed the 'GPN' (Global Perspectives Network). The process of raising awareness of global issues, citizenship and sustainability concepts began. By 1999, the group had formulated a document 'A Global Vision for Bournemouth University' and a plan for engaging the recognition and commitment of the wider University. As part of the strategy, it was determined as vitally important to secure commitment through the formal committee structures, to get senior management buy-in, as well as staff and students on side. Fortunately two of the 'volunteers' were already on several committees so facilitated this; representation was also made to the Office of the Vice Chancellor. The 'Global Vision' document passed through the committee structure and found its way to Senate. It secured the approval of Senate, with the recommendation that all Schools within the University should consider how the issues raised in the document could be addressed in curriculum design.

The reactions to the document were mixed. Some Schools were very enthusiastic; others less so; some staff welcomed the opportunity to debate the wider issues; other staff were uncomfortable with the debate about 'values' and thought it was not the business of HE; others suggested that 'teaching a capitalist approach ensured students survived in the job market!' The 'International Office' was particularly supportive however, were reminded that the agenda was not just about improving the environment for overseas students, albeit that this was important. As most staff in the sector are under pressure most of the time, it was not surprising that immediate change was not achieved. There were pockets of activity but nothing radical.

The 'Network' continued to seek opportunities to move the agendas forward and to raise awareness. Staff development activities and workshops addressed such issues as 'Supporting UK and Overseas' students in a multi-cultured University' and 'Global Perspectives and the Curriculum'. A unit was also developed for the MA Professional Development programme. Progress was disappointingly slow, in part because the 'volunteers' were dispersed across the University and largely, because the only resource available was their time. Securing funding was seen as critical and the group deployed considerable effort at the end of 1999, into completing a DFID 'matched funding' bid to set up a Global Perspectives Unit within the university. Unfortunately, while the 'strength of the proposal' was commended, DFID responded that its priorities were the *'5-18 age range and teacher training, though there may be important opportunities in…higher education'.*

It would have been easy at that point to go no further. A handful of volunteers continued, with the Business School providing a leading role, driving the agenda forward and leading a funding bid to the DEA (Development Education Association). Only four universities were selected to take part in the 'DEA Global Perspectives in Higher Education Project' launched in 2000; Bournemouth University was one of them. Unfortunately there was no correlation between the complexity of the bid requirements and the funding however in completing the application, information had to be provided on some of the University's own 'sustainable/environmental policies' and this in itself, acted as a trigger for development. The University also became a member of the DEA. An internal bid (Learning and Teaching Development Initiative Funding) was also successful and this enhanced the viability of the project.

Attracting the DEA funding, albeit modest, was a critical success factor and the external trigger for change. Last year the group made further representation to members of the Office of the Vice Chancellor. Global issues have now been incorporated into the University's Strategic Plan and the PVC (Academic) agreed to take over the chair of GPN. The Network has now been formally recognised as the University's 'Global Perspectives Group' and reports into the University's Learning and Teaching Committee. All Heads of Learning and Teaching were asked to provide a report on how their School has responded to the 'Global Vision' document. Formal links have also been made with the 'Energy Group', the 'International Office', the 'Equal Opportunity and Diversity' agenda and the 'Widening Participation Group'.

HOW HAVE WE DEVELOPED THE CURRICULA WITHIN THE BUSINESS SCHOOL?

The Business School Executive responded positively to the ideas expressed in the 'Global Vision' document and the paper was referred to the School Committee for debate. The Committee needed very little convincing that it would be an excellent idea to embrace some of the concepts. It would improve the learning experience of both UK and International students (the student population represents over thirty countries). It would enhance the learning environment. It was part of educating 'critical beings' in the sense of Barnett (1997). It would also differentiate Bournemouth students and add to the School's growing reputation for innovation.

Business School students secure employment across a range of industry sectors and professions, achieving positions of influence quite early in their careers. It therefore seemed logical, that if the curricula were to encompass more 'global citizen' ideology, then over time, there might be a possibility of affecting a degree of change in business practice. Perhaps all students might not embrace the issues and bring about 'transformation' in the 'emancipatory' sense but at least they would have had some grounding in the agenda, and an increased awareness of the consequences of personal and organisational decision making, on the global context.

The decision was made that the concept of educating 'global citizens' should be part of the philosophy of the School and that developing global perspectives should be part of the Learning and Teaching Strategy.

The School has pioneered the application of experiential and participative learning approaches. Action Learning and reflective practice have always been seen as important. This helped us to secure the DEA funding and meant that we already shared a common perspective with our new contacts working in development education, where their way of working matched the learning and teaching ethos of the School.

The curricula already included units such as 'International Awareness' (Level C), 'International Capability' (Level I) 'Management Ethics' (Level I) and an M Level unit, 'International Social Responsibility'. Reviewing the curricula revealed a gap at Level H and further work that could be undertaken to develop a coherent theme through the programmes. Our DEED colleague demonstrated 'Preferred Futures' (Hicks 1996) exercises and these became part of all students' first-year induction. (These are now being refined and will be part of Personal Development Portfolios). The DEA funding allowed us to critique the provision and seek further opportunities to broaden perspectives. It also allowed for the development of an 'on-line' Level H unit, 'Global Responsibility and Sustainable Business Practice'.

All first year students engage with Business Simulations to integrate core knowledge and skills. The activities they undertake were modified to shift the focus from setting up an enterprise for personal gain to working with voluntary organisations. The skills deployed are the same but the learning is enhanced to embrace the concept of local 'citizenship'. The emphasis has become more altruistic and allows for engagement with 'community'. The students have participated with enthusiasm. The learning experience will provide valuable CV and interview material. It has also enhanced the visibility of the School within the community.

The 'Adaptive Manager' core unit at Level H has also been developed to facilitate 'reflective learning' techniques and enhance students' abilities to manage ambiguity and uncertainty. The unit encourages students to challenge management orthodoxy, question their own values and explore the socio-political context.

As all programmes within the School were due for review to bring them in to line with the new Quality Framework and Subject Benchmark, the opportunity was presented to secure the DEED partner as a consultant, to critique the wider curricula. This involved meetings with Programme Leaders and reading and commenting on, all programme documentation. The importance of developing a common language was continually highlighted. The project has required careful facilitation to translate the University perspective for DEED

and the DEED perspective to the academic team. Sensitivity is also important where group members have strong and sometimes conflicting, value sets. This can come to the fore when dealing with difficult concepts. Defining a 'global citizen' is essentially problematic and tied with values. In developing the curriculum, the view was adopted that students should explore for themselves the features of this problematic. The curriculum perspective is, after all, one that emphasises diversity of perspective and personal learning.

As a result of introducing a development education perspective, all students will now enjoy a wider learning experience. The 'global citizen theme' runs through all levels of the programme and the intention is to pick up the theme from the level of 'Records of Achievement', build on 'citizenship' concepts and develop it through to the final year. The unit that we have developed with the DEA funding is described in more detail below.

THE GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY AND SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS PRACTICE 'UNIT'

Part of the sprit of sustainable development and Agenda 21 is action. It was therefore decided that the unit should embrace both the theoretical concepts and sustainable business practice, pragmatically blending the 'experiential liberalism', 'experiential vocationalism' and 'critical' models of management education (Holman, 2000).

One of the outcomes of the HE21 project was a Business Specification for facilitating the design of business programmes (HE21, 1999). The design team reviewed the specification and despite the fact that it had been designed to be embedded within programmes as parts of units, it was felt that with minor alterations, it could form the basis and learning outcomes of a dedicated unit specification.

The HE21 specification covers both concepts and solutions by providing a set of learning outcomes, these learning outcomes and a desire to engender an ethos that sustainability is about action within one's own sphere of influence, suggested an active learning approach.

Units and programmes cannot be designed in isolation; the University's and concomitant school's strategic plans imparted additional agendas, especially as the unit was in receipt of modest development funding. As part of the funding was from the LTDI fund, the unit also had to be a 'learning and teaching exemplar'. The University's strategic plan stressed a number of applicable agendas: widening access and participation, flexibility and life-long learning, and an emphasis on, delivery within a 'constrained resource base'. It was decided that a facilitated, asynchronous, student-centred online learning approach, would offer the greatest potential to meet strategic needs and offer a vehicle to enhance student learning.

'On-line delivery' would eventually enable the unit to be delivered to students from other parts of the world; a multi-cultural student group would provide a richer understanding of the diversity of perspectives and a wider base to de-construct global issues. Further, curriculum design is never value free; interaction with students and academics from other countries would allow for a 'reality check', on our own 'western – influenced' perspectives.

The pro's and con's of such approaches need to be carefully considered during the design phase. Experience within the school and elsewhere has shown that "content" driven

multimedia type online is costly; has a limed shelf-life and is androgogically dubious, encouraging a reductionist, transmisive, passive, reproductive and shallow approach to learning. Conversely, the collaborative co-construction/deconstruction of knowledge from pre-existing materials, be they textbooks, sets of readings or web resources, can engage students in deep, reflective learning that is both cost effective and self-rejuvenating (Salmon, 2000; Weller 2002).

A review of materials revealed many suitable resources to support the intended learning outcomes. Many organisations are promoting sustainability; much of this is online, and importantly from multiple perspectives, including resources from governments, global organisations (e.g. UN World Bank), regulatory quango's, NGO's, learned societies, companies, 'standards' organisations and business advisory services. Many of these sites were compiled into an online resource base and supplemented with selected readings forming a printed resource pack to provide material to support collaborative learning activities. Such mixed media approaches result in more efficient study logistics and are therefore preferred by students (Laurillard 2001).

A set of learning activities and assessment strategies were constructed around the learning outcomes. Early on it was decided that the unit should be assessed purely through coursework. This decision acknowledged that student-centred units can be study intensive and need a motivational driver. With a student body that can be outcomes orientated and pragmatic, extended coursework provides an additional engagement strategy.

Two sets of learning activities and assessments were designed to investigate the broad topics of sustainability concepts and solutions.

Sustainability concepts are explored through online pyramiding and concept mapping, investigating the relationship between business and sustainability. These 'e-tivities' (Salmon 2000) then inform a series of debates and discussions that develop the issues. The e-tivities are not assessed directly but inform an essay. This helps inhibit "competitive" discussion forum, posting behaviour. The marking criteria are carefully designed to foster good conferencing practice, by asking the student to demonstrate the extent to which their contributions have contributed to the online debate, that is, expanded or commented on the views of others.

Sustainability solutions are investigated through the online collaborative preparation of a group report and an individual learning journal.

A fictional case study has been developed that requires students to formulate a sustainability strategy for a small manufacturing company, after the introduction of a sustainability purchasing policy by one of the major customers. The learning journal requires students to reflect on their learning process and relate their learning to other units that they have studied.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM DEVELOPING THE UNIT AND TRYING TO INCORPORATE GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES?

It would be incorrect to say that as a result of the project we have a definitive sense of the terminology and all the issues. At times it has seemed that it is a case of, 'the more you know, and the less you understand'. We do however, have a stronger conviction that we are on the right track and that exploring these issues, while not always producing concise answers, is important. Reflection on the journey so far, allows us to identify those factors that have enabled development. It is tempting in reviewing experience to pull out the 'facilitators' and 'inhibitors'. What is however, quite clear is that the differences are not clear-cut. Indeed, we are more inclined to see some of these factors as having two faces and thus, presenting a paradox where a strength can also be a weakness.
.

Facilitators

- **Project champions** – as with any innovation someone needs to have a belief that what you are doing is right, coupled with the energy to enthuse others and the capability to articulate the issues. Champions also need moral support when circumstances are difficult. Drawing together a group of staff who share interests is important and provides a forum for debate. It is helpful if champions are in a position to influence committees, and programme design teams.

- **Working in partnership** – this has been a learning experience and DEED and DEA have been a valuable source of information. External partners bring new perspectives and provide a new language. This allows the introduction of new rhetoric, where 'moving the language on', is such an important part of culture change. Working with DEED has demonstrated that while we do not always agree on what are the most important issues, we all feel strongly about the fundamental issues. Our partnership has highlighted the importance of giving time to the articulation and sharing of different perspectives. This has to be combined with a willingness to learn and to develop a discourse that will facilitate the adoption of the global perspectives and sustainability' agendas within a diverse community such as a University.

- **Funding –** it is difficult to say how far we would have got without funding. We had already achieved a considerable amount and would have continued our work without the DEA funding however, external funding, albeit a small amount, enhanced the status of the project. LTDIF funding allowed us to align our 'on-line development strategy' with this initiative and ensured that someone had time to develop the Level H unit.

- **Timing-** as with any innovation the market has to be receptive. Certain events worked in favour of the development:

Curriculum Review – the 'quinnqennial review' of our undergraduate programmes provided an opportunity to make changes

Subject benchmark- the recently published 'benchmark' included, as one of the three purposes of General Business and Management programmes, 'enhancement of lifelong learning skills and personal development to contribute to society at large'. Also included, as part of a 'contemporary and pervasive issues', are 'sustainability, globalisation, business ethics values and norms'. This leant considerable support. It is after all, more difficult to argue against the benchmark.

Media coverage – most people are aware that the 'Citizenship Agenda' is to be implemented within Schools, this year. Media attention has focused on business ethics (post-Enron) and the 'west is best attitude' has come under question since events in the USA last September. There has been sufficient press attention to create a favourable climate for the development.

- **Support from Senior Management** – Members of OVC and the Head of the Business School have been supportive throughout. Working through the committee structure, making presentations to OVC and other 'working groups' has ensured wider commitment.

Problems/difficulties

- **Project champions** – if project champions falter then there is the danger that the initiative loses momentum. 'Champions' have to guard against designing/developing units that no-one else can, or wants to deliver. A fine line has to be trod, to ensure that a perception of 'zealots' is not engendered.

- **Working in partnership-** while working with non-HE partners has benefits at times there were difficulties. Our partner did not always appreciate that the aims and objectives of a business programme had to be met and that learning outcomes had to be appropriate to level. Arriving at a 'shared view' was not always straight forward as:

Perspectives on issues are emotive and vary- the 'right' and 'wrong' or priority of issues can cause heated debate. Views also shift depending on the extent to which an issue has personal impact (the NIMBY syndrome)

Labels and acronyms are problematic- HE acronyms are baffling to an outsider. DEA terms were not always familiar. We had conflict at one stage over the label 'southern perspectives' and sometimes had to remind our partner that we had to address the requirements of a business programme.

Different perspectives and pressures – it is easy to forget that both parties have other agendas and different financial constraints. It was difficult for our partner to appreciate that programmes need to be coherent and are constrained by the programme aims and objectives

- **Entrenched view** – the biggest challenge was finding a gap in the curriculum, ensuring that the Level H unit appeared in early design diagrams and fighting to keep it there, as the various groups argued their corner. Everyone in HE will be familiar with the tussle of programme design and power processes at play. This is exacerbated when you have a non-modular scheme. Comments include: 'too much finance', 'too little finance', 'you have to have marketing at Level C', 'the HRM staff are taking over', and 'I need more time for my unit'. At one point it looked as if the unit would be written out or only available to a small group of students.

In response to a request to include broader perspectives in all units in the programme, some staff were reluctant. One strategic management lecturer suggested that '*business is cut-throat. We teach students how to shaft the competition. I can't deliver what I currently need to within the time available*'. Another comment was, '*students will be too nice. Its macho management that is important*'.

- **Timing**- it could equally be argued that grappling with Subject Benchmarks, the National Qualifications Framework, Widening Participation, developing 'on-line' learning, ensuring assessment strategies match learning outcomes etc., leaves little time for creativity. We concur with Blewitt (2002) who suggests:

'People engaging with tightly defined subject disciplines or being shaped by the prescribed learning outcomes of vocational programmes have their horizons limited rather than expanded.'

- **Media coverage** – there are some who suggest that the citizenship agenda in schools is *'a silliness and distraction'*, a *'pseudo subject'* (Woodhead 2002). There has also been sufficient emphasis on the need to concentrate on 'local, short-term issues rather than the enormity of the long-term picture.

If the most critical success factor had to be identified then it would have to be project champions, followed by 'pump-priming' funds. The project would have continued without the funds however, the pace would have been slower and individuals would have had to work harder to gain the attention of decision-makers. The ability of the project champions to influence decision-making structures was also very important.

The greatest difficulty, and the one that took the most time, was persuading staff that 'global perspectives' should figure in the curriculum and then finding the 'space' for its inclusion. During the process of programme design there were several occasions where the future of the level H unit, looked precarious and strong argument was required, to ensure that it was not 'squeezed out' by the entrenched view of what needed to be in a business studies curriculum. At times the inability of some staff to see the obvious was painfully frustrating, in spite of using examples such as GAP, NIKE, and Enron to reinforce the argument.

SO HAS IT BEEN WORTH IT?

Despite the difficulties, the development has resulted in a wider curriculum, our on-line learning strategy has been extended and the learning and teaching experience of students has been enhanced. Further developments will take place and while there are difficulties, we adhere to the belief that:

"Education for sustainable development enables people to develop the knowledge, values and skills to participate in decisions about the way we do things individually and collectively, both locally and globally, that will improve the quality of life now without damaging the planet for the future". (Sustainable Development Education Panel Report, 2000).

The media coverage of the Earth Summit has highlighted the seriousness of the issues and confirmed that this development is appropriate. The recent call for business schools to engage in serious dialogue of the issues by the 'Critical Management Studies Interest Group' has also confirmed that this is the right track and should not be a marginal activity. Apart from the curriculum development, the process has initiated a debate that will be ongoing and will inform further change.

WORKING FROM THE INSIDE OUT

This paper demonstrates throughout quite powerful external drivers for this agenda. The early section in particular summarises policy development and while it is suggested that much of the exhortations for action have been largely ignored, the policy papers add weight to the case for change. In reviewing the process of the development, it might not be immediately obvious that we have worked from 'the inside out'. This is an important point. The project was instigated by a group of staff who felt strongly about the issues and shared an innate belief that this was the right thing to do. Investigating the policy papers in depth, gaining further information from 'development education' colleagues and investigating sources of information, came second. The policy papers and the research were extremely helpful but these had to be fashioned into a case. In formulating the case the rationales identified earlier in the paper were teased out and harnessed to match the University's mission and strategy. The case was then presented and argued through the appropriate University committees. This approach though frustrating at times, enabled stronger commitment across the University to be secured and persuade many of the sceptical colleagues.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

This paper has highlighted the importance of the 'global responsibility and sustainable development' agenda. The developments at Bournemouth University and in particular the Business School have been described, and it has been demonstrated how working from the inside out, has resulted in a change agenda. The 'facilitators' and difficulties associated with the project have been summarised. It is hoped that in the detail, other institutions will be able to learn from the process. There is no doubt that the development is gaining pace; involving students, evaluating their experience and drawing in a wider group of staff will be important.

As part of future strategy, the intention is to use our internal experience to engage with developments 'outside' through contribution to national work and the 'DEA Global Perspectives in HE' publication. Further collaboration with colleagues in Development Education will aim to extend activity with the Students Union, the local community, and seek to engage business partners in the debate. 'Internally', the publication of guidelines for curriculum development will enable other schools to consider the introduction of broader perspectives; a global perspective after all, has implications for every subject.

Retrospectively, we are drawing on our experience to consider how the 'global agenda' is located within Holman's four 'management education models' (Holman 2000). The development of the curriculum to encompass the global perspective and the concepts of citizenship have allowed us to consider, that while much of what we are introducing is in the 'experiential/critical school' model, aspects of the other three models apply. This perhaps highlights the complexity of the agenda. It has to be considered that just as sustainable development cannot be addressed by any one discipline, then educating students to address 'global citizenship' means that one model of management education is insufficient to address the learning agenda.

In concluding we would like to emphasis the conviction that the ideas of global responsibility, citizenship and sustainability are important and need to be addressed within

higher education. As the Centre for Philosophy, Technology and Society at Aberdeen aptly proposes:

'*University students, many of whom will occupy significant positions in society in their careers, will exercise influence in the general direction of policies. Many of these will have international dimensions. That they have identities and commitments beyond their immediate political communities seems crucial to the development of a more environmentally sound, peaceful, safe and humane world*' (Centre for Philosophy, Technology and Society, 1999)

This would seem even more critical for those students educated within business schools.

The relevance of the agenda is undeniable. What remains is the challenge for business school academics, who need to move out of the concerns of their sometimes, narrow functional/specialist areas and engage with a broader debate. It seems imperative to ensure that this '*broader agenda is integrated with our core focus and management concerns*' (Adler 2000). Doing something is surely better than doing nothing? Perhaps the question that needs to be asked is not how do we tailor the concepts of global responsibility and sustainable business practice to a business programme but how do we tailor a business programme to concepts that need to be central?

REFERENCES

Adler, P (2002) *Corporate Scandals: its time for reflection in business schools*.
http://www.aom.pace/edu/cms/scandals.htm.

Ali Khan, S (1996) *A Review of the 1993 Toyne Report*, DFEE.

Barnett, R. (1997) *Higher Education: A Critical Business*, Buckingham, SRHE/Open
University press.

Barnett, R. (2000) *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*, SRHE/Open
University press.

Blewitt, J (2002) New learning in the learning age, *The Development Education Journal*,
Vol. 8.3, June.

Bournemouth University Global Perspectives Network (1999) *A Global Vision for
Bournemouth University*, BU Publication.

Centre for Philosophy Technology and Society (1999) *Exploring the Concept of Global
Citizenship*, Report on the Global Citizenship Project, 1997-1999 submitted to the Gordon
Cook Foundation, University of Aberdeen.

Dower et al (1999) in *Exploring the Concept of Global Citizenship*, Report on the global
Citizenship Project submitted to the Robert Cook Foundation, Centre for Philosophy,
Technology and Society, University of Aberdeen.

Hardin G., (1968) The Tragedy of the Commons, *Science*, 162: 1243-1248.

Holman, D (2000) Contemporary Models of Management Education in the UK,
Management Learning 31(2) 197-217.

Laurillard, D (2001) *Rethinking University Teaching*, 2nd Ed, Routledge, Falmer, London.

Mezirow, J (1997) Cognitive Processes: Contemporary Paradigms of Learning in
Sutherland P (Ed) *Adult Learning: A Reader*, Kogan Page: London.

McKenzie, A & Shiel C (2002 The DEA 'Global Perspectives in Higher Education
project: progress to date, *The Development Education Journal*, Vol 8.3, June.

Oxfam (1997) *Curriculum for Global Citizenship,* Oxford, Oxfam Education.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (2000) *The General Business and
Management Subject Benchmark.*

Salmon, G. (2000) E-Moderating: *The key to teaching and learning online*, Kogan Page,
London.

Sustainable Development Education Panel First Annual Report (1998), DETR Free
Literature, West Yorkshire

Sustainable Development Education Panel -Second Annual Report (1999), DETR Free Literature, West Yorkshire

Sustainable Development Education Panel (2000) *What Sustainable Development Education means for further and higher education*, DETR Free Literature West Yorks.

Toyne P et al (1993) *Environmental Responsibility: An agenda for further and higher education*, London: HMSO

Welller, M (2002) *Delivering Learning on the net: the why, what and how of online education*, London: RoutledgeFalmer

Woodhead, C (2002) writing in the Education Section in the Sunday Times, 5.11 18/08/02

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our Common Future*, OUP, Oxford.