OUR FUTURE IS IN OUR HEARTS AND MINDS

Jenny S. Tripses PhD

Bradley University, Peoria Illinois

Abstract: The title of this paper comes from a quote from Senator William Fulbright who sponsored legislation that resulted in the Fulbright Scholar program, which is based upon a shared commitment by American leaders post World War II who believed everything possible should be done to prevent the horrific tragedy and destruction of that conflict. Fulbright said, "Our future is not in the stars but in our own minds and hearts. Creative leadership and liberal education, which in fact go together, are the first requirements for a hopeful future for humankind. Fostering these--leadership, learning, and empathy between cultures--was and remains the purpose of the international scholarship program that I was privileged to sponsor in the U.S. Senate over forty years ago. It is a modest program with an immodest aim--the achievement in international affairs of a regime more civilized, rational and humane than the empty system of power of the past. I believed in that possibility when I began. I still do." [Fulbright, J.W.(1989*, p. xi*].

In the context of contemporary complexities of globalization, including widespread poverty, misuse of the environment and violent conflict, societies at all levels need leaders who can think beyond current conditions to leadership that is grounded in moral principles or "behavior connected to something greater than ourselves that relates to human and social development" (Fullan, 2004). School leaders including professors who prepare them, can benefit from developing greater capacities to successfully address the challenges of the future.

Title: Our Future is in Our Hearts and Minds

Format: Single author paper

The title of this paper comes from a quote from Senator William Fulbright (1905-1995), an American Senator who represented Arkansas from 1945 til 1974. His comment refers to the Fulbright Scholar program that he sponsored which was created from a shared commitment by American leaders post World War II who believed everything possible should be done to prevent the horrific tragedy and destruction of that conflict. Fulbright said,

> Our future is not in the stars but in our own minds and hearts. Creative leadership and liberal education, which in fact go together, are the first requirements for a hopeful future for humankind. Fostering these--leadership, learning, and empathy between cultures--was and remains the purpose of the international scholarship program that I was privileged to sponsor in the U.S. Senate over forty years ago. It is a modest program with an immodest aim--the achievement in international affairs of a regime more civilized, rational and humane than the empty system of power of the past. I believed in that possibility when I began. I still do." [Fulbright, J.W. (1989, *p. xi*].

The paper begins with the concept of globalization sharing wisdom from those who have considered global change and its effect upon humankind. From there I explain ways of thinking or habits of mind necessary to create a positive future for humankind. Finally I conclude with the invitation to all readers who prepare future school leaders to join in learning and acting intentionally in ways that demonstrate leadership, learning and empathy across all cultures and disciplines.

Three premises provide the foundation for this paper. Each may at first appear simplistic, but on deeper consideration, have profound implications. First, how and what we think affects our actions. What is meant by this assertion goes much deeper than simple positive thinking to include the nature of cognitive activity of all sorts. "Cognitive perspectives remind us that what administrators do depends on what they think – their overt behaviors are the result of covert thought processes" (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995, p.7). Second, the past is over, which may seem obvious, but when considering appropriate actions into the future, those advocates who claim we need to go back to what worked in the past fail to comprehend what will be needed for the future. The degree, rate, and unpredictability of change in societies worldwide will continue and very likely increase for the foreseeable future. "…We are authors of our own future. We study the past not to discover our destiny but to master it, to gains hints and perspectives and insights on how we can improve upon the performance of our ancestors" (Fulbright, 1989, p. 228). The third premise is that all societies will be dependent upon leaders of social institutions, including schools, or perhaps, especially schools, for wisdom and cognitive capacities to create and implement conditions that successfully navigate globalization. Fulbright referring to what he termed the nuclear age, which of course, humanity can never escape, when he said, "The nuclear age calls for a different kind of leadership- a leadership of intellect, judgment, tolerance, and rationality, a leadership committed to human values, to world peace, and to the improvement of the human condition" (p. 232).

Globalization

While the truth conveyed in Fulbright's quote about our futures being in our

hearts and minds remains, the reality is also that the world has changed dramatically since the end of World War II. Fulbright spoke of a time post World War II of unprecedented societal upheaval. Sixty years later, contemporary societies face new global trends—economic, cultural, technological, and environmental shifts that are part of a rapid and uneven wave of globalization. Interdependence across cultures, governments, and business calls for a generation of individuals who can engage in effective global problem solving and participate simultaneously in local, national, and global civic life. Preparing students to participate fully in today and tomorrow's world demands conscious development of global competence as " the capacity and disposition to understand and act on issues of global significance" (Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. xiii).

Gardner (2008), the American psychologist who revolutionized thinking about human intelligence, identified four unprecedented trends of globalization: (1) movement of capital and other market instrument around the globe, (2) movement of human beings across borders, (3) movement of information across cyberspace to anyone with access to a computer, and (4) movement of popular cultures. Gardner speculates that human beings are engaged in what may be the "ultimate, all-encompassing episode of globalization." (p.16). He contends that education worldwide prepares students more for the world of the past rather than for the potential worlds of the future.

Gardner documented important obstacles to global ways of thinking (Gardner foreward in Mansilla & Jackson, 2011) including the vast majority of educators and policymakers concerned with education have not thought about the implications of education on global terms, nor have educators engaged in the necessary preparation for

effective action. The second point Gardner makes is that a lack of deep motivation, whether individually or on a societal level, to understand how innovative education differs from past practice. At most, innovations are tolerated as long as they lead to adequate performance on traditional measures. Assessments are almost all geared for classical subject matter and rarely offer the means to assess the flexible, cooperative thinking required for interdisciplinary thought. Finally, Gardner identifies what he terms a "pernicious" and deep distrust towards education particularly in the United States. "Cosmopolitanism, internationalism, and globalism are often considered dangerous concepts or even "fighting words" (p. x). "What is needed more than ever is a laser-like focus on the kinds of human beings that we are raising and the kinds of societies— indeed, in a global era, the kind of world society— that we are fashioning" (p. xi). In other words, American and other educational leaders are likely "stuck" in mindsets of the past that do little to allow for effective engagement for the future. Educators engaged in school leadership preparation/development, then need to consciously shift thinking involved in planning future programs and delivery. Gardner poses a powerful question, "What kinds of school leaders do schools throughout the world need" (as cited in Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. xi). The answer will require simultaneous local and global consideration of conditions likely to be faced by future school leaders.

At both personal and professional levels, developing deeper understandings of ways to refine one's thinking is critical at this point in history. School leaders face increasingly complex conditions brought on by societal factors (growing income disparities, school violence, and accountability, just to name a few). School leaders who are firmly grounded in their discipline (school business) and have capacities to synthesize

and think creatively to solve problems will successfully navigate the uncertainties involved in leading schools and transcend barriers to create conditions where students learn what <u>they</u> need to be "college and career ready" (Common Core). Thinking differently is a foundation for leadership. Respectful and ethical minds will be necessary to exercise true leadership, which benefits all.

Leaders by definition, see reality in ways that others for whatever reason do not. Looking specifically at performance and environment in top companies, Collins and Hansen (2011) conclude, "We cannot predict the future. But we can create it" (p.1). Collins and Hansen (2011) elaborate further,

> The best leaders we studied did not have visionary ability to predict the future. They observed what worked, figured out *why* it worked, and built upon proven foundations. They were not more risk taking, bolder, more visionary, and more creative than the comparisons. They were more disciplined, more empirical, and more (productively) paranoid (p.9).

As the world changes, leadership must also change. Flowers states, "In a world of global institutional networks, we face issues for which hierarchical leadership is inherently inadequate…. For networks of (shared) leadership to work with real awareness, many people will need to be deeply committed to cultivating their capacity to serve what's seeking to emerge" (Senge et al, 2004, p.186).

Friedman & Mandelbaum (2012) explain "the merger of globalization and the Information Technology (IT) revolution that coincided with the transition from the twentieth to the twenty-first century is changing everything- every job, every industry,

every service, every hierarchical institution….this merger has raised the level of skill a person needs to obtain and retain any good job, while at the same time increasing the global competition for every one of those jobs" (p. 121). Their prediction is as relevant for schools, school leadership preparation/development, and universities as it is for other segments of society. Figuring out effects upon a particular profession, in this case school leadership preparation/development, require understanding the fundamental restructuring that is occurring in global economies, communication, the environment, and so on.

Friedman & Mandelbaum (2012) go on to categorize workers of the future into creators and servers and they subdivide each of those two labels into creative or routine creators and creative or routine servers. The challenge for individuals charged to lead education and successfully navigate unforeseen forces of globalization is enormous. While American society does not necessarily hold educators in high regard, anyone who understands the challenges and complexities of school leadership can identify that the best school leaders and the professors who prepare them must strive to fit into the creative creator category.

Apple (2011) explains education's role in internationalization this way:
It has become ever more clear that education cannot be understood without recognizing that nearly all educational policies and practices are strongly influenced by an increasingly integrated international economy that is subject to severe crisis..... all of these social and ideological dynamics and many more are now fundamentally restructuring what education does, how it is controlled, and who benefits from it throughout the world. (pp. 222-223)

Admiral Carlisle Trost, former chief of naval operations who knows something about leadership opined, "The first responsibility of a leader is to figure out what's going on…That is never easy to do because situations are rarely black or white, they are a pale shade of gray…they are seldom neatly packaged" (as cited in Bolman and Deal, p. 36, 2013).

Hearts and Minds for the Future

So what do school leaders who have "figured out what's going on" to use Trost's terminology, look like? Surely they have a hunch that American preoccupation with test scores and frantic searches for the next big silver bullet new initiative does little if anything to prepare students for the future. Howard Gardner writes, " The world will not be saved by high test scores" (Gardner in Mansilla, V. & Jackson, A. (2011, p. xi), which seems only more evident when stated so simply. School leaders needed by societies worldwide have figured this out. Knowing what not to do is a start, but certainly nothing more. "The organizations (and their leaders) that best adapt to change a changing world first and foremost know what should *not* change. They have a fixed anchor of guiding principles around which they can more easily change everything else. They know the difference between what is truly sacred and what it not, between what should never change and what should be always open for change, because, what we stand for" and how we do things" (Collins in Hesselbein, 2002, p. xv)

Gardner (2008) identifies five minds or ways of thinking necessary to thrive in the future: (1) the Disciplined Mind, becoming an expert in an individual area of expertise –

educational leadership is the discipline considered in this paper, (2) the Synthesizing Mind, the ability to put together different sources of information in ways that make sense to the synthesizer and others, (3) the Creative Mind, having capacity for new ideas and ways of doing, (4) the Respectful Mind which notes and appreciates differences between humans, and (5) the Ethical Mind which considers the nature of one's work and in the context of the needs and desires of society in which one lives. "With these 'minds,' as I refer to them, a person will be well equipped to deal with what is expected, as well as what cannot be anticipated. Without these minds, a person will be at the mercy or forces that he or she can't understand, much less control" (Gardner, *2008,* p.2).

Pink (2005) offers another framework on habits of mind necessary for the future. "We are moving from an economy and society built on the logical, linear, computerlike capabilities of the Information Age to an economy and a society built on the inventive, empathic, big-picture capabilities of what's rising in is place, the Conceptual Age" (p. 2). Pink organizes his ideas into what he calls the six senses: (1) design, meaning that creations must go beyond function to be beautiful, whimsical, or emotionally engaging, (2) story, explaining that the essence of persuasion, communication, and self-understanding is embraced in the ability to fashion a compelling narrative, (3) symphony, seeing the big picture, crossing boundaries, and being able to combine disparate pieces into an arresting new whole, (4) empathy, understanding what makes others tick, to forging relationships and care for others, (5) play, appreciating the benefits of laughter, games and humor, and (6) meaning, the human desires for purpose, transcendence, and spiritual fulfillment (p. 65-67).

While Gardner's "minds" and Pink's "senses" have some similarities (creative mind and design, synthesis and symphony, empathy and respect), there are aspects where one framework touches on concepts the other does not. A comparison of these two broad concept ideas for the future should begin with their backgrounds. Gardner born in 1943, the Hobbs Professor of Cognition and Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, is the developmental psychologist who is most well known for his groundbreaking work on multiple intelligences. Pink born in 1964, graduated from law school at Yale, but then decided not to practice law. Pink worked in several positions in politics and economic policy. So each author's ideas must be considered in the context of their professional training and also their age. Both are prolific authors, but of course, Gardner has 19 years' head start on Pink. Both frameworks have merit and expand upon Fulbright's contention that our future is in our hearts and minds. In a comparison of their books, Five New Minds for the Future and A Whole New Mind Rao's (2007) concludes that both authors think with complex concepts, employ conceptual metaphor and narratives. Gardner is more comfortable with taxonomies and he has a knack for rules and aphorisms. Gardner has an instinct for theories and meta-theories. Rao (2007) gives Pink more credit for evolved aesthetic sensibilities and design instincts. Gardner writes to influence policy (Sawyer, 2008) and Pink's audience is aimed at business (Conrad, 2008). While Gardner's Ethical Mind is explained primarily through the Good Work's (when excellence and ethics overlap) projects Gardner created in conjunction with Csikzentmihalyi and Damon, Pink's Six Senses fail to consider ethical thinking for the future. Each framework enriches understanding of how leaders can expand repertoires of

thinking and taken together provide direction for the kinds of thinking Fulbright envisioned.

Returning to Fulbright's original contention that our future lies within our hearts and minds, Gardner and Pink both address relationships that can and should be applied to globally. Gardner's Respectful and Ethical Minds and Pink's sense of empathy capture leadership qualities of the heart necessary for the future.

Noddings (2005) terms a global citizen as one "who can live and work effectively anywhere in the world. A global way of life would both describe and support the functioning of global citizenship" (p. 2-3). Mansilla and Jackson (2011) define global competence as "the capacity and disposition to understand and act on issues of global significance" (p. xii). Global citizens display affection, respect, care, curiosity, and concern with the well being of all human kind (McIntosh, 2005). Each attribute (affection, respect, care, curiosity, and concern) relates to the other concepts. Leaders who display respect develop capacities to understand human tendencies to identify with and value members of their own group while simultaneously accepting and living with differences, and most importantly valuing those from other socio-economic, racial, ethnic, groups (Gardner, 2008). Leaders for the future recognize that respect is not passive (Issacs, 1999) and caring is being in relation with others not a set of specific behaviors (Noddings, 1992). Goleman, Boyatzis &McKee (2004) describe leaders with empathy as capable of attuning to a wide range of emotional signals, allowing them to sense the emotions of a person or group. Such leaders listen attentively in order to grasp the perspectives of others. Empathy enables leaders to get along well with people of diverse backgrounds and cultures.

Universal well-being, or progress towards it, includes the elimination of poverty, concern for the environment, and world peace (Noddings, 2005). Other conceptions of global competency include the ability to work effectively in international settings; awareness and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions, and approaches; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise; and capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries (Brustein, 2007). School leaders need to grasp the importance of creating learning culture designed to help students understand the worldwide circulation of ideas, products, fashions, media, ideologies, and human beings on a much deeper level than is currently included in most curriculums worldwide. These phenomena are real, powerful, and ubiquitous. School leaders coming up through the ranks today need preparation to tackle a range of pervasive problems from human conflict, climate change, poverty, the spread of disease, and the control of nuclear energy (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

In order to think and act differently, individuals and societies must come to grips with the attitudes, perceptions, and cultures that may inhibit learning. Hunter, White, & Godbey (2007) caution that while there may be some similarities in the definitions or conceptions of global competence, there is limited commonality and, in almost all cases, these definitions are American derived. Walker, Bridges, & Chan, 1996 (as cited in Crow et al., 2010) contend that preparation and development of educational leaders be constructed and delivered within knowledge and understanding that embrace both local and global considerations. Americans in general are not as familiar with other cultures and so have a need to intentionally develop more globally focused perspectives. College-bound students in other countries know far more about the wider world, including the

United States, than American students. Stearns (2009) commented, "Our parochial gap is not only striking, but dangerous, depriving us (Americans) of the knowledge we should have to operate effectively" (p. 9). Americans may tend to assume other professionals eagerly await opportunities to learn from our practices, when indeed, that may not be the case. Americans who are open to learning practices from other cultures will in many cases gain far more knowledge and understanding than they impart.

Whether one conceives of qualities of the heart necessary for future leaders as global competence or global citizenship, all school leaders including those who prepare them in graduate school must become more fully aware of the need to develop capacities of understanding and acting in ways that value and respect other cultures and societies. This is as true for the school leader of an isolated rural homogeneous school community as it is for a school that includes students who represent languages and cultures around the world. The school leader whose heart looks into the future will cultivate the practice of developing capacities within themselves as well as others, for respect for difference and in particular for those who hold opposite points of view (Issacs, 1999).

The future in our minds considers what could also be considered more concrete or not as relational ways of thinking. There is no corollary of Gardner's Disciplined Mind in Pink's senses. Gardner's Creative Mind and Pink's design sense overlap as do Gardner's Synthesizing Mind and Pink's Symphony Sense. The Information Age when knowledge workers employed information in specialized ways until access to that information exploded ushering in the Conceptual Age when the abilities of creators and empathizers to master right-directed thinking that recognizes patterns and seeks meaning (Pink, 2005, p. 49). The distinction between the Knowledge and Conceptual Ages is the necessity to shift from discrete bodies of knowledge or information to capacities that organize, prioritize,

create, empathize, what Pink terms high concept and high touch. "Today facts are ubiquitous, nearly free, and available at the speed of light" (p.102).

Gardner's disciplined mind involves the cultivation, over time (at least ten years) of a distinctive way of thinking in line with a scholarly field or professional realm. For instance, a physicist not only knows and understands physical properties, but also actually comes to see the world and behave in a way that reflects the guiding principles of this science. While development of a disciplined mind requires diligence and perseverance that results in steady improvement over time, Gardner's definition extends beyond this idea of a dedicated work ethic to include an actual framework, or lens, through which a scholar and/or professional approaches decision-making and problem-solving.

A disciplined mind is necessary to effectively improve and innovate in any field. Gardner (2008) argues that the pool of expertise that becomes accessible through a collective cultivation of a disciplined mind will be necessary to meet challenges that are currently unforeseen. A disciplined mind holds the capacity to generate new information, both by delving deeper into a given area of research and by making horizontal connections between other fields of thought in way that first requires advanced knowledge and skill in one's field of focus.

The cultivation of a disciplined mind requires investment of the time and attention necessary to develop this depth of knowledge and experience. Gardner (2008) states, "We live in a time where our most talented minds know more and more about increasingly narrow spheres" (p. 74).

Developed over a lifetime, a disciplined mind continues to learn by both deepening knowledge and expanding toward interdisciplinary treatment of real-life applications.

Falling short of true discipline is an over-assertion of one's expertise following more shallow preparation. Also less than a disciplined mind is one that mechanically follows the rules of his or her field without the wisdom to discern where there may be room for change, creativity, or an amended approach. Likewise, the acquisition of knowledge and skills in one's field, but inability to apply this expertise in complex problem-solving that spans multiple disciplines, falls short of the disciplined mind as described by Gardner (2008).

Gardner's Synthesizing Mind and Pink's Symphony Sense bring us to consideration of the next way of thinking. While there are differences in the two authors' conceptions, Pink (2005) captures them both, "Symphony, as I call this aptitude, is the ability to put together the pieces. It is the capacity to synthesize rather than to analyze; to see relationships between seemingly unrelated fields; to detect broad patterns rather than to deliver specific answers; and to invent something new by combining elements nobody else thought to pair" (p.130). Gardner's definition is more succinct "The ability to knot together information from disparate sources into a coherent whole" (p. 46).

Gardner (2008), while explaining the Synthesizing Mind, crosses over into Pink's Storytelling Sense when he states "Those individuals who can generate several representations of the same idea or concept are far more likely to come up with potent syntheses than those who are limited to a single, often attenuated representation of that idea" (p. 69). Pink (2005) explains, "Stories are easier to remember- because in many ways, stories are *how* we remember" (p.101). The critical capacity is to place facts in context and to deliver them with emotional impact (Pink, 2005).

Creativity is highly valued in the Conceptual Age. Both Gardner (2008) and Pink (2005) address these capacities, although Gardner sets creativity apart from his other

minds while creativity is more of a thread throughout Pink's (2005) Design, Symphony, and to some extent Play Senses. The goal of a creator is to extend knowledge into unanticipated directions (Gardner, 2008). Creativity is essential to the way we live and work today (Pink, 2005; Florida, 2002;), human creativity is multifaceted and multidimensional (Pink, 2005; Florida, 2002), and looking into the future, ongoing tension between creativity and organization will characterize the future (Florida, 2002; Gardner, 2008).

Thinking back to global issues identified earlier by Noddings (the elimination of poverty, concern for the environment, and world peace), new ways of thinking about the problem and possible solutions seems necessary into the future. "Needed today is a generous dollop of creativity in the human sphere- in particular, in the ways in which we human beings relate to one another personally, carry out our work, and fulfill our obligations as citizens" (Gardner, 2008, p. 101).

Creation builds upon one or more established disciplines and requires an informed "field" to make judgments (Gardner, 2008). This distinguishes the precocious five year old whose paintings, dance movements, language, piano playing appear to outpace her peers from the creator who has devoted years to acquire knowledge about their field and hone their skills.

Moving forward into the Conceptual Age, few creators will work alone. Creativity, according to Csikszentmihalyi (1996) is never simply the accomplishment of an individual, or even a small group. Creativity requires a supportive environment that provides a broad range of social, cultural, and in some cases, economic stimuli including:

1.	The individual has mastered a discipline (playing a musical instrument, a software engineer writing programs) and is steadily creating variations in that domain.

2.	The cultural domain in which the individual is working includes models, prescriptions, and proscriptions (a musical score, a program).

3.	A social field that provides access to relevant educational experiences, opportunities to intermingle with other creative individuals, as well as opportunities to perform to ultimately pass judgment on the candidate's performance. (Csikszentmihalyi 1996, Gardner, 2008, Florida, 2002).

Successful futures in the Conceptual Age that lie within our hearts and minds require "inventive, big-picture capabilities" (Pink, 2005, p. 2). Given the enormous global challenges faced by humanity -poverty, global warming, and the necessity for individuals and their "tribes" to accept differences, learn to live with them, and value other "tribes" (Noddings, 2005; Gardner, 2008), school leaders throughout the world play a critical role in the future.

Preparing School Leaders for the Future

Those who prepare (in the United States) and/or develop (as it is done in most of the rest of the world) school leaders have a responsibility to carefully consider the former chief of naval operations, Admiral Trost's admonition. Recall he said, "The first responsibility of a leader is to figure out what's going on…That is never easy to do because situations are rarely black or white, they are a pale shade of gray…they are seldom neatly packaged" (as cited in Bolman and Deal, p. 36, 2013). What is going on is neither simple nor straightforward. Looking into current conditions in school leadership

preparation in the United States, circumstances in the role of principals and presumably

also superintendents, has never been more uncertain or volatile (Fullan, 2014). The New

York *Times* quoted a Belfast citizen during the Northern Ireland 'troubles', "anyone who

isn't confused here doesn't really understand what's going on" (Hamill as cited in

Gladwell, 2013, p. 222).

If one accepts Gardner's (2008) position of the need for <u>effective</u> schools for the

future to abandon preoccupation with test scores that purport to improve schools, but

actually measure classical subject matter, then it is essential to seriously consider what <u>is</u>

important for the future. Effective schools of the future will turn instead to focus on the

flexible, interdisciplinary thinking that global societies require. The United States lacks

and needs a systemic approach to developing and distributing expert teachers and school

leaders to improve schools. Such change will require a new policy environment that

recognizes and encourages successful innovation (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

English et al (2012) persuasively argue that programming in educational

administration is an instrument of reform" (p.ix). The remainder of their work develops

further the case that leadership preparation programs need to reconsider content, delivery,

and focus of leading for learning in ways that move away from 20th century emphasis on

"managerial efficiency, bureaucratic expediency, and student and adult accountability"

(p.x) towards school leadership focused on the core technology of education – teaching

and learning. School leaders as chief executives and general managers are expected to

have capacities to see the big picture. They should look beyond their own background,

experience, and specialization to understand the various components of their organization

or constituency, to think systematically about what is and is not working, and what needs

to change to achieve ends that are beneficial to all (Gardner, 2008).

At a very basic level, then it is incumbent upon American school leadership

preparation faculty to understand what is going on in rapidly changing environments. We

can choose to wait for the next round of standards and mandates or we can decide to

figure out how to prepare future school leaders to become more flexible and

interdisciplinary thinkers. We can teach as we've always taught using the power point

lectures taken from heavily theoretical books read long ago or we can inquire more

deeply about current conditions and the kinds of school leaders needed for the future.

Neatly aligned standards to syllabi and assessments will not do the job. Rather, we need

to create new minds for ourselves in order to meet the challenges and opportunities of the

future.

References

Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education.* p. 290-305.

Apple, M. (2011). Global crisis, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. Retrieved from http://jte.sagepub.com/content/62/2/22210

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013) *Reframing organizations, 5th Ed.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brustein, W. I. (2007). The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 382-391.

Collins, J. & Hansen, M. (2011). *Great by choice: uncertainty, chaos, and luck- why some thrive despite them all.* New York, NY: HarperCollins Books.

Conrad, D. (2008). Reflecting on strategies for a new learning culture: can we do it? International Journal of E-Learning and Distance Education. Downloaded at http://ijede.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/483/712

Common Core State Standards Initiative Preparing American Students for College and Career. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/read-the-standards/

Crow, G., Lumby, J., & Pashiardis, P. (2008). *Introduction: Why an international handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders?* In Lumby, Crow, & Pashiardis (Ed). International Handbook on the Preparation and Development of School Leaders pp. 1-20.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding Flow.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

English, F., Papa, R., Mullen, C., & Creighton, T. (2012). *Educational leadership at 2050: Conjectures, challenges, and promises.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community, and everyday life.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Friedman, T. & Mandelbaum, M. (2012). *That Used to Be Us.* New York, NY: Picador/Farrar, Straua and Giroux.

Fulbright, W. (1989). *The price of empire.* New York, NY: Pantheon Press.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M. (2004). *Leadership and sustainability: systems thinkers in action.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: three keys to maximizing impact.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: an anatomy of leadership.* New York: NY. Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1999). *The disciplined mind: what all students should understand.* New York NY: Simon & Schuster Publishers.

Gardner, H. (2008). *Five Minds for the Future.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Gladwell, M. (2013). *David and Goliath: underdogs, misfits, and the art of battling giants.* New York, NY: Back Bay Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. and McKee, A. (2004). *Primal leadership: realizing the power of emotional intelligence.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Hesselbein, F. (2002). *Hesselbein on leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Issacs, W. (1999). Dialogue: and the Art of Thinking Together. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Leithwood, K. & Steinbach, R. (1995). *Expert problem solving: evidence from school and district leaders.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mansilla, V. & Jackson, A. (2011). Educating for global competence: preparing our youth to engage the world. Council of Chief State School Officers' EdSteps Initiative & Asia Society Partnership for Global Learning.

McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press, pp. 22-39.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). Conclusion: what have we learned? In N. Noddings (Ed.) *Educating citizens for global awareness.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Pp. 122-136.

Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.) *Educating citizens for global awareness.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Pp. 1-21.

Pink, D. (2005). *A whole new mind: why right-brainers will rule the future.* New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Rao, V. (2007). Dan pink, howard gardner and the da vinci mind. Downloaded at http://www.ribbonfarm.com/2007/08/27/dan-pink-howard-gardner-and-the-da-vinci-mind/

Sawyer, R.B. (2008). Howard gardner's recommendation for the future book review. *American Journal of Psychology*

Senge, P., Scharmer, C., Jaworski, J., Flowers, B. (2004). Presence: *human purpose and the field of the future.* New York, NY: Currency Doubleday, Society for Organizational Learning.

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Stearns, P. (2009). *Educating global citizens in colleges and universities.* New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Stoyko, P. (2007). Fashionable minds for leaders. Fugitive Knowledge: Escape from the
Planet of the Robotic Bureaucrats. Downloaded at
http://www.stoyko.net/fugitiveknowledge/?p=30