Developing an Undergraduate Global Citizenship Program: Challenges of Definition and Assessment

Jill Sperandio
Lehigh University

Magdalena Grudzinski-Hall
International Education Management Group

Hannah Stewart-Gambino
Lafayette College

This article describes the development of an undergraduate interdisciplinary global citizenship program. The process of program development was guided by the core belief that students need not only information and skills, but the tools to develop their own individual citizenship in today's world. Using document analysis, interviews with key informants and survey data from faculty involved in course development and delivery, the authors examine the challenges of construct definition, of establishing learning outcomes, and of program assessment that confronted the program developers. The article concludes with an exploration of the underlying assumption that university programs are effective means for building an engaged citizenry.

Changing times call for changing approaches. The dramatic developments in the flow of capital, labor, goods and services, and information that have come to be termed 'globalization' have led many colleges and universities to re-examine their curricula in light of the skills needed by students to take their place in a global workforce (Humphreys, 1998). Ethnic intolerance, world-wide migration, and global warming have prompted similar concerns about student understanding of the need for commitment to civic engagement, social responsibility, and global stewardship (Adams & Zhou-McGovern, 1993). Not surprisingly, some attempts are being made to link two concerns – civic engagement and skills for operating in an environment of globalization. For example, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) explicitly focuses its efforts on global learning and social responsibility, emphasizing the need to develop social, civic, and global knowledge in university graduates by linking liberal education with democracy (AAC&U, 1999). Funded jointly by the AAC&U's ongoing initiative, *Shared Futures: Learning for a World Lived in Common*, and the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE), in 2002 ten colleges and universities began the construction of new global studies curricula designed to spur civic engagement and social responsibility, promote democracy, and cultivate intercultural competencies. The ten participating colleges and universities looked at modifying their existing majors, restructuring their minors, and/or rethinking the internship and study abroad opportunities available to their students. The ten colleges and universities competitively chosen to participate in "Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy," are: Albany State University, Beloit College, CUNY – Brooklyn College, Heritage College, John Carroll University, Pacific Lutheran University, Rochester Institute of Technology, University of Alaska Fairbanks, University of Delaware, and University of Wisconsin.

These programs, as well as the many others developed by individual educational organizations across the U.S., all rest on the assumption that post-secondary institutions play a critical role in the development of tomorrow's citizens, both U.S. citizens and global citizens (Grudzinski-Hall, 2007). Caryn McTighe Musil, Project Director at AAC&U, stated that:

> The academy is committed to moving this agenda to the center of higher education reform efforts. The world is plagued by violence and injustice and a host of complex problems that need sophisticated, collective solutions. Higher education is clearly one of the places to address these problems by educating students in ways that promote active engagement and a sense of shared obligation to humanity as a whole (University of Alaska Fairbanks [UAF], 2002).

Many colleges and universities are building global programs and are revisiting their institutional mission statements and strategic plans in order to provide both justification and support for their newly launched educational initiatives (Hovland, 2005). However, the very complexity of these problems that higher education programs must seek to address present, at a program implementation level, challenging issues of definition of terms and student learning outcomes and of short and long term program assessment (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999). Since there is no accepted definition of the term "global citizenship," it is not surprising that no consensus exists concerning the design of undergraduate global citizenship programs by those who direct its curriculum. Colleges and universities that have launched such programs have done so using a variety of methods.

We seek in this article to examine the challenges of construct definition, establishing learning outcomes, and program assessment that confronted and are still engaging a U.S. university that has initiated an undergraduate global citizenship program. Consistent with the AAC&U's emphasis on using higher education to foster the intersection of global studies and renewed civic engagement/responsibility, the Global Citizenship Program (GCP) at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania was initiated in 2001, admitting its first group of students in 2004. The program is based on the core belief that students need not only information and skills, but also the tools to explicitly develop their own individual citizenship in today's world. We will describe the processes involved in establishing the structure and intent of the program including issues surrounding the definition of the term *global citizen*, and examine attempts to build an assessment model to measure the effectiveness of the program. Finally, we will explore the underlying assumption that university programs are effective means for building an engaged citizenry.

Purpose

Our objective in this article is to present a case study of the process of program development around a contested construct, that of global citizenship. While primarily descriptive in nature, the study seeks to draw out issues of student and program evaluation that are specifically linked to the nature of this guiding construct. The data is drawn from archive document analysis and from interviews with key informants involved in the initial discussions and implementation of Lehigh's Global Citizenship Program. The documents include the formal program descriptions available to prospective students as well as the meeting minutes and recommendations of the initial group of faculty who engaged in discussions around the launching of the program, the application for funding, and decisions regarding program structure and student enrollment. The minutes provide a basic historical record of the development of the program, and they shaped the prompts we used when interviewing key informants. These key informants included both the president and provost of the university at the time the program was initiated, two members the faculty committee involved in initial discussions about the program, together with a faculty director of the program and a program administrator. These participants were consulted as the documentary evidence was analyzed and questions arose, and they fleshed out the description of the program development discussions for us. They also provided us with an understanding of the consideration, or lack of it, given to program and student evaluation, and the debate over definitions of

global citizenship that influenced early program decisions.

In addition, other sources of data provided us with a means of triangulating the perspectives and understandings of current participants, both faculty and students, involved in the global citizen program. Survey material collected from faculty members involved in seminars since 2004 concerning course development within the program was analyzed (Sperandio, Grundzinski-Hall, & Stewart-Gambino, 2008). Student essays written when applying to the program, end of program student surveys, and program administrators' video-taped interviews of students describing their progress towards their own vision of a global citizen, were also made available to us. These sources provided additional insights into the complexities of both student and program assessment.

The authors/researchers have all had direct involvement in the program. One was the faculty program director, one a faculty participant in the interdisciplinary faculty seminars that are an ongoing feature of the program, and one was directly involved in the managing of day to day operations of the program and advising of its 100+ students. While we appreciate this involvement may have colored our objectivity, we would argue that this is offset by the multiple perspectives and in-depth understanding of the program that we collectively now have.

Lehigh's Global Citizenship Program

Assumptions and Ambitions

The group of faculty (ranging from six to ten members during the course of program development) from the three undergraduate colleges at Lehigh University (business and economics, arts and sciences, and engineering) who developed the framework of the GCP were initially involved in issues of definition. Thus, before turning to what it means to develop a curriculum that fosters citizenship, much less the development of global citizens, the group discussions focused on common assumptions behind globalization. The following understandings emerged from these initial discussions as documented in program files between 2001 through 2007:

The need for tools for operating in a global environment. Today's college and university students enter their adulthoods as workers, family and community members, and citizens facing a far different, and far smaller world than did their parents or grandparents. The rapid technological developments that enable almost instantaneous circulation of information, capital, services, and labor blur the traditional territorial boundaries between nations and cultures in a way that is historically unprecedented

(Castells, 1999). Although the concept of globalization means different things to different people, it does connote the basic truth that today's technology makes crossing national boundaries easier for everyone. International travel and work are no longer the province of the elite or a subset of occupations.

Preserving undergraduate curricular silos such as Lehigh University's very popular business major in the 1980s and 90s called *International Careers* seems increasingly anachronistic. Whether as virtual tourists, business travelers, consumers of internationalized services, or simply owners of computers sitting on the phone with a customer service representative in India, very few people have no brush with the world outside of U.S. borders**.** Thus, the first imperative for colleges and universities today is to provide students with the intellectual tools to understand the forces of globalization and technological change in order to make informed career and personal choices.

The need for tools for understanding global responsibilities. Simply providing information and training for students to take their places in the global economy is not sufficient. Since U.S. foreign policy adopted a unilateralist stance dedicated to preserving and furthering U.S. interests in the world, the American profile abroad is higher than ever. This heightened profile brings with it special responsibilities for U.S. citizens. National sensitivities to anti-Americanism is at an all-time high following the events of 9/11, and students must understand both the dangers that the American profile brings with it as well as the responsibilities that individuals bear in representing the U.S. beyond the world's stereotypes.

The U.S. presents two faces to the world. In terms of military expenditure, it dwarfs that of any other nation (Stalenhein, Kelly, Perdomo, Perlofreema & Skon, 2009). At the same time, private American donations help ameliorate such crises as the AIDS epidemic in Africa and fund critically important humanitarian initiatives in the world (Clinton Foundation, 2009; McCoy, Kembhavi, Patel, & Luintel, 2009). America's stance in world affairs affects U.S. citizens abroad and at home in ways that we do not yet fully understand**.** Colleges and universities should provide more than information and training for individual career choices in a globalized world. Students need the tools for understanding their individual responsibilities as citizens of a world in which the U.S. is, and will remain for the foreseeable future, a driving force economically, militarily, and culturally.

The need for understanding responsibility at the community, national, and world level. The U.S. economic, strategic, and military interests will continue to shape international realities. The U.S. electorate will be asked to vote for national candidates on the basis of their vision for their country's role in the world. The concern for the decline of participation in public issues that drives civic engagement initiatives in both K-12 and university curricula should also guide our decisions regarding the perspectives acquired by students when studying the non-U.S. world. U.S. students are woefully ignorant of world affairs, much less the rich cultural and historical traditions of other countries or peoples (Andrzejewski & Alessio, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000; McConnell, 2002). A more deliberate strategy of integrating international awareness into U.S. efforts to strengthen student civic engagement is crucial to the education of our students. Students must learn to make the connection between their responsibilities in their communities, their nation, and the world, both in terms of their own individual lives and careers and their ability to make judgments about their nation's role in the world.

Defining a Global Citizen

Once the three key understandings about the purpose of the program noted above were established, the faculty committee charged with program development moved on to the definition of what it would mean to be a global citizen and how this would translate into a workable undergraduate program. The program's archive of meeting minutes reveals that discussions started with the notion that today's students will live in a diverse, global, and interconnected world whether they want to or not, whether they necessarily know it or not. The questions that guided this part of the discussion included: What does it mean to ask of any student, regardless of major or intended career paths, that they become a global citizen? What is the difference between being a person who knows about non-U.S. cultures or languages and a global citizen? Is there a specific content, ideological perspective, or set of beliefs that are inherent in a citizen? What do students need in order to be able to determine, for themselves, their own relationship to the world? As discussions continued, support emerged for the belief that since all students will be affected by globalization, each student should be called upon to develop a stance as a global citizen that has a clear emphasis on the requirements of citizenship as opposed to global competencies. Rather than a tight, prescriptive, faculty-determined definition of what a global citizen should be, the faculty voted and chose to give students the perspective necessary to develop their own agency as responsible actors in the world, not just as observers or consumers of the rapid trends of globalization.

Program Design

The decision to allow students to develop their own understandings and definitions of a global citizen had

Table 1
Lehigh University Plan of Study for
the Global Citizenship Certificate program

Year	Course Requirements	Credits
Freshman Year - FALL	MLL/GCP 082 "Globalization & Cultures"	3
Freshman Year - FALL	GCP 087 "GC Practicum" trip preparation	1
Freshman Year - Winter (INTERSESSION BREAK)	10 day faculty led trip abroad	0
Freshman Year - SPRING	ENGL 007 "Global Literature"	3
Sophomore & Junior Years	ECO 001 "Principles of Economics" or other large introductory course	4
Sophomore & Junior Years	3 GCP Designated Courses	9-12
Senior Year - FALL or SPRING	GCP 387 Global Citizenship Senior Capstone Course	3-4
Any time	Study Abroad for a minimum of 6 weeks in a non-English speaking country	0
Each Semester	At least 2 co-curricular activities related to themes of "global" and/or "citizenship"	0

clear implications for the design of the program. Reproducing a new 21st century version of the old International Careers business major curriculum, which layered a veneer of cultural awareness over an essentially business or international relations model of the world, would not meet the program goal. Nor would program goals be satisfied by reforming existing disciplinary content, training for career choices, or focusing the program on the traditional area studies model in which students are expected to develop a deeper understanding of a particular region of the world. However, some existing university structures and procedures could contribute to meeting the goals of the new program. Faculties in all colleges of the university continually revise their curriculum, whether pre-professional or liberal arts, preparing students for integration into a global economy. Thus, students' majors and minors could be expected to provide specific skills and analytical tools for negotiating their career choices and abilities to access and use technologies.

The faculty committee concluded that there was no point in designing a specific program to deliver global citizenship, given the understanding that there is no major that is not, at some level, a global one – either because of the content of the discipline itself or because of the trajectory of the individual student after leaving university. The committee moved to a conception of the program as a "backpack" that any student should be able to assume regardless of his/her disciplinary home. This approach offered both exciting opportunities and tough challenges. On one hand, breaking the notion of global citizenship away from traditional academic disciplines opened possibilities for bringing ideas and interests from across all undergraduate disciplines together. While this is a commonly-stated goal in multidisciplinary studies, it is one that is very difficult to achieve in a research-intensive university setting in which faculty are disproportionately rewarded for

scholarly productivity in highly specialized fields rather than curricular innovation and cross-disciplinary pedagogy. The metaphor of a backpack suggested that each student would need to round out his/her major and extra-curricular/life experiences with tailored tools and perspectives, rather than participating in one program that narrowed exposure to just a few questions—such as economic or political questions—to the exclusion of others. Business or engineering students might need to fill their backpacks with classes and experiences in language or culture, while liberal arts students might need a greater awareness of the technical or business ramifications of globalization. The intellectual flexibility of a program not conceived as a new major/minor or concentration is that it allows students to deliberately tailor their educational experience around their concept of a global citizen.

The Challenge of an Interdisciplinary Approach

The greatest challenge of the backpack metaphor was that some students' curricula are so constrictive as to allow very little flexibility in their undergraduate career. For example, many Lehigh undergraduate engineering students have as few as 12 elective credits in their 4-year career. With such tight parameters, the typical approach of multidisciplinary program design, which is to simply add courses from a variety of disciplines, was impossible.

A key challenge facing the faculty committee charged with designing the program was to successfully overcome the territorial disputes of traditional academic disciplines. Faculty debates over the ownership of the intellectual content of global citizenship were fierce because the requirement that any student be able to tailor his/her backpack within the credit hours available ruled out the strategy of simply adding up enough requirements to satisfy a diverse faculty committee. The question of whether it was possible to be a global

citizen without, for example, speaking another language with proficiency, was one example of a heavily debated issue. If proficiency was needed, how would an engineer fit enough language into an already very constrictive curriculum? What if a student used every additional credit hour in language classes simply to become a fluent bigot? Is it enough to understand global financial trends with a smattering of language, or is some knowledge of cultural diversity necessary to transform a student from a student knowledgeable about the world into a global citizen?

Experiential and Co-curricular Learning

While the student "backpack" provided the solution to the challenge of program design, the solution to the challenge of the territorial debates between academic disciplines with the potential limitations and inflexibility of discipline-based curricula was to maximize experiential and co-curricular learning. The design for the GCP program integrates a structured engagement with the world through a number of practical and experiential components. This includes such commonplace experiences as study abroad, intersession trips abroad and summer opportunities to participate in nongovernmental organization (NGO) activities, lecture series, exchanges with foreign students and faculty, and the like. The design draws on understandings of service learning and other educational initiatives that seek to structure students' activities in their communities in an explicit theoretical framework in order to give them the intellectual building blocks for a life of civic engagement.

The faculty committee charged with designing the program believed an emphasis on experiential, co-curricular learning in conjunction with some additional coursework was consistent with the core assumption that global citizenship cannot be achieved by merely learning things in a traditional classroom experience, but rather requires active engagement with the world. Again, like service learning or community-based civic engagement, students' global engagement must begin with leaving the protective walls of the university. It is not the same to know something about another country from studying a third source such as books, the Internet, film, or music (although these can be valuable resources), as from *engaging* in another culture (Heath, 2000; Nussbaum, 2002). *Engaging* requires both experiencing viscerally the differences in cultures as well as thinking deliberately about one's stance in relation to the differences. Indeed, the majority of students seem to understand the value of leaving the classroom and engaging in the world, from their local communities to the world beyond the U.S. borders. For example, in a poll conducted by the *Chronicle of*

Higher Education (2004), 57% of the entering first year university students thought that promoting international understanding by encouraging students to study in other countries was either very important or important.

Yet the percentage of students who actually study abroad is much lower than 57% nationwide (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2004). There are several reasons for the disparity between student beliefs and reality. One barrier is the additional financial burden of studying abroad. Others include fear of the unknown, lack of confidence, and the lure of on-campus social life—especially in students' junior year when most students consider study abroad. Even for students who believe that international travel and study are important, it is easy to choose to stay in the familiar environment of their friends and professors in their junior and senior years, especially when they have positions of leadership in their fraternities/sororities or other extra-curricular activities. Often, it is just too difficult to imagine taking the huge step to immerse oneself in another culture if one's friends do not also value it. In order to help students build the confidence and develop a network of internationally-interested friends beginning from their freshman year, a third foundation stone for the GCP was decided upon—that of a heavily-subsidized inter-session trip for first year GCP students (GCP students contribute $500 toward the cost of the first-year trip abroad, while the University contributes the remainder, approximately $2500 - $2700 per students).

Focused Travel Abroad

In order to prepare for the trip abroad, the first year GCP students take a specially-designed course in the fall semester named *Globalization and Cultures* as well as a weekly orientation led by the faculty trip leader who is an expert in the politics and culture of the destination country. GCP students' first year is rounded out with a spring semester intensive writing course, taught by an English Teaching Fellow who also participates in the inter-session trip. The spring semester writing intensive course focuses on the students' trip experiences and the literary traditions of the country. Thus, the design of the first year of the GCP was constructed not only to incorporate the best practices in writing-intensive courses designed to foster critical thinking but also to build a social network of students interested in GCP that will provide the peer support for future, more in-depth study abroad.

Faculty Involvement in Course Development

The final challenge for the program design was to involve the faculty in course development to provide as wide a choice as possible of relevant courses from which students could choose to fill their backpacks.

Starting in the winter of 2004 through 2007, an annual faculty seminar, set up using Mellon Foundation funding, provided up to 15 faculty members from across the University an opportunity to participate in a semester-long structured discussion of global citizen themes. Each faculty member applied to participate in the seminar by agreeing to either create a new course or substantially revise an existing course in his/her departmental curriculum by incorporating the global citizenship themes chosen by the faculty program design committee. The multidisciplinary faculty seminar is intended to both spread faculty participation in the program as well as inspire the creation of new courses throughout the curriculum each year. This not only provides courses woven together by a common intellectual purpose but also transforms the curriculum over time for all students.

Challenges of Assessment

Once the program design and aspects of its implementation were finalized by the faculty committee, attention turned to the issue of program assessment. Baseline information that would assist in documenting the program as it evolved and guiding further program (re)design would also assist other institutions struggling with the same tasks of integrating assessment to new program implementation. A review of the literature on program evaluation stressed the importance of integrated assessment.

Colby et al. (2003) noted that effective programs build an assessment plan into the original design in order to provide the mechanism for clarifying program goals, reviewing progress toward those goals, and identifying components in the program that need improvement. Evaluation can give the insight and information needed for designing better programs (National Endowment of the Arts [NEA], 1993). Schuh and Upcraft (2001) pointed out that a well-designed assessment strategy is the best way to guarantee institutional commitment to high quality education and proper program development:

> National pressures on higher education institutions to demonstrate their effectiveness are continuing to mount. State legislatures and governors, the federal government, the general public, and students and their families are asking tough questions. What is your college's contribution to learning? Do your graduates know what you think they know, and can they do what your degrees imply? (p.9)

Student academic success can be measured by proper assessment models. It should be the responsibility of academic leaders or program directors to design and conduct appropriate evaluations (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001). Yet, for most universities, needs assessment is a challenge. Current assessments conducted in most universities are inadequate, and they rarely occur before new programs are launched (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001). Furthermore, program officers and decision makers hardly ever look at the evaluation's intended use prior to data collection (Patton, 1997). American colleges and universities focusing on civic and global programs rarely measure changes in attitude or measure competencies in terms of linguistic ability or cultural abilities (Grundinski-Hall, 2007).

Universities and colleges are reluctant to commit the resources necessary to adequately assess existing programs, and additional challenges are presented by programs such as the GCP. Given how difficult it is to broker the faculty compromises that are necessary to overcome disciplinary territorial battles, it is easier to focus faculty attention on the intellectual excitement of the program's goals than point the discussion toward often difficult questions of assessment. Moreover, the faculty committee that designed the GCP deliberately rejected a design that focuses on skill development or acquisition of specialized knowledge, adopting instead the much less crisp goal of fostering students' ability to develop their own stance as engaged citizens of the world. Not surprisingly, as Colby et al. (2003) explained, civic education is seldom assessed because success is so difficult to define and therefore measure. Yet the authors assert that a proper assessment model would not only strengthen such programs but also enlighten faculty, who should aim to survey substantive knowledge, communication skills, and aspects of analytical or critical thinking.

Program assessment can take many forms and can be equally successful with a qualitative or quantitative model. The decision will depend on the evaluation's purpose and audience (Colby et al., 2003; Patton, 1997, 2002). Evaluation conducted both formally and informally will allow for opportunities to analyze each component of the program. Yet what is essential is to apply methods that best suit the process through which the program operates, the nature of student's experiences, and the changes that students will undergo (Brisolara, 1998; Yin & Kaftarian, 1997). It is important to find out what the expectations of intended users are and negotiate a shared understanding of realistic, intended use. Schuh and Upcraft (2001) argued that a good assessment model starts with the institution or program's core mission and identifies the factors, conditions, resources, services, and learning opportunities that students need in order to meet the educational goals.

Existing Assessment Models

What assessment models are available for programs such a Lehigh's GCP? Because both civic engagement and globalization are the focus of so much national attention, leading many colleges and universities to reform their curricula in the light of national debates, it is not surprising that some assessment templates are available. For example, the Carnegie Corporation (2003) that has funded important pilot programs in civic engagement nationally advocates using longitudinal studies that examine students' attitudes and civic engagement after graduating. Similarly, a Pew Charitable Trust initiative funded researchers at George Mason University developing "youth civic engagement indicators" to measure the levels and types of student participation in public life (Andolina et al., 2003). The goal of this index, consisting of 19 indicators, is to measure behavior before and after the program as a means to test the success of the venture.

Similar efforts to assess internationalization programs can be found. In 2000, the American Council on Education (ACE) began a project that surveyed three specific audiences in U.S. postsecondary education with the goal of analyzing changing internationalization efforts in colleges and universities nationwide (Siaya & Haywood, 2003). This project, funded by the Ford Foundation, sampled 752 U.S. colleges and universities, 1,027 undergraduate faculty, and 1,290 undergraduate students and focused, at the institutional level, on internationalizing undergraduate experiences, the practices and policies put in place to support internationalization efforts, foreign language requirements, and student participation in international courses, travel experience, and personal interests.

At present, no Lehigh specific survey exists which focuses on the topics of civic, global or international education. Every year, however, Lehigh University administers the *National Survey of Student Engagement* to first year students. Although the survey is not specific to global, civic, and international issues, some questions are relevant. For example, the survey asks about participation in a community-based project; how often students have had serious conversations with students of different race or ethnicity than their own; whether student plan to take a foreign language course or study abroad before they graduate; and for student perceptions of the extent to which their institution encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds. Although this survey is intended to encompass all aspects of college experience, questions about experiences with student government, ethnic studies, women's studies, cultural workshops, and study abroad could be relevant to the development of a global citizen.

Finally, Lehigh students are asked to complete the *Senior Survey* focusing on their undergraduate educational experience. A subset of questions measure students' understanding of moral and ethical issues, including awareness of social problems; sensitivity to people of different races, nations, and religions; the relevance of historical/cultural/philosophical perspectives; appreciation of art, literature, music, drama (although not specifically of other cultures); and reading/speaking a foreign language.

A Tool for Comparing Pre and Post GCP Skills, Attitudes, and Knowledge

Assessment models often emerge out of a messier process than simply starting with the core mission and devising a tool tailored to the particular educational goals of the program or even borrowing from similar templates available nationwide. The fundamental problem for Lehigh's GCP was that the faculty group that designed the core educational mission did not view its charge as including the development of an assessment tool. In fact, the university admitted the first class of 26 entering GCP students in 2004 and then, at the insistence of the Provost, scrambled over the summer, under the leadership of a faculty member who had not participated in the original program development faculty committee, to devise an assessment tool to administer at the beginning of the academic year in August 2004.

None of the national templates for measuring civic engagement or globalization, nor the surveys currently used at Lehigh, were examined with an eye to how they might be adapted to the Global Citizenship program. The one national instrument specifically designed to measure "global citizenship," created by the AAC&U, was implicitly rejected by the faculty committee. Since there is no accepted definition of the term "global citizenship," it is not surprising that no consensus exists concerning the design of the program. According to the AAC&U, a global citizen is one who has a "sophisticated understanding of the increasingly interconnected but unequal world, still plagued by violent conflicts, economic deprivation, and brutal inequities at home and abroad" (AAC&U, 2002). Although the Lehigh faculty committee agreed on the description of the world, the consensus was that the definition of the term global citizen focused too exclusively on the acquisition of knowledge about the world rather than a developed stance as an individual with responsibilities in that world.

The committee consulted with the then university's Director of International Students & Scholars who had developed an assessment model for "global competency," derived from research using educators and transnational corporation human resource managers

(Hunter, 2004). According to Hunter (2004), global competence is "having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, and leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside one's environment" (p. 10). The only assessment tool developed to gather base-line data from the first cohort of 26 GCP participants drew heavily on Hunter's model while borrowing from questions developed in the Ford Foundation *Internationalizing the Curriculum* (Siaya and Haywood, 2003). Although "competency" is not part of the mission of the GCP, it does encompass several of the key ideas specific to knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Hunter, 2004).

Consistent with the faculty committee's vision, the definition of Hunter's (2004) global competence focuses on gaining knowledge, perspectives, and skills that a student would bring to bear on situational decision making rather than decision making based on previous thought or conjecture. According to Hunter (2004), globally competent citizens possess certain types of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that others do not. Based on the results of his survey, Hunter found that the kind of knowledge that marks a global citizen includes an understanding of one's own cultural norms and expectations and the cultural norms and expectations of others, an understanding of the concept of globalization, knowledge of current world events, and knowledge of world history. The kinds of skills that would distinguish a globally competent student include successful participation in a project-oriented academic or vocational experience with people from other cultures and traditions as well as the ability to access intercultural performance in social or business settings, to live outside one's own culture, to identify cultural differences, to collaborate across cultures, and to participate effectively in social and business settings anywhere in the world. Finally, a global citizen recognizes that one's own world view is not universal, and she has a willingness to step outside of her own culture and experience life as 'the other,' to take risks in pursuit of cross-cultural learning and personal development, to have an openness to new experiences including those that could be emotionally challenging, to cope with different cultures and attitudes, and to be non-judgmental about these differences and celebrate diversity. Thus, while the instrument developed to gather the baseline data for the program did not arise out of the faculty committee that devised the program, it was, in general, consistent with the faculty intent.

Ongoing Challenges in Developing Assessment Tools

The obvious and fundamental challenge for the Lehigh GCP is defining the term global citizenship. The original intent of the program is to provide students with the tools—information, experiences, and perspectives—necessary to think deliberately about their own responsibilities and stances as citizens in a globalized world. There are several problems with this initial purpose. While it is possible to operationalize some of the characteristics of a global citizen (for example, foreign language proficiency, knowledge of other cultures, and habits such as reading non-U.S. sources), measuring a student's evolving definition of his/her citizenship is both highly subjective and easily contested. We can imagine a student who rates himself highly on awareness, cultural sensitivity, and global responsibility, and yet others would characterize him as naïve, arrogant, self-absorbed or simply ignorant. Measuring student's self-perceptions is not without value, but the inferences we can draw only relate to how students view their educational experience, not whether their education produced an externally-defined intended outcome. While Hunter's (2004) definition of global competency is an improvement over the AAC&U definition of global citizenship in that it includes skill-based and attitudinal measures to a basic knowledge-based set of criteria, more work on operationalizing the intent of the program is necessary.

Another consideration in devising an adequate definition and measurable outcomes of the construct of a global citizen is the question of whether a "stance in the world" is a non-verifiable goal. Is it possible for someone *not* to have a stance in and toward the world? The GCP faculty committee did not define the program outcomes as a specific set of beliefs or attitudes, much less an ideological or political position on specific issues. Yet, the intent of the program is not that students simply gain knowledge or awareness but that students deliberately explore their own responsibilities in relation to specific issues in the world. Like a self-definition of citizenship, it is possible to imagine someone whose exposure to complicated issues and thorny world problems is to retreat to a stance that many would not view as a successful outcome—for example, jingoism or a fatalistic religious perspective. These are stances in the world, and yet many of us would not feel comfortable citing them as measures of success.

A further aspect of assessing the program is how GCP students compare in relation to some standard. Do Lehigh GCP students measure higher on selected indicators than students in some other group? It is tempting to select a subset of questions from surveys already administered to all Lehigh students in the hope of demonstrating some measurable difference in outcomes between GCP students and the general Lehigh population. What the program might sacrifice in learning about specific program outcomes it might gain in having a more robust comparison of the impact of the program on a select number of students. A snapshot

comparison of GCP students with a larger population, either Lehigh students generally or students from across the country on campuses administering the same instruments or subset of questions, would deepen the knowledge of the real effects of the GCP program versus the intellectual growth and maturity and awareness that might result from four years of study. The ability to compare GCP students to other populations could highlight potential differences, for example, between GCP students and liberal arts versus pre-professional undergraduate majors, as well as indicate the relative importance of other factors such as gender, socio-economic group, or region.

An alternative view is that a more accurate measure of the impact of the program may be a longitudinal study of GCP students after they graduate. This is based on the understanding that 'citizenship' is a dynamic identity and the program's mission is to provide students with the tools to continue to develop their individual definitions of their roles as citizens in the world—roles that surely will change over time as individuals' lives move through the various phases of adulthood. While program administrators would give up some of the potentially interesting contrasts that might be yielded by selecting a subset of questions administered broadly to students nationwide, they could develop more finely tuned instruments with more open-ended questions to administer to the small group of GCP students at key points in their lives.

The considerations above are both theoretical and practical. Any assessment strategy will be a compromise between the ideal instrument tailored to the specific mission of a program and the institutional resources that can be reasonably deployed for this purpose. To some degree, the choice of an assessment tool will be driven as much by institutional leadership and culture as by faculty design or student experiences.

There is another challenge to developing an appropriate and adequate assessment strategy that is rarely considered. All of the national justification for funding either civic engagement or global citizen initiatives rests on the assumption that colleges and universities are uniquely situated to create future generations of citizens. Yet, some research suggests that colleges and universities do not necessarily play such a pivotal role in shaping student's long term civic engagement, social responsibility, or attitudes/beliefs; rather, students who were already inclined toward social activism, volunteerism, and political engagement tend to find their interests reinforced by their college experiences. Sax (2000), for example, showed not only that students self-select into majors that will strengthen their predispositions toward these kinds of attitudes and behaviors but also that some majors lead to a real decline in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors associated with civic engagement. In the end, what the GCP may

be doing is simply better equipping students on a path that they already were inclined to take. This is not a small accomplishment; however, it is not the same outcome as creating a larger or more diverse population of global citizens for the future.

Conclusion

At this time, the full four years of the Global Citizen Program structure is now officially in place, consisting of a mix of traditional on-campus courses generated by participants in the annual faculty seminar and co-curricular/experiential opportunities ranging from study abroad, flexible practicums with domestic and international NGOs, participation in the range of internationally-related activities, and a senior capstone experience. The inter-session trip for up to 30 students each year now rests on a sound university budget model, and a number of sites for this activity have been developed. The first inter-session trip in 2004 took half of the students to Santiago, Chile and half to Hong Kong. In 2005 half of the students traveled to Prague, Czech Republic and half to Shanghai. In 2006 the first-year group traveled together to Cape Town, South Africa. In 2007 one group of first-year students traveled to New Delhi and Hyderabad, India. First-year students (2008) are now preparing for their inter-session trip to Accra, Ghana.

At a basic level, much of this work has been political—re-brokering a series of compromises in each of the three undergraduate college committees, passing the university-wide committee, and winning a majority vote in the university faculty meeting (a committee of the whole). The difficulties inherent in such a political process are made all the harder when faculty are also asked to debate, design, and implement a solid assessment strategy alongside the creation of a new program. For the faculty who have been most involved to date, the cornerstone of the GCP is its emphasis on citizenship defined as a vague but important "stance in the world," and any assessment model that is perceived as narrowing that emphasis to outcomes that are more easily measured runs the risk of losing important faculty support. The political issues, in addition to the methodological challenges inherent in assessment debate, make development of an adequate assessment strategy for Lehigh University's GCP a complicated puzzle that will require administrative support, skilled leadership, and more than a good dose of patience.

References

Adams, M., & Zhou-McGovern, Y. (1993). The sociomoral development of undergraduates in a social diversity course: developmental theory, research, and instructional applications. Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Andolina, M., Keeter, S., Zukin, C., & Jenkins, K. (2003, June). *A guide to the index of civic and political engagement.* New York, NY: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning [CIRCLE] and Pew Charitable Trusts. Retrieved from www.servicelearning.org/resources/links_collection/index.php?popup_id=594

Andrzejewski, J, & Alessio, J. (1999). *Education for global citizenship and social responsibility* (John Dewey Project on Progressive Education 1998-99 Monograph Series). College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (1999). *The academy in transition: Globalizing knowledge, connecting international and intercultural studies (fourth in a series of discussion papers for faculty members and academic leaders).* Washington, D.C.:Cornwell, G. H. and E. W. Stoddard.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2002). *Liberal education and global citizenship: The arts of democracy.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Brisolara, S. (1998). A history of participatory evaluation and current debates in the field. *New Directions for Evaluation, 80*, 25-41.

Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning (CIRCLE). (2003). *The civic mission of schools.* New York, NY: CIRCLE.

Castells, M. (1999). Information technology, globalization, and social development. *UNRISD* Discussion Paper, No. 114.

Chronicle of Higher Education (2004). Chronicle of higher education almanac issue.

Clinton Foundation (2010) *Clinton foundation HIV/AIDS initiative.* Retrieved from http://www.clintonfoundation.org/what-we-do/clinton-hiv-aids-initiative/_.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ehrlich, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education. American Council on Education Oryx Press Series on Higher Education.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Grudzinski-Hall, M. (2007). *How do college and university undergraduate-level global citizenship programs advance the development and experiences of global competencies?* Unpublished

doctoral dissertation, Drexel University, Pennsylvania.

Heath, P. (2000). Education as citizenship: Appropriating a new social space. *Education, Research, and Development, 19* (1), 2000. 43-57.

Hovland, K. (2005). Shared futures: Global learning and social responsibility. *Diversity Digest, 8 (3),*16-17.

Hunter, W. (2004). *Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences necessary to become globally competent.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania.

Humphreys, D. (1998). Diversity and the college curriculum: How colleges and universities are preparing students for a changing world. *Association of American Colleges and Universities.* Retrieved from http://www.diversityweb.org/diversity_innovations/curriculum_change/principles_and_practices/curriculum_briefing.cfm

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*(4-5), 289-30.

McConnell, M. W. (2002). Don't neglect the little platoons. In M. Nussbaum (Ed.), *For love of country?* (pp. 78-84). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization focused evaluation.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (20O2). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication

Sax, L. J. (2000). Citizenship development and the American college student. In T. Erlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* (pp. 3-18). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Schuh, J. H, & Upcraft, M. L. (2001). *Assessment practice in student affairs: An application manual.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Siaya, L., & Haywood, F. M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U. S. campuses.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education. Retrieved from www.acenet.edu/bookstore/public Info.cfm?pubID=306

Stalenhein, P., Kelly, N., Perdomo, C., Perlofreeman, S., & Skons, E. (2009). SIPRI Yearbook: Appendix 5A. *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.* Retrieved from http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2009/05/05A

Sperandio, J., Grudzinski-Hall, M., & Stewart-Gambino, H. (2008). Fostering institutional innovation: Promoting change through program-focused faculty seminars. *Journal of Learning in Higher Education, 4*(1), 37-45.

Yin, R. J., & Kaftarian, S. J. (1997). Challenges of community-based program outcome evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 20*(3), 293-297.

_____

JILL SPERANDIO is currently an Associate Professor teaching in the international section of the graduate educational leadership program at Lehigh University. Her research interests include the globalization of public and private education around the world, and the development of global citizenship at the high school level. Prior to joining Lehigh, Dr. Sperandio completed a thirty-year career as teacher and administrator in K-12 international schools abroad, and was employed as a teacher trainer and program evaluator by the International Baccalaureate Organization. She received her Ph.D. in Comparative Educational Administration from the University of Chicago.

MAGDALENA GRUDZINSKI-HALL is currently the Vice President of *International Education Management Group (IEM Group)*, with responsibilities focusing on building partnerships that emphasize international education programs at the university level both in the United States and abroad. Between 2004-2008 Dr. Grudzinski-Hall was employed by Lehigh University, where she launched, and subsequently directed the undergraduate Global Citizenship Program. Previous to working at Lehigh University, she was the Associate Director for MBA Online Programs at Drexel University's LeBow College of Business. She received her Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Learning Technologies from Drexel University.

HANNAH STEWART-GAMBINO joined Lafayette College as Dean of the College and Professor of Government and Law in 2007. Prior to coming to Lafayette College, she was Professor at Lehigh University, serving as Associate Dean for Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and founding Director of Global Citizenship. Dr. Stewart-Gambino has served as President of the Mid-Atlantic Council on Latin American Studies, as well as being a member of the Latin American Studies Association. She received her Ph.D. in Political Science with concentrations in Comparative Politics, Political Theory and Latin American Studies from Duke University.