

Summer 2013

In Pursuit of a Globalized University: An Analysis of the SJSU Salzburg Program

Elizabeth Diane Ohlhausen
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Ohlhausen, Elizabeth Diane, "In Pursuit of a Globalized University: An Analysis of the SJSU Salzburg Program" (2013). *Master's Theses*. 4358.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.j5sh-up8r>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/4358

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

IN PURSUIT OF A GLOBALIZED UNIVERSITY:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE SJSU SALZBURG PROGRAM

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Office of Graduate Studies & Research

Interdisciplinary Studies

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Elizabeth Diane Ohlhausen

August 2013

© 2013

Elizabeth Diane Ohlhausen

CREATIVE COMMONS
ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL-
SHAREALIKE 3.0 UNPORTED LICENSE

The Designated Thesis Committee Approves the Thesis Titled

IN PURSUIT OF A GLOBALIZED UNIVERSITY:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE SJSU SALZBURG PROGRAM

by

Elizabeth Diane Ohlhausen

APPROVED FOR THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES & RESEARCH
INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2013

Dr. William J. Reckmeyer	Department of Anthropology
Dr. Dennis Jaehne	Department of Communication Studies
Dr. Jochen Fried	Director of Education Salzburg Global Seminar
Dr. Reinhold Wagnleitner	History Department University of Salzburg

ABSTRACT

IN PURSUIT OF A GLOBALIZED UNIVERSITY: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SJSU SALZBURG PROGRAM

by Elizabeth Diane Ohlhausen

Colleges and universities are responding to the force of globalization by encouraging faculty and administrators to develop programs that support students in the global worlds of work and of citizenship. Through a partnership with the Salzburg Global Seminar's International Study Program (ISP), San José State University (SJSU) is making efforts to "globalize the campus" through institutional change. The ISP draws on the Salzburg Global Seminar's experience with the Universities Project and with other institutions of higher education in the United States to create the desired change. This paper examined the progress of the SJSU Salzburg Program (the Program), drawing on a framework for success created by the Universities Project and on the author's experience as a participant in the Program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For Wyatt and my Girl Scout Sisters

It cannot be easy to take a program you've created, allow a student to review it, and encourage that review to be unflinchingly honest. My thesis committee, Dr. William Reckmeyer, Dr. Jochen Fried, Dr. Reinhold Wagnleitner, and Dr. Dennis Jaehne, did so, all the while offering invaluable input and support. I hope this work lives up to their expectations. All of the members of my thesis cohort, but especially Darci Arnold and David Goldman, who also supported me with my internship in 2008, helped me get through the day-to-day challenges of sitting down and putting one word after another. There's a joke somewhere in here about a tontine. Astrid Schröder, who was immensely helpful during my internship with the ISP, was the first person who ever said indicated that I could write something people might want to read.

Peter Stephens, Anissa Amador Tria, Moira Enerva and everyone I met while working with the World Bank created a wonderful experience for me, and I hope my time with them was as valuable for them as it was for me.

My mom, Donna Fleshman, was my inspiration and my hero. Rolf Ohlhausen and Suzanne Davis provided unwavering and generous support. Ruth Kirchmeier and Nelson Bryant helped me believe I had something worth writing about. Joel and Susan Goldstein helped me to just keep writing. Johnna Magee and Samantha Hilber believed in me my whole life.

In the last 15 years, people in four countries have allowed me to sleep in their homes, eat their soup, and play with their children. Without those experiences, I never

would have thought to write anything like this. My experience of the world would not have been big enough for ideas about global citizenship and my exposure to soup would be sadly wanting. With apologies to Reinhold's *goulash* and Numajiri-Okasan's *misoshiro*, the best soup is clam chowder eaten with Jacob Ohlhausen on a ferry. I love it when a plan comes together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Common Sense	1
Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum	2
Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial	3
Global Citizenship in College	4
Visiting the World Bank of the Philippines	6
My European Expansion.....	7
A Fish Doesn't Know Water	8
GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION	10
Introduction—A New Need.....	10
The Salzburg Global Seminar	11
San José State University.....	13
SJSU Salzburg Program	16
THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT	18
Overview	18
Purpose of the University	19
Challenges for the Globalizing University.....	22
Possible Solutions.....	23
THE INTERNATIONAL STUDY PROGRAM (ISP)	27
Background.....	27
Student Session	29
Faculty-Administrator Session	33
ISP Partner Institutions	36
Conclusion	37
THE SJSU SALZBURG PROGRAM	38
Introduction.....	38
Typical Participant Experience	39
Projects	40
Conclusion	46
MOVING FORWARD	49
Introduction.....	49
The Universities Project as a Framework.....	49
Other Observations.....	54
Conclusion	63
APPENDIX: POSSIBLE SURVEY CONSIDERATIONS	65
Survey Goals	65
Definitions	65
Suggested Audience.....	66
WORKS CITED	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Subjects Discussed at the Salzburg Global Seminar.....	14
Table 2. SJSU Salzburg Program Progress toward Goals of the Universities Project.....	51

CHAPTER 1

Common Sense

During my junior year of high school, I lived in Tsuchiura, Japan as an exchange student. As a Californian, every t-shirt I had ever owned was already old, and every pair of jeans had holes in them at the time of purchase. Wearing the uniform of my private Japanese school made me feel as awkward and gangly as I had at thirteen.

I must have eventually gotten the hang of things because, by the middle of the year, I was captured on film at a school rugby game standing casually in my uniform while drinking Coca-Cola from a can. I heard about the footage from the tall school administrator from Afghanistan who was something of a guidance counselor for me during my time in Japan. He was the kind of considerate administrator who was committed to the success of the programs he worked on and to the students who passed through them. He cared about me and about my experience in Japan. Throughout the year, he negotiated space for me to participate in every school function I was interested in, even if I would have otherwise been ineligible. I was quite surprised when, upon seeing me in the hallway, he growled, “I know what you did.”

I had no idea what I had done and I recall that my response was quite rational. Having since dealt with teenagers, I recognize this as a lie I have been telling myself for so long I have forgotten the truth. More likely, my response was to scrunch up my nose and pull my head back as though his stupidity was a foul odor. I would have likely used words like “with all due respect” before words that connoted anything but that, in order to explain that I had not done anything.

He dragged me by the scruff of my neck into his office and showed me the footage of the rugby game, where the camera had panned into the stands to capture my friends and me eating our lunches and laughing. It was the kind of scene any institution trying to promote intercultural friendship would want to show on parents' night and my hair was not even frizzy. He rewound the tape a few times so I could watch the scene again and again. Finally, he paused it at the moment when I lifted the can of Coca-Cola to my mouth. It was wrong to drink Coca-Cola in my school uniform, he said. I asked, why? He responded that it was "just common sense."

A few years later, an introductory Anthropology course provided me with the tools I needed to understand this encounter for the first time. I would come to understand that my teacher was not wrong—it was common sense. I just didn't share in the commons.

Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum

My mom visited me in Tsuchiura and, while she was there, we took a trip together to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum. My strongest memory of the museum itself was the exhibit of bronzed protest letters in the east building. Each time a nuclear weapon is tested, the mayor of Hiroshima writes a letter of protest to the leader of the country that performed the test. Naïvely, I hoped to learn that my country would not have participated in further testing. After all, the existence of the museum had already proven that the United States could successfully develop and deploy an atomic bomb. I learned fourteen letters were addressed to President Clinton by 1999; by the end of his second term in 2000, he had received a total of nineteen.

I was devastated. My mother recollects that at the time I had seemed profoundly sad, and I still am. At the time it seemed that people, such as President Clinton, believed quite strongly that there were simply not enough ways for us to kill and maim each other. In a world that was, in my limited experience, quite peaceful, there was still enough reason to test weapons that we have all pretty conclusively agreed not to use under any circumstances.

Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial

I felt this disappointment again in 2008 at the Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial in Germany, but this time with myself. The area between the small buildings of the Jewish Memorial and the Protestant Memorial was lined with wide, flat stones about the size of my palm. To get from one memorial to the other, a visitor can either walk a short distance to double back to the path or take a short cut across the stones. Before I decided on my course, I looked for etiquette guidelines. Since I didn't see any signs, and I had seen others use the short cut, I took that route.

This seemed efficient, until I encountered a small incline where I thought the ground was flat. Moreover, the stones were in a loose pile even though they looked like they were set firmly in the ground. I found it hard to plant my feet and the stones clattered together when I pushed away from the ground with each step. I focused on my feet for the first part of the walk. By the time I looked up, I was standing in the center of a large area, visible from almost everywhere in the camp, making a thunderous noise. This noise attracted everyone's attention and for a moment I felt that they could all see

the horrible part of me that imagined I was the center of attention in a concentration camp memorial.

I got away from that place and sat on a bench near a beautiful grove of trees. I thought about eating my lunch. There, I saw

A wall where they would line people up and execute them along that wall. You can even see the trenches that were used to drain that blood. In addition, that would be where they would have scattered the ashes of all of the people who were there. You're walking through a small place that is a graveyard for 30,000 people, roughly... (Goldman, Dachau Brief 2008).

It seemed inappropriate to eat my ham sandwich. Goldman had said, "I think what's important is, what does this mean for us today? Not just looking in the past and saying this was a long time ago, but to really try to turn it around." I tried to imagine myself being a good and heroic person in Germany during the Holocaust, but I knew every effort I had made in the eight years between visiting Hiroshima and visiting Dachau had not meant a thing.

Global Citizenship in College

In 2003, I was assigned as Peer Mentor in Dr. William Reckmeyer's course at SJSU on "National Strategy in the 21st Century." 9/11 had happened since my high school Civics class, and the world had changed a great deal since I had last thought about foreign policy. In Civics, we had talked about remnants of the Cold War still in our lives. I felt like a member of a generation unmarked by world events. In contrast, Reckmeyer's class was civics in a post-9/11 world. It was an era where a conversation about foreign policy was a conversation about national security.

Based on the assigned readings, Reckmeyer struck me as a kindly but Machiavellian figure. One day, he passed around an article from *Mother Jones*, the left-leaning “nonprofit news organization that specializes in investigative, political, and social justice reporting.” This evidence of his open mind so impressed me that I marched up to him with my usual tact and blurted out, “So... you’re not a right-wing nut, are you?”

Reckmeyer would go on to inspire me, and I followed him around between German classes. The next semester I took his “Leadership Studies” class, in which I wrote a paper about Wangari Maathai, the 2004 Nobel Peace Prize winner whose work inspired me to see that my sphere of influence in geopolitical events might be bigger than I thought it was. Maathai founded the Green Belt Movement, which halts deforestation in Kenya by teaching women to plant trees. She also stood up for democratic elections, despite very real threats to her health and safety (Maathai 2011).

I started to study the ingredients in my cat’s food to make sure her diet did not support practices that would destroy oceans and ecosystems. I was working at a Starbucks when we started to seriously discuss global issues and I used those lessons to consider the coffee trade that I was a part of. These were small acts of critical conscience building, but I was starting to visualize my sphere of actions and the possibility that I could at least make a small difference.

My last course as an undergraduate was titled “Global Citizenship.” This was co-taught by Reckmeyer and Dr. Jochen Fried, who was a Fulbright Distinguished Scholar in Residence at SJSU in Fall 2007, and was flavored subtly with occasional contributions from Dr. Dennis Jaehne. The class had online discussions with Dr. Reinhold

Wagnleitner's students in Salzburg. The largest class assignment was to "go do Global Citizenship" and then to present the results of our efforts at the end of the semester. I had been reading Jeffrey Sachs' *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities of Our Time* and was interested in doing my part (2005). I began writing about my lessons in a blog. My first post was about trying to sort out the statistic "1.1 billion people live on less than a dollar a day" by tracking down its source and doing the math on my own life (Fleshman, 2007).

That post received a comment from Peter Stephens (then Director of External Communication for the World Bank in East Asia). After a few exchanges, he offered me a short-term consultancy to see the World Bank's work first hand in the Philippines.

Visiting the World Bank of the Philippines

In February, 2008 I visited some of the homes and communities of people who had been impacted by World Bank projects. One such project began in response to a new law. In 2000 a landfill had collapsed, killing thousands of scavengers; the national government passed a law that required all open landfills to be closed by 2010. Thus, in Teresa in the Province of Luzon, the Mayor and the Municipal Engineering and Natural Resources Officer, with the help of the World Bank and other NGOs, created a plan to eliminate trash in their municipality.

I saw that the new law, a change in policy, drove real change in three ways. First, it created a pressure for new technologies and gave the local government justification to require personal change from its citizens. Second, it paved a way for good ideas to reach a wider group. Other municipal leaders learned from Teresa's excellent program, but

they would have had no motivation to attempt such a change otherwise. Third, it institutionalized the new processes, ensuring that the changes themselves would last long after the current leadership left office (Fleshman 2008).

My European Expansion

Following my time with the World Bank, I traveled to Salzburg, Austria to serve as an intern at the Salzburg Global Seminar's International Study Program on Global Citizenship (ISP).¹ From March to June 2008, I undertook a variety of tasks as an intern, but the project that had the greatest impact on me addressed the challenge: what could the ISP do to support their alumni? This was especially pertinent during my time with the ISP because alumni were beginning to use new forms of media to record their time with the program. I established a Facebook page and introduced the staff to a few other online tools that would let them easily communicate with a larger audience.

At the ISP I met Dr. Reinhold Wagnleitner, Professor of History at the University of Salzburg. I decided to extend my visit in Austria for a semester and study American History, particularly the Cold War, under his supervision. Much of Wagnleitner's research focuses on the cultural Cold War and on the perception of the United States in other parts of the world. For me, Wagnleitner's most startling thesis is that "The Americas are seen as an artifact of European expansion" (ISP 26). With this, he demonstrated that the reason the United States is so important to the world has as much to do with its history as an experiment of Europeans, as it does with its current role as the

¹ In 2006, the Salzburg Seminar changed its name to the Salzburg Global Seminar. In 2013, the International Study Program changed its name to Global Citizenship Program. This document uses Salzburg Global Seminar, except when discussing the history of the organization, and International Study Program (ISP) for the sake of clarity.

only global super power. That is to say, to Europeans, the actions of the US are the legacy of Europe.

This changed my understanding of many interactions I had had with Europeans as a US-American abroad. On a short trip to Slovenia, a few months before the 2008 Presidential elections, I was walking along the beach one night as a young couple stopped me. The woman said, “American?” I nodded and with an insistent look in her eye she said, “Obama.” Her political preferences probably had a great deal to do with Europe’s distaste for the general policies of George W. Bush, but her belief that she had the right to tell me how to exercise my franchise—an experience I have never had in the United States—speaks to me as an example of Wagnleitner’s important point.

I continued to study with Wagnleitner at Salzburg University through 2008. This was an important experience for me because I was able to study the Cold War from within a neutral country. My understanding of the legacy of the Cold War came from having grown up in a place where we were taught to hide under our desks in case of bomb, but Wagnleitner’s course focused especially on parts of the world where “the Cold War was not so cold,” including Iran, Guatemala, Indochina, Egypt, Israel, Poland and Hungary (Der Kalte Krieg, 2008). This new perspective demonstrated to me that many of the current global hotspots were created during the Cold War.

A Fish Doesn’t Know Water

By 2009 I was once again home in California, finishing the coursework for my Master’s degree and preparing to write this thesis. As I discuss in the following chapters, the ISP and SJSU have developed a partnership to help create globally competent

students at SJSU. Having spent time with the ISP in Salzburg, I began to experience the operations of the partnership at SJSU with a more complete perspective. The partnership between the two institutions, now called the SJSU Salzburg Program started in 2006, was reaching a critical mass. Campus seemed abuzz with talk of change and globalization, and there seemed to be many more like-minded people around than there had been before I left in 2008. It turned out that I was in an excellent position to report on the SJSU Salzburg Program.

CHAPTER 2 GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction—A New Need

Institutions of higher education are responding to the forces of globalization by changing the way they train students to live and work. In 2008 the *New York Times* wrote, "... internationalization has moved high on the agenda at most universities, to prepare students for a globalized world, and to help faculty members stay up-to-date in their disciplines" (Lewin). Traditional activities included programs like study abroad, research partnerships, faculty exchanges, and joint degree programs. However, a number of colleges and universities throughout the United States are making an effort to take their programs further in order to continue to compete, and to create competitive students, in a rapidly changing world.

In order to meet this need, San José State University (SJSU) has partnered with the Salzburg Global Seminar's International Study Program (ISP). The Salzburg Global Seminar (the Seminar) has experience in globalizing campuses; before beginning work on the ISP, their Universities Project brought together faculty and administrators from both sides of the Iron Curtain to discuss how the fall of Communism would change the way education would happen. This project established a framework that identified the role of universities, challenges universities face, and solutions towards these challenges. This paper uses both that framework and my observations as a participant in the ISP and SJSU Salzburg Program (the Program) as a lens to analyze the Program and to suggest

ways of moving the Program forward. The following chapter will introduce the partners and the Program in order to provide context for the rest of the analysis.

The Salzburg Global Seminar

The Seminar has a rich history of addressing global issues. Founded in 1947 by three Harvard students, Clemens Heller, Scott Elledge, and Richard Campbell, the Seminar was conceived as a “Marshall Plan of the Mind.” The founders hoped to “mend the residual bitterness and prejudice engendered by six years of warfare....” (Ryback 1997, 10). The first session was a summer school experience and took place at Schloss Leopoldskron, in Salzburg, Austria.

Count Leopold Anton Eleurthurius von Firmian commissioned the construction of Schloss Leopoldskron in 1736 (Schloss Leopoldskron 2012). He did this after expelling 22,000 Protestants from Salzburg because they refused to renounce their faith. There is some question as to whether he commissioned the Schloss to repair his family’s reputation (Schloss Leopoldskron 2012) or because the expulsion of the Protestants dramatically increased his personal fortune, thereby enabling him to engage in such an undertaking (Wikipedia 2012). In either case, “the late baroque style, with its impressive details and the choice itself were clear signs of the absolute power of the Prince-Archbishop” (Dopsch 1996, 129-130).

Max Reinhardt, noted theater director and co-founder of the Salzburg Music Festival, bought the property in 1918. He spent considerable time and wealth restoring the Schloss, where he hosted theatre productions between the two world wars (Schloss Leopoldskron 2012). Reinhardt fled to Hollywood in 1937 and the Nazi regime seized

the Schloss. Stephanie von Hohenlohe was instructed to convert it into a guest house for prominent artists and as a reception facility for guests to Hitler's nearby Berghof home (Wikipedia 2012). After the war, the property was returned to the Reinhardt family and his widow, Helene Thiemig, who allowed the Harvard students to make use of the property in 1947 (Ryback 1997, 10).

At its inception, the Seminar was called "The Salzburg Seminar in American Civilization" and was able to serve "veterans of the French underground and survivors of Nazi concentration camps... a good number of Germans, Italians, and Austrians, many of whom had served in the military and first learned English in prisoner-of-war camps (Ryback, 1997, 10). The original intent was to host only one session, in the style of a summer school. The first session was successful, so the founders and instructors decided to continue (Ryback 1997, 11).

Starting in 1965, the Seminar actively expanded its focus and began seeking participants from Eastern Europe. It would become "one of the few forums in the world where large numbers of men and women from both sides of the Iron Curtain could gather to discuss issues of common concern" (Ryback 1997, 15). In the years since its inception, the Seminar has grown to address issues such as "international trade relations, global security arrangements, international political cooperation, environmental concerns, and transnational law and legal institutions" (Ryback 1997, 15). Table 1 shows subjects discussed at the Seminar.

Table 1. Subjects Discussed at the Salzburg Global Seminar.

<p>American Studies Culture and the Arts Economics and Finance Education Genocide and Prevention Geopolitics Global Citizenship</p>	<p>Global Media Literacy Health and Healthcare Innovation Reform and Transformation in the Middle East Sustainable Development Policies</p>
---	---

The Seminar also addresses these issues through other programs, which are organized differently from the traditional sessions (which are called “numbered sessions” by Seminar staff), typically because they are multi-year programs, organized between the Seminar and other partner organizations, and involve reconvening related groups of people over a period of time. The Universities Project (discussed in chapter 3) and the ISP (discussed in chapter 4) are two such projects that have focused on higher education issues during the past 15 years.

San José State University

San José State University (SJSU), a state-funded university of 30,000 students at the heart of Silicon Valley, is undertaking a globalization effort through the work of its faculty, administrators, staff, and students. This change is a result of multi-directional leadership from different academic disciplines and offices across campus. This is unlike most change at other institutions, in which one sees either top-down directives from the university administrator or bottom-up influence created by student demand (Lewin 2008; Klemencic 2002, 65). People in various institutional levels and positions at SJSU have

created a variety of programs, projects, and initiatives designed to meet their own special needs.

For example, in 2005, SJSU's Associated Students (AS) built a statue to commemorate Tommie Smith and John Carlos, the olympians whose "Black Power" raised-fist salute stood for the American Civil Rights movement at the 1968 Olympic award ceremony in Mexico City. The AS Commemoration read, "This is a great symbol for the community of San José State University. Tommie Smith and John Carlos were both students at this prestigious university and showed San José State University students of the present and the future that students can make a difference on the global stage" (2005).

This statue, commissioned and supported by the Associated Students over a three-year period, was erected across from the building that houses many of the Social Science and the Humanities and the Arts faculties. It is intended to commemorate student action on a global stage, rather than success as a teacher or influence as an engineer—two of the more traditional calling cards of SJSU students. As such, and having been erected by the student body, the statue speaks daily to the kind of global and inclusive university SJSU students want.

When I arrived at SJSU as an undergraduate in 2001, there was little emphasis on educating globally competent students. A high-powered group, led by the Provost and including the members of the Academic Senate, was working toward acclimating first-year students to the university environment. The Metropolitan University Scholar's Experience (MUSE), which began in 2002, was supported by the Academic Senate

because “a high proportion of new first year SJSU students need assistance in making a successful transition from high school to college” and “first year retention, as well as retention to graduation of new first year SJSU students, show room for improvement” (SJSU Academic Senate 2001).

Those in less powerful positions were less kind. The general feeling about SJSU and its students was less than respectful. The campus was considered a “commuter school” full of disinterested students. On one occasion, while working in a department office, I overheard a faculty member whining about how students in his classes cared less about school than students at Stanford and knew less about the world than his four-year-old daughter.

The campus was also known for having a large number of “non-traditional” students, who were older and therefore had additional priorities like work and family. On one occasion, an Anthropology professor told me that I should consider what my values said about our society if my job at Starbucks was really so important that it was worth missing a class session for it. At the time it seemed like she and other professors were profoundly disconnected from students reality; many of us were doing everything we could to afford our educations.

The other popular saying on campus was that “SJSU produces teachers and engineers.” We are, in fact, the biggest provider of engineers in Silicon Valley and the university’s original mission was to create teachers. This wasn’t said with pride, however, but to remind those of us in the Arts, Social Sciences, or any other field that we would be attending another school if we were good at what we were doing. Our

championship Judo team, its 31 Olympians, and famous alums like Amy Tan were little more than exceptions to the rule.

SJSU Salzburg Program

The SJSU Salzburg Program seems to have grown out of a frustration with SJSU's poor self-image. Neither the university's President nor Provost nor any other powerful campus representative sent out a memo indicating that *globalization* would be a campus priority. Instead, a faculty member, Dr. William Reckmeyer (Professor of Leadership and Systems in the Department of Anthropology), approached Dr. Mark Novak (Associate Vice President for International and Extended Studies) in 2005 with the idea for a partnership between SJSU and the Salzburg Global Seminar's International Study Program (ISP), and the SJSU Salzburg Program was born.

The partnership they created brings campus stakeholders together to form a "critical mass of collaborative change agents from across campus who work together on globalizing the University..." (SJSU Salzburg Report 2010). It has created an inclusive framework for cooperation among the wide range of programs, projects, and initiatives addressing globalization at SJSU. Moreover, the partnership with the ISP helps these stakeholders at SJSU emphasize institutional change. Indeed, the SJSU Salzburg Program is unlike other study abroad programs because it is not intended to teach students about global issues or Austrian culture; instead, all campus constituencies are charged with globalizing the campus.

Over the first six years, this partnership has had a significant influence at SJSU. Through year-long faculty-student mentor relationships, cooperative work between

faculty, such as co-teaching projects and co-curricular development across disciplines and silos, and events both at SJSU and in Salzburg, participants have created a network that is flattening the top-to-bottom hierarchy. Acceptance to the Program has become quite selective, and membership in the network is exclusive.

One sign of the Program's success has been external recognition. The US Center for Citizen Diplomacy, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and the US Department of State named the Program a "Top 10 Program on Global Citizen Diplomacy in Higher Education." This award recognizes the SJSU Salzburg Program and other programs because they "serve as outstanding examples of how to engage many more Americans in citizen diplomacy and address the major global challenges of the 21st century" (US Center for Citizen Diplomacy 2013).

The following chapters lay out the details of the SJSU Salzburg Program. Chapter 3 uses the Universities Project Report to create a framework for globalizing a university. I describe the the purpose, structure, and partner institutions of the ISP in chapter 4. In chapter 5, I show how the ISP influences and supports SJSU through the SJSU Salzburg Program. Chapter 5 includes information about the typical participant experience and a detailed look at what has changed on campus by the Program. Finally, chapter 6 looks forward through the framework I created with the Universities Project. I also address some of my other observations as an ISP intern and student at SJSU.

CHAPTER 3 THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT

Overview

In this thesis, I look at the ISP and the SJSU Salzburg Program through the filter of the Universities Project (UP), which took place between 1997 and 2002. Olin Robinson (then President) and Jochen Fried (then Program Director and now Director of Education) brought together leading administrators of higher education institutions to discuss the shaping of higher education in post-communist Central and East Europe, the Russia Federation, and their neighbors. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation funded the project specifically to help shape higher education in former countries behind the Iron Curtain following the end of the Cold War. Although the Universities Project focused on the role of the university in the context of changing nation-states, their findings are of interest to those attempting to situate their universities in a changing, globalizing world.

The project was summarized in the *Universities Project Report*, by the global cohort of participants, who explored the role of universities in society (Fried and Robison, 2002). In order to adapt to the changing world, some contributors to the Universities Project asked: what is the role of institutions of higher education? Is it in fact, “their responsibility to educate not only highly knowledgeable and skilled workers, but also socially aware, responsible, and involved citizens,” as student-participant Manja Klemencic put it (2002, 65)? Or should the university maintain its traditional ‘ivory tower’ purpose? The following summary builds a case for globalizing higher education

by re-defining the purpose of universities, identifies the challenges of creating and managing such universities, and proposes solutions that would help academia meet those challenges.

Purpose of the University

Some of the articles described the purpose of the university in terms of supporting the nation-state. Ossi V. Lindqvist (then Chair of the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council) observed, “Human capital is the best resource any country and nation can have;” therefore, nation-states that invest in higher education will see returns in their national endeavors (2002, 53). Judith Ramaley (then Assistant Director for Education and Human Resources at the National Science Foundation) also saw that, “No nation can prosper with a poorly educated workforce, nor can it continue to compete if its workforce fails to learn continuously” (2002, 59). Nation-states that do not invest in higher education will be left behind economically and militarily.

Some participants of the Universities Project saw the university as a mechanism to support civil society. Josef Jarab of the Czech Republic described the impact of higher education on civil society while in his position as the first freely-elected University rector in his country. He wrote, “it was in the institutions of higher learning where the spirit of regained liberty generated and brought about the first desirable changes, where reforms started to be carried out before we even had a name for them” (2002, 26).

During the transition period following the Velvet Revolution, universities in the Czech Republic banned political parties from using their space. This created a concern:

Necessary and healthy efforts to depoliticize universities may have been overdone - that, in fact, universities were not allowed, if not forced, to fall into a very undesirable isolation outside the most relevant public and political debates, outside the real and larger political context. Thus a potentially vital agent in the process of promoting democratic and civic literacy was left out. And so, universities, somewhat unwittingly, seem to have refrained from one of their basic social roles (Jarab 2002, 26-27).

This position was unacceptable for universities because “it became evident that life in freedom and democracy has to be learned” (Jarab 2002, 27). He concluded,

Institutions of higher learning should also be in a position to create agendas for political deliberations or disputes. In a free society, a fear of overpoliticizing the academic world might belie a genuine trust in the strength of its own judgment and readiness to enter an open intellectual contest. An open society can only be built and developed when openness is practiced and cultivated. And universities should be playing a seminal role in such a process in the society at large (Jarab 2002, 27).

Yolanda Moses (then President of the American Association of Higher Education) also thought universities should support civil society. She wrote, “In order to do a better job of serving students and the larger society, we need to do a better job of aligning public interest and institutional moral purpose and core values, such as social and civic responsibility, with academic strength” (2002, 23). Jarab’s and Moses’ articles together create an argument that institutions of higher education impact civil society; thus they should change to support (or criticize) the goals of the society in which they operate.

The university must also prepare students for the world-of-work. Lindqvist recognized that the world-of-work’s needs were changing and these new needs would not be met without a ‘knowledge-society.’ Students also respond to market forces, increasing the pressure on the university system. Manja Klemencic (former Secretary General of the

National Unions of Students (ESIB)) observed, “Acquiring transferable skills during the study process has become the primary request among current students. They are aware of the rapidly developing world” (2002, 64).

Ramaley and Jairam Reddy (Senior Research Fellow at the Human Sciences Research Council in Pretoria, Chair of the Council of the United Nations University, and former Chair of the National Commission on Higher Education in South Africa) identified a litany of skills that workers in a knowledge-society would require. Ramaley argued that workers in the knowledge-society needed to “exploit new technologies and create a different kind of work place where innovation and change is continuous. Knowledge production and the effective use of that knowledge is now essential for organizational success” (2002, 58).

Reddy observed that the short innovation cycles of the modern economy driven by, among other things, insatiable consumer needs required workers to have “broad generic and transferable skills thus enabling workers to deal flexibly with new demands, problems, and challenges” (2002, 55). He went on to describe those skills. Students must be prepared for lifelong learning, because as workers they can expect to change jobs and careers, retrain in new technologies, and address unanticipated problems. They should expect specialized knowledge to become obsolete. Furthermore, they must be prepared to apply the knowledge and scientific rigor they learn in institutions of higher education to real world situations (Reddy 2002, 55).

Reddy quoted the 1998 UNESCO World Conference, which called on “higher education to address issues of global importance, such as peace, sustainable ecological

development, international cooperation, democracy, and cultural enhancement...” He continued, “higher education is increasingly expected to foster international competencies in order to play a role in shaping the international environment: area studies, foreign language competency, comparative methods, international law, trade, and sensitivity to different cultures and to different modes of thinking” (2002, 56).

Ramaley added that interdisciplinary learning, especially that which includes “knowledge of science, technology, and a capacity for quantitative reasoning,” is necessary (2002, 62). Lindqvist further demonstrated that overspecialization is now a liability in the workforce (2002, 59). Moreover, students in math and sciences must be taught basic social skills and the “qualities of a person prepared to live a productive, creative, and responsible life” (Lindqvist 2002, 60). Finally, the university should not forget to teach “personal happiness and personal development” (Lindqvist 2002, 54).

Challenges for the Globalizing University

Thus, the university has three roles: as a contributor to the nation-state, as a member of civil society, and as a source for creating workers who can succeed in the knowledge-society. Lindqvist, Reddy, and Ramaley go on to describe the challenges of creating and managing such a university. The university and its faculty must contribute quite profoundly to the students who engage with it because, "In the deepest sense [the university and the academic community] involve a truly scientific, critical, and open relationship between the teacher and the student. And such a relationship is at its best a two-way street that enriches all parties involved... new knowledge should be created in such a process” (Lindqvist 2002, 54).

Meanwhile, university leaders need to help their institutions adapt to a global economy that demands high-level capacity development (Reddy 2002, 55). As Ramaley put it, “we must prepare our students for a world that we ourselves cannot completely anticipate” (2002, 60). Lindqvist established that this adaptation cannot be accomplished by individual institutions and will require the support of, among other regional sectors, national policies. Unfortunately, “In a sense this new pressure has taken the whole higher education sector by surprise, and the same has happened even within governments” (Lindqvist 2002, 54).

In the context of this shifting and unpredictable world, Ramaley noted that academic decision-makers “must rethink what learning means, who their students are, how to close the gap in participation and educational achievement among various sectors of society, and how to support the continuous learning that modern society demands...” (2002, 59). Thus, the notion of “globalizing a university” is an adaptive, 21st-century challenge for the educators and university administrators themselves, even as they are in the act of trying to teach others who face such challenges.

Possible Solutions

There’s a tension in the Universities Project Report, as the authors are reacting negatively to pressures from the world-of-work, which did not traditionally fit the role of the university. On the other hand, students were calling for more relevant educations. Decision-makers began to explore how the academic system could be adapted (Reddy 2002, 55). The Universities Project Report presented three solutions: 1) a diversification

of institutional types of higher education; 2) a change in the nature of high-level leadership; and 3) recognition of students as key stakeholders in higher education.

Reddy suggested that an increase in the variety of the types of available higher education (e.g. trade schools) would improve the way students were educated for the globalizing world. Unfortunately, “the comprehensive research university has been the ‘gold standard,’ which every country aspires to establish,” and so heretofore diversity in institutions of higher education has not been widely appreciated (2002, 56). However, this diversification would have significant benefits. Not only would it meet the needs of students not traditionally interested in the ‘Ivory Tower’ and provide more opportunities for job creation, pursuing this path in an integrated way would have “many advantages—increased academic rigor, improved student articulation and transfer, improved systemic leadership, and reduced administrative costs” (Reddy 2002, 58).

Green proposed another solution to the new challenges facing higher education: a change in leadership style from a top-down approach, which requires one person to be an “enabler, catalyst, and steward...,” to a system that supports an institution where “the ability of any single person to know enough or have sufficient reach to direct matters in far-flung corners of the institution is very limited” (2002, 45). University leaders who can make space for a diverse group of stakeholders may have better success at adapting to the challenges and pressures created by the globalizing world. Green wrote, “It is not enough to have good ideas; it is the ability to implant them in others that creates a sense of ownership and shared purposes.” This sense of shared purpose among stakeholders is

desirable, especially as faculty and staff are being required to reconsider their individual roles within the institution (2002, 46).

Klemencic described the third mechanism for change: universities should see stakeholders in all elements of society, including “local businesses, NGOs, and municipalities; consultancy services; the use of local issues as case studies in teaching... If higher education institutions are to teach democracy and citizenship, they need to act themselves as sites of democratic governance, citizenship, and civic responsibility” (2002, 65).

Klemencic placed significant emphasis on the role of the student as a stakeholder in this process. She wrote,

It is of utmost importance for the higher education institution’s leadership to involve student representatives in its decision-making processes... [Students can be a] powerful source in supporting the... implementation of policies and realization of projects... [and] need to be regarded as partners..., given opportunities to contribute actively..., [and] should not be seen as a problem (2002, 65).

To sum up, the *Universities Project Report* identified three roles of the university—as a contributor to the nation-state, as a member of civil society, and as responsible for creating workers who can succeed in the 21st-century. The *Universities Project Report* also defines several challenges in running such a university.

There is a sense that these writers saw this challenge as an overwhelming, but worthwhile endeavor. Ramaley wrote, “we must prepare our students for a world that we ourselves cannot completely anticipate” (2002, 60). Likewise Lindqvist noted, “in the deepest sense [the university and academic community] involve a truly scientific, critical,

and open relationship between the teacher and student. As such is at its best a two-way street that enriches all parties involved” (Lindqvist 2002, 54). Finally, some solutions were discussed—more diverse types of higher education, a change in the nature of leadership, and the recognition of students as key stakeholders.

There appears to be a link between these goals, challenges, and solutions and the ISP’s methods of thinking and working. This would not be surprising, as Fried directed both projects, and many ISP faculty members have been drawn from the Universities Project; namely, Bernd Baumgartl, Michael Daxner, Peter Magrath, Yolanda Moses, Peter Rose, and Reinhold Wagnleitner. If the Universities Project was the question, then the ISP is an answer.

CHAPTER 4

THE INTERNATIONAL STUDY PROGRAM (ISP)

Background

In 2005, shortly after the conclusion of the Universities Project, the team at the Seminar initiated a new effort to help internationalize institutions of higher education through the International Study Program (ISP). The ISP assists two-year, four-year and six-year institutions of higher education in the United States by providing an “intensive international experience designed to help develop the global competency skills of their students and faculty members...” (International Study Program 2012).

The ISP’s Strategic Mission, updated in its new Strategic Plan, expresses a commitment to promoting global citizenship at its partner institutions. Its goal is to help them educate global citizens, people who “are consciously prepared to live and work in the hyper-complex interdependent society of the 21st century and contribute to improving the common global welfare” (International Study Program 2012, 27). The Plan identifies four characteristics of a global citizen—someone who has

developed the knowledge, skills, tools, values, and commitment to: a) understand the nature of globalization, including its positive and negative impacts around the world, and realize how it is transforming human society; b) appreciate the diversity of humanity in all of its manifestations, from local to global, and interact with different groups of people to address common concerns c) recognize the critical global challenges that are compromising humanity’s future and see how their complexity and interconnections make solutions increasingly difficult; and d) collaborate with different sets of stakeholders, by thinking globally and acting locally, to resolve these critical challenges and build a more equitably sustainable world. (International Study Program 2012, 27).

The ISP further asserts, “many campuses are characterized by random acts of globalization, but few have developed the kind of integrated approaches that connect the dots between different sets of such activities” (International Study Program 2012, 27).

The ISP means to assist partner institutions in expanding their efforts so that students are exposed to a “coherent globally-oriented education.” The ISP identifies seven qualities of a globalized campus:

- *Engaged Campuses* where faculty, staff, administrators, and students are deeply involved in a diverse and stimulating educational environment committed to examining, discussing, and addressing the global complexities and opportunities of our time
- *Campus Cultures* that honor human diversity, across the full range of its domestic and global variations, and promote cross-cultural interactions throughout the enterprise as an asset and indispensable competency for cooperative action on a global scale
- *Curricular Programs and Activities* that provide a coherent combination of teaching-learning experiences, infused across the campus rather than limited to specific academic programs, that help students develop the intellectual knowledge, practical skills, and critical leadership abilities needed to thrive in our diverse global world
- *Co-Curricular Programs and Activities* that facilitate global exchanges; promote diverse interactions throughout and beyond campus. Encourage the sharing of global ideas, values, and perspectives; and provide critically reflective experiences.
- *Partnerships* with local, regional, national, and international organizations and communities that promote research, service, and applied learning about the evolving global context of our contemporary condition
- *Strategies and Resources* that intentionally, coherently, and comprehensively support and promote global citizenship on a campus-wide basis, involving all aspects of the enterprise
- *Practices* that enhance an institution’s ability to act as a global citizen itself – as a business, as an educational enterprise, and as a community resource

The last part of the ISP’s strategic mission concerns higher education itself. The ISP is working to connect its partner institutions “into an expanding network of educational enterprises” in order to help “globalize higher education itself” (International Study Program 2012, 27).

The ISP brings students, and faculty, staff, and administrators to respective weeklong sessions at Schloss Leopoldskron. During my internship at the Seminar, I observed three student sessions and one faculty-admin session. In this section, I describe what I observed during ISP 25 (a student session that ran from May 22 to May 29, 2008) and during ISP 27 (a faculty-admin session that ran from July 1 to July 8, 2008). Both were representative of the two types of ISP sessions (student and faculty/administrator), although typical sessions vary slightly based on the presentations given and the interests of the attendees. Some sessions also vary depending on the needs of the school or community. For example, the ISP also brings together students from Appalachian community colleges with students from Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Student Session

Typical ISP student sessions are designed to introduce attendees to concepts in global citizenship. Participants attend several lectures, visit the Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial, and complete a group project. ISP 25 began with “Mapping Ethnocentrism,” presented by David Goldman (Associate Director of Education) and Astrid Schröder (Program Director). Their presentation demonstrated that maps are cultural artifacts shaped by our understanding of the world, even as they appear to definitively describe the world around us. Goldman and Schröder showed several projections of the world map and demonstrated how those images either emphasized or marginalized certain places in the world. For example, on the Mercator projection, Africa and Greenland are the same size, even though Africa is 14 times the size of Greenland (Goldman and Schröder 2008).

The next day, Norm Yetman (Emeritus Professor of American Studies and Sociology at the University of Kansas) presented “The First Universal Nation: The American People in the 20th and 21st Century.” He showed that negative perceptions of new immigrants remained similar over time, despite the origin of those new immigrants and how they integrated into a new society (Yetman 2008).

Reinhold Wagnleitner (Associate Professor of Modern History at the University of Salzburg) considered the United States as an experiment in democracy in “The US of America and the World: Views from a Distance.” In doing so, he exposed the attendees to European impressions of the United States and highlighted the importance and influence of US American culture within the culture of globalization (Wagnleitner 2008).

Students visited the Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial on the fourth day. Before departure, Goldman presented an overview of the camp that not only helped students know what to expect, but also set the context of their visit in the ongoing discussion about global citizenship. At face value, because Dachau was used as a model camp during the Holocaust, Ryback referred to it as “the place where the need for global citizenship was born” (Goldman 2008). Moreover, Goldman’s introduction firmly cemented the visit to the concentration camp in a 21st century context by considering the present-day attitudes of those who live in the town of Dachau:

Within Dachau, the relationship to the historical site is kind of a political matter, and the mayors always run on one side or another of how the town should handle this... You find people who want to tear it down, get rid of it..., move on. And the other side are very committed and say this is not only part of our past, but the German past, and it's our responsibility to maintain it as such and keep it there...

I think what's important is, what does this mean for us today? Not just looking in the past and saying this was a long time ago, but to really try to turn it around... It is very important that we learn about this, but what does it mean, what do I do with this knowledge (2008)?

By that point in the week, students had been taught to try to see beyond their ethnocentric worldviews through the Mapping Ethnocentrism presentation. Yetman and Wagnleitner exposed them to two views of the United States and the power behind citizenship, and the trip to Dachau made global problems urgent. The rest of the week focused on what could be done. Champa Patel (then with the National Black Youth Forum, an NGO committed to implementing social, political, and economic change in the face of inequality) described how she helped youth in the UK engage in dialogue between differing ethnic groups and how this could inform students planning to create change in their own communities.

In "Inter-Cultural Communication in a Global Context," Dennis Jaehne (then chair of the Communication Studies Department at San José State University) explored the relationship between curiosity, culture, and meaning (Jaehne 2008). Mary Catherine Bateson (author and cultural anthropologist) concluded the presentations with "Educating and Learning for Social & Global Responsibility," which sought to inspire students to take the lessons learned during their week abroad and act on them at home (Bateson 2008).

Students were also assigned group work to “take an in-depth look at migration and how it relates to global citizenship.” The project had two requirements: a research summary, which gave students a concrete issue to sink their teeth into; and an informational leaflet for a proposed NGO dealing with migration issues in specific countries. Faculty-advisors who accompany students from their home universities are assigned to these mixed-university groups and encourage them to think like social entrepreneurs (ISP 2008). Students then present their work to all attendees, and the ISP faculty members give feedback.

This group project presents a challenge to students—they must present a plan that will improve a situation from the perspective of multiple stakeholders who do not necessarily agree with one another. Like the stakeholders in their assigned countries, the students may disagree strongly about which solution to put forward because of where and how they live. Moreover, there is an element of professionalism expected in output and group behavior, since the students are representing their universities. Like in any group, this professionalism is difficult to accomplish when participants have competing preferences about how to spend their limited time (including expectations from the participating universities and the students’ individual desires about visiting the city of Salzburg).

The quality of student work that I saw varied. Some groups had trouble developing realistic solutions. One group has become almost a legend for their idea to build an underwater tunnel between Spain and Morocco, called Sporocco. This underwater tunnel would eliminate the danger to migrants as they attempt to cross the

Strait of Gibraltar in makeshift rafts. This idea seems quite sensible, if one is only concerned with the lives and safety of those traveling to Spain. Indeed, it is quite heartwarming that this group took that perspective. And sadly, the idea is preposterous—Spain certainly would not be in favor of Sporocco. Moments like these at the ISP present interesting teaching moments, as students and faculty come face-to-face with how truly difficult it is to grasp the nuances of global issues and to develop realistic solutions.

Other groups that struggled seemed to do so because of personalities within the group. One group in particular seemed to implode because of a conflict between a directive faculty-advisor and an opinionated student from another university. The ISP faculty is adroitly able to turn even situations like these into lessons. When groups are unable to accomplish their goals, questions about process are raised, and the group is encouraged to reflect on how their failure compares with real-world group environments.

Faculty-Administrator Session

The ISP Faculty-Administrator sessions, titled “Colleges and Universities as Sites of Global Citizenship,” encourage faculty and administrators to consider global citizenship and education for a globalized world as it pertains to work at their campuses in the United States. Participants attend several presentations throughout the week and complete a group project with other participants drawn from their respective campuses.

ISP 27 began with a presentation by Jochen Fried on “Rethinking Global Citizenship,” which provided an overview of the week by demonstrating the need for universities to adapt to the 21st century (2008). Fried called for universities to educate global citizens. To discuss how this could be done, in “Strategies for Institutional

Change,” Reckmeyer and Andy Rowan (senior fellow at the National Center for Educational Alliances and a lecturer in the English Department at Bronx Community College) presented updates about the ISP-related programs at SJSU and CUNY, respectively (Reckmeyer and Rowan 2008).

In “Darfur: A Global Conflict,” Najwa Gadaheldam (a private citizen of Sudan) spoke about Darfur and misinformation she observed in media coverage of the issue. Her presentation underscored the complexities of the issues in the region, and the challenge to those who try to teach about them (Gadaheldam 2008).

Reinhold Wagnleitner presented “America and the World: A Meta Presentation,” which took a look at the same topics that he had discussed during ISP 25, and updated this presentation to talk more about President Obama's campaign and his positive impact on the image of the United States abroad.

In “Global Citizenship for a Global World,” Reckmeyer demonstrated that globalization creates complex challenges and multiple stakeholders. These stakeholders can choose to be “part-smart and whole-stupid” or they can sublimate their desires and work toward the greater good (Reckmeyer 2008). Today, multiple stakeholders (e.g. multi-national corporations, governments, and NGOs) provide fragmented efforts that result in promoting individual stakeholder interests instead of finding more cohesive solutions that benefit their common goals.

Wagnleitner and Tom McDermott (a composer and piano player from New Orleans known for his eclecticism) presented “Jazz: The Classical Music of Globalization.” As musicians and academics, they emphasized how slavery and

migration through New Orleans shaped jazz, and how jazz helped spread U.S. American culture during the Cold War (Wagnleitner and McDermott 2008).

Finally, Chuck Hopkins (UNESCO Chair in Education for Sustainable Development at York University in Toronto, Canada) spoke about “Roles that Education Can Play in the Pursuit of a More Sustainable Future: An International Perspective.” His presentation examined concrete ways that universities can create better citizens. One recurring theme was the importance of teaching students relevant skills and information (Hopkins 2008). Hopkins gave several examples of information that might have been irrelevant to particular students—one student from the Caribbean could name all of the train stations in Canada by heart!

Participants were asked to prepare presentations after working in institutional and thematic groups. The two types of groups provided

both practical discussions among those from the same institutions on how they can develop ideas and strategies to implement them within the specific context of their institutions... while also allowing participants to discuss the same issues on a more theoretical level and benefit from the ideas and experiences of those working in different institutional contexts (ISP 2008).

Guiding questions were provided with three categories: institutional policies and practices; curriculum enhancement; and faculty development. The institutional groups were challenged to define existing structures at their campuses that encouraged or interfered with the goals of global citizenship and to find ways to support or change those structures.

The thematic groups were instructed to “imagine that the College of Higher Aspiration has recently engaged in a strategic planning process... Faculty committees [are] to recommend ways in which the college can incorporate more global perspectives in its work.” Faculty members were encouraged to present both good ideas and “practical short-term methods for implementing those ideas” (ISP 2008). This was intended to give faculty members a better sense of the types of initiatives that might create a more global outlook, the strategies that could be used to implement those ideas, the challenges they would face, and how those challenges could be overcome.

ISP Partner Institutions

Because the ISP’s mission is to help colleges and universities globalize their campuses, its influence is primarily realized through its partner institutions. Since 2004, approximately 85 institutions across the United States have participated in the ISP (International Study Program 2012, 17). Due to the diversity of institutions in the ISP network, the ISP’s impact can take many different shapes. In one example, students at Miami Dade College organized an ‘All Nighter for Haiti’ fundraiser.

In another example, Santa Monica College’s ISP-related Program comes from participating in only three faculty-administrator sessions, after which they created a general education requirement so that all students would be exposed to global citizenship. The program includes an International Education Week and a Student Research Symposium and Tournament that accepts globalization-related research completed in any discipline. There is also an annual, campus-wide global theme, the goal of which is to “help students and faculty connect their work, across disciplinary boundaries and inside

and outside the classroom, by offering a tangible set of issues that illustrate the more abstract ideas of globalism and citizenship” (Santa Monica College 2013). In 2012, that theme was “Poverty and Wealth; Want and Waste.”

Conclusion

Like at Miami Dade College and Santa Monica College, the community at SJSU has taken advantage of its partnership with the ISP to globalize the campus in its own way. Chapter 5 takes an in-depth look at those efforts by examining the SJSU Salzburg Program, a campus-wide, interdisciplinary effort to create change.

CHAPTER 5 THE SJSU SALZBURG PROGRAM

Introduction

Founded in 2006, the mission of the SJSU Salzburg Program is to “develop a critical mass of collaborative change agents from across campus who work together on globalizing the University and encouraging our diverse constituencies - students, faculty, staff, and administrators - to become better global citizens” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, iv). For this mission to be realized, Reckmeyer determined that selection for participation would be based on merit; that participants needed to have a shared transformational experience; that they should be drawn from all units and stakeholders on campus; and that it was important to recognize participants with a distinctive title, calling faculty and administrators “Salzburg Fellows” and, later, students “Salzburg Scholars” (Reckmeyer, Director, SJSU Salzburg Program 2012).

The Program has a broad spectrum of support on campus. The funding structure, although not completely transparent to me, indicates significant multidisciplinary support.² Students are not required to pay their own way; rather, all of the seven colleges, and other units on campus, sponsor students. Faculty and administrators across all traditional campus boundaries are selected for participation. Participants also include those who work in non-academic roles. This diversity has led to projects to globalize the University from all corners of the campus.

² I estimate that in 2013 it cost at least \$4000, between tuition and air fare, to send a student to participate in the ISP.

Typical Participant Experience

Before their departure to Salzburg (late May for students and early July for faculty), both students and faculty participate in orientation activities. These activities have changed and improved over the years; however, the basic pattern seems to be that applications are sought and reviewed by a selection committee that chooses the final participants in the Fall semester. An orientation session is typically held in the Spring semester. In 2012, this took the shape of a three-hour meeting that provided an overview of the entire SJSU Salzburg Program, information about what to expect in Salzburg at the ISP, travel plans, and upcoming program events (SJSU Salzburg Program 2012).

SJSU Salzburg Scholars. Since 2007, SJSU has sent 12-18 students to participate in an ISP student session each year. Students receive full scholarships, including travel expenses, so that “cost considerations [do] not prevent worthy students from participating” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 7). Upon their return from Salzburg, they commit to serving for an 18-month period, which includes their orientation semester, and a course on *Global Citizenship*. They work with SJSU Salzburg Fellows on projects to promote global citizenship on campus or in the community, for which they receive three units of academic credit and coaching on their career plans and life from their faculty mentor.

SJSU Salzburg Fellows. Since 2006, SJSU has sent 9-17 faculty, staff, and administrators to participate in an ISP faculty/admin session annually. These participants are selected from all of SJSU’s operational units, including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administrative Services and Advancement. The Program has also intentionally

recruited several senior administrators over the years, in order to support the Program's goal of creating "strategies and activities to transform a wide range of curricular, co-curricular, and operational aspects throughout the university" (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 5).

Projects

On their return to campus, participants in the Program initiate their own on-campus projects to further enhance awareness or knowledge of global citizenship and to change the campus. These projects range from very effective to incomplete. After examining the full range of projects, I've determined that they tend to fall into six categories: 1) curricular, 2) co-curricular, 3) guests, 4) research, 5) program infrastructure, or 6) campus strategy.

Curricular. Curricular projects include study abroad courses and exchanges, as well as the creation of new course work or adaptations to existing course work at SJSU. Several study abroad programs have been founded or improved upon. For example, in 2007-08 Jaehne and Julia Howe developed a course on *Intercultural Communication and Global Understanding*, which took place in Bath, England. That same year, Jaehne, Howe, and Beth von Till also arranged an exchange program between SJSU and Chiba University in Japan (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 31).

Likewise, curricular projects were developed on campus. In 2008, Reckmeyer, Fried, Jaehne, Arnold, and I developed an experimental undergraduate course on *Global Citizenship* (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 31). That course was recently converted into a permanent upper-division course for the Global Studies Program and has begun to

influence the development of a new set of general education courses that were offered experimentally online in Spring 2013 (SJSU Salzburg Program 2013).

Scholars and Fellows also turned their attention to coursework in the Communication Studies Department. Jaehne and Jad Mogannam developed an experimental undergraduate course on *Communicating for Global Citizenship* in 2008 (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 31). In 2009, Jaehne and Karla Davidson converted that course to a permanent undergraduate elective. Meanwhile, von Till and Robin Mara developed modules about global issues for use in a *Public Speaking* course. They also developed a workshop for a *Speech Communication Lab* that “links concepts of global citizenship, cultural communication and ethnocentrism” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 32).

The College of Business also saw some changes. In 2008, Bill DeVincenzi and Linzey Hypes developed ways to enhance the *Gary Sbona Honors Program* and *The Fiscal Management Association*. The next year, DeVincenzi developed a program to enhance global outreach by the College of Business with the support of Mariah Martinez and Tara Martinez, through the new Thompson Global Internship Program. William Jiang and Douglas Mendez also developed an elective seminar on *The Post-Globalization Business World: Managing Without Stereotypes*.

Some faculty members have used this opportunity to co-create courses across disciplines. For example, in 2010 five faculty members, Reckmeyer, Steve Branz (Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies), Debra David (Associate Dean for First Year Experience, Jaehne, and Maribel Martinez (Director of the Cesar Chavez Community

Action Center) developed a proposal for an interdisciplinary campus-wide Leadership Studies minor that has morphed into the Global Leadership & Innovation Minor hosted by the Global Leadership Advancement Center (GLAC) in the College of Business (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 33).

Other program participants deepened the global nature of their own disciplines. For example, Anne Fountain, Michael Conniff, George Vasquez, and Jessica Lammers developed a series of films and speakers for the campus that reflected many interests, including “the presence of other cultures (Chinese, Japanese, Middle Eastern, Eastern Europe and French) in Latin America, the role of Jewish influence on Latin American literature, and the legacies of slavery in Africa, Brazil and the Caribbean” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 35). They also added global components to existing language (Spanish and Portuguese) and history courses dealing with Latin America.

Co-Curricular. Campus-life is now significantly more global than it was when I was an undergraduate at SJSU, due to the activities of Salzburg Fellows and Scholars. For example, Mark Novak and Joan Merdinger (AVP of Faculty Affairs) created and endowed the Peter Lee Memorial Lecture, an annual invited lecture series included in SJSU’s International Week, that “focuses on key topics related to education, international harmony and transnational cooperation in a global world” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 5-6).

In 2008, Susan Hansen and Travis Campbell conducted a study on the SJSU University Housing Services; while in 2009 Cora Gerdes, Helen Stevens, and Matthew Peng created the SJSU Global Village—a floor of on-campus housing dedicated to

students interested in social justice and global issues (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 31-33).

Other examples include work by Cheryl Allmen-Vinnedge and Sahil Gulati, who introduced international internship opportunities into the *SJSU Career Center* (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 31). Likewise, Laurie Morgan and Suzanne Lee developed a program for SJSU's Health Center to help "promote awareness about global wellness issues" (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 33).

Guests. The SJSU Salzburg Program has also brought many distinguished guests to speak about global affairs on campus. The most important has been through the Peter C. Lee Memorial Lecture, held annually during International Week, which has attracted a diverse group of notable speakers, many of whom have also served as ISP faculty in Salzburg. These include Peter Magrath (then interim President of West Virginia University) and Yolanda Moses (Professor of Anthropology and Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Excellence, as well as Executive Director for Conflict Resolution at University of California, Riverside), both of whom have been university and association executives in higher education. They also include scholars, such as Steve Stedman (Freeman Spogli Senior Fellow at the Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law at Stanford University); Richard Goldstone (former Justice of the Constitutional Court in South Africa who helped to undermine apartheid from within the system); Mary Catherine Bateson (author of *Composing a Further Life: The Age of Active Wisdom*); and Kavita Ramdas (former President & CEO of the Global Fund for Women).

Other guests have included faculty members from the ISP who visited SJSU to share their expertise with a wider public audience. A mix of faculty, students, staff, and administrators generally attend these lectures. Students at SJSU have had an opportunity to hear both Wagnleitner's presentation on "America and the World," and the presentation with McDermott on "Jazz: The Classical Music of Globalization." Hopkins, likewise, presented his material described above to a group composed primarily of SJSU faculty.

Moreover, the campus has had the opportunity to welcome back Darci Arnold, an SJSU alumnae, who is now a regular faculty member at ISP student sessions. She speaks annually on campus about corporate sustainability and why it matters. Arnold emphasizes that it has become too easy to dismiss the efforts of big business. She demonstrates that significant work is being done within the corporate domain to engage in social responsibility and/or sustainability. In *Planet Building: A Case Study of Corporate Sustainability*, she participated on the CB Richard Ellis (CBRE) team that built an award-winning sustainability program (Arnold 2010).

Of particular note, in 2007, SJSU welcomed Fried as a Distinguished Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence. As Director of the ISP, he was invited to spend a semester on campus to "amplify and reinforce the impact of SJSU's participation in the ISP by supporting and enhancing ongoing efforts to globalize our university through an emphasis on global citizenship..." (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 15). While Fried was on campus, he co-taught the first course on *Global Citizenship* with Reckmeyer and Jaehne.

Research. Program participants (undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty members) have conducted studies on topics related to globalization, global citizenship, or educating globally competent students. The 2010 Program Report cites five Master's theses, of which this document is one, that have been undertaken to advance the knowledge of these topics. Likewise, Darci Arnold's thesis (referenced above) was published in 2010.

Moreover, Bill Briggs and Jun Wan researched freedom of the press in Hong Kong; Reckmeyer and Nicole Lucas conducted research about climate change; Reckmeyer and Karen Jardine studied global pandemics; Lawrence Quill and Fernando Marquez explored *Globalization and Urban Art*; and Brad Stone and Cynthia Ly studied how Jazz spread around the world.

Program Infrastructure. As mentioned above, many program alumni also help run the SJSU Salzburg Program. The Salzburg Scholars Club was formed in 2008 to help bring speakers to campus. By 2010, it was involved in

organizing orientation sessions for the new Scholars in Spring 2010, establishing peer mentoring arrangements between current and new Scholars, developing infrastructure to integrate new Scholars into the Program before their trip to Salzburg, making travel arrangements... and handling other logistical details (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 36).

Program participants also developed a website, which grew into an outreach and public relations effort. The Program Report was begun through this effort. In 2010, the next wave of participants planned to

develop strategies and infrastructure to increase campus visibility of the Program and selected activities on a regular basis - including communication, advertising, news coverage and Web presence through

traditional (print) and emerging media (electronic, video, etc.) (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 36).

Another group developed “guidelines, templates and examples of public presentations and private communiqués for SJSU Scholars to reflect on their experiences as SJSU Salzburg Scholars (including their global projects) and share with a variety of campus as well as public audiences...” These templates can be used when “contacting program funders and their department heads on campus upon their return from Salzburg” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 33).

Campus Strategy. Because the Program includes University community members in all constituencies, across departments and hierarchies, participants have become

a resource for the president, provost, deans and other senior administrators to call on for assistance in globalizing the university... that can provide creative and collaborative assistance across institutional boundaries (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 21).

For example, in the 2011-2012 academic year, SJSU began the preparation for a new a Strategic Plan. Seven SJSU Salzburg Fellows encouraged the campus to include global citizenship as part of that strategic plan. Two faculty members engaged the Academic Senate in globalizing the university by organizing a retreat on Globalization. Another group of participants, including a mix of faculty and students, tried to create a web portal for global activities on campus.

Conclusion

Clearly, the SJSU Salzburg Program has impacted campus life for the better. In the seven years since the Program’s inception, participants have been working diligently to ensure that SJSU gets the best from its partnership with the ISP. The Program has

touched many areas of campus life, creating opportunities for its participants and non-participants alike—study abroad programs, curricular improvements, updates to co-curricular facilities and programs, and guests can all impact a broader number of faculty members and students. Less tangibly, it has influenced campus strategy through its influential participants.

In addition to those many intentional benefits, the Program has also improved the on-campus experience in two ways. First, entering into a relationship with an organization as prestigious as the Salzburg Global Seminar appealed to parties who were trying to improve the brand of SJSU (Reckmeyer, Director, SJSU Salzburg Program 2012). As mentioned above, the university's 20th century legacy was a perception perception from within and without that it was 'a last resort' school.

Second, due to a lack of interdisciplinary cooperation on campus, faculty members were operating in disciplinary silos. Reckmeyer observed that many individuals on campus were engaged in "random acts of globalization, rather than part of a coherent education experience that students really need to succeed in the 21st century" (SJSU Salzburg Program 2010, 20). The SJSU Salzburg Program has allowed faculty, administrators, and students to become members of a powerful community of change agents, which I will address more fully in chapter 6.

Thus, we can say that the SJSU Salzburg Program has made a substantial impact at SJSU, successfully created instances of institutional change, and that it continues to significantly shape the experiences of many students on-campus. As a relatively young effort, however, the SJSU Salzburg Program still has areas for growth and improvement.

The next chapter will consider those through a rubric inspired by the Universities Project.

CHAPTER 6 MOVING FORWARD

Introduction

There is no doubt that the SJSU Salzburg Program has influenced SJSU. In this final chapter I will explore whether or not, and to what degree, the SJSU Salzburg Program is helping move SJSU in the right direction. The Universities Project described in chapter 3 established a framework that identified three roles of universities, two challenges universities face, and three solutions that can be used to achieve the goals and overcome the challenges facing universities. After looking at the SJSU Salzburg Program through this lens, I add additional areas of opportunity for the Program that I have perceived as a participant of the Program and the ISP over the past several years.

The Universities Project as a Framework

The UP identified three roles of the university: it should contribute to the global system, it should be a member of civil society, and it is responsible for creating workers who can succeed in the 21st century. To do this, the university faces two challenges: it must prepare students for a changing world, and it must facilitate deep and meaningful relationships between teachers and students, even in a period of significant financial cutbacks. Three solutions are proposed: more diverse types of higher education should be offered; a change in the nature of campus leadership is required; and students should be recognized as key stakeholders.

These roles and solutions provide five criteria by which to judge the SJSU Salzburg Program, excluding the responsibility to provide more diverse types of higher

education, which is not a problem that can be solved by SJSU alone. The goal that the university should be a member of civil society is also excluded, as I believe this is a preexisting strength of SJSU. The campus library, which is a joint project between SJSU and the City of San José, is a physical and administrative monument to community engagement. Because of this towering library, children come to campus and are able to see themselves as recipients of a university education. Table 2 outlines the program's progress toward the other goals of the Universities Project.

Successes. The SJSU Salzburg Program is succeeding in three areas. First, it is creating opportunities for SJSU to be a contributor to the global system through participant projects that contribute to the local community. For example, the Pipeline Project encourages students from Leigh High School and West Valley College to consider attending SJSU and participating in the SJSU Salzburg Program. Newly created Study Abroad and internship-abroad programs not only create opportunities for students who are able to travel, as well as to students who are exposed to exchange students, but they also facilitate cross-cultural communication about school and work around the world. The SJSU Salzburg Program's "Top 10 Program on Global Citizen Diplomacy in American Higher Education" award from the US Center for Citizen Diplomacy also indicates that the Program has gained, as a model, national recognition, even if its impacts have not been fully evaluated. As a next step, the SJSU Salzburg Program, through research done by its participants (described in chapter 4), may have influenced academic fields beyond higher education itself. If this is true, the Program should gather and publicize this evidence.

Table 2. SJSU Salzburg Program Progress toward Goals of the Universities Project

Goal	Stage	Evidence	Next Step
University contributes to global system	Partial Success	Program reaches out to neighboring community, such as Leigh High School – SJSU Salzburg Program pipeline; program participants have developed study abroad and internship abroad opportunities for SJSU students; “Top 10” award indicates a program has something to commend it to other universities	Show an impact on fields outside of higher education
University is a member of civic society	<i>Preexisting strength of the university.</i>		
University is responsible for creating workers who can succeed in 21 st century	In progress	Program’s focus is on institutionalizing globalization on campus, with the assumption that students will use learning in the world of work	A survey of students who have been in the program or influenced by it would shed light on whether this assumption is true
University must prepare students for non- anticipatable world	In Progress	Students who attend ISP or participate in a Global Citizenship class are being actively prepared; International Week takes place on campus annually; on-campus talks bring new ideas	Efforts to include Global Citizenship in the GE directive should be continued, so that this preparation can reach every student
University should facilitate deep relationship and learning environment between student and teacher	Partial Success	SJSU Salzburg Mentorship Program	Mentorship Program should be evaluated to ensure that participants are not slipping through the cracks.
More diverse types of higher education	<i>Outside the scope of SJSU</i>		
Change in the nature of leadership	Partial Success	Faculty and administrators make up an interdisciplinary community of like-minded individuals	Community should include room for non-like-minded individuals, and those who are not selected or choose not to go to Salzburg
Recognition of students as key stakeholders	Area of opportunity	Students doing busy work; students voices dismissed in public forums	Projects should be more closely monitored; required to work outside of program; admin work should not be acceptable; honors for excellence could be used to inspire

The second success is in the Program's ability to facilitate a deeper relationship between teachers and students, which is done through team projects. Students have long had access to faculty members in classes and office hours, and now the SJSU Salzburg participants have more formal mentor/mentee relationships. Faculty and administrators are able to work with students on projects of particular interest, and are in a position to assist their mentees with challenges of any type. However, as in any program, some people fall through the cracks.

I have observed faculty members who do not follow through with their mentoring commitments, and students who are able to deflect their responsibilities. To move forward, the Program might create a more formal set of guidelines for these projects and develop evaluations during and after the year of service. This would be especially fitting since students receive three units of academic credit for the project experience.

The SJSU Salzburg Program has also succeeded at changing the structure of leadership at SJSU. Although the formal structures still stand, faculty members describe a flattening of the hierarchy and access to colleagues from disciplines they did not have access to before. To further improve upon this strength, the Program should begin to find ways to include individuals who are not considered like-minded or who have not participated in the SJSU Salzburg Program. Below, I discuss concept metaphors and pre-theoretical commitments and suggest ways for the program to clarify its process, as far as defining key program language. This would go a long way toward making the Program more approachable to non-participants on campus.

Two areas can be considered solid works-in-progress. The SJSU Salzburg Program is able to prepare its student-participants for the changing world, either by sending them to Salzburg, by requiring them to take the Global Citizenship course, or by exposing them to talks and other activities on campus. However, the majority of students at SJSU are not being directly or indirectly prepared for the global world. Efforts to include global elements in the G.E. policy are underway and should be continued so that every student has at least some exposure to global issues.

The university is also considered responsible for creating workers who can succeed in the 21st century. For the SJSU Salzburg Program, this is less of a priority than creating institutional change. The thought appears to be that if the university creates this institutional change, then 21st century workers will emerge from the university. A survey of students who have attended SJSU in the seven years since the Program's inception would be one way to test this assumption. The appendix outlines some considerations for such a survey.

Finally, using the UP as a rubric brings forth one area of opportunity for the SJSU Salzburg Program: students should be recognized as key stakeholders. The Program only appears to recognize students as lesser stakeholders: they are required to choose a faculty member with whom to partner, and rarely develop issues of their own. Some students contribute through less-challenging support projects—administrative support for the Program itself, SJSU Salzburg student club development, or even as personal assistants to their faculty members—and are not pushed toward true learning opportunities. Once

again, detailed expectations and rubrics could be given to participants before the year of service. In addition, honors for excellence could be given.

Other Observations

As a participant, I have noticed other successes and areas of opportunity. First, participants may claim to agree with certain Program core beliefs and practices because it is an expedient way to earn a trip to Europe and to network with high ranking university officials. In addition, it seems that the Program obfuscates its failures in favor of creating marketing collateral, which makes measurements of its achievements difficult and indicates inadequate follow-through on the Program's part. Finally, the Program continues to work on clarifying its goals and refining its language as it communicates with a broader audience.

Concept Metaphors and Pre-Theoretical Commitments. Henrietta Moore's article "Global Anxieties: Concept Metaphors and Pre-theoretical Commitments in Anthropology" is a useful tool for this discussion. Throughout this thesis, the words *globalization* and *internationalization* have not been used interchangeably; however, it may seem so to the reader. Moore would refer to these two terms as concept-metaphors, or "examples of catachresis, i.e. they are metaphors that have no adequate referent. Their exact meanings can never be specified in advance—although they can be defined in practice or in context—and there is part of them that remains outside or exceeds representation" (Moore 2004, 444). As Fried has said, *globalization* is "the cliché of our times, a buzzword, and a catch-all" (2008). The interdisciplinary nature of the SJSU Salzburg Program and the history of the words as the Program's community has used

them add a layer of complexity for those engaged in the on-campus dialogue who are outside the SJSU Salzburg community. The challenge of dealing with concept-metaphors in the very definition of the Program's goals has created some confusion.

A model for a higher education program to educate globally competent students has been established using the University Project as a lens (although they were speaking specifically about higher education within newly democratic nation-states and newly established market economies). This gathering of academics occurred during a time of great global uncertainty, just after the fall of the Iron Curtain. At the time, most of the conversation was about *internationalization* rather than *globalization*. They did ask what the impact of economic globalization might have on the future of higher education, but not in the context of the hyper-speed globalization we experience in 2013. During the ISP faculty/admin session I attended as an intern in 2008, we were still discussing *internationalizing* campuses and it was only at the beginning of 2013 that the ISP changed its name from the International Studies Program to the Global Citizenship Program. This is the perfect example of a concept-metaphor.

Through use, members of the SJSU Salzburg community also came to see that what they meant was *global* and not *international*. The community meant neither the interactions between two or more nation-states, nor any other esoteric use of the term as we might see it in Political Science texts. Part of what they were attempting to describe was the sense that one is personally responsible for the fate of a Columbian coffee farmer or the disquiet that comes from reading up-to-the-minute first-person accounts of world-changing events like the Arab Spring on a cell phone.

Between 2008-2011, the community struggled with *global*. *Globalization* is a term with its own baggage, as it often implies multi-national corporations squashing the little guy and destroying the environment (Fried 2008). *Global Citizenship* then means to be engaged, or perhaps to be affected by globalization. The word *citizen*, an exclusive notion of national belonging, with something so large as *global*, but with a little explanation, it adequately describes what it was intended to (Fried 2008). *Global Citizen* sounds like a self-identification marker, like woman, scientist, cat owner, or Bruin's fan. I abandoned the term on a return trip to California from Hawaii when I was questioned by airport security. The guard asked me what I did, and what I studied. When I said "Global Citizenship," he asked me if that meant I had renounced my American citizenship.

Hakan Altinay uses the term *global civics* in his book *Global Civics: Responsibilities and Rights in an Interdependent World*. To me, this seemed like a better way to describe one's role as a stakeholder in events around the world; however, after using it after Altinay's visit to campus, Reckmeyer called me liberal. Oddly, a neo-conservative I later spoke with accepted *global civics* as a necessary and interesting academic discipline.

In the past year, the phrase *globally competent student* seems to have become the term of choice and we hear people around campus talking about *educating globally competent students*. Fried provided an interesting take on *globally competent*:

As far as I can see, the language of educating for global competence acquired currency because in an environment that is obsessed with testing and measuring 'student learning outcomes,' the term 'competence' seems

to be more conducive than the competing notions of ‘global awareness’ or ‘global perspectives’. Competence is the more familiar concept that you can break down in sub-categories like knowledge, skills, behavior/attitudes, values, etc. and then measure (2013).

Globally competent student still seems inadequately defined at SJSU.

Does the Program mean students prepared to improve their nation-state through civic engagement and the world-of-work as the Universities Project authors seem to suggest?

Furthermore, the ISP and the SJSU Salzburg Program attempt to *globalize the campus* through institutional change. While the right word for the idea of a *globally competent student* seems evasive, the concept-metaphor of a *globalized campus* appears to be shifting in meaning, even as the term itself remains constant. At SJSU, this can be seen through the participation of actors at all levels of the campus hierarchy from students to top campus administrators, and throughout campus disciplines, including both academic and campus-life departments. Each group and person redefines what a *globalized campus* looks like based on his or her position—in short, they start where they are with what they have—and the notion of a *globalized campus* has grown to include a *globalized* housing program, a *globalized* college of business, and a *globalized* health center.

To me, this indicates that Fried, Reckmeyer, Altinay, the neo-conservative and the faculty at SJSU are all talking about the same colossal elephant—Lindqvist’s world that we ourselves cannot fully anticipate—in the room. Because the SJSU Salzburg Program is able to capture a plethora of impressions of this from different angles and through

individual practice, we are capable of expanding our understanding of a ‘global campus’ and of globalization itself.

This strength creates miscommunication on campus. As participants working in interdisciplinary fields are trying to communicate to those outside of the SJSU Salzburg community, the concept-metaphors mentioned above, as well as others used within the community, such as *cosmopolitanism, leadership, power, speed, change, and responsibility*, are not shared across disciplines, by newcomers, or by those unfamiliar with terms and concepts we might now use with ease within the community. Moreover, the fuzzy nature of some of the concept-metaphors supports the human tendency to accept data that confirms one’s beliefs and to reject data that does not.

Encouragingly, the SJSU Salzburg Program has done considerable work defining its concept-metaphors since my research began. A series of Global Sustainability Dialogues was held in the Spring of 2012 to “define concepts, clarify relationships, discuss subjects...” (SJSU Salzburg Program 2012). Furthermore, chapter 4 includes four characteristics of a global citizen and seven qualities of a globalized campus, written by the ISP. It is my hope that this work continues to take place. An easy place to start in 2014 might be to determine if the SJSU Salzburg Program agrees with the ISP’s characteristics of a global citizen and seven qualities of a globalized campus. The goal is not to reach some type of terminological purity, but rather to create the opportunity for a clearer understanding of the ongoing dialogue, particularly so that the Program can be better evaluated at SJSU and so that dialogue can contribute to better research in the future.

Pre-Theoretical Commitments and the SJSU Salzburg Program. In the Universities Project Report, Madeline F. Green (then Vice President of the American Council on Education (ACE)) recognized an awareness gap in higher education. She wrote, it is

difficult to see the invisible cultural assumptions and the mental models that we use to define our own educational systems and instinctively frame our views of other systems... The process of making the unseen manifest and articulating the unexpressed poses enormous challenges, yet promises great rewards (2002, 44).

In the same spirit, Moore defined pre-theoretical commitments as the underlying assumptions and principles that inform methods of study and concept-metaphors themselves (Moore 2004). Pre-theoretical commitments found in the ISP and the SJSU Salzburg Program appear consistent with the research done in the Universities Project. These include that students should be taught skills relevant for the global system (although the Universities Project authors spoke of the nation-state), civic life, and world-of-work; that leadership is an important skill for students in the 21st century; and that the 21st century and the age of globalization require that students be prepared to succeed in a knowledge-society. They also include that it is challenging to change an institution of higher education; and that interdisciplinary experts and diverse stakeholders can make important contributions to the process.

As a student in the community, I find the pre-theoretical commitment that folds *leadership* into *global citizenship* problematic. This pre-theoretical commitment appears to have entered the discussion about global citizenship through faculty at universities themselves, who were working toward the “world they themselves could not completely

predict” (Reddy 2002). *Leadership* was required by that set in order to make the kind of change they deemed necessary at complex and highly bureaucratic academic institutions. Moses wrote, “as colleges and universities grow more complex, with more stakeholders demanding their say in institutional matters, the ability of any single person to know enough or have sufficient reach to direct matters in far-flung corners of the institution is very limited” (Moses 2002, 61). With this, Reddy and Moses show that leadership was important for faculty members, but they do not show that leadership is an important quality for global citizens, globally competent students, or students who are prepared for the world-of-work or the changing nature of the 21st century. The skills I have found more useful in the world-of-work have been closer to problem solving, resourcefulness, respect and an appreciation for diversity.

Reckmeyer is a Professor Anthropology who focuses on Leadership Studies, as well as the Director of the SJSU Salzburg Program. He believes that “leadership is an enhanced value in global citizenship (in terms of building a better world) though it is not essential” (Reckmeyer, Director, SJSU Salzburg Program 2012). In my Leadership Studies courses, Reckmeyer instructed us to consider different types of non-traditional leadership, such as bottom-up leadership, transformational leadership and situational leadership (Leadership Studies 2005).

I would propose that a more formal structure within the SJSU Salzburg Program be created that challenges the community to more fully and more regularly examine these pre-theoretical commitments. The Program has an opportunity to consider more carefully whether specific skills and knowledge are helpful for those educating globally competent

students, for global competence itself or specifically useful for the success of the SJSU Salzburg Program. Such a consideration would not only clarify the role of the SJSU Salzburg Program on campus, but would also contribute to a broader understanding of what is necessary for success in the 21st century.

Benefits of Participation. An opportunity for improving the SJSU Salzburg Program stems from the appearance that the rewards for merely participating in global citizenship efforts at SJSU may be too significant. Besides the paid international opportunity at the Salzburg Global Seminar, students and faculty members gain access to a network of influential professors and administrators on campus. To have access to these opportunities, one must only appear to believe in the mission that globalizing the campus is a good thing.

For example, students occasionally work on their required projects within the SJSU Salzburg community, perhaps by assisting with administrative tasks or Program organization. These projects are less challenging than those that require working outside of the network to accomplish a globalizing effect. Students who do this kind of administrative work have better access to faculty and administrators who can help them manipulate the academic system. Students who help manage the program will likely have a similar opportunity in another program or internship and so an opportunity exists to encourage them to overcome more unique challenges.

In the case of faculty, it is not unusual to encounter participants who do not seem interested in global citizenship at all, and yet give lip service to the idea of creating students who are global citizens. Several participants in the 2008 cohort from SJSU

indicated that they felt they had little to learn from faculty members from two-year ISP partner institutions attending the same ISP session. I observed certain faculty from SJSU treat faculty from two-year schools with a marked sense of superiority. Simply put, if a partnership with the Salzburg Global Seminar is considered so desirable, then SJSU's participants should be respectful and authentically engaged.

In my observation, the SJSU Salzburg Program admits a high proportion of go-getters, some who appear to use the Program merely as a path to pursue their personal goals. Those in the former class harm the reputation of the campus when they are allowed to interact with our partner organizations because they show outsiders their lack of interest. They also harm the Program's reputation when they represent it to the greater on-campus community because they are unable to clearly explain and support the true goals of the Program.

This problem is exacerbated because, like any other program, the SJSU Salzburg Program experiences attrition. It is difficult to tell which on-campus projects have actually been completed. The 2010 SJSU Salzburg Program review listed most every project attempted by the community, while the SJSU Salzburg website lists the 2011-2012 projects. It is not clear whether those projects reached completion, achieved their goals, found any new techniques, or stumbled into familiar hurdles. Thus, the Program's communication tools tend to function more as marketing collateral, which creates a lack of transparency.

A solution may require a better and more formal evaluation of the contributions of individual members of the community. Instead of applauding every effort, the

community has an opportunity to review and provide feedback, grant awards to exceptional participants, push students out of the nest, and challenge faculty to earn their kudos. A formal process would allow both the participants to learn more from their projects and for the program to learn more about where participants were struggling. It would also allow a more accurate picture of how *globalized* the campus was really becoming.

Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the SJSU Salzburg Program, beginning with its partner, the Salzburg Global Seminar. Through the Universities Project in 1996, the Seminar prepared to help institutions of higher education function in the changing world. Universities, faculty, administrators, and students would need to adapt to the new, global world-of-work. The Seminar continued this work with the ISP, which works directly with 2-year, 4-year, and 6-year institutions of higher education that are working to globalize their campuses. The Program has sent faculty, administrators, and students to the ISP annually since 2006 and challenges participants to act on what they have learned at the ISP by engaging in projects on-campus. This has created a solid foundation for globalizing the campus.

Since 2006, there have been many key successes. Most notably, the Program has earned national recognition from the US Center for Citizen Diplomacy, NAFSA, and the US Department of State as a “Top 10 Program on Global Citizen Diplomacy in American Higher Education.” The Program has created a change in tone on campus at SJSU, as faculty and administrators now have an opportunity to cooperate across traditional

academic silos. Moreover, the participants in the Program are working toward creating General Education requirements that will prepare every student on campus to work and live in a globalized world.

Of course, the Program can improve. The Universities Project Report can be tweaked into a useful evaluation tool that the Program can refer back to year after year to track its progress to its overall goals. Participants and projects themselves can also be more rigorously measured to better track the impact of the Program on campus. Meanwhile, Program participants can continue to focus on using the right language—clarifying concept metaphors and uncovering pre-theoretical commitments—surrounding *globalization*, *global citizenship*, and *globally competent citizens* as they continue helping SJSU prepare itself for a predictably unpredictable future.

APPENDIX: POSSIBLE SURVEY CONSIDERATIONS

Survey Goals

The purpose of this survey should be to determine if the students SJSU has graduated since the Program's inception in 2006 are, in fact, globally competent. Further, this survey can help the SJSU Salzburg Program test its beliefs about global competence against the experience of its students. Throughout the creation and development of the survey, and during the reading of the results, absolute care should be taken to remember that the goal is *not* to measure whether or not SJSU Salzburg student participants have become more global. If that is a relevant question, it is a question for another survey.

Definitions

In 2012, the ISP identified four characteristics of a global citizen. This very recent definition may be an excellent launching place for the SJSU Salzburg Program's preliminary definitions of global competence. A global citizen is someone who has,

developed the knowledge, skills, tools, values, and commitment to 1) understand the nature of globalization, including its positive and negative impacts around the world, and realize how it is transforming society; 2) appreciate the diversity of humanity in all of its manifestations, from local to global, and interact with different groups of people to address common concerns; 3) recognize the critical global challenges that are compromising humanity's future and see how their complexity and interconnections make solutions increasingly difficult; and 4) collaborate with different sets of stakeholders, by thinking globally and acting locally, to resolve these critical challenges and build a more equitably sustainable world (International Study Program 2012).

Starting here, I recommend that a committee of SJSU Salzburg Program participants (faculty and students) evaluate what concept metaphors and pre-theoretical commitments are evident in this definition. For example, when I read the word "diversity," I do not juxtapose "local" and "global." The committee will have to come to some sense of whether they have captured a definition that is, at least, measurable. Only then can the survey questions themselves actually be written.

Suggested Audience

Students who have graduated from SJSU since 2000 should be randomly selected from all colleges. Care should be taken that participants in the survey are not selected based on their global or international experience at SJSU or otherwise. Those who graduated before the Program began in 2006 will provide a control.

WORKS CITED

- Arnold, Darci. 2010. *Planet Building: A Case Study for Corporate Sustainability*. San José: San José State University.
- Bateson, Mary Catherine. 2008. *Educating and Learning for Social & Global Responsibility*. ISP 25: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Dopsch, Heinz. 1996. *Kleine Geschichte Salzburgs*. Salzburg: Stadt und Land.
- Fleshman, Elizabeth. 2007. Global Poverty Blog. "Project Brainstorming." <http://povertydiscussion.blogspot.com/2007/09/project-brainstorming.html> [accessed June 25, 2013].
- Fleshman, Elizabeth. 2008. *Back to Office Report*. Manila: World Bank of the Philippines.
- Fried, Jochen. 2008. "Rethinking Global Citizenship." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Fried, Jochen. 2013. Personal Communication. Salzburg, Austria. June 25.
- Fried, Jochen and Olin Robinson. 2002. *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Gadaheldam, Najwa. 2008. "Darfur: A Global Conflict." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Goldman, David. 2008. "Dachau Debrief." ISP 25: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Goldman, David and Astrid Schroder. 2008. "Mapping Ethnocentrism." ISP 25: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Green, Madeline. 2002. "Leadership in Context: A Transatlantic View." In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 44-45. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Hopkins, Charles. 2008. "Roles that Education Can Play in the Pursuit of a More Sustainable Future: An International Perspective." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.

- International Study Program. 2008. *Guidelines for Group Work*. Salzburg: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- International Study Program. 2008. *Instructions for Group Work*. Salzburg: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- International Study Program. 2012. *International Study Program Strategic Plan*. Salzburg: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Jaehne, Dennis. 2008. "Inter-cultural Communication in a Global Context." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Jarab, Josef. 2002. "The Political Role of Higher Education in Democratic Societies." In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 26-28. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Klemencic, Manja. 2002. "Preparing Students for the Future: Can Universities Meet the Challenge?" In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 26-28. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Lindqvist, Ossi V. 2002. "Preparing Students for a Changing Market." In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 53-54. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Maathai, Wangari. 2011. *Unbowed: My Autobiography*. New York: Random House.
- Moore, Henrietta L. 2004. "Global Anxieties: Concept Metaphors and Pre-theoretical Commitments in Anthropology." *Anthropological Theory*, Vol. 4(1): 71-88.
- Moses, Yolanda. 2002. "The Moral Purpose of Higher Education." In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 23-25. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Ramaley, Judith. 2002. "Meeting the Needs of the Market." In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 58-63. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Reckmeyer, William. 2004. *National Strategy in the 21st Century*. San José: San José State University.
- Reckmeyer, William. 2005. *Leadership Studies*. San José: San José State University.

- Reckmeyer, William. 2008. "Global Citizenship for a Global World." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Reckmeyer, William. 2012. Personal Communication. San José, CA. Feb 8.
- Reckmeyer, William and Andy Rowan. 2008. "Strategies for Institutional Change." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Reddy, Jairam. 2002. "Global Trends in Workforce Training." In *Universities Project Final Report 1995-2002*, ed. Jochen Fried and Olin Robinson, 55-58. Salzburg: Salzburg Seminar.
- Ryback, Timothy. 1997. *The Salzburg Seminar: The First 50 Years*. Salzburg: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. 2005. *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Salzburg Global Seminar. International Study Program on Global Citizenship. <http://www.salzburgglobal.org/current/isp-b.cfm> [accessed March 1, 2008 - March 24, 2013].
- San José State University: SJSU Salzburg Program. Global Citizenship Courses. <http://salzburg.sjsu.edu/news/4new-ge-courses> [accessed Feb 24, 2013].
- San José State University: SJSU Salzburg Program. Global Sustainability Dialogue #1. <http://salzburg.sjsu.edu/events/global-sustainability-dialogue/> [accessed Feb 12, 2012].
- Santa Monica College. Global Citizenship at Santa Monica College. <http://www.smc.edu/GlobalCitizenship/Pages/default.aspx> [accessed May 1, 2012 – March 13, 2013].
- Schloss Leopoldskron. 270 Years of History. <http://www.schloss-leopoldskron.com/en/palace/270-years-of-history/the-era-of-the-prince-archbishop/> [accessed May 24, 2012].
- SJSU Academic Senate. 2001. *Sense of the Senate Resolution Endorsing the Proposed Metropolitan University Scholar's Experience (MUSE) New Student Seminar Program*. San José: San José State University.
- SJSU Salzburg Program. 2010. *SJSU Salzburg Program Report*. San José: San José State University.

- SJSU Salzburg Program. 2012. *Program Orientation*. San José: San José State University.
- US Center for Citizen Diplomacy: Higher Education Task Force. 2010. "The Unique Contributions of U.S. Higher Education to Global Citizen Diplomacy." http://uscenterforcitizendiplomacy.org/images/pdfs/summit-reports/Task-Force/TF_Higher-education.pdf [accessed on June 25, 2013].
- Wagnleitner, Reinhold. 2008. "America and the World: A Meta Presentation." ISP 27: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Wagnleitner, Reinhold. 2008. *Der Kalte Krieg*. Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg University.
- Wagnleitner, Reinhold. 2008. "The US of America and the World: Views from a Distance." ISP 25: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Wagnleitner, Reinhold and Tom McDermott. 2008. "Jazz: the Classical Music of Globalization." ISP 25: Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Yetman, Norm. 2008. "The First Universal Nation: The American People in the 20th and 21st Century." ISP 25: Salzburg Global Seminar.