Increasing Access to Development-Focused Graduate Programs

Through the Online Format

A Project and Thesis

By Lisa San Martin

L. Forrest Inslee, Ph.D.

April 23, 2016

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in International Community Development

to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

of Northwest University.

Table of Contents

Dedication

To the Cohort 7b students in our online program. If we had animal monikers for each cohort I'm afraid yours would be "guinea pigs." Thanks for taking a chance with the experiment, helping this vision of online education become a reality, and letting us be part of your visions!

Acknowledgements

Thank you, first of all, to Tetiana Myhalyna Machabeli and Hanna Moisei Vandiver of Zakarpattya, Ukraine. I can never overestimate the influence you have had on me, simply by taking my teenage self into your world, serving as cultural brokers, and letting me get that inside view that first freed me to question accepted models of missions and development. Any special care for issues of local empowerment probably comes down to your early influence in my life.

Thank you to Dr. Joanne Pepper and Dr. Jonathan Dawn, and to Jim and Blanche Vantol, for your formational influence in my college years in Canada. Thank you to the DNM crew in Argentina for walking in such an inspiring vision of empowered non-American callings all over the world. Thank you to Drs. Gwen Dewey and Lowell Bakke (among other BGU people) for reverse engineering all my paradigms! You all watered and gave light to a seedling that was whisked away from you, but any future blooms are to your credit as well.

Thank you to Dr. Forrest Inslee for patiently indulging my ideas, dreams, and timelines in this thesis project, and for all your creative influence in my life. I hope you will like it; this thesis obviously could not exist without your faithful, intentional, and grace-filled labor with students over the years. You are a blessing.

Thank you to my readers, KC Cox, Leslie Aaron, Dr. Leihua Edstrom, and Karla Butts, for your important contributions to content and form!

Thank you to my parents, who launched my love for language, culture, art, and projects, and who have patiently accepted my husband as a substitute child while I worked on this...

And finally: thank you to my amazing husband Marcos San Martin for taking good care of me when I am overcommitted, which is most of the time, and for living so kindly and patiently with a project-oriented wife who barely cooks. I love you!!

Preface

Even though it's been a long time in the works, it is a great pleasure to write (as well as to finish!) this thesis project. The curious joy of working in education, and especially in higher education, is to see yourself constantly surpassed by your students. But in this particular field of development-focused graduate education, the nature of what we are studying gives me more reason than most have, to love that. I am always inspired by the students and alumni of MAICD, and the ways you are changing the world. Thank you for letting me into your stories!

Throughout this work, the words "developing contexts" are used to indicate the places in which students of development-focused graduate programs work, or hope to work. They refer to both a) nations with relatively poorer economies and sometimes, more overt or prevalent injustice, and b) smaller locations with the same description, but located within more wealthy nations.

I prefer the word "contexts" to the more common "nations" or "countries," because it would be superficial to suggest that poverty is *only* to be found in certain countries – or that within countries, levels of poverty are homogenous. Additionally, the word "contexts" is a gentle reminder of the need for contextualization in approaching issues of development. The so-called developing "world" actually consists of numerous distinct communities, with distinct circumstances, assets, and issues that tend to defy generalization.

The words "developed" and "developing" are quite imperfect terms for this use, for three reasons: first, because it is unusual to include justice in their definitions; second, because they are overly general labels; and third, because they imply a static relationship of power. Shose Kessi, a lecturer in the Department of Psychology at the University of Capetown, objects to the term on the grounds that it "assumes a hierarchy between countries . . . . the developed-

developing relationship in many ways replaces the colonizer-colonized relationship" (qtd. in Silver). Unfortunately, I have not found better commonly understood terms. All nations are developing and developed in many ways, and standards of poverty and justice are notoriously difficult to quantify. Nevertheless, we do need a term to refer to relative levels of economic poverty and poverty of justice, which certainly are more endemic and entrenched in some communities than in others, with more serious, widespread, and long-term effects on people and environments. While imperfect, the term "developing contexts" indicates these relative levels, while avoiding the generalization of entire nations.

Access to development-focused graduate education, or DFGE, is the central theme of this thesis project. I use this term to refer to graduate programs (masters or doctoral level) that focus on poverty, social justice, and related issues as they impact people and the environment, and that, through their students, seek to promote holistic development. I am limiting my discussion to programs that – like the online program launched in this project – have a fairly broad focus, tying together areas such as holistic missions, culture studies, community development, leadership, and globalization, with an emphasis on contextualization and a concern for issues of social justice. (For a full list of the programs I reviewed in my research, please see Appendix C.) All fields of education have the capacity to contribute to development, but I am limiting my discussion to those that purport to develop leaders for organizations, issues, and processes in developing contexts.

Finally, I should note for the record that I am writing from a Christian worldview, with a model of development that is necessarily holistic – encompassing physical, spiritual, and other aspects of health and wholeness. For ease of reading, I do not consistently refer specifically to *Christian* development-focused graduate education. However, my understanding of development

is rooted in the concept of poverty as a relationship issue leading to "marred or diminished identity and a degraded understanding of . . . vocation," for the poor, while the non-poor (who are in fact poor in other ways) "suffer from an inflated sense of identity and of vocation" (Myers 178). Ultimately this marred identity is due to the presence of sin in the world. I welcome dialogue with those approaching development-focused graduate education from other perspectives, and I trust that much will apply to all. However, I cannot really guarantee the applicability of my comments to paradigms of development that vary greatly from this one.

PART I: DEVELOPMENT-FOCUSED GRADUATE EDUCATION

Introduction

Supunnee "Nee" Pargul was born in Isan, a fairly rural area of Thailand from which

many young women have moved to cities and resort areas in order to work and help support their

families. Very often, the work they find includes participation in Thailand's sex trade. Nee's

story, however, is quite different (Pargul). According to Danielle Neufeld, a co-founder of

ethical clothing company Same Thread, Nee was encouraged and supported by her brother to

leave her village and "see the world." She eventually moved to the United States, where she

completed her Master of Arts degree in International Community Development (MAICD) at

Northwest University. True to her sense of calling, she returned to her village and began finding

ways to empower girls to embrace a stronger future, including setting up a "tutoring program for

school age girls in the village" (Neufeld). When Americans Danielle Neufeld and her friend

Katie Metzger decided to look into sex trafficking survivor options in Thailand as part of their

own work in the MAICD program, Nee became their friend and de facto cultural broker. As a

local, she opened doors for them to explore cultural aspects of trafficking that are often

overlooked, helping them to arrive at their eventual conclusions. These included the observations

that the economic pressure exerted by families and communities is often greater in Thailand than

in many other contexts where trafficking is a major concern, while the sense of stigma attached

to sex work is not as strong as it is in many other such contexts.[1] Nee was also able to help them

see the assets of the community more clearly, including the rich textile traditions of her region of

Thailand. After Danielle and Katie had also graduated from the MAICD program, the three of

---

[1] According to a paper by EPCAT UK, per the "traditional customs the first duty of a girl is to support her family in any way she can. Due to this sense of duty and to pay off family debts, many girls have been forced into prostitution" (2). The cultural pressure to care for parents is sometimes stronger than the cultural pressure to avoid prostitution.

them worked together to begin Same Thread with an eye to leveraging globalization in favor of traditional crafts, and giving local women in Isan legitimate business alternatives to the sex trade. Today, in addition to her tutoring program, Nee runs the Thai operations for Same Thread. She is "challenging the traditional female role in her village by creating an alternative employment opportunity" (Neufeld). Education truly made her story distinct.

Of course, it is not only Nee's life that was changed through her education. The children in Nee's village also benefit. Katie and Danielle have also drawn on her knowledge and perspectives in order to form a vision for what could be done, and now their vision has the advantage of her on-the-ground oversight of their Thai operations. Without Nee, Katie and Danielle would not have been able to begin Same Thread, or to make it an effective vehicle for transformation in the region. An unassuming young woman from a developing context for whom English was a second language was able to obtain a development-focused education, and an entire community is being changed. These advances would not have been possible without the combination of Nee's local knowledge of the context and her high-level training and education.

Nee's story, however, is sadly atypical. It begs certain questions: how can more leaders from developing contexts be equipped? While the issue of access to education has no panacea, online education has the potential to improve access to development-focused graduate education for many people in developing contexts. In this thesis project, I provide a philosophical rationale for such access, using the recent launch of the online MAICD (an access-inspired experiment) as a lens. The most effective use of online education toward the expansion of access is rooted in relationship that honors the agency of the poor, and that requires both ongoing attention to the needs of students from developing contexts, and a continuing stance of sacrificial love and service toward these contexts.

Key Concepts in Development

Development-focused graduate education is predicated on a philosophy that affirms that development itself is important and good. To some, however, the term development has negative connotations. It has often been accompanied by objectionable political agendas, colonialism, and detrimental effects on communities; according to Bryant Myers, it conjures up images of "material change or social change in the material world [as well as] modernization and westernization" (3). There are certainly better and poorer development practices, and there are also underlying philosophies of development that can promote drastically different outcomes. Myers finds it necessary to signal the kind of development that is truly healthy for communities through the phrase "transformational development" (3), which he attributes to Wayne Bragg (16). He uses the term to "reflect . . . concern for seeking positive change in the whole of human life materially, socially, psychologically and spiritually" keeping in mind that "human progress is not inevitable; it takes hard work . . . [and] implies changing our choices." While I will not use the term "transformational development" consistently in this work for ease of reading, I have Myers' definitions of it in mind when using the term "development." Transformational development is certainly concerned with rectifying poverty – but in Myers' view, poverty is fundamentally a relational problem of "marred identity" that affects everyone (144). He contends that the domineering relationships with others that facilitate the material symptoms of poverty also cause an identity crisis: "At the center of this relational understanding of poverty is the idea that the poor do not know who they really are" (144), as they understand their identity in the context of relationships of oppression and dependence. The identity issues serve to legitimize and prolong the relational malaise, thus perpetuating the material symptoms of poverty. These symptoms are often crystalized into what Daniel Groody refers to as a "system of structures,

policies, and institutions" that also affect the relationships of the poor, by "diminish[ing] their

options and keep[ing] them in poverty" (94). However, the materially wealthy often suffer from

poverty of another kind (Myers, 145). The so called "non-poor" can be entrenched in an equally

marred identity, and – to justify their power – rely on a "web of lies" that causes them to live in

fear, with a degraded "quality of life" (147), playing God in the lives of others (145). In reality,

everyone is in need of transformation; there is a sense in which we are all in this together (148).

The end-goals of transformational development are "changed people and just and peaceful

relationships" (17) that benefit all. Hence, it is not just a nicety to suggest that the poor and non-

poor be seen as partners in the quest for transformational development; it is essential. Neither the

poor, nor the non-poor, can fix the relationships behind their respective poverty issues on their

own, but must work out their true relationship to one another in order to restore justice to their

identities. This relationship, however, must always honor the agency of each party; it must be a

relationship defined by respect. As Myers puts it, "The beginning of healing the marred image of

the poor is to accept that they alone have the right to describe their reality and to shape their

vision of their better future" (185). Recognition and honor of the agency of others should

permeate any discussion of what the non-poor can do for the poor, mark the relationships formed

in development processes, and guide program decisions.

This principle of relational partnership that honors local agency is crucial to

development, and as such, to education that holds development as a goal. There are other

common components of development-focused graduate programs, including holistic approaches

to development (encompassing spiritual, physical, and other aspects), and the importance of

contextualization and local copowerment; these latter two concepts are of particular importance

to the issue of access, so I will address them separately within this work. However, the principle

of relationships honoring local agency is not just a matter of curricular content for DFGE; it also explains why access to DFGE is so important, and is a guideline for how it can be approached. DFGE is a force for leadership development and empowerment in the developing world, and as such, has direct opportunities to share agency, and to demonstrate the power of respectful relationships restoring a true sense of identity.

Development-Focused Graduate Education

In the story of Nee Pargul and Same Thread, Nee can be seen as an activist for education, of the genre of young women to which Malala of Pakistan and Mazoun Almellehan of Syria also belong (Thompson and Hawkins). Nowhere is education more valuable than in the developing world. Addressing particularly the value of education for women in developing nations, Lawrence Summers, former Chief Economist at the World Bank, writes, "[I]nvestment in girls' education may well be the highest return investment available in the developing world" (11). Development-focused graduate education programs, or DFGE, are a subset within education that bring a particular value to the developing world. Most fields of study can lead to a legitimate contribution to development, if applied in the right ways; DFGE, however, helps one find those ways. It serves as a lens through which one learns to ask deeper questions and listen carefully, from within nearly any field and in any context, in order to lead the processes of development.

It is through this equipping for leadership and empowering that DFGE taps into the rather central principle of development named above: that of relationships honoring local agency. DFGE done well can help to promote and expand the leadership of those who are in and from developing contexts. DFGE can also be a force to promote agency, validate the knowledge and experience of existing local leaders, and allow those in developing contexts to better exercise that "right to describe their reality and to shape their vision of their better future" (Myers 185).

This right, of course, does not depend on higher education – but higher education is a useful tool in its implementation.

DFGE programs originating in developed contexts naturally have complex identities and audiences. They emphasize a value in local action, initiative, leadership, and ownership, but they do not always live up to the implications of this value. In program population and design, they often favor those who are crossing cultures from developed contexts above those with the most natural right to leadership. While expanding access to DFGE globally is logistically challenging to universities, the need to do so is something of a moral challenge. Institutions must find ways to espouse in practice the principles taught in public. Leadership of development processes (both on a local level and on a systemic, global level) too often falls to non-locals – a situation that is potentially both unjust and ineffective. Educating leaders for developing contexts without providing access to such education to those in and from those contexts perpetuates the problem of leadership equity in the developing world. Access is an important issue for universities and DFGE programs to address, and online education in particular can be an important component of an access solution.

PART II: THE CASE FOR ACCESS

Perspectives on Access

To avoid misunderstandings, it's important to acknowledge that the online model of providing access to higher education appeals to stakeholders in distinct ways. University administration, for instance, may prioritize the possibilities for expansion that the online mode offers: it is efficient, scalable, and potentially lucrative. Attracting a higher number of students is the primary good; there is no real intrinsic motivation to target those with specific barriers to their enrollment. While visions of expanded access to specific populations may exist and may

indeed be tied to a school's mission and vision, they must correspond to very deeply held personal values in order to compete with pressing financial goals.

Development-focused program leadership, on the other hand, may well value the access that the online format affords for the benefits it affords to the program itself. Greater access may raise the profile of a program by increasing the percentage of students with practitioner status and with interesting and prestigious roles. This can aid recruitment and lead to a larger and more selective applicant pool, and thus potentially make the process of teaching more rewarding – since students with better writing skills and more relevant experience can be selected.

However, in addition to these program-centered perspectives, development-focused program leadership typically also share the perspectives and experiences of field-based development practitioners, consider development itself as a long-term aim of their work. Along with other development practitioners, they may value access most because of its direct benefits to communities. These may include preventing the kinds of harm that can occur when leaders follow poor community development practices out of ignorance, and providing additional leadership opportunities to those who have the benefits of contextual/cultural knowledge, in order to promote more sustainable development. They may especially value expanding access to students who can best represent the contexts where development is actually occurring: those who are in and potentially even from developing contexts.

To community members from developing contexts, however, making a program more accessible is often a matter of justice. It is not merely a question of what works; it is also a very personal question of whether or not their voices matter, whether ongoing and future development processes can truly be owned by the community, and whether or not there is room for their voices in the arena of global decision-making. Referencing the Aspen Institute's first training

with local African leaders, Quinn asserts that "the most important part of the curriculum turned out to be a crash course in confidence: how to believe in the importance of what you have to say. For many of our fellows, unused to thinking of themselves as "thought leaders," the leadership component was new territory." Sadly, there is an elitist side to the development world that has affected leaders and potential leaders. Access to higher education that provides both the tools to assert themselves as leaders and a genuine validation of local knowledge and context is needed both on a practical level and on a heart level.

As a graduate program coordinator, I understand and identify with institutional concerns. But as a former missionary whose formational experiences in developing contexts drove home the values of contextualization, local friendships, and local leadership, I understand and identify with the concerns of locals – and I consider these to be of higher value than institutional concerns. In fact, it's important to step away from the question of how access can benefit universities. By considering the value of access from the perspective of developing context community members, we can appreciate the priority of their claims and choose solidarity with their needs for both ownership in local development processes and a place at the table of global decision-making around development issues. For this reason, in my treatment of access, I focus primarily on expanding access to those both in and from developing contexts – and secondarily, to expanding access to those who are in, but not from, these contexts.

Development's Leadership Problem

The popular "Radi-Aid: Africa for Norway" video is a spoof on Norwegian aid to Africa, in which Africans return the aid favor by gathering radiators for the poor cold Norwegians (SAIH Norway). The implied critique is that far too often, Africans are marginalized as mere recipients, naturally incapable of offering something of value to help another country, or of

leading efforts to help their own countries. Sadly, this isn't just a generalization about which

countries have been helping others; it's also a statement about which countries are allowed to

lead in development issues. But that is not to say that the developing world isn't producing

experts. As Andrew Quinn of the Aspen Foundation notes, "experts from Africa and other parts

of the developing world are pioneering solutions to a vast range of development challenges on

everything from improving maternal health to boosting sustainable crop output." Yet for some

reason, the development world still has something of a leadership issue: far too often, leaders are

neither local nor representational. By local leadership, I refer to the issue of who is directing

development efforts in smaller, local contexts; by representational leadership, I refer to the issue

of who is making strategic decisions about processes and agendas at the highest levels of

organizations and agencies. As Niall Ferguson explains in his foreword to Dambisa Moyo's book

Dead Aid, "It has long seemed to me problematic, and even a little embarrassing, that so much of

the public debate about Africa's economic problems should be conducted by non-African white

men. From the economists . . . to the rock stars . . . the African discussion has been colonized as

surely as the African continent was a century ago" (ix). I cannot address whether current

leadership is fair or effective, or whether contextual input is sought and applied. I can simply say

that this gap is concerning, and that it is unlikely that the development world is collectively

functioning as well as it could if higher levels of leadership were more truly representational of

the contexts served. Donna Bryson cites an Active Learning Network for Accountability and

Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) study that highlights the development field's

concentrated leadership presence in developed contexts:

> "[T]he humanitarian sector worldwide . . . is dominated by the United Nations, the
>
> International Red Cross, and five giant international NGOs: Médecins Sans Frontières,

Catholic Relief Services, Oxfam, Save the Children, and World Vision, all based in

Europe or the United States, with an average of nearly six decades of experience and

expertise. Overall, 45 percent of the international NGOs are based in the United States."

Paul Knox Clarke, head of research and communications for ALNAP, adds that it is difficult to

find precise numbers, but "few would argue that the leaders of most international NGOs are

representative of the global population" (qtd. in Bryson). This lack of diversity is seen as a

drawback, however. As Dianne Calvi, CEO of Village Enterprise, puts it, "It is more challenging

developing local leaders, because it's always easier for people to work with people who are like

them . . . [though] you really need local people to have significant impact" (qtd. in Bryson). Both

in local contexts and higher levels of leadership, leaders from the contexts served will have a

better natural sense of their own contexts, and – particularly if they are able to link their contexts

to global issues such as might be learned in DFGE – will be natural experts in contextualization

within their own contexts.

Contextualization is a key concept within DFGE, and a major factor in the importance of

access. David Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen define Christian contextualization as "the

attempt to communicate the message . . . in a way that is faithful to God's revelation . . . and that

is meaningful to respondents in their respective cultural and existential contexts" (200). Within

development, I use contextualization to refer to the belief that deeply understanding the context

of a problem is critical to finding the right solution. Imported solutions are not trustworthy

solutions, and it's not at all assured that the right solution for one context is the right solution for

another. There are serious problems in the world that need to be solved – injustice, corruption,

need, and environmental destruction, among them. However, those located outside the problems

are not more likely to have the answers because they have more money, a privileged language, a

dominant cultural outlook, or even the proper education on international development solutions. The best answers are found on the ground and within the context. The best things outsiders can bring are the ability to listen deeply and learn, the will to help others hear voices that aren't always heard, and an openness to giving up control. Anything additional that outsiders can bring is subject to and must be discovered through the processes above. Hence, important local knowledge can be overlooked and underutilized if local leaders are few. New local power structures can damage the autonomy and initiative of locals. At higher levels, there is a risk that the concerns of large groups will be minimalized or misunderstood if leaders do not truly represent those from developing contexts.

Consider the history of errors in judgment in the aid and development worlds. Moyo gives the example of a mosquito net maker who is put out of business when a Hollywood star gathers a huge quantity of mosquito nets to be given away in his region, temporarily destroying demand for the local business. In a few years, when most of the nets need replacing, the net manufacturer cannot immediately recover the business (44). This is not just a logistical problem, but a problem of power imbalance in the leadership of developing contexts. Even a quick and well-intended good deed with outside power can cause a long-term problem. The issue of clothing exports to Africa affecting local textile and apparel industries has also been raised (Brooks and Simon, 1265). It is clear that there are many implications to the problems of leadership in development, which include not only issues of efficiency, or what works, but also concepts of justice.

Justice, Power Imbalance, and Development

The concept of justice, or "social justice" as it is sometimes called, is naturally compatible with the "God of justice" of Psalm 50:6; it is certainly a biblical idea. However, as

Christopher Hays points out, there is ambivalence to the term "social justice" in some Christian

circles. This may relate to a fundamental misunderstanding about the nature of justice.

Justice is, first of all, relational (Groody 99); it is a matter of truthful and respectful

relationship between parties. Groody describes three types of justice forming human

relationships. The first is commutative justice, or contractual justice, which deals with "the

relationships between individuals, groups, and classes" in a fairly procedural way (100). The

second is contributive justice, which addresses "an individual's relationship to society as a

whole," including duties such as taxes. The third is distributive justice, which protects the "rights

. . . and well-being of all members of a community (100). Some groups of evangelical Christians

have tended to view justice almost solely in terms of individual vertical relationships with God –

and in particular, Jesus' provision of justice (or righteousness) through his death and

resurrection, to each individual. The danger is that when the horizontal relationships described

above are neglected, it is easy to become like the Pharisees, who excused parental neglect

because of a gift to God. Christians cannot afford to neglect horizontal relationships with our

neighbors – and with the pervasive proximity of the internet, "neighbors" can be considered a

global concept today. Jesus affirmed the existence of rights within horizontal relationships, as

ordained by God:

> "[W]hy do you break the command of God for the sake of your tradition? For God said,
>
> 'Honor your father and mother' and 'Anyone who curses their father or mother is to be
>
> put to death.' But you say that if anyone declares that what might have been used to help
>
> their father or mother is 'devoted to God,' they are not to 'honor their father or mother'
>
> with it. Thus you nullify the word of God for the sake of your tradition." (*New*
>
> *International Version*, Matthew 15:3-6)

Just as Jesus affirmed parents' rights to support from their children, so throughout society there are rights that belong – rightly! – to other people. While the basis for demanding one's rights from God is tenuous, the existence of rights and of a moral basis for just relationships between people (as individuals or in groups) is entirely biblical. Ignoring or transgressing the rights of others is also called oppression.

According to Catholic theologian Daniel Groody, "[J]ustice begins with attention to the needs and rights of each person," naturally follows with attention to the structures supporting these (97), and is all about the restoration of true relationships (99). Attention must be paid to the rights of others in order to avoid outright oppression, but we are also accountable for our response to the needs of others. Attending to "the needs and rights of each person" (97) involves both caution not to oppress where rights exist, and a love for others that goes beyond rights and seeks out needs. However, in the sacrifice of Christ, needs and rights have become entwined, because in paying our debts he has left us with a debt of love to others. Because of his sacrifice, others have a right to our love and concern for their needs. As Cornel West, Professor at Union Theological seminary, has said, "justice is what love looks like in public"; seeking needed justice on behalf of others, then, is a way of loving them.

What does justice require of us when addressing situations of global inequity and power imbalance? Faced with rampant global poverty, inequity, and injustice, what ought to be our response? How can we best rectify injustice, and go about demonstrating love? These are central questions in the field of community development.

Of course there are many suggested solutions, including aid and the variation of aid that Hanlon, Barrientos, and Hulme explain throughout their book: direct cash transfers to the poor (*Just Give Money to the Poor: The Development Revolution from the Global South*). A potential

issue with all kinds of aid, however, is that mechanisms are not always in place to ensure that the aid reaches its intended beneficiaries on a large scale. Holistic responses to poverty must therefore address not only the tangible financial realities, but also the systems, structures and power imbalances that sustain poverty. Empowerment, therefore, and the mitigation of power imbalances, must be priorities; relationships that honor agency are key.

The underlying premise that power imbalances ought to be addressed strikes some as a western cultural assumption. But while cultures vary in their acceptance of power distance within their own ranks (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 57), all cultures assign value to power and autonomy – albeit in distinct ways. The terminology for issues of power imbalance, however, is complicated. On the one hand, when power is so unevenly distributed, we require terms that help us to express that legitimate need to shift the global balance of power and/or divest power. The word "empower" helps express this power imbalance correction on a systemic level. Yet its usage has come under criticism as sometimes implying that one group (usually outsiders) has all the power, resources, wisdom, and knowledge – and others are waiting helplessly for their arrival. Ironically, by adopting this simplification, it's possible to disempower and insult those we hope to help. Some maintain that the true work of empowerment is listening itself, as Micah Bournes puts so well in his spoken word poem: "Let us speak humbly for ourselves and allow others to tell their own story. For every voice has something to teach, and there is no such thing as a voiceless person, only a world who must learn to listen" (3). Listening to and accepting the influence (and authority) of others are critical to restoring the "marred identity" that Bryant Myers writes of (144) – both for the poor and for the non-poor. This is the essence of relationship that honors agency.

But is listening the only thing non-locals can do to address power imbalance? What about acting collaboratively on what we have heard? What can we call this process? L. Forrest Inslee's term "copowerment" indicates a collaborative process of empowerment (Inslee, "Empowerment or Copowerment?"). In this work, I use it to refer to the on-ground realities and actual processes in which all can engage, in order to shift these balances together. These include listening. No one should enter another context assuming that they can "empower" others. Yet working together in copowerment processes should result in a wider empowerment as well – in a positive shift, measurable at some level, toward greater freedom and influence for the poor.

Copowerment and empowerment are difficult; they involve giving up or holding back from using some of one's own power. The end results are generally better, but the process is counterintuitive and can involve sacrifice. It's therefore rare to see empowerment occur without intentional effort.

The Online Format as a Solution

Online DFGE has a particular role to play in developing contexts: it fosters the empowerment of developing context leaders, furthering both short-term and long-term development goals. The short-term benefits of DFGE include both context-specific benefits and more broadly applicable benefits. The context-specific benefits will, of course, vary by context, by program content, and by the needs of the students. One of the most beautiful aspects of DFGE programs like the MAICD is that there is an openness to – and indeed, and emphasis on – the assets, issues, and concerns associated with the contexts where students live and work. Such programs offer students the flexibility and opportunities to delve more deeply into the real needs of the contexts they choose, through the tools and mindsets of qualitative research. The most important takeaways will thus vary by context, but also by student area of interest and prior

experience, and by the specific program in which students are enrolled. Broad content areas that

students from developing contexts may find most valuable in DFGE include the following:

- A deeper understanding of how globalization is affecting contexts, and context-

  specific understanding of how best to mitigate the harmful effects of globalization

  while leveraging its benefits;

- Skills to lead and manage development processes on the ground;

- Authority to influence the direction of development at a higher level;

- Communication and collaborative skills to lead national and international

  organizations of development; and

- A deeper understanding of cultural variety and its value. L. Forrest Inslee, Chair

  of the Master of Arts in International Community Development program at

  Northwest University, lists on a course syllabus certain "values and assumptions"

  surrounding contextualization that are central to that program (and likely true of

  most other development-focused programs). Among these, he notes that "[a]ll

  cultures are beautiful and worthy of our respect and appreciation" but also "as

  human constructs, contain aspects of brokenness" (9). The principles of cultural

  humility that are hopefully learned through such education are valuable to local

  leaders as well as to non-local leaders, as they may help to provide a lens through

  which to better view one's own culture. Only with this sort of lens is it possible to

  see the broken areas, work to build them up, and be intentional about what one

  receives from other cultures. While non-local leaders may take away from DFGE

  that they must first listen, the principles are also valuable to locals; they can serve

  as inoculation against the temptation to assume that all so-called developed world

intervention is helpful – and the capacity to protect others from this common assumption.

Long-term benefits include increased academic and other authority to influence the direction of development at a higher level, an increasing share in the decision-making and leadership of the development movement, more widely-heard voices, and educational momentum to establish additional schools and programs that are both local and global – better contextualized than today's imported options, and more globally respected than many of today's local options in developing contexts. These are long-term goals, but worth leaning into.

Increasing access is a matter of justice, but it is also an issue of sustainability. The contribution of DFGE to sustainability has to do with that primary value in the field of development: contextualization. Providing access to graduate programs to those already in developing contexts promotes their leadership and is an effective way to attain contextualized development programs, processes, and concepts. It is a shortcut to the traditional development model; it gives away the role of the outsider middleman and streamlines the process. Contextualized solutions come easier to local or indigenous leadership than to those trying to cross cultural barriers. This is not to say that those who cross cultural barriers have no role in development, or in leadership. But local leadership has special value to sustainability – and therefore, finding ways to equip local leaders can be seen as more globally effective than finding ways to equip those who are not actually from and in a given context. The development field has, in its worst moments, focused on doing things for others, ignoring their agency. In better times, there has been an emphasis on leading others to get things done together. There is an old Chinese proverb attributed to Lao-Tzu: "A leader is best when people barely know he exists, when his work is done, his aim fulfilled, they will say: we did it ourselves." What if we helped locals to be

the leaders? Instead of training non-locals to cross cultural divides, manage leadership processes, and perhaps subtly direct locals into believing that they had done the work themselves, what if educational institutions instead prioritized the amplification of the voices of local leaders, and let them lead? Providing access to quality DFGE serves this purpose of strengthening and copowering local leaders, thus providing contextual, sustainable solutions over the long term.

Finally, access to DFGE is a matter of integrity. DFGE educators teach about the power imbalances in the world, and promote action to right these imbalances, across many fields and spheres of influence – but are also responsible to ensure that our own field addresses injustice. As we educate about social justice, we ignore power imbalance in graduate programs at our own peril. Integrity requires us to find ways to share power – and in education, access is power. By amplifying the voices of those best equipped to address their contexts from the inside (and in many cases, the voices of those who have been oppressed), access to DFGE has the potential to change these power dynamics in ways that extend beyond the field of education to strengthen communities. This is worth what it may cost in power, resources, and convenience.

The online format offers incredible benefits to those seeking to provide greater access to DFGE. It is efficient: it is possible to reach multiple contexts at once through one program. This has the added benefit of diversifying program population, which provides a richer learning environment for students – and that is critical, considering the subject matter.

Online education is also a logistical help to those who simply cannot travel to another location and leave their own context for up to two years in order to complete a residential program. Allowing leaders to stay in their contexts is extremely valuable – not only in terms of access, but for long-term results. DFGE options that force students to leave their contexts and immerse themselves in another culture run the risk of isolating the students from the contexts

they wish to help. A surprising number of students from developing countries do not go home to their contexts after they finish their studies. George O. Odhiambo of the University of Sydney explains that "[t]he migration of academics from Kenya has mainly taken two forms: direct migration or settling down after completion of one's studies in a given country" (510). It is tempting to blame the students and suggest that they were not truly committed to serving their contexts. But the current system of on-campus education does nothing to help them retain their sense of commitment, and much to make their commitments more difficult. Not only must a student be willing to go home to what *may* now seem to be a less convenient culture, but he or she may also go through reverse culture shock. DFGE principles are assumed to be helpful, but other concepts, ideas, and practices absorbed in everyday life abroad may include many that could damage a student's ability to fit into their own culture well: a stronger sense of individualism and autonomy, expectations on personal financial goals, social customs, food preferences, general worldview adjustments, and others. The influence lost first in leaving the community and second through an awkward return may never be regained. These risks are poorly documented, but easily hypothesized based on what is known about reentry among missionaries, and trends among students returning from abroad. Some students do make the transition back very well, but the risks and difficulties are real. Online programs – even foreign online programs – have the potential to be the best option in this regard, as even fairly local programs may require relocation and remove students from their immediate contexts.

While online access to DFGE has incredible potential and benefits, there are of course many things it won't accomplish. It won't solve all of the problems of development, replace on-the-ground training or education in needed specialties, or be a quick fix. Whether or not access is done well, DFGE will still take a leader's time. Earning a degree is a long-term investment and

may realistically mean less time invested in other projects, and potentially less accomplished in development in the short-term. As an investment, however, DFGE is worth it long-term.

Risks and Limitations of the Online Format

Balancing Local and Global

The fact that any given program related to development is not offered in Bangladesh or Haiti does not necessarily constitute a problem. As the presumably fictional nutrition specialist Dr. Pranab Karadkar shares in the spoof video TIMS, "Out of the hundreds of smoothie franchises available, we found that in rural Africa, there are exactly zero" (qtd. in Tripp and Tyler). His ironic subtext is that not every lack is a need. The video ridicules the cultural arrogance characteristic of some efforts to eradicate poverty. It illustrates that until we find a way to enter the cultural framework of others and see their contexts through their eyes, we will attempt to use our own culture as a measuring stick, and likely find all others to be lacking. The temptation is to then fill that lack with a quick export, supposing that smoothie machines – or education – will fix all the problems. Of course, no one can really compare the value of education and kitchen appliances. But it's worth asking: why use an export/import approach? Given that contextualization is such a key issue in development, why not apply the principles to the approach? Why not advocate for *local* versions of the programs that currently exist, or other truly local educational options?

The answer is a resounding yes: yes to local options, yes to partnerships, yes to contextualized education. But it is also worth saying yes to online. While a fully-contextualized approach is most natural and obvious at the primary school level, the nature of higher education and the rapid globalization affecting it do tend to make education that is *global* in terms of both

content and recognition more worthwhile for graduate students. Online can bring that element of globalized education more effectively than most formats.

At play in this assessment is the premise that higher education has a superorganism side to it. Merriam-Webster defines a superorganism as "an organized society (as of a social insect) that functions as an organic whole" ("Superorganism"). The universities that make up the world of higher education are rooted locally in their own communities, but they are *also* typically rooted laterally to each other through accreditation, certification, affinity societies, traditions of hiring from other universities, and collaborative research projects. Even in competitive ventures, institutions validate each other's existence through generally symbiotic relationships. Graduate programs must be global and connected to other programs, as well as locally rooted in a context. Fully localized and contextualized DFGE – if it exists – may not be very effective as graduate education.

Higher education can also be considered a culture, as Peter Maassen notes (158). Each local "[a]cademic culture . . . the set of attitudes, beliefs, and values that integrates a specific group of academics" (158) varies, but also shares in a joint academic culture. Perfect contextualization, therefore, may not be possible; what is needed is a capacity to serve as a cultural broker. Jeff King, a Native American professor of psychology, refers to the process of straddling the culture of academic psychology and his own Native culture as "walking in two worlds." He practices the tension of accepting tenets of academic culture he cannot embrace in order to work against them from inside academic culture, and push for change. Because of the globalized culture of academia, that is a common tension. Some elements of contextualization in DFGE, such as helping leaders to stay in their contexts as much as possible while studying, can have very important benefits for community development. But education that ignores

globalization isn't likely to provide opportunities for leadership on a global level. A balanced strategy of access for developing contexts does have room for globally connected educational options, as well as local partnerships, and the creative variations in between.

Partnership in education is the obvious and ideal way to empower communities as well as individuals (and strategies that seek to empower communities as a whole tend to work better than those that focus exclusively on individuals, at furthering development goals in collective cultures; see Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov chapter 4). One concern about the online modality's approach to access is that it circumvents the typical need to listen to a community and develop partnerships before entering it. As online education is indiscriminate in its reach where there is internet, it is a difficult product to control for context. The direct importation of the global culture of graduate education may have unforeseen effects on communities and cultures. While long-term partnerships may not always be practical for online programs (since student provenance varies annually), partnership with local schools need not be ruled out merely because online models do not *rely* on them. Conscientious practitioners may find ways to offer online programs in conjunction with existing local universities, and may also advocate for short-term collaboration with the contexts of students, for the involvement of a student's community in their learning processes, and for other creative approaches honoring the collective nature of many developing contexts.

Walking in a Global Community

Another possible objection to access concerns its potential to cause harm to communities by dividing them. The premise is that imported education could actually increase power imbalance within communities in culturally inappropriate ways, by providing a new kind of power for young leaders, and by instilling a disdain for the traditions and knowledge of their

elders. Sometimes, foreign education may do this. Leslie Aaron, a global nutrition consultant and adjunct faculty member for the MAICD program, notes that she has seen this kind of divisive effect among young Africans who study nutrition abroad and then return to their homes. This is unlikely to occur in well-run DFGE programs, however, where the value of local knowledge and appreciation for cultures is explicitly taught, as well as the skills to listen well to communities.

Influencing or changing existing power structures, even in good ways, does involve some risk. One way to mitigate the risks could be to avoid separating local leaders from their contexts during their education, but instead, to educate each person as an integral part of a community, even encouraging the student to involve their local friends and mentors in their education as participants. This can also make the difference between access that is helpful and access that promotes brain drain, or the exodus of the highest talent and best-educated away from the contexts that – arguably – most need them.

Ultimately, leaders will benefit from the globalized style of online DFGE, as it provides the tools needed for global/international leadership challenges as well as context-specific work. However, schools initiating such programs must be aware that their outreach is not only to individuals, but also to existing communities. Efforts must be made to evaluate the effects of such education on communities, to partner with communities, and to help students function in both their local communities and their educational communities. Institutions offering online programs don't merely exist in cyberspace; they are reaching into real cultures, and can find ways to listen to and partner with the communities they serve as true development practitioners. The challenge is to use online access, but also to continue to seek the most copowering ways of providing education, even when that means giving away one's own power and resources. It takes a high level of institutional commitment to maintain this stance over time.

With attention to context and community, online DFGE can capitalize on its natural strengths in global learning, and provide an important opportunity for those in developing contexts. In the sections that follow I will explore the context of my project proposing the launch of an online version of the MAICD program, discuss the results, and propose some suggestions for educational institutions interested in using this modality to increase access to their own development-focused programs.

PART III: LAUNCHING THE MAICD ONLINE

The MAICD Program at Northwest University

The MA in International Community Development program at Northwest University is one of three graduate degrees in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and has existed in its on campus format for approximately nine years. Formerly known as the MA in International Care and Community Development, its design features a mix of practical skills and theoretical knowledge, with content created in consultation with local non-profit organizations and adapted periodically with input from alumni. Students in the MAICD have opportunities to shape their writing, research, fieldwork and thesis project goals to fit and their own sense of vocation and area of focus within the fields of community development, social justice, and related issues. MAICD students' areas of emphasis vary widely, including both local and international issues. Topics of interest to our students have included localized community development, human trafficking prevention, orphan care, contextualized nutrition, education issues, environmental justice, holistic missions, social enterprise, race relations and equality, peacemaking, empowering trauma survivors, women's issues, land rights, water access, immigration, refugee assistance, and many others.

An emphasis on listening to the perspectives of the local population and understanding their contexts sets us apart from other programs. Some programs with similar content areas are rooted in economic science; as part of the College of Social and Behavioral Science, the MAICD approaches development with a strong value placed on listening to others, balanced with practical skills training to equip students to lead processes of change.

The MAICD is a fully accredited, cohort model, 40 credit, 21 month program.

My Research and Proposal

In November 2012, Dr. Forrest Inslee and I spoke about my potential fieldwork and thesis project for the MAICD program. I hoped to focus my fieldwork on making DFGE more available to the developing world; he suggested that I help with the launch of an online version of the MAICD program (see Appendix A). I immediately began conducting basic qualitative research into programs that were similar in one or more ways to the MAICD program, including interviews with Northwest University staff and faculty, staff and faculty at other universities, ICD program alumni, and additional textual and internet research. (See Appendix C for detailed information on research.)I collected written statements of their opinions about such a launch, and studied what had made other similar programs successful. I then followed the university's New Program Proposal form in place at the time in order to make the case for the program both in regards to a) its importance with respect to the university's core values, and b) the financial/logistical implications of the launch. The proposal, excerpts of which are included as appendices, was completed in August 2013. Modifications were later requested. It was finally approved in December 2013; it had been just over a year in process.

Results

Student response data from annual surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction with the program and classes. The number of students enrolled in the program has grown each year (although with some possible detrimental effects on enrollment to the on campus version of the program). Students express satisfaction with both the community feel and the level of flexibility of the program; the trips to Oxford have been highly praised as contributing to the overall experience. The retention rate has been higher for our online program than for our on campus program, which is fairly unheard of for strictly online programs. Instructors have commented that the quality of the students' writing may be better than that of our on campus students – whether that is due to additional practice, having more current experience in development (as many of our online students do) – or simply more practice writing forum posts regularly, for their classes.

With regards to increasing access, the numbers require some interpretation. First of all, the large majority of those who are in the online program would not have attended the on campus version of the program. The launch of the online has been beneficial for *all* these students, because the program was previously inaccessible to them.

Next, we should look at the number of students who are "in" developing contexts and making an impact in these contexts while they study. In our first online cohort, there were four students out of eleven who were based in developing contexts full time (Honduras, India, French Polynesia, and the red-light district of Brussels, Belgium). A fifth student moved to Kenya mid-program, and a sixth student takes regular trips to Indonesia. In our second online cohort, out of fifteen, only one student is truly in a developing context full time (China). A second student's spouse is from Haiti, and they do occasionally travel there; a third student has taken trips to

Liberia. Our third online cohort is still in formation, but there is one confirmed applicant who is currently in Indonesia, another who is from Ghana and hoping to return there one day, and another in inner-city San Francisco.

Finally, we can look at the number of students who are "in and from" developing contexts. The Online Global Hybrid MAICD has not had any students in this category to date, although more than one such applicant has been accepted.

Overall, the results of providing the program in an online format have been favorable in terms of access. Students have been able to obtain the education they need without leaving their places of work – from a student working with Ugandan trafficked women in China, to another student leading an anti-trafficking network from Belgium, to a student who was able to accept an International Justice Mission fellowship position in Kenya mid-program, to a missionary in Indonesia – there is no question that the access offered is beneficial. However, while the development of the online program has certainly expanded access to the program in important ways, there are still barriers preventing those from developing contexts from entering the program.

PART IV: EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What Has Worked

It is difficult to say with certainty which aspects of the online MAICD program would be most beneficial to students from developing contexts, without current students from that population. However, two aspects of the program that seem to be generally helpful in providing access are worth noting. In conjunction with efforts to remove any outstanding barriers to access, I expect these aspects of the MAICD program to serve students well.

One of these aspects of the program is the prioritization of community. This is particularly notable in the inclusion of face-to-face time in the program. The MAICD program's format is officially called the "Online Global Hybrid" as it meets twice during the program in Oxford, England, at the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies. Counterintuitively, these trips – while not always easy for students to arrange – have contributed positively to program accessibility overall. At first glance, a trip requirement may not sound very accessible. However, if one begins from the standpoint that face-to-face community is a necessary part of community development programs and other DFGE, then clearly the trips provide this community in a much more accessible way for students from developing contexts than programs that require relocation. It can also be argued, however, that the trips make the program more accessible than a fully online program would be. Typically, online programs do not have high retention rates. The MAICD online program, on the other hand, has a higher retention rate than the on campus version of the same program. Students have credited the trips with developing a strong sense of community through a shared immersive experience; that community sustains and motivates them as they are separated from each other during the rest of the program. When asked, the overwhelming majority of students indicate that the trips should be mandatory for all students. While no students have yet attended who are both in and from developing contexts, it is very likely that the opportunities to connect with other students in person and experience the rhythms and ethos of the program as part of a group will be even more important to those traveling an increased cultural distance and requiring additional orientation. I recommend face-to-face time as a highly beneficial addition to online DFGE programs, for increasing both accessibility and retention rates among all students.

The cohort model also contributes to community within the program, and thus to retention rates. However, there can be some tension between the value of a cohort model and the value of flexibility, when it comes to developing-context students. In the MAICD online program, there is a balance between these; students are encouraged to continue with their cohort, but are permitted to take up to four years for their degrees. This balance is likely to be a critical factor in providing access.

A second aspect of the MAICD that lends itself well to the pursuit of access is its emphasis on slow growth as opposed to rapid growth. Student advising and retention functions are more effective when students and their situations are personally known, and can provide responsive listening and flexibility. Close listening to students about their needs and contexts can result in more carefully targeted curriculum. While even more contextual knowledge of student needs would of course be helpful, what is learned through both general student advising and thesis advising does allow for a certain shaping of the program toward the needs of students. Knowing students and their contexts well also permits advisors and professors to work together to extend grace (including extensions and assistance) when truly needed.

Of course, the MAICD program leadership is not against growth – but rapid growth is problematic. In a field with high stakes for communities, where it's notoriously easy to do harm with good intentions, slow growth is a core value. To value rapid growth is essentially to prioritize the financial interests of a school above other interests, such as the best interests of students and the quality of programming. This can lead to the recruitment prioritization of those students who are nearest and most able to afford the program, and thus to the neglect and exclusion of those who require more resources to reach, but who most need the program – and are closest to its heart, in terms of their capacity to effect change in developing contexts. Because

programs are influenced by their student populations over time – taking into account their values and needs – a less global and more vocal group of student stakeholders could even affect the focus of the program over time, potentially steering it through market demand to become something that is less useful and applicable to the rare developing-context student.

Small American universities often enlist the help of online program partnership companies in order to build up profitable, scalable, and rapidly growing online programs. In the case of MAICD, a partnership was attempted during the first year of the program. The importance of keeping the program "in house" rather than sharing management of it with an online program partnership company became increasingly obvious, however, until management of the program was fully restored to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Partnerships should be based on shared values, and too many values were lost in translation – most especially the value of slow growth.

Universities are wise to consider whether scalable growth is truly a rational goal for certain programs. In the case of DFGE programs like the MAICD, a less rushed approach is permitting for a stronger program foundation, while still encouraging growth. Starting small is an application of core DFGE values. It aligns with Easterly's contention that the world needs "searchers" rather than "planners" to solve critical issues: those willing to flex with situations, try something and evaluate it, and generally operate on the assumption that they don't *already* have all the knowledge they need (5). Starting slowly allows more time for critical knowledge to be absorbed, and for adjustments and improvements to be rolled out.

Overcoming the Obstacles

In an earlier section I examined the typical barriers that affect access to DFGE programs across multiple formats. Specifically in the Online Global Hybrid MAICD, the barriers I have seen most often faced by our developing context applicants and potential applicants include the following issues:

First, **financial barriers** are the most often-cited deterrents for applicants. The majority of students applying to the MAICD program who are both "from" and "in" developing contexts, who choose the online version of the program, do so because of their local responsibilities. These typically do not pay well, or at all, in developing contexts. If these students are from foreign developing contexts, they are ineligible for loans. Of all students in online or on campus programs, these students have the most acute need (and arguably the most profitable use from) scholarships.

The most important thing that can be done to level the playing field and increase access is to provide scholarships. The MAICD program has had access to little scholarship money, and has always prioritized foreign on campus students. In the MAICD, inquiries do come from highly qualified foreign students who are both in and from the contexts they are working in, but none have yet materialized as students. In our first year of the program I interviewed a highly qualified applicant from Eastern Europe, whose annual income was less than $5,000 per year. She was intent on studying in the MAICD program and applied two years in a row, but later accepted a full scholarship from a similar program with more scholarship funds (Eastern University). In fact, almost all other schools I found with DFGE programs offer substantial scholarships (see Appendix C). In the case of St. John's University, this is accomplished through a special fund through the Catholic Church; in the case of Eastern, there is leeway to make

decisions about scholarships as long as all costs are met, and a minimal percentage is given back to the school (see Appendix B).

I see the lack of scholarships as the primary barrier to access for students who are both in and from developing contexts – and even for those who are either in or from developing contexts. Universities considering online expansion in DFGE should count the cost and be prepared to allow such programs to cover their costs and make a profit, but not serve as money-makers for the university. DFGE programs are at the missional heart of the institutions that have them, and ought to be treated with the honor and fiscal grace that is often afforded to other kinds of ministry programs.

Second, **language barriers** are very typically an issue. Students who are not adequately prepared to write in English will struggle and are generally not accepted to the MAICD program. In areas where English is rare, indigenous leaders are even more likely to lack exposure to English. For instance, tribal leaders in Peru (where 100 languages are spoken) do often learn Spanish as a second language, but have little exposure to English.

Strategies to broaden access beyond those who are currently proficient in English may include the following:

1. Hire a special tutor or coach to provide additional assistance and help to level the playing field for non-native speakers of English. The MAICD is currently exploring a similar role for students in both the online and on campus versions of the program.

2. Provide higher-level language preparation classes that focus on the specific language levels and skills needed in a writing-focused graduate school program. These may be included as part of the program or as prerequisites, or ideally, taken year-round. Of

course, the cost of these classes can be a barrier. Self-guided online courses with only limited instructor interaction and grading may be worth testing for effectiveness.

3. Offer dual-language program options. This is currently being done at several universities, especially for ministry programs; Eastern University is one example (see Appendix B). The weakness, of course, is that a dual-language program still excludes all those who do not speak one of the two languages featured, thus likely reducing the breadth of student diversity in a program.

4. Offer multiple language program support – but have students set it up. If students have adequate English reading skills but poor writing skills, they could well be encouraged to write in their first languages but have their papers translated to English (or another primary language of a program) prior to submission. This does make grading a little more complex, as the work of translation contains many nuances; it may be unclear in the end who did what, and for what quality of work the initial submitter is responsible.

5. Partner with local language schools in developing contexts to provide training prior to enrollment. Quality language schools with local-economy prices can potentially fill this need more effectively and cheaply than programs initiated by the university. Of course, no local school is local to all potential applicants, so the best option may be to develop an ideal curriculum to prepare students for graduate school, and share it with as many local schools as are interested. The model is an adaptation of that used by Development Associates International.

Third, **internet connection barriers** can prevent some applicants who are in and from developing countries from attending an online program. Applicants are sometimes afraid of not

being able to connect well to the internet, and get the most out of their studies. While a lack of stable and cost-effective internet connections does prevent some potential students in developing contexts from applying, there may be ways in which programs can adapt.

One suggestion would be to explore alternative technologies for accessing the internet. Cell phones are prevalent even in areas where internet connections are not stable, so as costs stabilize, smart phones may help to bridge this gap. Tablets with keyboards may also be set up on cell phone plans.

A different way of addressing this problem would be to adjust the requirements. Highly flexible timing for the completion of work, with fewer distinct assignments, would be a welcome curricular change to students with poor (or expensive) internet. I have found in the MAICD program that it's important to be a little bit flexible with students while they are traveling – but this is even more true when students have to deal with internet instability on a constant basis.. Offering local in-person "intensives" as a component of classes may be another way to work around the issue. The particular hybrid format used in Eastern University's development program involves an intensive two-week program, in various new classes begun on site and discussed. Later, students turn in their assignments via the internet. Development Associates International likewise offers such an intensive for all of the classes in its Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership. Students typically begin each semester with an on-site intensive class featuring one teacher and subject in the morning, and another teacher and subject in the afternoon. Homework is submitted to the teacher via email, reducing the need for educational interface programs that likely use more bandwidth.

Fourth, **time barriers and place barriers** are an issue pertaining to access. For many, there is often a need or desire to get away from the developing context location in order to be

able to focus on studying, due to intense demands on-site, and sometimes poor conditions. This is in tension with the desire to be present in one's context and lead well. The challenge is to continue to find ways to help students do both – or alternate.

It can be difficult for leaders in developed contexts to envision what leaders in developing contexts face in daily life. Not only do technical issues exist, but a host of legitimately important interruptions can put homework on hold indefinitely. These may include medical emergencies, crises of war, necessities that take longer due to poverty (like seeking clean water or harvesting one's own food), and the social requirements of cultures that are less project-oriented and more interdependent. When leadership responsibilities are added to these, the result can be overwhelming. While avoiding the removal of students from their leadership roles in developing contexts is an important goal, ironically, helping students to stay in their contexts does not always facilitate the completion of school work. What strategies can we employ to better serve those whose contexts require all of their attention, when they are in fact needed in those contexts?

One strategy is to help students maximize their time in the program by stretching out the program longer than two years, and allowing the learning to be a family or social group activity. In Turkey, for instance, Inslee points out that since "Much of what is important in a Turk's life, for example, revolves around his social clan – or his *cevre*, as it is called . . . . . It might even be possible to provide education for entire *cevres* (or at least portions thereof), and to make courses accessible to whole families" (35-36). Bakke Graduate University attempts to facilitate this by asking incoming students to create their own panel of supporters, who pledge to read and comment on the work that the students submit. Students write their papers "to" this audience of their family and friends (sometimes including leaders and subordinates, as well). This enables

students to not only stay connected to their social circles, but also to learn within them, and to bring their friends, leaders, and colleagues along with them on their journey of learning and applying new concepts and paradigms. At the end of the program, when student are free to devote themselves again to their work and ministry full-time, there is no sense of shock about shifts in direction; there is a common understanding about what must be done next in the ministry or organization.

Some of the ideas presented above for internet technology will be helpful in these circumstances as well. In particular, partnering with local schools to provide intensives and/or places for study retreats may help to ease this pressure by allowing students to escape from their more difficult contexts periodically and focus on their studies. However, the approach is limited in that it targets specific locales; even if one were to set up a partnership in Rwanda or South Africa, it would mean a trip across the continent for those in Ghana. Flexibility with assignments, advising and coaching to help each student come up with a study and retreat plan that will work for them.

Fifth, **the dubious reputation of online education** is actually an issue affecting enrollment. There are parts of the world where it seems that online education is not seen as very prestigious, or as equivalent to full-time on campus study. (In particular, I have heard from many potential applicants in African countries.) While some will always prefer on-campus education, hybrid programs are likely to be seen more and more favorably in the future, as they become more prevalent and better known. Hybrid programs with some face-to-face time are valuable for many reasons, including their increased retention rates (based on our experience, and what we learned about other schools as well) and sense of community. For those in contexts that traditionally value on-campus studies, the trips involved in hybrid education are a novel

alternative. Whether or not hybrid education can equal the prestige of on campus education

remains to be seen, and may vary by culture and context. But to our target population of students

– those who are leaders in developing contexts and hope to continue to serve in their contexts –

an increase in hybrid programs must come as a welcome development.

The MAICD currently only features two separate weeks of face-to-face time, at the

beginning and end of the program; for some students, this is not enough to replace their

expectations of an on campus program, while for others they are a bit of a sacrifice. Eastern

University and St. John's University offer similar experiences, but with much longer sessions

face-to-face. It is likely that there is no right amount of trips or face-to-face time, but that variety

in program requirements can help to serve a greater variety of students. The MAICD, for

instance, could consider adding more optional trip courses in the future, or possibly an eventual

partnership with a local school that allows for more frequent hybrid course sessions. While a

hybrid component is optimal, the quantity of time needed in face-to-face interaction, as well as

the optimal locations for such meetings, will vary greatly.

Sixth, there are **other context-specific issues** that require further research, including,

perhaps, issues related to perceived applicability of program content. Following up with students

in qualitative research to discover potential issues is important. This approach is very much in

line with the concept of "listening to the voice of place," a core value in the MAICD program.

As Ray Bakke explains, Bakke Graduate University has combined this idea of listening to

student context needs with the idea of seeking ways to empower those in developing contexts, in

its Board of Regents (Bakke 2). Respected leaders representing different contexts can help to fill

the gap between the information students provide and the needs of the larger community, by

providing input into what kind of education is needed in order to better develop local leadership in their contexts.

Interested universities could consider implementing a similar strategy through their alumni. A selected group of leaders and alumni who represent specific developing contexts could be asked to serve as consultants who review new curriculum, syllabi, and proposals, and provide non-binding input. An online program cannot take every context into account. But by focusing on a few developing contexts with our alumni and possibly other contacts on-site, we may be able to ensure that we are providing what is needed for these contexts, and to position the MAICD to serve more strategically, with increased access. This positioning may include adaptations to program offerings, content, timelines, faculty, logistics, and partnerships – or may simply involve perspectives that could be worked into current classes more thoroughly.

Other Approaches to Consider

Existing universities in developed contexts do have a role to play in solving the problem of access – but theirs is not the only way. Development Associates International (DAI) is using a new model to offer one program through many local universities. According to Joseph Macias, a professor in the program, the MA in Organizational Leadership (MAOL) was originally developed in conjunction with Eastern University, but is now provided through a non-profit organization directly to over 17 universities in 17 developing countries (Development Associates International, "MAOL"). By prioritizing a direct partnership model of delivery that relies on existing local institutions for accreditation, degree recognition, and enrollment, DAI removes developed-country universities as middlemen and makes access scalable. Rather than a one-to-one relationship between universities, DAI services multiples schools with two primary products: curriculum and faculty.

The model does have some drawbacks. First, the program is not self-funding for DAI; funds must be raised to supplement the amounts that local universities provide to access its program. Second, while it is an excellent model of strengthening local communities and of the willingness to give up control that is a hallmark of integral development programs, there is no guarantee that the education is always on par with more traditional DFGE programs at existing universities. Standards vary widely, according to Macias: in Egypt, he was not qualified to teach because he did not have a PhD, while in Nigeria, the grading scale assigned a value of A to all work receiving between 75-100%. Accreditation, also, varies widely – and that can limit global leadership and further educational prospects for graduates. All in all, this model serves to provide content that might not otherwise have been available in each country, to empower local schools, and to increase opportunities for attendance. It does not, however, reduce the need to make existing programs in developed contexts accessible to all. Many individuals may be better served by a more globally-recognized education than some of the schools that DAI works with can provide; access to existing programs may serve these students and their contexts most effectively. Both DAI's model of equipping local universities and the provision of greater access to existing fully-accredited universities have value; they both affect power imbalance, though in distinct ways. DAI and similar programs, however, can't exempt online DFGE programs from the responsibility to seek collaboration and to conduct careful research into the contexts affected by their programs. In fact, while DAI takes partnership to a new level, some universities find ways to do the same. Eastern University has given away two programs – functioning offshoots of its own program in development – to schools in Rwanda and Costa Rica (see Appendix B). It can be done!

There is one more door that may be worth opening in the wider search for access mechanisms: that of accreditation agencies. Perhaps there are ways that they, too, can move to shift the current power balance by providing regional accreditation at reduced rates. This would be several steps ahead of sharing regional accreditation with individual students. However, further research into this possibility is needed.

Challenges for the Future

The challenge for universities with DFGE programs is to maintain a stance of sacrificial love and service toward developing contexts. Within that challenge, two areas stand out as of greatest urgency and importance. First, increased financial support for student scholarships must accompany more accessible formats. Second, continued research should occur into the contexts affected by DFGE, the outcomes of existing programs and policies, and the needs of current and potential students. This research should be carried out in conjunction with students, alumni, and leaders.

All of this takes work, of course, but more than that, it requires institutions to value and be moved to action by love for developing contexts. It requires a commitment to personal and institutional transformation, a commitment to justice, and a willingness to sacrifice. As a mission field, development requires institutional sacrifices on par with missions: a willingness to reprioritize and sacrificially give of time, knowledge, curriculum, power, money, and other resources. Universities that can accept this challenge to personal and institutional transformation first, should do so; they will ultimately be strengthened. There is no way to truly change the realities of power and resource imbalance without giving up some power and resources. Painful and even impossible as this may seem to institutions with consuming problems closer to home,

that is the challenge: to be integral about the development principles that are taught, and to prioritize institutionally that which is truly most important.

Works Cited

Aaron, Leslie. "RE: draft." Message to the author. 28 Mar. 2016. E-mail.

Bakke, Ray. "Why is BGU in Hong Kong and Other Places? An open letter to all recent BGU

staff additions (both present and future hires)," Letter to the author. Dec. 2010.

Bournes, Micah. "The Voice of Justice." The Justice Conference 2014 Los Angeles, CA.

Conference Program. Print.

Brooks, Andres, and David Simon. "Unravelling the Relationships between Used-Clothing

Imports and the Decline of African Clothing Industries." *Development and Change.* 43.6

(2012): 1265-1267. Web. 1 May 2016.

Bryson, Donna. "Diversifying NGO Leadership." *Stanford Social Innovation Review.* n. pag.

Web. Spring 2013. <http://ssir.org/articles/entry/diversifying_ngo_leadership>

Development Associates International. "MAOL." n.p. n.d. Web.

<http://www.daintl.org/programs/#education>

Easterly, William. *The White Man's Burden.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. Web.

EPCAT UK. "Child Sex Tourism in Thailand," n.d.,

<http://www.ecpat.org.uk/sites/default/files/thailand05.pdf>

Groody, Daniel G. *Globalization, Spirituality, and Justice.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2007. Print.

Hanlon, Joseph, Armando Barrientos, and David Hulme. *Just Give Money to the Poor: The*

Development Revolution from the Global South. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 2010.

Hays, Christopher M. Heie, Harold Ed. "Why Social Justice Still Polarizes Evangelicalism."

Respectful Conversations. Blog. 23 Apr. 2016.

<http://www.respectfulconversation.net/ae-conversation/2013/7/31/why-social-justice-

still-polarizes-evangelicalism.html>

Hesselgrave, David J. & Edward Rommen. *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models,* Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2000.

Hofstede, Geert, Gert Jan Hofstede, and Michael Minkov. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* 3rd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 2010.

Inslee, L. Forrest. "Empowerment or Copowerment?" Spirituality, Culture, and Social Justice course, Northwest University, Kirkland, WA: 30 Jan. 2014. Lecture.

Inslee, L. Forrest. "Masters of Christian Studies Research Project: Theological Education for the Turkish Protestant Church: Some Contextual Considerations." MA thesis. Regent College, 1998. Print.

Inslee, L. Forrest. Research for Social Change - GLST 5153, Online Syllabus. Spring 2016. College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Northwest University. Web.

King, Jeffrey. "Psychology and Culture." Northwest University. Argue Health and Science Center, Kirkland, WA. 13 Jan 2015. Guest Lecture.

Maassen, Peter A. M. "The Concept of Culture and Higher Education." *Tertiary Education and Management.* 1.2 (1996). Web. 1 May 2016.

Macias, Joseph. Personal interview. 15 Apr. 2016.

Moyo, Dambisa. *Dead Aid.* New York: Ferrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2009.

Myers, Bryant. *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011.

Neufeld, Danielle. Silvestri, Megan Ed. "Meet a Changemaker – Suppunee Pargul." *Same Thread.* Blog. 20 Feb. 2016. <http://samethread.com/blogs/news/69278403-meet-a-changemaker-suppunee-pargul>

New International Version Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011. Print.

Odhiambo, George O. "Academic Brain Drain: Impact and Implications for Public Higher

    Education Quality in Kenya." *Research in Comparative & International Education* 8.4

    (2013): 510. *SAGE.* Dec. 2013.

Pargul, Nee. "Re: mentioning you in my thesis." Message to the author. 26 Mar. 2016. E-mail.

Quinn, Andrew. "Is there any space in the development debate for African experts?" The

    Guardian, 23 Aug 2013. <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-

    professionals-network/2013/aug/23/aspen-new-voices-africa-

    fellowship?CMP=share_btn_fb>

SAIH Norway. "Radi-Aid: Africa For Norway." Online video clip. *Rusty Radiator.* SAIH

    Norway, 2012. Web. 22 Apr. 2016. <http://www.rustyradiator.com/>

Silver, Marc. "If You Shouldn't Call It The Third World, What Should You Call It?" *Goats and*

    Soda: Stories of Life in a Changing World. Blog. 04 Jan 2015.

    <http://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2015/01/04/372684438/if-you-shouldnt-call-

    it-the-third-world-what-should-you-call-it>

Summers, Lawrence H. "Investing in All the People: Educating Women in Developing

    Countries." *EDI Seminar Paper* 45. WA, DC: The World Bank, Apr. 1994.

    < http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/

    1994/04/01/000009265_3970128112330/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf>

"Superorganism." *Merriam-Webster Dictionary.* Merriam Webster, 2015. <http://www.merriam-

    webster.com/dictionary/superorganism> Web. 1 May 2016.

Thompson, Nick, and Jonathan Hawkins. "'Malala of Syria': The inspiring story of one girl's

    fight to educate refugees." *CNN,* 20 Aug 2015. Web. 23 Apr. 2016.

    <http://www.cnn.com/2015/06/26/middleeast/jordan-malala-of-syria/>

Tripp and Tyler. "TIMS - A Revolutionary New One for One Campaign." Online video clip.

YouTube, 30 Apr. 2013. Web. 22 Apr. 2016.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5jx0ZjAXWwQ>

West, Cornel. "A Love Supreme." *The Occupied Wall Street Journal.* Blog. 18 Nov. 2011.

<http://occupiedmedia.us/2011/11/a-love-supreme/>

Appendix A: New Academic Program Initial Planning Worksheet

Northwest
UNIVERSITY

NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM INITIAL PLANNING WORKSHEET
For discussion with Provost prior to submission to Academic Affairs Committee

DATE: 8/15/2013

NAME OF SCHOOL/COLLEGE/OFFICE: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: International Care and Community Development

NAME OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM OR INITIATIVE: MA in International Care and Community

Development

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM OR INITIATIVE:

Proposal: That a second delivery format of the Master of Arts in International Care and Community Development (MAICCD) program be created in a hybrid format, with the vision of expanding to new markets, increasing accessibility, and preserving the current strengths of the program, including an emphasis on cohort community developed through multiple modalities.

The hybrid format program retains the 40 credits of the original MAICCD but rearranges their contents into 12 three-credit courses of eight weeks' duration to be taken one at a time, and four additional one-credit courses of eight weeks' duration. The 4 one-credit courses are to be taken simultaneously with the three-credit courses at the rate of two per year, so that students are generally studying three credits at a time, and never more than four. The program will be spread out over two full years rather than the current program's 20 months. The program will feature a calendar of courses that is compatible with other, primarily-online programs, including the MBA, MIM, and MATESOL. However, the program's fall semester will begin one week earlier (during the last week of August, which is a break week for the programs mentioned above). All other classes will follow the online class calendar.

Most of the first class, Globalization, as well as the last class, Children and Development, will be offered in a one-week intensive format in Oxford, England, on the campus of the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies. In addition, new students will receive orientation, and finishing students will present their final thesis projects. Students who wish to opt out of the face-to-face intensives may apply to the Program Chair for permission. Students granted permission may take the two classes online with the Kirkland-based cohort.

MODALITY:

☐FACE-TO-FACE ☐STUDY ABROAD

■HYBRID ☐ONLINE

■OFF-SITE (Extension Site or Other) Please Specify: The two weeks per cohort of face-to-face

class time will occur in Oxford, England on the campus of the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies

(OCMS), where NU will also hire one part-time staff member to manage Oxford-based

administrative tasks and recruiting.

TARGET DATE FOR IMPLEMENTATION: August 2014 (Fall semester)

DOES THIS PROPOSAL REPLACE AN EXISTING

DEGREE/CREDENTIAL/CERTIFICATION/CONCENTRATION?

☐YES ■NO

If Yes, please specify: This proposal expands the MAICCD but does not replace the

current format of a Kirkland-based cohort.

Appendix B: Research

Methods Used to Collect Evidence

There were two primary types of evidence collected: 1) evidence of a potential need for the program and of positive student response, and 2) an analysis of how programs with similar content are working. Evidence for the former was gathered primarily through emails, as well as through in-person, Facebook, Skype and phone conversations with experts (NU and other university personnel, missionaries, and leaders). Informally, the opinions of some former students were also sought. Evidence for the latter was collected primarily through internet research, supplemented with phone and Skype calls to universities. Schools with similar programs were sought via search engines (primarily Google and Yahoo) by using key words such as Master's degree, social justice, community development, global, and international. A few schools were suggested by contacts who were aware of a similar program. Additional searches were made for similar degree programs in Britain, and for similar degree programs from Christian institutions in Europe. While the schools listed cannot be considered an *exhaustive* list, they can be considered a *representative* sampling of the most prominent similar programs found in both North America and Europe. As part of the research, a number of relevant articles were also read.

Summary of Findings

On the surface, "basing" a program in a foreign country may seem to be a waste of more secure marketing and networking opportunities closer to home. But in the arena of global development, distance is experienced differently. The closest open door often leads quite far away, and following one's network – one's true market – can't be done from one location. In development, the untapped markets are those of a) practitioners who are already employed in the field, on location in many countries, and b) indigenous, future practitioners who are poised to make the greatest difference in the world, but who have the most difficult time moving to the United States for two years. The people in this field work with and depend upon relatively hidden networks of respected practitioners. These networks – these markets – are open to us. But it can't be accomplished from home. We must demonstrate the same passion and commitment as these practitioners. We must be willing to step outside of our own contexts and develop community in new places, utilizing every form and format that we can, including the most personal: the face-to-face encounter.

Through our research, we found that the market for a site-based, hybrid version of the MAICCD is likely to be very strong. Other schools are succeeding – and the more they insist on creating the programs in accordance with their values, the better their programs succeed, and the stronger their global influence becomes. This ensures the success of their alumni, who in turn become their programs' strongest allies in recruiting others, and in growing more success for the institutions. Such is the case at OCMS in England, at St. John's in New York (and Italy), and at Eastern in Pennsylvania (and Africa, and Latin America).

The MAICCD is a relatively new program, and certainly not NU's largest. Yet it is known for the quality of its outcomes. If the values that have guided its creation are also permitted to guide its expansion, it will be poised to propel Northwest University into a chapter of increasing global influence for good.

Competitor Research/Summary

Schools with Similar Degree Programs

Please refer to *Appendix C: Similar Programs* for a detailed summary of the programs that were studied for this report. The programs are divided into three sections: traditional format or on-campus, hybrid format with both in-person and online components, and purely online programs. All except two of the programs listed are master's level programs that are similar in content to the MAICCD. Two doctoral programs were also listed, because their content was similar and their formats applicable. Of the masters programs found through online research, 14 were traditional format. Five of the programs listed are based in Britain, and these are listed first in each section. Another 13 master's programs as well as the two doctoral programs were offered in hybrid format. Of these, only one was found in Britain: the MPhil/PhD program offered by the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies, or OCMS. However, all four of the purely online programs were located in Britain. None of these approach the topic of development from a Christian standpoint.

The research clearly indicates that for the kind of content we are presenting, traditional and hybrid format programs are the norm. It's likely that there is an expectation on the part of students that community development programs include as much community – in its many forms – as possible. But what kind of market might exist for a hybrid program with a European "base" or face-to-face component? Three points should be taken into account:

1) With regard to the market in Europe: The presence of four online programs in Britain is very interesting. It indicates that online education can work there. But does it indicate that the market would be stronger for a purely online degree than for a hybrid degree? Three out of four of these purely online degrees grant a Master of Science rather than a Master of Arts. There are only two other Master of Science degrees that appeared in the research (and both are North-American-based, traditional format degrees). While the vast majority of programs on both continents are either hybrid or traditional formats, master's of science programs are the exception to that rule, with just over half available in a purely online format. It seems likely that there is a better market for more technical degrees to be offered in purely online formats, and this is probably true on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Taking this into account, the most striking difference between the European market and the American market is that there are relatively few online and hybrid programs available in Europe. There also appear to be more programs that approach the content from a Christian worldview based in the U.S. Judging from a comparison

with the American market, this could very well point to legitimate market opportunity and need.

2) With regard to the American market: While degrees based in British universities were highlighted for the sake of a comparative view into the European educational market, there are several American universities offering programs that are very similar to what we propose. St. John's University, Andrews University, Eastern University, Azusa Pacific University, the University of Victoria, Carson-Newman University, Cambridge College, Loyola University, and Abilene Christian University all run "low residency" hybrid programs (requiring the equivalent of one semester or less of face-to-face time). Out of these programs, however, only St. John's University might be considered our "competitor" in the market for American degrees with an on-site component in Europe. None of the other schools regularly schedule their face-to-face time in Europe (although Andrews University and Abilene Christian University do so on an occasional basis). Eastern University also runs a very similar (and successful) program, but their on-site classes are located in Africa. Judging from the success of St. John's and the limited competition we would encounter, the market appears to be quite viable.

3) With regard to the international market, including American expatriates and missionaries: The Oxford Centre for Mission Studies demonstrates that the hybrid format works well in Europe, and in Oxford, and in the particular site we have chosen, and for the particular demographic we seek to attract. Not only has OCMS kindly demonstrated this, but since they offer a degree that is not in competition with our own but would actually benefit from our success, they are willing to partner with us and provide very generous terms for the resources we would need.

Case Study: St. John's University
Information provided by Alyssa G. Monturi, Assistant to the Director at the Center for Global Development at St. John's (personal interview, July 10, 2013), and by the website of St. John's University.

St. John's University is a Catholic university based in New York. It offers the Master of Arts in Global Development and Social Justice in a hybrid format only, and is launching the 8th cohort this summer. Their website expresses their mission and describes their program in this way:

> The M.A. in Global Development and Social Justice aims at best practices and leadership in global development. Our mission of social justice and human rights advocacy, grounded on Catholic Social Teaching, is reflected through our innovative online methodology. We seek to provide education, especially to those lacking economic, and/or social means. This innovative multidisciplinary program is chaired by the Director of the Center for Global Development. It combines classroom instruction with online

learning to offer students the flexibility to pursue in-depth research in a broad variety of critical areas related to development and social justice that can be accessed worldwide. Furthermore, our committed faculty and support staff teach students how to search out the causes of poverty and social injustice and encourage them to explore and identify solutions which are adaptable, effective, and concrete.
(St. John's University, n.d.)

Students begin the program by spending the month of June in Rome, studying three courses: *Models of Intervention and Global Development, Impact of International Organizations in Global Development* and *Information Resources*. The rest of the courses are completed online over a period of two years, with the exception of the final course, *Integrating Seminar & Capstone Project*. Students return to Rome to take this final course.

Each cohort is made up of 20-25 students, and recent years have seen between 90-115 applicants. When asked how many of the students in the cohort are from within a 60 mile radius of the school, Monturi answered emphatically, "None!" Usually, however, there's a token alumnus of St. John's in a cohort. While the program is Catholic in orientation, students come from a variety of religious or non-religious backgrounds. St. John's aims to attract indigenous development professionals and practitioners from all over the world, and particularly from locations where aid is most needed. They have been extremely successful in attracting qualified students from this demographic.

One of the most important factors in St. John's success in attracting applicants from developing countries has been the level of financial aid offered. In fact, St. John's gives financial aid to all of its students. Each year, ten full scholarships are awarded, and fifteen scholarships at a forty percent discount. This brings the cost of their 33 credit program from $34,650 plus fees to $20,790 plus fees, for all those who have not received free tuition. During the recession, there was some uncertainty as to whether the scholarships (which are funded through an organization in Italy) would be available; this affected, for a time, the percentage of applicants from developing countries. It did not, however, cause the program itself to suffer.

When asked about the school's marketing strategy, Monturi laughed. In her words, "We spent tons for the marketing department; I don't know what they did with the money but I didn't see a student out of that. That's not the way I see students come. You have to do a good job in the small things; if a student has a bad experience, they will tell others. So get good staff, not marketing." Her advice also included reaching out to nearby organizations, promoting the degree amongst those who are already in the field, promoting the degree in healthcare and church ministry settings, and reaching out to alumni who are in different fields, including economics, political science, education, intercultural studies, and nursing.

The hybrid format was implemented from the beginning of the program, and reaction to it has been "fairly happy." Students love the on-site time in Rome. Student-suggested changes have

dealt with the curriculum more than with the format. These include trying to make the program more practical – for instance, adding Project Management with a business school professor. When asked if the school had considered making the face-to-face portion in Rome optional, Monturi responded, "Yes, they considered it. But the directors all said that if it were 100% online no one would know each other, and they do think that there is something very important that occurs in face-to-face contact, especially between the professor and student… even if it is just a meeting."

There are many similarities between the two programs. Both allow non-Christians to study. Both take time to study an "intensive" in Europe at the beginning and end of the cohort. Critically, both have as their aim not only to have a program, but to provide education for a specific demographic.

Lessons from St. John's. As a successful similar program, St. John's can offer Northwest University several lessons:
1) Cohorts can be filled quite well even when the face-to-face portion is required, is far away, and is for a considerable amount of time (one month in this case).
2) The face-to-face portion is considered a vital piece of the program both by those operating it and those studying within it.
3) The 60-mile-radius principle does not apply to this kind of program.
4) Traditional marketing is likely to be ineffective for this kind of program; intentional networking by the right staff members is likely to be most effective.
5) A coordinated strategy to help students afford school is beneficial to enrollment, and may include exploring ways to either subsidize tuition, or to lower tuition rates significantly. This will be very important to consider in light of the long-term objective of providing transformative education for practitioners from developing nations, and for service workers (who make low wages in most cases).

Case Study: Eastern University
Information provided by Dr. David Bronkema, Chair of the School of Leadership and Development and Director of the International Development Programs at Eastern University (personal interview, July 30, 2013).

Eastern University is a Christian university based in St. David's, Pennsylvania. It offers the Master of Arts in International Development in more than one hybrid format. The one most similar to the proposed MAICCD is called the Master of Arts in International Development: Blended Online Delivery Model – Africa Annual Residency.

Eastern's MBA in Economic Development began 30 years ago, and from this foundation came the Master of Arts in International Development in 2006. Its hybrid format features one residency of two weeks each year of the program. The two weeks are divided up so that each

two-and- a-half-day period is dedicated to a new course, that is then completed online when the students are in their home environments around the world.

About half the students in the African residency program are from Africa, while the other half travel there from the United States. Cohorts consist of 15 students and are consistently filled; most start with 16-17 students to account for attrition. When asked if any of his students were from within a 60 mile radius of the school, Bronkema denied that this occurred: "No – the 60 mile radius idea kind of flies in the face of all the analysis we've seen."

Substantial scholarships are provided to many students; to accomplish this, the price of tuition is raised to a level that subsidizes scholarships for those who cannot afford to pay. According to Bronkema,"There are flat 15% tuition grants for US students; in Africa we start there and go on up." There is also substantial buy-in to the values of the program, from the university administration: "We meet all of our direct costs, and we also kick back to the university. Our university would like to see a giveback rate of 40%, but they allow us to get away with a lot less because of the mission of our program. I think our giveback rate is close to 35%."

Bronkema maintains that the in-person components of the program are completely indispensible:

> The face-to-face time is huge: every single student has called it the number one plus of the program. The face-to-face residency time of staying together, eating together has been a strong part of our program. In fact, our students are furiously opposed to losing the face-to-face time. This [hybrid model] is built on a World Vision/Habitat for Humanity model called Pathways to Leadership. It's proven time and again to be an important part of the program - absolutely vital.
> (Personal interview, July 30, 2013)

Another key to their success, according to Bronkema, has been the cohort model. Journeying through the program together while truly knowing one's classmates as well as possible (through the multi-modal hybrid format) seems to be the winning combination for this program, establishing a community that ensures student success.

When asked about a marketing strategy, Bronkema replied that the only marketing they really do is "word-of-mouth, participation in conferences, and a few ads here and there." While he'd like to have a more coordinated and better-resourced marketing plan, currently most referrals come from alumni and from the Christian development organizations that know them well.

Bronkema's vision, however, goes far beyond his own program. The school has also begun similar programs, less visible on the website, in Latin America and (separately from the Africa Residency Program above) in Rwanda. In Latin America, they work primarily with Christian development agencies, and teach the courses entirely in Spanish; the locations are varied, and the average tuition discount has been 70%. The vision of the school extends not only to the empowerment of students, but to the empowerment of schools and churches overseas. In

Bronkema's words, "We are handing over the leadership of the Latin American program to the National Evangelical University in Costa Rica, and they are putting it online at a much lower cost, because part of our vision is to give our program over to local institutions. We are also starting this in Rwanda." Clearly, this is a program – and a school – that has fully embraced its calling to influence the world.

Lessons from Eastern. As a successful similar program, Eastern can offer Northwest University several lessons:
1) This type of delivery model offers potential for long-term growth even in less developed nations.
2) With a strategy to make education affordable, such as differentiated or sliding scale tuition rates, it's possible to have a high percentage of students come from less-developed countries.
3) Again, the in-person components of the program are indispensible, especially from a student perspective.
4) The cohort model is an important part of a successful international hybrid format. It provides for the ongoing growth of a community established in person.
5) Most effective marketing for this kind of program seems to come through networks, relationships, and referrals – both personally, and with organizations.
6) A school's influence and power to bring transformation through education can be multiplied by a giving and empowering approach toward other institutions, as well as toward students.

Pricing

The data also shows that we are moderately competitive in our pricing. American master's degrees in development offered in the hybrid format range from 15-36 months in length, and cost between $13,440 plus unspecified fees (Carson-Newman University) and $64,000 plus fees and travel costs (Concordia). With a tuition cost of $641 per credit, or $25,640 total tuition, the MAICCD is certainly a viable option. Compared to our closest competition, St. John's, we are charging nearly a third less. However, both St. John's and Eastern employ scholarship strategies to offer education at a more affordable price to students from developing countries, which give them a competitive edge. The need to develop alternative ways for students to finance their education, including scholarships, is something that must be considered in the future, if the MAICCD is to have maximum impact on the world.

Appendix C: Similar Programs

School Name	Location	Format	Total Credit Hours	Degree Name, Link	Tuition
Traditional Format: On-campus					
Kings College London	London, England	On-Campus	UK 180/ECTS 90	Master of Arts in Global Ethics and Human Values	Not accessible online (unclear)
University of Glasgow	Glasgow, Scotland	On campus. Complete four core-courses and a practice placement and a research project	"180 total credits at masters level 11 (SCQF)." (1 yr. FT, 2 yrs. PT)	M. Ed. in Community Learning and Development	5000 pounds (or $7680) for FT British/ EU students; 3.2x more for international
University of Essex	Colchester, England	On-campus	12 months FT	Master of Arts, Human Rights and Cultural Diversity	6000 pounds for British students; 12950 pounds for non-British
University of Edinburgh	Edinburgh, Scotland	On-campus. Of interest: the Global Justice Academy joins the three existing Global Academies at Edinburgh: the Global Health Academy, Global Development Academy and Global Environment and Society Academy (GESA). Programs incl: MA Social Anthropology with Development, or Msc in: Africa & Int. Dev.; Envir., Cult. & Society; Envir. Sustainability; Envir. & Dev.; Global Social Change; Int. Dev. Science; Tech. & Int. Dev.; Social Policy; South Asia & Int. Dev.	Varies	Multiple Global Justice Academy Programs	Varies. Msc in Afr. Int. Dev. Home/EU 13/14 fee: £10,100. Overseas student fee: £13,700.
Nottingham-Trent University	Nottingham, England	On-campus	1 year FT or 2 years PT	MA in International Development	1 year FT: £4,800; PT: £2,215; Foreign: £11,100
Clark University	Worcester, MA	On-campus. (Quite a bit of course flexibility; some may be taken at linked institutions; travel encouraged)	48 credits (12 units of 4 cr. each)	MA in International Development, Community, and Environment	$58,800 total tuition (plus fees) $4,900 per "unit" or 4 cr. course.

Vanderbilt (Peabody School)	Nashville, TN	On-campus with optional overseas summer field experience	30 (3-4 Academic Sem.)	M.Ed. in Community Development and Action	$37,950 total tuition (not including fees, increases). $1265 per credit hour.
Arizona State University	Phoenix, AZ	Hybrid: both on-campus and online (only two semesters really must be done on campus; the rest completed from anywhere OR on campus.)	33 credits (18 months)	Master of Arts in Social Justice and Human Rights	Approximately $39,000 total tuition & fees.
Columbia University	New York, NY	On-Campus (with use of "global technology" in classrooms)	54 credits; two years	Master of Public Administration in Development Practice	$67,800 per year; $135,600 for two years.
Hawaii Pacific University	Honolulu, HI	On-Campus	42 credit hours	M.A. in Global Leadership and Sustainable Development	$14,850 per year; for two years, $29,700 plus fees
UC Davis	Davis, CA	On-campus	51 units; 2 years	Master of Science in Community Development	$31,212 per year out of state tuition; $62,424 total, plus fees
University of British Colombia (UBC)	Vancouver, BC	On-campus	60 credits (24-36 months)	MA/MSc (Planning)	Can. Tuition per year: $4,349.16 International: $7,640.70
Kilns College	Bend, OR	On-campus. One year. (New - not yet accredited.)	32 (one year)	Master of Arts in Social Justice	$7584 Total tuition (fees not included).
American University	Washington, DC	On-campus	39-42	MA in International Development	Four intensives at $3600 each; (+ cost of 11 more credits?)
Hybrid Format					
OCMS	Oxford, England	Hybrid: Newly enrolled students attend a 10 week, full-time, residential Induction Programme at OCMS. This comprises a 4 week Research Induction School, followed by 6 weeks of independent study, under the guidance of an OCMS Mentor; students spend at least 6 weeks in full-time study at OCMS each year.	Unclear	Mphil + PhD	Tuition: 33,250 pounds for 2 yrs OCMS stage + 3 yrs University stage.

St. John's University	New York, New York	Hybrid: two year Distance Learning and on-site program (9 cr. for First Summer in Rome, 21 cr. Distance Learning, Fall – Spring, and 3 cr. Final Summer in Rome). Three courses: Models of Intervention in Global Development, Impact of International Organizations in Global Development, and Information Resources for Global Development and Social Justice practices are taken at the St. John's University Rome Campus in the beginning of the program. All of the other courses are taught online. When students return to Rome, after two years of study, they take Integrating Seminar & Capstone Project, the final course.	33 (two years)	MA in Global Development and Social Justice	$34,650 total tuition ($1050 per credit hour during 12-13 school year), plus fees
Concordia & Intl. Partnership for Service Learning & Leadership	Portland, OR	Hybrid: Two semesters in Portland, Oregon, on the campus of Concordia University-Portland, and two semesters at two different IPSL International program locations (Siena, Italy, and Quito/Galapagos Islands, Ecuador, or Chiang Mai, Thailand.)	36-40, four semesters	MA in International Development and Service	$64,000 ($32,000 per year) + fees and travel costs
Andrews University	Battle Creek, MI	Hybrid: Classes taught in 2-3 week intensive sessions at extension sites in various locations around the world. Students are required to attend four intensives to complete the core courses. Teaching sites include Canada, Chile, Ghana, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa.	39-40, 3 years (max 6 years)	Master of International Development	$35,480 total tuition, based on 7,096 per semester of 8 credits
SIT Graduate Institute	Brattleboro, VT	Hybrid: 9 mos on campus in Vermont, then six months of field-based practicum with related academic work, then capstone paper, presentation, and seminar in Vermont (1 wk)	52 (?) - 2 years	MA in Sustainable Development	estimated $60,000 (obscure)
Eastern University	St. David's, PA	Hybrid (in person + travel with online coursework). 12 months in US and 3 months in a developing country (required field semester). The final three-month course in the MA is the Development Field Practicum, in which students work for a development organization in the field. Students work with a mentor, applying the concepts and practical skills of development they have learned in coursework throughout the year. Final coursework for the program is done online as the student is on Field Semester.	30 (15 months)	MA in International Development (International or Urban concentrations)	$650 per credit; $19,500 total tuition, plus fees

Eastern University	St. David's, PA	Hybrid: "USA or Africa Annual Residency" model. Students come together annually in Africa (or U.S.A.) for a 2.5 week residency and the "classroom" coursework for a few courses. Throughout the following year, they will complete the on-line portion of those courses, applying them to the work in their respective organizations. Students will repeat the process the following year with the remaining courses in their program. A 200-Hour Field Development Practicum is also required to complete the program.	30 (2 years)	MA in International Development (Blended Online Delivery Model - Working Professional)	$650 per credit; $19,500 total tuition, plus fees
Azusa Pacific	Azusa, California	Hybrid, Overseas-based. Following initial orientation/ training in LA, students relocate to program sites, find housing with local church families of slum communities, and begin intensive language learning for 6-8 months. Following language study, students begin internships through local community organizations, as well as coursework. Online discussions are complemented by intensive, face-to-face interaction with national instructors and field mentors. Each course features an intensive, one-week classroom phase followed by a multi-week fieldwork phase. Five practitioner training courses integrate students' living and issue-oriented service. Each field supervision process extends over a one year period.	45 (2.5 years)	Master of Arts in Transformational Urban Leadership	$15,750 Tuition only "base cost"; $350 per credit/unit.
University of Victoria	Victoria, BC	Hybrid: delivered through a combination of online and residential courses. Each of the two residential workshops is held in the summer terms. The program starts each May and courses are offered year round. There is the option of attending class at an international university in one of five locations (3 in Mexico, 2 in the US) for one semester, while still taking that semester's classes online through UVic simultaneously. The only face to face requirements are to attend a summer residency in each of the first two years of the program. The remaining courses are completed online.	19.5 units of study, including 4.5 units for the Master's Project; just over two years.	Master of Arts in Community Development	Total tuition = $15,000 for domestic students. More for int'l. See also the full description of fees and Information on program fees.
Carson-Newman University	Jefferson City, TN	Hybrid online. "Low residency (mostly online, some on campus)."	32 hours	Master of Arts in Applied Social Justice	420 per credit hour; $13,440 total tuition; fees not included

Cambridge College	Boston, MA	Hybrid: Students begin their course work in the summer with a two or three-week intensive classroom residency in Boston. They return home to complete their summer courses by distance learning. Students continue to network with their cohort of students and faculty instructors, completing the program in the fall and spring by distance learning. In some cases students will return for a second summer to complete their coursework.	32 credits, 4 terms (one year + one more summer)	M.Ed. in Teaching Social Justice	$466 per credit hour; $14,912 total tuition (plus fees) - 2012 rates.
Loyola University	Chicago, IL	Hybrid, but also available online or on-campus. "Beginning in the Fall of 2013, incoming students will have the opportunity to complete all or part of the MASJCD degree online. Through a customizable degree, students outside of Chicago will be able to fulfill all of the degree requirements online while completing a local internship and applied research project. Alternatively, students are also welcome to do the first year online and come in for a semester to do a Chicago based internship or Chicago based collaborative research project."	36-credit hours Full-time: four academic terms. Part-time: five years	MA in Social Justice and Community Development	$25,740 total tuition (not including rather heavy fees, or any increases). $715 per credit hour.
Abilene Christian University	Abilene, TX	Hybrid. Both online coursework and three, two-week residency sessions. The first and last 2-week residency sessions are scheduled for Abilene. The middle residency will be at an international location.	48 credits - 3 years (2 if supplemented with face-to-face courses in Abilene)	MA in Global Studies	$45,600 total tuition and fees (2013-14 prices). $950/credit hour includes all fees.
Marygrove College	Detroit, MI	Hybrid; meet on campus one weekend per month.	36 credits	Master of Arts in Social Justice	Not accessible online
George Fox	Newberg, OR	Hybrid. Online with 3 overseas components as well as weekly synchronized learning sessions (online classes in real time). Each overseas component is essentially a trip course, meeting in a new location each year. First is orientation (August), then end-of-first-year (April), then end-of-second-year (April).	36 (doctoral level)	DMin - Leadership and Global Perspectives	$22,212 approx. total cost of tuition and trips ($487/hr; $1,560 for each trip)
Online Format					
Open University	London, England	Online; includes 120 credits from the Postgraduate Diploma in Development Management (D37).; 30 credits from one additional module from the postgraduate diploma programme; 30 credits from the following compulsory module: development management project.	180-credit masters degree (Min. 2 years - generally longer.)	Master of Science in Development Management	Non-Europeans not eligible for standard pricing, and also perhaps not admitted.

University of Leicester	Leicester, England	Online (also avail. In person)	2 years PT	Master of Arts, Human Rights and Global Ethics	Pricing not clear on website.
University of London International Programmes	London, England	Online (and available globally)	10 modules (2-5 years)	Master of Science in Poverty Reduction: Policy and Practice	Total MSc (10 modules) 14489 USD + 2113 Reg. fee.
University of London International Programmes	London, England	Online (and available globally)	10 "modules" (2-5 years)	Master of Science in Sustainable Development	Total MSc (10 modules) 14489 USD + 2113 Reg. fee.

Project References

Clift, E. (2009, May 21). I'll never do it again. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from

http://chronicle.com/article/Ill-Never-Do-It-Again/44250/

Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Retrieved from http://highered.mcgraw-

hill.com/sites/dl/free/007091091x/79496/KreitnerSmapleCh.pdf

Ma, W. (n.d.). *Welcome to OCMS.* Retrieved from

http://www.ocms.ac.uk/content/index.php?q=node/204

Northwest University (n.d.). *M.A. in International Care and Community Development.* Retrieved

from http://www.northwestu.edu/social_behavioral/maiccd/

Oxford Centre for Mission Studies (2010). *Building.* Retrieved from

http://www.ocms.ac.uk/content/index.php?q=ocms/facilities/building

Oxford Centre for Mission Studies (n.d.). *OCMS.* Retrieved from

http://www.ocms.ac.uk/content/

St. John's University (2013). *Program overview.* Retrieved from

http://www.stjohns.edu/academics/graduate/liberalarts/departments/cgd/ma_gdsj

Sternberg, R. J. (2013, June 17). Giving employers what they don't really want. *The Chronicle of

Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Ill-Never-Do-It-

Again/44250/