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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This QEP falls within the broad area of campus internationalization and within the context of ongoing internationalization efforts at Florida Tech. It has two student-centered goals (Expand Knowledge and Understanding of Global Cultures, and Develop Cross-Cultural Competence). These goals are designed to help prepare Florida Tech students for the global workforce, an aim presented in the university’s Strategic Plan for 2013-2023. For each goal, student-learning outcomes (SLOs) have been derived from recent Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC) efforts. New programs in two areas are planned to achieve these goals and SLOs: (a) for Goal 1, a new academic minor in Global Cultural Studies that will be available to undergraduate students in nearly all academic majors; and (b) for Goal 2, a new non-academic certificate program in Cross-Cultural Competence that will be made available to all undergraduate students. Of these, (a) will expand global/ international academic offerings through development of: (YR 1) this minor program, and required introductory and culminating courses; (YRS 2-5) additional elective courses; and (YRS 2-5) a summative assessment to be administered in the culminating course. Similarly, (b) will expand global/intercultural non-academic and experiential offerings through: (YR 1) new opportunities in the first-year University Experience course, Cross-Cultural Competence (3Cs) workshops, development of a senior-year Synthesis project, and development of a points and database system for tracking student progress toward certificate requirements; and (YRS 2-5) use of the Cross-Cultural Navigator (CCN) for formative and summative assessment. Each year, assessment and evaluation data will be used for QEP formative evaluation purposes to Document as well as Improve and Modify QEP Implementation. In Years 2 – 5, these data also will be used for QEP summative evaluation purposes (Changes and Growth in Program Offerings, Student Participation, and Student Learning). Organizational plans and budgets have been developed to allocate the human, physical, technological, fiscal, and other institutional resources needed to support these QEP implementation and evaluation efforts.

This QEP capitalizes on the presence of a large population of international students at Florida Tech, and units that have supported their participation on campus. It also builds on the work of units that have advanced internationalization efforts in academic, research, and service areas, including those of the ICC, formed in 2009, to advance these efforts. Finally, this QEP reflects input from the wide range of campus constituencies, including students, staff, faculty, administrators, and Trustees. Thus, the internationalization efforts in this QEP will help advance and accomplish Florida Tech’s Mission and Strategic Plan.
2. ENGAGEMENT OF CONSTITUENCIES IN CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION EFFORTS AND IN THE QEP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

There has been a lengthy history of internationalization efforts at Florida Tech. This has included the development of agreements with governments and universities abroad (see Appendix A), the matriculation of a large number of undergraduate and graduate students from outside the U.S. and a growing number of International Student Organizations (see Appendix B), the hiring of faculty born and educated outside of the U.S., and the development of global/international academic offerings (see Appendix C). In 2009, steps were taken to expand campus internationalization efforts, starting with the establishment of the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC) by the President and Chief Operating Officer to lead, coordinate, and advance these efforts. Since 2009, ICC members have supported a number of studies and a wide range of activities within this broad area of campus internationalization (see Appendix D). A number of these are included in the first section of this timeline, notably those that have made a contribution to the development of this QEP.

At the same time, ICC did not determine the scope, the goals, or the programs for this QEP. The process involved in shaping this QEP and making these decisions began in 2013. Those who guided this process included the QEP Coordinator, the QEP Research Team, and the QEP Advisory Committee or QEPAC (see Appendix E). This process has involved a number of steps and a variety of constituencies, as described below in the second section of this timeline.

2.1. Relevant ICC and Campus Internationalization Activities

June, 2009: At the President’s Annual Retreat, the President established a new university committee to explore, develop, advocate, and help implement academic and other initiatives associated with the “internationalization” of the university. Soon thereafter, Executive Vice President McCay formed the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC). (Appendix D)

April, 2010: The ICC completed the report of its comprehensive inventory of internationalization efforts on campus, and recommendations derived from this analysis. (Appendix F)

Academic Year 2010-11: ICC formed subcommittees to address recommendations in three areas: Development, Communication, and Academic Strategies. Products included a concept paper for a Center for Global Engagement, and the results of survey of Colleges that included a draft set of Global Learning Outcomes.
Academic Year 2011-12: ICC participated in the American Council on Education’s Mapping Internationalization Survey, and conducted an Internationalization Survey of faculty, staff, and students.

April, 2012: The Strategic Plan: Targeting the Top 10, compiled by Executive Vice President McCay with input from the Colleges, staff, and administration, was presented at a retreat attended by President Catanese, Board of Trustee members, Deans, and senior administrators. (Appendix G)

Academic Year 2012-13: With support from ICC, Florida Tech’s Institute for Cross-Cultural Management conducted its first half-day training in cross-cultural competence for selected staff. Study Abroad Programs in Spain and Netherlands were added to the Oxford Program, and evaluations were begun. The Did You Know? campaign was launched. ICC’s Annual Report recommended exploration of a Global Passport program, development of an International Living/Learning Community, and focusing the next QEP on student attainment of cross-cultural competencies.

October, 2013: The Board of Trustees approved the current Florida Tech Mission Statement.

Spring and Summer 2014: ICC prepared for, conducted, and reported results from an International Alumni Survey.

2.2. The QEP Development Process

Step 1: Conceptualize the Structure of the QEP Plan
July, 2013: Florida Tech’s QEP Coordinator participated in sessions on the QEP at the 9th Annual SACSCOC COC Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation in Daytona Beach. Shortly thereafter, Dr. Baloga, Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, provided him with a copy of the SACSCOC Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation (2011). He used information from this Institute and Handbook to prepare a preliminary list of sections (general Table of Contents) for the QEP document.

Step 2: Establish a Working Relationship Between the ICC and the QEP
August, 2013: QEP Coordinator met with Dr. Kenkel, Chair of ICC. She oriented him to the history of the ICC and its activities. They also discussed how best to foster a cooperative relationship and communication between ICC and the QEP, now and over the next 5-6 years.

September, 2013: Dr. Kenkel extended an invitation to the QEP Coordinator to join the ICC, and he attended his first ICC Meeting (9/5/13). At that meeting, he extended an invitation to Dr. Kenkel to appoint members of the ICC to serve as liaisons to the QEP. Dr. Perez (CoB) and Dr.
Gabrenya (CoPLA) were appointed as initial liaisons. In subsequent discussion, Dr. Kenkel and the QEP Coordinator agreed that QEP would consider taking on ICC initiatives that were broad in scope, in an early stage of development, and required substantial time, effort and cost.

**Step 3: Formation of the QEP Research Team**

*October, 2013: Dr. Baloga* was invited to speak about SACSCOC 2015 Reaffirmation matters at this monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate. The QEP Coordinator, also a member of the Senate, assisted her in describing the QEP process to the Senate. At this Senate meeting, he issued an open invitation to faculty to join a new QEP Research Team, the initial QEP Advisory Committee (QEPAC). In response to this call, Dr. Vamosi, Associate Dean, CoB, approved Dr. Perez’s and Mr. Muth’s request to join this team.

*December, 2013:* Following discussions between the QEP Coordinator and Dr. R. Bonhomme, Director of the Center for First Year Experience, Mr. Finn and Ms. Ha (1st Year Advisors), agreed to serve on the QEP Research Team. Dr. Page (CoPLA) and Mr. Connell (Residence Life) also agreed to serve. At the first QEP Research Team meeting (12/11/13), members agreed to review survey data, QEPs focused on internationalization at other SACSCOC institutions, and international living/learning communities (LLCs) at other universities over the next month. (*Appendix E*)

**Step 4: Reviewing Research Team Results and Soliciting Input from Constituencies**

*January, 2014:* QEP Coordinator met with Student Government Association (SGA) Senators to introduce the broad topic of this QEP, as well as to initiate plans to collect students’ perceptions of need and suggestions for activities relevant to this QEP.

*February, 2014:* Mr. Muth, member of the QEP Research Team, began a review and further analysis of ICC responses to the ACE 2012 Mapping Internationalization Survey.

*March, 2014:* QEP Coordinator met with Dr. Perez to review results from internationalization surveys of students conducted by he and by Dr. Page, with their students, and with Mr. Connell to chart his review of international LLCs. Mr. Muth presented his results at the fifth meeting of the QEP Research Team. QEP Coordinator presented requests for input on perceptions of need and suggestions for activities relevant to this QEP to the Faculty Senate (3/11/14), SGA Senators and Student Organization representatives (3/12/14), and the Dean’s Council (3/19/14). QEP Coordinator also presented his first request to the Dean’s Council for information on QEP-related majors and courses. (*Appendix H*)

**Step 5: Review Input from Constituencies and Preparation of a Conceptual Overview**
April, 2014: The SGA President provided a summary of student input on QEP needs/activities. Ms. Brooke sent results of the 2013 ISSS Student Engagement Survey to the QEP Coordinator. The QEP Coordinator met with Dr. Griffith, Institute for Cross-Cultural Management (ICCM), to discuss the recently developed cross-cultural assessment tool, other work on the assessment of cross-cultural competence, and ICMM trainings. Further, QEP Coordinator presented a draft Conceptual Overview of this QEP to Dr. Baloga (4/13/14). This overview included a draft set of goals and program areas based on input received from constituencies and other results from the QEP Research Team. Dr. Baloga presented features of this to President Catanese and the Executive Council (4/14/14), as well as to the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Committees of the Board of Trustees (4/24/14). Finally, the QEP Coordinator invited the 6 members of the QEP Research Team and 10 representatives of faculty, staff, and student constituencies to join the QEPAC. (Appendix E)

May, 2014: The first meeting of the expanded QEPAC was held (5/12/14), including formation of Subcommittees and discussion of operations. QEP Coordinator also met with the Dean’s Council to review the Conceptual Overview, as well as responses to requests for their input in March.

Step 6: Gather Missing Data and Expand Plans
June - July 2014: QEP Coordinator worked with Dr. Baloga to prepare a budget for this QEP. Using NAFSA annual reports, Internationalizing the Campus, Ms. Ha and the QEP Coordinator charted features of university internationalization programs for selected as Simon Award recipients. QEP Coordinator also met with Mr. Graham, Assistant V.P. for Business and Retail Operations, who oversees Residence Life, to discuss LLCs and discuss and begin to draft plans for International LLCs on campus.

August, 2014: First meeting of the QEPAC in Fall '14. QEP Coordinator, Mr. Colley and Mr. Connell, designed and implemented an online survey of on-campus students regarding their perceptions of and interest in LLCs in general and in International LLCs.

September, 2014: QEP Coordinator prepared a position description for the QEP Director, and submitted this to Dr. Baloga who, in turn, shared this with Human Resources.

October, 2014: Following discussion with Executive Vice President McCay, Dr. Baloga finalized the QEP budget. Also, following brief discussions with QEP Coordinator, Dr. Baloga nominated a QEP Lead Evaluator: Ms. Lisa Donatelli, Senior Advisor for Global Partnerships, Georgetown University.
Step 7: Review of the Draft Plan

November, 2014: A draft of this QEP Plan was circulated to members of the QEPAC and College Deans for preliminary review and comment, with specific attention to the selection and refinement of Program Areas for this QEP.

January, 2015: A revised draft of this QEP Plan was circulated to the President Catanese, Executive Vice President McCay, Vice President for Academic Affairs Koksal, members of the Dean’s Council, and members of ICC for final review and comment.
3. THE TOPIC, ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNIVERSITY MISSION AND STRATEGIC PLAN, AND RELEVANT NEEDS AND KEY ISSUES

3.1. The Topic Area and Key Topics
The topic area in which this QEP fit is internationalization. Its breadth is reflected in the description provided by the American Council on Education on its Campus Internationalization webpage: “Internationalization refers to the efforts of institutions to incorporate global perspectives into teaching, learning, and research; build international and intercultural competence among students, faculty, and staff; and establish relationships and collaborations with people and institutions abroad” (www.acenet.edu/higher-education/topics/Pages/Campus-Internationalization.aspx). This description encompasses the range of internationalization recent initiatives, needs, goals, and plans described in this document, and subsumes the description that has appeared in each annual report prepared by Florida Tech’s Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC) since 2009: “The process of integrating an international/intercultural dimensions to the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1994, cited in ACE, 2003, p. 3).

Within this topic area, two topics of specific relevance to this QEP are global workforce and cross-cultural competence. For the purposes of this QEP, global workforce or international labor pool refers to “a new international division of labor that has been emerging since the late 1970s in the wake of other forces of globalization” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_workforce). More specifically, global workforce “refers to the international labor pool of workers, including those employed by multinational companies and connected through a global system of networking and production, immigrant workers, transient migrant workers, telecommuting workers, those in export-oriented employment, contingent work or other areas of employment (James & O’Brien, 2006).” For the purposes of this QEP, cross-cultural or intercultural competence may be defined as: “the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately with people of other cultures” (Messner & Schafer, 2012, p. 41). This subsumes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions such as motivation and willingness associated with this ability. These topics are relevant because, increasingly, Florida Tech graduates find themselves entering this global workforce and, whether as part of or apart from their work, find themselves in situations that require this kind of communication ability.

3.2. Relationship to the University Mission and Strategic Plan
In October 2013, the Florida Institute of Technology (Florida Tech) Board of Trustees approved the current University Mission Statement. The opening sentence states that Florida Tech’s “mission is to provide high-quality learning to a culturally diverse student body in order to
prepare students for entering the global workforce, seeking higher-education opportunities, and serving within their communities. The university also seeks to expand knowledge through basic and applied research and to serve the diverse economic, cultural, and societal needs of our local, state, national, and international constituencies” (see Appendix I, emphases added). This mission statement is explicit in presenting teaching/learning, research, and service as vital elements of Florida Tech’s mission, both locally and internationally. In addition, on a more university-specific basis, the two phrases highlighted above serve as the basis for two goals of this QEP: preparing students for entry into the global workforce, and developing their cross-cultural competence (i.e., their willingness and ability to accept, understand, and communicate effectively with people from cultural backgrounds other than their own).

Florida Tech’s Strategic Plan, Targeting the Top Ten, Strategic Plan, 2013-2023 (2012), both follows from this mission and reflects this emphasis on internationalization. “That is what this plan is about … providing a quality, globally based education in all our disciplines to continue to produce the global leaders of tomorrow while performing the research that will benefit all mankind in the fields of health, energy, the environment, transportation and quality of life” (p. 17). The phrasing provided in the 2023 Vision Statement within this Strategic Plan is equally clear about the importance of the university’s globalization efforts: “Florida Tech produces graduates who are good global citizens” (p. 6). That this appears as a Core Value of Florida Tech is not surprising: “The Florida Institute of Technology is heavily involved in the recruitment of international students and faculty, and they make up a significant percentage of the Florida Tech family. But [this] core value is something much more than having a significant presence of internationals on campus. It is about ingraining in the curriculum, in the extracurricular activities, and in the culture of Florida Tech that we all (faculty, staff, and students) must be good stewards of the globe’s resources and indeed, good citizens of the world in which we live (p. 19) (see Appendix G).

Within this Strategic Plan, two Strategic Initiatives present specific goals designed to translate the internationalization dimension of the Mission, Vision, and Core Values statements into reality. Under Strategic Initiative 2, Undergraduate Education, the very first goal is “To continue the on-going process of internationalizing the campus” (p. 22). Goals pertaining to students include “to provide additional opportunities for international students to be engaged with the campus community through co-curricular activities”, and “to develop additional study abroad/international exchanges for students” (p. 22). Further, there is a goal pertaining to faculty: “to promote, encourage, value, and reward faculty engaged in internationalization efforts” (p. 22). Finally, as encompassed in the ACE description of internationalization quoted
above, there is a goal pertaining to institutional collaboration: “to establish new international partnerships and twinning programs with institutions that have a similar mission as Florida Tech’s” (p. 22). Under Strategic Initiative 5, Student Life, there also are several goals that pertain to internationalization. One of these goals is “to establish a global presence on campus” and a second is “to enhance campus living and dining facilities” (p. 27). Specific initiatives under these goals include the establishment of a Center for Global Engagement, living-learning communities in residence halls, and Dining Services special events that feature the campus’ cultural diversity. Viewed as a whole, these and other goals in the Strategic Plan present a broad, holistic picture of initiatives on campus that would address academic, residential, and community-based aspects of internationalization for students, both directly and indirectly.

3.3. Relevant Needs and Key Issues: Findings from ICC Campus Internationalization Reviews and Surveys

As indicated in Section 2, a new wave of campus internationalization efforts began in 2009 with the establishment of the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC). Since 2009, ICC has undertaken a variety of activities, including those designed to identify needs and issues, or to support recommendations related to campus internationalization efforts. Some of the needs and issues identified by, and some of the recommendations offered by, ICC are relevant to this QEP. These activities, data, and recommendations will be summarized here because they reflect historical and institutional background relevant to this QEP. For the sake of clarity, the proposed QEP goals and program areas have been used to organize this summary even though these goals and program areas were refined after all of the work described in this section had been completed. The proposed goals included: (Goal 1) Prepare for the Global Workforce; (Goal 2) Develop Cross-Cultural Competence; and (Goal 3) Enhance University Coordination and Capacity. Similarly, the proposed program areas included (Area 1) Global/International Academic Offerings; (Area 2) Residential Living/Learning Communities; and (Area 3) Campus Community/Culture Offerings.

3.3.1. Findings from the ICC Review of Campus Internationalization (2010)

Following Dr. McCay’s charge, ICC undertook a comprehensive review of the status of internationalization efforts at Florida Tech in 2009-10 (ICC, 2010). For this review, “the ICC decided to draw upon the substantial resources developed by the American Council on Education (ACE) … The ICC used the ACE’s framework of nine central components of internationalization to conduct the inventory and to draw up recommendations” (ICC, 2010, p. 1). The full set of recommendations offered by ICC is presented in Appendix F. The nine ICC recommendations found to be most relevant to this QEP are identified below:
• **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goals 1 and 2.** Recommendation 1: the inclusion of global competence as a university-wide educational goal, and the specification and assessment of associated knowledge, skills, and dispositions;

• **Relevant Proposed QEP Goal 1 and Program Area 1.** Recommendation 9: provide more financial resources to support international curriculum development; Recommendation 10: explore a required global perspectives course or its equivalent as part of the general education curriculum; Recommendation 11: develop more globally oriented courses; Recommendation 12: strengthen and increase liberal arts offerings so as to increase student interest in international study/experience; and Recommendation 13: provide additional opportunities for a university-wide international experience;

• **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goals 1 and 2, and Program Area 2.** Recommendation 6: until funds are available to support an international center, the university should be set aside space for an international lounge/seminar room; and

• **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 3.** Recommendation 16: a specific position or group should be charged with leading efforts to internationalize the curriculum; and Recommendation 17: a specific person or group should be charged with coordinating international components on campus.

3.3.2. Findings from ICC Participation in ACE’s *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* (2012)

Although the 2010 comprehensive review undertaken by ICC provided useful information, it did not clarify how Florida Tech’s internationalization efforts compared to those of other U.S. institutions. Thus, ICC sought to address this by participating in this ACE national survey in 2012. Highlights from this national survey included the following general trends (ICC, 2013):

- The focus on campus internationalization has accelerated: 93% doctoral institutions; 84% master’s, 78% baccalaureate;
- Development of specific global student learning outcomes at 55% of institutions;
- 98% of doctoral institutions administer their own study-abroad program. More institutions are providing scholarships for education abroad;
- 28% require undergraduate students to take courses on global trends/issues;
- Decreased percent with an undergraduate foreign language requirement (37%); and
- 27% of institutions have collaborative programs with oversea partners (joint degree, dual-degree, certificate programs).
The more relevant question here is “How did Florida Tech’s 2012 responses compare to these trends?” More specifically, “How did Florida Tech’s responses compare to trends at comparable institutions (i.e., doctoral, private, and smaller)?” To answer this question, Mr. Muth (QEP Research Team, CoB) undertook an analysis of ICC’s 2012 responses for Florida Tech using ACE’s Mapping Internationalization Assessment Tool [www.acenet.edu/mapintl]. Below is a summary of what he found for survey items most relevant to this QEP.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goals 1 and 2**: Florida Tech did have specific international/global learning outcomes (ICC, 2011), although these functioned for some, but not all, academic units. Relatively few doctoral institutions had institution-wide outcomes (26%), although the number of private (31%) and smaller institutions (39%) that did was slightly greater.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 1 and Program Area 1**: Florida Tech did not [and does not] have a general education course requirement in the area of global/international studies (other than foreign language). This was comparable to doctoral (56% did not), private (54% did not) and smaller institutions (48% did not).

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 1 and Program Area 1**: Florida Tech did offer Study Abroad and Field Study Abroad opportunities to undergraduates for credit, although the institution did not offer Research Abroad, International Internship, or International Service opportunities. A majority of doctoral institutions (more than 55%) provided all of these opportunities. Among private and smaller institutions, the only opportunity provided by more than 45% was Study Abroad.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 1 and Program Area 1**: Florida Tech did have “double or dual degree” programs in collaboration with non-U.S. institutions overseas. Of these, 52% doctoral institutions had these types of programs, while less than 15% of private and smaller institutions had them.

These results support ICC’s contention that participation in this ACE survey “[P]ut us among the universities working on and making significant progress on internationalization” (ICC, 2012).

### 3.3.3 Findings from the National Survey of Student Engagement (2013) and the ICC Internationalization Survey of Campus Students, Staff, and Faculty

These two recent campus surveys provide evidence regarding the frequency and nature of interactions between U.S. and international students on the Florida Tech campus. These findings are most relevant to **Proposed QEP Goal 2**, as well as to **Proposed Program Areas 2 and 3**.
The most comprehensive of these was the 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). One of the two indicators of Learning with Peers pertained to Discussions with Diverse Others, and two of the four items associated with this indicator asked about discussions with (Item 8a) “People from a race or ethnicity different than your own” and (Item 8c) “People with religious beliefs other than your own.” Among Florida Tech First Year Students, the percent that chose Often or Very Often were relatively high (i.e., 76% and 78%, respectively). These percentages exceeded those of Florida Tech’s IPEDS Peer Group and Carnegie Class (NSSE, 2013). Among Florida Tech Seniors, the percent of student who chose Often or Very Often were noticeably lower (i.e., 53% and 59%, respectively), even though these percentages exceeded those of Florida Tech’s IPEDS Peer Group and Carnegie Class.

There could be several possible explanations for the apparent decline from First Year Students to Seniors in these 2013 NSSE data, so it is worth reviewing the results from another campus survey from this time period to determine which seem to be more plausible. With support from ICC, Dr. Perez conducted a survey of students, staff, and faculty (ICC, 2012). The goals of this survey included to “identify internationalization priorities and barriers, determine training and education needs of the different constituencies, and elicit interest and involvement in internationalization efforts” (ICC, 2012). Responses from students to three items stood out in these results. Similar to NSSE, Item 13 asked “How much do you interact with people from nationalities or ethnic group other than your own on campus?” A total of 61% selected At Least Once a Day or Continuously, and when those who selected At Least Once a Week were added, this percent increased to 84%. These are reasonably consistent with NSSE (2013) results, above. However, the responses to several additional items were noteworthy. When asked if they were “unsure how to react or proceed with a conversation” when interacting with those of other nationalities/ethnic groups (Item 15), 28% selected Sometimes or Always. Further, when asked if they had difficulty communicating with people on campus of other nationalities/ethnic groups (Item 16), 22% selected Sometimes or Always. Of those who expressed such difficulty, the greatest number (57%) indicated that it was in Talking with Other Students (Item 17), and 90% (n=319) indicated that this was due to Cultural Differences (Item 20). Finally, when asked if they would “like to learn about the norms, customs, and practices of other nationalities” (Item 23), 74% selected Somewhat Interested or Very Interested. Thus, even though the frequency of interactions with students from other national, cultural, or ethnic backgrounds is relatively common due, in part, to the large number of international students on campus, the nature of these interactions is not always smooth or satisfying. Further, it is noteworthy that many students seem eager to learning how to overcome these communication barriers. These results
led Dr. Perez to start the *Did You Know?* campaign, with support from ICC and the involvement of his students, in 2012-13 (ICC, 2013).

3.3.4. Findings from the ISSS Engagement Survey (2013)

In Spring 2013, ISSS conducted this survey and reported results to ICC (ICC, 2013). A total of 176 students participated in this survey. The findings most relevant to this QEP are summarized below.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Program Area 2**: Students were asked to rate their level of interest in “A multicultural living arrangement (e.g., mixed-culture residence halls)”. Of those who responded, 50% (n=88) selected *Very Interested*, and another 38.6% (n=68) selected *Somewhat Interested*.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Program Areas 2 and 3**: Students were asked to rate their interest in “Conversational practice with English-speaking language partners”. On this item, 56.8% (n=100) selected *Very Interested*, and another 28.4% (n=50) selected *Somewhat Interested*.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Program Area 3**: Students also were asked to rate their interest in several international/intercultural events. One event was the annual *International Festival* (see Appendix J). On this item, 70.5% (n=124) selected *Very Interested*, and another 27.3% (n=48) selected *Somewhat Interested*. A second item focused on the *International Coffee Hours* (see Appendix J). On this item, 48.3% (n=85) selected *Very Interested*, and another 35.2% (n=62) selected *Somewhat Interested*. A third item focused on *Multicultural Sporting Events*. On this item, 56.3% (n=99) selected *Very Interested*, and another 29.0% (n=51) selected *Somewhat Interested*. A fourth item asked students to “Please list any other multicultural social events in which you would be interested in participating”. A total of 24 responses were received, many of which mentioned various kinds of international festivals/exhibits (e.g., for different countries and cultures, traditional dress, fashion, art, and movies) or meals (e.g., food tasting, lunches, potlucks, dinners or dinner parties). Students also mentioned “international friendship program”, “small community meets where different cultures interact”, and even “multicultural study sessions.”

3.3.5 Findings from the ICC International Alumni Survey (2014)

In Spring 2014, ICC conducted an International Alumni Survey. A total of 91 responses were received from alumni living in 40 countries, and reflecting a range of graduation dates (1974–
This survey consisted of rating scale, open-ended, and demographic items. The findings that are most relevant to this QEP are summarized below.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goals 1 and 2**: Alumni were asked to rate “their experience in acquiring the following” on a 5-point scale, ranging from No Effect to Very Great Effect. An item that pertained to Goal 1 asked about their “Ability to work in an international context after graduation.” On this item, most responses ranged from Little Effect (n=6) to Some Effect (n=30) to Great Effect (n=24) to Very Great Effect (n=27). In addition, at least two items pertained to Goal 2. The first of these asked about their “Understanding and familiarity with other nationalities.” On this item, most responses ranged from Little Effect (n=8) to Some Effect (n=27) to Great Effect (n=37) to Very Great Effect (n=18). The second of these asked about their “Developing the skills to engage with people from diverse backgrounds.” On this item, most responses ranged from Little Effect (n=5) to Some Effect (n=29) to Great Effect (n=37) to Very Great Effect (n=19).

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 2**: Alumni also were asked to rate “their satisfaction with these experiences as an international student” on a 5-point scale, ranging from Very Unsatisfied to Very Satisfied. One item asked about their “Interactions with other international students.” On this item, most responses range from Neutral (n=9) to Satisfied (n=42) to Very Satisfied (n=34). A parallel item asked about their “Interactions with US students.” On this item, most responses range from Unsatisfied (n=5) to Neutral (n=20) to Satisfied (n=45) to Very Satisfied (n=16). These findings suggest a difference in the quality of interactions they had with international students vs. U.S. students.

- **Relevant to Proposed QEP Program Areas 2 and 3**: In Item 7, alumni were asked to indicate “which of the following would you suggest to improve the experience of international students at FIT?” Of the 10 possible responses, the two selected most frequently were: #6: “More structured opportunities for International and American students to socialize” (64%), and #5: “Residence halls that mix students interested in international learning” (49%) (ICC, 2014).

### 3.4 Relevant Needs and Key Issues: Findings from QEP Reviews and Surveys

Since Fall 2013, the QEP Advisory Committee (QEPAC) also has taken steps to identify needs and solicit suggestions from the campus community to guide the selection and refinement of the goals and program areas for this QEP. Over the course of these reviews and surveys, these proposed QEP goals and program areas took shape and were eventually selected. However, as was done in Section 3.3, for the sake of clarity, the proposed QEP goals and program areas are
used to organize this summary. These proposed goals included: (Goal 1) Prepare for the Global Workforce; (Goal 2) Develop Cross-Cultural Competence; and (Goal 3) Enhance University Coordination and Capacity. Similarly, these proposed program areas included: (Area 1) Global/International Academic Offerings; (Area 2) Residential Living/Learning Communities; and (Area 3) Campus Community/Culture Offerings.

3.4.1. QEP Findings from a Review of Academic Offerings On Campus

The findings reported here are from a detailed review of three distinct types of academic program offerings: global/international courses in the undergraduate core curriculum, global/international majors, minors and other courses, and four types of additional course offerings. These findings pertain to Proposed QEP Goal 1 and Proposed Program Area 1.

Within the core curriculum, all students are required to complete 9 credits in Humanities (HUM), “including HUM 2051 [Civilization I], one 3-credit humanities course from the humanities core requirements listed below and one additional 3-credit humanities course” (2014-15 University Catalog, p. 34). At present, six courses are included in the list for the Humanities core requirement: two courses with a global or international focus (HUM 2052, HUM 2142); two courses in British and American Literature that may or may not fit such a focus (HUM 2212 and HUM 2213); and two courses in American History (see Appendix C). Although these last two courses do not fit a global or international focus for U.S. students, from the perspective of international students, those courses offer an international focus. Beyond this, Dr. Taylor, Head, School of Arts and Communications, confirmed there are ongoing efforts by that faculty to develop additional core humanities courses with a global or international focus (personal communication, April 7, 2014). One example of this is a new HUM course, Introduction to Asia (or Asian Studies). As reported in the 2012 Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses, this is the closest Florida Tech comes to having a general education course requirement in the area of global/international studies.

In addition, in March 2014, each College Dean was asked to identify majors, minors, and courses with a global or international emphasis offered by their College. Responses were received and these lists were merged. With the assistance of faculty serving on the QEPAC Academic Subcommittee, the courses in these lists were reviewed. The results of this review of academic offerings are presented in Appendix C, and indicated that the kinds of global/international courses offered tended to differ from College to College (i.e., as was found for capstone courses included in Florida Tech’s 2005 QEP).
At present, the only undergraduate major with a global or international emphasis is offered by the College of Business (i.e., Business Administration – Global Management & Finance). However, the School of Arts and Communication within the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts is in the process of developing either an International Studies major or a Humanities major with an International Studies concentration. Further, at present, there are no undergraduate minors with this as its emphasis (minimum of six courses). The academic courses that come closest to resembling a minor are offered by the College of Business; all nine B.S. degrees in Business Administration require four courses with a global or international emphasis: BUS 1801: Global Business Perspectives; BUS 4701: International Business; an elective in BUS restricted to courses with this emphasis; and an elective in HUM restricted to courses with this emphasis. A total of 68 courses were identified using this process (see Appendix C). The attention given to courses with a global or international emphasis in three Colleges is limited (i.e., number of courses or number of participating academic units). For the College of Aeronautics, only two courses appeared in the University Catalog. However, the College of Aeronautics recently received approval from the European Union (EU) to train pilots, and their standards are higher than those set for training pilots by its sister agency in the U.S., the Federal Aviation Administration. Florida Tech is the first, and remains the only, flight-training program in the U.S. to receive this approval. For the College of Engineering, 17 courses were identified. All are offered by the Department of Marine and Environmental Systems as part of its degree programs in Environmental Science (ENS), Meteorology (MET), Oceanography (OCN) and Ocean Engineering (OCE). All of these courses reflect this Department’s commitment to the global perspective inherent in Earth Systems Science, which is apparent in each of these degree programs. For the College of Science, 8 courses were identified. Seven are offered through the Department of Biological Sciences, and all are field biology and ecology courses taught in locations around the world (e.g., Australia, Peru, the Galapagos, and Puerto Rico). The only course offered outside Biology is ISC 3250, a globally oriented course in the Sustainability major.

Substantial attention has been given to courses with a global or international emphasis in the College of Business and the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts. In the College of Business, 13 courses were identified. These courses reflect the global and international nature of business (e.g., finance, marketing, trade). As described above, two of these courses (BUS 1801 and BUS 4701) are required in all nine B.S. degree programs offered by the College of Business. The College of Psychology and Liberal Arts is comprised of the School of Psychology, the School of Arts and Communication, and the School of Behavior Analysis. In the School of Psychology, three courses were identified, two in cross-cultural psychology and one in sociology. In the
School of Arts and Communications, 25 courses were offered. Of these, 19 were foreign language courses (French, German, Spanish, Italian, Chinese) and one was in linguistics. The remaining five courses were Humanities courses in areas of world history and culture. In addition, this School is in the process of developing new foreign language courses, notably in Russian, Arabic and Portuguese. As reported in the 2012 *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses*, there is no foreign language requirement for undergraduates, but there is substantial support for foreign language study.

Several additional types of academic course offerings are relevant to this QEP. These include: (a) the mandatory course for all First Year Student called *University Experience* (ASC 1000), (b) courses for undergraduate involvement in international research and internships (e.g., Physics research with CERN); (c) the set of capstone courses now embedded in all undergraduate degree programs as a results of Florida Tech’s first QEP, which focused on *scholarly inquiry*, and (d) courses for student participation in the university’s Co-op and ProTrack Programs. Any effort to gather, aggregate, and analyze data for each of these offerings as they relate to this QEP have been limited. With respect to (a), Ms. Veronica Giguere, Associate Director of the Academic Support Center and UE Coordinator, recently shared initial formative assessment data relevant to this QEP from students enrolled in UE sections in Fall 2014 (V. Giguere, personal communication, October 13, 2014). With respect to (b), there are anecdotes about undergraduate participation in these offerings, but little more. With respect to (c), the most pertinent data would come from the College of Engineering and Department of Biological Sciences, due to their use of teaming in senior capstone projects. Data regarding the inclusion of U.S. and international students on the same team are available in QEP archives, and data regarding students’ perceptions of each other’s contributions to the team had been collected by some Departments exist but have not been organized. Finally, with respect to (d), Florida Tech has had a Co-op Program since 1978, primarily for the College of Engineering, but open to students in other Colleges. Only a few students have engaged in international experiences in these programs, notably from the Colleges of Engineering and Aeronautics (D. Gaynor, Dir., Career Management Services, personal communication, October 27, 2014). Due to the critical timing of UE and capstone courses, and the potential value of international research and internship opportunities, these represent potentially useful sources of data.

### 3.4.2. QEP Findings from a Review of Study Abroad Offerings

A review of Study Abroad Programs also was undertaken, as this is very relevant to [Proposed QEP Goal 1](#) and [Proposed Program Area 1](#) (see *Appendix C*). Among current courses with a global or international emphasis, five have been used in Study Abroad Programs. These include
HUM 2085, which was has been used in the Oxford Program, COM 3085 in the Netherlands Program, and BUS 4504 in the Spain Program. In addition, Biology courses have been used for the Galapagos Program (BIO 4904) and Peru Program (BIO 4421). Of these, only the Oxford Program existed prior to 2012, and on the basis of the number of students enrolled overtime, this remains the largest and most stable of the Study Abroad Programs. However, with the addition of the other four Study Abroad programs in 2012 and 2013, the total number of participating students has more than doubled to about 70 (Appendix C). Beyond this, efforts are underway to develop and offer a new Study Abroad Program in Chengdu, China, to include courses in Mandarin, as well as Chinese history and culture. Some of the barriers noted in the 2010 report remain, although efforts have been and continue to be made to address several of them (e.g., providing financial assistance in the form of partial scholarships; raising funds to increase financial assistance for participating students; following the example set by Biological Sciences, integrating new Study Abroad Programs into the design of existing degree and research programs).

3.4.3 QEP Findings from Surveys of Constituents Regarding Academic Needs

As noted in Section 2, and as apparent in Appendix H, an instrument was circulated to students, faculty, and College Deans seeking their input on needs and activities for this QEP. The responses from each constituency in the area of academic needs are relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 1 and Proposed Program Area 1.

With the support of the Student Government Association (SGA) President, and following two presentations about this QEP to SGA Senators and Student Organization representatives in Spring 2014, a survey was distributed to students (see Appendix H). Responses were summarized and provided to the QEP Coordinator in April, 2014. Those responses included the following student perceptions of need and interest in the academic area.

- A “Cultural Awareness” section in UE classes to promote internationalization
- Use classes like UE to encourage Freshmen to be more international
- Create cultural classes in the Humanities
- Create a required multicultural course for all majors
- Expand the art-related Humanities classes
- Create an Arabic language course
- Invite more international companies to give seminars about working in a global economy
- Propose a mandatory semester abroad
Further, a nearly identical version of this survey was distributed to members of the Faculty Senate in March 2014 following a second presentation about the QEP development process. Responses were received from faculty in three academic units. Those responses included the following faculty perceptions of need and interest in the academic area.

- Expand the offering of foreign language courses
- Need more technical elective courses with global context
- The study abroad program should not be limited to course offerings but should also include research collaboration and projects
- Link research groups from abroad with groups at Florida Tech
- Need international internship to entice students
- One of the biggest barriers is language; students will need to learn a second language
- Global Engagement Certification

Finally, with the cooperation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, a nearly identical version of this survey was distributed to the members of the Dean’s Council in March 2014. Responses were received from three College Deans. Those responses included these Dean’s perceptions of need and interest in the academic area.

- Better articulation of targeted cross-cultural competencies, and how they can be learned and demonstrated through classroom and extra-curricular activities
- Broaden the Undergraduate Core Requirements by adding new courses that address cultural diversity, international languages
- Consider developing internationalization-oriented courses with global perspectives, or include such courses offered by other colleges as part of their degree plan
- Allow undergraduate students to take two social sciences/humanities/free electives in CoPLA and/or CoB
- Development of multiple course offerings and research experiences where students can learn cross-cultural skills and knowledge
- An International Studies major or minor
- Expanding a foreign language requirement to as many FIT majors as possible
- Offer classes on foreign language familiarity
- Integrated Capstone Projects: team involving both International and US students working together to solve engineering/science problems can serve as a viable vehicle for integration
- Greater encouragement/support for domestic students to study abroad
In summary, from these sets of responses, there are needs and opportunities in multiple areas: a common set of competencies; in the UE course; courses in the Humanities core requirement; global/international courses for Humanities, Social Science and Technical electives and in degree programs; global/international majors and minors; modern language courses and study support; expanded study abroad offerings; and international internship and research opportunities.

3.4.4 QEP Findings from a Survey of Campus Residents on Living/Learning Communities

In light of the interest in residential living/learning communities in the ISSS Engagement Survey (2013) and International Alumni Survey (ICC, 2014), as well as support for the development of residential living/learning communities (LLCs) in the Strategic Plan (2012) and by ICC (2013), further steps were taken to determine the nature and extent of interest in International LLCs. These findings pertain to Proposed QEP Goals 1 and 2, and Proposed Program Area 2.

In September 2014, QEPAC members developed an online survey for all degree-seeking undergraduate and graduate students living in on-campus housing. This survey contained items about students’ awareness of, perceptions of, and interest in LLCs in general, and in International LLCs specifically (Colley, 2014). A cover letter and link to survey materials were sent to a total of 1,574 students, and 243 responded (FR: 124; SO: 41; JR: 43; SR: 22; and GR: 13). This included 153 U.S. students and 90 international students, representing 40 countries, as well as 133 males and 109 females. Item 13 asked if they had ever heard of LLCs, with 83% responding with no. Of those who responded yes (n=41), some students had either lived in an LLC (n=10), or knew others who had (n=18), and most had a favorable impression of LLCs (77.5%). On Item 19, respondents indicated that Florida Tech should include the following types of activity in LLC programming: residential (n=194), extra-curricular (n=157), co-curricular (n=96), and curricular (n=108). Item 20 asked students to select up to four LLC themes that most interested them. Academics (n=157) and Careers (n=101) were selected most often, while themes related to an International LLC were selected by a modest number of students: International (n=47), Languages (n=51), and Multi-cultural (n=54). When asked if LLCs “are needed on the Florida Tech campus” (Item 21), a total of 68 students selected Considerably or Extremely. Also, when asked if “an international LLC would make a valuable addition to the campus community” (Item 24), a total of 106 students selected Probably Would or Definitely Would. Further, when students were asked how likely they would want to live in an International LLC (Item 26), a total of 88 students selected Probably Would or Definitely Would. Finally, when asked if they “would like to be added to a mailing list regarding the development of an International LLC at Florida Tech” (Item 31), 58 students provided their name and e-mail.
address. Although the response rate was limited, these results indicate there is sufficient interest among current campus residents to support plans to develop an International LLC. However, a comparison of responses from U.S. and international students indicated more favorable perceptions of and interest in LLCs in general (e.g., Items 21) and International LLCs in particular (e.g., Items 19, 24, 26, and 31) in the latter group. The extent to which these differences may be associated with communication barriers and concerns described earlier is unclear, but they will be important to monitor.

3.4.5 QEP Findings from Surveys of Constituents Regarding Residential LLC Needs

As described in Section 3.4.3, an instrument was circulated to students, faculty, and College Deans seeking their input on needs and activities for this QEP. The responses from each constituency in the area of residential living/learning community needs are relevant to Proposed QEP Goals 1 and 2, and Proposed Program Area 2.

The responses summarized and provided by the SGA President included the following student perceptions of need and interest in the area of residential living/learning communities.

- Make an effort to have dorms that mix all cultures
- Specialized international dorms filled with students interested in learning more on that culture
- Rooming with an international student could possibly equal a 1 credit course in international studies, along with relevant coursework
- Have ResLife partner with a Diversity Committee
- Encourage more RA/resident interactions
- Encourage RAs to do more Cultural Awareness activities
- Door decorations in dorms based on culture

The responses from faculty included the following perceptions of need and interest in the area of residential living/learning communities.

- Pair American students with foreign students
- Encourage communication in a foreign language
- Space for cultural and social activities (International Coffee Hours, musical cultural events)
- Space accommodation for religious practices
- Use some aspect of the hostel living model – shared kitchen with options in each living area
The responses from Deans included the following perceptions of need and interest in the area of residential living/learning communities:

- Intentionally integrating undergraduate students in housing
- Roommates in dorms: Mixing American students with international students
- Programming for an international residence hall, make a lot of it student-driven/initiated
- Create real international living experiences in the residence halls
- “Living skills class”. In Europe there are centers that are contracted to provide orientation (e.g., 3-4 weeks). Much of this could be done online
- Create a new training program for the RAs to be assigned to “international” residence halls
- Faculty members can reside in dorms.
- Housing for visiting scholars is needed. Some current housing options could be used for this
- Establish a norm that every student wants to spend at least one year in the international living/learning residence

In summary, from these sets of responses, there are needs and opportunities in virtually all areas associated with the development of campus residential communities: the intentional integration of U.S. and international students in residence halls (macro) and as roommates (micro); social and recreational activities for residents; cultural and language activities to reflect the international theme; the role of students in initiating and sustaining activities; training for Head Residents and RAs for their expanded roles, including proactive, interactive, and reactive approaches to programming; the potential roles of faculty in residence and visiting scholars; and development of the physical space to support a wide range of activities, including kitchen space and space for cultural and religious practices.

3.4.6 Findings from a Review of Campus Community and Culture Offerings

In light of findings from the NSSE (2013) and ICC Internationalization Survey (2012) regarding the frequency and nature of interactions between U.S. and international students on the Florida Tech campus, the QEPAC undertook a review of campus services and extra-curricular activities with an international emphasis because these are relevant to Proposed Program Area 3. This included a review of activities coordinated by service units and those coordinated by student organizations that are open to all students on campus.

One of the prominent features of the Florida Tech campus is the sizable number of international students. Since 2000, the total number of international undergraduate and graduate students on campus has risen from almost 700 (2000) to more than 1,900 (2014), as indicated in Appendix.
G. At present, these international students come from more than 100 countries. This number and this diversity present both challenges and opportunities for the campus. This number of international students requires substantial support services.

There are currently five major units that share [responsibility for] various aspects of international life on campus: [1] International Graduate/Undergraduate Admissions and the Office of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS), all student services under the Office of Enrollment Management; [2] International Academic programs (IAP) and Study Abroad under the Office of Academic Affairs/Provost’s Office; [3] Coordinator for International Credit Transfer, under the Registrar’s Office, Academic Affairs/Provost’s Office; [4] English-as-a-Second Language and foreign languages, Center for Critical Languages, under the Department of Humanities/College of Psychology and Liberal Arts; and [5] International Alumni Affairs, under Alumni Affairs/University Advancement. Because of the unique nature of what each office does, they work independently, but in concert with each other to provide their respective international support to students and faculty. (ICC, 2010)

Of the five units noted above, ISSS, International Credit Transfer, and the Center for Critical Languages provide immediate support services for international students at Florida Tech.

Of these, the Office of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) serves as the primary point of contact for all international students (e.g., Visas and immigration, compliance with university and sponsoring agency regulations, employment and tax matters). Several of the programs that ISSS has developed and continues to operate provide additional support services for international students, such as the International Friendship Program, Florida Tech Diplomat Program, and Orlando Airport Pickup Program (see Appendix J). However, since 2005, ISSS has extended its initiative well beyond these support services to provide cultural programming for international students and for the wider campus community. This has included International Coffee Hours, Multicultural Dinners, and the annual International Festival (see Appendix J). Several of these programs have been offered in cooperation with the International Student Service Organization (ISSO) and with other International Student Organizations.

It is noteworthy that as the number and range of nationalities in Florida Tech’s international student population has grown, so has the number of organizations by and for international students. This number grown steadily since 2007, as has the number of international students that participate in these organizations. Today, there are 14 recognized International
Student Organizations on campus, with a total membership or more than 1,500 students (see Appendix B). In addition to co-sponsoring campus offerings with ISSS, these organization are involved in a sizable number of activities each year, ranging from fund raisers to recreational activities to participation in wider campus events such as Homecoming to service projects such as clothing drives (Database for 2010-2014 provided as a personal communication from R. Bowers, Dean of Students, October 1, 2014). The information provided by ISSS and by Mr. Bowers indicated that there are many opportunities for international students to participate in recreational, social, cultural and other activities on campus. What is not readily apparent is the extent to which U.S. students are favorably disposed to participate in international and intercultural activities that are “open to all” such as international coffee hours and dinners.

3.4.7 QEP Findings from Surveys of Constituents Regarding the Campus Community and Culture

As described in Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.5, an instrument was circulated to students, faculty, and College Deans seeking their input on needs and activities for this QEP. The responses from each constituency in the area of campus community and cultural needs are relevant to Proposed QEP Goal 2 and Proposed Program Area 3.

The responses provided by the SGA President included the following student perceptions and interests relevant to the campus community and cultural needs.

- Actively engage with international organizations, create a committee to work with all [of them]
- Encourage all organizations to collaborate on an event with a club outside of their interest, for example SGA and ISA working together to create a Holi celebration
- Create more events that utilize classes and culture, for example the International Festival and Global Business classes
- Work with Ruth Funk Textile Museum and international students to have an International Fashion Show
- International Game Day, every culture gets a spot on campus to play the sport that defines their country, countries with sports that overlap can compete with each other
- International Meal Day; cultures showcase their food, different countries get the spotlight
- Expand the International Festival to a full week, add in activities like the International Fashion Show, International Game Day, and International Meal Day
- During International Festival, encourage other clubs/orgs. not to have competing events
The responses from faculty included the following perceptions of need and interest in the area of campus community and cultural needs.

- Translate some key webpages into the most prevalent foreign languages on campus; Likewise with campus maps, etc.
- Help international Freshmen acclimate
- Help international students enhance their English skills
- Pair freshmen from different cultures, have them interview each other, and keep journals
- Have students shadow students from other cultural groups to learn more

The responses from Deans included the following perceptions of need and interest in the area of campus community and cultural needs.

- Development of a culture where we define ALL FIT students as “international” students because of their competence and interest in cross-cultural skills
- More interaction between domestic and international students
- Programs to enhance understanding and appreciation of cultural matters, country-specific rules and regulations, and language aspects at all levels of the university community
- Offer classes, seminars, workshops about specific cultures on a regular basis
- Use international films, music and dance, sports programs, cultural events, and cuisine to bring people together regardless of where they are from
- Create a Model United Nations Organization on campus to take advantage of FIT’s large international student population
- Make use of international alumni. For example, for study abroad experiences, have alumni in that region host a reception or talk. Build connections
- International service projects. Don’t actually have to be there to do this

In summary, from these sets of responses, there are needs and opportunities in a wide range of areas that may further the development of the campus community and culture: from shifting perceptions and communications about who is an “international student”; to providing more and better opportunities for new non-U.S. students to acclimate; to creating more and better opportunities to foster interaction and understanding between U.S. and non-U.S. students; to creating more opportunities to engage international student organizations, including collaborating with classes, service units, other student organizations on campus events; to offering a wider range of extra-curricular international and culture-specific events/activities (textiles and fashion, music, arts, film, sports and games, cuisine); to the expansion of
opportunities that capitalize on student backgrounds and interests (Model U.N., international service projects, interaction with international alumni).

3.5. Summary of Needs and Key Issues Relevant to This QEP
The finding from this review of ICC’s Campus Internationalization reviews and surveys, as well as from this set of reviews and surveys undertaken for this QEP are broad and diverse. Nonetheless, several strands are readily apparent. First, there was widespread support for this QEP to focus on specific needs, goals, and programming within the broader area of campus internationalization.

Second, there was clear evidence that there was ample room for, need for, and support for growth in the area of global/international academic offerings. As indicated in the summary for Section 3.3, these needs and opportunities included: expanded attention to global/international themes in freshman year courses such as UE; courses in the Humanities core curriculum; a broader range of required and elective courses with a global/international emphasis; new concentrations, minors and majors with a global/international emphasis; both new and a wider range of study abroad offerings; new ways of working with teams of U.S. and non-U.S. students in existing capstone and other courses; and new international internship and research opportunities for students. Some of this can be done within the framework of existing university resources, and some is likely to require substantial additional resources.

Third, there was clear evidence of the need for, student interest in, and support for the development of new on-campus residential opportunities for students, specifically international living/learning communities (LLCs). However, as this would be relatively new to the menu of residential opportunities at Florida Tech, the list of needs, considerations, and opportunities is long and substantial, as indicated in the summary at the end of Section 3.4.5. Within these sets of findings, it was apparent that due consideration should be given to the immediate needs of residents (e.g., social and recreational opportunities for them), as well as the interests of students as they relate to the theme of International LLCs (e.g., cultural offerings for the wider campus community, language groups, credit for some combination of residence in a LLC and assignments). Further, the experience, voice, and roles of students, as well as of Head Residents and RAs, in shaping LLC programming should be considered carefully.

Fourth, there was clear evidence that of the need for, student interest in, and support for growth in the area of campus community and culture (i.e., extra-curricular experiences within and that extend beyond the university environment). As indicated in the summary at the end of Section
3.4.7, there are needs, considerations, and opportunities that pertain to international students, including those associated with their acclimating and adjusting to culture(s), language(s), and regulations common to the U.S. There also are needs, considerations, and opportunities that pertain to interactions between U.S. and international students on campus. For example, there are daily opportunities for these students to interact, but there are some recognized barriers that appear to affect the frequency and nature of these kinds of interactions. Finally, there are needs, considerations, and opportunities that pertain to U.S. students on campus, including, but not limited to, their exposure to, understanding of, and appreciation of non-U.S. cultures. Many of the opportunities cited by students, faculty and Deans pertained to cultural festivals, events and activities that would, at one and the same time, allow international students to express aspects of their culture and allow U.S. students to experience this in a self-directed, non-threatening, first-hand manner.
4. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE, GOALS, AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

4.1. Purpose

Consistent with material presented in the previous section, the overarching purpose of this QEP is to help maintain, strengthen, and broaden international and intercultural educational opportunities within the wider context of ongoing internationalization efforts at Florida Tech.

From an institutional perspective, this QEP has been designed to address recommendations and plans put forth by the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC) in 2010 and since then. There are several reasons for this. First, many of those ICC recommendations and plans remain as relevant and needed today as they were in 2010. This is apparent in the findings summarized in Section 3. Second, enhanced attention to internationalization will contribute to the wider range of efforts aimed at maintaining and enhancing Florida Tech’s ability to remain competitive as a Tier 1 private technical university on a national and international scale. As indicated in the Strategic Plan (2012), the university leadership is well aware that for Florida Tech to be recognized as one of the top ten private technological universities in the world, this must be grounded in actual university practices and accomplishments. Third, following from this, attention to several purposefully selected educational programs that are consistent with ICC recommendations and plans to internationalize the Florida Tech campus will further develop the institutional capacity and infrastructure needed to support these international teaching, research, and service practices.

This overarching purpose also may be viewed from the perspective of current and future students at Florida Tech. Very simply, these students will face and enter a world that is more global in scale, and more international and intercultural in perspective than has been true for past generations of students. Given this, Florida Tech’s mission is to help prepare its students to enter, help shape, and succeed in that world: “to prepare students for entering the global workforce, seeking higher-education opportunities, and serving within their communities” (Mission, 2013). Thus, this QEP has been designed to provide Florida Tech students with a wider range of academic and non-academic experiences designed to better prepare them for their future in this kind of world.

Finally, this overarching purpose may be viewed from the perspective of Florida Tech as a higher education institution within the SACSCOC region. “The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is the component of the reaffirmation process that reflects and affirms the commitment of the Commission on Colleges to enhancing the quality of higher education in the region and to
focusing attention on student learning … The QEP should be embedded within the institution’s ongoing institution-wide planning and evaluation process and may very well evolve from this existing process” (SACSCOC, 2011, pp. 39-40). Although this QEP Plan has been developed to address requirements set forth by SACSCOC, fulfilling these is not the overarching purpose of this QEP. Rather, as noted above, the overarching purpose of this QEP is help maintain, strengthen, and broaden ongoing internationalization efforts at Florida Tech, and the purpose of this Plan is to document how Florida Tech will do that in manner that is consistent with these requirements.

4.2. Goals
The list of needs and associated opportunities presented in Section 3.5 is extensive. During the period of review and discussion of these needs in Fall 2014, it became clear that this list was far too broad for this QEP Plan. Thus, this review and discussion process with College Deans, members of the QEPAC and ICC, and other key faculty and staff naturally led to a narrowing of the scope of this QEP. As a result, decisions were made to focus this QEP on (a) academic offerings, specifically on a new minor in Global Cultural Studies designed to be available to most undergraduate students, and (b) non-academic offerings, specifically a new certificate program in Cross-Cultural Competence that would be available to all undergraduate students. The narrowing of the scope of this QEP Plan is central to this discussion because these new programs must reflect the content of and contribute to the achievement of the goals for this QEP.

With these purposes and these new programs in mind, there are two primary goals for this QEP. Each of these goals focuses on better preparing Florida Tech graduates to work in global, international, and intercultural contexts, both in the U.S. and abroad (i.e., as effective members of the global workforce). Each goal, and the rationale for it, is described below.

**Goal 1, Expand Knowledge and Understanding of Global Cultures:** Florida Tech students will expand their awareness, knowledge, and understanding of global cultures through academic study. The rationale for this goal is apparent in the University Mission (2013) and Strategic Plan (2012) and, in the wider higher education literature, on the higher educational needs in this area (e.g., ACE, 2008, Appendix C, p. 108). This goal will be addressed and achieved by a new academic minor in Global Cultural Studies.

**Goal 2, Develop Cross-Cultural Competence:** Florida Tech students will demonstrate a greater willingness to interact with, accept, understand, and learn from those who are from
nations, cultures, and ethnic groups other than their own. There are two rationales for this goal. First, as indicated in the findings and summary of needs presented in Section 3, there is a growing number of international students on the Florida Tech, so it is increasingly common for U.S. student and for international students to interact with students from nations, cultures, and ethnic backgrounds other that their own. However, there are several apparent barriers to interaction and understanding on the part of both U.S. and international students. These barriers reflect limitations in many students’ existing level of cross-cultural competence that, in turn, can limit further development of this competence. Furthering students’ development of this competence in the confines of a safe university campus environment will benefit individual student developmentally, as well as help develop the kind of campus community and culture that is reflected in the Core Values within the Strategic Plan (2012). Second, and of equal importance, these same barriers can and do exist in the business world, and limitations in cross-cultural competence limit the ability of any graduate, including Florida Tech graduates, to function effectively in global, international, and intercultural work settings. Given this, furthering the development of students’ cross-cultural competence will parallel and complement Goal 1, expanding Florida Tech graduates’ knowledge and understanding of global cultures. This premise that Goals 1 and 2 can be, and even need to be, complementary is not new (e.g., ACE, 2007). This goal will be addressed and achieved by the new non-academic certificate program in Cross-Cultural Competence.

4.3. Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are statements of what students will know, be able to do, and be willing to do upon completion of their participation in a designated education or training program (e.g., Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom et al., 1956; Gronlund, 2006; Harrow, 1972; Krathwohl et al., 1964; SACSCOC, 2013). In the context of this QEP, these outcome statements pertain to what Florida Tech undergraduate students will know, be able to do, and be willing to do at the time of their graduation.

To begin, the selection of competencies and development of more specific SLOs for university-level international education is difficult because the literature in this area offers limited guidance.

What competencies do students need to become world citizens and succeed in today’s global workforce? What learning outcomes should institutions of higher learning focus on to enable students to meet the challenges of the 21st century? There is no easy answer and, while there have been many attempts to answer these questions, there is no consensus. Part of the problem … is the interdisciplinary nature of the competencies.
Each field brings to the debate its own perspectives and there has been little discussion among them. (ACE, 2008, p. 106)

Despite this apparent lack of consensus, there now appears to be modest agreement on competencies in this area. For example, in 2012, the U.S. Department of Education issued a strategic report on international education for K-16 programs, in which one of the three objectives was “to increase global competencies.” This report referenced the work of the Global Competence Task Force, which defined *globally competent individuals* as follows: “those who use their knowledge and skills to investigate the world beyond their immediate environment, recognize their own and others’ perspectives, communicate their ideas effectively with diverse audiences, and translate their ideas into appropriate actions” (U.S. Department of Education, 2012, p. 5). In addition, a recent review of the literature on goals for global citizenship education by Zahabioun, *et al.* (2013) proposed the following as curriculum goals in this area: (1) promotion of knowledge and understanding (e.g., understanding of existing differences, awareness of issues); (2) improvement of skills (e.g., critical thinking including the ability to analyze and compare, self-assessment and mutual understanding); and (3) enhancement of values and attitudes (e.g., moral values such as tolerance, respect for differences, compassion, and empathy) (Table 4, p. 204). It is noteworthy that recent statements such as these, developed by different groups using different methods, feature the development of the knowledge and understanding, skills, and dispositions that will enable them to interact and work with people from diverse cultures in real-world settings (e.g., social, academic, business, and humanitarian).

In 2010, the ICC Subcommittee on Academic Strategies took the first step to develop a set of competencies and learning outcomes for international education at Florida Tech. This Committee developed a survey called the *Global Learning Priorities Scale*, based upon a lengthy list of possible competencies prepared by ACE (2008, Appendix C, pp. 106-110), and distributed copies to each of Florida Tech’s Colleges. A total of 82 responses were received. These responses were used to identify “the most highly endorsed *global learning outcomes*, notably those ranked among the top three outcomes by more than 50% of respondents (ICC, 2011, pp. 6-7). This resulting set of competencies or global learning outcomes included the following.

1. **Knowledge**
   a. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues, processes, trends and systems (51%)
   b. Understands his/her culture in global and comparative context (56%)
2. Skills
   c. Uses knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to
      think critically and solve problems (58%)
   d. Adapts his/her behavior to interact effectively with those who are different (52%)
3. Dispositions
   e. Is willing to learn from others who are culturally different from him/her (57%)
   f. Accepts cultural differences and tolerates cultural ambiguity (51%)

These global learning outcomes correspond to the QEP Goals presented in the previous section
(i.e., outcomes a-c correspond to Goal 1, and outcomes d-f correspond to Goal 2). This
 correspondence is evidence of support within and across Florida Tech for those QEP goals.

As valuable and useful as this initial set of global learning outcomes has been, they do not serve
as the final set of student learning outcomes (SLOs) for this Plan. The reason for this is simple.
To be valid, any set of SLOs must reflect the specific kinds of programs in which students
will participate, the kinds of activities in which those students will engage, and the contexts or
settings in which they will do so (e.g., Airasian & Russell, 2008; Chase, 1999; Gronlund, 2006;
Mertler, 2003; Oosterhof, 2001; Popham, 2011). Thus, for this QEP, it is vital that the final set
of SLOs closely reflect the unique features of and needs at Florida Tech (Section 3) and the
unique design features of the new academic and non-academic programs to be developed and
implemented for this QEP (Section 6). In addition, these SLOs should reflect the form of SLOs
recommended by SACSCOC (e.g., SACSCOC, 2011, pp. 44-45).

The set of SLOs for each QEP goal and associated new program, as adapted from the global
learning outcomes above, are presented below and on the next page.

**Goal 1. Expand Knowledge and Understanding of Global Cultures through the New
Academic Minor**

SLO 1.1: Graduates will be able to communicate their knowledge and understanding
of conditions, trends, systems, and problems and issues in other global cultures (adapted from 1.a)

SLO 1.2: Graduates will be able to explain how features of their own culture and other
students’ cultures influence their perception of conditions, trends, systems, and
problems and issues in other global cultures (adapted from 1.b)

SLO 1.3: Graduates will demonstrate their ability to use their knowledge, diverse cultural
frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically, analyze
complex problems and issues, and develop strategies for solving them (*adapted from 2.c*)

SLO 1.4: Graduates will demonstrate their willingness and ability to work with and learn from those who are from academic fields, as well as from nations, cultures and ethnicities other than their own (*adapted from 3.e*)

**Goal 2. Develop Cross-Cultural Competence through the New Certificate Program**

SLO 2.1: Graduates will demonstrate their willingness to seek out opportunities to interact with those who are from nations, cultures and ethnicities other than their own in interpersonal and social settings (*adapted from 3.e*)

SLO 2.2: Graduates will demonstrate their willingness and ability to accept cultural differences and tolerate cultural ambiguity in interpersonal and social settings (*adapted from 3.f*)

SLO 2.3: Graduates will demonstrate their willingness and ability to adapt their behavior to interact effectively with those who are from nations, cultures and ethnicities other than their own in interpersonal and social settings (*adapted from 2.d*)

SLO 2.4: Graduates will demonstrate their willingness and ability to learn from those who are from nations, cultures and ethnicities other than his/her own in interpersonal and social settings (*adapted from 3.e*)
5. Review of Literature and Recognized Practices

5.1. Overview of Internationalization in Higher Education

Dolby and Rahman (2008) provide a concise overview of historical developments in the area of internationalization in higher education within the U.S.

In the aftermath of World War I, the Institute of International Education (IIE) was founded with the mission of promoting international peace and understanding. In its early years, the IIE instituted educational exchanges with European universities, created International Relations clubs on U.S. campuses, and lobbied for the creation of nonimmigrant visas, allowing visiting students and scholars to bypass the restrictive immigration quotas imposed by the Immigration Act of 1921 (Bu, 2003) … The Fulbright Program was established by Congress in 1946, and in 1947 the Council on Student Travel (now the Council on International Education Exchange or CIEE) was founded … In 1948, NAFSA: The Association of International Educators was established as the National Association of Foreign Study Advisors to provide a professional organization, Training, and development of the advisors responsible for the growing population of International students on U.S. campuses … During the early years of internationalizing higher education, the primary concern was geopolitical … [P]erhaps the most significant from the policy perspective was the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 and the subsequent creation of Title VI area studies centers at universities throughout the United States (O’Meara, Mehlinger, & Newman, 2001; Ruther, 2002) … in 1966 the International Education Act was passed but not funded … As federal policy became less central of a central issue in international education through the 1970s and 1980 scholarly interest in this area also waned … Economic priorities began to predominate in the 1990s and soon merged with the renewed focus on international security concerns in the early part of the 21st century.

With reference to more recent influences on internationalization, ACE has attempted to articulate both the differences and relationships between globalization and internationalization (ACE, 2003). For example, “A fairly neutral definition [of globalization] points to the flow of ideas, capital, people, and goods around the world in the context of diminishing importance of national borders. For some, globalization is simply the description of an unstoppable reality … [that] has provided greater impetus for internationalization” (ACE, 2003, pp. 2-3).
A definition of internationalization in higher education was presented in Section 3. Consistent with that definition, internationalization initiatives in higher education have continued to build upon the historical developments outlined by Dolby and Rahman (2008) above, both in response to and in reaction to these recent, large-scale globalizations trends (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 1999). As a result, internationalization in higher education functions on three scales: the macro scale, which involves arrangements and planning at the international and national levels (e.g., IIE and Fulbright Programs); at the meso scale, which involves institutional arrangements and planning at the state and local levels (e.g., campus internationalization plans by SACSCOC institutions); and at the micro scale, which involves arrangements and planning at the campus unit and program level. This QEP focuses on specific programs in the broad area of internationalization only at the micro scale (Goals 1 and 2). However, efforts will be made to coordinate these programs with other meso-scale campus internationalization efforts led by ICC, as discussed in Section 3.3, as well as to continue to pay attention to other relevant macro-scale opportunities (e.g., participation in IIE, ACE, and NAFSA activities; partnerships and twinning programs with universities abroad as identified in Appendix C). For this reason, ongoing attention to internationalization networks and initiatives at the national and international level will continue to be needed, both within and beyond this QEP, for Florida Tech to become “recognized as one of the top ten private technological universities in the world” (Strategic Plan, 2012, p. 2).

5.2. Research on Internationalization in Higher Education

From a review of sources and studies, it became apparent that the state of research in this area can be characterized in several ways. First, research in this area is diverse. It has been conducted at different kinds of higher education institutions (e.g., community colleges, liberal arts colleges, public and private universities), in a wide range of academic fields (e.g., business, career and vocational education, counseling, engineering, foreign languages, journalism, library and information science, nursing, the sciences, teacher education, and veterinary medicine), and about different kinds of global/international education programs, ranging from traditional Study Abroad programs (e.g., Akli, 2013; Lewin, 2009) to more contemporary e-learning (e.g., Mihhailova, 2006). The goals and objectives of international programs reflect this diversity, as do the instruments used to measure program outcomes and impacts.

Second, research in this area is not well organized. From their review of research trends, Dolby and Rahman (2008) found that “research on internationalization of higher education has lacked a well-defined academic ‘home’.” One reason for this is that the task of organizing, reviewing and summarizing this research does not fall within any single academic field; rather, it would
require cooperation from professionals in many fields. A second reason is that this diversity also makes it difficult to identify and access potentially relevant studies due to the sizable number of national and international research journals in which such studies are published, and equally difficult to interpret findings due to differences in terminology and frameworks used in these different fields. Thus, one might look outside academia to professional organizations to facilitate the organization, review, and summarize findings from this body of research. However, there is no evidence on the ACE and NAFSA websites that either does this. Further, although IIE has “pioneered applied research and policy analysis in the field of international student mobility” and published reports on best practices (http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Research-Projects), this addresses only part of this need for a home to organize, review and summarize research. The significance of this for this QEP is that there are very few reviews, syntheses, and summaries of research findings in this broad area.

Third, research on internationalization in higher education has been influenced by national and international policy. For example, Dolby and Rahman (2008) indicated that “given the critical role and importance of federal policy in the internationalization of higher education … it is not surprising that policy analysis and evaluation was a significant focus of research in the 1960s and 1970s” and further, that “as federal policy became less of a central issue … through the 1970s and 1980s, scholarly interest in this area waned.” On a more contemporary basis, due to the recent explosion of interest in internationalization in higher education, the relationship between national-level policies and university practices has itself become a topic of substantial research interest (e.g., Ayoubi & Massoud, 2007; Frolich, 2006; Lo, 2009; Luxon & Peelo, 2009; Pellert, 1998; Takagi, 2009). Although such macro-scale policy research may be relevant to Florida Tech’s internationalization efforts, policy research offers limited guidance to university programming at the micro-scale for QEPs such as this.

Fourth, most research in this area is oriented toward practice. As indicated by Dolby and Rahman (2008), “research in internationalization in higher education emerged essentially from what began as a field of professional practice.” Thus, it is not surprising that few reviews of research by IIE and by others that do exist in the literature tend to focus on practice (e.g., Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Lewin, 2009; Littrell & Salas, 2005). For example, in their review of research trends, Dolby and Rahman (2008) refer to “the third research trajectory in internationalization of higher education … [as] academic aspects of international education.” They cite studies of practice, including studies of the experiences, performance, and personal growth of both U.S. and international students, comparative analyses of university efforts to internationalize the curriculum, and efforts to assess the outcomes of policies and programs at a small number of
universities. In line with Dolby and Rahman’s (2008) third research trajectory, most of the studies on internationalization in higher education located in peer-reviewed journals tended to reflect these and similar aspects of practice. Many reported on in-depth studies of program practices at a single university (e.g., Baernholdt, Drake, Maron, & Neymark, 2013; Choi, Khamalah, Kim, & Burg, 2014; Holland & de Velasco, 1999; Walton & Basciano, 2006), while some reported on surveys of a narrower or broader range of practices across a sizable number of universities (e.g., ACE, 2008, 2012; Finkelstein et al., 2013; Horn et al., 2012). However, very few of the studies located in this search involved an in-depth comparison of programs at multiple universities (e.g., Childress, 2009; Pechak & Thompson, 2011), and none involved the use of control or comparison groups (i.e., both substantive and methodological limitations).

In summary, although the volume of research on internationalization in higher education is substantial, some segments are not relevant to this QEP (e.g., policy research). Of the research that is relevant to this QEP, most tends to be very diverse (i.e., with respect to type of institution, academic field, and type of international program), disorganized (i.e., few comprehensive bibliographic collections or summaries of findings), and largely composed of studies that reflect programming at one or a small number of institutions (e.g., case studies). As a result, studies in academic fields and program areas relevant to this QEP were difficult to locate, often of questionable empirical quality and/or limited generalizability, and therefore of questionable value. Thus, rather than attempt to develop generalizations from this small number of selected studies, greater attention was given to the review of literature and university practices that are of more immediate relevance to this QEP.

5.3. Reviews of University-Wide Internationalization Practices
Two reviews of university-wide internationalization efforts were undertaken to better understand the nature and scope of internationalization programs and practices at comparable higher education institutions. The first was a review of internationalization programs undertaken for QEP purposes by universities within the SACS region. The second was a review of comprehensive internationalization programs at selected universities that have been recognized by NAFSA as part of its Senator Paul Simon Awards for Campus Internationalization. Of these, the colleges and universities in this first review are at varying stages of internationalization, while those in the second review may be considered exemplary. Key findings from each of these reviews will be presented below, with particular attention to those that pertain to the goals and actions for this QEP (see Sections 4 and 6).
5.3.1. Review of International QEPs within the SACS Region

Members of the QEP Research Team undertook a review of universities within the SACSCOC region that began a QEP in the area of internationalization between 2007-2011. Nearly all of this information was drawn from reports housed on the SACSCOC website (www.sacscoc.org). The results of this review are summarized in Appendix K. A total of 23 colleges and universities focused their QEP on internationalization during this time period. Of these, eight were colleges and 15 were universities, of which 16 were private (all 8 colleges and 8 universities). Those institutions of particular interest were: (a) those ranked higher than Florida Tech by U.S. News and World Report in 2014 (Duke University: #7; and Southern Methodist University: #60); (b) technological universities (Southern Polytechnic State University); and (c) those of comparable size (i.e., 2,500 – 4,500 students: Anderson University; Bellarmine University; Flagler College; and Southeastern University).

One major part in this review involved the identification of the primary emphasis of each of these 23 QEPs (see Appendix K). Many of these QEPs placed sole emphasis on on-campus curricular and/or co-curricular approaches to internationalization (n=10), including Florida International University and Southeastern University. Of these, many focused on programs for first-year students and/or on core requirements. Three QEPs placed primary emphasis on Study Abroad Programs, including Duke University and Anderson University. In addition, several of these QEPs included an emphasis on faculty development in conjunction with curriculum enhancements (e.g., Bellarmine University, Covenant College, and Regent University). Further, three QEPs placed primary emphasis on some form of experiential learning, community service, and/or service-learning, one of which was Southern Methodist University. Finally, a total of six QEPs featured living/learning communities, either alone (e.g., Flagler College’s QEP), or in combination with on-campus approaches and/or Study Abroad (e.g., Southern Polytechnic University).

Among these 23 QEPs, there is substantial support for the final goals and programs in Florida Tech’s QEP (see Sections 4 and 6). As was found in 10 of these 23 QEPs, Florida Tech’s QEP includes a major curriculum component, and as in three additional QEPs, Florida Tech’s QEP includes its Study Abroad Program (i.e., as part of the new Academic Minor). In addition, as in at least two of these 23 QEPs, Florida Tech’s QEP includes the development of cross-cultural competence as a major goal, as in three additional QEPs, Florida Tech’s QEP includes a major co- or extra-curricular component, (i.e., the new Certificate Program). Further, although community service and service-learning are not a primary emphasis of Florida Tech’s QEP (i.e., as they are in three QEPs), international service projects have been included in Florida Tech’s
QEP as part of the Certificate Program. Finally, six of these 23 QEPs include the development of Living/Learning Communities (LLCs). Even though decisions were made not to develop new International LLCs as part of Florida Tech’s QEP, there continues to be interest in this within Residence Life. For this reason, if and when such LLCs are developed on the Florida Tech campus, residence and active participation in LLC programs would be included in Florida Tech’s QEP as part of the Certificate Program. Thus, Florida Tech’s QEP will either emphasize or accommodate most of the approaches to internationalization that are featured in these 23 QEPs.

Given this, one possible question or concern is whether Florida Tech’s QEP is too inclusive and therefore too broad. During the period in which the broader set of proposed goals and program areas in Section 3 were under investigation and consideration, this may have been true. However, those proposed goals and programs were narrowed in Fall 2014, so the best response to this question is no. There are two reasons that support this response. First, both of the new programs to be developed for this QEP will build upon what already exists. Specifically, this QEP will use the variety of existing global/international courses (see Appendix C) to support the development of the new Academic Minor. Similarly, it will use the variety of existing extra-curricular offerings, some of which are described in Appendix J, to support the development of the new non-academic Certificate Program. Second, this QEP will support the gradual addition of global/international courses that fit this new academic minor (i.e., two per year), as well as the gradual expansion of existing extra-curricular offerings (e.g., UE Course opportunities, 3C Training Workshops, and the International Festival) and the gradual addition of new ones (e.g., International Education Week). This gradual expansion will allow for the stable development and expansion of these new international programs, which is in the university’s interest. For these reasons, the overall design and scope of this QEP appears to be feasible, sustainable, and therefore appropriate.

5.3.2 Review of Selected Recipients of NAFSA’s Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization

The second review focused on comprehensive internationalization programs at selected universities that had been recognized by NAFSA.

The Senator Paul Award for Campus Internationalization recognizes colleges and universities that are making significant, well-planned, well-executed, and well-documented progress toward comprehensive internationalization – especially those using innovative and creative approaches … The Simon Award for Comprehensive
Using print copies of NAFSA’s annual *Internationalizing the Campus Reports* and the NAFSA website, members of the QEP Research Team conducted a review of recipients of the Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization since 2006. Community college and four-year college recipients were not included in this review. Similar to the previously described review of SACSCOC institutions, particular attention was given to: (a) institutions in Florida Tech’s IPEDS Comparison group; (b) those ranked higher than Florida Tech by U.S. News and World Report in 2014; (c) technological universities; and (d) those located in Florida. The results of this review are summarized in Appendix L.

Seven universities were included in this review, and of these, two were in Florida Tech’s IPEDS Comparison group, four were ranked nationally, three were technological (STEM) universities, and one was a state university in Florida. The only two private universities were Carnegie Mellon University and Northeastern University, both of which are in Florida Tech’s IPEDS Comparison Group. These two universities had the smallest undergraduate enrollment (6,200 and 13,200, respectively), followed by Georgia Tech (14,600). The four remaining institutions were large public universities, each with an undergraduate enrollment greater than 30,000. Finally, the only university founded after 1900 was the University of South Florida, indicating that almost all are long- and well-established institutions. In light of these general characteristics, the universities of greatest relevance here are Carnegie Mellon, Northeastern, and Georgia Tech, even though these are older and larger than Florida Tech. However, the four large public universities are included for general comparison purposes.

The following are prominent features of internationalization programs are from those universities most relevant to Florida Tech for this QEP:

- all three have an Office of International Education or of International Studies;
- all three have developed a distinctive approach to global/international curriculum offerings. Georgia Tech has a School of International Affairs and a School of Modern Languages as well as a Center for International Business Education and Research, Northeastern has a World Language Center as well an online Dialogue of Civilizations Program (http://www.northeastern.edu/studyabroad/programs/?type=Dialogue+of+Civilizations), and Carnegie
Mellon has a less centralized, infusion-oriented program called *Global Awareness Across the Curriculum*;

- all three have a vigorous Study Abroad Program. Georgia Tech’s is part of *The International Plan* “that integrates overseas experience, language proficiency, and globally-focused coursework into any participating major” ([http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/specialacademic/international.php](http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/specialacademic/international.php)). Northeastern’s program is called *International Co-op* ([http://www.northeastern.edu/internationalcoop/](http://www.northeastern.edu/internationalcoop/)), and supports study abroad in an extensive list of fields;
- only Georgia Tech has an established International LLC; and
- only Northeastern has a major extra-curricular event, specifically an international festival for the campus community called *Carnevale*, which lasts for two months.

The four large public universities included in this review (*Appendix H*) reflect similar international program characteristics to those described above, although these are more likely to have an administrative position for all internationalization efforts (e.g., an Associate Provost, Associate Dean, or Director).

### 5.3.3 Summary on Comprehensive Internationalization

It is evident why the universities above were recognized by NAFSA: each has given clear attention to the elements (*target areas*) of Comprehensive Internationalization set forth by ACE.

Comprehensive internationalization, as defined by CIGE [ACE’s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement], is a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions.

The CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization is comprised of six interconnected target areas for institutional initiatives, policies, and programs:

- *Articulated Institutional Commitment* [Program Planning, Internationalization Committee, Campus Stakeholders, and Assessment];
- *Administrative Structure and Staffing* [Senior Leadership, and International Office];
- *Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes* [General Education Requirements, International Courses in the Disciplines, Co-Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes, and Technology];
- *Faculty Policies and Practices* [Tenure and Promotion Policies, Hiring Guidelines, Faculty Mobility, and On Campus Professional Development];
- *Student Mobility* [Credit Transfer Policies, Financial Aid and Funding, Orientation and
Re-Entry Programs, and Ongoing Support and Programs for International Students];
• Collaboration and Partnerships [Strategic Planning, Partner Selection, Formal Agreements, Assessment, and Partnership Tracking]. (http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx, with material in [ ] added from links).

In Appendix L, the results of a review of selected university recipients of the Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization provided evidence regarding four of these target areas (i.e., second, third, fifth, and sixth), although for any university to advance in these areas, the first also must be in place. The only ACE CIGE target area that was not readily apparent in NAFSA’s annual reports for these Simon Award recipients was the fourth target area, faculty policies and practices.

Given the close relationship between characteristics of NAFSA Simon Award recipients and the target areas in the ACE CIGE model, two questions arise. First and more broadly, are Florida Tech’s internationalization efforts on a path toward the kind of comprehensive internationalization that is apparent in this model and these award-winning universities? More specifically, has this QEP been designed to advance Florida Tech’s internationalization efforts in these areas? The answer to both of these questions is yes, and there is reasonable evidence in this Plan to support each answer.

• **Articulated Institutional Commitment**: Evidence of this is provided in Section 3.2 which presents a description of key features of Florida Tech’s Mission (2013) and Strategic Plan (2012), and in Section 3.3 which contains a description of the roles and contributions of ICC. This QEP is additional evidence of these commitments.

• **Administrative Structure and Staffing**: Evidence of this is provided in Section 7 and Appendix M, which identify the units that will house the new QEP Director (Division of Student Affairs) and Faculty Coordinator (School of Arts and Communication), and where these units fit within the university’s administrative structure. With the hiring of these key QEP personnel, this QEP is designed to advance efforts in this target area.

• **Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes**: Evidence of this is provided in Sections 4 and 6, and in Appendix D. As described in Section 6, this QEP will result in a new Academic Minor and a new non-academic Certificate Program, as well as expanded curricular and extra-curricular offerings that are designed to achieve the student learning outcomes described in Section 4.
• **Faculty Policies and Practices:** Although faculty members will become involved in this QEP and new Academic Minor in several ways (e.g., membership on the Academic Minor Sub-Committee; teaching existing courses for this new Minor; designing, developing, teaching, and assessing new required and elective courses for this new Minor; involvement in the development and use of new academic advising forms), for the most part, this ACE CIGE target area lies beyond the scope of this QEP.

• **Student Mobility:** Evidence of this is provided in Section 3 and Appendix C. This QEP will encourage students to become active members in International Student Organizations as part of the new Certificate Program, as well as recognize and expand existing opportunities for U.S. students to go abroad as part of both the new Academic Minor and the new Certificate Program (Section 6).

• **Collaboration and Partnerships:** This ACE CIGE target area lies outside of the scope of this QEP.

5.4. Review of Literature and Practices for Programs New to Florida Tech
The actions planned for this QEP focus on the development of two programs that will be new to Florid Tech. The first new program fits within proposed program area 1, global/international academic offerings (Section 3.4.1), and will focus on a new academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies (Section 6.2). The literature on and practices relevant to academic minors will be reviewed below. The second new program fits within proposed program area 3, campus community/culture offerings (Section 3.4.6), and will focus on a new non-academic Certificate on Cross-Cultural Competence (Section 6.3). The literature on and practices relevant to certificate programs also will be reviewed below.

5.4.1 Review of Practices Pertaining to the New Academic Minor
The QEP Coordinator ran several Internet searches using International Studies Minor, Global Studies Minor, and Global Cultural Studies Minor. A complete analysis of the results of these searches is beyond the scope of this planning process and section, although a number of findings appear to be relevant. First, college and university programs are called by different names, in part reflecting *different historical periods* in which they were begun (e.g., programs in International Relations at Florida International University), in part reflecting the *scale of and diversity within* the program (e.g., the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington; the Einaudi Center for International Studies at Cornell University), or some combination of the two (e.g., the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University, the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs at Georgia Tech). In larger
universities with established university programs such as these, as all of the universities ranked highest by U.S. News & World Report, it is not uncommon to find 5-10 majors and 10 or more minors within this broad area of international studies. Second, the more recent trends in globalization appear to have contributed to either an expansion of slightly older programs (e.g., programs now named International and Global Studies, or vice versa, at Rutgers, Brandeis, Penn State, and the University of California Santa Barbara), or a newer generation of Global Studies programs (e.g., the University of California Los Angeles, Illinois, Maryland, Nebraska Lincoln, Pittsburgh, Tennessee, Vermont, and Wisconsin Milwaukee). Third, as a result of these longer-standing and more recent trends (Section 5.1), hundreds of colleges and universities across the U.S. now offer academic programs with either majors and minors, or only minors, in the area of International and/or Global Studies. This trend includes all of the universities within Florida Tech’s IPEDS group. Thus, if Florida Tech aspires to become one of the top ten technological universities in the world (Strategic Plan, 2012), it appears inevitable that Florida tech will need to expand majors, minors, and concentrations within a global/international focus beyond those currently in place (see Section 3.4.2).

One of the interesting trends apparent in this newer generation of Global Studies Programs is in the design and naming of more narrowly focused academic programs. For example, there are programs in Global Health Studies (e.g., Yale, Northwestern, and Washington University), Global Environmental Studies (e.g., Kenyon College, Clark University), Global Media Studies (e.g., University of Michigan, New York University), and Global Education Studies (e.g., University of Illinois, University of Virginia). Of particular relevance to this QEP are those universities that offer programs in Global Cultural Studies (e.g., Auburn University, Duke University, and the University of California Irvine), variations on this (e.g., majors and minors in area studies as part of The Ohio State University’s International Studies Program), programs that combines Cultural Studies with Study Abroad (e.g., Columbia University’s Global French Program, the University of British Columbia’s Go Global program), or some unique combination that includes Global Cultural Studies (e.g., Emory University’s program in Global Health, Culture and Society; the University of Virginia’s program in Global Culture and Commerce). The presence of university programs in specific fields of study offers support for the decision to develop an Academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies for this QEP, a step that will contribute to the expansion of Florida Tech’s academic programs with a global/international focus.

5.4.2 Review of Practices Associated with the New Certificate Program
The QEP Coordinator also ran several Internet searches in the area of global/international certificate programs. Searches using either international or global certificate programswere
complicated in that these terms identified a sizable number and mix of certificate programs for employees or for international students that were not relevant to this QEP.

For this reason, additional searches were run using certificate programs in cross-cultural (or intercultural) competence (3C). Searches using this were more productive, although the number of university-based certificate programs in this area is limited. Several of these certificate programs were designed for working professionals at the post-baccalaureate level (e.g., at the University of California Davis; for health-care professionals at Winston-Salem State University and at the College of Staten Island, CUNY; for education professionals at Pacific University; in the School of International Service at American University). Other certificate programs were designed for undergraduates, but were designed as coursework-only programs (e.g., the University of Iowa; in human services at Fresno State University; in counseling and educational psychology at the University of Missouri; for the Honors College at Washington State University). Although these programs are of some relevance to the design of the new Certificate Program at Florida Tech, these differences in target audience and/or approaches render them of less immediate relevance.

Four programs were located that featured goals, target audiences, and approaches that more closely resembles those in this new Certificate Program, and therefore are of greater interest. One is the Cultural Competence Certificate Program at Macomb Community College, which targets, among others, students, and which uses non-academic offerings to further 3C. Completion of this certificate requires a minimum of 20 contact hours. Campus offerings are identifiable by the tag “applies to the Cultural Competence Certificate” and progress maybe tracked online (http://www.macomb.edu/future-students/campus-life/MMII/cultural-competency-certificate.html). A second relevant program is the Cultural Competency Certificate Program offered by San Diego State University, “one of the most diverse and inclusive universities in the nation.” This was the first such Certificate Program offered in the California State University system. Workshops, seminars, service-learning opportunities, interactive dialogue programs, and feedback are used to further the development of 3C (http://go.sdsu.edu/student_affairs/intercultural/certificate1.aspx). A third program is the Cultural Competency Certificate Program, which began at The College of St. Scholastica in 2013. This program is open to all traditional first-year students, and is “a non academic, non credit, co-curricular, certificate” that does not appear on academic transcripts (http://www.css.edu/administration/office-of-diversity-and-inclusion/cultural-competency-certificate-program.html). A fourth program is the Global Pathways Certificate Program at Florida State University. It was designed to maximize “the rich cultural learning experiences available to you on campus, in the community and abroad”.
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Certificate requirements do include academic coursework (i.e., 4 courses, study of a language), as well as international experience, international events or activities on campus, and a synthesis project. ([http://global.fsu.edu/students/certificate/certificate.htm](http://global.fsu.edu/students/certificate/certificate.htm)). Each of these certificate programs reflects the somewhat unique characteristics of the institution in which it is offered, much as will this new Certificate Program at Florida Tech. At the same time, there are distinct features of each of these programs that are reflected in the design of this new Certificate Program at Florida Tech that is presented in Section 6.3 (e.g., an emphasis on non-academic experience; the use of workshops, campus events/activities, service projects, and international experience to help develop 3C; the inclusion of required and optional elements; a minimum number of contact hours or points; some type of synthesis experience).
6. DESIGN AND PLANS FOR ACTIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED

6.1. Overview of the QEP Design
The actions planned for this QEP have been selected and designed in response to identified needs within the university (Section 3), associated goals (Section 4), and a review of literature and practices (Section 5). Based upon comments from the QEPAC, Deans, and others, the proposed goals and program areas outlined in Section 3.5 were narrowed. For example, almost all indicated that it was vital and timely to address needs in the area of global and academic offerings. Further, there was strong support for non-academic means to address needs in the area of cross-cultural interactions, communication, and understanding. However, few supported the development of new International LLCs as a major element of this QEP, and those most involved in international events and activities on campus indicated that program needs in this area were being addressed by other campus units and organizations, such as ICC, ISSS, and ISSO (see Appendix J).

By the end of this process, there was widespread agreement on two major focal points for this QEP, as reflected in the goals and student learning outcomes in Section 4. First, a new undergraduate academic minor in Global Cultural Studies will be developed to address Goal 1: Expand Knowledge and Understanding of Global Cultures. Similarly, a new undergraduate non-academic certificate program in Cross-Cultural Competence will be developed to address Goal 2: Develop Cross-Cultural Competence. The specific actions planned for each of these new programs will be described in reasonable detail in the next two sections (i.e., Sections 6.2 and 6.3).

The initial actions to accomplish these two goals are outlined below. These actions focus on getting the right personnel in place to develop, finalize, implement, and evaluate these two new programs.

- **Hire a QEP Director:** This full-time Director will have primary responsibility for all QEP evaluation, database, archive and reporting activities, as well as all planned activities associated with the new non-academic certificate program. These roles and responsibilities will include: appointing members to and Chairing the QEPIC (below); working with staff and faculty who provide services vital to this QEP (e.g., branding and marketing; assessment and evaluation support); Chairing the QEPIC subcommittee for the non-academic certificate program; and serving as an ex officio member of the QEPIC subcommittee tasked to
support the new academic minor; and serving as an ex officio member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UGCC).

- **Hire a Faculty Coordinator for the New Minor.** This new full-time faculty member will actively assist the QEP Director in all QEP evaluation, database, archive and reporting activities, as well as oversee all planned activities associated with the new academic minor program. This Coordinator’s roles and responsibilities will include: serving on the QEPIC; Chairing the QEPIC subcommittee for the academic minor; serving as an ex officio member of the QEPIC subcommittee for new non-academic certificate program; and serving as an ex officio member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UGCC).

- **Establish a QEP Implementation Committee (QEPIC).** This university-wide committee will include representation from: the university administration, Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and Student Government, ICC, and units that have an active role the new academic minor and new non-academic certificate program;

- **Within QEPIC, Form a Sub-Committee for Each New Program.** The Sub-Committee for the new Academic Minor will include the Faculty Coordinator (Chair), QEP Director, the instructors of courses required in the minor, and at least one faculty member from each of the on-campus Colleges and from the university’s online program. This Sub-Committee will assist and support to the Faculty Coordinator, as well as these instructors, in all aspects of this program (e.g., design of new courses and course-based assessments, list of approved elective courses, development of advising forms, interpretation and uses of assessment and evaluation data). The Sub-Committee for the new non-academic Certificate Program will include the QEP Director (Chair), Faculty Coordinator, and representatives of campus units and organizations involved in the certificate program (e.g., the UE Course Coordinator, ICCM, ICC, ISSS, ISSO, International Student Organizations, Student Government Association, Office of Civic Engagement, and other options abroad). This Sub-Committee will assist and support the QEP Director, as well as these program providers, in all aspects of this program (e.g., design of requirements and assessments, the list of approved activities and point allocations, design of databases for tracking student participation, and interpretation and uses of assessment and evaluation data).

**6.2. Planned Actions for the New Academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies**

The actions planned to address Goal 1 and the associated set of student learning outcomes (Sections 4.2 and 4.3) focus on the development of a new academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies that will be available to students in nearly all undergraduate degree programs at Florida
Tech. These plans include (a) the design of this new Minor, and (b) steps to be taken to finalize, gain approval for, implement, gather assessment data for, and evaluate this new Minor. According to university policy: “Colleges/departments may designate minors that require 18-21 credit hours of selected coursework, excluding the core courses COM 1101, COM 1102, HUM 2051 and one Humanities (HUM) core course from the published list … no more than nine credit hours applied to the minor may be named courses for the major” (2014-15 University Catalog, p. 37).

Consistent with these policies, the design of this new Minor is presented in Table 6.1 (p.50). This design resembles the design of the Sustainability Minor in that both include required introductory and culminating courses, and both permit students to choose courses from a restricted list of electives in areas relevant to the minor (2014-15 University Catalog, p.214). However, this new Minor in Global Cultural Studies will focus exclusively on the study of human cultures, and therefore does not include courses in the natural and physical sciences. Further, based on recommendations from the College Deans, this new Minor has been designed to allow students to maximize the use of elective courses in their degree programs to fulfill these minor requirements (i.e., Humanities or HUM, Social Science or SS, Liberal Arts of LA, and Free Electives). Allowing students to select Coursework Areas, select courses within each Area, and fit these courses as electives in their degree programs will provide the flexibility needed to allow this new Minor to fit within all but the most restrictive degree programs.

Due, in part, to the small number of courses in the social sciences with a global/international focus (see PSY and SOC courses in Appendix C), two additional courses will be developed for this Minor each year during Years 2-5. To ensure that maximum value is derived from new elective courses, those who wish to develop such courses will be required to submit a proposal to the Faculty Coordinator that contains the following: (a) a proposed course prefix, number, and title; (b) a course description, including unique content and design features; (c) a description of the relevance of the proposed course to this new Minor, and of its fit to the Coursework Areas identified in Table 6.1 (p. 50); (d) evidence of need and student interest; (e) a description of any assessments that will be associated with this new Minor, this QEP, or the wider university assessment program; and (f) a plan and timetable for implementation. Each new course, as well as any substantive modifications to existing courses, must be reviewed and approved by UGGC. This review and approval, along with (e), above, are designed to institutionalize and sustain these new course enhancements.
Table 6.1.
*Design of the New Academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies*

**A. Required Courses:** 6 credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Courses</th>
<th>Type(s) of Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Course: PSY 1464, Psychology of Cultural Identity (3 crs.)</td>
<td>SS, LA, or Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Course: HUM 3XXX, Ethics in a Global Age (3 crs.)</td>
<td>HUM, LA, or Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Elective Courses:** min. of 12 credits in 3 of more areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework Areas</th>
<th>Type(s) of Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Courses: 3 – 6 credits</td>
<td>HUM, LA, or Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Courses: min. of 2 semesters, 6 credits</td>
<td>HUM, LA, or Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Sociology Courses: 3 – 6 credits</td>
<td>SS, LA, or Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Courses: 3 – 6 credits</td>
<td>Free Electives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>Dependent on the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad: 3 – 6 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Only courses with a global/international focus can be used to meet Minor requirements. A list of current courses in each of these Coursework Areas is included in *Appendix C.*

As noted at the beginning of this section, the actions planned for this new Minor also include (b) steps to be taken to finalize, gain approval for, implement, gather assessment data for, and evaluate this new Minor. These planned actions are presented as a series of related and overlapping steps in Table 6.2 (p. 51), and are described in greater detail below.

As mentioned in Section 6.1, these planned actions begin with **Step 1: Personnel Decisions:** hiring a Faculty Coordinator for this minor and hiring a QEP Director (AY 2015-16), as well as the establishment of the QEPIC and Academic Minor Sub-committee (YR 1: AY 2016-17). On the basis of discussions with Dr. Kenkel, Dean of the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts, and Dr. Taylor, Head of the School of Arts and Communication, this new Faculty Coordinator will be housed in this School and College (R. Taylor, personal communication, December 12, 2014).

In YR 1, these key personnel, along with the developers/instructors of required courses, will undertake planned action for **Step 2: Program Development.** Dr. Kenkel, Dean of the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts, and Dr. Taylor, Head of the School of Arts and Communication,
### Table 6.2. Planned Actions for the New Minor in Global Cultural Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel: Faculty Coordinator</td>
<td>Hire Faculty Coordinator &amp; QEP Director</td>
<td>Oversee Minor Development &amp; Form Committee</td>
<td>Oversee Minor Implementation: CoPLA &amp; CoB</td>
<td>Oversee Minor Implementation: CoE &amp; CoS</td>
<td>Oversee Minor Implementation: CoA &amp; Other UG Programs</td>
<td>Oversee Ongoing Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel: QEP Minor Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: New Courses</td>
<td>Develop Syllabi for New Required Courses (2)</td>
<td><strong>Pilot</strong> Courses; Develop New Electives (2) &amp; Submit to UGCC</td>
<td><strong>Pilot</strong> New Electives; Develop New Electives (2) &amp; Submit to UGCC</td>
<td><strong>Pilot</strong> New Electives; Develop New Electives (2) &amp; Submit to UGCC</td>
<td><strong>Pilot</strong> New Electives; Develop New Electives (2) &amp; Submit to UGCC</td>
<td><strong>Pilot</strong> New Electives; Develop New Electives (2) &amp; Submit to UGCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: New Minor</td>
<td>Submit New Minor &amp; New Courses to UGCC</td>
<td>Formative Evaluation of Minor</td>
<td>Formative Evaluation of Minor</td>
<td>Formative Evaluation of Minor</td>
<td>Summative Evaluation of Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: New Assessment</td>
<td>Develop Assessments for the Minor</td>
<td><strong>Pilot</strong> Assessment</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement: New Acad. Advising Forms</td>
<td>Design Advising Forms for Minor</td>
<td>Develop, <strong>Pilot</strong> &amp; Refine Forms for CoPLA &amp; CoB UG Programs</td>
<td>Develop, <strong>Pilot</strong> &amp; Refine Forms for CoE &amp; CoS UG Programs</td>
<td>Develop, <strong>Pilot</strong> &amp; Refine Forms for CoA &amp; Other UG Programs</td>
<td>Develop, <strong>Pilot</strong> &amp; Refine Forms for Any New UG Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement: Faculty Orientation</td>
<td>Design Faculty Orientation</td>
<td>Orient Faculty in CoPLA &amp; CoB to New Minor &amp; Advising Forms</td>
<td>Orient Faculty in CoE &amp; CoS to New Minor &amp; Advising Forms</td>
<td>Orient Faculty in CoA &amp; Other Programs to New Minor &amp; Advising Forms</td>
<td>Orient New Faculty and Faculty in New UG Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement: Marketing to Students</td>
<td>Design Marketing Plan &amp; Materials</td>
<td>Market Minor to UGs in CoPLA &amp; CoB</td>
<td>Market Minor to UGs in CoE &amp; CoS</td>
<td>Market Minor to UGs in CoA &amp; Other UG Pr.</td>
<td>Market Minor to UGS in New UG Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also agreed to host this new Minor within this School and College (R. Taylor, personal communication, December 12, 2014). With this in place, planned actions in Step 2 will proceed with the development of syllabi for the new introductory and culminating courses required for this minor. Dr. Gabrenya offered to develop this new introductory course, PSY 1464, and provided a brief description of it: “Discuss cultural diversity in the United States and internationally from a psychological perspective. Examine psychological issues in multicultural group work, international teams, expatriate workers, immigrant workers, and performance in overseas assignments. Methods for developing competence for interaction between diverse individuals and groups are introduced” (W. Gabrenya, personal communication, November 21, 2014). In addition, Dr. Taylor and faculty in that School have tentatively agreed that the new culminating course should be a 3000-level Humanities (HUM) course. Further, they agreed that in this course: students would form interdisciplinary and intercultural teams; each team would select, investigate, and analyze real-world problems and issues in a chosen culture; and each team project would culminate in a final written report and presentation (R. Taylor, personal communication, December 12, 2014). The focus of this culminating course on problem-based projects is consistent with Florida Tech’s initial QEP (2005-2011) and academic culture. Finally, as part of the development of these syllabi, key personnel and course developers/instructors will develop assessments as described in Section 9 and in Step 4, below.

As indicated in Table 6.2 (p. 51), once these course syllabi and assessments have been developed, and other features of the Minor have been finalized in Year 1, key personnel will prepare and submit the paperwork required by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (see Adding a New Course to the Curriculum and Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum under University Forms for Faculty and Advisors at http://www.fit.edu/registrar/forms.php).

Once this new Minor and these new required and elective courses have been approved by UGCC, **Step 3: Program Implementation** can proceed. Implementation of this new Minor will be undertaken in three annual cycles over Years 2-4, as depicted in Table 6.2. In the first cycle (Year 2, AY 2017-18), implementation will begin in the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts and College of Business, which will include most online undergraduate degree programs. In the second cycle (Year 3, AY 2018-19), implementation will continue in the College of Engineering and College of Science. In the third cycle, implementation will take place in the College of Aeronautics and in any remaining undergraduate degree programs. As noted in Table 6.2, each annual cycle will include the following:
• the Faculty Coordinator and members of the Academic Minor Sub-Committee, in consultation with personnel in each College, will develop new academic advising forms that depict and describe how students in each major in each Colleges can fit the two required and four elective courses for this minor in their degree program;

• the Faculty Coordinator and members of the Academic Minor Sub-Committee, in cooperation with personnel in each College, will design, schedule, and offer orientation sessions about this new minor and these new advising forms for faculty with academic advising responsibilities for undergraduate students in each major in each College; and

• the Faculty Coordinator and members of the Academic Minor Sub-Committee, in cooperation with personnel from each College and from the Office of Creative Services, will develop plans and materials to market this new minor to students in each major and in each College.

Although Step 4: Assessment and Evaluation is presented last, planned actions will be undertaken concurrently with Step 3: Program Implementation. The assessments to be undertaken for this new Minor are described in Section 9.2.1. These include preliminary assessments in the new introductory course and formative assessments in elective courses that will be used to track student progress and guide student advising in this new Minor. Further, of particular importance to this QEP, the summative assessment of students in this Minor on the student learning outcomes for Goal 1 (Section 4.3) will take place in the culminating course, HUM 3XXX. As indicated in Table 6.2 (p. 51), these assessments will be: developed in Year 1; piloted, reviewed and, as needed, revised or refined, in Year 2; and fully implemented in Years 3-5.

The actions planned for the evaluation of this new Minor are described in Section 9.3. These actions will include: (1) documentation of program development in Year 1, and program implementation in Years 2-5; (2) documentation of adjustments and improvement to planned actions that are made during each year (Years 1-5), as well as any needed adjustments and improvement that need to be made in the following year, the actual adjustments and improvements made in that next year, and the outcomes of those adjustments and improvements; (3) changes and growth in program offerings from year to year (e.g., changes in required and elective courses); (4) changes and growth in student participation from year to year (e.g., students in and graduates with this Minor); and (5) changes and growth in student learning from year to year based on assessments.

6.3. Planned Actions for the New Certificate Program in Cross-Cultural Competence
The actions planned to address Goal 2 and the associated set of student learning outcomes (Sections 4.2 and 4.3) focus on the development of a new non-academic Certificate Programin
Cross-Cultural Competence that will be available to all undergraduate students at Florida Tech. These plans include (a) the design of this new Certificate Program, and (b) steps to be taken to finalize, implement, gather assessment data for, and evaluate this new Certificate Program.

Unlike the new academic Minor described in Section 6.2, there are few university policies that pertain to non-academic certificate programs. This has allowed for greater flexibility in the design of a Certificate Program to address Goal 2 of this QEP (Section 4.2) and achieve the student learning outcomes associated with it (Section 4.3). Nonetheless, a set of premises about the development of cross-cultural competence (3C), based on learning and developmental theory, as well as on practical experience, emerged during QEPAC discussions over 2013-14. These premises, which served as an important influence on the design of this new Certificate Program, are as follows:

- The process of developing 3C is **experiential**: student learning and growth stems from a wide variety of experiences, particularly those in which students interact with people from nations, cultures, and ethnicities other than their own;
- The development of 3C is **multi-dimensional**: different kinds of experiences and activities contribute to student growth and development in different learning domains (knowledge, skills/abilities, affective dispositions, and behavior);
- The development of 3C is **developmental**: learning and growth within and across these domains takes place over extended periods of time, and on the basis of multiple active experiences (e.g., activities), internal processes (e.g., reflection), and interactions between the two;
- The development of 3C contributes to **leadership development**: as students develop 3C over time, they find and create opportunities for different kinds of leadership roles and responsibilities in various campus internationalization efforts (e.g., events, organizations, and programs);
- The development of student leadership in the area of 3C comes in varying degrees and many forms: students who assume leadership roles/responsibilities do so to varying degrees (e.g., overseeing part of vs. coordinating entire events). Further, some forms are more traditional (e.g., International Festivals) and others are more creative (e.g., YouTube postings for Did You Know? and for other campaigns, such as [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tqE4_sp2NhY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tqE4_sp2NhY));
- Student leadership **expands the educational roles of students**: in traditional educational settings, students tend to be receivers (e.g., participants). However, in some leadership roles, students work with faculty and staff as co-learners, and in other roles, students serve as providers (e.g., workshop trainers, developers of new events); and
Student leadership helps strengthen and build the **campus community and campus culture**: the greater the extent to which students, individually and collectively, assume meaningful leadership roles/responsibilities for the development and expression of 3C on the Florida Tech campus, the greater their contribution to campus life, to campus internationalization efforts, and to the university.

It is noteworthy that these premises connect the development of cross-cultural competence at the individual student level to the development of a campus community that embraces and reflects the values inherent in cross-cultural competence and the Core Values in the Strategic Plan (2012). With these premises in mind, the design of this new Certificate Program is presented in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3.

*Design of the New Non-Academic Certificate Program in Cross-Cultural Competence*

**A. Requirements**: up to 16 points  
1. **Start of the Certificate Program** (Freshman Year)  
   - Introductory Exposure: UE Course (up to 4 pts.)  
   - Initial Training Workshop: Cross-Cultural Competence (3C) Training by ICCM Staff (4 pts.)  
2. **End of the Certificate Program** (Senior Year)  
   - Synthesis Project and Presentation: *To Be Developed* (4 pts.)  
   - Summative Assessment: Cross-Cultural Navigator (CCN) (4 pts.)

**B. Optional Activities**: 16 or more points*  
- Leadership in ISSO or an International Student Organization (e.g., as officers, event planners and coordinators)  
- Collaboration with ISSO and Other International Student Organizations (e.g., on major activities)  
- Active Role in Campus Cultural/Intercultural Events (e.g., SP: International Festival)  
- Active Role in New College Cultural/Intercultural Events (e.g., FL: International Education Week)  
- Going Abroad (e.g., university-sponsored Study Abroad; international internships, research, Co-op, and ProTrack; international service projects sponsored by the Office of Civic Engagement)  
- Formative Use of the Cross-Cultural Navigator (e.g., one time in their SO and/or JR year)

* Note: In Year 1 and thereafter, the QEP Director and Certificate Program Sub-Committee will: (a) review and refine this list of Optional Activities (i.e., ways students can develop 3C); (b) develop and follow procedures for adding new and removing existing Optional Activities from this list (e.g., add: on the basis of student proposals; remove: on the basis of assessment and/or evaluation data); and (c) determine an equitable allocation of points for all Requirements and Optional Activities.

As noted at the beginning of this section, the actions planned for this new Certificate Program also include (b) steps to be taken to finalize, gain approval for, implement, gather assessment data for, and evaluate this new Certificate Program. These planned actions are presented as a series of...
related and overlapping steps in Table 6.4 (p. 57), and are described in greater detail below. By design, these steps and planned actions parallel those presented in Table 6.2 (p.51).

As mentioned in Section 6.1, these planned actions begin with **Step 1: Personnel Decisions:** hiring a QEP Director to oversee this new Certificate Program and a Faculty Coordinator (AY 2015-16), as well as the establishment of the QEPIC and Certificate Program Sub-committee (YR 1: AY2016-17). On the basis of discussions with Dr. Alford, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Mr. Bowers, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, the QEP Director and this new Certificate Program will be housed in the Division of Student Affairs (http://www.fit.edu/studentlife/).

In YR 1, these key personnel, along with the developers and coordinators of Certificate Program requirements (Table 6.3, p. 55), will undertake planned actions for **Step 2: Program Development.** For the first Certificate Program requirement, Ms. Giguere, Coordinator of the UE Course, has agreed to make the following opportunities available in this course (V. Giguere, personal communications, April 3 and October 30, 2014):

- Expand the presentation to UE sections about Study Abroad Programs to include this new Academic Minor and this new Certificate Program (e.g., a 1-2 page overview with a description of each);
- Ensure that the student involvement component of UE (attend five campus events, worth 25%) can include Optional Activities for this Certificate Program (Table 6.3, p. 55), and that this participation is tracked via the unique UE card-swipe system;
- Revise the existing set of required reflection journal assignments (four entries, worth 2.5% each) to include one that focuses on barriers or difficulties he/she has experienced when interacting/communicating with someone from another national, culture, or ethnicity; and
- For the existing assignments in which groups of students pick a Department or Service Unit on campus to research for a 5-7 minute class presentation – as part of the existing “We are FIT” group project due at the end of the semester, and for the three-hour community service requirement – gather and use monitoring data to determine how many of each pertain to the QEP as well as how many of these groups included a mix of U.S. and international students.

Student participation in these UE opportunities will be recorded either by UE section instructors or using the UE card-swipe system. These data will be organized and communicated to the UE
Table 6.4. Plans for a New Certificate Program in Cross-Cultural Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel:</strong> QEP Certificate Committee</td>
<td>Committee Formation &amp; Orientation in FL ’16; Support Certificate Development in SP ’17</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
<td>Support Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program:</strong> New Offerings</td>
<td>Pilot Modifications to UE Course</td>
<td>Implement Revised UE Course &amp; Other Offerings; <strong>Begin</strong> 3C Workshops; Design Synthesis Project; Prepare Colleges for Int. Ed. Week in SP ’17</td>
<td>Implement UE Course, 3C Workshops &amp; Other Offerings; Pilot Int. Ed. Wk.</td>
<td>Implement UE Course, 3C Workshops, Int. Ed. Week &amp; Other Offerings</td>
<td>Implement UE Course, 3C Workshops, Int. Ed. Week &amp; Other Offerings</td>
<td>Implement UE Course, 3C Workshops, Int. Ed. Week &amp; Other Offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program:</strong> New Assessment</td>
<td>Pilot CCN for Online Summ. Assessment</td>
<td>Pilot CCN for Online Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data via CCN</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data via CCN</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data via CCN</td>
<td>Gather Assessment Data via CCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement:</strong> New Database</td>
<td>Design Database for Data Sources &amp; Annual Student Cohorts</td>
<td>Field Test Certificate Database</td>
<td>Implement Certificate Database</td>
<td>Implement Certificate Database</td>
<td>Implement Certificate Database</td>
<td>Implement Certificate Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement:</strong> Orientation for Campus Units</td>
<td>Design Orientation for Offices, Colleges and Student Organization</td>
<td>Schedule &amp; Conduct Orientations</td>
<td>Schedule &amp; Conduct Orientations</td>
<td>Schedule &amp; Conduct Orientations</td>
<td>Schedule &amp; Conduct Orientations</td>
<td>Schedule &amp; Conduct Orientations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinator, who will aggregate and report them to the QEP Director. Students can earn up to 4 points toward this Certificate for active participation in these UE Course opportunities. However, because these data will be collected from first-year students, they are considered developmental and preliminary. As a result, these data will not be used for the assessment of students on student learning outcomes for Goal 2.

The second Certificate Program requirement (Table 6.3, p. 55) will be the completion of a one-day training on the basic elements of cross-cultural competence (3C) provided by faculty and staff affiliated with the Institute for Cross-Cultural Communication (ICCM) in FloridaTech’s School of Psychology (http://research.fit.edu/iccm/). Over the past few years, ICC has arranged for ICCM to provide 3C Training Workshops for university staff in units that serve international students, Head Residents and Resident Assistants on the university’s Residence Life staff and, most recently, student leaders of campus organizations. These training workshops have been very well received. Dr. Griffith confirmed that ICCM was willing and able to provide 3C Training Workshops for all students in each Freshman cohort over Years 1-5 of this QEP (R. Griffith, personal communication, December 16, 2014). Further, he indicated that each 3C Training Workshop would accommodate about 20 students, so for a class cohort of about 700 students, this would require about 35 training workshops (i.e., about 12 workshops each FL, SP, and SU semester). Each training workshop would continue to be staffed by a lead facilitator and a supporting co-facilitator. To meet staffing needs for this number of workshops each semester, ICCM will need to hire and train several doctoral-level Graduate Student Assistants (GSAs). Dr. Griffith indicated that there are doctoral students in the School of Psychology capable of serving as GSAs/lead facilitators, and that graduate students serving as co-facilitators could be given credit for their work as part of practicum requirements in their degree program. Given this, tuition and stipend support for GSAs has been included in the QEP Budget (see Appendix N). These GSA-facilitators will be responsible for maintaining and providing a list of students who complete each 3C Training Workshop, as well as other workshop assessment and evaluation data, to the QEP Director. Each student who successfully completes this training will earn 4 points toward this Certificate. However, workshop data will not be used for the assessment of students on student learning outcomes for Goal 2.

For the purposes of this QEP, all Freshmen and Sophomores will be considered part of this Certificate Program. As a result, all students will be able to engage in UE Course opportunities and all students will complete a 3C Training Workshop. This will ensure that all Florida Tech students will have, at a minimum, the opportunities at the Start of the Certificate Program to further develop their cross-cultural competence (Table 6.3, p. 55). Consistent with this, all points
earned by Freshmen and Sophomores will be recorded and maintained in the database for this Certificate Program, although this Program will not be marketed to Freshmen; only to upper-class students. Further, students can choose to opt out of this Certificate Program during their Junior Year. Those students that opt out will not complete the End of Certificate Program requirements presented in Table 6.3 (p. 55), and described below.

The **third Certificate Program requirement** (Table 6.3) is some type of *Synthesis Project and Presentation* required of all Seniors in this Certificate Program, and will be worth 4 points toward this Certificate. It is similar in purpose to that required in the *Global Pathways Certificate Program* at Florida State University ([http://global.fsu.edu/students/certificate/certificate.htm](http://global.fsu.edu/students/certificate/certificate.htm)). Each Senior in Florida Tech’s Certificate Program will be expected to: (a) select one or more of their international/intercultural experiences, (b) summarize salient features of each experience, (c) describe how/why each experience was meaningful (personally and/or professionally), and (d) include additional reflections about each experience and its meaning. This material can be presented to others in and affiliated with the Certificate in any number of ways (e.g., as a written report, PowerPoint presentation, slide show, or in some other communication/artistic medium). During Year 1, the QEP Director and members of the Certificate Program Sub-Committee will refine and further develop plans for this *Synthesis Project and Presentation* (e.g., whether to develop this as a 0 credit ASC course for which Seniors must register; how, when, and where to schedule presentations; and who must and can attend these presentations).

The **fourth Certificate Program requirement** (Table 6.3) is the summative assessment for this Program; i.e., completion of the Cross-Cultural Navigator (CCN) by Seniors as described in *Section 9.2.2*. To ensure successful completion of this online assessment, it will be worth 4 points toward this Certificate. As noted in Table 6.4 (p. 57) and as described in *Section 9.2.2*, the CCN will be made available for use in this QEP by ICCM at no cost. Further, as indicated in Table 6.4, the CCN will be piloted as a summative assessment tool in 2015-16, and administered in Years 2-5.

The **Optional Activities** in Table 6.3 were proposed and selected by members of the QEPAC. For example, at present, there are 14 International Student Organizations (see *Appendix B*), and membership in each is not limited on the basis of a student’s country of origin. Also, other recognized student organizations have begun to partner with International Student Organizations for the purpose of planning joint activities and events. In addition, existing campus events such as the International Festival held each Spring, and new campus events such as an International Education Week to be held each Fall ([http://eca.state.gov/programs-](http://eca.state.gov/programs-))
initiatives/international-education-week/ and http://www.iie.org/en/Programs/Generation-Study-Abroad/International-Education-Week) provide additional opportunities for students to work and interact with students, staff, and faculty whose culture, nationality, and ethnicity differs from their own. For the latter, students will be encouraged to organize events in and for their College, as well as around university-wide events that week such as an annual Keynote Speaker (see QEP Budget, Appendix N). Further, experiences associated with students going abroad for an extended period, whether for academic or non-academic reasons (e.g., Alternative Spring Breaks organized by the Office of Civic Engagement) provide numerous opportunities for further intercultural experience and therefore for students to further their cross-cultural competence. Finally, as described in Section 9.2.2, formative use of the CCN has been included due to the educational and developmental value this may have for students (e.g., a maximum of onetime per year in a student’s Sophomore and Junior Year).

These planned actions to be undertaken in Year 1 for **Step 2: Program Development** are necessary. However, this Certificate Program is a more flexible and dynamic program than the Academic Minor, and therefore it is likely that there will be changes to the design of this Certificate Program over Years 2 – 5. Consequently, as mentioned in the Note at the bottom of Table 6.3 (p. 55), these additional planned actions will be needed during Years 2 – 5 as part of **Step 3, Program Implementation**. First, the QEP Director and Certificate Program Subcommittee will decide which Requirements and Optional Activities can and do contribute to the development of cross-cultural competence and therefore should remain part of the design of this Certificate Program (e.g., those in Table 6.3, as well as any new campus activities such as residence in a new International Living/Learning Community, participation in a new Model U.N. Association on campus, and helping develop special programs for the Funk Center for Textile Arts, the Foosaner Art Museum, the Music Program, and Panther Dining’s International Dining Series). Second, the QEP Director and Certificate Program Subcommittee will decide how and when students may propose their own individual or small group activities as Optional Activities for this Certificate Program (e.g., projects for other courses or travel abroad that is not associated with any university program). Finally, the QEP Director and subcommittee will review and decide on the minimum number of points required to earn this Certificate, and how points should be allocated for each Requirement and Optional Activity.

There are two sets of additional planned actions for **Step 3, Program Implementation**. The first set focuses on how student participation in this Certificate Program will be monitored. Since 2009, Florida Tech’s Division of Student Affairs has used OrgSync to monitor student participation in campus activities and for other purposes (http://www.fit.edu/activities/). OrgSync
is a dynamic online platform and database system that can be used to “create an online community for campus that helps departments, programs, and member-based organizations streamline processes and drive engagement … track co-curricular involvement, and … generate reports on all data collected for annual reports and accreditation” (http://www.orgsync.com/).

The Division of Student Affairs has expressed its willingness to provide separate space for the QEP to be featured on OrgSync (E. Richardson, personal communication, November 13, 2014). Thus, with support from personnel in Division of Student Affairs, the QEP Director and Certificate Program Sub-Committee will be able to use OrgSync to meet the following monitoring-related needs in this Certificate Program:

- present an online list of all Certificate Program Requirements and Optional Activities;
- set up and manage an online proposal process in which students apply to have additional activities included in the Certificate Program;
- assign points online to each Requirement and Optional Activity;
- track student participation in campus events using card-swipe and other online features; and
- merge and manage databases for points earned by student in each annual cohort.

As is apparent in the quote above from the OrgSync website, OrgSync can be useful to the QEP Director, QEPIC, QEPIC Sub-Committees, and other campus units and organizations involved in this Certificate Program in numerous other ways. As a result, they will decide which additional features of OrgSync to develop and use to support the QEP as a whole and this Certificate Program in particular. Additional features of OrgSync they may wish to develop would allow them to:

- create an umbrella list of all campus units and organizations involved in planning, delivering, and evaluating 3C Trainings and Optional Activities for this Certificate Program;
- create and maintain a common, online calendar of meetings and of events associated with this Certificate Program; and
- create customized groups and lists for the QEPIC, both QEPIC Sub-Committees, and campus units and organizations to maintain communications, plan events, store agendas and minutes, store and archive program documents (e.g., Optional Activities and points for that year; lists of participating students; Synthesis Project reports and presentations), and bookmark documents online (B. Bernard, personal communication, November 13, 2014).
The second set of planned actions focuses on how student participation in this Certificate Program will be recognized on campus. There are a several ways in which students in this Certificate Program can and will be recognized for their participation and contributions:

- **Recognition of Participation**: At the end of each academic year, the names of students with point totals that meet or exceed the minimum required for this Certificate will be included in a list for their annual cohort;

- **Recognition as a Cross-Cultural Ambassador**: Upper-class students who demonstrate a consistently high level of participation and a pattern of leadership in this Certificate Program may be invited to serve as Program Ambassadors each academic year (e.g., assist with Orientation, monitor participation in campus activities, speak to sections of UE);

- **Recognition of Leadership**: Students who demonstrate strong leadership in this Certificate Program will be invited to work with Certificate Program and university personnel to develop a personal and pre-professional profile for posting on the QEP website (e.g., on OrgSync);

- **Recognition for Outstanding Contributions to Campus Internationalization**: Each year, up to four students among those with the highest point totals in this Certificate Program and with strong recommendations (i.e., one female and male international student, and one female and male U.S. student), will be selected to receive an award during the university-wide Spring Convocation, and will be recognized at an International Dinner and Awards Ceremony to be held each Spring; and

- **Recognition of Completion**: Each year, prior to the graduation ceremony in December and in May, graduating students who have completed Requirements and met or exceeded the minimum number of points required in this Certificate Program will receive an official certificate.

Although **Step 4: Assessment and Evaluation** is presented last, planned actions will be undertaken concurrently with **Step 3: Program Implementation**. The assessments to be undertaken for this new Certificate Program are described in **Section 9.2.2**. These include preliminary assessments (i.e., of activities in the UE Course) and formative assessments (i.e., optional use of the online Cross-Cultural Navigator [CCN] during the Sophomore and Junior year) that will be used to help track student participation and guide student advising in this new Certificate Program. Further, of particular importance to this QEP, the summative assessment of students in this Certificate Program on the student learning outcomes for Goal 2 (**Section 4.3**) will be their required completion of the online CNN during their Senior Year. As indicated in
Table 6.4 (p. 57): the summative use of the CNN will be piloted in 2015-16 and revised as needed; the formative components of the CNN will be piloted as revised as needed in in Year 1; and these formative and summative assessments will be fully implemented in Years 2-5.

As for the new Academic Minor, the actions planned for the evaluation of this new Certificate Program are described in Section 9.3. These actions will include: (1) documentation of program development in Year 1, and program implementation in Years 2-5; (2) documentation of adjustments and improvement to planned actions that are made during each year (Years 1-5), as well as any needed adjustments and improvement that need to be made in the following year, the actual adjustments and improvements made in that next year, and the outcomes of those adjustments and improvements; (3) changes and growth in program offerings from year to year (e.g., changes in required and elective courses); (4) changes and growth in student participation from year to year (e.g., students in and graduates with this Certificate); and (5) changes and growth in student learning from year to year based on assessments.
7. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCES PLAN

7.1 Overview of FIT Administrative Structure Pertaining to This QEP

Reporting directly to the Office of the President are four major academic and administrative divisions of the university. These are: Operation and Academic Affairs, Financial Affairs, Alumni Affairs and Development, and External Relations and Economic Development. All Operation and Academic Affairs units report to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer (EVP/COO). Among others, these include Academic Affairs, Institutional Effectiveness, Student Affairs, and Support Services.

The deans of the five colleges at Florida Tech report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The five colleges are the College of Aeronautics, the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business, the College of Engineering, the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts, and the College of Science. The College of Engineering and College of Science are further divided into academic departments, while the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts divides its academic structure into three schools. The Colleges of Aeronautics and Business are not subdivided into lower academic units; however, the College of Business is segmented into main campus, online, and extended studies units.

Institutional research, assessment and accreditation efforts fall under the auspices of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) and Accreditation. The Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and International Programs also has oversight of study abroad programs and international academic agreements and serves as the university’s Accreditation Liaison.

The administrative officers in the Offices of Student Affairs, Enrollment Management, and International Student and Scholar Services report to the Vice President of Student Affairs. In the Division of Student Affairs, the Dean of Students/Associate Vice President oversees the personnel in the Academic Support Center (who administrates and teaches the University Experience [UE] courses), Student Activities, Student Organizations, and the Civic Engagement initiative, which matches community needs with student and employee interests.

Among other areas, the Vice President for Support Services manages administrative officers with oversight of student services, such as dining facilities and residence life.

7.2 Administrative and Operational Structure for This QEP

The divisions reporting to the EVP/COO are important to note because academic and administrative units within each will contribute to the Internationalization theme of the QEP, as
described in previous sections of this report. Educational offerings with an international/global emphasis within each College are provided by the academic colleges under Academic Affairs. Community service and other co- and extra-curricular activities relevant to the new Certificate Program in Cross-Cultural Competence are managed by personnel in various Student Affairs and Support Services administrative and academic support offices. Data collection and assessment of student learning, determination of completion of all Certificate Program requirements, and evaluation of the effectiveness of this QEP will be facilitated by Assessment and Institutional Research personnel reporting under Institutional Effectiveness, in close consultation with the new QEP Director.

7.3 QEP Coordination: QEP Director and Faculty Coordinator Reporting Lines and Responsibilities

This QEP will be implemented by committee, the QEP Implementation Committee (QEPIC). Chairing the QEPIC will be the QEP Director, a new full-time, 12-month position at the university created for the purposes of coordinating, implementing, and evaluating aspects of this QEP. The QEP Director will report directly to the Dean of Students within the Division of Student Affairs and will assume the following operational and programmatic responsibilities:

- Establishing and maintaining the membership of the QEPIC;
- Maintaining collegial relationships and open communications with administrators, faculty, staff and students who support these new QEP programs and related initiatives;
- Overseeing the development, implementation, and evaluation of the new Certificate Program, as well as the Sub-Committee convened to support those planned actions;
- Working with the new Faculty Coordinator to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of the new Academic Minor, and the expansion of on-campus and study abroad academic offerings pertaining to this QEP;
- Working with student government, student organizations, university offices and QEP-related academic offerings on signature events for this QEP;
- Overseeing the development and maintenance of a database system for tracking student participation in the new Academic Minor and new Certificate Program;
- Overseeing the development of online student assessments (e.g., CCN) and associated databases for periodic analysis and review;
- Overseeing the development and maintenance of QEP program evaluation efforts;
- Preparing annual reports on: accomplishments, participation, and assessment results; goals for the next year; needed modifications and improvements; and budgetary needs.
Assisting the new QEP Director will be a new 9-month faculty member with educational and professional qualifications in international studies. The faculty member will report directly to the Associate Dean and Head of the School of Arts and Communication, and will serve as the Faculty Coordinator for the new Academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies, facilitating its development, implementation, and evaluation as described in this Plan.

7.4 QEPIC Representation and Representatives
The QEPIC will be comprised of members from the current QEP Advisory Committee (QEPAC) and the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC), in addition to representatives from the university administration, Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and Student Government. Specifically, QEPIC membership will include the new QEP Director, the new Faculty Coordinator, the IE Assessment Analyst, and the Associate Director of the Academic Support Center (who manages the UE courses), as well as representatives from the Office of Civic Engagement, and International Student and Scholar Services. Finally, QEPIC membership will include representatives from units that will have an active role in the new Academic Minor, new non-academic Certificate Program, and the Sub-Committee associated with each, as described in Section 6.1.
8. SUSTAINABILITY OF FISCAL, PHYSICAL, AND PROGRAMMATIC RESOURCES

The budget (details found in Appendix N) for the Internationalization-themed QEP includes lines for additional personnel, training, physical resources (equipment, allocation of office space), funding for conference travel, scholarships for faculty, funding for campus events, including speakers, and operating and miscellaneous expenses. Each line item will be described in full below.

A. Personnel
   1. QEP Director – the new QEP Director will be hired as a full-time 12-month staff member; this person will report directly to the Dean of Students in the Office of Student Affairs
   2. Faculty Coordinator – the salary quoted is the average value for a full-time 9-month Assistant Professor in the School of Arts and Communication at Florida Tech
   3. Assessment Analyst – this is an existing position and the staff member reports directly to the Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness
   4. Graduate Teaching Assistantships – this amount covers 6 credit hours of tuition remission per semester and 9-month stipend for three graduate students; they will assist with the Student CCM workshops
   5. College Roll positions – this amount covers the hourly pay for two part-time students (graduate or undergraduate) who will assist the QEP Director

B. Fringe Benefits
   1. New positions – this is calculated for QEP Director and Faculty Coordinator at 31%

C. Student Workshops and Training
   1. Student CCM – this amount covers supplies and refreshments for 12 workshops per semester and during the summer (36 total)
   2. GSA Training – this amount covers the cost of training GSAs who will assist with the Student CCM workshops

D. Travel
   1. Conferences – this amount covers travel to conferences for professional development.

E. Scholarships
   1. Faculty Course Program Development – this amount will be used as a modest stipend for existing faculty in order to promote the development of new international courses/programs

F. Campus Events
   1. QEP Sponsored Events – this amount covers any events related to the Cross-Cultural Competence certificate program
   2. Speaker Series – this amount covers travel, food, and lodging for Keynote speakers

G. Operation
   1. Operating Expenses – this amount covers general office operating expenses (telephone, copier, etc.) for the QEP Director
   2. Supplies – this amount covers any office supplies
9. Assessment and Evaluation Plan

9.1. Definition and Use of Key Terms

As assessment and evaluation are vital and necessary parts of plans for this QEP, it is important to describe how these terms will be used (i.e., the kind of practices are associated with each). For the purposes of this QEP, the term assessment will be used to refer to those activities that involve gathering, scoring, and interpreting evidence of student learning (e.g., Airasian & Russell, 2008; Chase, 1999; Gronlund, 2006; Mertler, 2003; Popham, 2011). This usage allows for traditional and alternative forms of student assessment, as well as for formative and summative uses of assessment. In this QEP, the term assessment applies only to the two goals and to the student learning outcomes associated with these goals (Sections 4.2 and 4.3).

Further, for the purposes of this QEP, the term evaluation will be used to refer to those activities that involve collecting, analyzing, interpreting and judging, making decisions based on, and using evidence about the quality of specified educational programs (e.g., Fitzpatrick et al., 2011; Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994; Patton, 1997; Rossi et al., 1999). This allows for both quantitative and qualitative approaches to program evaluation, as well as for formative and summative uses of evaluation. In this QEP, the term evaluation applies to the QEP as a whole, and specifically to the two new programs associated with Goals 1 and 2 (Section 6).

Finally, this use of evaluation is consistent with SACSCOC’s emphasis on “closing the loop,” specifically as this pertains to the use of assessment results for program evaluation and improvement purposes. Thus, in this QEP, assessment results pertaining to Goals 1 and 2 and their associated student learning outcomes will be included as part of the evaluation of the design, delivery, and overall quality of QEP programming.

9.2. Assessment Plans for QEP Goals 1 and 2

Assessment plans for Goal 1 and for Goal 2 differ substantially due to differences in the nature of these goals and the student outcomes associated with each, as well as differences in the nature of the activities in which student will engage in the new program associated with each goal.

9.2.1. Assessment Plans for Goal 1 and for the New Academic Minor in Global Cultural Studies. There are three components to the assessment plan for this goal, associated student-learning outcomes (Section 4.3), and new minor.
The first component of this assessment plan involves preliminary assessments of students in the new course that will be required as an introductory course in this new minor, PSY 1464: Psychology of Cultural Diversity. These assessment data will be gathered by the course instructor for each student, and reported to the Faculty Coordinator of this new academic minor. Due to their preliminary nature, these data will be maintained for the purpose of tracking and advising students in this minor, and will not be used as evidence for any of the student learning outcomes for Goal 1.

The second component of this assessment plan is formative in nature, and will involve the collection of end-of-course grades in each course completed by each student who has declared Global Cultural Studies as his or her minor. These data also will be maintained for the purpose of tracking and advising students in the minor, and will not be used as evidence for any of the student learning outcomes for Goal 1.

The third component of this assessment plan is summative in nature, and will involve the collection of assessment data for each student on each of the student learning outcomes for Goal 1 (Section 4.3). As described in Section 6.2, those outcomes reflect the involvement of students in projects to be undertaken in small interdisciplinary and intercultural teams. Teams will engage in an investigation, analysis, and evaluation of selected problems/issues in a chosen culture, which will culminate in a written report and a presentation for each project. Both individual and team performance will be assessed using scoring rubrics that reflect each student learning outcome and specific course assignments to be determined by the Faculty Coordinator of the new minor and the developer(s) of this new culminating course. The assignments, scoring rubrics, and assessment procedures associated with these student learning outcomes will prepared as part of the course development process in Year 1 of this QEP.


There are three components to the assessment plan for this goal, associated student-learning outcomes (Section 4.3), and new certificate program.

The first component of this assessment plan involves preliminary assessments of first-year students in the University Experience course (UE, ASC 1000). Assessment data will be limited to course-based assignments and activities that focus on students’ willingness and ability to interact with, accept, adapt to, and learn from those who are from other nations, cultures, and ethnicities. These assessment data will be gathered by UE course instructors for each student and reported to the UE Coordinator, who will then
organize and summarize them for the QEP Director. Due to their preliminary nature, these data will be maintained for the purpose of monitoring students for this certificate program, and will not be used as evidence for any of the student learning outcomes for Goal 2.

The second and third parts of this assessment are based on the use of a recently validated measure of cross-cultural competence (3C). This measure was developed by faculty in the Institute for Cross-Cultural Management (ICCM) in the School of Psychology at Florida Tech (ICCM, 2013). The impetus to develop this measure followed from results of their earlier analysis of 33 commonly available measures of cross-cultural competence (Gabrenya et al., 2012), which found evidence of construct validity, but missing or weak evidence of concurrent or predictive validity (see Appendix O). Initially, ICCM’s new measure was called the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale, but in 2014 this was changed to the Cross-Cultural Navigator (CCN). The CCN is part of software package that includes other features, including the ability to analyze responses on a per-student and aggregated basis. Permission was granted to use the CCN for this QEP at no cost (R. Griffith, personal communications, April 14 and October 23, 2014).

The CCN consists of 56 items and is designed to measure seven dimensions of 3C, with eight items per dimension or subscale (see Appendix P). The CCN subscales and their correspondence to Student Learning Outcomes for Goal 2 are presented in Table 3.

Table 9.1.
Cross-Cultural Navigator (CCN) Subscales and Their Alignment with Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for Goal 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCN Subscale</th>
<th>Corresponding SLOs for Goal 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mindfullness</td>
<td>basic to all SLOs for Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Experience Seeking</td>
<td>SLO 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Broad Perspective</td>
<td>SLO 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Rapport</td>
<td>SLO 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) General Acceptance of Other Cultures</td>
<td>SLO 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Acceptance of Other Specific Cultures</td>
<td>SLO 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Perseverance</td>
<td>SLO 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the very close association of the subscales of the CCN to the SLOs for Goal 2, the CCN was deemed to be a content-valid assessment for Goal 2. Nonetheless, in 2015, the CCN will
be piloted with known groups of Florida Tech students in an effort to further establish its reliability with and concurrent validity for this population.

- The second component of this assessment plan involves student use of the CCN on an optional basis for formative assessment purposes. The online version of the CCN will be made available to all Sophomores and to Juniors who are participating in the certificate program (i.e., with successful completion worth up to 4 points toward their certificate, as described in Section 6). The CCN software program will: (a) provide a customized report or profile for each student (i.e., with five performance levels for each of the eight dimensions), as well as (b) provide reflection questions for that student using a program feature called Insight. These features of the CCN program will allow interested students to gain unique insights into their development of 3C at points in time prior to their Senior Year, as well as provide them with feedback and guidance that they may use to support their further development of 3C. The only data to be gathered from this formative use of the CCN will be on student use; i.e., individual student responses, profiles, and other output features will not be collected for QEP purposes. These use data also will be maintained for the purpose of tracking students in the certificate program, and will not be used as evidence for any of the student learning outcomes for Goal 2.

- The third component of this assessment plan involves the use of the CCN for summative assessment purposes. The CCN will be administered to students who are participating in the certificate program during the Spring semester of their Senior Year (i.e., with successful completion worth 4 points toward their certificate). To ease logistical problems associated with the use of pencil-and-paper measures, as well as to support data analysis, the CCN will be administered online using a software package developed by Select International, a partner to ICCM. This package will allow responses to be limited to one per student, and responses to be tracked using students e-mail addresses and ID numbers. However, for QEP analysis and reporting purposes, responses will be aggregated, and results summarized for each subscale. In turn, these results will be related to each of the student learning outcomes for Goal 2, as outlined in Table 9.1 (p. 70).

### 9.3. Plans for the Evaluation of This QEP

Due to the unique nature of QEPs in general and of this QEP, there are several different purposes for program evaluation, each of which requires the collection, analysis, interpretation and use of different kinds of information and data. These purposes are as follows.
(1) **Documentation of Implementation:** during each year of this QEP, information and data will be collected on what is done for the new minor and for the new certificate program, by whom, and for whom. Each of the purposes that follow depends on accurate and comprehensive records of this. This information is needed for annual reporting and internal review, as well as for final reporting to SACSCOC.

(2) **Implementation Adjustments and Improvements:** during each year of this QEP, feedback and constructive suggestions will be gathered from program providers and participants to inform QEP stakeholders what is going well, what needs improvement, and which of these plans may need smaller- or larger-scale adjustment. This information is needed to pinpoint the need for and to guide program changes during each year, and adjust implementation plans for the next year, as well as for annual reporting and internal review, and for final reporting to SACSCOC.

(3) **Change and Growth in Program Offerings:** this is the *first key element of enhancement* for SACSCOC, for Florida Tech, and for this QEP (i.e., programs to support and advance Goals 1 and 2). Documentation and adjustment/improvement information summarized in annual reports will allow these year-to-year changes to be monitored, identified, and described.

(4) **Changes and Growth in Student Participation:** this is the *second key element of enhancement* for SACSCOC, for Florida Tech, and for this QEP (i.e., the number of students enrolled in the new minor and participating in the new certificate program). Documentation and adjustment/improvement information summarized in annual reports will allow any year-to-year changes to be monitored, identified, and described.

(5) **Changes and Growth in Student Learning:** this is the *third key element of enhancement* for SACSCOC, for Florida Tech, and for this QEP (i.e., evidence of student learning over all outcomes for Goals 1 and 2). Documentation and adjustment/ improvement information, along with assessment data *(Section 9.C)* summarized in annual reports will allow year-to-year learning to be monitored, characterized, and described.

These are the five primary purposes for program evaluation in the context of QEP programs in general, and this QEP in specific. Each of these purposes holds important implications for information and data collection, whether on a formative or a summative evaluation basis. The specific kinds of information and data to be collected as part of formative and summative evaluation for this QEP are identified below.
9.3.1 Plans for the Formative Evaluation of this QEP

During each of the five years in which this QEP Plan will be implemented, several kinds of formative program evaluation data will be collected. These include, but may not be limited to:

- **For the New Academic Minor**: an annual record of the status of and any changes in the minor and associated course offerings; of student participation in those offerings; of assessment results for these offerings; and end of course/program feedback that pertains to these offerings (e.g., evaluations of the new required introductory and culminating courses, of other elective courses, and of the minor as a whole); and

- **For the New Certificate Program**: an annual record of the status of and changes in the UE course (intercultural options), 3C training workshops, the new synthesis requirement, and major campus events/activities associated with this certificate program described in Section 6; of the status of and changes in the number of campus units, student organizations, and other entities sponsoring and supporting campus events/activities associated with this certificate program (e.g., ICCM, ISSS, ISSO, International Student Organizations, campus and community partners); of participation in each required and optional activity within the certificate program; of the type and extent of participation by individual students in each annual cohort (points); of formative use of and assessment results from the CCN; and of feedback and suggestions from both providers and participants regarding events/activities, monitoring, assessments, and points.

One of the major roles of the QEP Director is to oversee and help coordinate the collection, organization, storage, and use of these assessment and evaluation data. However, in light of the kind and amount of information and data to be collected, this will require considerable time and effort each year. Therefore the Director will require the assistance of the Coordinator of the Faculty Minor and of technical personnel such as Mr. C.J. Colley, Assessment Analyst, as well as active cooperation from personnel in the Office of Institutional Research, those responsible for the University Experience course (ASC 1000) and other courses, those in responsible for non-academic offerings including 3C training workshops and sponsored events, those responsible for the University Assessment Program and the WEAVE online system, and other entities involved in activities that relate directly to QEP programming, assessment, and evaluation efforts. In light of the large number of campus units that will have some role in the collection of assessment and evaluation information/data, one of the functions of the QEPIC’s subcommittees will be to assist the QEP Director, Faculty Coordinator, Mr. Colley, and others by coordinating the collection, storage, analysis, interpretation, and use of information and data pertaining to the QEP goals, outcomes, and new programs described in this Plan. One QEPIC
subcommittee will be composed of faculty members from each College and will work closely with both the QEP Director and Faculty Coordinator of the new minor. The second QEPIC subcommittee also will work closely with the QEP Director and Faculty Coordinator of the new minor, and will be composed of staff, students and faculty affiliated with campus units and organizations that have major roles and responsibilities in the certificate program.

9.3.2. Plans for Summative Evaluation of This QEP

Each year, following the organization, analysis and interpretation of assessment and evaluation information and data, a number of steps will be taken. First and foremost, an annual report will be prepared for this QEP for that year, to include: (a) a summary of major activities and accomplishments for each goal and new program; and (b) a list of steps to be taken in the coming year that will build on what was learned and on the successes from that year, include ‘next steps’ to be taken in each program based on this Plan, adjustments and improvements in each program, and how to address other apparent needs and opportunities that may have emerged over that academic year.

In addition, for Years 2-5, this report will include an additional section. The will be a summary of noteworthy changes from the previous year to that year (e.g., changes that arose between the end of Year 1 to the end of Year 2) in each of three areas outlined in the introduction to Section 9.C: (3) Changes and Growth in Program Offerings; (4) Changes and Growth in Student Participation; and (5) Changes and Growth in Student Learning, by Goal and Outcome.

From a summative evaluation perspective, there are two primary uses of these annual reports. First, internally, these annual reports will be made available to university administrators and, as has been done in annual reports by ICC, they may be used to identify issues and offer suggestions that pertain to this QEP and to wider campus internationalization efforts. Second, externally, these annual reports will be used to prepare the QEP Impact Report to SACSCOC for this QEP.
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**Appendix A. List of most active international agreements**

Florida Tech engages in multiple international academic programs which contribute to our increasing international student population. The types of programs include 2+2 undergraduate transfer programs (2+2 UG), graduate transfer programs (Grad), and exchange programs. The most active of these agreements are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Institution</th>
<th>Location/ Country</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>College(s) (Academic Unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecole National d'Aviation Civile (ENAC)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Exchange, Grad</td>
<td>BS Mech Engin, BS Civil Engin, BS Bus. Admin, BS Info Systems, BS Marketing MBA</td>
<td>COE (Mech Engin, Civil Engin) COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng Chia University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG, Grad, Exchange</td>
<td>BS Mech Engin, BS Elec Engin, BS Civil Engin</td>
<td>COE (Mech Engin, Elec Engin, Civil Engin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbin Institute of Technology (and at Weihai)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td>BS Mech Engin</td>
<td>COE (Mech Engin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huazhong University of Science &amp; Technology (HUST)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td>BS Mech Engin</td>
<td>COE (Mech Engin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubei University of Education (HUE)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td>BS Elec</td>
<td>COE (Elec Engin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunming University of Science &amp; Technology (KUST)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td>BS Mech Engin, BS Civil Engin, BS Bus Admin, BS Info Systems, BS Marketing, BS Aero Sci, BS Avi Comp Sci, BS Avi Met (*Flt &amp; non-Flt options)</td>
<td>COE (Mech Engin, Civil Engin) COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian School of Management (NSM)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Exchange (Grad)</td>
<td>I/O Psych</td>
<td>COPLA (SOP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Dian Ji University (SDJU)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Ocean University (SOU)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEMA Business School</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2+2 UG, Fast-track Grad, Exchange</td>
<td>Any area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat de Valencia</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Exchange (Grad)</td>
<td>I/O Psych</td>
<td>COPLA (SOP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Tecnologia de Panama</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td>BS Avi Mgmt (Flt &amp; non-Flt options)</td>
<td>COA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang Gongshang University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2+2 UG</td>
<td>BS Comp Sci Engin, Sci &amp; Bus degrees</td>
<td>COE, COS, COB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. International Students and International Student Organizations at Florida Tech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>525 (27.6%)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>515 (25.3%)</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>444 (21.8%)</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>447 (20.3%)</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>371 (16.7%)</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>326 (14.4%)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>350 (15.6%)</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>494 (20.5%)</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>527 (21.4%)</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>543 (22.5%)</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>531 (22.8%)</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>675 (26.7%)</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>791 (28.3%)</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>947 (30.9%)</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>1,188 (35.5%)</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Full-time on-campus student data were provided by Florida Tech’s Office of Institutional Research.
2. The percentage of graduate students that are international students was not calculated because nearly all international students are full-time, as required by the U.S. State Department, while many American graduate students are only part-time.
3. International Student Organization data were provided by Mr. Rodney Bowers, Associate V.P. for Student Affairs.
4. International Student Organizations active on the Florida Tech campus include (year established, if after 2008): African Student Association (S.A.); Brazil S.A. (2013); Caribbean S.A.; Chinese Students and Scholars Association; Florida Tech Persian Association (2009); International Student Service Organization; ISA-Sanskrit; Korean S.A. (2010); Kuwaiti Student Organization (2011); Latin American S.A. (2012); Muslim S.A.; Omani S.A. (2012); Saudi Students Union; and Taiwanese S.A. (2008).
5. International student organization members may exceed full-time international students counts due to part-time student as members.
Appendix C. Majors and Courses with an International Emphasis and Study Abroad Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Courses (Credits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td></td>
<td>AVF 3010: International Flight Operations Training (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AVM 4401: International Air Commerce (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7764</td>
<td>BUS 1801: Global Business Perspectives (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 3801: Cross-Cultural Management (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 3802: Global Macroeconomic Issues (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 3805: Emerging Markets Strategies (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4219: Globalization &amp; Corporate Social Responsibility (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4220: International Accounting &amp; Reporting (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4504: Special Topics: An International Experience (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4516: Global Strategic Management of Technology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4686: International Marketing (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4701: International Business (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4801: International Trade (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4802: Global Accounting &amp; Tax (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 4803: Global Fiscal Management (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENS 1000: The Whole Earth Course (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENS 3101: Atmospheric Environments (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENS 4001: The Earth System (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENS 4009: Environmental Satellite Systems &amp; Data (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENS 4010: Geographic Information Systems (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MET 3401: Synoptic Meteorology I (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MET 3402: Synoptic Meteorology II (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MET 4233: Remote Sensing for Meteorology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MET 4310: Climatology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCE 4522: Coastal Engineering Processes &amp; Shoreline Design (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCE 4563: Port &amp; Harbor Design (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCN 1010: Oceanography (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCN 2407: Meteorology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCN 3103: Biological Oceanography (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCN 3301: Geological Oceanography (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCN 4106: Mitigation &amp; Restoration of Coastal Systems (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCN 4204: Marine &amp; Environmental Pollution (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 3045: Intercultural Communications (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 3085: Special Topics in Applied Communication (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM 4130: Global Communication (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 1015: Mythology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 2085: Critical Approaches to Humanities &amp; Soc. Sciences (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 2140: World Architecture (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 2141: World Art History I (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 2142: World Art History II (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 2385: Special Topics in World History (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 3026: The Civilization of Islam (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 3027: History &amp; Culture of China (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 3085: Special Topics in Humanities (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUM 3285: Special Topics in Literature (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colleges  Majors
Psychology & Liberal Arts
(cont.)

Courses (Credits)
HUM 3351: History of Science & Technology I (3)
HUM 3352: History of Science & Technology II (3)
HUM 3385: Special Topics in History (3)
HUM 3521: World Religions (3)
LNG 1101-02: Elementary French I (3) and II (3)
LNG 1201-02: Elementary German I (3) and II (3)
LNG 1301-02: Elementary Spanish I (3) and II (3)
LNG 1601-02: Elementary Italian I (3) and II (3)
LNG 1701-02: Elem. Chinese Language & Culture I (3) and II (3)
LNG 2101-02: Intermediate French I (3) and II (3)
LNG 2201-02: Intermediate German I (3) and II (3)
LNG 2301-02: Intermediate Spanish I (3) and II (3)
LNG 3301-02: Advanced Spanish I (3) and II (3)
LNG 3085: Special Topics in Foreign Language Literature (3)
LNG 3401: General Linguistics (3)
PSY 2444: Cross-Cultural and Ethnic Psychology (3)
PSY 4541: Culture & Psychology (3)
SOC 1102: Global Perspective (3)

Science
BIO 2955: Biology and Ecology/Coral Reefs (3)
BIO 3935: Ecology of Tropical Systems (3)
BIO 3940: Tropical Marine Ecology (3)
BIO 4420: Pre-Columbian Ecosystems (1)
BIO 4421: Neotropical Archaeology (3)
BIO 4515: Ecology of Coral Reefs (3)
BIO 4904: Field Biology & Evolution of the Galapagos Islands (3)
ISC 3250: Systems, Governance, and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The Major Code 7764 is for Business Administration – Global Management & Finance
2. These courses are used in Study Abroad programs, as indicated in the table above.
3. These courses count toward the Undergraduate Core Requirement in Humanities (9 credits):
   HUM 2051: Civilization I required
   HUM 2052: Civilization II elective
   HUM 2142: World Art History II elective
Appendix D. Membership of the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M.B. Kenkel, Chair</td>
<td>College of Psych. &amp; Liberal Arts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. R. Alford</td>
<td>Grad. School/Intern. Acad. Prog.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J. Brooke</td>
<td>ISSS/Enrollment Management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C. Fausnaugh</td>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. K. Oyman</td>
<td>College of Aeronautics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. H. Rassoul</td>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M. Shaikh</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C. Bragdon</td>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Doss</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Faisal</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W. Gabrenya</td>
<td>College of Psych. &amp; Liberal Arts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carey Gleason</td>
<td>Development &amp; Comm. Relations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wes Sumner</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Monica Baloga</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Enrique Perez</td>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kurt Winkelman</td>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tom Marcinkowski</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stephen Rice</td>
<td>College of Aeronautics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. The ICC was constituted in 2009 by President Catanese and Provost McCay. During this AY, ICC conducted a comprehensive inventory to determine what the university was doing to internationalize the Florida Tech campus.

2. Over 2010-11, ICC formed three subcommittees to begin to address recommendations offered in its 2010 Report *Internationalizing Florida Tech*.

3. In 2011, one of ICC’s activities and accomplishments was a second university-wide assessment using the American Council on Education’s *Mapping Internationalization Assessment Tool*.

4. In 2014, one of ICC’s activities and accomplishments was a survey of international alumni.
### Appendix E. Membership of the QEP Advisory Committee, 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Campus Position &amp; Unit</th>
<th>QEP Research Team</th>
<th>QEPAC Sub-Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Colley</td>
<td>Specialist, Inst. Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Connell</td>
<td>Asst. Director, Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Cudmore</td>
<td>Director, Study Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Deras</td>
<td>President, Student Govt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Edwards</td>
<td>Assoc. Head, School of Arts &amp; Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Finn</td>
<td>Advisor, First Year Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gabrenya</td>
<td>Prof., Undergraduate &amp; I/O Psych.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Giguere</td>
<td>Assoc. Dir., Academic Support Ctr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Ha</td>
<td>Advisor, First Year Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tori Leslie</td>
<td>Program Coord., ISSS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Marcinkowski</td>
<td>Prof., Science &amp; Env. Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Muth</td>
<td>Instructor, College of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Perez</td>
<td>Asst. Prof., College of Business</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Rice</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof., College of Aeronautics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzaffar Shaikh</td>
<td>Asst. V.P., International Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judi Tintera</td>
<td>Director, Creative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. The Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC) was formed in 2009.
2. The QEP Research Team was formed in Nov. 2013 to initiate discussion of QEP matters and support data collection efforts.
3. The QEP Advisory Committee (QEPAC) was formalized in April 2014 to continue and expand the work of the Research Team.
Appendix F. Recommendations from the ICC Comprehensive Review of Campus Internationalization Efforts (ICC, 2010)

ACE Component 1. Articulated Commitment: Mission, Goals, and Vision

- **Recommendation 1**: Undergraduate and graduate education at Florida Tech should incorporate the acquisition of global competence and should specify and measure the desired knowledge, skills, and attitudes that is expected for a student to be globally competent.

- **Recommendation 2**: The “global focus” goals articulated in the strategic plan should be publicized and disseminated.

- **Recommendation 3**: Recruiting materials and other documents and depictions of the university (e.g. website, catalogue, Campus Observer and alumni magazines) should highlight the international nature of Florida Tech and emphasis on students’ developing global competence.

ACE Component 2. Environment for Internationalization:

- **Recommendation 4**: Florida Tech should establish an international center, a meeting space to conduct cultural seminars, workshops, and training; a venue in which to welcome external groups, as well as house international student organizations and administrative offices including ISSS and international admissions. The creation of an international center will require a staffed position whose primary role it is to develop a comprehensive community outreach program, manage the facility, and provide overall support to the internationalization effort at Florida Tech.

- **Recommendation 5**: Until funds are raised to support a comprehensive international center, the university should set aside an existing space or house for an international lounge/seminar room with adjoining kitchen facilities to meet the needs of international programming in the short term.

ACE Component 3. Strategy

- **Recommendation 6**: Seminars and special events should be organized by a stronger outreach division to encourage local, state, and campus wide cultural participation.

- **Recommendation 7**: Promotion incentives should be given to faculty to increase their international participation and activities.

ACE Component 4. Structure, Policies, and Practices

- **Recommendation 8**: Explore ways to disseminate information regarding what units on campus do and the unique international expertise each provides.
• **Recommendation 9**: Provide more financial resources to support international curriculum development, faculty international travel and research; and travel grants for student study abroad opportunities.

**ACE Component 5. The Curriculum:**

• **Recommendation 10**: Explore possibility of requiring all students to take a *global perspectives course* or the equivalent (foreign language, area studies, comparative religions course, etc.) as a part of the general education curriculum.

• **Recommendation 11**: Develop more globally oriented courses, such as international music, history of science, and new foreign languages.

**ACE Component 6. Study Abroad:**

• **Recommendation 12**: Strengthen and increase our liberal arts course offerings so that more Florida Tech students would have an interest in participating in an international experience.

• **Recommendation 13**: As our student population grows and a critical mass is attained, provide additional opportunities for a university-wide international experience.

**ACE Component 7. Engagement with Institutions in Other Countries:**

• **Recommendation 14**: Develop only agreements that are capable of producing a steady number of quality, full-paying international student-scholars.

**ACE Component 8. Campus Culture and Co-curriculum:**

• **Recommendation 15**: We recommend Florida Tech consider instituting cultural enrichment opportunities for faculty and staff professional development.

**ACE Component 9. Connections among Campus Components:**

• **Recommendation 16**: A specific position or group should be charged with leading the effort to internationalize the curriculum.

• **Recommendation 17**: A specific person or groups shall be charged to coordinate all the international components on campus. A likely body would be the Dean’s Council with the addition of Judy Brooke from the International Student Services Office.

• **Recommendation 18**: The general campus community should be more aware about international efforts, activities, and opportunities. (ICC, 2010, pp. 14-15)
Appendix G. Selected Material from
Targeting the Top Ten, Strategic Plan, 2013 – 2023
(http://www.fit.edu/president/documents/2012strategic-plan.pdf)

1. Introduction by Dr. T. Dwayne McCay, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
Florida Institute of Technology has never been on a more upward trajectory than it currently
finds itself. The faculty, staff and student body are improving each year and it has been reflected
by the national and international recognition received by the university and the individual
colleges. The College of Engineering is ranked in the Top 50 nationally and our College of
Science continues to lead the university in research.

Our other colleges also continue to gain recognition around the world, e.g., the Scott Center for
Autism Treatment and the Clinical Psychology program have established a presence in the
United Arab Emirates, the College of Aeronautics now has flight students from Turkey, Ireland,
Kazakhstan, China and Panama and the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business is pushing the
envelope in online learning and entrepreneurism.

So where do we go from here? That is what this plan is about; … providing a quality, globally
based education in all our disciplines to continue to produce the global leaders of tomorrow
while performing the research that will benefit all mankind in the fields of health, energy, the
environment, transportation and quality of life. (p. 17, emphasis added)

2. University Vision
Vision for 2018: Florida Institute of Technology is a technology and science orientedinstitution
of higher education focused on the successful careers of the students, the conduct of applied
research for the benefit of mankind and the production of a global citizenry thatfully
understands the global issues and the dependency of both the inhabitants and nature. The
mantra is “high technology with a human touch.” (p. 6, emphasis added)

Vision for 2023: Florida Institute of Technology is a broad-based university with a
technology and science focus but with a deep appreciation for the liberal and fine arts. Florida Tech
produces graduates who are good global citizens but who appreciate the interaction of
technology, art and nature. The mantra is “high technology with a human touch and a full
respect for the planet and its wonders.” (p. 6, emphasis added)

3. Core Values

Core Value #1, Student Success: This is the primary reason the university exists, why it was
founded and why it is successful. The success of our future alumni is not merely being educated
by taking classes, achieving good grades indicating their knowledge of the material, and then
eventually receiving their degree. The student success that we focus on is a lifelong adventure.
We pride ourselves on preparing the graduates for both a successful career and a successful
life. It is education for a lifetime of success and happiness. Employers value Florida Tech
graduates enormously. They are well prepared to function in today’s environment and future
environment. Lifelong learning is not a chore but a joy. Our desire is for them to never “work” a
day in their lives. This can only occur if their education is appropriate for their chosen career and
the joy of learning is firmly ingrained in all they do.

Core Value #2, Research for the Benefit of Mankind: As a national doctoral university, we are
by definition involved in research. Unlike most of the independent universities within Florida, we
operate on a national and indeed an international scale. We are concerned with not just technological and social developments to support the American economy but to benefit all mankind. As a technical institute, our roots have been in applied research, and we continue that even in our socially oriented research programs. Esoteric is not in our vocabulary, we leave that to other universities. Probably the most significant component of this core value, however, is the commitment we made in 2005 to involve every on-campus student in team-oriented scholarly activities (research). This plan was presented to our regional accreditor, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, was accepted and in 2011 was designated a success by the accrediting board. The effort was significant but the payoff for our graduates and their employers will be huge.

Core Value #3, Development of Global Citizens: The Florida Institute of Technology is heavily involved in the recruitment of international students and faculty, and they make up a significant percentage of the Florida Tech family. But the core value is something much more than having a significant presence of internationals on campus. It is about ingraining in the curriculum, in the extracurricular activities, and in the culture of Florida Tech that we all (faculty, staff and students) must be good stewards of the globe’s resources and indeed, good citizens of this world in which we live. (p. 19, emphasis added)

4. Strategic Initiatives, Goals for 2018

Strategic Initiative 2, Undergraduate Education

- To continue the on-going process of internationalizing the campus
  - To infuse a global component (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) in the current curricula and/or create new courses with a global perspective across all colleges
  - To bring international content/research into the classrooms
  - To promote, encourage, value and reward faculty engaged in internationalizing efforts
    - To support international workshops and symposia
    - To encourage students to study a foreign language
  - To provide additional opportunities for international students to be engaged with the campus community through co-curricular activities
    - To pair new internationals with domestic students to help internationals better integrate into the American classroom
    - To provide social events so international and domestic students can develop more meaningful relationships
  - To develop additional study abroad/international exchanges for students
  - To evaluate existing international partnerships
  - To establish new international partnerships and twinning programs with institutions that have a similar mission as Florida Tech’s (p. 22, emphasis added)

Strategic Initiative 5, Student Life

- To establish a global presence on campus
  - To establish a Center for Global Engagement
  - To establish a slate of regular Dining Services special events that focus on the cultural diversity represented on campus
  - To enhance campus living and dining facilities
    - To refurbish and modernize existing residential facilities
    - To establish living-learning communities within the residence halls
    - To expand programming within residential living to foster a sense of community (p.27, emphasis added)
Appendix H. Soliciting Input from Campus Constituencies for QEP 2 Planning

Submitted to:
(A) Dr. Semen Koksal, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Deans of the Colleges at Florida Tech
(B) Dr. William Arrasmith, President, Faculty Senate, and
(C) Ms. Carla Deras, President, Student Government Association

Prepared by Dr. Tom Marcinkowski, QEP 2 Coordinator

Context
Florida Tech is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). In the early 2000s, SACS began to require all colleges and universities to develop, implement, and evaluate progress on a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). This plan was intended to reflect unique features of each college/university, and to address apparent needs and opportunities for growth. These Plans were to be implemented over a five-year period, and a summative report of those efforts was to be prepared and submitted to SACS as part of a Fifth-Year Review.

Florida Tech’s first QEP Plan was submitted in January 2005, and focused on the inclusion of one or more scholarly inquiry capstone courses in all undergraduate degree programs. Implementation of this Plan or QEP began in January 2006. A final report was submitted to SACS in March 2011, and approved by SACS later that Fall.

Florida Tech’s next QEP Plan (QEP 2) is due in January 2015, and work has begun to develop this Plan. Based on needs within the university community and activities undertaken by the Internationalizing the Campus Committee (ICC) since 2009, the focus of Florida Tech’s next QEP Plan will be on internationalization.

Purpose
One important part of the QEP 2 planning effort is to solicit input from major campus constituencies, including students, faculty, staff, and administration.

In February/March, I approached Dr. Koksal, Dr. Arrasmith and Ms. Deras, seeking their help in setting up forums and/or procedures that would allow those involved in QEP 2 planning efforts to gather specific input from the faculty (through Faculty Senate) and student body (through the Student Government Association), respectively.

The specific input I am seeking pertains to two broad questions.

1. Within the Florida Tech community, which needs pertaining to internationalization can and should be included in and addressed by QEP 2 (e.g., concerns, problems, barriers, gaps/what’s missing, and opportunities)?
2. Within the Florida Tech community, which **activities** that are intended to address these *internationalization* needs can and should we include in QEP 2 (e.g., new programs, events, services, and opportunities; what can be done differently or more often or better)?

**Provide Us With Your Input for QEP 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(your views on concerns, problems, barriers, gaps, and opportunities)</td>
<td>(your views on what could/should be done, done differently, done more often, done better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Academic Offerings&lt;br&gt;Includes on-campus offerings (e.g., courses, minors, majors) and offerings abroad (e.g., study abroad, internships and practica, design/research projects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Residential Living/Learning&lt;br&gt;Includes on-campus housing (e.g., living/learning communities) and housing abroad (i.e., for academic study abroad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Campus Community and Culture&lt;br&gt;Includes on-campus (e.g., organizations, workshops, and activities/events) and abroad (e.g., service projects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I. Florida Institute of Technology Mission Statement

Approved by the Board of Trustees in October, 2013

With our focus on student success, Florida Institute of Technology’s mission is to provide high-quality education to a culturally diverse student body in order to prepare students for entering the global workforce, seeking higher-education opportunities, and serving within their communities. The university also seeks to expand knowledge through basic and applied research and to serve the diverse economic, cultural, and societal needs of our local, state, national and international constituencies.

In support of this mission, we are committed to:

- Fostering and sustaining a productive institutional culture of assessment leading to the continuous improvement of academic and administrative programs in order to promote student development;
- Developing an organizational culture that values and encourages intellectual curiosity, a sense of belonging and shared purpose among faculty, students and staff, and the pursuit of excellence in all endeavors;
- Recruiting and developing faculty who are internationally recognized as educators, scholars and researchers;
- Achieving recognition as an effective, innovative, technology-focused educational and research institution;
- Recruiting and retaining an excellent, highly select and culturally diverse student body;
- Continually improving the quality of campus life for all members of the university community;
- Providing personal and career growth opportunities for both traditional and nontraditional students and members of the faculty and staff;
- Securing and maintaining professional accreditation for all appropriate programs.
Appendix J. Activities Sponsored by International Student & Scholar Services (ISSS), 2005-

1. **International Friendship Program**: This Program was founded in Spring 2005. It is designed to enable students from around the world to meet members (hosts) of the Florida Tech and local community. In this Program, international students are paired with hosts, with the aim of helping students settle down and learn about American culture. Currently, this program has more than 15 students paired with 10 different hosts.

2. **Florida Tech Diplomat Program**: This Program was founded in Fall 2005. In it, “veteran” international students from around the world help new students transition into life in the U.S. To date, more than 80 diplomats have served over 3,000 new students.

3. **Welcome BBQ & Football 101**: The Welcome BBQ was begun in 2005, and expanded in Spring 2014 to include ‘Football 101.’ At present, it is offered by ISSS in conjunction with ISSO and Florida Tech Athletics/Football Team. At the beginning of each semester, these entities host an American-themed BBQ as a way to welcome all new international students and scholars, and to teach those who attend about American football.

4. **Coffee Hours**: These began in 2006. Today, they are offered on a bi-weekly basis each semester, and now contain more educational and cultural components. Each coffee hour is hosted by a different International Student Organization, at which they are asked to give a 10-15 minute presentation about their country/culture. This is followed by five quiz questions. The number of International Student Organizations has grown significantly (currently 14), enabling ISSS to provide two semesters worth of unique coffee hours.

5. **Florida Tech’s Annual International Festival**: This festival was started in February 2007, and the 9th annual is scheduled for February 2015. Over this period, the festival has tripled in size, now including more than 45 cultural displays, international food vendors, and multicultural shows. It was estimated that nearly 1,500 to 2,000 people attended the 2014 festival.

6. **Multicultural Dinners**: These Dinners are hosted once each semester by ISSS and the International Student Service Organization (ISSO). These dinners showcase the various International Student Organizations that participate in each semesters’ coffee hours. A variety of international dishes are served to coincide with FIT’s diverse student population.

7. **Orlando Airport Pickup Program**: This Program was started in Fall 2012. This unique complimentary service has provided airport pickup for over 430 newly admitted international students, transporting them from the Orlando International Airport to the Melbourne area. In AY 2012, 73 students were picked up, and this has grown to 206 students in AY 2014.

8. **International Dinner Series**: This Dinner Series was established in Fall 2014. It is co-sponsored by ISSS and Panther Dining. It features regional menus from around the world, as well as cultural displays and performances by Florida Tech international students. These dinners are hosted once a month at the Panther Dining Hall, and attract over 1,500 guests from the Florida Tech and local community.
### Appendix K. QEP Internationalization Practices at SACS Institutions Since 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Type of Institution (Size)</th>
<th>QEP Title (Start Date)</th>
<th>Primary Type of Activity</th>
<th>Link to QEP Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampden-Sydney College</td>
<td>Private All Male HCBU (1,100)</td>
<td>Preparing Good Men and Great Leaders or a Culturally Diverse World (2007)</td>
<td>LLCs, Int. House, &amp; Study Abroad, Visiting Scholars</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sacscoc.org/2007TrackbQEPSummaries.asp">www.sacscoc.org/2007TrackbQEPSummaries.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix L. Internationalization at Selected NAFSA Simon Comprehensive Awardees, 2007 – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Type of Institution (UG Size)</th>
<th>Inter. Center/ Position/ Council</th>
<th>Inter. P'ships</th>
<th>On-Campus Academic Offerings</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>Int. LLC</th>
<th>Campus Activities</th>
<th>Webpages for International Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of South Florida (2013; 1956)</td>
<td>Public: State Univ. in Florida (36,200)</td>
<td>Director, USF World</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5 International Centers/Inst.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.usf.edu/world">www.usf.edu/world</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Univ. (2010, 1898)</td>
<td>Private: IPEDS Gr. (13,200)</td>
<td>Office of Intern. Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>World Lang. Center; Online MBA</td>
<td>also Coop, Service</td>
<td>2 Month Inter. Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.northeastern.edu/studyabroad/programs/?type=Dialogue+of+Civilizations">www.northeastern.edu/studyabroad/programs/?type=Dialogue+of+Civilizations</a> also internationalcoop/]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N. Budget Outline for QEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. QEP Director</td>
<td>Full-time (12-month)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Full-time Faculty (9-month), International Scholar</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment Analyst</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>n/a (existing position)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3 Graduate Student Assistantships</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$97,800 (6 ch tuition remission + stipend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2 College Roll positions</td>
<td>2 x 10 hrs./wk. x 38 wk. @ $10/hr.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$235,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. Fringe Benefits (31%) | | |
| A.1 | Annual | $21,700 |
| A.2 | Annual | $18,600 |
| **Subtotal, Fringe** | | **$43,300** |

| C. Student Workshops and Training (Contractual: Institute for Cross-Cultural Mgmt.) | | |
| 1. Student CCM Supplies/refreshments; 12 perSemester | Annual | $3,000 |
| 3. GSA Training | Annual | $2,000 |
| **Subtotal, Training** | | **$5,000** |

| D. Travel | | |
| 1. Conferences | Annual | $5,000 |
| **Subtotal, Travel** | | **$5,000** |

| E. Scholarships | | |
| 1. Faculty Course/Program Development (4 years) | 2 per Summer @ $5,000 | Annual | $10,000 |
| **Subtotal, Scholarships** | | **$10,000** |

| F. Campus Events | | |
| 1. QEP Sponsored Events | Annual | $5,000 |
| 2. Speaker Series (2 per year) | Annual | $10,000 |
| **Subtotal, Campus Events** | | **$15,000** |

| G. Operation | | |
| 1. Operating Expenses | Annual | $3,500 |
| 2. Supplies | Annual | $2,500 |
| **Subtotal, Operation** | | **$6,000** |

| **Budget Totals** | | |
| Annual | **$316,700** |
| Five Year Total | **$1,577,260** |
Appendix O. A 2012 Review of Instruments for Assessing Cross-Cultural Competencies

Faculty and graduate students associated with Florida Tech’s Institute for Cross-Cultural Management in the School of Psychology, and with the College of Aeronautics completed a report entitled *A Validation Study of the Defense Language Office Framework for Cross-Cultural Competence and an Evaluation of Available Assessment Instruments* (Gabrenya, Moukarzel, Pomerance, Griffith, & Deaton, 2012).

**Purpose**

“The Framework was evaluated in three ways. First, its contents, comprised of a hierarchically organized set of competencies and a set of antecedent variables or ‘enablers’ were compared to four theoretical and empirical statements of competencies thought to be important for effective performance in novel cultural settings … Second, existing research support for the Framework competencies and enablers was assessed … A wide-scale search for existing instruments was conducted with which to evaluate the Framework. 33 instruments were located. The validity of each instrument was evaluated … Nine of the most commonly used instruments used in 3C [cross-cultural competence] were critiqued in depth for their usefulness in 3C research and applications. Instruments that were deemed valid and for which evidence of predictive or concurrent validity based on performance or adjustment criteria were available were used … Third, the relative value of retaining the competency model style of the Framework versus creating a causal model of military cross-cultural performance was discussed” (Executive Summary, p. iii).

**Key Findings and Recommendations**

The portion of this review of particular relevance to this Plan was the review of existing instruments developed to measure selected dimensions of cross-cultural competence. “In-depth examination of the instruments available for assessing 3C competencies and enablers revealed a serious paucity of good instruments. Instruments commonly put forth as available to 3C researchers proved to be inadequate or of little use; and several of the most highly visible instruments were found to have serious shortcomings” (Executive Summary, p. iv). More specifically, they found that “[f]or the few constructs, such as flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity, criterion validity findings were mixed … We were surprised at the extent to which well-known instruments were poorly validated, especially lacking predictive and concurrent validity studies. We had to reject several instruments that included potentially useful subscales for lack of validity. In many cases, instrument validation was confined to construct validity efforts such as MMT matrix studies to show convergent and divergent validity. Of greatest concern, the criterion validity information that was available for most instruments was disproportionally based on psychological and sociocultural adjustment rather than on any kind of performance measures” (p. 93).

As a result, the recommendations offered included the following: “(2) valid, behaviorally-anchored assessment methods need to be developed to assess the competencies to support research and training outcome studies” (Executive Summary, p. iv).
Appendix P. Description of the Cross-Cultural Navigator (CCN)

The CCN, formerly referred to as the Intercultural Effectiveness Survey (IES), was developed by faculty in Florida Tech’s Institute for Cross Cultural Management (ICCM), in cooperation with Select International, to address the need for more valid measures of cross-cultural competence, as noted in Appendix Q. The CCN consists of six dimensions and seven subscales: (a) mindfulness, (b) experience seeking, (c) broad perspective, (d) rapport, (e) acceptance (two subscales: general and culture-specific), and (f) perseverance. There are eight items per subscale, for a total of 56 items. The descriptions below are taken from a 2014 Feedback Report prepared by faculty associated with this Institute.

(a) **Mindfulness** refers to the extent to which individuals understand their own strengths and weaknesses, philosophies and values, the impact of their past experiences on themselves, and the impact of their values and behaviors on others. Being aware of these factors allows individuals to identify areas of improvement and seek knowledge in those areas when in a new setting for self-improvement purposes. Mindfulness is expected to have a strong impact on relationships between individuals from different cultural backgrounds.

(b) **Experience Seeking** captures an individual’s pleasure in and willingness to seek out new international and cultural situations. This involves the proactive pursuit of these experiences, as well as knowledge of cultural differences, and the preference to embark on opportunities for growth and learning rather than remain continually rooted. Experience seeking includes the extent to which individuals learn from past mistakes and allow the knowledge collected from that reflection to impact their current perspectives and behavior and promote their success. Taking initiative to learn about new cultures relates to better cross-cultural adjustment, feelings of psychological and emotional comfort with a new culture.

(c) **Broad Perspective** refers to the mind opening, active, and passionate acquisition of knowledge from and about people originating outside of one’s national boundaries. It is captured by behaviors such as watching foreign movies, reading foreign novels, and taking classes with international content. This competency closely resembles cosmopolitanism, or the “willingness to explore and learn from alternative systems of meaning held by others.” Possessing this trait lays the ground for building international friendships as the knowledge pursued builds common ground.

(d) **Rapport** to an individual’s tendency to build and maintain cross-cultural partnerships. This characteristic includes facilitating and fostering long-lasting connections with individuals in other cultures. This may involve actively seeking out relationships and putting in effort to maintain the relationship (e.g., learning a different language). Having a strong relationship with those in other cultures is expected to increase knowledge of other cultures and adjustment within other cultures, as the friends may act as mentors and provide guidance regarding cultural norms and expectations.

(e and f) **Acceptance** refers to the tendency of individuals to think positively about others from cultural backgrounds different from their own, both in general and with respect to other specific cultures. This characteristic includes refraining from believing in negative stereotypes and maintaining a favorable outlook about others from different cultures. This may involve suspending judgmental perceptions and being receptive to situations that differ from norms and expectations retained from one’s own culture (e.g., refraining from ethnocentrism, or perceiving cultures different from one’s own as wrong). Being open to cultures other than one’s own is expected to reduce likelihood of failing to adapt to new cultures and withdrawal from cross-cultural acceptance.

(g) **Perseverance** refers to an individual’s strength in the face of trying experiences. It includes maintaining composure in the face of stress and persevering through the demanding and challenging circumstances. This may involve coping well with and bouncing back quickly from difficult experiences, such as those faced while in new cultures. Effectively coping with stressful situations should aid in the adjustment to a new culture and is expected to be negatively related to withdrawal behaviors.