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OVERVIEW

On March 24, 2011, the Academic Senate formed the Global Education Task Force, with representation from each of the nine colleges. The charge to the Task Force emerged from the recognition that RIT's global programs and international education efforts were not well coordinated or guided by a strategic vision. The charge further provided:

The time has now come for a comprehensive and systematic review of the many efforts across the campus to achieve greater internationalization of the student experience and of RIT’s academic profile. Therefore the Academic Senate charges the Global Education Task Force to:

- Frame a new conversation on internationalization within the RIT community, including developing a shared understanding of internationalization across colleges and a broader perspective on comprehensive approaches to global academic experiences;
- Conduct a review of the current state of internationalization at RIT;
- Research proven models, best practices, and appropriate governance mechanisms for advancing and monitoring internationalization in higher education;
- Articulate goals for advancing internationalization of the RIT’s undergraduate and graduate curricula;
- Assist in the development of the learning outcomes associated with internationalization and enhanced student experiences such as study abroad and international co-ops;
- Identify learning outcomes and academic practices that bridge the gap between multicultural education and internationalization;
- Suggest ways to further operationalize the international aspects of the University’s Strategic Plan;
- Identify incentives for faculty and student participation in internationalization initiatives.
- Gather information from and consult with other constituents involved with international education.

The Task Force was further charged to complete its work no later than the end of the 2011-2012 academic year.

Recognizing the ambitious nature of this charge, the Task Force met regularly throughout the 2011/2012 academic year. As the Task Force became more knowledgeable and
informed, the work focused in key areas - governance, learning outcomes, study abroad, faculty-led programs, international campuses, and the connections between diversity and inclusive excellence and international education.

It should be noted that the Provost’s decision to create the position of Associate Provost for International Education and Global programs had significant impact on the work of the Task Force. Since this decision occurred after the Task Force was formed, our final report may not reflect all of the expectations set out in the original charge. Further, limited time and resources did not allow for the development of a complete inventory or assessment of the many international activities and programs within RIT. If this information were readily available it would undoubtedly enhance any efforts toward internationalization at RIT.

The Task Force consulted literature in the key areas and investigated best practices in internalization education as recognized by higher education organizations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, American Council on Education: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, and the Association for Studies in International Education (Journal of Studies in International Education). The Task Force consulted research monographs published by the University Leadership Council and white papers and various other materials on international education from several other institutions.

The Task Force also interviewed several key stakeholders within RIT (a list of interviews and dates is provided in Appendix A), conducted an online survey of faculty (Report of Results in Appendix B) and an informal survey of students.

The Task Force discovered that "global education," "international education" and "internationalization" have many meanings and can mean different things to different people, even within our own campus. To fulfill its charge, the Task Force was guided by the definition of Internationalization as adopted by the National Association of International Educators. International education encompasses

the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and
global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education.
To be fully successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the
academic community in global networks and partnerships. (NAFSA: Association of
International Educators’ 2010 Task Force)

This definition was interpreted to have local as well as global applicability; in other words, internalization occurs through conscious efforts to embed concepts and ideas in curriculum, and through growing and meaningfully engaging the international community of students and faculty on campus as well as providing students educational experiences abroad. The Task Force further recognized that internationalization involves "the process of integrating an international perspective into the teaching/learning, research and service functions" of the university. (Hudzik 2011, p. 10)
The Task Force has concluded that comprehensive internationalization is a complex task for institutions of higher education, a task that encompasses a wide variety of considerations and dimensions. It requires intentionality and leadership at the highest levels and meaningful buy-in from all stakeholders, especially faculty. Many scholars view internationalization as requiring a major culture change for higher education. (Hudzik 2011; Knight 2001)

ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE

Charge to the Task Force
Research proven models, best practices, and appropriate governance mechanisms for advancing and monitoring internationalization in higher education.

Current Status
Internationalization efforts at RIT suffer from a lack of coordination and integration. This was noted in the Academic Senate charge to the Task Force and was repeated in many Task Force interviews and discussions throughout the campus. Although there are a number of activities, programs and projects taking place across the campus and at international sites, the Task Force observed that many of these efforts are relatively isolated from each other. This lack of coordination has led to disjointed programming, the lack of strategic direction with regard to international programming and decisions, resource allocation decisions without consistent regard to academic priorities or quality, the failure to engage the entire RIT community in discussions regarding internationalization efforts and the failure to build an institutional culture necessary for comprehensive internationalization.

Experts in international education note "the impediments to comprehensive internationalization are substantial without campus-wide leadership and coordination at some effective level. Indeed, the notion of [comprehensive internationalization] without any point leadership is absurd." (Emphasis in the original, Hudzik, 2011, p.23)

Models
Prior to the Provost’s announcement establishing the position of Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs, the Task Force investigated the administrative structure for international education at a number of universities. A key resource was the list of current recipients of the Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization, sponsored by NAFSA: the Association of International Educators. This award "recognizes institutions for overall excellence in internationalization efforts as evidenced in practices, structures, philosophies, and policies." Recent recipients include Indiana University – Purdue University (Global Affairs Officer and Global Affairs Council); University of Michigan (International Institute); University of Arizona (Office of International Affairs); Boston University (Office of Global Programs); and Portland State University (Vice Provost for International Affairs/Office of International Affairs). The Task Force also looked at Virginia Tech (Associate Provost for International Affairs/Office of
International Research, Education and Development) and Lehigh University (Vice President for International Affairs/Office of International Affairs).

With this perspective in mind, the co-chairs of the Task Force, Robert Barbato and Ann Howard, were invited to meet with Provost Haefner in fall 2011 to provide input regarding the creation the position of Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs. With concurrence from the full Task Force, the co-chairs supported the creation of a central position to assure greater coordination and oversight for internationalization efforts at RIT. The co-chairs also urged the Provost to develop the position with the expectation that the individual holding that office would ensure that faculty have a significant role in enhancing and developing internationalization programs and activities. "[Comprehensive internationalization] cannot occur without majority faculty support and engagement." (Hudzik 2011, p.25)

**Recommendation**

Work collaboratively with the Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs to ensure that the Academic Senate provides appropriate guidance on academic issues as they relate to International Education

As noted above, the Task Force supported Provost Haefner’s decision to create the position of Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs. Simultaneously, the Task Force would not support a centralized office that did not engage in meaningful ways with faculty across the Institute. The Task Force heard many concerns regarding academic integrity and accountability with respect to all international activities. In this regard, the Task Force sees the need for a permanent mechanism for assuring broad faculty participation in RIT’s internationalization efforts. The Task Force believes the Academic Senate is the appropriate body to take responsibility for this function. This is consistent with RIT’s commitment to shared governance and is consistent with the advice of experts in the field. Several institutions the Task Force investigated have institute-wide global councils or faculty committees charged with coordinating internationalization efforts and serving as a communication linkage for new initiatives. The Task Force recommends that the Academic Senate provide a forum within which current and future international education and global programs be assessed to assure academic quality and accountability and to assure a greater degree of transparency in decision making.

**Recommendation**

Establish a Standing Committee of the Academic Senate on International Education and Global Programs to assure transparency, academic quality and accountability in the areas of International Education.

The work of this Standing Committee should be coordinated with other RIT committees, including the International Education Working Group and the Global
Education Council. It is further recommended that the chair(s) of the Standing Committee be invited to sit on these other institute committees.

As noted in the charge to the Task force, RIT’s Strategic Plan emphasizes Student Success and the connection to global education. Further, the Academic Program Profile and General Education Framework explicitly require that RIT programs embed the essential program outcome of Global Interconnectedness and that students take courses that “encourage them to see life from a perspective wider than their own and to understand the diversity of human cultures within an interconnected global society”. In spite of these guiding documents and directives, there is no comprehensive, institute-wide guidance that links these desired outcomes with internationalization programs and activities. In addition, there is no institute-wide guidance that assures the potential linkages between activities and programs, nor is there a strategic vision that encourages effective utilization of RIT’s many resources to support internationalization efforts.

The results of the faculty survey conducted by the Task Force indicate there are many potential ways in which internationalization can be fostered. Faculty interest in international education activities is discernible, but we believe is largely untapped. As one respondent observed,

> We have tremendous resources and knowledge among our faculty and staff, but we do not always do a very good job of identifying these, nor in fostering networks, or building scholarly research/interest groups.

Further, data from the Task Force faculty survey suggest that RIT faculty would support and participate in internationalization efforts but lack of resources, incentives, and time are deterrents. In addition, there is no concerted effort to take full advantage of the presence of RIT’s significant population of international students and faculty.

The Task Force believes that these circumstances can be addressed through a strategic planning process. As one author has noted,

> [I]nternational plans are higher education institutions’ written commitment to internationalization...Such plans advance institutional goals for internationalization by expressing international commitment, defining institutional goals, informing stakeholders' participation, as well as informing and stimulating stakeholder involvement in international initiatives. (Childress 2009, p. 291)

**Recommendation**

The Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs should consult with the Standing Committee of the Academic Senate to develop a strategic action plan and to engage the entire RIT community in establishing goals and priorities for internationalization at RIT.
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES

Charge to the Task Force

Assist in the development of the learning outcomes associated with internationalization and enhanced student experiences such as study abroad and international co-ops

Current Status

It appears that global learning outcomes are being developed across campus by individual units and programs but a comprehensive framework is still in draft form.

The Task Force completed a review of global learning outcomes already developed and in place at RIT. RIT’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Office, led by Dr. Anne Wahl, developed a draft framework for establishing global learning goals. This framework, which is included as Appendix C, identifies goals at 5 levels:

I. Institutional goals
II. Divisional and Departmental Goals
III. General Education Goals
IV. Individual Course Goals
V. Campus Life Goals

As semester conversion is completed, all programs will be tracked via a central database. It will then be possible to pull data on how each RIT program touches international education, providing a much broader view of the integration of internationalization across the curriculum.

Learning outcomes that have already been established include:

• General Education, Ethical, Social and Global Awareness
  o Analyze similarities and differences in human experiences and consequent perspectives
  o Examine connections among the world’s populations
  o Identify contemporary ethical questions and relevant stakeholder positions

• Study Abroad
Students will develop and enhance their cultural awareness and cross
cultural skills as a result of their participation in the Study Abroad
program.

An additional assessment instrument already in use is the National Survey of Student
Engagement. This survey is administered to RIT freshmen and seniors every other year
and includes a section to assess global education.

Models
Research revealed strong models for establishing global learning outcomes, both from
individual institutions and educational associations. The American Council on Education
has a comprehensive tool kit for assessing international learning outcomes using a student
survey/ePortolio approach
http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/cii/res/assess/inde
x.htm. The ACE also provides a ranking document to assist universities in selecting
international learning outcomes relevant to their institutional culture:
http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/cii/res/assess/Intl
_Learning_Outcomes_Ranking_Document.doc.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities Essential Learning Outcomes,
http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/EssentialOutcomes_Chart.pdf, incorporates global
outcomes, with a focus on knowledge of human cultures and personal and social
responsibility. Another AACU publication, Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good
Intentions with Good Practice,
http://www.aacu.org/SharedFutures/documents/Global_Learning.pdf, provides a
detailed overview of the framework that was adopted by RIT’s Assessment Office with
guidelines for establishing global learning goals at the 5 levels.

There are also many notable examples of learning outcomes representing the different
levels from individual universities:

- Washington State University, global learning outcomes and rubrics for study
  abroad, http://ip.wsu.edu/education_abroad/outcomes-program-
  assessment/education-abroad-learning-outcomes.html

- Michigan State University, Liberal Learning & Global Competence at MSU,
  http://global.undergrad.msu.edu/userfiles/file/LLG_GC_combined_table.pdf

- Bronx Community College
  http://www.bcc.cuny.edu/NationalCenterForEducationalAlliances/?page=Gl
  obal_learning_Outcomes

- Bowling Green State University, International Studies Program learning
  outcomes,
  http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/isp/page107307.html
Recommendation

Student Learning Outcomes for RIT's international efforts should be coordinated by the office of the Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs, working in collaboration with the Assessment Office, individual colleges and departments and the Standing Committee of the Academic Senate.

Learning outcomes should address the complementary nature of multicultural education and internationalization.

THE CURRENT STATE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION AT RIT

Charge

Conduct a review of the current state of internationalization at RIT. (The Task Force divided this charge into three separate areas of inquiry: study abroad, faculty-led programs, and international campuses. Time did not allow a thorough review of internationalization of curricula.)

STUDY ABROAD

Current Status

The RIT Office of Study Abroad and Fellowships direct study abroad activities. The office has three full-time staff, one part-time advisor and one temporary worker. The office is responsible for student advising, developing affiliated program partnerships, marketing study abroad activities, event planning, training, and assisting with faculty-led study abroad and related activities. The office coordinates with staff of the Global Delivery Corporation regarding study abroad opportunities at RIT international campuses in Croatia, Kosovo and Dubai.

RIT students have a variety of choices for study abroad and a total of 275 students participated in study abroad programs in AY 2010/2011, up from 232 in AY 2009/2010. Of this number, 110 students participated in programs sponsored by affiliate institution, 98 students attended one of RIT’s international campuses, and 67 students participated in programs led by RIT faculty. An informal survey of a small group of students provided some insight on the obstacles facing students interested in studying abroad. Cost and lack of time within their program of study were two of the top reasons that students gave for not studying abroad, the same top reasons given in previous surveys conducted by the Study Abroad Office in 2007 and 2008.
It appears that not all of the affiliate programs have been subject to a faculty review process. Many of the affiliates have long-standing reputation in study abroad and would be readily acknowledged for the quality of their programming. While the Task Force has no evidence that any of the affiliate programs are questionable, the lack of a faculty vetting process is concerning.

Recently, the study abroad office has been promoting study abroad at RIT’s international sites in Croatia, Kosovo and Dubai. In spite of discounted tuition for study abroad at these sites, student interest in these locations is not strong. One faculty member reported that he had to cancel a 2011/3 class for RIT students scheduled for Croatia due to lack of student interest. While the Task Force does not challenge the value of study abroad at these locations, we do question if these locations will ever generate substantial student interest. If RIT is to increase student participation in study abroad as part of its internationalization efforts, the role of the international campuses must be seriously evaluated.

Finally, the Task Force observes that while the number of students studying abroad is increasing, RIT students, especially in computing and engineering, seem to be disinterested in study abroad, even for programs that include courses in their field of study. We do not currently have deep insight into this problem or its solution, but it needs to be addressed if we are to significantly increase the number of students going on such programs. Thus, when looking for inspiration from other universities regarding study abroad, and setting targets for enrollment (if we choose to do so), we should look to institutions with similar student profiles.

Models
There are numerous models for study abroad programs and high quality study abroad experiences are a cornerstone for comprehensive internationalization. A respected resource is the Forum on Education Abroad, an organization whose exclusive purpose it is to serve the field of education abroad. The Forum’s Standards of Good Practice is a valuable tool for self-evaluation of current study abroad practices. In addition, the Forum provides excellence guidance on integrating study abroad into curricula.

The Association of International Educators (NAFSA) also provides guidance on strengthening study abroad (NAFSA 2008). NAFSA has laid out four categories of criteria for institutional management of study abroad: institutional commitment, study abroad infrastructure, adequate resources and clarity and accountability. NAFSA emphasizes the importance of embedding study abroad as an integral component of academic offerings and integrating study abroad into the academic life of the institution. Further, NAFSA recommends that study abroad oversight rest with an office with "institution-wide purview" to assure a high level of accountability and academic quality. Most critically, study abroad must be faculty-driven.
Recommendations
The Associate Provost for International Education and Global Programs, in consultation with the Standing Committee of the Academic Senate, should

1. Conduct an assessment of the current study abroad programs
2. Assess the current study abroad administrative structure
3. Review and assess the proposed learning outcomes for study abroad
4. Incorporate study abroad goals and measures into the Institute Internationalization Plan.

Conduct a campus wide student survey and hold student focus groups to gather student input on study abroad interest and obstacles.

Establish a scholarship fund for study abroad so that study abroad opportunities are accessible to all RIT students.

FACULTY-LED STUDY ABROAD

Current Status
There appear to be a number of faculty-led study abroad programs at RIT. Examples include 5/6 week summer language and cultural immersion programs led by faculty in the modern languages and cultures department in the College of Liberal Arts and 1/3 week experiences lead by faculty in the College of Imaging Arts and Sciences. Research suggests that short-term study abroad experiences – those lasting fewer than eight weeks – “are worthwhile educational endeavors that have significant self-perceived impacts on students’ intellectual and personal lives.” (Chieffo & Griffiths 2009 p. 179). Development and encouragement for increased faculty-led offerings is critical to RIT’s internationalization efforts.

Based on information gathered by members in their respective colleges and the results of the faculty survey conducted in March 2012, the Task Force concludes that there is interest among faculty to participate in faculty-led activities. However, there are barriers. In general, the Task Force found that faculty-led programs are not well supported administratively or financially and there are limited incentives for faculty. Compared to other universities there is a minimal level of logistical and academic support for faculty who are interested in leading study abroad.

Faculty-led programs at RIT are not well documented and information is fragmented. A review of the Study Abroad database (Compass) conducted during fall 2011 revealed information regarding 11 offerings, of which 5 were for summer, 3 for 1-3 week programs and 3 for regular academic quarters. Few of those offerings included specific dates. This
suggests that students would have a difficult time identifying faculty-led study abroad opportunities. Task Force members also were aware of faculty-led programs that were not reflected in the database. For example, some faculty members have arranged international study/projects with RIT global campuses or with partner universities. Often these activities are not recorded outside of the department or college. Faculty members in some areas have indicated a desire to lead activities that are more focused on the students’ fields of study, but are frustrated by the lack of standardized protocol.

In terms of creating new faculty-led study abroad programs, the available support and approval process is not very clear. Especially when going to one of RIT's global campuses, the delineation of effort between Study Abroad, Global Delivery Corporation and the partner campus is not clear. Further, in the fall 2011 a new approval form was developed by Study Abroad which includes "non-academic learning objectives" as well as logistical questions (risk assessment, etc.), but there is very little guidance for faculty as to what the expectations are and who will be reviewing this document and the follow-up assessments.

**Models**

The University Leadership Council has identified a number of considerations derived from its research regarding faculty-led study abroad initiatives. Nationally, short-term, faculty-led programs currently represent more than 55% of all students who go abroad. While there are a number of drivers for this, a significant factor is containing costs – short-term programs are more affordable for participating students.

The institutions that have a leading reputation for faculty-led programs “support faculty through all stages of the process, reducing the bureaucratic burden on faculty as well as risks to students.” (University Leadership Council 2009 p.xiv) Further, as with all study abroad activities, experts urge the development of specific student learning outcomes for each study abroad experience. (Donnelly-Smith 2009 p.14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a mechanism to provide the necessary information and support for faculty-led programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and distribute a comprehensive course/program inventory so students and faculty are aware of the offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create genuine incentives for faculty to participate in international academic course/program activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL CAMPUSES

Current Status
RIT currently operates three international campuses, ACMT in Croatia, American University of Kosovo, and RIT Dubai. In addition, RIT also has an affiliation with Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra in the Dominican Republic. These sites are administered by RIT Global Delivery Corporation (GDC) a separate 501(c)(3) legal entity. According to Greg Van Laeken, business manager and analyst for global programs, GDC was established in 2004 to provide support for RIT's academic programs outside of the US and to protect RIT's assets from any financial risk that may be associated with those programs. The GDC has its own board of directors and staff and has no direct financial relationship with RIT.

During all the Task Force deliberations, the international campuses were frequently the topic of discussion, often in the context of faculty governance, study abroad, or academic accountability. Time did not allow for thorough vetting of each of the global programs, nor did the Task Force see this as within its purview. However, because of the frequency with which the international campuses were raised in discussions and meetings, the Task Force felt an obligation to raise those concerns here.

A major concern regarding the international campuses is the perceived lack of transparency and academic oversight as decisions regarding these programs are made. Students graduating from ACMT in Croatia, American University of Kosovo, and RIT Dubai receive RIT degrees. Because of this the international campuses should be subject to the same oversight, transparency, and academic accountability as other colleges of RIT. The Task Force does not challenge the need for the unique administrative structure (GDC). However, there is a role for faculty oversight through the shared governance process.

Tied to the concern regarding faculty oversight is the decision-making process to establish new international campuses. There is no formal process within the shared governance structures through which new international sites would be considered. The Task Force views this as a weakness of RIT's internationalization efforts.

Recommendations
The role of RIT’s international campuses should be assessed within the internationalization plan development. Consideration should be given to the strategic value of the current sites and whether there are opportunities in other parts of the world that provide equal or greater value.
If RIT is to expand its global presence through other international sites, affiliates or campuses, any considerations in this regard should be subject to shared governance processes and deliberations.

Create genuine incentives for faculty to participate in international academic course/program activities at RIT’s international sites

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

Charge: Identify learning outcomes and academic practices that bridge the gap between multicultural education and internationalization

Current Status
RIT’s 2005-2015 Strategic Plan clearly articulates the potential for bridging multicultural education and internationalization. The plan anticipates that RIT will engage all members of the campus community in the shared responsibility for an enriching and inclusive experience for all...; have an enriched academic curriculum with courses and programs addressing a broad understanding of global issues and featuring enhanced opportunities for acquiring language skills...; and foster] a learning, living and working campus community environment that supports and encourages cross-cultural understanding and global awareness.

RIT’s 2010-2015 Inclusive Excellence Framework identifies specific goals, objectives and strategies for fostering a more diverse and inclusive campus. Many of these elements have clear implications for internationalizing the RIT campus. Specifically, the Framework establishes a goal for education and scholarship; "[E]ngrade students, faculty and staff in learning perspectives of domestic and global diversity, inclusion, and social justice." Strategies include implementation of curricular transformation with courses and programs addressing a broad understanding of global issues and establishment of incentives for faculty to adapt existing courses and academic programs for global outreach education.

Models
Multicultural education and internationalization have divergent histories in higher education and as a result are often viewed as separate and distinct institutional priorities. Multicultural education emphasizes issues of social justice and inequality with a focus on domestic diversity while internationalization focuses on the integration of international, intercultural, and global dimensions. However, experts have long recognized the connection between diversity, social justice and global learning as an education priority...
and that they can complement each other and enhance institutional commitments to both. The literature is rich with evidence of the individual benefits, the institutional benefits and curriculum benefits. (Teraguchi & Musil 2011; Milem, Chang & Antonio 2005). As noted by many scholars, "multicultural education and internationalization both point to a process of institutional transformation." (Olsson, et al p. ix)

The American Council on Education (ACE) has been studying the potential overlap and intersection of internationalization and multicultural education for several years. ACE has recognized that by working on the intersection of such programs, institutions will be able to help students understand multiculturalism and social justice in a global context. While internationalization and multicultural education

should not be subsumed into the other ... the two areas have much they can substantively contribute to each other. Indeed, neither area is complete without consideration of what the other brings to bear in terms of understanding and living effectively with difference. (American Council on Education 2007)

Similarly, the Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) has encouraged "bridging" this divide. In its Greater Expectations initiative, AACU has focused specifically on the connections. (Leskes & Miller 2006) As Jeffrey Schultz, of Arcadia University, has observed,

[I]f we start to see U.S. multiculturalism and internationalization as intertwined rather than divided, we can vastly improve our teaching about diversity... Arcadia has taken significant steps to reformulate its general education program to address the traditional division between international programs and domestic diversity education. (Schultz, et al 2007. p 5)

Arcadia operationalizes this commitment by offering students domestic options that allow students to cross racial, economic, and cultural lines without leaving the U.S. These experiences are captured through electronic portfolios and live video forums.

**Recommendations**

The Associate Provost for International Education and Global programs should collaborate with the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, the Standing Committee of the Academic Senate and the individual colleges to promote educational opportunities aimed at bridging the divide between multicultural education and internationalization.

RIT's internationalization plan should specifically address strategies for incorporating RIT's commitment to multicultural education and inclusive excellence.
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Appendix A
Interviews conducted by the Global Education Task Force

10/14/11 James Myers - Director of the Center for Multidisciplinary Studies

10/28/11 Tynelle Stewart and Jenny Sullivan - Office of Study Abroad

11/11/11 Hector Flores - Dean of Graduate Studies

12/2/11 Jeffrey Cox - Director of the Office of International Student Services

1/13/12 Greg Van Laeken - Business Manager and Analyst for Global Programs
Descriptive analysis of respondents (N=186)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of respondents by job title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer, Sr. Lecturer, Principal Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample distribution of respondents by job title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of respondents by length of employment at RIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of employment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: The survey data more strongly reflects individuals with long-term participation in the RIT faculty.

- Most of the respondents (86.63%) hold professorships.
- Most of the respondents (77.9%) have been employed at RIT longer than 5 years.

Limitation: While the survey data represents a group of people with extensive experience with RIT culture and programs, newer faculty at RIT were underrepresented.

- Results reflect long-held perceptions of global education programs.
- Data may lack some emerging perspectives held by new faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Percentage of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAS</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCIS</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGCOE</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHST</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top three responding colleges (percent)
1. GCCIS (21.55)
2. COLA (16.57)
3. CIAS (12.15)

Faculty with international experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travelled outside of US</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in a country outside of US</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studied abroad as an undergraduate</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued graduate studies outside of US</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked outside of US</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued research projects outside of US</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented at international conferences</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular interaction with international colleagues</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived outside of US  and country of birth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the listed responses apply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NTID | 9.94 |
| GIS  | 1.10 |
| Multidisciplinary Studies  | 2.21 |
| No answer | 0.55 |
Teaching abroad

- Note: Some respondents mentioned that they were involved with RIT's strategic partnership with PUCMM in the Dominican Republic (in Santiago and Santo Domingo).

- The RIT faculty respondents mentioned a variety of unique international experiences to contribute to global education programming.

Responses:
- “The PhD program where I got my degree in the US was composed of many international students.”

- “I have been an external examiner for a foreign university.”

- “I was on Fulbright Commission and a Fulbright Scholar.”
“I have traveled to over 40 countries.”

“I have taught for companies in South East Asia.

“I participated in the People to People Student Ambassador Program.”

**Faculty Perceptions of international learning at RIT**

When asked to rate different value statements related to international learning on a numeric scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree, to 5 = Strongly Agree:

- The top three counts for “strongly agree” were:
  1. Contact with people whose background is different than one’s own is an important part of education.
  2. Learning about people from different cultures is a very important part of education.
  3. Students can understand their own culture more fully if they have studied another.

**Program leadership**

![Pie chart showing RIT faculty participation in study abroad leadership]

- **Note:** Out of the faculty who led study abroad programs at RIT, involvement in short term programs was most common, while summer involvement was relatively rare.
A number of RIT faculty are already going above and beyond to enrich global education:

**Responses:**
- “I am working with the University of Paderborn to explore possibilities for an exchange program.”

### Sample distribution of faculty led study abroad programs by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study abroad program</th>
<th>Proportion of study abroad programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>short-term program, credit</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short-term program, non-credit</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarter-long program</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer program</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of study abroad faculty leaders by involvement type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent &quot;Yes&quot; of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One short-term program (1-5 weeks, non-credit)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One short-term program (1-5 weeks, credit)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple short-term programs (credit)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple short-term programs (non-credit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One quarter-long program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple quarter-long programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One summer program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple summer programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I have had my students develop educational games for the One Laptop per Child program, an International effort.”

“I have worked with UNICEF to begin placing co-ops overseas.”

Faculty non-participants

**Q: If you have not participated in a faculty-led study abroad experience, please indicate your reasons. Please check all that apply.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Doesn’t fit my area of teaching or scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Doesn’t fit in my teaching/research workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I am unsure about how to develop this kind of educational offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am discouraged from participating in faculty-led study abroad by my college/department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>It is not part of my plan for tenure, merit or promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>RIT does not provide the necessary support to develop faculty-led study abroad experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>My family/personal obligations preclude me from taking this on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Representative/common “other” responses:
  
  “I have not been approached with the idea.”

  “While I don’t want to get rich by doing this type of experience I should not have to go to the poor house just to make RIT look good.”

  Many respondents said additional funding awards for faculty teaching abroad was necessary for an inclusive and robust international education program.

  “We are really short on faculty in my discipline.”
Student Support

Q: Have you encouraged your students to participate in learning experiences at any of RIT’s International sites?

49 - Yes, I frequently encourage students
56 - Yes, I have occasionally encouraged students
72 - No, I am not familiar enough with the programs there
3 - No, I discourage students from considering studying at these sites.

➢ There are common ways that RIT faculty are supporting student global education experiences. The messages in the following remarks came from multiple respondents.

Responses:
- “I encourage all of my students not only to travel but, while they have the opportunity, to live in another country.”
- “I have examined the list of courses offered and the options of research projects that such an opportunity holds; and I have discussed in person with these students the added advantages of taking specific course work in these international settings.”
- “I held a brief discussion about the opportunities in class.”
- “Recruitment presentations, facilitating communication between US-based and Kosovo-based students and ACMT-based students, arranging funding to support such activities, and similar efforts.”

➢ There are common reasons why some RIT faculty do not advocate among students for the current global education experience. I have chosen some representative comments to portray the themes:

Responses:
- “I am not familiar enough with the programs/opportunities at RIT’s international campuses.”
- Programs don’t exist for their discipline e.g. art/glass, graphic design, clinical sciences, advanced mathematics/science and others.
“There’s no research activity and no advanced study in areas of interest at those sites.”

“The choices are too limiting.”

“Dealing with transfer courses is hard. They are not interchangeable and often not career oriented.”

“I personally don’t believe that RIT’s "international sites" constitute true international experiences.”

“I teach first-quarter freshmen who not ready to hear about such opportunities.”

“Not sure if they are deaf-friendly.”

Important “additional comments”

“Actually, I would enjoy teaching in a study abroad program. It appears that the opportunities are limited.”
  • Many of the respondents expressed an interest in signing up for teaching international programs.
  • Some respondents highlighted alternative ways to bring in international education such as (1) bringing in more international students, (2) fostering rich interactions between students from different countries and the US, (3) helping faculty to conduct international research or teaching.
  • More than one respondent mentioned that better telecommunication technology was needed to facilitate long-distance learning with international campuses and the main campus.

“We must do more to strengthen our ties to other non-US institutions, to encourage faculty exchange, and to ensure that a global approach is a fundamental aspect of our entire curriculum.”
  • One respondent suggested partnering with local domestic institutions as a good first step.

“RIT needs to ramp up its support for such programs.”
  • Many respondents said that international education is only available to the wealthier students who can afford it.
  • One respondent highlighted the need for building an incentive structure for departments to support our international campuses.
- Increased administrative support was mentioned as an incentive for faculty to teach abroad.
- A need for increased administrative planning was mentioned by many respondents, with one saying that all Deans should prepare a globalization plan for their College.
- A stronger commitment to foreign language programs was mentioned by many respondents as a key to preparing students to go abroad and sparking student interest in global education.

- “Currently requires a lot of effort on the part of the faculty person leading the course(s) to make the opportunities happen.”
  - Some faculty expressed the need for more consistency in course offerings to help reduce last-minute hassle.

- “I am becoming disillusioned by the increasing amount of "red tape" that accompanies faculty-led programs. RIT has become so risk adverse about sending students abroad that it is making it more and more challenging for the faculty who want to provide this valuable service to students to comply with all of the regulations and paperwork.”

- “Any sort of personal challenge such as that provided by study abroad supports people in widening their horizons and increasing their flexibility and self-understanding. Such challenging experiences can be found within our domestic borders as well, such as by engaging in service learning.”
  - Many faculty stressed the need for cultural immersion for meaningful international education.

- One faculty member brought up a solid point – RIT needs to do a better job identifying the global education assets that lie within the faculty: “We have tremendous resources and knowledge among our faculty and staff, but we do not always do a very good job of identifying these, nor in fostering networks, or building scholarly research/interest groups. It is noteworthy that in your list of questions in the survey, you do not ask if we have fluency in another language and what it is.”
Level I Institutional Goals

RIT VISION
RIT will lead higher education in preparing students for innovative, creative, and successful careers in a global society.

RIT MISSION
The RIT mission is to provide a broad range of career-oriented educational programs with the goal of producing innovative, creative graduates who are well-prepared for their chosen careers in a global society. The RIT community engages and motivates students through stimulating and collaborative experiences. We rigorously pursue new and emerging technologies and social conditions. Our community is committed to diversity and student centeredness and is distinguished by our innovative and collaborative spirit. Internal and external partnerships expand our students’ experiential learning. RIT is committed to mutually enriching relationships with alumni, government, business and the world community. Teaching, learning, scholarship, research, innovation, and leadership development for promoting student success are our central enterprises.

Academic Program Profile - Essential Outcomes
One of the five essential outcomes identified at RIT is Global Interconnectedness.

**Global Interconnectedness** refers to the ability to understand and function in an increasingly multicultural, international, yet connected environment. It fosters the development of individuals to become successful professionals, civic leaders, and informed citizens in a diverse national and global society. Individuals with these competencies would: demonstrate an understanding of the relationships between diverse populations and social, economy, and political power both in the United States and globally; demonstrate knowledge of contributions made by members of diverse and/or underrepresented groups to our various communities; consider perspectives of divers groups when making decisions; and function as members of society and as professionals with people who have ideas, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors that are different from their own.

• **Strategic Plan Key Results Areas**
  1: Goal 3 Increase Student Participation in Global Initiatives
    • International Students, 1800 - 2013
• Enrollment@ International Sites, 1700 - 2013
• Study Abroad Placements, 350 - 2013
• CO-OP Assignments, 5% - 2013

• Inclusive Excellence Framework
  • Education and Scholarship

Goal: Engage students, faculty and staff in learning varied perspectives of domestic and global diversity, inclusion, and social justice.

Strategies:
1. Implement the plan for undergraduate curricular transformation (Human Diversity into curriculum found in the RIT Strategic Plan) and enrich academic curriculum with courses and programs addressing a broad understanding of global issues.
2. Establish incentives for individual faculty and academic units to adapt existing courses and academic programs for global outreach education, and develop new courses and programs as needed.

Indicators:
1. Number of students enrolled in courses with the Human Diversity designation.
2. Number of undergraduate and graduate students engaged in internationalization efforts using measures outlined in Global Society efforts (e.g. number of students participating in education abroad, work abroad, etc.)
3. Increase in students reporting increased dialogue between and greater understanding of other races or cultures on assessment surveys (e.g. NSSE and other relevant surveys of student experiences/outcomes).

Level II Divisional and Departmental Goals

• 2013 Academic Program - Level Assessment Plans - Academic Program Profile - mapped to Essential Outcomes (See Attached Sample)

  o Student Learning Outcomes Examples:

    • International and Global Studies
      • Demonstrate knowledge of key perspectives, concepts and terminologies of globalization
      • Demonstrate knowledge of the relative rights of peoples, cultures and societies in a global context

    • Political Science
      • Critically assess the theory and practice of international relations
and influence of globalization on relations between nation-states and the role of international law and organizations in regulating these relations

• Semester Conversion - NYSED Program Form
  o Global Interconnectedness
    o References to Global Interconnectedness and qualitatively analyzed:
      o Associate Programs - 20
      o Undergraduate Programs - 37
      o Graduate Programs - 28
      o Doctoral Programs - 5

• Institutional Effectiveness Maps - Linked to RIT mission
  o Study Abroad
  o International Student Services

Level III General Education Goals

Ethical, Social and Global Awareness
  • Analyze similarities and differences in human experiences and consequent perspectives
  • Examine connections among the world’s populations
  • Identify contemporary ethical questions and relevant stakeholder positions

Through the semester conversion, each program is mapping their course-level goals to the General Education Student Learning Outcomes.

The General Education faculty team has developed an implementation plan and the goals are assessed on a five-year cycle. All outcomes will be assessed for the first time between 2010 and 2012. The outcomes will be assessed using direct (course-embedded assignment) and indirect measures (co-op and NSSE).
Level IV Individual Course Goals

Through semester conversion, each course is mapping their course-level goals/outcomes to the General Education Student Learning Outcomes on the course outline form.

Level V Campus Life Goals

Mission

The Division of Student Affairs assumes a leadership role in creating a campus environment that integrate the learning experience which complements the academic curriculum. We provide programs and services to enhance students' ability to learn and develop the life skills necessary to become productive and caring members of our global society.

Goal: Create opportunities that foster a living, learning and working environment where international and domestic students, faculty, and staff interact in order to develop cross-cultural awareness.

Note: The framework was adapted from the Five Integrated Levels from AACU's Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good intentions with good practice by Caryn Mctighe Musil.

curriculum outline form.