



MOTLOW
STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM

**Improving Learning Through International
Education: Preparing Students for Success in a
Global Society**

August 2007

Foreword

Acknowledging Thomas Friedman's "flat world" that notes the successful citizen will be one who is flexible, is adaptable, has an understanding of how to learn, and is knowledgeable about and comfortable with diversity, Motlow State Community College has focused its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) with the major goal of improving student learning through culturally diverse perspectives to prepare students for success in a global society.

Motlow State Community College is proud to submit this Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), *Internationalizing the Curriculum—Improving Learning Through International Education: Preparing Students for Success in a Global Society*. The QEP will enhance the student's success by infusing international education into the existing curriculum, thus promoting student learning through consciousness raising and comprehension of international issues arising from the cultures of other nations. Adding international content to existing courses supports positive shifts in student knowledge, attitudes, and values toward peoples and systems of different nations and cultures.

Educating our students from a global perspective is now an institution-wide initiative to which Motlow College is fully committed with specific strategies and measurable goals to support the abbreviated mission of Motlow College to "enrich and empower its students and the community it serves." Our goal is that the QEP will serve as a springboard for future international initiatives that may ultimately transform the institution and the quality of education provided to MSCC students to fulfill our vision "to be the area's recognized center for life-long learning and growth opportunities."

With this QEP, Motlow State Community College has begun its international travels. . . .

MaryLou Apple, President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Section 1 History of the Quality Enhancement Plan.....	3
Reaffirmation of Accreditation Core Requirement 2.12. – the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)	3
Definition of Student Learning	3
History, Rationale and Empirical Basis for QEP Topic Selection	4
Alignment of the QEP with Institutional Strategic Goals and Plan.....	4
QEP Development Committee	5
Narrowing the QEP Topic.....	7
Internationalizing the Curriculum.....	8
International Professional Development for Faculty	9
International Study Abroad and Experiential Learning	9
Course Syllabus Internationalization Survey	10
Faculty and Staff Internationalization Survey (FSIS).....	11
Final Iteration of the QEP Topic	11
Relevance of the QEP to Student Learning and the College Mission	11
Promotion of the QEP	12
Section 2 Overview of Internationalization.....	13
Internationalization Defined.....	13
The Social, Political, and Economic Context of Internationalization.....	13
Internationalization and Higher Education.....	15
Governmental and Educational Policy on International Education.....	16
Internationalization at Community Colleges	17
Section 3 Internationalizing the Curriculum – Best Practices	23
Best Practices	26
Advantages and Disadvantages of International Modules	27
Model Programs	28
Section 4 Implementation Plan	31
Essential Components of Course-Specific International Modules.....	31
Method for Identifying Courses to be Internationalized	32
Faculty Development.....	33
Implementation Timeline	33
Section 5 Assessment Plan	35
Assessment Contributing to Planning and Implementing the QEP	35
Formulation of the QEP Goal, Objectives, and Student Learning Outcomes	35
Assessment Design and Instrument Selection.....	38
Quantitative Assessment.....	38
Qualitative Assessment.....	39
Assessment Matrix	39
Closing the Assessment Loop.....	40

Section 6 Evaluating, Monitoring, and Sustaining the QEP	41
Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan on Student Learning.....	41
Coordinator of International Education.....	42
International Education Committee	43
Section 7 Funding the QEP	45
Funding Sources.....	45
QEP Annual Expenditures	45
Section 8 The QEP – Transformation and New Horizons	47
Membership in International Consortia	47
Study Abroad	48
Faculty Exchange and International Development.....	48
Other Possible Future Internationalization Approaches.....	49
References	51
Appendix A Committee Memberships	57
Appendix B Course Syllabus Internationalization Survey	58
Appendix C Faculty & Staff Internationalization Survey (FSIS)	
Summary Results	60
Appendix D Promotion of the QEP	66
Appendix E Sample International Module	76
Appendix F Template for Course-Specific International Module	79
Appendix G Coordinator of International Education Position Description	80
Appendix H International Education Committee	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of Motlow State Community College's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is to improve student learning through culturally diverse perspectives to prepare students for success in a global society. This goal will be accomplished by incorporating international education into existing courses across the curriculum through the infusion of course-specific international modules. Internationalization is a key objective in the Tennessee Board of Regent's (TBR) strategic plan and is articulated in MSCC's Statement of Mission that declares the college's aim to prepare students for success in the global community. The QEP was developed to address the following four convergent issues:

- To improve student learning
- To comply with the requirements for reaffirmation of accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC)
- To meet the internationalization objective articulated by TBR
- To actualize the aspiration to prepare students for success in the global community embodied in the MSCC Statement of Mission.

The Quality Enhancement Plan – Development Committee (QEP-DC) conducted a thorough review of the literature on history and best practices regarding internationalization in higher education, especially in the context of the community college. A number of potential strategies to accomplish internationalization were reviewed and the relative merits and limitations of each considered within the context of MSCC's mission, resources, and student characteristics. While each approach to internationalization studied had merit, ultimately, an internationalization strategy focusing directly on the existing curriculum was identified as the optimal approach to impact the greatest number of students at the college and to be sustainable given the resources of the college.

A plan for developing and implementing course-specific international modules must be formalized and must provide an assessment plan that will quantify the direct impact of the QEP on student learning. The results from the assessment of the QEP will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the QEP and to adjust the QEP as indicated.

Finally, the QEP recommends the utilization of a faculty member to serve as the Coordinator of International Education and the creation of a standing committee, the International Education Committee, to work collaboratively on the implementation and monitoring of the QEP and ancillary internationalization initiatives and the preparation of the *Impact Report* for submission to SACS-COC.

Our goal is that the QEP will serve as a springboard for future internationalization initiatives that may ultimately transform the institution and the quality of education provided to MSCC students.

SECTION 1

HISTORY OF THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

Reaffirmation of Accreditation Core Requirement 2.12—the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Motlow State Community College (MSCC) is a 2008 Reaffirmation Track A institution under the auspices of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In fulfillment of Requirement 2.12 (2004, 2005, 2007), MSCC has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), described fully in this report.

According to Core Requirement 2.12 of the *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement (Interim Edition, 2007)*:

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), submitted four to six weeks in advance of the on-site review by the Commission, is a document developed by the institution that (1) includes a broad-based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment, (2) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution, (3) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP, (4) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP, and (5) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. The QEP should be focused and succinct (no more than seventy-five pages of narrative text and no more than twenty-five pages of supporting documentation or charts, graphs, and tables). (p. 4)

This charge and focus, as understood by the MSCC QEP Development Committee, reflects a spirit of critical institutional self-assessment, identifies an area of student learning that merits value-added adjustment, and culminates in a viable, forward-looking, and transformative plan for the implementation and assessment of the programmatic outcomes articulated in the QEP. MSCC is proud to reaffirm its commitment to student learning through the inception and implementation of this Quality Enhancement Plan.

Definition of Student Learning

For the purposes of the MSCC QEP, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2004) notes, "Student learning is defined broadly in the context of the QEP and may address a wide range of topics and issues. Student learning may include changes in students' knowledge, skills, behaviors, and/or values that may be attributable to the collegiate experience" (p. 22).

History, Rationale, and Empirical Basis for the QEP Topic Selection

In fall 2003, former MSCC president, Dr. Arthur Walker, appointed the SACS Leadership Team which included Dr. Walker, Dr. Mary McLemore, Dr. Janice Harder, Mrs. Marcia Everett, and Mrs. Carol Holt.

In 2005, Dr. Walker appointed the QEP Topic Selection Advisory Committee that, in consultation with the college's SACS Leadership Team, was charged to research potential topics focusing on improvement of student learning that might serve as an appropriate topic for the QEP. This process was guided by a review of empirical data taken from the college's Strategic Plan, the *Fact Book*, and the results of student assessment data from the *Faces of the Future Survey*, the *Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)*, the *Enrolled Student Survey*, and the *Alumni Survey*.

During the 2005 Fall Faculty/Staff Assembly, Dr. Walker's presidential address described the nature and scope of the QEP to be developed by MSCC. Members of the SACS Leadership Team also presented information regarding the QEP and distributed a questionnaire to the faculty and staff asking for their input regarding a possible topic for the QEP. An online survey eliciting student input into the selection of the QEP topic was also conducted.

Working throughout fall 2005, the QEP Topic Selection Advisory Committee ultimately identified four potential topics for the QEP and submitted these for final review and selection by the SACS Leadership Team. After reviewing the relative merits of these four possible topics, the MSCC topic was selected, based in part on self-reported student data.

For example, current CCSSE data revealed that scores in the area of cultural diversity were not only low but had actually diminished below the scores from the previous assessment period. The SACS Leadership Team regarded the CCSSE results as being especially cogent since these were clear, empirically validated indicators of learning needs originating from the students' retrospective assessment of their educational experience at MSCC.

In addition to these empirical data, consideration was also given to the selection of a QEP topic that would be congruent with the educational goals articulated in the MSCC and Tennessee Board of Regents strategic plans.

Alignment of the QEP Topic with Institutional Strategic Goals and Plan

Motlow State Community College is a member institution governed by the Tennessee Board of Regents in the State University and Community College System of Tennessee. This system includes six universities, thirteen community colleges, and twenty-six technology centers.

The appropriateness of the MSCC QEP topic is further reinforced by its logical congruence with the published strategic goals and plans of the Tennessee Board of Regents and the college.

In *Setting New Directions—Tennessee Board of Regents 2005-2010 Strategic Plan* (Tennessee Board of Regents [TBR], 2005), Leadership Goal L2 reads as follows:

Objective L2

Increase emphasis on internationalization system-wide.

Strategy L2

Internationalize curricula, facilitate faculty and student exchanges, coordinate financial strategies, increase study abroad opportunities, encourage sister university relationships, increase faculty international research, develop selective degrees and concentrations with an international focus, and take other steps to increase understanding of global concepts and other cultures.

Benchmark L2

- a. By the end of 2006, the central office will have identified a means to support the coordination of system efforts in international education including federal, private (both international and domestic), research, and corporate fund development.
- b. By the end of 2006, TBR will document status of internationalization of institutional curriculum, strategies, and practices at all TBR institutions.
- c. By the end of 2006, recognize faculty who achieve Fulbright Scholarships and other major funding for research and teaching abroad.
- d. By the end of 2006, recognize institutions, faculty, and students who develop and implement major initiatives in international education that lead to an increased understanding of global concepts and other cultures.
- e. By 2010, TBR will provide evidence that all institutions are actively addressing issues related to international education/globalization within required curricula for completion of a degree or certificate and that institutions are committed to internationalism through documented actions. (p. 5)

Thus, TBR has clearly articulated the vision and importance of international education for all its member institutions.

In addition to the above TBR strategic goal, MSCC Strategic Goal 0002, Objective 2.10.00 states that the college “will offer at least one international education opportunity for students and/or faculty annually” (MSCC, 2006). Thus, MSCC has likewise articulated the intent to incorporate elements of international education into the curriculum consistent in spirit with the TBR goals and strategic plan.

As a result of this process, the SACS Leadership Team selected the proposed QEP topic giving it the provisional title of “Improving Student Learning Through Culturally Diverse Perspectives to Prepare Students for Success in a Global Society.”

QEP Development Committee

In consultation with the college’s SACS Leadership Team, in February 2006 Dr. Walker appointed the chair and members of the QEP Development Committee

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 1

(QEP-DC). This group was designated to further refine the QEP topic in accordance with the parameters and requirements specified by SACS-COC. The QEP-DC members included faculty and staff from the college's academic divisions and administrative units as well as student representatives. The faculty were represented as follows: four faculty members from the Humanities and Social Science division, three faculty members from the Math, Science, and Education division, and three faculty members from the Career Education division. The remaining four members of the committee were the dean of the Math, Science, and Education division and the directors of the Counseling and Testing Center, the Disability Services and Minority Affairs unit, and the MSCC Smyrna campus. Two members of the college SACS Leadership Team, Dr. Mary McLemore and Dr. Janice Harder, served as advisors to the QEP-DC. A complete listing of the members of the QEP Development Committee and SACS Leadership Team appears in Appendix A.

The QEP-DC convened its first meeting on March 1, 2006, and met subsequently at weekly to bi-weekly intervals to initiate the formal tasks of refining the topic to a manageable focus, to conduct a review of the relevant literature and best practices, and to finalize the essential elements of the QEP. These open working meetings continued through the remainder of 2006. A recorder transcribed the minutes of meetings of the QEP-DC, which were then disseminated by email to the entire college community across the four campuses. These minutes, distributed by campus-wide email following each meeting of the QEP-DC, have been archived with the QEP-DC recorder and remain available for public access.

During the initial meetings of the QEP-DC, the members discussed the broad and specific aspirational objectives of the chosen topic. After these initial exploratory discussions, the following informal preliminary vision statement was drafted by the QEP-DC to describe the importance, value, relevance, and appropriateness of the QEP topic to the faculty, staff, and students and the college:

Breathtaking technological advances in communication systems coupled with seismic shifts in global economic and geopolitical conditions (i.e., globalization) have precipitated challenges to modern institutions of higher education with respect to the adequate preparation of students to function competently in an increasingly interdependent international environment. Successful graduates must be educated to knowledgeably and effectively interface in multinational employment settings and organizations with individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds. A competent understanding of various cultures other than one's own will serve to promote effective collaboration and cooperation in the global work environment.

The initial task of the QEP-DC was to narrow the focus of the QEP. An initial review of the literature on issues pertinent to multicultural education in higher education (including community colleges) revealed the existence of a growing trend toward the increased *internationalization* within American universities and colleges. After deliberations in both the full committee and in focused subgroups, the QEP-DC decided unanimously to narrow the QEP topic to a focus on internationalization (i.e., international education) since this was the dominant conceptual framework consistent with a large body of relevant educational literature. Further, the term "internationalization" as articulated in the professional education literature encompasses constructs such as "multiculturalism," "multicultural education," and "cultural diversity."

Based upon this initial research into the relevant literature on internationalization in education, the QEP-DC elected to narrow/refine the topic to that of the incorporation of international education into the curriculum at MSCC. By slightly reframing the topic to one of internationalization of the curriculum, the spirit and intent of the initial topic title remained intact while bringing the QEP topic in line with the language of TBR and college strategic goals and objectives.

Once the theme of internationalized education was adopted as the narrowed focus of the QEP topic, the QEP-DC discussed potential student learning outcomes that would guide the development of the QEP. After researching other student learning outcomes found in the internationalization literature, the QEP-DC formulated the following outcomes which served to guide the future efforts of the QEP-DC as it worked to develop fully the QEP:

The college will endeavor to provide an enriched and stimulating internationalized learning experience that seeks to:

- *Enhance student awareness and comprehension of non-American cultures through the provision of an internationalized curriculum embodying exposure to the ideas, mores, values, and human systems of other cultures in the international arena.*
- *Prepare students with the essential capability to engage in critical, knowledge-informed analysis and problem-solving regarding globalization and the international exigencies that drive global change.*
- *Equip students with the cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral skills essential to function successfully in diverse multicultural environments.*
- *Increase student respect, understanding of and receptivity for cultures other than their own.*
- *Elevate the student's consciousness of the immediate and downstream consequences of personal and collective choices with respect to multicultural and international cooperation and stability.*
- *Address and ameliorate ethnocentrism by increasing student interaction with persons from diverse cultural backgrounds and across international boundaries.*

While the final form of the student learning outcomes eventually adopted into the final QEP differs somewhat from these initial iterations, they originated from the same aspirational ideals.

Narrowing the QEP Topic

The QEP-DC next conducted a review of the literature pertaining to internationalization in higher education, focusing especially on those internationalization initiatives undertaken at the community college level. This review revealed that under the umbrella of internationalization, various strategies and practices have been historically employed, ranging from elaborate internationalization programs, especially among the larger, financially advantaged universities, to modest single-element programs at small, economically challenged colleges. The most common internationalization strategies discovered include studying abroad, recruiting

Internationalizing the Curriculum Section 1

international students, organizing faculty exchange programs, increasing foreign language instruction, expanding faculty development opportunities, and conducting co-curricular campus events of a cultural nature (Altbach, 2002; Hayward & Siaya, 2003). The literature review further indicated that the mission, economic resources, and student characteristics of the institution largely appeared to determine the internationalization strategies, if any, adopted by a given university or college. As Green and Olson (2003) note, an institution's efforts toward internationalization may vary widely from transformative systemic change to little more than "tinkering" on the periphery.

Consequently, the QEP-DC elected to focus on three possible internationalization initiatives based on improving student learning (as opposed to merely conferring institutional benefits), improving the learning of the greatest number of students, and forging a QEP that would be practical, achievable, measurable, and sustainable within the resources of Motlow College.

At the end of spring 2006 semester, the QEP-DC divided into three working subgroups, each tasked to research further the feasibility of three internationalization initiatives focusing on student learning: 1) internationalizing the curriculum, 2) providing international professional development for faculty, and 3) providing international study abroad and experiential learning for students.

Beginning fall 2006 semester, these three subgroups presented their findings and recommendations, summarized below.

Internationalizing the Curriculum

Research indicated that internationalizing the curriculum appeared to present a feasible and logical first step toward college internationalization, one that would conceivably impact student learning for the largest number of students. Nationally prominent internationalization experts such as Green and Olson (2003) refer to the curriculum as the "heart of the matter" and offer the following analysis:

Among all the elements of an internationalized campus, the curriculum stands out as the key part of any internationalization effort if all students are to experience international learning in college. Despite the tremendous value of study-abroad programs to promote international and intercultural learning, recent ACE data indicate that only 10 percent of students will participate in some academic experience abroad during their college career, and most will do so for a month or less. (Siaya & Hayward, 2003 as cited in Green and Olson, 2003, p. 57)

They conclude,

Internationalization of the curriculum is indeed the 'heart of the matter.' It is the principal mechanism that institutions can use to shape student learning and, ideally, to provide a series of mutually reinforcing learning opportunities. Such opportunities will allow students to develop a nuanced understanding of the place that their own cultures and assumptions occupy in the larger global context. Internationalizing the curriculum is a complex task, requiring attention to general education, the major and pedagogy. (p. 67)

This subgroup subsequently recommended further consideration of the following possible elements addressing improving student learning by internationalization of the curriculum:

- Creation of new courses focusing on internationalization
- Creation of honors and independent study courses
- Recruitment of international faculty
- Universal student reading list on international themes
- Adoption of textbooks with international content
- Development and implementation of international modules to be incorporated into existing courses. Community colleges such as the Maricopa community college system have utilized this approach. Consortia of community colleges such as the Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education (<http://orgs.kvcc.edu/Midwest/>) and California Colleges for International Education (www.ccieworld.org) have employed this module approach (R.L. Raby, personal communication, August 3, 2006).

At this stage of the QEP development process, the degree to which the MSCC curriculum contained international content was not known. The QEP-DC recommended that a survey of international course content and questions of related interest be developed. This survey was conducted during the spring 2007 semester, and the results are summarized on pages 10-11 and described fully in Appendix B.

International Professional Development for Faculty

Enhancing student learning of international knowledge essentially mandates that faculty be provided opportunities to develop their own international expertise (Green & Shoenberg, 2006). As Green and Olson (2003) observe, "Faculty engagement drives successful internationalization" (p. 69). The degree to which faculty is receptive to and knowledgeable about international content specific to their discipline directly impacts student learning (Green, 2005). The MSCC subgroup recommended the following:

- Conducting faculty exchange with international colleges such as Fulbright Teacher Exchange Programs
- Exploring the feasibility of a "sister institution" affiliation
- Securing faculty development funds for international conferences
- Conducting faculty development training in other aspects of internationalization

The QEP-DC recommended that a survey of faculty and staff interest and experience regarding internationalization be developed. This survey was conducted during the spring 2007 semester, and the results are reported on page 11 and included in Appendix C.

International Study Abroad and Experiential Learning

Study abroad programs within higher education have been the principal strategy for providing students with international perspectives. Indeed, for many the term internationalization is synonymous with study abroad. The power of study abroad programs as a means to raise student consciousness and comprehension of

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 1

international dynamics is seldom debated (Green, 2005). However, as Green (2005) observes, “The vast majority of U.S. students will not study abroad during college” (p. 29). This observation is especially true of community college students (Green & Siaya, 2005). Study abroad opportunities for community college students are often limited, cost-prohibitive, and impractical given their typical employment and family demands.

Thus, the subgroup recommended the following:

- Hosting college-sponsored forums on international topics
- Inviting representatives from other cultures to participate in international events
- Showcasing international students with international events
- Conducting “piggyback” co-curricular programs with other area institutions
- Developing affiliations with other “Sister City” programs

This subgroup also noted that particular characteristics and demographics of many current community college students (i.e., concurrent employment, family responsibilities, limited economic resources, etc.) might significantly limit their participation in co-curricular campus events (Olson, Green & Hill, 2005, 2006).

Course Syllabus Internationalization Survey

To answer the question regarding the degree to which international education content was already a part of the MSCC curriculum, the QEP-DC conducted a survey of MSCC course syllabi in spring semester 2007. The following rubric for judging the degree of international content reflected in the syllabus was developed:

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
1	No indication of international course content
2	Indication of moderate international course content such as an occasional lecture, readings, or other assignment
3	Indication of significant international course content, such as specific planned class activities or assignments of an international nature, readings, reflective papers, etc., intended to introduce the student to an international aspect of the discipline. Student’s final grade is significantly affected by performance on the international assignment.

During the spring 2007 semester, members of the QEP-DC were assigned, according to academic division, to review these course syllabi and perform a rating according to the above rubric. A summary of the findings is presented below. A full presentation of the survey data can be found in Appendix B.

A total of 213 course syllabi were available for review. Among these, 161 syllabi (76%) received a rating of 1, 40 syllabi (19%) received a rating of 2, and 12 syllabi (6%) received a rating of 3. The median and mode rating (due to the ordinal nature of the data, the median and mode were the appropriate measures of central tendency) for the

entire sample of syllabi was 1.00. Thus, it was evident that the existing MSCC curriculum contained little to no international course content.

Faculty and Staff Internationalization Survey (FSIS)

To answer the questions regarding the experience and receptivity of MSCC faculty and staff to internationalization, the QEP-DC developed a 36-item online questionnaire. This survey was made available online to all MSCC faculty, staff, and administrators from March 28, 2007 through April 23, 2007. A total of 89.15 percent of eligible college employees completed the FSIS.

The results of the FSIS generally indicate little internationalization experience and foreign language proficiency among employees of the college. Respondents expressed, overall, an acknowledgement of the importance of internationalization initiatives at the college and a receptivity to further developments in this area. A full synopsis of the FSIS results can be found in Appendix C.

Final Iteration of the QEP Topic

The QEP-DC members debated the relative merits, weaknesses, benefits, and potential downstream disadvantages and risks of each of the three possible internationalization initiatives described above. After extensive review, keeping clearly focused on the necessity of a QEP that is dedicated to improving student learning but also one that is practical, achievable, measurable, and sustainable, the QEP-DC unanimously agreed on the QEP topic, "Improving Student Learning Through Internationalizing the Curriculum."

As Green (2005) notes:

The vast majority of U.S. students will not study abroad during college. Although institutions need to make every possible effort to stimulate interest in study abroad, as well as to make it practical and affordable, the fact remains that students will acquire international skills and knowledge on campus, and primarily in the classroom. The primary international learning opportunities include courses with international or global themes, foreign language learning, and infusion of courses that are not specifically internationally focused with international or global themes. (p. 29)

Relevance of the QEP to Student Learning and the College Mission

After much research, the QEP-DC determined that infusing international education into the existing curriculum was the best approach to promote student learning through consciousness raising and comprehension of international issues, including the cultures of other nations. Adding international content to existing courses could lead to positive shifts in student knowledge, attitudes, and values (affective learning) toward peoples and systems of different nations and cultures. Further, committee research affirmed that such a curricular initiative would be consistent with the college mission and that a clear and substantive precedent existed for this approach because of successful

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 1

outcomes in comparable institutions. Additional study indicates that the college has adequate infrastructure and resources to facilitate the adoption of such a methodology; thus, the MSCC QEP is feasible.

Therefore, the initial goal and working title of “Improving Student Learning Through Culturally Diverse Perspectives to Prepare Students for Success in a Global Society” can be fully realized by the practical infusion of international education into the existing curriculum.

Promotion of the QEP

All minutes of the QEP-DC meetings have been disseminated throughout the four campuses on a regular basis by email and the college web site under the SACS link. In every instance, MSCC faculty, staff, and students have been encouraged to participate in the QEP selection and development. Faculty and staff have also been kept informed of the evolving QEP through on-site presentations at Fall Faculty/Staff Assembly (August 22, 2006) and regular updates from the SACS Leadership Team. A briefing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the three division deans took place on October 19, 2007. A detailed briefing to faculty of all three academic divisions and other interested personnel via ITV link-up to all four campuses was conducted on October 27, 2006. Appendix D includes minutes and outlines of these meetings.

SECTION 2

OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

Internationalization Defined

One of the phenomena observed in reviewing international education literature has been the gradual evolution of a uniform terminology to describe collectively the initiatives commonly associated with international education. Terms such as “cross-cultural education,” “comparative education,” “borderless education,” “cross-border education,” “multi-cultural education,” “intercultural education,” “transnational education,” “global education,” “globalization,” “global learning,” “diversity,” and others abound and are typically used interchangeably. This varied terminology may reflect uncertainty among educators as to whether or not any meaningful distinction exists between the terms and the constructs they represent or if different pedagogical emphases are used relative to each term. Such imprecision has likely contributed some element of confusion among professionals and professional groups involved in international education (Knight, 2003; Green & Olson, 2003; Ellingboe, 1997).

Green and Olson (2003) articulate an incisive analysis and discussion of the semantics of internationalization, drawing noteworthy distinctions among the various terms and contexts in which these terms are often employed. They particularly distinguish internationalization from “international education,” “global education,” “globalization,” “multicultural,” and “intercultural education.” Readers interested in the substantive arguments regarding these sometimes fractious debates are urged to read Green and Olson (2003). Their conclusion is that the term “internationalization” best captures the thrust and nuances of educational efforts aimed at promoting an awareness and understanding of other nations and their peoples and cultures. They specifically caution against applying the term “globalization” to international education because of its politically charged connotation. They recommend that institutional leaders develop a shared terminology to promote coherence in vision and practice.

After a thoughtful analysis of the debate and evolution of terminology associated with internationalization, Knight (2003) offers the following updated definition of internationalization:

Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education. (p. 2)

Knight’s definition above appears to have attained generally broad acceptance by educators and policymakers as the preferred term (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Thus, the QEP-DC adopted it as the foundational definition for the QEP.

The Social, Political, and Economic Context of Internationalization

In *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys About International Education*, Hayward and Siaya (2001) state, “Historically, the U.S. public has been uninformed and uninterested in the rest of the world” (p. 27).

Commenting on the results of a 1981 Educational Testing Service (ETS) survey of college students' international knowledge, they quote the survey authors who have concluded, "This suggests that a very small proportion of the students have the level of knowledge necessary for an adequate understanding of global situations and processes." Hayward and Siaya note that the "results of the ETS survey suggested that college students learn little about international affairs from their undergraduate education and called into question whether colleges and universities had any impact on the international education of students" (p. 27). Hayward and Siaya find similar results regarding proficient knowledge of international matters in their reviews of other similar and more recent surveys of both college students and general U.S. citizens. They summarize their findings by noting, "The findings from these studies paint a very bleak picture of the level of citizens' international knowledge" (p. 27).

Social, geopolitical, and economic developments since the 1980s have essentially forced the U.S. and its institutions of higher learning to address and ameliorate this low level of international literacy among Americans. Fortunately, recent data indicate that public interest in international affairs may be growing (Hayward & Siaya, 2001; Hayward, 2000). In more recent replications of the earlier surveys, level of education and, to a lesser extent, age emerged as the best statistical predictors of accuracy in international knowledge.

Friedman (2000; 2006), writing to a general audience, has attempted to deliver an urgent wake-up call regarding the rise of internationalism (i.e., globalization) in business and commerce as a result of the convergence of sophisticated technology and geopolitical events ("flatteners" as he refers to them) which have blurred international borders and brought peoples from disparate cultures into economic competition. Educating and preparing graduates to meet competitive challenges inherent in this new "flat world" thrust international knowledge and education to center stage on the American educational landscape. The opportunities and risks wrought by the new "flat world" Friedman envisions cannot be ignored by American institutions of higher education. Nations and institutions that foolishly ignore the reality of the "flat world" imperil both themselves and their students in this new technologically and globally connected marketplace. In Friedman's "flat world," the economic competitor is as likely to be from a foreign culture halfway around the world as on the same continent, much less the same county, state, or city. Preparing students for such an economic and geopolitical reality necessarily entails equipping them with the functional cognitive and attitudinal capacity to interface effectively with colleagues and competitors from global cultures, many strikingly different from their own.

Analyzing data from more current surveys regarding the American public's attitudes toward international affairs, Hayward and Siaya (2001) draw a somewhat more optimistic conclusion:

The American public is now more committed to U.S. participation in international affairs than it has been in the past. Particularly important is the evidence of overwhelming support among the public, including college-bound students, for all forms of international education at the college and university level. The public recognizes the importance of international knowledge and skills, and views them as essential to successful competition in today's global environment—even more important for success in the future. This perception is particularly strong among young people. (p. 41)

Replicating an earlier survey of public attitudes regarding international education, Siaya, Porcelli, and Green (2002) report enthusiastic support for international education as well as foreign language training among the students, faculty, and general public.

In *Americans Call for Leadership on International Education: A National Survey on Preparation for a Global Society*, a sample of over one thousand Americans was asked a series of five critical questions focusing on their perceptions on global preparedness, study abroad, language learning, knowledge of other cultures, and international students. The results indicate the following:

- Question 1: If, increasingly, what happens around the world affects Americans at home, how important is it to prepare our children and grandchildren for a more global society?
Finding: 90 percent believed it was important
- Question 2: Would you agree or disagree that knowledge of other languages will give our children and grandchildren a competitive advantage in career opportunities?
Finding: 92 percent believed knowledge of foreign language was important
- Question 3: How important is it for our children and grandchildren to participate in a study abroad program while in college, where they can spend time living and studying in another culture?
Finding: 77 percent believed study abroad was important
- Question 4: How important is it for our children and grandchildren to attend a college where they will have an opportunity to interact with and get to know international students from other countries?
Finding: 86 percent believed this was important
- Question 5: How important is it to provide our children and grandchildren with knowledge of other countries and cultures?
Finding: 94 percent believed this was important

(NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2006)

Internationalization and Higher Education

Internationalization now appears to have become a robust trend both in American higher education and in the higher education systems of other countries (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Altbach, 2002; Green & Barblan, 2004). A comprehensive review of the history, goals, and movement toward internationalization in American higher education is beyond the scope of this report. A broad comparative and conceptual analysis of this expanding trend has been presented elsewhere by de Wit (2002) and Scott (1998).

Qiang (2003) observes that the internationalization of education is necessary for preparing college graduates who comprehend the globalization of societies, economies, and labor markets. He further states that these contingencies demand not only specific types of knowledge but also “multilingualism and social and intercultural skills and attitudes” (p. 248). Hayward (2000) presents a cogent analysis of the issues pertaining to the internationalization of U.S. higher education institutions. Bibliographies pertaining to internationalization in U.S. higher education provide a compilation of academic and

professional resources (Knight, 1996; International Association of Universities, 2006; Michigan State University, 2006).

The Center for Institutional and International Initiatives of the American Council on Education (ACE) has been at the forefront of internationalization in U.S. higher education, and the number of groups in higher education devoted to the promotion of international education initiatives in U.S. colleges and universities has grown (Hayward & Siaya, 2001; Hayward & Siaya, 2003; Green & Barblan, 2004). Commenting on this growing interest in internationalization in education, Olson, Green and Hill (2005) state:

Three major trends are shaping the environment for internationalization. First is an intensified interest in international and global matters on many campuses across the country, the result of accelerating globalization and the growing consciousness—heightened by the events of September 11, 2001—that isolation is not an option. A second trend is the emphasis on student learning, with the concomitant shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered pedagogy and assessment. And finally, the world of higher education has been reshaped by the growing presence of “new majority” students, that is, students who do not fit the profile of full-time, traditional-age undergraduate students. (p. v)

Governmental and Educational Policy on International Education

In April 2000, then President Bill Clinton issued a “Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies” on international education policy, noting the following:

It is the policy of the federal government to support international education. We are committed to:

- Encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States;
- Promoting study abroad by U.S. students;
- Supporting the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society;
- Enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise;
- Expanding foreign language learning and knowledge of other cultures;
- Preparing and supporting teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students; and
- Advancing technology to aid the spread of knowledge throughout the world.
(American Association of Community Colleges, 2002).

Former U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley (2000) reinforced this policy position and the responsibility of American education to impart international knowledge to all students.

In *Beyond September 11: A Comprehensive National Policy on International Education*, the American Council on Education’s Center for Institutional and International Initiatives (2002) articulates the need and imperative to develop and implement a sound national policy to promote international education in U.S. higher education. Proposing a

partnership between the federal government and education institutions, three national policy objectives for international education are outlined: 1) produce international experts and knowledge to address national strategic needs; 2) strengthen U.S. ability to solve global problems; and 3) develop a globally competent citizenry and workforce. The proposed strategies for the achievement of these objectives include the recommendation to “internationalize teaching and learning” through exposure to “international content throughout the curriculum” and to “[E]nsure that every postsecondary undergraduate experiences a curriculum designed to impart crosscultural understanding and skills, an international dimension in the major field of study, and a broad understanding of global issues” (p. 16).

Thirty-four leading higher education associations, including the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, officially endorsed this important policy paper.

In *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language for U.S. Economic and National Security* (2006), the Committee for Economic Development (CED)—an independent, non-partisan, non-profit research and policy organization comprised of leaders of business and education—delivered an assessment of the economic and security threats to the United States due to insufficient international content in education. The executive summary of this report states:

As we begin the twenty-first century, technological, economic, political, and social forces have created a new era. Technological advancements and lower trade barriers have paved the way for the globalization of markets, bringing intense competition to the U.S. economy. Political systems and movements around the world are having a profound impact on our national security, as well as our human security. The increasing diversity of our workplaces, schools, and communities is changing the face of our society. To confront the twenty-first century challenges to our economy and national security, our education system must be strengthened to increase the foreign language skills and cultural awareness of our students. America’s continued global leadership will depend on our student’s abilities to interact with the world community both inside and outside our borders. (p. 1)

One of the key recommendations made in the CED report is that international content be taught across the curriculum.

Despite this growing consensus of support for internationalization in higher education among various sectors (Rainey, 2006) and the broad support among the general public for educating internationally literate and globally competent students, the U.S. lacks a formal national governmental policy on international education (NAFSA, 2006).

Internationalization at Community Colleges

Community colleges have been in the forefront of the movement toward internationalization in higher education. This engagement is exemplified by the 1982 publication by the American Association of Community College’s *AACC Policy*

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 2

Statement on International Education (Chase & Mahoney, 1996). This forward-looking policy statement notes that:

Education for international/intercultural understanding has thus become an imperative for Americans. The urgency of world issues confronting the United States increases the need for an internationally aware and competent citizenry, able to understand and function within the diversity of cultures and systems both within and beyond our national boundaries. (p. 47)

This early AACC policy statement urges, among other educational reforms within community colleges, the adoption of “an overall curriculum with global dimensions” (p. 47).

Another pivotal point in the movement toward internationalization by community colleges occurred in late 1994 at a conference co-sponsored by the American Council on International and Intercultural Education (ACIIE) and the Stanley Foundation. Convened at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Virginia, November 28-30, 1994, the conference was entitled “Building the Global Community: The Next Step” (ACIIE & Stanley Foundation, 1994). A second, follow-up conference—again co-sponsored by ACIIE and the Stanley Foundation—was held at the same location November 15-17, 1996, entitled “Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges” (ACIIE & Stanley Foundation, 1996). The first conference came to be known as “Airlie I” and the second as “Airlie II.”

The following mission statement drafted by the 24 attendees at Airlie I expresses a rather presentient assessment:

To ensure the survival and well-being of our communities, it is imperative that community colleges develop a globally and multiculturally competent citizenry. (p. 1)

Conferees at Airlie I declared, “Community colleges are the vanguard of global education in America, a fact unnoticed and underappreciated by too many U.S. decision makers and policy shapers” (p. i).

To address the acute need for students’ global competency, Airlie I recommended that the curricular content of community colleges (which, notably, educate approximately half of all college undergraduates in the U.S.) should address the following five key areas:

- Global interdependence
- Human resources, values, and culture
- Global environment and natural resources
- Global peace and conflict management
- Change and alternate futures

Of the educational strategies specifically advanced by Airlie I was the need to “[i]nfuse global education perspectives and content into all courses” (p. 5). Dr. Ernest Boyer, then President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, notes in his keynote address:

I do not believe that internationalism means a new set of courses. I think rather that it means teaching internationalism across the curriculum. Whether you are discussing science or religion, history or art, civics or economics, the human agenda penetrates them all. None of these issues is nation-specific. The challenge of the curriculum for the next century is to ensure that the entire curriculum recognizes both the universalities of the commonalities and the inevitability of interdependence. (p. 28)

Dr. Boyer also observes, "In educating for a global community, three principles must dominate: to help students understand that we are all different, that we are all the same, and that we all depend on one another" (pp. 28-29).

In November 1996, Airlie II was convened to develop further the vision and strategy for internationalization at community colleges (ACIIE & Stanley Foundation, 1996). This conference focused on the following two key questions:

- What does it mean to be a globally competent learner?
- What is required institutionally for community colleges to produce globally competent learners?

Airlie II conferees subsequently identified the following four stages of development for a globally educated community college student:

- 1) Recognition of global systems and their connectedness, including personal awareness and openness to other cultures, values, and attitudes at home and abroad
- 2) Intercultural skills and direct experiences
- 3) General knowledge of history of world events—politics, economics, geography
- 4) Detailed area studies specialization, expertise in another language, culture, and country

(ACIIE & Stanley Foundation, 1996, p.3)

The participants of Airlie II offered the following definition of global competency:

Global competency exists when the learner is able to understand the interconnectedness of peoples and systems, to have a general knowledge of history and world events, to accept and cope with the existence of different cultural values and attitudes and, indeed, to celebrate the richness of this diversity. (p. 4)

Airlie II also defined the essential characteristics of the globally competent learner as one who:

1. Is empowered by the experience of global education to help make a difference in society
2. Is committed to global, lifelong learning
3. Is aware of diversity, commonalities, and interdependence
4. Recognizes the geopolitical and economic interdependence of our world
5. Appreciates the impact of cultures on American life
6. Accepts the importance of all peoples

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 2

7. Is capable of working on diverse teams
8. Understands the nonuniversality of culture, religion, and values
9. Accepts responsibility for global citizenship

(ACIIE & Stanley Foundation, 1996, p. 3)

Finally, Airlie II highlighted the key role played by infusion of international content into the general education curriculum and analyzed the needs and potential challenges facing community colleges seeking to internationalize their programs.

Global Awareness in Community Colleges: A Report of a National Survey (Chase & Mahoney, 1996) describes the results of a 1995 survey of 664 (53 percent of the 1,154 community colleges responded to the survey; MSCC participated in this survey) member community colleges of the American Association of Community Colleges. Over 80 percent of the community colleges responding to the survey reported offering some type of international education experience in their programs, with 43 percent having offered it for more than ten years prior to the survey. Thirty-five percent offered study abroad and/or exchange opportunities for faculty and/or students.

Five years later, in 2000, the AACC repeated the 1995 survey described above and found incremental gains in the amount and type of internationalization available at community colleges:

- 82 percent of the responding institutions reported the inclusion of international components in their courses, up from 40 percent in the 1995 survey.
- The number of colleges with international business programs increased from 23 percent in 1995 to 60 percent.
- 83 percent of the responding colleges sponsored global awareness activities on their campuses and in the communities contrasted with only 43 percent in 1995.
- Community colleges are increasingly actively recruiting international students, thus bringing increased international diversity to their campuses.
- 44 percent of the responding institutions reported recruiting international faculty and staff or those who have international experience.

(Blair, Phinney, & Philippe, 2001)

The results of this survey also show that 87 percent of community colleges offer international curricula including increased foreign language, and 82 percent offer English as a second language (ESL) classes. Forty-nine percent offer courses on the cultures of other countries, and 25 percent offer a degree or certificate program with an international component (e.g., international business). In fact, the survey shows that international business programs have shown the most significant growth.

The internationalizing of the curriculum went far beyond in that more than 75 percent of the responding institutions reported having an international component in social science and humanities courses, and 61 percent reported having an international component in their business classes.

Finally, the 2001 AACC survey reveals that 83 percent of community colleges were expanding global awareness through activities or programs that encouraged

student and faculty interaction across international boundaries. This included using Internet research for international assignments, studying and traveling abroad, supporting students seeking grants for international exchange, sending students and staff to meetings with an international focus, actively recruiting international students, affiliating with sister colleges in other countries, sponsoring meetings with an international focus, and establishing satellite campuses overseas.

In 2001, the American Council on Education (ACE) Center for Institutional and International Initiatives (Green & Siaya, 2005) conducted a survey of 233 community colleges to assess their methods for internationalizing curricula and programs. These authors computed an “internationalization index” based upon six dimensions they believed to be accurately indicative of institutional internationalization: articulated commitment, academic offerings, organizational infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students and student programs. Using this approach, they concluded that the majority of community colleges score low in overall internationalization.

However, since Airlie II and the surveys described previously, other researchers have found that community colleges are gradually increasing internationalization initiatives across the board, although some institutions are clearly further along in this process than are others (Zeszotarski, 2001). Obstacles and challenges remain. Farnsworth (2002) and Dellow (2002) have persuasively articulated the mission and urgency to integrate international education into the community college educational experience. Farnsworth, President Emeritus at Crowder College in Missouri and Director of the Center for International Community College Education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, notes:

I find that, despite the crying need for a new literacy in this country—a literacy based upon knowing about and understanding other cultures—we are a nation of cultural illiterates. Such realizations should send a clear message to the American educational community. Just as it has been our responsibility to provide the literacy of the three Rs and the literacy required by the age of computer technology, it now becomes our responsibility to help those with whom we work to develop a new international and multi-cultural literacy. (p. viii)

Dr. Donald A. Dellow (2002) has noted that numerous authorities on international education have repeatedly warned about the “dangers of ethnocentrism,” which he defined as “the idea that good things will emerge only from American society” (p. 6). Dellow, former president of Broome Community College in New York, cites the crucial role of campus leadership in establishing an international vision and institutional ethos on campus. In developing strategies to bring international education to his campus and thereby inculcate students’ global competency, Dellow suggests viewing the acquisition of an international competency as a continuum that begins with the student’s personal awareness of cultural differences and culminates with that student being able to function competently in another culture or country.

In *Building the Global Community: Joint Statement on the Role of Community Colleges in International Education* (adopted in April 1997 and amended by the Board of Directors in November 2001), the official position statement of the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, the commitment to ongoing international education by community colleges is underscored.

Internationalizing the Curriculum Section 2

A number of other community college advocacy organizations including Community Colleges for International Development, the Global Community College (the Stanley Foundation), and the League for Innovation in the Community College have all endorsed the mission of bringing international education to the community college. In January 2007, Community Colleges for International Development (CCID) merged with the American Association on International Intercultural Education to form the new Community Colleges for International Development: An Association for Global Education, thus forming a network of approximately 160 community and technical colleges in 14 countries (ACIIE, 2007).

According to the American Council on International and Intercultural Education (2006), an increasingly popular and effective strategy for community colleges wishing to promote internationalization has been the formation of consortia that pool resources and increase opportunities individual community colleges might not have available. Consortia such as the California Colleges for International Education, the Midwest Institute, and Maricopa Community Colleges are prime examples. An exciting parallel development for MSCC has been the founding of the new Tennessee Consortium for International Studies, operating under the auspices of the Tennessee Board of Regents.

As this brief review of the literature on internationalization in higher education—and community colleges in particular—highlights, internationalization is an educational initiative with strong precedent, broad support, and increasing resources and opportunities that can tremendously enrich student learning. Community colleges have increasingly embraced the urgent mission to educate their students to become globally competent citizens.

SECTION 3

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM – BEST PRACTICES

While the desirability of international education has wide support among institutions of higher education in the United States and elsewhere, the specific avenues to accomplish this internationalization of the university or college are based upon a host of variables. These variables include the history and mission of the institution, infrastructure, economic considerations, faculty expertise, and student interest. Because of these factors, different institutions choose different internationalization strategies (ACE, 2007) and employ a variety of approaches. As Green and Olson (2003) observe, no simple answer exists to the question of which internationalization strategy is best:

The complexity of internationalization, the diversity of U.S. institutions, and the strength of disciplinary traditions permit no simple answer to this question. Ultimately, each institution—and each of its programs—will have to arrive at its own response and shape strategies accordingly. (p. 58)

General systemic issues and methods of internationalization at community colleges have been described by Frost, Savage, and Natali (2004) and Tulbane (2006).

Among the thirteen “good practice” approaches to internationalization described in the literature (Ellingboe, 1997; also cited in Green & Olson, 2003), the top four focus on the infusion of international content into an institution’s existing curriculum. Their recommendations include the following:

- Incorporate international learning into the general education curriculum
 - Infuse the disciplines with international perspectives and content
 - Use comparative educational approaches
 - Discuss international issues in courses and through interdisciplinary studies
- (p. 63)

In *Best Practice Guidelines for Internationalizing the Curriculum*, Whalley (1997) presents the rationale for international education and describes aspirational standards for an internationalized curriculum based on the typology of international curricula suggested by Dutch educators Bremer and van der Wende.

Dr. Rosalind Latiner Raby, Director of California Colleges for International Education (CCIE), a consortium of 72 community colleges involved in international education since 1985, defines internationalizing the curriculum as:

The process by which international awareness is enhanced through increased attention on:

- Knowledge and understanding of societies’ histories, geographic and physical environments, values, institutions, languages and cultural traditions;
- Understanding the relationships of modern global society, which increasingly involves the U.S. in economic, political, legal and cultural relationships with other nations;

Internationalizing the Curriculum Section 3

- Ability to comprehend diverse cultural perspectives on the problems and issues facing the human race and to understand the role of culture in shaping those perspectives;
 - Capacity to make informed personal and public policy decisions on international issues;
 - Highlighting specific topics to be included in a particular course curriculum.
- (Raby, 1999, p. 1)

Raby (1999) also notes that an international component to the curriculum underscores the “need to understand a variety of perspectives (geographic, ethnic, cultural, gender, etc.) by acknowledging similarities, but also in a way that respects and protects differences among multi-country diversities” (p. 3). She emphasizes that all community college disciplines (academic, technical, vocational, and occupational) are influenced by international relationships and that no discipline is so provincial that it cannot be viewed from an international perspective.

As Bhatia (1985) observes, what international education requires is a process of active learning in which:

People begin to think in international and intercultural terms; where differences in response can be anticipated and understood merely as differences and not right and wrong reactions; where one is constantly conscious of the different meanings and interpretations of the same words and expressions by people whose minds are conditioned by other languages. (p. 1)

Raby (personal communication, February 2, 2007) writes:

In turn, an internationalized curriculum becomes a pragmatic tool that ensures national security, prepares students for a globalized job market, encourages politically active citizens who can contribute towards a participatory democracy, and helps heighten problem-solving and listening skills that are essential to ensure multicultural harmony. Pedagogically, it is indefensible to not prepare community college students to live, work, and transact in our global world. Most importantly, however, is that the community college provides, for many, the only means to acquire international literacy. As such, internationalization serves to promote equity and access, two of the primary missions of community colleges. (p. 1)

Picket and Turlington (as cited in Cornwell and Stoddard, 1999) note that strategies for accomplishing the internationalization of higher education have typically focused on a few relatively commonplace activities including study abroad, faculty exchange, area studies, and foreign language study.

In *Internationalizing the Campus—Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities* (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2006), examples of internationalization by economically advantaged institutions are described. Unfortunately, institutions lacking such economic largesse are unlikely to be able to afford sweeping changes such as exotic and lengthy study abroad opportunities; the creation of new disciplines, majors, and courses; and the recruitment of faculty with renowned international expertise, for example. Community colleges, while tasked with a vital mission, often do not have the economic resources to offer such high-profile

internationalization measures and opportunities. Furthermore, the students who typically attend community colleges often lack such economic resources as well. Yet the working class community college student is as deserving of an internationalized collegiate experience as an affluent student at an Ivy League university.

In *The World is Flat; A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century (Updated and Expanded Edition)*, Friedman (2006) champions broader availability and access to technical schools and community colleges that will prepare students to function competently in a globalized economy and society. Accomplishing this mission will not only prepare the students for technical proficiency in their chosen field, but also provide international educational content. Thus, given the challenging economic and administrative exigencies with which the typical community college must contend, the question becomes, which approach to internationalization, especially the college's first venture into internationalization, would be best?

The *Position Statement on International Education* notes that community colleges might address the international education imperative through a variety of relatively practical strategies including the following:

- Internationalized curricula
- Multicultural activities and programs
- Language programs
- Cultural and ethnic studies
- Study abroad programs
- Faculty and student exchange programs
- Professional development
- Technical assistance to other countries and their businesses/industries
- Local, state, and international forums
- International student enrollment
- Community education forums

The American Association of Community Colleges (1997; 2001, p. 1)

In *International Programs at Community Colleges*, Blair, Phinney, and Phillippe (2001) review data from a 2000 survey conducted by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). They identify three broad international education initiatives—internationalizing curriculum, providing campus and community activities designed to increase global awareness, and facilitating person-to-person international experiences and cooperation—and report that community colleges have generally increased their activities in these areas. Comparing and contrasting the 2000 survey results with the results of the same survey conducted in 1995 revealed that the number of community colleges having international content added to their course offerings more than doubled, with one-fourth of responding colleges reporting the utilization of “international modules tailored to specific classes.” More than three-fourths of colleges reported having an international component in social science and humanities courses and sixty-one percent reported having an international component in business classes.

In *Preliminary Status Report 2000: Internationalization of Higher Education*, a survey commissioned by the American Council on Education (Hayward, 2000), a broad overview of international education at U.S. colleges and universities reveals ambiguity

and mixed results. Summarizing the international content of the curricula in the institutions surveyed, Hayward concludes that:

Effectively measuring the international content of college and university courses is difficult. For instance, while language, area study, and other such classes are widely understood to be international in nature, reaching consensus on what constitutes international content and how it should be measured has proven elusive. Despite differences in interpretation, research suggests there is much room for improvement. Broad curricular internationalization is lacking; postsecondary graduates are poorly informed about other countries, people, and events; and offerings by institutional type are uneven, with two-year institutions providing far fewer international education opportunities than their four-year counterparts. Competency represents an even more pressing concern—one study indicates that less than 7 percent of all higher education students meet even basic standards of “global preparedness.” (p. 2)

Lastly, *Where Faculty Live: Internationalizing the Disciplines* strongly makes the case for focusing internationalization efforts directly on the curriculum:

Our work with institutions has corroborated how central the curriculum is to internationalization. Because the vast majority of U.S. students do not study abroad, and many of these students commute to campus and have families and jobs that keep them from attending campus events, the major venue for global learning is the classroom. And even for those students who do go abroad or attend campus events, the curriculum is still the foundation of a college education. Thus, internationalizing the curriculum—that is, infusing international, global, and intercultural perspectives across courses and programs—is the key strategy to ensure that *all* students learn about other nations, languages, cultures, and histories, and global issues. It is a long-term process that requires the full engagement of a broad spectrum of faculty. This is no small undertaking. (Green and Shoenberg, 2006, p. 1)

Best Practices

The QEP-DC subcommittee charged with researching the feasibility and best practices associated with internationalizing the curriculum conducted a focused literature review during summer 2006 and returned to the QEP-DC with a report of its findings and recommendations (QEP-DC minutes, September 26, 2006).

Mindful of Green and Olson’s (2003) admonition that the curriculum is the “key part of any internationalization effort if all students are to experience international learning in the college” (p. 57), a thorough literature review of best practices for internationalizing the curriculum was completed. Each best practice identified in the literature review was examined carefully in terms of potential implementation feasibility, given the resources and infrastructure of the college.

The subcommittee literature review indicated that the chief strategies used for internationalization of the curriculum by institutions of comparable size and mission focus generally on the following:

- Creation of new courses devoted to internationalization, globalization, area studies, or comparative multicultural content
- Creation of honors or independent study courses on international themes
- Recruitment of faculty with international expertise
- Creation of a universal reading list on international topics
- Development and implementation of international modules to be infused or embedded into courses across the curriculum

In full QEP-DC review and deliberation, the relative merits, weaknesses, and downstream consequences of each best practice strategy were carefully analyzed. The QEP-DC determined that cost and human resource limitations of the college and legislated program-length limitations would likely limit significantly the development of new required courses devoted specifically to internationalization. Therefore, new courses devoted specifically to internationalization would be electives; thus, students might be unable or unwilling to enroll in them, particularly if the students judged these new international courses as being irrelevant to their degree. Since few students would be predicted to enroll in such elective international courses, the vast majority of students would complete their degree requirements at MSCC without having had any exposure to international education.

Elective honors and independent study courses taught by current faculty as well as a universal reading list on international topics might be financially feasible for the college. However, the QEP-DC reasoned that potential low enrollment, resulting in little impact on improving the learning of the great majority of students, would significantly limit the applicability of these strategies as well. Therefore, they were rejected as being ineffective approaches to institution-wide internationalization for the QEP. Finally, recruitment of faculty with international expertise was judged to be beyond the financial capability of the college at this time and was likewise rejected.

Ultimately, the subcommittee recommended to the QEP-DC consideration of the approach featuring the infusion (embedding) of international modules in selected courses across the curriculum.

Advantages and Disadvantages of International Modules

In evaluating the advisability and feasibility of using infused/embedded international modules in multiple courses across the existing curriculum, the QEP-DC considered carefully the advantages and possible disadvantages of adopting this methodology for the MSCC QEP.

Advantages. Advantages of infusing international modules in courses across the existing curriculum include the following:

- Availability of substantial well-documented precedent for infusion of international modules into existing curriculum

Internationalizing the Curriculum

Section 3

- Availability of a large catalog of existing international modules
- Simplicity, practicality, and ease of implementation
- Faculty control of curriculum with utilization of international modules
- Involvement of faculty in the development and implementation of international modules, thereby facilitating greater sense of control and personal investment in achievement of intended student learning outcomes
- Exposure of more students to international educational content, regardless of major
- Flexibility to revise modules with implementation and assessment as course and instructor circumstances warrant
- Relatively low costs related to the modules; adoption and implementation within the current financial and human resources of the college
- Not dependent on outside funding
- Student learning outcomes defined and assessed for each module with results used to modify the module and/or implementation as indicated
- Alignment with TBR and MSCC strategic goals and objectives with respect to internationalization
- Infusion of international modules into many, if not most, existing courses
- Potential to tap into international expertise and interest of faculty
- Logical first step toward future integrated internationalization initiatives

Disadvantages. Disadvantages of infusing international modules include the following:

- Non-support or resistance by faculty and staff
- Ideological or personal bias against teaching of international perspectives
- Ethnocentrism within faculty
- Lack of international experience or expertise on part of faculty
- Unanticipated or unforeseen limitations in institutional resources necessary to implement fully

Methods for addressing the disadvantages. Once potential disadvantages had been identified, the QEP-DC suggested the following methods for addressing the possible disadvantages:

- Plan and conduct institutional survey to measure current interest, experience, and receptivity toward internationalization and use results to address potential problems
- Identify and enlist faculty and staff with special interest and expertise in internationalization to serve as facilitators and mentors
- Plan and conduct faculty development in internationalization
- Set reasonable benchmarks and timeline for infusion of international modules
- Make faculty adoption of international modules voluntary

Model Programs

When and where the first international modules were developed is not clear. However, the precedent for their use is well documented. According to Dr. Theo Sypris,

Director of the Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education (MIIE) located at Kalamazoo Valley Community College in Oshtemo, Michigan, a consortium of 113 community colleges across 17 states throughout the U.S., the inception and implementation of international modules can be traced back to the late 1970s or early 1980s. At that time, a number of community colleges recognized the movement toward international education and began to develop and infuse international modules into existing courses (T. Sypris, personal communication, January 17, 2007). According to the American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE) website (<http://www.aciie.org/consortia.htm>), 21 community college consortia devoted to international education are currently operating in the U.S.

MIIE member institutions have been developing and cataloging international modules since 1992; these modules are shared among member institutions and can be used “as is” or adapted by the individual professor for infusion into a particular course. At this time, MIIE maintains a catalog of over 250 international modules accessible to member institutions either through print editions, the MIIE website, or MIIE CD-ROM. An example of a MIIE international module can be found in Appendix E. MSCC became a member of MIIE in 2006.

MIIE also provides the following services to member institutions:

- Assistance to faculty developing curriculum materials on international-intercultural content for course infusion
- Summer training workshops
- Fall and spring regional workshops
- Faculty mentoring
- International modules, curriculum handbooks, newsletters, and related publications
- Travel/study abroad projects with financial support
- Funding for curriculum projects
- Training in grant writing

California Colleges for International Education (CCIE) is an example of another consortium of community colleges dedicated to increasing community college students’ international knowledge through a variety of initiatives including the infusion of international modules into existing courses. In *Internationalizing the Community College Curriculum: A Handbook* (1999), CCIE’s director Dr. Rosalind Latiner Raby describes the essential components of an “international master module” that might be infused/embedded into a course. International modules could be developed for virtually any course in the curriculum and can be an effective practical way for infusing international content throughout the existing curriculum (R.L. Raby, personal communication, August 3, 2006).

The Maricopa Community College system in Arizona (2006) has infused successfully international modules into a number of courses across many disciplines. Since 1996, Maricopa has provided funding for ten faculty members to participate in a year-long professional development internationalization experience, culminating with the faculty members designing an international module to infuse into their discipline. Once the faculty members internationalize a course, they assume faculty-mentor roles for other faculty desiring expertise in international module creation and infusion (American

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 3

Council on Education, 2007). Maricopa College system posts these international modules on its website (<http://www.maricopa.edu>) for faculty access within and outside its system.

SECTION 4

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Following a review of the literature regarding best practices for incorporating internationalization into the curriculum, the QEP-DC decided to use international modules to achieve the infusion of international educational content across the curriculum.

After deciding to use international modules, the next task was to formalize a strategy for identifying which MSCC courses were to be “internationalized” (i.e., contain an infused or embedded international module). The QEP-DC studied the options for implementing a practicable approach for identifying the courses to be internationalized, a projected timeline for doing so, and the essential components of an international module. The QEP-DC also considered the nature and extent of faculty development and training for those faculty members who sought to internationalize one or more of their courses.

Essential Components of Course-Specific International Modules

The QEP-DC reviewed the catalog (available in print, online, and CD-ROM) of course-specific international modules available through the Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education (MIIE) for examples of modules. Faculty internationalizing a course may elect to use one of the existing MIIE modules or create their own international module. If the faculty member chooses to create a new module, objective standards pertaining to the essential components of a module must be established. After a careful review of available international module examples, the committee recommended that all international modules developed for infusion into existing courses must contain, at minimum, the following identifiable elements:

- Name of course instructor
- MSCC course number and title
- Description of the international module
- Objectives and intended student learning outcomes of the international module
- Methodology to be used
- Description of how student learning outcomes are to be formally assessed
- List of resources to be used in the implementation of the module

At least four weeks prior to the beginning of the semester in which the internationalized course is to be taught, a written copy of the international module stating the essential elements described above is to be submitted for review and approval to the following:

1. Coordinator of International Education (see Section 6)
2. Discipline coordinator of the relevant academic discipline
3. Dean of the academic division in which the internationalized course is taught
4. Vice President for Academic Affairs

Internationalizing the Curriculum Section 4

Each of these individuals must give written approval of the submitted international module before it may be implemented in the identified course. Once an international module has received written approval, that particular module need not be submitted for re-approval in future semesters. This approval process does not intend to infringe in any way upon the academic freedom of faculty by dictating the content of the module, but only seeks to specify the essential pedagogical components that must be contained.

The official syllabus for the course must reflect that it is an internationalized course and must contain a brief description of the international module to be implemented. This information must appear in the written syllabus provided to the student at the beginning of the course.

Lastly, faculty who seek to internationalize a particular course using an international module have the following options:

- Using an existing international module from another source as long as appropriate attribution for the authorship of the module is maintained
- Adapting or revising an existing module with appropriate attribution for the original author
- Creating a new international module

In every instance, however, the international module must contain the key elements noted previously and have the written approval of the individuals named. A template for a course-specific international module is in Appendix F.

Method for Identifying Courses to be Internationalized

The QEP-DC recommends that internationalizing an existing course through the infusion of a course-specific international module be voluntary. That is, while it is the clear hope that over time many, if not most, courses will be internationalized, no faculty member will be compelled to internationalize a course. In addition to respecting the vital principle of academic freedom, the QEP-DC acknowledges that the goal of internationalizing the curriculum will be best served by faculty who are intrinsically motivated toward the aspirational aims of internationalization.

The identification of courses to be internationalized and the faculty who will teach them will be based on the following considerations:

- The Faculty and Staff Internationalization Survey (FSIS) identified faculty who expressed an interest in internationalization. These faculty members will be given the opportunity to internationalize one of the courses they teach.
- Informal discussions with faculty in division and discipline group meetings may also identify faculty interested in internationalizing a course.
- Discipline groups may identify courses and willing instructors.
- Individual faculty members may volunteer to teach an internationalized course.

At the discretion of the college leadership, faculty who elect to internationalize a course may receive special incentives or recognition.

Faculty Development

Obviously, internationalization is an entirely new initiative for MSCC and one unfamiliar to many faculty. Therefore, faculty must receive requisite training in aspects of internationalization including the development and implementation of course-specific international modules. To address these faculty development needs, the following activities are planned:

- A broad overview of the QEP and internationalization will be provided at the 2007 Fall Assembly.
- A consultant in community college internationalization and/or instructional methods supporting the implementation of the QEP (e.g., writing and assessing student learning outcomes) will be retained.
- MSCC's membership in MIIIE will allow faculty to access the staff development opportunities offered through that organization.
- Faculty seeking to internationalize a course will be provided with the MIIIE CD-ROM containing all the available international modules. Permission was granted by Dr. Theo Sypris (email, personal communication, November 8, 2006).
- Faculty will be provided with a template detailing the essential components of an internationalized module (see Appendix F).
- Academic deans will encourage and support faculty internationalization initiatives and allocate adequate time in division and discipline group meetings to review the QEP and international modules. The QEP-DC has briefed academic deans and divisions on the development of the QEP since the inception of the QEP project.

Implementation Timeline

The QEP will be implemented according to the following timeline:

Year 1 (2007-08)

1. Appoint Coordinator of International Education to oversee QEP implementation, data collection, and coordination of ancillary internationalization activities in the college.
2. Establish a standing International Education Committee (see Section 8).
3. Identify courses to internationalize.
4. Provide faculty development in internationalization, international module development, articulation and assessment of intended student learning outcomes, and use of assessment results.

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 4

Year 2 (2008-09)

1. Introduce international modules into at least one to three courses and complete assessment of the student learning outcomes.
2. Use the assessment results to improve student learning.
3. Provide further faculty development in internationalization, international module development, articulation and assessment of intended student learning outcomes, and use of assessment results.

Year 3 (2009-10)

1. Introduce international modules into at least one to three courses and complete assessment of the student learning outcomes.
2. Use the assessment results to improve student learning.
3. Provide further faculty development in internationalization, international module development, articulation and assessment of intended student learning outcomes, and use of assessment results.

Year 4 (2010-11)

1. Introduce international modules into at least one to three courses and complete assessment of the student learning outcomes.
2. Use the assessment results to improve student learning.
3. Provide further faculty development in internationalization, international module development, articulation and assessment of intended student learning outcomes, and use of assessment results.

Year 5 (2011-12)

1. Introduce international modules into at least one to three courses and complete assessment of the student learning outcomes.
2. Use the assessment results to improve student learning.
3. Provide further faculty development in internationalization, international module development, articulation and assessment of intended student learning outcomes, and use of assessment results.
4. Prepare and submit the QEP *Impact Report* to SACS-COC.

SECTION 5

ASSESSMENT PLAN

The QEP-DC designed a comprehensive QEP assessment plan of objectives, intended student learning outcomes, an assessment matrix including both quantitative and qualitative measures, and the use of assessment results, in compliance with SACS-COC Core Requirement 2.12 (the Quality Enhancement Plan). Core Requirement 2.12 stipulates that the institution's QEP must contain "A comprehensive evaluation plan clearly related to the QEP goals, with the latitude and flexibility to make adjustments to achieve the desired student learning outcomes" (2004, p. 26).

The requirement continues,

The institution's evaluation of its QEP should be multifaceted, with attention to both key objectives and benchmarks to be achieved in the planning and implementation of the QEP as well as the overall goals of the plan. Initially, evaluation strategies will need to focus on the planning and implementation process and provide crucial feedback to those with primary responsibility for the QEP. In evaluating the overall goals of the QEP, primary emphasis will need to be given to the impact of the QEP on the quality of student learning. Multiple strategies using both quantitative and qualitative measures will need to be employed and student learning outcomes will require careful analysis for consistency of results across different measures and for variation among the outcomes. (p. 27)

In addition, SACS-COC requires the institution to submit the *Impact Report* five years following the institution's last decennial review which "seeks to demonstrate the extent to which the QEP has affected outcomes related to student learning" (p. 38).

Assessment Contributing to Planning and Implementing the QEP

The planning and development of the QEP were guided by two key assessments: the Course Syllabus Internationalization Survey and the Faculty and Staff Internationalization Survey. A description of these assessments and results is presented in Section 1, with full information in Appendix B and Appendix C. The QEP-DC used the results from these assessments to inform and guide the evolution of the eventual QEP.

Formulation of the QEP Goal, Objectives, and Student Learning Outcomes

As previously articulated, the essential thrust of the MSCC QEP is the improvement of student learning through the infusion of international educational content into courses across the existing curriculum. The background and rationale for this approach has also been described previously.

Goal of the QEP. As described in Section 1 of this report and in the QEP Abstract submitted to SACS-COC in November 2006, the goal of the MSCC QEP is

“improving student learning through culturally diverse perspectives to prepare students for success in a global society.”

Relevance of QEP goal to student learning. As the review of the literature summarized in Sections 2 and 3 of this report highlights, the internationalization of higher education, and particularly in community colleges, is a movement with well-defined need and broad support both within and outside academia. By infusing international (i.e., cross-cultural) knowledge and perspectives to students across multiple disciplines and courses in the existing curriculum, students exposed to such pedagogy can be expected to develop a more sophisticated comprehension of the world and their place in and relation to it. The acquisition of international perspectives may be expected to increase the students’ capacity to engage in fact-based critical thinking. Students will learn to make informed judgments as they negotiate the personal and professional demands of a society transcending national boundaries and an economy increasingly shaped by the forces of globalization.

Objectives and intended student learning outcomes. The formulation of student learning outcomes reflects a broad movement within higher education toward learner-centered assessment. A student learning outcome is a statement of the expected change in the student’s knowledge, thought process, behavior, attitudes, values, or skills resulting from the learning experience, be it didactic instruction or experiential learning. This definition of a student learning outcome is consistent with the SACS-COC definition of student learning presented in Section 1 of this report. It is beyond the scope of this report to provide a comprehensive exposition of the psychoeducational theory, pragmatics, psychometrics, or comprehensive taxonomy of student learning outcomes. A plethora of excellent sources is available ranging from Bloom’s original work (1956, 1984) through more current reformulations by Musil (2006) and educational psychologists such as Anderson and Krathwohl (2001).

In the development of the objectives and student learning outcomes delineated below, the QEP-DC reviewed the relevant literature on international student learning outcomes and was particularly guided by Siaya’s review which summarizes the competencies a student might be expected to acquire through an internationalized educational experience:

Knowledge

- Knowledge of world geography, conditions, issues and events
- Awareness of the complexity and interdependency of world events and issues
- Understanding of historical forces that have shaped the current world system
- Knowledge of one’s own culture and history
- Knowledge of effective communication, including knowledge of a foreign language, intercultural communication concepts, and international business etiquette
- Understanding the diversity found in the world in terms of values, beliefs, ideas, and worldviews

Attitudes

- Openness to learning and a positive orientation to new opportunities, ideas, and ways of thinking
- Tolerance for ambiguity and unfamiliarity
- Sensitivity and respect for personal and cultural differences
- Empathy or the ability to take multiple perspectives
- Self-awareness and self-esteem about one's own identity and culture

Skills

- Technical skills to enhance the ability of students to learn about the world (i.e., research skills)
- Critical and comparative thinking skills, including the ability to think creatively and integrate knowledge, rather than uncritical acceptance of knowledge
- Communication skills, including the ability to use another language effectively and interact with people from other cultures
- Coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and challenging situations
(Siaya, 2001, p. 106)

Working from this foundation, the QEP-DC articulated the following objectives and intended student learning outcomes for the QEP:

Objective 1: Students in internationalized courses will develop greater knowledge and understanding of cultures other than their own, and in the process they will gain the ability to comprehend diverse cultural perspectives on important issues confronting humanity and to understand the role of culture in conditioning those perspectives.

Student Learning Outcomes:

- 1a. Students will increase their knowledge of the various cultures in the world around them.
- 1b. Students will analyze the nature and impact of cultural diversity around the world and the role differing cultural perspectives play in shaping world events.

Objective 2: Students in internationalized courses will acquire increased knowledge of the international aspects of the selected subject areas (i.e., course and academic discipline).

Student Learning Outcomes:

- 2a. Students will analyze how international cultural diversity shapes the foundational elements, theory, research, and practice of various academic disciplines and professions.
- 2b. Students will compare and contrast theoretical and practical issues and problems regarding the international aspects of the course and academic discipline.
- 2c. Students will describe how the course-related international content and knowledge impact their own professional development.

Objective 3: Students in internationalized courses will demonstrate an increased awareness and understanding of the interdependency and consequences of international events and issues.

Student Learning Outcomes:

- 3a. Students will identify how events in other nations affect them and how events in the United States affect other nations.
- 3b. Students will analyze how the consequences of personal choices impact the economies, political systems, and cultures of other nations.
- 3c. Students will articulate the perspectives of other cultures and nations when analyzing world events.

Assessment Design and Instrument Selection

A quasi-experimental (i.e., experimental and control group) design and repeated measures (pre- and post-testing) assessment using both quantitative and qualitative instruments will be implemented.

Each student learning outcome (SLO) will be assessed using a combination of both quantitative and qualitative measures.

Quantitative Assessment

Quantitative assessment uses numerical representations (i.e., test scores) of an individual's performance on objective tests that may be subjected to statistical analysis based upon the nature of the data.

Pre- and post-testing in the internationalized course. The instructor of each internationalized course will construct an appropriate objective pre- and post-test measure that will be administered to the class before the infusion of the international module and at the conclusion of the module. The instructor will conduct an item analysis on the pre- and post-tests to determine the incremental gain in the attainment of the student learning outcomes. The scores from the pre- and post-tests and the item analyses will be recorded and sent to the Coordinator of International Education.

Control group cohort pre- and post-testing. For every internationalized course being quantitatively assessed with the pre- and post-test described above, an identical course will also be identified and this non-internationalized course will serve as the control group cohort. For example, if a particular section of PSY 1310 General Psychology I is to be internationalized, another non-internationalized section of PSY 1310 will be administered the identical pre- and post-test that same semester. A statistical comparison (t-test) between the internationalized and non-internationalized sections will reflect the improvement in scores that may be attributable to the independent variable (i.e., the international module).

Institution wide quantitative assessment. During the period of the QEP, items from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the Alumni Survey reflecting multicultural learning and experience will be compiled and analyzed.

The results will be compared to the data from these instruments prior to the implementation of the QEP and from year to year during the QEP.

The Coordinator of International Education will archive the results of all pre- and post- tests in internationalized and control cohort non-internationalized courses and report the data in the QEP *Impact Report*.

Qualitative Assessment

In Albert Einstein's office at Princeton University reportedly hung a sign that read, "Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted." Qualitative assessment endeavors to describe an individual's performance or achievement by analyzing the subjective aspects of the individual's performance in a way that conveys some sense of the quality of what is being evaluated. Instructors of internationalized courses may choose to use additional qualitative assessment techniques such as direct observations, interviews, reflective essays, research papers/term projects, reflective journals, student portfolios/e-portfolios, photographic essays, videotapes, oral presentations, group projects/activities, simulations, student surveys, and faculty professional judgment.

The QEP-DC recommends that the instructor of each internationalized course identify at least one qualitative assessment measure for use in conjunction with the quantitative measure (i.e., the pre- and post-test).

Assessment Matrix

In matching SLO's with their course quantitative and qualitative assessment, as well as system-wide assessment, the following matrix will serve as a guide:

	Assessment Matrix							
Assessment Instrument	Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes							
	Objective 1		Objective 2			Objective 3		
	SLO 1a.	SLO 1b.	SLO 2a.	SLO 2b.	SLO 2c.	SLO 3a.	SLO 3b.	SLO 3c.
Quantitative Measure Pre- and Post-Test	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Qualitative Measure	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)	Item 12k	Item 12k	Item 12k	Item 12k	Item 12k	Item 12k	Item 12k	Item 12k
Alumni Survey	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Closing the Assessment Loop

In *A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn*, Olson, Green, and Hill (2006) pointedly observe, “If assessment results are not used to improve teaching and learning, assessment risks becoming an exercise of gathering potentially interesting information that is ultimately useless” (p. 13).

The QEP assessment approach described above is viewed as a recursive process in which assessment results will be used to adjust and modify the QEP if necessary. Thus, the flexibility to make changes to the QEP based upon the ongoing collection and analysis of assessment results will be maintained.

The results from both the quantitative and qualitative assessments from both the internationalized course and its control cohort will be collected by the instructor of the internationalized course and forwarded to the following individuals:

1. Dean of the academic division in which the internationalized course was taught
2. Vice President for Academic Affairs
3. Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness
4. Coordinator of International Education
5. International Education Committee

Any of these individuals may recommend modifications of the QEP and the overall assessment plan, the intended student learning outcomes, or the infusion of the international modules as dictated by extant circumstances and data review. Thus, the assessment results will not be merely summative (i.e., accumulation and analysis disconnected from the data assessment feedback loop) but will be formative and drive evidence-based decisions for adjusting the QEP. Ultimately, these assessment data will be used as a stimulus for ongoing monitoring and adjustment to maximize the success of the QEP.

Example of the use of assessment results. The following example illustrates the use of assessment results:

Professor X internationalizes PSY 1310 General Psychology I by infusing an international module into the course. Following quantitative (pre- and post-test) and qualitative assessment (e.g., reflective paper), the item analysis of the assessment results shows that SLO 2a and SLO 3b are consistently lower than results tied to the other SLO's. Using this assessment information, Professor X adjusts the course so that the next time it is taught, instruction focusing on those identified SLO's is reinforced. Following assessment, Professor X examines the quantitative and qualitative assessment to determine whether the reinforced instruction elevated indices tied to SLO's 2a and 3b.

SECTION 6

EVALUATING, MONITORING, AND SUSTAINING THE QEP

As previously described, internationalized course assessment data will be used to assess the attainment of the objectives and SLO's of the QEP. Aggregate data from the ongoing assessment process must be included in the *Impact Report* of the Quality Enhancement Plan on Student Learning.

Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan on Student Learning

- Definition:** The *Impact Report*, submitted five years prior to the institution's next decennial review, is a report demonstrating the extent to which the QEP has affected outcomes related to student learning. It is part of the institution's Fifth-Year Interim Report.
- Audience:** The *Impact Report* is reviewed by the Commission on Colleges as part of the Fifth-Year Interim Report and is subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the initiation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.
- Report Presentation:** When preparing the report, the following should be included in the narrative: (1) a brief description of the institution, including a description of its current mission and its geographic service area, a description of the composition of the student population and enrollment, governance structure, summary of academic programs offered, and a description of any unusual or distinctive features of the institution; (2) the title and a brief description of the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan as initially presented; (3) a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP; (4) a discussion of significant changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes; and (5) a description of the QEP's direct impact on student learning including the achievement of goals and outcomes as outlined in item three above, and unanticipated outcomes of the QEP, if any.
- Due Date:** The *Impact Report* is part of the institution's Fifth-Year Interim Report and is due five years prior to the institution's next decennial review. The institution will be notified by the President of the Commission regarding the specific due date.
- Number of Copies:** See the letter from the President of the Commission requesting the Report.

Source: (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Reports%20requested%20for%20COC%20review.pdf>; Edited and Revised for the Principles of Accreditation: December 2003; Updated January 2007)

The QEP-DC recommends that administrative oversight for the QEP, including monitoring the QEP, collecting and reporting assessment data from the QEP, and writing the *Impact Report*, be vested in a faculty member working in collaboration with appropriate college administrative personnel and a new standing committee on international education. This plan necessitates the utilization of a faculty member to serve as the Coordinator of International Education and the creation of a standing committee, the International Education Committee.

Coordinator of International Education

The President and the SACS Leadership Team approved the position of Coordinator of International Education in a meeting on March 23, 2007. Appendix G includes the position description for the coordinator.

Since the QEP entails enrichment of the curriculum and faculty are the “stewards of the curriculum,” the QEP-DC recommends this new position be filled by a full-time member of the college faculty. Additional qualifications for this position include the following:

- Interest and commitment to the QEP and the institutional mission regarding international education and its ancillary components
- Appropriate experience and background in key aspects of international education comprising both curricular and co-curricular elements
- Knowledge of the infrastructure of the college and demonstrated capability to interface effectively with all faculty and administrators, as well as networking with individuals, agencies, professional groups, and institutions outside the college on internationalization initiatives

The QEP-DC recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs appoint the Coordinator of International Education from among interested and qualified full-time faculty and that the faculty member be given redistributed time equivalent to six to nine hours per semester, contingent upon the responsibilities of the position. In the early stages of the QEP implementation, more redistributed time may be necessary but may be adjusted afterwards as future circumstances and administrative exigencies warrant.

The QEP-DC recommends that the Coordinator of International Education serve a five-year term (re-appointment possible) and, in the conduct of duties pertaining to the QEP and other internationalization activities, serve under the administrative oversight of and be evaluated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The appropriate dean will maintain administrative oversight and evaluation of the coordinator as a faculty member.

The Coordinator of International Education will maintain assessment data used to evaluate the internationalized courses and the overall QEP effectiveness and will submit this data in a timely manner to the following:

1. Dean of the academic division in which the internationalized course was taught
2. Discipline coordinator of the relevant academic discipline
3. Vice President for Academic Affairs
4. Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness

5. President of the college
6. International Education Committee members
7. Vice President for Student Affairs
8. Director of Academic Services

At the conclusion of each semester, the Coordinator of International Education will submit progress reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and will conduct formal presentations to the college as requested.

In summary, the Coordinator of International Education will be responsible for maintaining assessment results from the internationalized courses and writing the *Impact Report*. The office of the Coordinator of International Education will be the repository of data and information pertaining to the QEP and related internationalization activities of the college.

International Education Committee

The QEP success will be enhanced by a broad base of faculty support acting to both advise and assist in the implementation of the QEP and related internationalization initiatives through a collaborative working relationship with the Coordinator of International Education and other responsible individuals within the college.

The QEP-DC recommends establishing a standing committee, the International Education Committee (IEC), to maintain oversight of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and all international education initiatives at Motlow College. The Coordinator of International Education will serve *ex officio* as Chair of the IEC during the five-year term of appointment and will retain administrative authority and responsibility for the duties assigned to the IEC, including setting the meeting schedule.

The appointments and terms of service of committee members with voting privileges will be as follows:

- Four faculty members (two from each division) appointed by the dean of the respective division for two-year terms
- One academic dean appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs for a two-year term
- One member from the Student Services unit appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs for a two-year term
- One student appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs for a one-year term

Terms of the faculty members will be staggered so that two members will be appointed each year. Committee members may succeed themselves in appointment.

The Coordinator of International Education will be a non-voting member, will set the meeting schedule of the IEC, and will appoint a member to serve as secretary/recorder charged with the responsibility of recording, archiving, and disseminating minutes of all IEC meetings.

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 6

The Director of Academic Services will serve *ex officio* as a non-voting member of the committee. Three other non-voting members representing the Information Technology and Telecommunications Services, Business Affairs, and Library units will be appointed by their respective vice presidents and serve two-year terms.

The QEP-DC recommends the following duties of the IEC:

1. Develop and review periodically the policies and procedures regarding the QEP and other internationalization initiatives as appropriate
2. Assist and advise the Coordinator of International Education in the mission and oversight of the QEP
3. Assist and advise the Director of Academic Services in other internationalization initiatives as appropriate
4. Coordinate, facilitate, and approve faculty development activities related to the QEP and other internationalization initiatives
5. Coordinate and facilitate internationalization initiatives including study abroad and co-curricular events
6. Review and recommend disbursement of all expenditures related to the QEP and other internationalization initiatives
7. Promote the mission of the QEP among faculty

The role of the IEC will be consultative with and advisory to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. All recommended actions or policies must be duly approved through the college approval process. A full description of the composition and duties of the IEC is presented in Appendix H.

SECTION 7

FUNDING THE QEP

Motlow State Community College will devote the necessary financial and human resources for implementation of the QEP. The QEP-DC determined that the QEP would be sustainable within the college's financial and human resources.

Funding Sources

President MaryLou Apple has committed funding for the QEP from the college's operating budget, which will include a \$5 international fee assessment per student per semester effective fall 2007. The international fee assessment will generate at least \$35,000 annually with the QEP receiving priority funding among all international initiatives. All unexpended funds from the international fee assessment will be recorded in a designated fund balance account on the college's year-end financial statement and will carry forward to the next year to be used for international initiatives.

QEP Annual Expenditures

The QEP-DC anticipates the following annual expenditures in support of the QEP:

2007-2008

International Education Consultant and Faculty Development	\$ 5,000
Travel and Supplies	3,000
Redistributed time, Coordinator of International Education	6,000
Promotional materials	1,500
Dues for membership in international consortia	<u>1,000</u>
Total	\$16,500

2008-2009

International Education Consultant and Faculty Development	\$ 5,250
Travel and Supplies	3,150
Redistributed time, Coordinator of International Education	12,000
Promotional materials	1,575
Dues for membership in international consortia	<u>1,050</u>
Total	\$23,025

2009-2010

International Education Consultant and Faculty Development	\$ 5,500
Travel and Supplies	3,300
Redistributed time, Coordinator of International Education	12,000
Promotional materials	1,650
Dues for membership in international consortia	<u>1,100</u>
Total	\$23,550

Internationalizing the Curriculum
Section 7

2010-2011

International Education Consultant and Faculty Development	\$ 5,750
Travel and Supplies	3,450
Redistributed time, Coordinator of International Education	12,000
Promotional materials	1,725
Dues for membership in international consortia	<u>1,150</u>
Total	\$24,075

2011-2012

International Education Consultant and Faculty Development	\$ 6,000
Travel and Supplies	3,600
Redistributed time, Coordinator of International Education	12,000
Promotional materials	1,800
Dues for membership in international consortia	<u>1,200</u>
Total	\$24,600

The estimated increase for inflation from 2007-2008 through 2011-2012 is approximately five percent each year.

Personnel. The only personnel cost is the hiring of adjunct faculty to cover the redistributed time of the Coordinator of International Education, who is faculty; therefore, the only expense for personnel benefits is the matching FICA tax for the adjunct faculty.

Technology. The Information Technology and Telecommunications (ITT) Services unit provides technical support for all college activities as needed. All technology costs associated with the QEP will be funded within the existing ITT budget.

Library. The library ensures that its collection is balanced and includes internationalization materials related to all disciplines. Most academic disciplines and subject areas have broad support materials incorporating international perspectives. Appropriate library support for the curriculum is documented in the SACS Compliance Report. In conjunction with the faculty, the library will acquire any such materials related to the QEP as requested by the faculty with costs funded within the existing library budget.

SECTION 8

THE QEP—TRANSFORMATION AND NEW HORIZONS

The QEP development generated considerable interest in the topic of internationalization with both the members of the QEP-DC and various constituencies within the college. Prior to the process of developing the QEP, MSCC had engaged in limited initiatives related to internationalization; internationalization remains largely unmapped terrain for MSCC and its stakeholders. Facing the unknown requires courage and commitment to move beyond individual and corporate comfort zones and challenge established paradigms.

As the QEP-DC members learned about internationalization through their research and discussion with colleagues, a number of ideas and exciting possibilities relative to internationalization evolved. The attraction and enthusiasm for other possible internationalization initiatives at times challenged the members of the QEP-DC to remain focused on developing a QEP within the parameters defined by SACS-COC. Researching and planning a viable QEP was a challenging and exciting process. Focus and momentum in the context of a naturally occurring dialectic of ideas, and the inevitable compromise that followed, were achieved.

The QEP-DC recognizes the critical importance of the acceptance and successful implementation of the QEP, both with respect to the immediate requirement for reaffirmation of accreditation of the college and for the significant long-term positive impact on student learning. In this latter all-important aim—the improvement of student learning—the QEP can rightly be regarded as both an immediate pedagogical intervention and also as an ideological seed that, nurtured to full fruition, offers the possibility of a profound transformative change for MSCC and the quality of the student learning experience offered.

Throughout the QEP development process, the members of the QEP-DC often raised the question: “What would MSCC look like if it were comprehensively internationalized?” That is, if the seed of internationalization planted by the QEP were to germinate, put down roots deep into the soil of the institution, and grow ultimately to full fruition, how would the college change? What changes and experiences are needed to enable and empower students to reap the full and potentially life-changing benefits of a comprehensively internationalized collegiate education?

The concluding portion of this section includes a hypothetical forecast of potential future internationalization initiatives that, contingent upon institutional nurturing, might come into being and culminate in the broad transformation of the college. These nascent ideas arise from the research and deliberations of the QEP-DC.

Membership in International Consortia

As described in Section 3, MSCC joined the MIIIE consortium in 2006. Beyond access to course-specific international modules, the full benefits and opportunities from this membership remain to be accessed.

Internationalizing the Curriculum References

In 2006, while work on the QEP was well underway, the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) authorized the establishment of the Tennessee Consortium for International Studies (TnCIS) of which MSCC has become a member. The first annual International Education Conference was held February 6-7, 2007, in Knoxville, Tennessee; four MSCC representatives attended this inaugural conference. MSCC Director of Academic Services is the official liaison to TnCIS. The QEP-DC anticipates that the Coordinator of International Education at MSCC will also interface with TnCIS. Comprising 19 TBR institutions, the TnCIS Mission Statement states that TnCIS was founded “. . . to provide greater focus on the international needs of the state and to develop, support, and promote international exchanges of all types” (<http://www.tncis.org/>). TnCIS aims to:

- Develop research and study abroad opportunities for faculty and students
- Attract high quality international students and faculty to Tennessee institutions
- Foster curriculum development in international education
- Offer cultural programs, seminars, workshops, and conferences on international topics
- Develop linkages and cooperative projects with institutions abroad
- Improve international education and cultural awareness throughout the state
- Use the international expertise represented by the Consortium to serve the people of Tennessee

Study Abroad

In June 2007, in collaboration with Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), a large TBR university in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, three MSCC students and two MSCC faculty members (who were also members of the QEP-DC) spent five weeks in Cherbourg, France. The MSCC faculty members were observers to the long-standing MTSU study-abroad program. These faculty members will return to MSCC as mentors and lay the groundwork for sending MSCC students and faculty to France in summer 2008 to study with MTSU students and faculty. This “piggy-back” arrangement for MSCC faculty and students is the first of its kind and represents an exciting new opportunity. Additional “piggy-back” study abroad opportunities with regional colleges and universities having well-established study abroad programs will be investigated.

Also in summer 2007, three MSCC students participated in a TnCIS study abroad program to Mexico. These students were the first official study abroad students from Motlow College.

The QEP-DC anticipates that MSCC membership in international consortia such as MIIIE and TnCIS will result in new, affordable, and practical study abroad opportunities for MSCC students.

Faculty Exchange and International Development

Through MIIIE and TnCIS, MSCC faculty interested in internationalization may explore and pursue future Fulbright exchange opportunities. MSCC has secured

corporate financial sponsorship through the Motlow College Foundation for faculty travel abroad. Attendance at international faculty colloquia, symposia, and workshops may stimulate faculty interest and expertise in internationalization.

Other Possible Future Internationalization Initiatives

Future internationalization initiatives to be explored may include the following:

- International sister-institution affiliations
- Opportunities for student international service learning
- Recruitment of international students
- Internationally-themed co-curricular events
- Technology-assisted international teaching
- Recruitment of international faculty
- Renewed interest in foreign language study
- Collaborative partnerships with internationally-based industry and business

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P.G. (2002). *Perspectives on internationalizing higher education*. Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, Spring 2002. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/newsletter/News27/text004.htm
- American Association of Community Colleges & Association of Community College Trustees. (2006). *Building the global community: Joint statement on the role of community colleges in international education*. Retrieved January 15, 2007, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Services/International/AACCACCT_Joint_Statement.pdf
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2001). *AACC position statement on international education*. Retrieved March 15, 2006, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Services/International/AACC_Policy_Statement_on_International_Education.htm
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national policy on international education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- American Council on Education. (2007). *Strategies for internationalizing the curriculum (bibliography)*. Retrieved January 15, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/PrinterTemplate.cfm?Section=Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&contentID=9354>
- American Council on Education. (2007). *The Maricopa Community Colleges*. Retrieved January 1, 2007 from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=16102>
- American Council on International and Intercultural Education & the Stanley Foundation. (1994). *Building the global community: The next step* [Electronic version]. Retrieved March 20, 2006, from <http://www.aciie.org/Airlie%20I.pdf>
- American Council on International Education & The Stanley Foundation. (1996). *Educating for the global community: A framework for community colleges* [Electronic version]. Retrieved March 30, 2006, from <http://www.aciie.org/Airlie%20II.pdf>
- American Council on International Intercultural Education. (2006). *National/state/regional global education consortia*. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from <http://www.aciie.org/consortia.htm>
- American Council on International Intercultural Education. (2007). *ACIIE and CCD to merge, effective January 1, 2007*. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from <http://www.aciie.org/merger.htm>
- Anderson, L. & Krathwohl, D.A. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Internationalizing the Curriculum
References

- Bhatia, V.N. (1985). The use of the curriculum in internationalizing the university. *Journal of the AIERA*, 5, 1.
- Blair, D., Phinney, L. & Phillipe, K.A. (2001). *International programs at community colleges-research brief* [Electronic version]. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/ContentGroups/Research_Briefs2/IntProgBrief.pdf
- Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of behavioral objectives, handbook 1: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Bloom, B.S. (1984). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon/Pearson Education.
- Chase, A.M., & Mahoney, J.R. (Eds.). (1996). *Global awareness in community colleges: A report of a national survey* [Electronic version]. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Services/International/Global_Awareness.pdf
- Clinton, W.J. *Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies: International education policy*. (2002). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved March 20, 2006, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Services/International/The_White_House.htm
- Committee for Economic Development. (2006). *Education for global leadership: The importance of international studies and foreign language education for U.S. economic and national security* [Electronic version]. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved January 11, 2007, from http://www.ced.org/docs/report/report_foreignlanguages.pdf
- Cornwell, G.H., & Stoddard, E.W. (1999). *Globalizing knowledge: Connecting international and intercultural studies*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Dellow, D.A. (2002). Why do community colleges need to be involved in international activities? In R.M. Romano (Ed.), *Internationalizing the community college*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, Community College Press.
- De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ellingboe, B.J. (1997). *The most frequently asked questions about internationalization* [Electronic version]. University of Minnesota, College of Education & Human Development. Retrieved March 13, 2006, from <http://education.umn.edu/IntEduc/IntFAQs.html>

- Farnsworth, K.A. (2002). Foreword. In R.M. Romano (Ed.), *Internationalizing the community college*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, Community College Press.
- Friedman, T.L. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Friedman, T.L. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century (updated and expanded)*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Frost, R., Savage, C., & Natali, J. *International studies in the community college: Faculty, courses and the curriculum*. Videoconference on November 10, 2004.
- Green, M.F. (2005). *Internationalization in U.S. higher education: The student perspective*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Green, M., & Barblan, A. (2004). *Higher education in a pluralist world: A transatlantic view* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 2, 2007 from http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2004Transatlantic_Pluralist.pdf
- Green, M.F., & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Green, M.F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Green, M.F., & Siaya, L. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at community colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Hayward, F.M. (2000). *Preliminary status report 2000—internationalization of U.S. higher education* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from <http://acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2000-intl-report.pdf>
- Hayward, F.M., & Siaya, L.M. (2001). *Public experience, attitudes, and knowledge: A report on two national surveys about international education* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from <http://acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2001-intl-report.pdf>
- Hayward, F., & Siaya, L. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses—final report 2003* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/mapping.pdf>
- International Association of Universities. (2006). *Selected bibliography on higher education and internationalization* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from http://www.unesco.org/iau/internationalization/rtf/i_bib1.rtf
- Knight, J.K. (1996). *Selected bibliography on internationalization of higher education* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 1, 2007 from <http://www.ryerson.ca/lag/reference/reports.html>

Internationalizing the Curriculum

References

- Knight, J. (2003). *Updating the definition of internationalization* [Electronic version]. Center for International Education at Boston College. Retrieved January 2, 2007 from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm
- Maricopa Community Colleges. (2006). *Internationalizing the curriculum project*. Retrieved June 6, 2006 from <http://www.maricopa.edu/academic/intldev/IntlCurrProjWeb/>
- Michigan State University. (2006). *Bibliography (international report appendix D)*. Retrieved January 1, 2007 from <http://accreditation2006.msu.edu/report/documents>
- Motlow State Community College. (2006). *Strategic planning-objectives-goals*. Retrieved December 31, 2006 from <http://www.mscc.edu/research/Sp/STRATEGIC%20PLAN%20FOR%20WEB.htm>
- Motlow State Community College. (2006). *Mission statement*. Retrieved December 31, 2006 from <http://www.mscc.edu/mission.html>
- Musil, C.M. (2006). *Assessing global learning: Matching good intentions with good practice*. Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2006). *America's call for leadership on international education: A national survey on preparation for a global society* [Electronic version]. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved July 24, 2006 from http://www.nafsa.org/press_releases.sec/press_releases.pg/american_public_international
- NAFSA: Association of International Education. (2006). *An international education policy for U.S. leadership, competitiveness and security* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 11, 2007 from http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/united_states_international/toward_an_international.pdf
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2006). *Internationalizing the campus 2006-Profiles of success at colleges and universities*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Olson, C.L., Green, M.F., & Hill, B.A. (2005). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Olson, C.L., Green, M.F., & Hill, B.A. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1, 248-270.
- Raby, R.L. (1999). *Internationalizing the community college curriculum: A handbook produced for the UCLA summer institute, 1999* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 20, 2007 from http://www.isop.ucla.edu/institute/1999/community_College/HANDBOOK.html

- Rainey, A. (2006, March 31). Academic groups urge the White House to strengthen international education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved April 7, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i30/30a04701.htm>
- Riley, R.W. (2000). *The growing importance of international education*. Public Address at La Maison Francaise, Washington, D.C., April 19, 2000. Retrieved July 24, 2006 from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourceCenter/Services/International/The_Growing_Importance_of_International_Education.htm
- Scott, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The globalization of higher education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press and the Society for Research Into Higher Education.
- Siaya, L. (2001). International/intercultural competencies. In M.F. Green & Olson (2005), *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Siaya, L., Porcelli, M., & Green, M. (2002). *Public opinion poll: One year later – Attitudes about international education since September 11* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 1, 2007 from http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2002_one-year-later.pdf
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Colleges. (2004). *The principles of accreditation: Foundation for quality enhancement*. Decatur, GA: Author.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Colleges. (2004). *Handbook for the reaffirmation of accreditation*. Decatur, GA: Author.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Colleges. (2005). *Resource manual for the principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement*. Decatur, GA: Author.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Colleges. (2007). *Principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement (Interim Edition)* [Electronic Version]. Retrieved July 1, 2007 from <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2007%20Interim%20Principles%20complete.pdf>
- Tennessee Board of Regents. (2005). *Setting new directions—Tennessee board of regents 2005-2010 strategic plan* [Electronic version]. Retrieved December 31, 2006 from http://www.tbr.state.tn.us/academic_affairs/stratplan/Setting%20New%20Directions%20Strategic%20Plan.pdf
- Tennessee Board of Regents. (2004). *Institution mission statements*. Retrieved December 31, 2006 from http://www.tbr.state.tn.us/academic_affairs/Stratplan/MissionStatements2004.pdf
- Tulbane, J.D. (2006). *Internationalization of the small college campus*. Interactive audio conference on July 26, 2006.
- Whalley, T. (1997). *Best practice guidelines for internationalizing the curriculum* [Electronic version]. Douglas College for the Province of British Columbia,

Internationalizing the Curriculum
References

Ministry of Education, Skills and Training and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology. Retrieved January 20, 2007 from <http://www.jcu.edu.au/office/tld/teachingsupport/documents/Whalley-Best-Practice.pdf>

Zeszotarski, P. (2001). Eric Review: *Issues in global education initiatives in the community college*. Retrieved March 15, 2006 from http://www.findarticles.Com/p/articles/mi_mOHCZ/is_1_29/ai_774881464/print

APPENDIX A

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

SACS Leadership Team

Dr. MaryLou Apple	President
Mrs. Carol Holt	Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness
Dr. Mary McLemore	Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mrs. Marcia Everett	Vice President for Student Affairs
Dr. Janice Harder	Professor, Business

QEP Development Committee

Faculty and Staff

Dr. Stephen Guerin	Chair; Instructor, Psychology
Toni Adkins	Director, Counseling and Testing
Gina Burke	Associate Professor, Accounting
Debbie Cleveland	Assistant Professor, Economics
Ann Greer	Director, Disability Services and Minority Affairs
Moneda Grimes	Instructor, Sociology
Dr. Ward Harder	Professor, Accounting
Dr. Linda Harris-Young	Discipline Coordinator; Professor, Biology
Jacqueline Johnson	Coordinator and Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Education
Debra McClellan	Recorder
George Ortega	Director, Smyrna Teaching Site
Dr. John Peterson	Dean, Mathematics, Science & Education
Dr. Judith Russell	Assistant Professor, English
Jean Williams	Associate Professor, Psychology and Sociology
Leslie Wurst	Assistant Professor, Mathematics
Brenda Lewis	Editor; Assistant Professor, English

SACS Leadership Team Advisors

Dr. Mary McLemore	Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Janice Harder	Professor, Business

Student Members

Jared Prugel (2006)
Mark Greenwood (2006-2007)
Julie Edwards (2007)
Ashley Fisette (2007)
Lona Gray (2007)
Christopher Grow (2007)

APPENDIX B

COURSE SYLLABUS INTERNATIONALIZATION SURVEY

Instructions:

Examine the official online syllabus posted for the courses in your division. These may be accessed online via the MSCC web page; click on Faculty & Staff, then go to the desired academic division (Career Education, Humanities & Social Science, and Math, Science & Education).

Evaluator's Name: _____

Date: _____

Course Title: _____

Division: _____

Internationalization Rating: _____

For the purposes of this survey, please use the following definition of internationalization:

Internationalization refers to the process of incorporating into the curriculum and co-curriculum a broad range of intellectual and experiential activities designed to help individuals acquire an understanding of the cultural, social, and political systems of other nations and the interactions between them, as well as with, and between, multinational structures.

Using the following scheme, please assign a rating (this will be referred to as the "Internationalization Rating" above) of the degree of international content of the course based upon your examination of the online course syllabus.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Interpretation and Examples</u>
1	No indication of international course content.
2	Indication of moderate international course content such as an occasional lecture, readings or other assignment.
3	Indication of significant international course content, such as specific planned class activities or assignments of an international nature, readings, reflective paper, etc. intended to introduce the student to an international aspect of the discipline. Student's final grade significantly affected by performance on the international assignment.

QEP Development Committee
February 2007

Appendix B
Course Syllabus Internationalization Survey
2007

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
1	No indication of international course content.
2	Indication of moderate international course content such as an occasional lecture, readings or other assignment.
3	Indication of significant international course content, such as specific planned class activities or assignments of an international nature, readings, reflective paper, etc., intended to introduce the student to an international aspect of the discipline. Student's final grade significantly affected by performance on the international assignment.

	Career Education	Math, Science, & Education	Humanities & Social Science	All Divisions
Number of Syllabi w/rating of 1	29	88	44	161
Number of Syllabi w/rating of 2	7	12	21	40
Number of Syllabi w/rating of 3	7	0	5	12
Totals	43	100	70	213
Median	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Mode	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Percentage w/rating of 1	67%	88%	63%	76%
Percentage w/rating of 2	16%	12%	30%	19%
Percentage w/rating of 3	16%	0%	7%	6%
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX C

FACULTY & STAFF INTERNATIONALIZATION SURVEY (FSIS) SUMMARY RESULTS

I. **Duration of FSIS:** 3-28-07 through 4-23-07 (27 days)

II. **Respondents**

- A. Faculty—84.62% completion rate
- B. Administration—93.75% completion rate
- C. Staff—90.7% completion rate

Total Employees Listed	212
Total Employee Responses	189
Total Completion Rate	89.15%

III. **Item Analysis** (Percentages rounded; N/A responses excluded from percentage calculations)

- 4. May we contact you for further follow-up?
Yes 180 (91%) No 17 (9%)
- 5. Were you born in a country outside the U.S.?
Yes 4 (2%) No 194 (98%)
- 6. Was either of your parents born outside the U.S.?
Yes 4 (2%) No 194 (98%)
- 7. Were any of your grandparents born outside the U.S.?
Yes 22 (11%) No 174 (89%)
- 8. Have you ever lived in another country for an extended period of time (i.e., six months or more?)
Yes 29 (15%) No 168 (85%)
- 9. Have you ever visited other countries on vacation, business, or military service?
Yes 123 (63%) No 73 (37%)
- 10. Do you have friends, family, or other relatives who reside in another country with whom you regularly communicate?
Yes 33 (17%) No 164 (83%)
- 11. Were any of your children, whether by birth or adoption, born outside the U.S.?
Yes 5 (3%) No 179 (97%)

12. Can you speak with fair proficiency any language(s) other than English?
(Click all that apply.)

Total Responding	194	
Mandarin Chinese	0	
Hindi	0	
Spanish	3	(2%)
Arabic	0	
Portuguese	0	
Bengali	0	
Russian	0	
Japanese	0	
German	2	(1%)
Polish	0	
Italian	0	
French	4	(2%)
Other	3	(2%)
No, I cannot speak any language(s) other than English	182	(94%)

Note: Total percentage may exceed 100% as some respondents checked more than one language.

13. Can you read with fair proficiency any language(s) other than English?
(Click all that apply.)

Total Responding	189	
Mandarin Chinese	0	
Hindi	0	
Spanish	9	(5%)
Arabic	0	
Portuguese	0	
Bengali	0	
Russian	0	
Japanese	0	
German	7	(34%)
Polish	0	
Italian	2	(1%)
French	18	(10%)
Other	1	(0.5%)
No, I cannot read any language(s) other than English	161	(85%)

Note: Total percentage may exceed 100% as some respondents checked more than one language.

14.	Can you write with fair proficiency any language(s) other than English? (Click all that apply.)			
	Total Responding		194	
	Mandarin Chinese		0	
	Hindi		0	
	Spanish		2	(1%)
	Arabic		0	
	Portuguese		0	
	Bengali		0	
	Russian		0	
	Japanese		0	
	German		2	(1%)
	Polish		0	
	Italian		0	
	French		5	(3%)
	Other		0	
	No, I cannot write any language(s) other than English		186	(96%)

Note: Total percentage may exceed 100% as some respondents checked more than one language.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|-------|--------------|
| 15. | Have you ever participated in an international educational program as a student, faculty, or chaperone? | | | |
| | Yes | 22 | (11%) | No 173 (89%) |
| 16. | As a component of your teaching do you have students communicate (i.e., email, blog, pen pal, etc.) with students in another country? | | | |
| | Yes | 2 | (2%) | No 107 (98%) |
| 17. | Have you ever taught students in another country via ITV? | | | |
| | Yes | 1 | (1%) | No 115 (99%) |
| 18. | Have you conducted research abroad? | | | |
| | Yes | 5 | (4%) | No 135 (96%) |
| 19. | Have you participated in or received funding from a grant(s) with an international focus? | | | |
| | Yes | 5 | (3%) | No 147 (97%) |
| 20. | Have you ever been employed in any capacity in another country? | | | |
| | Yes | 11 | (6%) | No 169 (94%) |
| 21. | Have you published any scholarly articles with an international theme? | | | |
| | Yes | 3 | (2%) | No 153 (98%) |
| 22. | Have you developed professional activities (conference, presentation, etc.) with an international theme? | | | |
| | Yes | 18 | (11%) | No 148 (89%) |
| 23. | Have you provided any international consulting? | | | |
| | Yes | 5 | (3%) | No 170 (97%) |

24. Have you attended any international conference (i.e., professional conference outside the U.S.)?
 Yes 9 (5%) No 171 (95%)
25. In the past five years, have you attended any community events that focus on the culture of another nation?
 Yes 65 (34%) No 124 (66%)
26. Do you communicate with professional colleagues in another country?
 Yes 8 (4%) No 179 (96%)
27. Have you participated in service activities in another country (e.g., church missions, professional services, etc.)?
 Yes 15 (8%) No 175 (92%)
28. Please check all of the following that apply. While employed at Motlow State Community College, I:
- | | | |
|--|----|-------|
| Total Responding | 65 | |
| Revised an existing course to have a significant international component | 14 | (22%) |
| Proposed a new course with a significant international component | 7 | (11%) |
| Traveled with MSCC students outside the U.S. | 7 | (11%) |
| Traveled outside of the U.S. on my own | 47 | (72%) |
| Increased my foreign language proficiency | 17 | (26%) |

Note: Total percentage may exceed 100% as some respondents checked more than one response.

29. It is important to provide our students with the knowledge, skills and attitudes they will need to function in a competitive global economy and society.
- | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | (3%) |
| Disagree | 1 | (1%) |
| Neutral | 17 | (9%) |
| Agree | 100 | (51%) |
| Strongly Agree | 72 | (37%) |
30. In order to compete successfully in a global economy and society, students need an understanding of the cultures of other nations.
- | | | |
|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | (2%) |
| Disagree | 1 | (0.5%) |
| Neutral | 12 | (6%) |
| Agree | 105 | (54%) |
| Strongly Agree | 74 | (38%) |

31. The employment our students will have in the future will likely involve interaction with persons from other countries.
- | | | |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| Strongly Disagree | 6 | (3%) |
| Disagree | 5 | (3%) |
| Neutral | 24 | (12%) |
| Agree | 99 | (51%) |
| Strongly Agree | 61 | (31%) |
32. Meeting a set of international education competencies should be part of the college's general education requirements.
- | | | |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | (2%) |
| Disagree | 22 | (11%) |
| Neutral | 65 | (33%) |
| Agree | 79 | (41%) |
| Strongly Agree | 25 | (13%) |
33. Learning a foreign language is important for students.
- | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------|
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | (1%) |
| Disagree | 12 | (6%) |
| Neutral | 43 | (22%) |
| Agree | 102 | (53%) |
| Strongly Agree | 35 | (18%) |
34. It is important to incorporate international content into at least one of the courses I teach.
- | | | |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| Strongly Disagree | 3 | (3%) |
| Disagree | 16 | (16%) |
| Neutral | 22 | (22%) |
| Agree | 37 | (37%) |
| Strongly Agree | 23 | (23%) |
35. Helping students gain understanding of other nations and their cultures can yield additional benefits such as enhanced critical thinking regarding issues of international importance, increased tolerance, reduced ethnocentrism, etc.
- | | | |
|-------------------|----|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | (0.5%) |
| Disagree | 3 | (2%) |
| Neutral | 22 | (11%) |
| Agree | 99 | (52%) |
| Strongly Agree | 67 | (35%) |

36. Finally, if the opportunity existed, would you like to participate in any of the following? Check all that interest you.

Serve a term on the International Education Committee	43	(32%)
Receive professional development regarding best practices for the infusion of international content into the courses I teach	35	(26%)
Participate in faculty/staff exchanges with colleges outside the U.S.	59	(44%)
Conduct presentations in international affairs, cultures, and issues for students	31	(23%)
Attend programs on international topics to broaden my understanding of other nations and cultures around the world	126	(95%)

Note: Total percentage may exceed 100% as some respondents checked more than one response.

APPENDIX D

PROMOTION OF THE QEP MINUTES/OUTLINE

1. Fall Assembly 8-22-06 (Handout and PowerPoint Presentation)
2. Briefing to Deans and Vice President of Academic Affairs 10-19-06
3. Campus-Wide Faculty Meeting 10-27-06

Fall Assembly (8-22-06)

Motlow State Community College

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Update
Handout

Fall Assembly
August 22, 2006

Presenter: Dr. Stephen Guerin

Background

- The QEP is one of two integral mandates from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) – Commission on Colleges required of all colleges and universities seeking reaffirmation of accreditation. The other requirement is the Compliance Report.
- Since MSCC is seeking reaffirmation of accreditation in fall 2007, an acceptable QEP must be developed and presented to the SACS on-site team. Failure to produce an acceptable QEP will adversely affect reaffirmation of accreditation.
- Clearly, the QEP is of critical importance.
- The development of MSCC's QEP is currently in progress.

SACS Requirement 2.12 - the QEP

The requirement of a QEP by SACS is a fairly recent addition to the overall requirements for an institution's reaffirmation of accreditation. The SACS Commission on Colleges "expects institutions to dedicate themselves to enhancing the quality of their programs and services within the context of their missions, resources, and capacities, and to create an environment in which teaching, public service, research and learning occur."

"The concept of quality enhancement is at the heart of the Commission's philosophy of accreditation; this presumes each member institution to be engaged in an ongoing program of improvement and able to demonstrate how well it fulfills its stated mission."

The Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement. SACS Commission on Colleges, 2001, p.5

SACS further notes, "Developing the QEP as part of the reaffirmation process is an opportunity and an impetus for an institution to enhance overall institutional quality and

effectiveness by focusing on an issue or issues the institution considers important to improving student learning.”

Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement. SACS Commission on Colleges, 2005, p. 21.

SACS stipulates that the QEP “describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) directly related to student learning.”

Enhanced student learning is the singular intent and objective of the QEP.

SACS defines “student learning” as changes in a student’s:

- Knowledge
- Skills
- Behaviors
- Values

An institution’s QEP is a “course of action that is specific to an institution and its mission. It is intended to be customized and designed to meet the needs of the particular institution. It is an opportunity for an institution to be creative in an area related to compliance with the Principles.”

The QEP must:

1. Address a verifiable student need
2. Increase/enhance student learning outcomes
3. Have learning outcomes that can be objectively measured.

A Brief History of the MSCC QEP

In fall 2005, the QEP Topic Selection Advisory Committee was appointed by Dr. Art Walker. This advisory committee began deliberations to identify an appropriate topic for the college’s QEP. SACS requires that selection of the QEP topic be based upon empirical data and arise from a solid assessment of the student needs. Prior to the advisory committee’s appointment, the SACS Leadership Team met with various institutional stakeholders (students, faculty and staff) to discern possible QEP topics.

The QEP Topic Selection Advisory Committee met during fall 2005 and subsequently submitted four possible QEP topics to the SACS Leadership Team. In December 2005, following careful consideration of these four possible QEP topics, one was ultimately selected based upon empirically supported student needs. Specifically, the needs assessment data supporting the QEP topic choice comprised the MSCC results from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the MSCC Alumni Survey. Results from these two key assessment instruments indicated that MSCC students and alumni expressed a significant need for more education and experience with respect to multicultural learning.

Drawing from these salient findings and with consensual agreement among the SACS Leadership Team, the initial MSCC QEP topic was tentatively given the working title

“Improving Learning Through Culturally Diverse Perspectives to Prepare Students for Success in a Global Society.”

In February 2006, President Art Walker and the SACS Leadership Team appointed the QEP Development Committee which was given the specific charge and focus of formulating and finalizing MSCC’s official QEP for presentation to SACS in 2007.

The first official meeting of the MSCC QEP Development Committee occurred on March 1, 2006 and immediately thereafter began a series of weekly and bi-monthly meetings throughout the remainder of the spring 2006 semester. The QEP Development Committee comprises faculty and staff representing the college’s academic disciplines and administrative units. These individuals are:

Dr. Stephen Guerin (Chair)
Toni Adkins
Gina Burke
Debbie Cleveland
Moneda Grimes
Dr. Ward Harder
Dr. Linda Harris-Young
Jacqueline Johnson
George Ortega

Dr. John Peterson
Dr. Judith Russell
Ann Simmons-Greer
Jean Williams
Leslie Wurst
Debra McClellan (Recorder)
Dr. Mary McLemore (Advisory)
Dr. Janice Harder (Advisory)

During the spring semester 2006 meetings, students Jared Prigel and Mark Greenwood also participated so as to provide important student perspectives. Mr. Prigel, a 2006 graduate of MSCC, had lived and studied abroad in France during his matriculation; Mr. Greenwood is currently a MSCC international student-athlete from the United Kingdom (England). Efforts will be made to identify and include additional students with an interest and/or experience in international education.

Progress of the QEP Development Committee

The initial meetings of the QEP Development Committee focused on formulating a Mission Statement, refining the QEP working title and delineating specific preliminary goals and objectives for the QEP.

Early in the deliberations of the QEP Development Committee it was noted that in Setting New Directions: Tennessee Board of Regents 2005-2010 Strategic Plan, the goal of internationalization figured prominently. In point of fact, TBR Objective L2 specifically states that all TBR institutions are to “Increase emphasis on internationalization system-wide.” TBR states that this objective may be achieved through the following strategies:

“Internationalize curricula, facilitate faculty and student exchanges, coordinate financial strategies, increase study abroad opportunities, encourage sister university relationships, increase faculty international research, develop selective degrees and concentrations with an international focus, and take other steps to increase understanding of global concepts and other cultures.” (Setting New Directions, p. 5.).

TBR Benchmark L2 for the above includes:

- a. By end of 2006, the central office will have identified a means to support the coordination of system efforts in international education including federal, private (both international and domestic), research, and corporate fund development.
- b. By the end of 2006, TBR will document current status of internationalization of institutional curriculum, strategies, and practices at all TBR institutions.
- c. By the end of 2006, recognize institutions and faculty who achieve Fulbright Scholarships and other major funding for research and teaching abroad.
- d. By the end of 2006, recognize institutions, faculty, and students who develop and implement major initiatives in international education that lead to an increased understanding of global concepts and other cultures.
- e. By 2010, TBR will provide evidence that all its institutions are actively addressing issues related to international education/globalization within required curricula for completion of a degree or certificate and that institutions are committed to internationalism through documented actions.

Following deliberations within the QEP Development Committee and to harmonize the MSCC QEP with the TBR's internationalization objectives noted above, the MSCC QEP topic was subsequently narrowed/refined to its present iteration:

Improving Learning Through International Education: Preparing Students For Success in a Global Society

During its work through the spring 2006 semester, the QEP Development Committee drafted a working Mission Statement as follows:

Breathtaking technological advances in communication and information systems coupled with seismic shifts in global economic and geopolitical conditions (i.e., globalization) have precipitated challenges to modern institutions of higher education with respect to the adequate preparation of students to function competently in an increasingly interdependent international environment. Successful graduates must be educated to knowledgeably and effectively interface in multinational employment settings and organizations with individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds. A competent understanding of various cultures other than one's own will serve to promote effective collaboration and cooperation in the global work environment.

Flowing from this draft Mission Statement, the QEP Development Committee articulated the following preliminary goals/objectives to be realized from implementation of the QEP:

For Our Students

The college will endeavor to provide an enriched and stimulating learning experience that seeks to:

1. Enhance student awareness and comprehension of non-American cultures through the provision of an internationalized curriculum embodying exposure to

the ideas, mores, values and human systems of other cultures in the international arena.

2. Prepare students with the essential capability to engage in critical and knowledge-informed analysis and problem-solving regarding globalization and the international exigencies which drive global change.
3. Equip students with the cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral skills essential to function successfully in diverse multicultural environments.
4. Increase student respect, understanding of and receptivity to non-American cultures.
5. Elevate the student's consciousness of the immediate and downstream consequences of personal and collective choices with respect to multicultural and international cooperation and stability.
6. Address and ameliorate ethnocentrism by increasing student interaction with persons from diverse cultural backgrounds and across international boundaries.

For Our Faculty

Recognizing that the faculty is the principal conduit through which knowledge is imparted in the academy, MSCC will endeavor to:

1. Stimulate, encourage and support efforts by faculty to infuse international and multicultural perspectives into curricular and co-curricular learning.
2. Provide professional development training to faculty seeking to internationalize their pedagogy.
3. Encourage faculty to develop new courses focusing on salient international issues as it impacts their respective disciplines.
4. Encourage faculty to adopt textbooks and related course materials which contain international and multicultural perspectives.

For the purposes of the QEP, the term "internationalization" refers to "the process of incorporating into the curriculum and co-curriculum a broad range of intellectual and experiential activities designed to help individuals acquire an understanding of the cultural, social, and political systems of other nations and the interaction between them, as well as with, and between, international structures."

Green, Madeleine & Olson, Christa. *Internationalizing the Curriculum: A User's Guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 2003.

Current Status of MSCC QEP

As a result of the work by the QEP Development Committee during the spring 2006 semester, three (3) specific initiatives for the MSCC QEP were identified for further feasibility study and development:

Initiative 1: Internationalized Curriculum

This initiative essentially entails exploring practical approaches for infusing international perspectives into existing curricula, adopting texts that offer international perspectives, and the possible creation of new courses which focus upon internationalization/globalization.

Initiative 2: International Professional Development for Faculty

This initiative entails exploring options for providing faculty with relevant professional development on issues germane to international education and supporting internationalization efforts in their pedagogy.

Initiative 3: International Study Abroad and Experiential Learning for Students

This initiative will examine the options and feasibility of developing study abroad opportunities for MSCC students, creating co-curricular experiential learning on international themes and bringing an international ethos to MSCC campuses.

At the conclusion of the spring 2006 semester the QEP Development Committee was formed into three ad hoc subcommittees and tasked with further researching the literature on each initiative over the summer 2006 break and returning in the fall with specific recommendations regarding the feasibility of implementing these initiatives at MSCC.

The subcommittees will reconvene with the full QEP Development Committee at the beginning of the fall 2006 semester and continue work on the development of the QEP.

SACS requires that the institution's QEP be a viable and sustainable one and, therefore, must be formulated and implemented within the extant financial resources of the institution. Before his retirement, Dr. Walker secured grants from both Jacobs Sverdrup (\$9K) and Jack Daniel Distillery (\$15K) to fund the QEP.

Questions and input from the college community are invited.

Briefing to Deans and Vice President for Academic Affairs (10-19-06)

Meeting Minutes
Thursday 10-19-06
2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

PRESENT: Dr. Mary McLemore
Dr. Niles Reddick
Dr. Jay May
Dr. John Peterson
Dr. Stephen Guerin

BUSINESS:

Meeting was held in President's Conference Room to present QEP update to the three division deans. Briefing provided by Dr. Guerin and Dr. McLemore regarding status and anticipated impact of QEP initiative: "Internationalizing the Curriculum and Co-Curriculum" and, specifically, the development and implementation of international master modules in existing curricula. Deans were provided with copy of "The Curriculum: The Heart of the Matter" (Chapter 7 in *Internationalizing the Curriculum: A User's Guide*). Following receipt of the overview, the deans posed questions and

discussion ensued. All deans expressed their approval and support for the QEP initiative.

- It was suggested that discipline groups determine the number of modules to be developed versus utilization of existing modules from the Midwest Institute consortium of which Motlow State Community College is now a member. Deans were shown example of modules for various subjects.
- Dr. Reddick discussed possibility of intensive “writing across the curriculum” as utilized at Florida (Gordon rule) which is a minimum 3200 word writing assignment.
- Dr. McLemore noted that “gifts-in-kind” might be utilized to as budgetary resource for QEP materials (e.g., library orders, computer support).
- Dr. McLemore suggested obtaining input for QEP from Advisory Groups (e.g., Gen Ed, Business Tech, Nursing & Allied Health).
- Dr. McLemore suggested inclusion of attorney Mr. Steve Worsham, a MSCC Foundation member as possible ex-officio member of the QEP.
- Discussion of need to publicize the QEP.
- The deans recommended that QEP Chair brief the entire college faculty in meeting via ITV link-up on Friday, October 27, 2006.

Dr. Guerin exited meeting at approximately 3:30.

Campus-Wide Faculty Meeting (10-27-06)

Faculty Meeting
Friday
October 27, 2006
MT 141 with ITV link to teaching sites

1:00 PM	Humanities and Social Science Division
2:00 PM	Math, Science & Education Division
3:00 PM	Career Education Division

1. Purpose

Thank you very much for attending this important presentation to the faculty of the college.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide you with a briefing on the current status and forward direction of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) currently under development since March of this year to bring you up to date on salient developments since my last presentation to you at Fall Faculty/Staff Assembly on 8-22-06.

I am only the spokesperson. The actual work on the QEP has been the result of the collective effort of the QEP Development Committee. This committee consists of your colleagues from each of the college’s academic divisions and administrative units, several of whom are her today (*recognize QEP-DC members*). These are the individuals who are doing the work and to whom I owe much gratitude. We are all indebted to their service.

2. Progress of the QEP-DC

I will not repeat the information I provided to you at the Fall Faculty/Staff Assembly which delineated the history of Motlow College's QEP. If you would like a copy of the detailed handout on the QEP I distributed at that time, please let me know and I'll email one to you. Our QEP title continues to be:

"Improving Learning Through International Education: Preparing Students for Success in a Global Society"

Since Fall Faculty/Staff Assembly last August, the QEP-DC has been meeting essentially on weekly basis on Monday afternoons. At the beginning of the Fall Semester we reviewed and discussed the research conducted by the three subcommittees over the past summer. As you will recall, with respect to bringing international education to our students, after preliminary research on the topic, the QEP-DC had considered the feasibility of three (3) initiatives:

1. Internationalizing the Curriculum
2. International Professional Development for Faculty
3. International Study Abroad and Experiential Learning for Students

The QEP-DC deliberations at the beginning of the fall semester revisited the research on these potential initiatives with a view towards further narrowing the focus of the QEP. The emphasis on selecting an appropriately narrow focus was predicated on recommendations from Dr. Apple and senior faculty and administrators at Motlow College who have substantial experience with SACS-COC and the requirements for reaffirmation. Following spirited deliberations regarding the feasibility of suggested QEP initiatives, the QEP-DC voted unanimously to narrow the focus of the Motlow College QEP to a single initiative: Internationalizing the Curriculum.

3. Rationale for Narrowing QEP to "Internationalization of the Curriculum"

Very simply, the more narrow a focus the greater likelihood of successful implementation. As Dr. Apple cautioned us, in her involvement with SACS and QEP's never was it heard that a college erred by having a QEP excessively narrow in focus but, conversely, SACS has rejected QEPs for being too broad in focus. A QEP too broad in focus runs the risk of eclipsing the ability of the institution to full implement and sustain the initiative. Recall your master's theses and doctoral dissertations: the more narrow and well-defined the focus, the better the outcome.

Also, internationalization is consistent with published TBR and MSCC strategic goals.

4. Focus on Student Learning

SACS is absolutely clear that the proper focus of any QEP must not be on the institution but, rather, on student learning. Any QEP, including our college's, must have enhancement of student learning as its only goal. Therefore, the QEP must be wholly directed at enhancing/improving the learning of the student. SACS defines student learning as any change in a student's:

Knowledge

Skills
Behaviors
Values or Attitudes

5. Internationalization Defined

According to Green and Olson (2003), internationalization refers to “the process of incorporating into the curriculum and co-curriculum a broad range of intellectual and experiential activities designed to help individuals acquire an understanding of the cultural, social, and political systems of other nations and the interaction between them, as well as with, and between, international structures.”

Note carefully that we are not talking about “globalization” or “diversity” per se. Internationalization, the term preferred by educators, is an outward-looking view of the world beyond America and seeks to help students acquire knowledge, skills, behaviors and values/attitudes with respect to cultures other than their own. As such, internationalization seeks to overcome the cognitive and attitudinal barriers to global awareness.

6. Best Practices

The QEP-DC subcommittee charged with researching the initiative “Internationalizing the Curriculum” returned to the full committee when it reconvened at the beginning of the fall semester and presented its findings. There are a number of approaches to creating an “internationalized curriculum” and each was evaluated with respect to the unique needs, resources and constraints of Motlow College. It was the decision of the committee that the best approach to internationalizing the existing curriculum was not to create new courses at this time but to adopt the approach a number of comparatively similar community colleges have done which is to “infuse” their existing curriculum with fresh and cogent international content. Committee research revealed that while infusing international content lends itself quite naturally easily to many courses (e.g., history, sociology, psychology, business, health, etc.) and that indeed, many current courses already contain significant amounts of material and learning that is international in scope and content, virtually any course can be internationalized.

Research has indicated that one popular and effective way to infuse international content into existing courses and thereby “internationalize the curriculum” is the development and implementation of what are termed “International Master Modules.”

Sample copies of various modules from the Midwest Institute – a consortium of community colleges in the Midwest of which Motlow College is now a member – have been provided to the deans and teaching site directors for distribution. These are examples of the international master modules we have in mind.

7. SACS-COC Requirements of the QEP

SACS-COC requires that the QEP be:

- Feasible: capable of being done within the resources of the institution
- Measurable: that changes in students learning can be measured and attributed to the QEP
- Sustainable: the QEP must be sustainable for five years

Internationalizing the curriculum by infusion with the international master modules appears to meet these criteria.

8. Goals, Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes

GOAL: Improve Student Learning Through International Education and Prepare Them for Success in a Global Society.

OBJECTIVE: Internationalize the Curriculum

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- Increase the number of students who show a greater sensitivity for cultures other than their own.
- Increase the student's knowledge of the international aspects of the selected subject areas.
- Increase the student's recognition of the interdependency and consequences of international events and issues.

These may be modified as the writing of the QEP progresses.

9. Infusing international master modules
10. Faculty development of international master modules, faculty development training
11. Assessment of student learning outcomes
12. Where to begin infusion with the curriculum
13. International Education standing committee and Tennessee Consortium for International Studies (TnCIS)
14. QEP and SACS-COC timeline
15. Questions, discussion

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE INTERNATIONAL MODULE

MIDWEST INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL/INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

Author: Peggy Goss

Course Title & Number: Economics – 809-195

Module Title: The Role of Government in the Economy: A Comparative Approach Using Selected Countries and Topics

DESCRIPTION OF MODULE

This module consists of a series of components infused into a lecture/discussion hour during the semester. During the 18 weeks of a semester, this will correspond to about 4 weeks of class time.

Each topic covered during the semester will include a snapshot look at that topic in another country. The theme of that role of government in the economy will be carried through, not only in the unit on the role of government, but also as other topics such as scarcity, competition, labor, etc., are covered.

Comparative information about the role of government in other countries will be made throughout the semester as appropriate. In addition, students will participate in semester-long group projects in which they will select a country and research the comparisons to the U.S. economy.

Objectives

1. To compare the role of government in come distribution/redistribution
2. To compare the role of government in regulating business
3. To compare the role of government in making corrections to the economy
4. To compare the role of government in providing old age income security (social security)
5. To compare the role of government in providing health care
6. To compare the role of government in providing services such as highways, education, parks, etc.
7. To compare the role of government in providing public welfare
8. To compare the role of government in regulating the money supply
9. To compare the role of government in regulating the environment
10. To compare methods and purposes to taxation

Methodology

Lectures/Discussion:

Lectures will lay the groundwork for class discussion of the topic. Class discussions will clarify and apply the principles covered to real-world applications. Topics will include:

Government Functions in the Economy
Government Budgets

Tax Structure
Government as a Component of GNP
Methods of Computing GNP
Fiscal Policy—Keynesian Economics & Supply Side Economics
Monetary Policy
Economic Problems: Inflation, Unemployment, Business Cycles
Banking System

Audio-Visuals:

Current videos which may include taped news programs will be shown as appropriate. Examples include Losing the War With Japan and Japan: The Side You Don't See.

Readings:

Chapters 5-11 and 22 of the textbook (Stafford & LoCascoi) on the role of government in the economy, fiscal and monetary policy. Current magazine and newspaper articles will also be assigned. These will vary from semester to semester as every attempt will be made to use pieces that are currently being read by the public.

Assignments:

Students will be divided into groups. Each group will select a country. Each group will research the country and compare the role of government in the economy to that of the role of the government in the U.S. economy. Each group will compile their information on a master matrix chart which will eventually show comparisons of the role of government in several countries. Each group will orally report their findings and participate in class discussions of the findings of all the groups.

The countries to be compared will change from class to class based on student interest. Guidelines can be set which could include requirements that countries compared be from the same part of the world (i.e., Central America) or represent a variety of areas of the world (i.e., Sweden, Guatemala, Ukraine, Thailand).

Topics to be compared may also vary from semester to semester and could include a variety of issues, financial and tax related issues, social welfare issues, gender issues in employment, etc.

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the student's understanding of what we covered during the semester will be based upon homework assignments, class discussions, critiques of magazine articles, exams, and the group project based on the following percentages:

Unit tests, midterm and final exam	60%
2 Critiques	20%
Group Project	10%
Class discussion and homework	<u>10%</u>
	100%

Bibliography/Resources

Books:

- Adas, Srearns and Schwartz. (1994). *Turbulent Passage: A Global History of the Twentieth Century*. (Harper-Collins publishers)
- Axtell. (1990). *Do's and Taboos Around the World*. (Benjamin Book: John Wiley & Sons)
- Campbell, Feigenbaum, Linden, Norpoth. (1995). *Politics and Government in Europe Today*. (Houghton Mifflin Company)
- Hanke and Rausch. (1992). *People and Issues in Latin American History: From Independence to Present*. (Markus Wiener Publishing, Inc.)
- Innis. (1979). *Essays in Canadian Economic History*. (University of Toronto Press).
- Jayawardena. (1986). *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*. (Zed Books)
- Keen. (1992). *A History of Latin America, Fourth Edition*. (Houghton Mifflin Company)
- Kiishlansky. (1995). *Societies and Cultures in World History*. (Harper-Collins College Publishers)
- Lippman, McConville and Yerushalmi. (1988). *Islamic Criminal Law and Procedure: An Introduction*. (Praeger)
- Newhill & Paglia. (1986). *Exploring World Cultures*. (Ginn & Company)
- Roskin, Micahel G. (1991). *The Rebirth of East Europe*. (Prentice Hall)
- Rossides. (1990). *Comparative Societies: Social Types and Their Interrelations*. (Prentice Hall)
- Scupin. (1992). *Cultural Anthropology: A Global Perspective*. (Prentice Hall).
- Terpstra & David. (1991). *The Cultural Environment of International Business, Third Edition*. (Southwestern Publishing Company).

Periodicals:

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Mediterranean Quarterly | National Geographic |
| Newsweek | Time |
| Trade and Culture | U.S. News and World Report |

Video:

Frontline: Losing the War With Japan (PBS Video – 58 min.)

[Taken directly from MIIIE “Internationalizing the Curriculum” CD, 1988-2004]

APPENDIX F

TEMPLATE FOR COURSE-SPECIFIC INTERNATIONAL MODULE

International modules created by an instructor for infusion into an existing course must contain the following elements as a minimum:

- Name of course instructor
- MSCC course number and title
- Description of international module
- Objectives and intended student learning outcomes of the international module
- Methodology to be used
- Description of how student learning outcomes are to be formally assessed
- List of resources to be used in the implementation of the module

The course syllabus provided to the student at the beginning of the course must reflect the inclusion of the international module.

Prior to infusion into the course, the international module must be submitted to and written approval (signified by appropriate signature) obtained from the following individuals (see Section 4 of the QEP):

- Coordinator of International Education
- Discipline coordinator of the relevant academic discipline
- Dean of the academic division in which the internationalized course is to be taught
- Vice President for Academic Affairs

APPENDIX G

COORDINATOR OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION POSITION DESCRIPTION

Suggested Qualifications:

- Full-time faculty
- Interest and commitment to the QEP and mission of international education
- Background/experience in aspects of international education (curricular and co-curricular experience)
- Ability to work with faculty and staff in all college academic divisions and administrative units

Line of Supervision:

- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- President of the College

Suggested Job Duties:

- Chair and work with the International Education Committee (IEC)
- Interface and coordinate with the IEC, Director of Academic Services, Tennessee Consortium of International Studies (TnCIS), and Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education to promote achievement of QEP objectives and develop additional international education initiatives (separate from the QEP) including study abroad, faculty and student international exchanges, sister-college affiliations, international service learning, international students, etc.
- Maintain administrative responsibility and oversight for the ongoing implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
- Assist in financial and resource allocation and oversight for the QEP and related internationalization initiatives
- Compile and report assessment results from all internationalized courses
- Collaborate with Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness in data collection and reporting
- Collect and prepare data for the QEP *Impact Report*
- Mentor faculty in the development, implementation, and assessment of course international modules
- Plan, organize, coordinate, and direct faculty development in internationalization.
- Attend state and regional meetings regarding internationalization
- Promote an international ethos in the college community including international co-curricular events

Suggested Work Arrangement:

- Redistributed time equivalent to six to nine hours per semester

APPENDIX H

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The International Education Committee (IEC) is a recommending body to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is organized to maintain oversight of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and all international education initiatives at Motlow College. This committee performs the following duties:

1. Develop and review periodically the policies and procedures regarding the QEP and other internationalization initiatives as appropriate
2. Assist and advise the Coordinator of International Education in the mission and oversight of the QEP
3. Assist and advise the Director of Academic Services in other internationalization initiatives as appropriate
4. Coordinate, facilitate, and approve faculty development activities related to the QEP and other internationalization initiatives
5. Coordinate and facilitate internationalization initiatives including study abroad and co-curricular events
6. Review and recommend disbursement of all expenditures related to the QEP and other internationalization initiatives
7. Promote the mission of the QEP among faculty

The IEC includes the following members:

1. Four faculty members (two from each division) appointed by the dean of their respective division for two-year terms
2. One academic dean appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs for a two-year term
3. One member from the Student Services unit appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs for a two-year term
4. One student appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs for a one-year term
5. Coordinator of International Education serving as the *ex officio* and non-voting chair for a five-year term
6. Director of Academic Services serving as an *ex officio* and non-voting member
7. Three *ex officio* and non-voting members representing the Information Technology and Telecommunications Services, Business Affairs, and Library units to be appointed by their respective vice presidents for two-year terms.

Terms of the faculty members will be staggered so that two members will be appointed each year. Committee members may succeed themselves in appointment.