April 30, 2014

To: Chancellor Lendley Black
   Executive Vice Chancellor Andrea Schokker

From: Leigh Neys and Dennis Falk on behalf of the Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT)

Re: Final Report of the Internationalization Leadership Team

Introduction

UMD, along with eight other institutions from across the nation, participated in the American Council on Education (ACE)’s 2012-14 Internationalization Laboratory Cohort, which began its work with a meeting in Washington, D.C. on August 30, 2012. As a member of the cohort, UMD formed an international Leadership Team (ILT) that 1) conducted a review of current international activities at UMD, 2) identified campus mission, vision and goals and student learning outcomes related to internationalization, and 3) developed a systematic plan for comprehensive internationalization at UMD.

This document provides 1) an overview of the ILT process, 2) a summary response to the charge letter from EVCAA Andrea Schokker, 3) suggestions for implementing the plan, 4) some brief conclusions, and 5) extensive appendices. Two critical parts of the ILT process, the internationalization review completed in 2012-13 and the UMD Global 2020 plan for comprehensive internationalization completed in 2013-14, appear in the appendices and will be referenced in this report.

Description of the ILT Process

The ILT began meeting in August, 2012. The team was composed of fourteen members who have strong interest and experience in international and intercultural activities, including five faculty members, five staff members, and four administrators, all of whom have extensive faculty experience. Leigh Neys, Director of the International Education Office, and Denny Falk, Professor of Social Work, co-chaired the ILT.

One of the first tasks the ILT undertook was to define internationalization for the purpose of this initiative. The following definition was approved at the September 24, 2012 meeting of the team:

Internationalization is the process of integrating international and intercultural dimensions into the teaching and learning, research, and global engagement functions of the UMD community.

Work on the internationalization review began during fall 2012 and continued through October, 2013. This comprehensive review examined all aspects of internationalization at UMD and was guided by a list of questions that focused this review (see Appendix B).
The review process included the following components:

- The ILT answered questions in the review based on information available to the members, who have varied responsibilities related to international activities on campus.
- The deans and other representatives of the five collegiate units were interviewed using an extensive list of questions relevant to their units.
- ILT members and a faculty representative from each academic department worked together to collect faculty surveys and to conduct a focus group discussion with each department following a specified protocol.
- Staff surveys and focus groups were conducted.
- Data from previously conducted focus groups were integrated to provide students’ perspectives on internationalization; a student survey was conducted early in September 2013.

A draft Internationalization Review Report was completed during July 2013 and was updated in December 2013 when the student survey was completed. The final review report is attached to this introduction as appendices B and C. Early sections of the report describe the methods and results of the various components of the review. Subsequent sections identify the 1) strengths, 2) weaknesses, 3) opportunities, and 4) threats associated with the current status of internationalization at UMD. A final section offers conclusions and recommendations that follow from the internationalization review.

Building on the internationalization review report, the ILT developed a plan for comprehensive internationalization beginning in September, 2013. Much of the initial work in developing this plan was completed in working groups. Eight separate working groups of five to eight members were created and addressed significant areas of internationalization: 1) Education Abroad; 2) Undergraduate Education; 3) International Students; 4) Diversity and Intercultural Competence; 5) Graduate Education; 6) Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity; 7) Global Engagement; and 8) Infrastructure, Technologies, and Information, Human, and Financial Resources. Each group created a vision statement, developed goals, and identified action steps for its area.

The ILT then used the results of the working groups and the internationalization review to create the “Global UMD” campus vision statement and mission statement. Goals were developed that closely aligned with campus goals adopted in UMD’s Strategic Plan. The ILT also identified student learning outcomes for global engagement and action steps to achieve each of the identified goals. The final versions of these planning elements were integrated into “UMD Global 2020: A Plan for Comprehensive Internationalization” (see Appendix D).

Campus forums to share information and to obtain ideas and feedback related to the review report and the plan for internationalization were held during fall semester 2013 and early in spring semester 2014. The first forum in September summarized the international review findings and sought ideas for goals. The second forum in December shared preliminary versions of the vision and mission statements, goals, and student learning outcomes and sought feedback on all of these elements of the plan. A final forum in January 2014 sought feedback on revised goals and the action steps that were identified to
achieve these goals. If UMD campus community members were unable to attend the forums in person, they were encouraged to share their responses to identical materials that were available on the Internationalization website at http://www.d.umn.edu/vcaa/intz/.

A preliminary report and plan was completed at the end of January 2014. On February 10-12, 2014, UMD welcomed a site visit from Barbara Hill, ACE Senior Associate for Internationalization; Susan Kalina, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs, University of Alaska Anchorage; and Penelope Pynes, Associate Provost for International Programs, University of North Carolina, Greensboro. These individuals provided valuable feedback on the preliminary report and plan, which is included as Appendix G.

Based on feedback from the campus and site visitors, the final report and plan was completed in late February 2014. The final report is appended to this introduction as Appendix D.

**Direct response to Charge Letter**

Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Andrea Schokker provided a charge letter to the ILT in August 2013. In that letter (see Appendix A), she requested that the ILT address a number of specific issues. The information below provides a direct response to four areas.

1. **Take the leadership role in the ACE review process.** As described above, the ILT provided leadership in the extensive review process. Through the “UMD Global 2020” report, the ILT also sharpened the institutional goals and student learning outcomes related to internationalization and developed an action plan to achieve these goals.

2. **Work closely with the UMD community.** Extensive efforts to engage the UMD community were undertaken, particularly in the internationalization review. Numerous meetings and focus groups with faculty, staff, students, and administrators; several surveys; and an extensive website provided opportunity for input on the internationalization review. Three campus forums were held as the plan for internationalization was developed during the 2013-14 academic year, and input from the campus community was solicited via email.

3. **Recommend a structure for international activities.** This area of the charge proved to be the most challenging. The ILT agreed that campus activities related to internationalization should be more centralized and that the role of Chief Internationalization Officer (or Senior Internationalization Officer) should reside with an Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) for Academic Affairs who has increased time to appropriately fill this role. The ILT also agreed that two committees should be created, one to work with the Chief Internationalization Officer (CIO) to coordinate services for international students and a second to advise the CIO on all other issues related to global engagement.

The ILT disagreed on some of the specifics related to an organizational structure for internationalization. Two plans that were developed during the process are appended. Plan A (see Appendix E) was developed by a subgroup of working group
#8; this working group addressed organizational structure in addition to a number of other infrastructure issues. Plan A involves creating the CIO role and the two committees described above, leaving the organizational structure largely unchanged for the short term, except for moving the international recruiting reporting line to the CIO. This plan would involve minimal additional expense. Plan B (see Appendix F) involves a more extensive restructuring, with the addition of a Director of International Affairs and a more centralized reporting structure. Both plans include specific suggestions for primary responsibility for specific international activities.

A key difference in the two plans relates to where the International Student Advisor (International Student and Scholar Regulations Associate) reports. This position currently reports to the Office of Cultural Diversity, which has the advantage of better coordination within the Multicultural Center. If the position reported directly or indirectly to the CIO, an advantage could be better coordination with other international activities. Plan B would involve additional expense.

4. **Suggest ways to engage the broader campus community as we move forward.**

   In general, the ILT recommends initially moving forward with actions that will have maximum impact with minimum expense. As suggested by the site review team, we can continue to improve the campus climate as an initial step. Two additional steps that can be completed shortly are the creation of the CIO position and the two proposed committees. Additional ideas related to this aspect of the charge appear in the section immediately following.

**Suggestions for Implementing the UMD Global 2020 Plan**

The UMD Global 2020 plan for comprehensive internationalization includes a number of action steps associated with each of the six internationalization goals. The various action steps are intended to be activities that could be achieved, if a primary focus, in 1-2 years. However, the proposed plan includes 28 action steps, and only a few of these steps could be completed in any specific 1-2 year period, particularly in the initial years when funding is likely to be limited.

1. **Select a Chief Internationalization Officer (CIO) and establish two committees,** an International Student Services Council and an International Advisory Committee. These entities and their responsibilities are described in the Plan A Organizational Structure and could be modified if administrative considerations dictate. A second decision relates to the position that focuses on international student recruitment. This position relates directly to other aspects of internationalization on campus and needs to be closely aligned with the CIO. Additional aspects of the Plan B organizational structure could be implemented as financially and administratively appropriate. Special consideration should be given to reporting lines for the International Student Advisor.

2. **Identify those action steps that can be initiated immediately** within current budgetary restraints and those that may need to be delayed until additional resources become available. The International Advisory Committee (IAC) could work with the CIO to identify initial action steps that have high impact with limited cost. These action steps could hopefully be accomplished in the first two years.
3. **Develop a tentative timeline** for the accomplishment of various action steps. One possibility is to identify approximately 9 action steps that can be accomplished in the 2014-2016 academic years, a second set of approximately 9 that can be accomplished in the 2016-18 academic year, and a remaining set that can be accomplished during 2018-2020. The CIO and IAC could develop these plans next year, and the completion of the action steps by 2020 would provide a natural alignment with the UMD Global 2020 plan.

4. **Identify individuals and groups who will be responsible for specific action steps** that can be undertaken initially. Once the initial action steps to be completed are identified, the individuals and groups that can complete these steps can be identified. These identified individuals and groups can then focus on achieving more specific, achievable activities.

5. **Develop objectives and measures to monitor achievement of the goals.** A number of objectives are inherent in the six global engagement goals. The CIO and IAC can work to identify these objectives and relevant measures of the objectives to monitor progress on achieving goals. Examples of objectives might include number or percentage of students studying abroad, number or percentage of international students, and number of strategic partnerships.

6. **Engage faculty and staff in adapting the proposed global engagement student learning outcomes** so they are more in line with the current UMD campus learning outcomes. The site review found the proposed global engagement outcomes to be laudatory, but also “bold and audacious.” We believe that faculty pushback would occur if 16 outcomes needed to be achieved and measured. Hopefully, aligning the 16 proposed outcomes with the 9 UMD learning outcomes would be a cooperative task that could bring faculty and staff together.

7. **Develop a plan for effective use of international student fees.** Significant fees are currently being collected from international students studying at UMD, and additional international student enrollment is targeted as part of strategic enrollment management. As these fees are collected and increased, and appropriate plan to support international student success should be developed.

**Conclusions**

The ILT conducted an extensive internationalization review that included input from diverse sources and provided a foundation for developing a plan for comprehensive internationalization of the campus. The resulting global engagement mission and vision statements, along with the student learning outcomes and campus internationalization goals, will provide parameters for the campus moving forward. The action steps identify more concrete activities that can be accomplished over the next six years. These activities can move UMD forward as we strive to be a globally engaged university that prepares globally and interculturally competent citizens; engages in research and creative activities that address worldwide issues; and creates mutually beneficial connections with global communities.
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