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Executive Summary

UMD is participating 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 is developing strategies for campus internationalization by: forming a campus leadership team to work on strategic planning and student outcomes, attending cohort leadership meetings in Washington, undergoing site visits and peer reviews, and participating in monthly phone calls with Laboratory Director Barbara Hill. The fourteen-member UMD Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT) will 1) conduct a review of current international activities at UMD, 2) identify campus goals and student learning outcomes related to internationalization, and 3) develop a systematic plan for comprehensive internationalization at UMD.

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 spring semester 2013. This comprehensive review examined all aspects of internationalization at UMD and was guided by a list of questions within categories that focused on 1) Articulated Commitment, Mission, Goals, and Vision, 2) the Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization, 3) Strategy, 4) Organizational Structure and Personnel, 5) Policies and Practices, 6) Resources, 7) Faculty and Staff, 8) Students, 9) Curriculum, 10) Co-curriculum and Campus Life, 11) Education Abroad, and 12) Engagement with Institutions Abroad.

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 will be conducted early in September 2013.

The full report concisely summarizes the methods and results of the review, and readers are directed to more thorough descriptions of the methods and results in the appendices. A key element of the analysis synthesized all of the results obtained to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges associated with internationalization at UMD.

Current strengths of internationalization at UMD include: 1) clearly articulated mission and vision related to global/international issues, 2) external connections related to water and natural resources, 3) capable and committed personnel working on international activities, 4) secure funding for some activities, 5) faculty and staff with extensive international background and experiences, 6) about 300 international students who annually enroll at UMD, 7) a Liberal Education requirement that all students take a course with a global perspective, 8) a rich set of co-curricular activities, 9) a variety of education abroad opportunities in which 20% of graduates participate, and 10) multiple partnerships with institutions abroad.

Current weaknesses related to internationalization include: 1) no articulated campus goals related to internationalization, 2) uncoordinated efforts to engage with international entities, 3) no institutional strategy for internationalization, 3) a fragmented set of units that engage in international activities, 4) lack of campus and unit policies to promote internationalization, 5) lack of central resources and external funding, 6) multiple demands and limited incentives for faculty, 7) limited financial support for international students or for domestic students to study abroad, 8) majors and programs that allow for limited global content, 9) limited incentives for students to participate in co-curricular activities, and 10) no campus-wide guidelines or assessment for partnerships.

The analysis also identified opportunities and challenges that can either be anticipated in the future or are present in the environment related to internationalization. The opportunities include 1) developing clear goals that could focus international activities, 2) enhancing connections within and outside the University system, 3) developing and implementing a comprehensive strategy for internationalization, 4) clarifying organizational structures,
practices and policies to achieve identified goals, 5) seeking additional campus and external funding for internationalization, 6) providing professional development for faculty and staff, 7) recruiting and supporting additional international students, and 8) integrating international and multicultural curriculum.

The challenges include: 1) varied demand on campus priorities and resources in a time of tight budgets, 2) time and money required to develop external relationships, 3) implementation of a long-term strategy, 4) resistance to change related to structure, policies, and practices, 5) faculty and staff being stretched thin with additional demands, 6) insufficient intercultural competence among faculty, staff, students, and the community to receive additional international students, and 7) additional vocational pressures that limit study abroad.

Recommendations for next steps emerge from building on strengths, addressing weaknesses, pursuing opportunities, and attending to challenges. Based on these considerations, the ILT recommends that the UMD campus:

1. Develop clear goals, along with a mission and vision statement, that provides focus for comprehensive internationalization while supporting the overall campus values, vision, mission, and goals;
2. Identify, prioritize, and develop or enhance relationships with key players in the broader community that will help the campus to achieve its internationalization mission and goals;
3. Identify and implement action steps that will move the campus toward achieving its internationalization mission and goals according to a reasonable timeline;
4. Clarify and implement an organizational structure that will promote the identified mission and goals. Lines of communication should be strengthened between units with separate reporting lines;
5. Assess the number, knowledge, skills and experience of personnel associated with internationalization and provide professional development and selective hiring to ensure that relevant personnel have the capacity to implement an internationalization strategy;
6. Revise current policies and practices and develop new policies and practices to be in line with the mission and goals for internationalization;
7. Identify the resources that would be necessary to achieve the internationalization mission and goals, keeping in mind current budget realities. Relevant groups within the campus should then maximize use of resources from entities such as the GPSA and University of Minnesota campuses and seek appropriate external funding from organizations and donors;
8. Examine and implement ways to empower and incentivize a motivated faculty and staff that has significant background and experience related to internationalization;

9. Expand and diversify its international student body, working to make the campus and community more hospitable to these students and to integrate services to meet their needs;

10. Identify and implement ways to infuse international/global/intercultural content across the curriculum;

11. Continue to offer extensive co-curricular events, increasingly integrating these events with the curriculum and living/learning activities;

12. Continue to offer and to expand the variety of education abroad activities, working to make these activities accessible to more students;

13. Inventory, assess, and develop selected international partnerships, supporting those partnerships that promote international and campus missions and goals;

Next steps involve the ILT building upon this report to develop student learning outcomes and campus goals related to internationalization early in fall semester 2013. The ILT will then develop a systematic plan to achieve these identified goals. This plan will address each of the recommendations listed above.

Campus forums to obtain ideas and feedback related to goals and the plan for internationalization will be held during fall semester 2013 and early in spring semester 2014. A preliminary report and plan will tentatively be completed by the end of January 2014. A site visit from ACE representative Barbara Hill and two additional knowledgeable reviewers is planned for February 2014, and based on feedback from the campus and site visitors, a final report and plan will be completed in April 2014.
Introduction

UMD, along with eight other institutions from across the nation, is participating 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 will develop strategies for campus internationalization by: forming a campus leadership team to work on strategic planning and student outcomes, attending cohort leadership meetings in Washington, undergoing site visits and peer reviews, and participating in monthly phone calls with Laboratory director Barbara Hill.

Leigh Neys, Director of International Education, and Denny Falk, Professor of Social Work are co-chairing the fourteen-member Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT) at UMD (See Appendix A for the charge to the team and Appendix B for team members). The ILT is in the process of 1) conducting a review of current international activities at UMD, 2) identifying campus goals and student learning outcomes related to internationalization, and 3) developing a systematic plan for comprehensive internationalization at UMD.

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 spring semester, 2013. This comprehensive review examines all aspects of internationalization at UMD and was guided by a list of questions that focus this review. The review process included the following components:

- The ILT answered review questions 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 are being integrated to provide students’ perspectives on internationalization; a student survey will be conducted early in September 2013.

This report summarizes the results of the internationalization review. The initial section of the report concisely summarizes the methods and results of the review. In each of the five areas of this section, readers are directed to more thorough descriptions of the methods and results in the appendices. Four subsequent sections identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges associated with the current status of internationalization at UMD. A final section offers recommendations and conclusions that follow from the internationalization review.

Building on the internationalization review report, the ILT will identify student learning outcomes and campus goals related to internationalization early in fall semester 2013. The ILT will then develop a systematic plan to achieve these identified goals. This plan will likely include a vision for internationalization at UMD, action steps to achieve each of the identified goals, and objectives and measures to monitor achievement of the goals.

Campus forums to obtain ideas and feedback related to goals and the plan for internationalization will be held during fall semester 2013 and early in spring semester 2014. A preliminary report and plan will tentatively be completed by the end of January 2014. We anticipate a site visit from ACE representative Barbara Hill and two additional knowledgeable reviewers in February 2014. Based on feedback from the campus and site visitors, we plan to have a final report and plan completed in April 2014.
Data Collection Methods and General Results

ILT Responses to the Comprehensive Internationalization Review Questions

During fall semester 2012, the ILT collected information about internationalization at UMD. These efforts were guided by the document, “Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review,” which is attached as Appendix C.

The ILT collected existing information in this initial portion of the internationalization review. Once this aspect of the review was completed, members of the ILT collected new information from deans, faculty, and staff to supplement and complement the information that was currently available. The results from these groups are summarized in subsequent sections of this report. The ILT was unable to complete a survey of students during the 2012-13 academic year; a summary of previously conducted focus groups is included below (see also Appendix G).

This section of the internationalization review contains only the most pertinent information collected by the ILT. This information is organized within the major categories from the “Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review” (Appendix C).

Articulated Commitment Mission, Goals, and Vision

Global/international learning is part of UMD’s vision, mission, and goals, as indicated in the excerpts below:

- Vision statement
  - We will prepare graduates who are sought after by employers because of their cultural, global, and professional competence
  - We will address issues central to the global society’s scientific, cultural, economic, and artistic vitality through research and creative inquiry.
  - Technology and information integration, global perspectives and connections, social justice, and collaboration.

- Mission statement: “The University of Minnesota Duluth integrates liberal education, research, creative activity, and public engagement and prepares students to thrive as lifelong learners and globally engaged citizens.”
• Goals: Goal 1 - Promote integrated curricular, co-curricular, and living-learning undergraduate experiences that achieve UMD’s student learning goals and prepare students for lifelong learning, **globally engaged citizenship**, and success in their academic, personal, and professional lives.

  – **Action Step 4: Develop and begin to implement a plan, including benchmarks, to create an integrated globally engaged campus**

• Student learning outcomes related to internationalization are articulated in the criteria for the global perspective in the Liberal Education Program; these outcomes will be assessed as part of an overall assessment of liberal education.

*The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization*

• UMD’s immediate environment from which it draws its students suggests possible connections with Nordic heritage immigrant communities and immigrant communities in the Twin Ports and Twin Cities, including the Latino communities and African immigrant communities.

• UMD’s location facilitates certain kinds of international connections, with iron ore and precious metals in drawing Asian and South American mining interests, Lake Superior provides international shipping and opportunities for research on large lakes.

• Several departments at UMD are in the process of developing relationships with Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Canada, and opportunities exist to collaborate with the College of St. Scholastica and local public and independent schools.

• Numerous local organizations and businesses have strong international ties, including Twin Metals, the Port Authority, the Chamber of Commerce, Enbridge Energy and the Duluth Sister Cities Program.

• UMD’s Natural Resources Research Institute (NRRI) and Large Lakes Observatory (LLO) have international connections.

• Opportunities exist for closer collaboration with the University of Minnesota system (particularly the Global Program and Strategy Alliance) and with other individual campuses and units within campuses.

*Strategy*

• Internationalization fits into the UMD strategic plan (which was approved in May 2011) in its mission, vision, goals, and action steps, as described above.

• UMD does not currently have an institutional internationalization strategy.
• Assessment of goals related to internationalization is beginning for the strategic plan and for liberal education, but no systematic assessment of international goals currently exists.

Organizational Structure and Personnel
• The current structure has several key offices reporting through a variety of institutional levels, often to different Vice Chancellors (Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, EVCAA; Vice Chancellor for Student Life, VCSL; Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations, VCFO).
• Many structures or bodies share responsibility for internationalization activities (reporting lines in parentheses):
  – Academic English Language Program (College of Education and Human Services Professions, EVCAA)
  – Alworth Institute (VCAA)
  – Collegiate advising and academic services offices (Deans, EVCAA)
  – Financial aid (EVCAA)
  – Food Services (VCSL)
  – Housing (VCSL)
  – International Admissions (Director of Admissions, EVCAA)
  – International Education Office (Assoc VC, EVCAA)
  – International Student Services (Office of Cultural Diversity, VCSL)
  – Intensive ESL—external vendor proposed spring 2014 (Assoc VC, EVCAA)
  – Residential Life (VCSL)
  – Registrar (EVCAA)
  – Student Accounts Receivable (VCFO)
  – UMD Grad School (EVCAA)
• The current structural arrangements could be more effective with more systematic intra-unit communication stemming from an organizational structure that drives common, agreed upon goals for internationalization.

Policies and Practices
• Faculty engagement in internationalization is promoted through unit and system grants and campus and workshops offered in Duluth and the Twin Cities.
• Faculty rewards for international activities and internationalization of their courses varies by unit. Some 7.12 (promotion and tenure) documents support international efforts as one example of favorable work toward tenure or promotion.
• The primary barriers to faculty engagement might be lack of consistent attention to, and reward for, efforts at internationalization.

• Liberal Education policy requires all students to take a course with a global perspective, and students can fulfill additional liberal education requirements by taking language courses.

• Students are encouraged to study abroad by the International Education Office, which recruits students to participate in study abroad opportunities, and increasingly, departments and colleges are participating in the recruitment of students, specific to particular majors/minors.

• Many UMD students find extensive and/or rigid curricular requirements as a deterrent to studying abroad.

• Administrative policies and procedures at UMD generally support transfer of credits from other domestic and international institutions, but this process could be streamlined.

• Most financial aid that a UMD student would be eligible for can be used for study abroad opportunities; tuition waivers do not apply, with the exception of the Best in Class scholarship, which can be used only for the Study in England program.

• Only a limited number of student scholarships are available to offset study abroad expenses.

Resources

• The International Education office is partially funded by university monies which are used to support the year-long UMD Study in England Program and scholarships. Other financial support is available for travel, though a formal program for these funds has not been established.

• The International Student Services office has a budget that is funded by the university; this budget is used to ensure UMD’s compliance with federal regulations and to provide support for international students.

• The International Club receives Student Service fees to support its programs, which are open to all UMD students and the community.

• The Office of Cultural Diversity, in collaboration with student organizations in the Multicultural Center, receives funding to provide several annual co-curricular events throughout the year.

• UMD does not have an institutional fund-raising strategy for internationalization.
• At this time there is no significant external funding for internationalization.
• Institutional resources are not in place yet to support campus internationalization goals.
• Members of the ILT perceive a pressing need to increase scholarships for international students to study at UMD and for domestic students who would like to study abroad.

Faculty and Staff
• Through fall 2012 UMD had not collected information on the faculty’s (or staff’s) language capacity, international background, interest, experiences, attitudes, or related issues related to internationalization. During spring 2013 the ILT collected extensive information on these factors, which is reported in a section below and will be used to develop a strategic plan for internationalizing the campus.
• Units at UMD annually invite numerous visiting faculty/scholars from abroad, most often building on individual relationships with UMD faculty. Faculty often builds relationships with international faculty as part of their own international efforts and invites them on campus as part of their ongoing collaboration.
• At the institutional level, there have been a few relationships built to bring in visiting scholars from abroad.
• Visiting scholars add to the teaching, research, and service missions of the University.
• The Alworth Institute has an international fellowship that allows scholars to visit UMD for about one month; while here the scholar gives lectures, writes web-blogs, guest lectures, and meets with faculty with similar interests. In addition, Alworth often invites international scholars to come as speakers, and they often stay for a week at a time.
• UMD does not systematically consider international experience in hiring faculty or in the promotion and tenure process, although this type of experience may be an advantage in specific searches.
• Many 7.12 documents (which guide promotion and tenure at the department level) have an international reputation, but not necessarily international experience, as criteria for promotion to full professor.

Students
• In fall 2012, UMD registered the following international students: 171 undergraduates (80 female, 91 male); 115 graduate students (51 female, 64 male) 11 pharmacy students; 43 students on Optional Practical Training; and eight other students.¹

¹ The overall composition of the UMD study body can be found at the following website: http://www.d.umn.edu/vcaa/institutionalresearch/
• The amount of staff time required for the new graduate students is much greater as they need help finding housing, furnishings, etc., whereas most of the new undergraduates live on campus.

• NAFSA: Association of International Educators estimates that international students and their dependents contributed approximately $7,386,000 in tuition, fees and living expenses to the UMD economy in the 2011-12 academic year.²

• Because UMD has a relatively homogeneous student body, a more concerted curricular and co-curricular integration of domestic and international students is advisable given the largely majority UMD population.

• UMD collected information on the campus climate in 2002 and again in 2009. In fall 2010, UMD students of color (undergraduate and graduate students, U.S. and naturalized citizens and international) were asked to complete a climate survey to collect more information because there were under-represented in the 2009 survey. Focus groups were also conducted during the spring of 2011 as a continuation and follow-up of the 2009/2010 Campus Diversity Climate Study.

• Results of the campus climate survey and focus group interviews are summarized in the section on student survey results in this report³

• The survey and focus groups data is being used as part of the new strategic plan action steps to improve campus climate.⁴

• Recent undergraduate enrollment trends of international students are as follows:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• International students are integrated into campus life through involvement in a UMD Seminar class required of all new freshman (except the Swenson School of Science and Engineering); through an International Club that organizes two-four events a month that are open to international and domestic students; and through involvement in the Multicultural Center, which sponsors numerous activities annually.

---

² See http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/eis2012/Minnesota.pdf for the entire report
³ See the full student survey results at http://www.d.umn.edu/chancellor/climate/surveys.html
⁴ See Strategic Goal #2: https://docs.google.com/a/d.umn.edu/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AofUILK6irQ4dER2V0thRmM0NVAYTHVOobjiT0UwyQnc#gid=0
Some strategies are in place to help domestic students learn from international students, including the International Student Services Mentor Program, the Multicultural Center Cultural Programs, the annual International Taste of UMD and Feast of Nations events, and international student presentations to UMD and community classes.

The Curriculum

- UMD requires a course with a global perspective of all undergraduate students as part of its Liberal Education program. Courses approved for the Global Perspective requirement focus on developing an awareness of contemporary global topics and transnational connections. Thirty-five courses from 20 separate departments meet the global perspective requirement.
- Some academic departments have worked to internationalize majors.
- Some majors encourage study abroad for students.
- There is a perception that many majors are so proscribed that the students can’t take a semester to go abroad because this could set their graduation date back a full year. At the same time, many of these students take advantage of spring and summer study abroad opportunities.
- To the best of our knowledge, study abroad is not integrated into any academic major, minor, and general education requirements.
- A review of course offerings at UMD could reveal the international majors, minors, concentrations, certificates, courses, and enrollment trends for courses with international content; this review is beyond the scope of the current activities.
- Information is not currently available on alumni use of language skills after graduation, the extent to which pedagogy takes advantage of the differing perspectives that domestic and international students bring to campus, and the extent to which the curriculum integrates U.S. multicultural issues with international/global perspectives and issues.

Co-curriculum and Campus Life

- All Alworth Institute for International Studies events are international, with three to five lectures/events each month during the academic year plus brown bag presentations.
- ISS collaborates with the campus and local community by coordinating requests for international student speakers as well as temporary home stays upon arrival and during breaks, and holiday meals.
• The Office of Cultural Diversity also offers many international events representing many countries around the world.

• Every semester the Office of Cultural Diversity and student organizations in the Multicultural Center have several international performers, films and speakers.

• To varying degrees the collegiate units have relevant events of an international nature (e.g., music and theatre productions in the School of Fine Arts and film festivals in the College of Liberal Arts).

• Students, faculty and staff attend many of the events. Students are encouraged by faculty to attend some of the films and presentations by giving (extra) credit to attend these events. Many community members attend the Alworth events.

• A number of opportunities exist in the local environment to enhance internationalization efforts, including collaborating with Duluth Sister Cities, Chamber of Commerce (Chinese connections), and the Duluth-Superior Port Authority.

• Multicultural Center and Alworth Institute programs integrate international and multicultural topics; additional opportunities exist.

• Limited formal international opportunities are available in the residence halls.

Education Abroad

• UMD offers study abroad, internships, fieldwork, research and service learning in a variety of capacities. Through its own programs and six affiliate programs, IEO offers approximately 650 program opportunities, but students are not limited to these programs and may elect other options.

• Approximately 400 UMD students study abroad each year, with approximately two-thirds being female and 90% being white. Students are more likely to study abroad after two or three years of courses.

• Students come from a range of programs across campus, with more students coming from education, business, social sciences, and physical and life sciences.

• Students study abroad in many countries, with the most common destinations for semester programs in 2012-2013 being the United Kingdom, Spain, Ireland, Italy, and New Zealand.

• Students use personal finances, financial aid, loans and scholarships to finance their education abroad.

• Financial aid is portable for all credit-bearing programs, and some scholarships are offered by the IEO and external constituents.
The amount of host country integration provided varies by program, but we encourage and support programs that provide this opportunity.

One study abroad program offered by the IEO, the “Study in England Programme” could be considered an island program, but has changed significantly enough to classify it as a hybrid program.

Credit taken on study abroad programs transfer back to UMD in the form of resident credit. There have been questions over the year from Academic Administration about the quality of courses offered by program providers and about courses that are outside UMD disciplines.

Students returning from study abroad experiences impact UMD in a variety of ways, including serving as Global Ambassadors for IEO, sharing information in the residence halls, and, with the encouragement of faculty, sharing their expertise in the classroom.

There is strong support for education abroad across campus, but more work needs to be done plan intentionally for study abroad during students’ academic careers.

Engagement with Institutions Abroad

UMD does not have an overall strategy for international partnerships.

Overall, UMD does not regularly or systematically evaluate its partnerships. The International Education Office has recently set forth a program evaluation timeline for all IEO sponsored study abroad programs. Other agreements are informally evaluated.

An inventory of partnerships throughout the institution was conducted in 2011 via email to all deans, and this inventory is housed in the IEO office. At this point the inventory is simply a collection of data, but in the future will be used to analyze the status of the partnerships.

Criteria for evaluation are varied. The IEO is working on this issue.

International Admission uses the feedback form international institutions and the success of enrolled students to gauge partnership effectiveness.

Recent evaluations have revealed difficulty with the articulation of international transfer coursework; in response a template for the submission of transfer course descriptions was developed and an Office of the Registrar staff member was identified to provide consistency.

General information on criteria for partnerships is available on the Global Programs and Strategy Alliance website about how to pursue partnerships, but there is no UMD specific strategy.
Faculty and staff exchange is generally conducted on an individual basis; there is no coordinated strategy for this activity.

Information on faculty’s international activities and attitudes is presented in the section below on faculty.

Exchange programs help to internationalize the curriculum by incorporating international student perspectives in the classroom and in the campus community. Partnerships help students think beyond the borders of the classroom and the local community.

IEO funds exchange program operations through student fees; these partnerships are generally sustainable because there is the commitment from the institution and office to continue the collaborations.

Individual department, collegiate unit and faculty partnerships are largely dependent for funding on the individuals initiating them and the support the unit provides for them.

Deans’ Interviews

Leigh Neys and Denny Falk interviewed each of the five UMD deans during December 2012. Three deans elected to have other persons participate in the interview; two included an associate dean and one included an associate dean and faculty members. The topics addressed were parallel to the broader internationalization review. A summary and analysis of these five interviews appears below. Additional results from the interviews with deans can be found in Appendix D.

Results of the interviews include the following conclusions:

- Global/international learning is articulated as part of each school/college’s vision, mission, and/or strategic plan, with different deans reporting internationalization as more or less central to the college’s priorities.

- All deans report that faculty and staff in their school/college have significant international activity, but that the unit does not have an internationalization strategy.

- Some deans report that internationalization is part of a plan, but none of the schools/colleges systematically assess their progress in achieving internationalization goals.

- Varied local, state, and broader environments for internationalization were identified, including sister cities, international communities (particularly in the Twin Cities), the Port Authority and shipping companies, and international companies.
• Deans have very different perceptions on where the primary responsibility for internationalization lies, with one dean identifying the International Education Office; some seeing deans initiating and/or supporting; and others suggesting the primary responsibility resting with the department heads and faculty.

• Organizational structures, staffing, and governance related to internationalization were generally not clearly specified.

• Faculty engagement in internationalization is promoted by 1) hiring international faculty, 2) participating in an Internationalizing Teaching and Learning cohort, 3) support from McKnight funds, 4) having international travel as part of routine activity, 4) communication through administrative committee meetings and monthly faculty and staff readings that have international content, and 5) “re-broadcasting” international announcements to all or selected faculty members.

• Only one school reported that international activities are specifically valued in 7.12 statements; one school reported that research was to be of international quality for promotion.

• Barriers to faculty engagement include 1) money, 2) content-driven curriculum, 3) higher teaching loads, 4) research expectations, and 5) lack of campus support.

• Other barriers to internationalization include 1) money for student travel, 2) no place for international visitors to stay, 3) not being aware of campus and system structures, 4) obtaining visas, 5) no support for return visitors after UMD faculty visit abroad, 6) no infrastructure for international activities, and 7) lack of second language.

• Financial resources provided by schools/colleges are often not specifically for internationalization, but fund international activities such as faculty travel.

• Some of the schools/colleges invite visiting faculty/scholars from abroad; extended visits in particular contribute to internationalization on campus.

• Colleges/Schools vary greatly in the integration of international/intercultural content into their curricula.

• Internationalization is manifested in the co-curriculum of the schools/colleges; international events, festivals, lectures, and films are all present in CLA and SFA, and departments and graduate students initiate events in other units.

• Opportunities for education abroad differ by school/college (study abroad, internships, field work, research, service learning), but each college has study abroad opportunities.

• None of the schools/colleges report having an overall strategy for international partnerships, but all have international connections.
• Schools and colleges with partnerships have a file with signed agreements in the dean’s office.
• None of the colleges/schools have a formal process for evaluating their partnerships.
• Partnerships have indirect effects on student international/intercultural learning on campus through UMD students and faculty returning to campus and sharing experiences and through international students and faculty interacting with UMD counterparts.
• Funding for partnerships is limited, often relying on recurring soft money. Some external grant funds are available.

Inherent in the results from interviews with the deans were a number of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges, which are summarized below:

**Strengths**
- Several units report that faculty are interested and invested in internationalization.
- International faculty are identified as key resources, and two schools/colleges report about one-third of their faculty have international backgrounds.
- SCSE has strong international research activities, with research on seven continents.
- LSBE reports cultural acceptance of internationalization within the school, especially in business and economics.
- CEHSP reports numerous study abroad experiences and diversity of faculty and experiences.
- CLA reports strong faculty-driven initiatives and student study abroad activities.
- SFA has practice-based curriculum with students interested in studying abroad.

**Weaknesses**
- Weaknesses of the school/college’s current efforts to internationalize focus around limited time and limited funding.
- Heavy teaching and research expectations leave less time for program development.
- Funding for program development and student study abroad is lacking.
- Lack of mission and coordination related to internationalization is frequently cited.
- Directed international student recruitment is a limitation.
- Current international activities lack visibility.
Opportunities

- Numerous opportunities for deepening internationalization exist; faculty have connections and interest but not the financial support and time to develop them.
- Lots of institutions around the world would love to have relationships with universities in the United States.
- International student recruiting could be expanded to other regions (e.g., South America, Canada).
- Recruiting efforts to other areas of study (e.g., science education, liberal arts) could be expanded.
- Specific opportunities include developing technology for international collaboration, international UROPs, and having students more deliberatively engaged in internationalization.

Challenges

- Major challenges to future progress continue to include funding, staffing, and time.
- A “threat” exists if we cannot fix our facilities and increase funding for faculty, talented people with international potential will leave UMD.
- Language barriers and potential de-emphasis on language education can limit options.
- Emphasis on particular fields of study could weaken other areas of study.
- Coordinating/integrating internationalization and U.S. diversity emphasis could be challenging.
- UMD needs focused, transparent leadership for internationalization to succeed.
Faculty Focus Groups and Questionnaires

ILT members and a faculty representative from each academic department worked together to collect questionnaires from faculty members and to conduct a focus group discussion with each department following a specified protocol. Members of the ILT, along with a departmental representative, distributed questionnaires (see Appendix E) to individual faculty members before or during department meetings. ILT members and/or departmental members also collected these questionnaires. To date, 349 completed questionnaires have been received from a total of about 470 faculty members for a 74% response rate. The ILT members and a departmental representative also conducted a focus group discussion with each academic department. The protocol used by ILT members and department representatives is also included in Appendix E.

Results from faculty questionnaires indicated that faculty members have wide involvement in international activities and positive attitudes about internationalization:

- Faculty members have diverse backgrounds and experiences, with 24% having been born abroad, 37% having lived two or more years abroad, 43% having teaching experience outside the U. S., and almost 50% having studied abroad.
- Faculty report a variety of international activities at UMD, with 33% having conducted research or engaged in other professional activity in their discipline outside the United States, 43% having participated in international conferences or other meetings, and 23% having travelled outside the U. S. with UMD students.
- Faculty members have positive attitudes about different aspects of internationalization, with 83% agreeing that international learning is an important element of the educational process, 90% agreeing that students can understand their own culture better if they learn about another culture, and 93% agreeing that international students enrich the UMD campus.

Additional questionnaire results can be found in Appendix E.

During focus group discussions in each academic department, ILT members asked faculty members to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges related to internationalization in their unit.

**Strengths**

- There is broad diversity within most UMD departments – both in the faculty and staff and within the student body.
• Intercultural and international programming (speakers, performers, etc.) offered at UMD for faculty, staff, students and community is plentiful and diverse.

• UMD provides a structure, the International Education Office (IEO), for students to experience varied study abroad opportunities.

• UMD faculty members have significant international experiences: traveling/presenting at international conferences, participating in a myriad of scholarly activities, and hosting international guests.

• Curriculum at UMD builds upon local resources as a source of intercultural learning (e.g. connections to indigenous populations in Twin Cities, immigrant populations, and local tribes).

• Many fields of study at UMD are inherently international – both in terminology and shared language, the historical modes of thinking within fields of study, and common international requirements and/or standards.

**Weaknesses**

Commonly identified weaknesses centered around five themes. These themes, and examples related to each theme, are summarized below:

• Several weaknesses focused on academic issues, including lack of international curriculum in many departments, a lack of understanding of the importance of international curriculum in some departments, a lack of courses on other countries and cultures, some majors having a lockstep nature to their programs and thus students (and faculty as well) do not want to add or change parts of the curriculum, difficulties with transfer credits from international universities, and sometimes the language skills of international students are low as UMD has lowered the language requirement for acceptance.

• Additional weaknesses related to limited resources, including housing for international students (specifically for early arriving graduate students during fall semester, during winter breaks, and for early spring arrivals), housing for visiting faculty and scholars, services for early arriving international students (e.g., Dining Center, Health Services), limited travel grants and release time for faculty and staff to develop relationships with international colleagues, lack of support for faculty exchanges (especially for visiting faculty), a shortage of staff to deal with incoming international students, and limited tuition waivers and scholarships for international students.
● Several departments commented on the fact that UMD doesn’t rank very high on various college and university ranking lists and thus doesn’t attract many good international students, with location and weather being related recruitment issues.

● Study abroad programs are very expensive for our own students, and for many of our students with high credit load majors study abroad may add one or two semesters to their graduation.

● Faculty perceive mixed messages related to internationalization from the administration, being encouraged to engage in activities like developing and leading study abroad programs and hosting visiting scholars, but these activities are not rewarded in merit pay.

Opportunities

● UMD is already positioned to build meaningful programming, which would build global awareness and continue to strengthen “study abroad at home” initiatives.

● UMD has numerous faculty members who could share models where internationalization has been successfully integrated into curriculum, share models of successful design of programs overseas and in the U. S., and provide leadership in how internationalization could look across campus.

● UMD could better promote the many activities happening throughout the year which promote intercultural awareness and understanding, as well as internationalization.

● UMD could build on a foundation of supporting visiting scholars by inviting more scholars to campus and including a residency component.

● We have assets within our faculty and staff who could be instrumental in creating protocols about hosting international guests.

● UMD could build on initial intercultural development training for faculty, staff and administrators, which could be foundational in creating a shift in how we interact with one another, understand ourselves, and create a welcoming culture for diverse students, faculty and staff.

● UMD has an opportunity to create a more welcoming path for students to receive/transfer credit (for required classes) for study abroad, but highly structured and sequenced majors will be challenged to find a way to allow for transfer.

Challenges

● Securing financial resources and support for international activities (faculty research, travel, curriculum);
- Improving the campus climate (racism, hate speech);
- Providing adequate support for international faculty and students;
- Securing time and commitment from faculty for international activities;
- Addressing international students' language proficiency;
- Expanding study abroad programs (students need more time abroad);
- Retaining international students;
- Securing institutional commitment and support for international activities;
- Reducing costs for students to enhance the opportunity to study abroad (financial resources).

Additional information about strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges can be found in Appendix E.

Staff Focus Groups and Survey

ILT members worked together to conduct three focus groups and to distribute an electronic survey to all staff. Two invitational focus groups were organized to include key staff connected to international efforts on campus. The third focus group was campus-wide for all staff. A total of 22 staff members participated in the focus groups. Members of the ILT designed a staff survey which was distributed to all staff including 205 full-time P&A (professional and academic) staff, 33 part-time P&A staff, and 833 full-time/part-time civil service employees. A total of 153 completed responses were received and were the basis for the analysis that follows. The focus group questions and survey are attached in Appendix F.

Highlighted results from the staff survey include:

- A vast majority of staff is U.S. born (92.8%), over half have traveled outside the U.S. within the last five years (54.2%). Only about 10% have lived outside the U.S. for two or more years. 63% of the staff has a current passport.
- Most of the respondents were native English speakers (90.85%). The other native languages of staff at UMD included Albanian, Arabic/French, Russian, and Yoruba.
- Nearly half of the respondents reported some level of proficiency in a language other than English (77 respondents; 49.7%). The most common second language was Spanish
(39 respondents; 50.6% of those reporting other language proficiency) followed by French (16 respondents; 20.8% of those reporting other language proficiency).

- Almost a quarter of staff have professional contacts with colleagues outside the U.S. and over half of the responding staff reported attending on-campus international events.
- In general over 60% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that contact with individuals with a different background and an understanding of international and intercultural issues is professionally important. Over 90% of respondents agree or strongly agree that the presence of international students and faculty is positive for the American students on campus.

Additional survey results can be found in Appendix F.

During focus group sessions, ILT members asked staff to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges related to campus internationalization.

**Strengths**

- UMD has globally recognized faculty that are engaged and committed to international initiatives.
- UMD has strong regional community support for international programs and students.
- Curricular and co-curricular programs have strong international components.
- UMD has strong support for international students and study abroad.

**Weaknesses**

- Lack of a coordinated effort to address dining and housing issues for international students and scholars;
- Limited awareness and recognition for international accomplishments; and
- Limited resources available to further internationalize the campus, in particular for staffing and professional development.

**Opportunities**

- Utilization of available technology to enhance internationalization;
- Expansion of current study abroad programming to diversify geographic destination and increase participation from underrepresented populations; and
- Professional development training for faculty and staff on working with international populations.
Challenges

- The continued struggle to keep the campus community engaged in creating an inclusive climate for all;
- Commitment to the intercultural component of the ILT definition of internationalization;
- Need to secure additional financial resources to sustain and expand internationalization;
- Need to address ways to internationalize at home, because all students will not be able to study abroad; and
- Need to coordinate services for international constituencies to eliminate redundancy, engage stakeholders and improve communication.

Overall, the staff focus group and survey results suggest that we have staff members that are generally positive towards the internationalization of the campus. The low response/participation rate, however, is of concern in any interpretation of these results. The detailed focus group and survey summaries in Appendix F provide a wealth of ideas that can be explored further as the ACE Internalization Lab Team continues its efforts to internationalize the campus.

Student Focus Groups

The student feedback summarized below is a compilation of two sources of information. The first source included 30 international students who completed a reflective assignment in one section of the UMD Seminar course in spring 2013. The assignment asked students what advice they would give to incoming international students. Comments from these assignments are integrated into the summary. The second source of feedback came from focus groups of underrepresented groups of students on campus that was conducted in October 2010. This focus group process is a continuation and follow-up of the 2009/2010 Campus Diversity Climate Study.

Five core researchers conducted the focus groups including: John Arthur, Jackie Onchwari, Susana Pelayo-Woodward, Kim Riordan and Anne Tellett. The focus groups were comprised of African American, Asian/Pacific, Latino/Chicano, American Indian, and international undergraduate and graduate students. Each focus group took place at UMD and a total of 54 students participated in six group interviews. A full copy of the focus group report can be found in Appendix G. The comments from those focus groups are integrated into the summary below:
**Strengths**

- Small campus which means small class sizes and stronger relationships with professors;
- Multicultural center provides a safe and comfortable space for students;
- Programming for intercultural events;
- Amount of effort and good intention put into the whole goal of integration in the university; and
- Positive academic programs and courses where instructors created an atmosphere where diversity was discussed and respected.

**Weaknesses**

- Living in the dorms means having to eat in the campus dining center and the food is American style;
- Winter weather is very cold;
- Discrimination based on country of origin;
- Need to expand access or design of Intercultural Communication course so more students can take advantage of the opportunities in that class; and
- UMD is not a diverse campus.

**Opportunities**

- Living in apartments or off-campus which allows students to cook their own food;
- Need to expand orientation for international students to include more about American life - maybe U.S. students could do something similar about international/intercultural students;
- Expand exposure and programming of the Multicultural Center; and
- Trainings for teachers on different learning styles for international students.

**Challenges**

- Language barriers – particularly in technical classes when English is not your first language;
- Need to talk about uncomfortable things like stereotypes;
- Feeling a sense of alienation/isolation from other UMD groups;
● Feeling oppressed by a sense of “white privilege” or a sense of entitlement on the part of white students and faculty;
● Assumption of racial preference and lower standards for people of color;
● Lack of safety in the community;
● Ignorance on the part of faculty and students; and
● Pressure to conform and the process of accommodating to a racist institution/community/society.

It is worth noting that the focus group was conducted in October 2010 and much work has been done through the Campus Climate initiative to address these concerns. However, there is still much work to do to create a positive and inclusive campus climate. The focus group for underrepresented students will be conducted again in October 2013 and results from these focus groups will be available to the ACE Internalization Lab Team for inclusion in the final recommendations.\(^5\)

\(^5\) Detailed information about the Campus Climate initiative can be found online at http://www.d.umn.edu/chancellor/climate/
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges at UMD

The results reported above from each of the sources of information about internationalization at UMD either explicitly or implicitly reflects the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges (SWOC) that the campus faces related to internationalization. This section of the report will synthesize the results from the various sources. The factors within each element of the SWOC will be organized according to the headings of the American Council on Education’s “Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review” in Appendix C.

Strengths

A number of existing factors were identified that enhance internationalization at UMD. These factors are described below.

Articulated Commitment Mission, Goals, and Vision

The importance of international and global dimensions is clearly reflected in the UMD Strategic Plan that was approved in May 2011. The expanded vision statement emphasizes the global competence of graduates and the global perspectives and connections of the campus; the mission statement includes preparing globally engaged citizens; and two of the six goals include important global elements.

The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization

UMD has built on its location to focus on fresh water research through units such as the Large Lakes Observatory and on regional resources, such as metals, through the Natural Resources Research Institute. UMD’s inclusion in the University of Minnesota system and its relationship with the Global Program and Strategy Alliance (GPSA) supports internationalization.

Strategy

UMD’s involvement in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory signals an important step in implementing its commitment to internationalization. The International Education Office (IEO) is initiating a comprehensive assessment strategy for study abroad activities that focuses on student learning outcomes.
**Organizational Structure and Personnel**

UMD has capable and committed personnel working on varied elements of its international efforts. IEO is clearly structured to support study abroad.

**Policies and Practices**

Policies and practices in discrete areas are clear and formalized in areas such as some study abroad programs and some aspects of supporting international students.

**Resources**

Two staff positions are funded for IEO and two for International Student Support (ISS). The Global Program and Strategy Alliance (GPSA) provides travel funds for international activities, and the IEO recently increased funding for its faculty travel grants. Most units self-fund international activities.

**Faculty and Staff**

Surveys of faculty and staff indicate they have positive attitudes about internationalization. Many faculty members in particular have diverse backgrounds and experiences, with 24% having been born abroad, 37% having lived two or more years abroad, 43% having teaching experience outside the U. S., almost 50% having studied abroad, 33% having conducted research or engaged in other professional activity in their discipline outside the United States, 43% having participated in international conferences or other meetings, and 23% having traveled outside the U. S. with UMD students. Over half of staff members have traveled outside the United States in the past five years, and nearly half reported some level of proficiency in a language other than English. Many units host visiting faculty and scholars from outside the United States.

**Students**

Approximately 300 international students enroll at UMD annually, with over 100 of these students enrolling at the graduate level. The Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Council proposed to triple the number of new international students matriculating annually by fall 2016. ISS staff goes out of their way to help international students adapt to their life at UMD and in Duluth, and new international undergraduate students are integrated into campus in the UMD Seminar. The campus plans to engage an outside contractor (ESLI) to assist in recruiting and preparing international students for success in fall 2014.
**The Curriculum**

UMD’s undergraduate student learning outcomes include a statement about contributing to the local, national, and global communities in which they live, and the Liberal Education program includes a policy that each undergraduate student must take a course with a global perspective. Many programs are inherently international, while other programs require additional international content.

**Co-curriculum and Campus Life**

A rich and extensive set of international activities occur on campus annually, including events sponsored by the Alworth Institute, the Office of Cultural Diversity, and the International Student Club. Opportunities for informal interaction around global issues are also available.

**Education Abroad**

IEO provides strong support for study abroad, with approximately 650 options being available to UMD students. About 20% of graduates study abroad during their undergraduate experience. Financial aid and some scholarships are available, and students can receive resident credit for study abroad.

**Engagement with Institutions Abroad**

UMD has multiple partnerships with institutions abroad at the individual, department, and collegiate level. Records of these partnerships are kept in the IEO and collegiate offices.

**Weaknesses**

A number of existing factors limit the success of internationalization at UMD. These factors are described below.

**Articulated Commitment Mission, Goals, and Vision**

While the campus mission, goals, and vision for the campus all reflect global ambitions, there are no goals explicitly addressing comprehensive internationalization.

**The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization**

The core UMD campus is not closely connected with many international entities. Efforts to take advantage of the environments are not coordinated.
Strategy
UMD does not currently have an institutional strategy for internationalization. Very limited assessment of international activities currently occurs.

Organizational Structure and Personnel
Many of the international activities on campus are fragmented and lack coordination. Different units important to comprehensive internationalization have diverse lines of reporting.

Policies and Practices
No policy exists on campus to systematically promote faculty participation in international activities or study abroad. Institutional barriers to bringing international scholars to campus, such as not being able to obtain an .x500 account prior to arriving on campus, exist.

Resources
Central campus resources for internationalization are limited, and UMD lacks external funding for internationalization.

Faculty and Staff
Multiple demands on faculty leave limited time for curriculum internationalization, hosting international scholars, and other relevant and important activities. Most departmental 7.12 documents (related to promotion and tenure) do not explicitly recognize international activities, and these documents are difficult to change. ISS has limited staff to meet the varied needs of international students. UMD does not have housing for international visitors.

Students
Limited financial support, such as scholarships and tuition reduction, is available for international students, and housing for international graduate students has been challenging. There are also few opportunities to integrate domestic and international students.

The Curriculum
Many majors are very proscribed and offer few opportunities for students to take electives with international content. International and multicultural content is often not integrated.
**Co-curriculum and Campus Life**

Many faculty members do not provide incentives for students to attend international co-curricular activities, even when relevant opportunities are available. International events are very limited in residence halls.

**Education Abroad**

Many students who arrive at UMD and hope to study abroad do not do so. There is a perception that the cost of study abroad is high and that studying abroad leads to added time to graduation. Some majors have a high number of required credits, making it difficult for students to study abroad.

**Engagement with Institutions Abroad**

No campus-wide guidelines or criteria for partnerships exist, and it takes significant faculty/staff time to develop and maintain quality partnerships. Individual partnerships often end when involved faculty members leave campus. No systematic evaluation of partnerships occurs.

**Opportunities**

A number of existing factors in the UMD environment and other likely factors in the future may provide opportunities for UMD to enhance its international and global activities. These factors are described below.

**Articulated Commitment Mission, Goals, and Vision**

Developing clear goals related to internationalization could provide focus for campus efforts. Mission and vision statements for international/global efforts at UMD could provide additional focus.

**The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization**

UMD could enhance connections to “heritage” communities in northern Minnesota (e.g., Sons of Norway) and more recent immigrant communities in the Twin Cities (e.g., Somali community). The campus could also enhance connections with local entities (e.g., Chamber of Commerce, Port Authority, Ikonics, Moline) that have international connections. Internationalization at UMD could also be strengthened by increased cooperation with the Global Program and Strategy Alliance (GPSA) and other University of Minnesota campuses.
Strategy
The development and implementation of a comprehensive strategy for internationalization holds significant promise in furthering the international/global mission of UMD.

Organizational Structure and Personnel
A clear organizational structure and defined lines of communication could integrate currently fragmented units and make international/global initiatives more effective and efficient.

Policies and Practices
Clear policies and best practices related to the elements of this review (described below) could also make these international/global initiatives more effective and efficient.

Resources
Additional funding and staff will be required if the number of international students increases. As the international mission and related goals are developed, external funding could be sought to support priority areas, including seeking donations from alumni and friends who value this mission.

Faculty and Staff
Current faculty and staff could be encouraged to engage in professional development activities related to internationalization, including participation in campus events and workshops. Many faculty and staff members will be retiring in the next few years, and qualifications related to international/intercultural issues could be sought. If the campus does triple the number of international undergraduate students, faculty and staff will need the knowledge and skills to interact effectively with this larger group of students.

Students
UMD can continue to recruit more international students, in part by contracting and partnering with other organizations to identify appropriate students and to promote their success. Many students from around the world want to study in the United States, and UMD can be a good fit for many qualified students. Additional programming will be required across campus to support increased numbers and diversity of international students.

The Curriculum
International topics and multicultural content related to campus goal 2 on equity, diversity, and social justice could be integrated to create intercultural curricular offerings. Enhanced language
and cultural content offered by Foreign Languages and Literature could strengthen the international curriculum, particularly if other majors allow or require this content.

Co-curriculum and Campus Life
If UMD attracts a more international and diverse student body, the campus can create opportunities for more meaningful interactions among diverse groups. Opportunities include an international/ intercultural residence hall and wider participation in international events.

Education Abroad
About 70% of matriculating undergraduate students indicates a desire to study abroad during their college career, but only about 20% actually do so. Intentionally integrating study abroad experiences could increase the percentage of students who study abroad. These students could then return to UMD and enrich the experiences of students who are unable to study in another country.

Engagement with Institutions Abroad
A limited number of carefully identified international partnerships could help UMD to focus its resources on partnerships that offer the best opportunities to enhance the teaching, research, and service components of the campus mission.

Challenges
A number of existing factors in the UMD environment and other likely factors in the future may provide challenges for UMD as it tries to enhance its international and global activities. These factors are described below.

Articulated Commitment Mission, Goals, and Vision
The varied demands on the campus could limit or fragment the focus on internationalization.

The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization
Making and maintaining connections with these environments takes time and some resources.

Strategy
Even if a strategy for comprehensive internationalization is developed, implementation over the long-term will remain a challenge due to changing priorities, budget restraints and leadership turnover.
Organizational Structure and Personnel
Structure and personnel can resist change, limiting the changes that can occur to promote internationalization.

Policies and Practices
Developing and modifying policies and procedures will require cooperation across varied units, which can be difficult if units do not have a history of cooperation.

Resources
Internationalization will compete with numerous other campus priorities for resources.

Faculty and Staff
Faculty and staff are already stretched thin with current demands; obtaining the knowledge, skills, and motivation required for comprehensive internationalization will not be priorities for many faculty.

Students
Many domestic students, faculty, staff, and community members lack the intercultural competence to provide a supportive environment for international students.

The Curriculum
Transfer students with an Associate of Arts degree may have completed a curriculum that does not include content with a global perspective, but will receive credit for meeting the full UMD Liberal Education requirement. External accrediting agencies limit the flexibility of some majors to include global/international/foreign language content.

Co-curriculum and Campus Life
Students, faculty, and staff have little incentive to engage in international activities on campus. Students who are employed and work off-campus cannot engage as fully in campus-based international activities.

Education Abroad
A narrow career focus, rising costs, limited study abroad scholarships, and the need to work to earn money for school, limit students’ ability to study abroad.
Engagement with Institutions Abroad

Limited time and funding are available to support international partnerships. Too many partnerships reduce the ability to focus on and support more productive relationships.
Recommendations and Conclusions

The results analysis reported above suggest important next steps for the internationalization process at UMD. In general, the campus should build on the strengths, address the weaknesses, pursue the opportunities, and attend to the challenges reported above. More specifically, the ILT makes the following recommendations related to key elements on internationalization.

Recommendations

Articulated Commitment Mission, Goals, and Vision
UMD should develop clear goals, along with a mission and vision statement, that provides focus for comprehensive internationalization while supporting the overall campus values, vision, mission, and goals.

The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization
UMD should identify, prioritize, and develop or enhance relationships with key players in the broader community that will help the campus to achieve its internationalization mission and goals.

Strategy
UMD should identify and implement action steps that will move the campus toward achieving its internationalization mission and goals according to a reasonable timeline.

Organizational Structure and Personnel
UMD should clarify and implement an organizational structure that will promote the identified mission and goals. Lines of communication should be strengthened between units with separate reporting lines.

UMD should assess the number, knowledge, skills and experience of personnel associated with internationalization and provide professional development and selective hiring to ensure that relevant personnel have the capacity to implement an internationalization strategy.

Policies and Practices
UMD should revise current policies and practices and develop new policies and practices to be in line with the mission and goals for internationalization.
Resources
UMD should identify the resources that would be necessary to achieve the internationalization mission and goals, keeping in mind current budget realities; relevant groups within the campus should then maximize use of resources from entities such as the GPSA and University of Minnesota campuses and seek appropriate external funding from organizations and donors.

Faculty and Staff
UMD should examine and implement ways to empower and incentivize a motivated faculty and staff that has significant background and experience related to internationalization.

Students
UMD should expand and diversify its international student body, working to make the campus and community more hospitable to these students and to integrate services to meet their needs.

The Curriculum
UMD should identify and implement ways to infuse international/global/intercultural content across the curriculum.

Co-curriculum and Campus Life
UMD should continue to offer extensive co-curricular events, increasingly integrating these events with the curriculum and living/learning activities.

Education Abroad
UMD should continue to offer and to expand the variety of education abroad activities, working to make these activities accessible to more students.

Engagement with Institutions Abroad
UMD should inventory, assess, and develop selected international partnerships, supporting those partnerships that promote international and campus missions and goals.
Conclusion

UMD has many current strengths upon which to build and future opportunities to pursue; the campus must also address its current weaknesses and attend to upcoming challenges. The next step of the internationalization process will involve the ILT building upon this report to develop student learning outcomes and campus goals related to internationalization early in fall semester 2013. The ILT will then develop a systematic plan to achieve these identified goals. This plan will address each of the recommendations listed above.

Campus forums to obtain ideas and feedback related to goals and the plan for internationalization will be held during fall semester 2013 and early in spring semester 2014. A preliminary report and plan will tentatively be completed by the end of January 2014. A site visit from ACE representative Barbara Hill and two additional knowledgeable reviewers is planned for February 2014, and based on feedback from the campus and site visitors, a final report and plan will be completed in April 2014.
Appendix A

Charge to the Internationalization Leadership Team

To: International Leadership Team

From: Andrea Schokker, Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Re: Charge of the Committee

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the International Leadership team that will be leading our efforts with the ACE Internationalization Lab. The efforts of this committee will be central to the development of a robust vision and plan that will be implemented to give UMD a presence in the International Education community. The goal of this work is to provide every UMD student, staff member, and faculty member the tools needed to become a global citizen who understands the role of cultural inclusivity in all they do. We must also further our education from awareness and acceptance along a journey toward development of true intercultural competence. We must also play a role in educating students from across the world at UMD and in working with academic institutions from a variety of cultures. We have some very unique qualities and world-class opportunities to offer students from all cultures.

The charge of the committee is to:

1) Take the leadership role in the ACE review process, including engaging in a review of current internationalization efforts with the goal of:
   a) Sharpening institutional goals
   b) Sharpening student learning goals
   c) Developing an action plan

2) Work closely with the UMD community through the review process and in development of goals and plans

3) Recommend a structure for international activities including:
   a) Admissions and recruitment
b) Visa, I-9 and other document related items

c) Curriculum

d) Study abroad

e) Potential standing committee(s)

f) International visits

g) International agreements and MOUs

h) Support of international students and visiting scholars

i) Fulbright programs

j) ESL courses

k) Any other items in the current or envisioned activities at UMD that have an international component

The proposed structure may include a centralized office or unit and/or a plan for incorporating the international focus into existing structures.

4) Suggest ways to engage the broader campus community as we move forward; include a summary of potential obstacles including campus climate related items.

This is an exciting initiative that will form the basis of a long-term plan for international activities at UMD.
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## Appendix C
Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulated Commitment: Mission, Goals, and Vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is global/international learning articulated as part of the institution’s vision, mission, or goals? If so, where (for example, in the mission statement, strategic plan, or recruiting materials)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the goals for internationalization (for example, preparing students for work in a global society or connecting international and multicultural agendas)? Where are those goals articulated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the institution developed student learning goals associated with the global and international dimensions of undergraduate education? What are they? Where are they articulated? Who knows about them? How consistent are goals for different programs or colleges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do faculty members assess student achievement of those goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the immediate environment from which the institution draws its students suggest a special approach to internationalization (for example, do local immigrant populations encourage ties to other countries and regions)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the institution’s location facilitate certain kinds of international interactions with a particular region or regions? What local organizations or businesses have strong international ties? Are they focused on particular parts of the globe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What opportunities exist in the state and local environments to enhance the institution’s internationalization efforts? To what extent has the institution taken advantage of those opportunities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶ This guide has been extracted from the 2008 forthcoming ACE publication *A guide to internationalization for chief academic officers* written by Barbara A. Hill and Madeleine F. Green. Permission has been granted for the reproduction of this text for usage in this workshop.
**Strategy**

- Does the institution have a strategic plan? Where does internationalization fit into the plan? If internationalization is not part of the strategic plan, where else is it outlined?
- Does the institution have an institutional internationalization strategy? If so, what are its main components?
- How does this strategy take into account the institution’s mission, history, and nature of the student body?
- How does the institution assess its progress in achieving its goals?

**Structures, Policies and Practice, Resources**

Organizational Structure and Personnel

- Where does primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?
- What are the staffing arrangements and reporting lines? How well are they working?
- What governance structures support internationalization? How well are they working?

Policies and Practices

- How does the institution promote faculty engagement in internationalization? To what extent does the institution reward or penalize faculty for international activities and internationalization of their courses, especially in the hiring, promotion, and tenure processes? What are the barriers to faculty engagement? To what extent is the institution succeeding in removing them? What is the evidence?
- To what extent are students encouraged to take courses with international content? To take language courses? To engage in education abroad? Who provides such encouragement? How do advisors encourage or discourage students to pursue international learning and experiences? How do departmental requirements and practices encourage or discourage international learning? To what extent is education abroad integrated into the academic major, minor, and general education requirements?
- How effective are the administrative policies and procedures pertaining to education abroad, with regard to financial aid portability and credit transfer?
- Is there differential pricing for programs in different locations? What are the implications of the current pricing structures?
- Beyond those mentioned above, what policies or practices hinder internationalization efforts at this institution?
### Resources

- What financial resources does the institution provide for internationalization? What resources are available to support curriculum development; faculty international travel and research; students’ study- or work-abroad opportunities; infrastructure (such as library holdings, technology, or language labs); and co-curricular programs?
- Does the institution have a fund-raising strategy for internationalization? How is it aligned with the overall institutional fund-raising strategy?
- What is the balance between internal and external funding sources for internationalization? Has this funding increased, decreased, or remained the same during the last five years? 10 years?
- How well do institutional resources align with institutional goals? What are the most important targets for future investment?

### Faculty and Staff

- Does the institution collect information on the faculty’s language capacity, international background, interests, and experiences? If so, where is this information available and how is it used? What is the faculty composition and experience? To what extent do faculty come from other countries, have extensive international experience, speak multiple languages, co-author with international colleagues, and take international sabbaticals?
- Does the institution gather information on the attitudes of faculty and staff toward international learning? If so, how is this information used?
- To what extent does the institution invite visiting faculty/scholars from abroad? To what extent and how does their presence contribute to institutional internationalization?
- Does the institution consider international experience in hiring faculty or in the promotion and tenure process?
- To what extent do faculty and staff perceive international learning as an important element of the educational process at the institution? What is the evidence?

### Students

- What is the composition of the student body? To what extent does it affect the institution’s internationalization strategy?
- Does the institution collect information on the international interests, experiences, and attitudes of students? If so, how is this information used?
- What are the enrollment trends of international students? How are
international students distributed among schools and colleges? Between undergraduate and graduate programs? How are international students integrated into campus life?
- What strategies are in place to help domestic students learn from international students?

**The Curriculum and Co-curriculum**

The Curriculum
- To what extent does the institution’s general education curriculum include international or global content, perspectives, and different ways of knowing? What is the evidence?
- To what extent do academic departments attempt to internationalize majors? To what extent do they promote or impede study abroad for students? What is the evidence? To what extent is study abroad integrated into the academic major, minor, and general education requirements?
- How rich are the opportunities for students to take courses with an international or global focus? What international majors, minors, concentrations, certificates, and courses are offered? What do enrollment patterns in these courses indicate about student interest over time?
- Does the institution have a language requirement (for some or for all students)? Why or why not? Is this requirement articulated in seat time or proficiency? What do enrollment patterns in language courses reveal? What qualitative data exist about language learning at this institution? What quantitative data?
- Has the institution gathered information about alumni use of language skills after graduation?
- To what extent does pedagogy take advantage of the differing perspectives that domestic and international students bring to the campus?
- To what extent does the curriculum integrate U.S. multicultural issues with international/global perspectives and issues?

Co-curriculum and Campus Life
- How is internationalization manifested in the co-curriculum (e.g., international events, festivals, lectures, films)? To what extent do students, faculty, and staff attend these events? To what extent does the campus host international scholars, performers, and lecturers?
- What opportunities exist in the local environment to enhance internationalization efforts? To what extent has this institution taken advantage of them? To what extent are the co-curricular activities open to and attended by members of the local community?
- To what extent does the co-curriculum seek to integrate U.S. multicultural issues and international perspectives and issues?
**Education Abroad**

- What opportunities exist for education abroad (study abroad, internships, field work, research, service learning)?
- What are the trends for student participation in these programs during the past five to 10 years? How many students participate? What are their destinations? How much time do they spend abroad—two weeks? A summer? A semester? A year?
- What is the distribution of students who engage in education abroad by gender and race/ethnicity?
- What is the distribution of students by discipline?
- How are students financing their education abroad? Is financial aid portable? Can students tap into additional sources of aid?
- How are students prepared for education abroad experiences—a pre-departure orientation? A specific orientation course?
- To what extent does the institution integrate students into the host country? To what extent are students in “island” programs?
- What issues, if any, surround the recognition of credit for study abroad?
- What effect do education abroad students have on the home campus upon their return? Upon residence life? Upon curriculum content and classroom practice? To what extent is education abroad integrated with the curriculum on campus?

**Engagement with Institutions Abroad**

- Does the institution have an overall strategy for international partnerships? If so, what does it address? How well is it working?
- Does the institution regularly evaluate its partnerships? If so, what criteria are used? What have recent evaluations revealed? What actions have been taken as a result?
- Does the institution have an inventory of partnerships throughout the institution? In what form? To whom is it available? How is it used?
- Does the institution have criteria for deciding whether to pursue potential partnerships? How well do they work?
- To what extent does the institution engage in student, faculty, and staff exchange? Do the institution’s study-abroad programs facilitate such exchanges?
- To what extent do faculty members engage in collaborative research and development cooperation with faculty at institutions in other countries?
- What effect do partnerships have on student international learning on campus?
- How does the institution fund its partnerships? How sustainable are the existing partnerships?
Analysis and Recommendations

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the institution’s current efforts to internationalize? What opportunities exist for deepening internationalization? What are the threats to future progress?
- What are the implications of the review process for the institution’s strategic priorities for the next year? For the next three to five years?
- To what extent does synergy exist among the various international activities and programs on campus? What communication channels exist, and how well are they working?
- What are the most important targets for future collaboration and connection among international programs/activities on campus?

Updated from Green, M., & Olson, C. (2003). Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide, pp. 91–94.
Appendix D
Deans’ Interviews Summary

Leigh Neys and Denny Falk interviewed each of the five UMD deans during December, 2012. Three deans elected to have other persons participate in the interview; two included an associate dean and one included an associate dean and faculty members. The topics addressed were parallel to the broader internationalization review. A summary of these five interviews appears below.

Articulated Commitment: Mission, Goals, and Vision

- Global/international learning is articulated as part of each school/college’s vision, mission, and/or strategic plan.
- Different deans report internationalization as more or less central to college’s priorities, ranging from being identified as a core component of curriculum and research of faculty to emphasis as diffuse or included in a wide spectrum of other priorities.

Strategy

- All deans report that faculty and staff in their school/college have significant international activity, but that the unit does not have an internationalization strategy. Some deans report that internationalization is part of a plan.
- None of the schools/colleges systematically assess their progress in achieving internationalization goals.

The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization

- Varied local, state, and broader environments for internationalization were identified. Sister cities were identified by three schools/colleges.
- International communities, particularly in the Twin Cities, were mentioned as possible connections that have not been realized.
- The Port Authority and shipping companies were identified, but specific connections were not mentioned.
- LSBE identified international companies such as Ikonics, the Moline Company, 3M, and General Mills, which can provide speakers and grant funding.
• Other possible connections in the environment include H2O group in Duluth, German-American partnerships, consulates in the region, and the Minnesota International Center.
• Most deans identified opportunities for greater connections with these environments.

Structures, Policies and Practice, Resources

Organizational Structure and Personnel
• Deans have very different perceptions on where the primary responsibility for internationalization lies within the colleges/schools. One dean thought this responsibility should lie with the International Education Office; some saw deans initiating and/or supporting; and others saw the primary responsibility resting with the Department Heads and faculty.
• Most deans report no specific staffing arrangements for internationalization.
• Different groups were involved in governance around internationalization, but processes were often not specific or actively followed.
• Organizational structures, staffing, and governance were generally not clearly specified.

Policies and Practices
• Faculty engagement in internationalization is promoted by 1) hiring international faculty, 2) participating in Internationalizing Teaching and Learning cohort, 3) support from McKnight funds, 4) having international travel as part of routine activity, 4) communication through administrative committee meetings and monthly faculty and staff readings that have international content, and 5) “re-broadcasting” international announcements to all or selected faculty members.
• No deans report any penalty for faculty for international activities and internationalization of their courses
• Deans report hiring the best people for teaching and learning activities; in two schools, over one-third of their faculty members are international.
• Only one school reported that international activities are specifically valued in 7.12 statements; one school reported that research was to be of international quality for promotion.
• Barriers to faculty engagement include 1) money, 2) content-driven curriculum, 3) higher teaching loads, 4) research expectations, and 5) lack of campus support.
• Other barriers include 1) money for student travel, 2) no place for international visitors to stay, 3) not being aware of campus and system structures, 4) obtaining visas, 5) no support for return visitors after UMD faculty visit abroad, 6) no infrastructure for international activities, and 7) lack of second language.
Resources

- Financial resources provided by schools/colleges are often not specifically for internationalization, but fund international activities such as faculty travel. These funds include 1) Dean’s Excellence grants, 2) Gonska Endowment for the Arts funds, 3) FLL Scholarships, and 4) McKnight Endowed Chair funds.
- CLA specifically supports international presentations through the Alworth Center.
- Two deans specifically mentioned the Global Policy and Strategy Alliance as a source of funds.
- SFA has supported international curriculum development and faculty travel for two years with faculty and staff development grants.
- International student activities have limited support, but some scholarships are provided from IEO and the Alworth Institute and for student study in Poland (SCSE).
- UMD library holdings were mentioned as excellent for internationalization by two deans.
- Co-curricular activities are supported by 1) the International Education Office, 2) the Alworth Institute (CLA), 3) using courses on books for international travel (SFA), and 4) American Indian Endowed Chair (CEHSP).

Faculty and Staff

- Some of the schools/colleges invite visiting faculty/scholars from abroad. SCSE reports having 10-15 presentations per year, with many occurring because of international contacts in Mathematics and Chemistry. LSBE annually invites doctoral students from China and has had visitors for a semester from Norway, Sweden, and Korea based on faculty contacts. Other colleges have visitors as facilitated by faculty.
- Extended visits in particular contribute to internationalization on campus.
- One dean commented that UMD does not have a Fulbright culture.

The Curriculum and Co-curriculum

The Curriculum

- Many CLA programs have inherent international content, but further integration is not comprehensive.
- The content-driven curriculum impedes long-term study abroad for SCSE students, but short-term study is possible.
- A number of departments in other schools/colleges have curricula that allow longer-term study abroad opportunities, and some departments promote study abroad.
• SFA faculty access work from across the globe (e.g., plays, music, art works).
• LSBE had a Department of Education grant to internationalize the curriculum several years ago; each program requires an upper division course with international focus.
• International content is integrated in some departments in CEHSP.
• The curriculum integrates U.S. multicultural issues with international/global perspectives and issues in selected departments; it is more difficult to achieve in other departments.

Co-curriculum and Campus Life

• Internationalization is manifested in the co-curriculum of the schools/colleges. International events, festivals, lectures, and films are all present in CLA and SFA. Departments and graduate students initiate events in other units.
• Faculty, student, and staff participation in co-curricular activities varies. Sometimes faculty model or require participation. LSBE requires student participation in international co-curricular activities through completing international “passport” activities.
• The co-curriculum integrates U.S. multicultural issues with international/global perspectives and issues to a varied but limited degree. CEHSP’s Indigenous Ed.D. program is an example.
• One dean suggested that UMD should have a multicultural housing experience and an international dorm.

Education Abroad

• Opportunities for education abroad differ by school/college (study abroad, internships, field work, research, service learning).
• CEHSP has international student teaching in Ireland, Slovenia, and Belize; it hosts short-term programs such as Ewha University students; outdoor education has opportunities in Finland; all departments have an option for education abroad in the curriculum, often for internships.
• LSBE has short-term opportunities for students to study abroad; internship opportunities exist globally within individual programs, often for credit, but work permits can be an issue.
• CLA reports multiple study abroad, research and field opportunities; internships are difficult because of work visa issues; short-term possibilities exist at department level; passion has to be at local site.
• SCSE emphasizes that faculty research opportunities exist and are pursued; short-term opportunities exist for students; content-driven curriculum often precludes longer term study abroad opportunities.
• SFA has study abroad and exchange programs in Lyon (Music) and Worcester (Art and Theatre); faculty members are involved in field work and research; opportunities for study abroad exist in the B.A. programs.

**Engagement with Schools/Colleges Abroad**

• None of the schools/colleges report having an overall strategy for international partnerships.
• LSBE has criteria that partnerships be with high quality institutions that are accredited; SCSE seeks partnerships that benefit the college; and SFA has parameters that the partnerships be mutually beneficial and a “good fit.”
• SCSE has signed partnerships with many institutions, including in Kazakhstan, Korea, Poland, and Ghana.
• LSBE has partnership with institutions in China.
• SFA has a number of signed partnerships, including in France, England, South America, and China.
• CEHSP works with IEO to develop partnerships, and CLA relies on departments to take the lead in developing partnerships.
• Schools and Colleges with partnerships have a file with signed agreements in the Dean’s office.
• None of the colleges/schools have a formal process for evaluating their partnerships.
• Faculty members in some schools/colleges engage in research with their counterparts in partner institutions.
• Partnerships have indirect effects on student international/intercultural learning on campus through UMD students and faculty returning to campus and sharing experiences after international activity and through international students and faculty interacting with UMD counterparts.
• Funding for partnerships is limited, often relying on recurring soft money. Some external grant funds are available.

**Analysis and Recommendations**

**Strengths**

• Many strengths exist with regard to school's/college’s current efforts to internationalize, and these strengths differ between units.
Several units report that faculty are interested and invested in internationalization.
International faculty are identified as key resources, and two schools/colleges report about one-third of their faculty have international backgrounds.
SCSE has strong international research activities, with research on seven continents.
LSBE reports cultural acceptance of internationalization within the school, especially in business and economics.
CEHSP reports numerous study abroad experiences and diversity of faculty and experiences.
CLA reports strong faculty-driven initiatives and student study abroad activities.
SFA has practice-based curriculum with students interested in studying abroad.

Weaknesses
- Weaknesses of the school/college’s current efforts to internationalize focus around limited time and limited funding.
- Heavy teaching and research expectations leave less time for program development.
- Funding for program development and student study abroad is lacking.
- Lack of mission and coordination related to internationalization is frequently cited.
- Directed international student recruitment is a limitation.
- Current international activities lack visibility.

Opportunities
- Numerous opportunities for deepening internationalization exist; faculty have connections and interest but not the financial support and time to develop them.
- Lots of institutions around the world would love to have relationships with universities in the United States.
- International student recruiting could be expanded to other regions (e.g., South America, Canada).
- Recruiting efforts to other areas of study (e.g., science education, liberal arts) could be expanded.
- Specific opportunities include developing technology for international collaboration, international UROPs, and having students more deliberatively engaged in internationalization.

Challenges
- Major challenges to future progress continue to include funding, staffing, and time.
• A “threat” is that if we cannot fix our facilities and increase funding for faculty, talented people, with international potential, will leave UMD.
• Language barriers and potential de-emphasis on language education can limit options.
• Emphasis on STEM fields could weaken other areas of study.
• Coordinating/integrating internationalization and U.S. diversity emphasis could be challenging.
• UMD needs focused, transparent leadership for internationalization to succeed.
Appendix E
Faculty Focus Group and Survey Summary

UMD faculty members participated in departmental focus groups related to internationalization issues. A member of the Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT), along with a departmental representative, facilitated the focus group discussion during a department meeting. The results are reported below:

Strengths
Faculty have significant international experiences including traveling/presenting at international conferences, participating in a myriad of scholarly activities and collaborations with international individuals or institutions, as well as hosting international guests. The curriculum at UMD builds upon local resources as a source of intercultural learning (e.g. connections to indigenous populations in Twin Cities, immigrant populations, and local tribes). In addition, many fields of study at UMD are inherently international – both in terminology and shared language, the historical modes of thinking within fields of study, and common international requirements and/or standards. Faculty are pleased with the intercultural and international programming (speakers, performers, etc.) offered at UMD for faculty, staff, students and community. Faculty also indicated satisfaction that UMD provides a structure (IEO) for students to experience varied study abroad opportunities.

Weaknesses
International curriculum is missing in many departments. In particular, there is a lack of understanding of the importance of international curriculum and thus there are some self-imposed roadblocks. Some majors have a lock/step nature to their programs and thus students do not (and faculty as well) want to add or change parts of the curriculum. There is also an issue with the transferability of credits from international universities. Some departments are more flexible than others in accepting credits from institutions abroad. This affects both international students and our students that travel abroad. Faculty were concerned that the large number of UMD students who do not study abroad still have the opportunity for an international/intercultural education and encouraged strengthening “study abroad at home” programming.
Many comments from faculty referred to international students. There was considerable
discussion about the lack of resources (physical and financial) for internationalization activities
and support and the need for a coordinated effort among departments and administration to
recruit international students. There is a shortage of staff to deal with incoming international
students. With the goal to increase the number of international students by 300% (both
undergraduate and graduate) over the next four years, the number of international students,
we need to increase staff. Graduate students specifically need a lot of assistance finding and
setting up housing. Presently there are 11 tuition waivers for international students and only
one scholarship.

There is a lack of support for faculty exchanges, especially for visiting faculty. Faculty and staff
need both travel grants and release time to develop relationships with international colleagues.

**Opportunities**

Faculty suggested current international/intercultural programming was plentiful and diverse
and, as such, UMD is already positioned to build more meaningful programming which would
build global awareness. UMD has plentiful examples of faculty members within majors/minors
and programs who could provide expertise in areas such as campus-wide training on the
definition, and goals, of “nation”; sharing of resources internationalizing the curriculum;
successful study abroad program design; and leadership training in internationalizing the
campus.

Faculty recognized that UMD has begun to provide intercultural development training for
faculty, staff and administrators. This momentum will be foundational in creating a shift in how
the UMD community interact with one another, understand ourselves, and create a welcoming
culture for diverse students, faculty and staff.

A focus on UMD’s development efforts to establish scholarships for study abroad could
alleviate the financial barrier to participation. For many students with high credit load majors,
study abroad may add additional semesters to their graduation. This could be also be alleviated
by easier transfer of classes and by more flexibility in programs. Increased understanding of
international structures and policies could enhance this opportunity.

A major concern from many faculty members was the perceived lack of adequate language
proficiency among international students. Having an on-site ESL program could help increase
English language proficiency and academic success of international students.
Faculty mentioned that UMD has a foundation of supporting visiting scholars. This could be enhanced by inviting more scholars to campus and include a residency arrangement, paid for by the university (such as Bluestone Lofts). Faculty encouraged the creation of protocols for hosting international guests.

**Challenges**

Faculty from many of the departments talked about the reward system in our university. Faculty are not willing to put in the time-consuming effort of leading study abroad programs or have large numbers of visiting students/scholars in their departments without some recognition. This is especially true for non-tenured faculty. The administration need to put in place a policy within each of our colleges systems to deal with this. Right now faculty/staff are encouraged to internationalize, however, it doesn’t show up in merit pay or promotion and tenure.

Many faculty commented that the cost of study abroad is high for most students compared to their UMD education. There is a need to develop more scholarship and financial aid opportunities for students who want to study abroad.

Several departments commented on the fact that UMD doesn’t rank very high and thus doesn’t attract many good international students. It is generally not known outside of the Midwest of the US. Faculty mentioned the geographic location and climate of the Duluth area and how these factors may not appeal to a large number of students from warmer climates. Faculty suggested enhancing marketing efforts to promote Duluth as an international destination. A number of departments were concerned about the English language skills of international students and that UMD has lowered the language requirement for acceptance. This creates difficulties for both faculty and students in preparing students for U.S. college-level courses.

**Recommendations**

- More centralized-campus wide focus for internationalization
- Faculty indicated the need for improved communication throughout campus on international activities and opportunities including: Programming, faculty training, and study abroad options for students, faculty exchange opportunities, financial support resources and community initiatives/programs.
- Prioritize diversity/ intercultural/ internationalization programming and possibilities of creating a co-curricular graduation requirement that involves intercultural/international awareness and education.
• Promotion of intercultural/ international foci as a way to recruit more diverse student and faculty body
• Emphasize the quality of the programming/ opportunities rather than the number of people who participate
• More funding for the construction of meaningful programming
• More collaboration between departments/ programs on campus
• Take advantage of new technologies to “bring” people to UMD and build meaningful relationships
• Build off sister-city relationships
• Value intercultural/ international initiatives in tenure and merit pay
• Host conferences at UMD; especially ones that promote interdisciplinary collaboration on campus
Faculty Survey for Internationalization Review

The UMD Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT) is collecting information that will document our current campus status as we prepare to develop goals and a systematic plan for more fully internationalizing UMD. The ILT appreciates you taking a few minutes to respond to the following questions. The information you provide will be aggregated and not identifiable as coming from you.

1. Related to international experiences:
   - Have you ever studied abroad? Yes___ No____
   - Have you had internship experiences abroad? Yes___ No____
   - Have you participated in service activities abroad? Yes___ No____
   - Were you born abroad? Yes___ No____
   - Are you a first generation resident of the United States? Yes___ No____
   - Have you lived abroad for two or more years? Yes___ No____
   - Do you have a current passport? Yes___ No____

2. Have you had teaching experience outside the U.S.?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes (If yes, please describe below):  

3. Have you collaborated with colleagues at institutions in other countries related to course development/instruction?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes (If yes, please describe below):  

4. Have you collaborated with colleagues in other countries on scholarship or creative activities?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes (If yes, please describe below):  

5. Is the subject matter of your scholarship or creative activity international?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes (If yes, please describe below):  

6. Do you currently have established relationships with any institutions in other countries?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes (If yes, please describe your established relationship below):  

v
7. What is your native language? ____________________________

8. What is your level of proficiency in languages other than English? (Please indicate below whether your proficiency is basic, intermediate, or fluent in languages other than English):

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

Language:
   Basic____  Intermediate_____  Fluent______

9. While at UMD, I have: (please check all that apply.)
   ____ revised an existing course to have a significant international/intercultural component
   ____ proposed a new course that has a significant international/intercultural component
   ____ taught a course that was/is a part of the International Studies major
   ____ taught a course that fulfills the current Lib Ed Global Perspectives Requirement
   ____ taught a course that fulfilled the former Lib Ed International Perspectives Requirement
   ____ travelled with UMD students outside of the U.S.
   ____ attended a conference/ seminar/ exhibited in my discipline outside the U.S.
   ____ conducted research/ performed/ produced a show in my discipline outside the U.S.
   ____ received funding from within the University of Minnesota to enhance international experiences
   ____ received funding from outside the University of Minnesota to enhance international experiences
   ____ attended at least one lecture with an international focus
   ____ attended at least one cultural event with an international focus
   ____ participated in other international activities (please explain below):
10. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. 
1=Strongly disagree  2=Disagree  3= Undecided  4=Agree  5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. International learning is an important element of the educational process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students can understand their own culture more fully if they learn about another culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Study abroad programs are the best way for students to encounter another culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Contact with individuals whose background differs from one’s own is essential for student success.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Understanding of international/ intercultural issues is important for work force success.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. International/ intercultural education helps prepare students to be responsible global citizens.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. International students enrich the UMD campus.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I enjoy having students whose first language is not English in my class.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What would you like to know about the internationalization process at UMD?

12. Please offer below any additional thoughts you have about internationalizing the UMD campus:

Thanks for taking the time to complete this survey! Please contact Leigh Neys at lneys@d.umn.edu if you have any additional questions or comments on the internationalization process at UMD.
Appendix F
Staff Focus Group and Survey Summary

UMD staff members were invited to participate in focus group meetings related to campus internationalization. Members of the Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT) moderated small group discussions (see focus group questions in attachment B). Twenty-two staff members participated in the focus groups. The results are reported below.

Strengths
A majority of staff members asserted that UMD has globally recognized faculty that are engaged and committed to international initiatives. Staff thought there was strong regional community support for international programs and students. There was widespread agreement that curricular and co-curricular programs have strong international components. Finally, staff indicated there was strong support for international students and study abroad.

Weaknesses
Staff stated the lack of a coordinated effort to address dining and housing issues for international students and scholars as a prime weakness. Staff acknowledged the impressive international achievements of UMD staff and faculty but felt that there was limited awareness and recognition for those accomplishments. Finally, all staff cited the limited resources available to further internationalize the campus, in particular for staffing and professional development.

Opportunities
Staff encouraged the utilization of available technology to enhance internationalization. Several staff suggested the expansion of current study abroad programming to diversify geographic destination and increase participation from underrepresented populations. Staff cited the need for professional development training for faculty and staff on working with international populations.

Challenges
A major challenge noted by staff was the continuing struggle to keep the campus community engaged in creating an inclusive climate for all. A comment was raised about the attitude that internationalization is glamorous; diversity/inter-cultural is threatening. Related to this comment, staff urged the ILT to remain committed to the intercultural component of our
internationalization definition. Staff also mentioned the need to secure additional financial resources to sustain and expand internationalization. In relation to study abroad, several staff members mentioned the need to address ways to internationalize at home, because all students will not be able to study abroad. Staff discussed the need to coordinate services for international constituencies to eliminate redundancy, engage stakeholders and improve communication.
UMD Internationalization Staff Survey

Q9 On behalf of the UMD Internationalization Committee, thank you for taking the time to complete the survey on the international experiences of staff. The information is vital to our goals of internationalizing UMD and it should take only 5-10 minutes of your time. This survey simply asks for your opinions and there are no right or wrong answers that we are looking for. Please be completely honest. Your answers are anonymous and will in no way affect your relationship with the University.

Q1 Related to international experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 Related to international experiences</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were you born outside the U.S.? (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a first generation resident of the United States? (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you lived outside the U.S. for two or more years? (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a current passport? (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you traveled outside the U.S. in the last five years? (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 What is your native language?
Q3 What is your level of proficiency in languages other than English? (Please indicate below whether your proficiency is basic, intermediate or fluent in languages other than English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Basic (1)</th>
<th>Intermediate (2)</th>
<th>Fluent (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language 1</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language 2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language 3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language 4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language 5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q4 Professional International Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you attended conferences or other professional events outside the U.S.? (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have professional contacts with colleagues outside the U.S.? (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you engaged in international research or projects? (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you attended international events on the UMD campus? (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 General attitudes about internationalization at UMD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My work requires interaction with and support for international students (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work requires interaction with and support for international faculty (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with individuals whose background is different from my own is essential for my work success (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of international/intercultural issues is important for my work success (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of international students and faculty on our campus enriches the learning experience for American students (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable addressing the needs of students whose first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel comfortable addressing the needs of faculty whose first language is not English.

Q6 What types of international/intercultural opportunities (i.e., trainings, events) would you be interested in participating in?

Q7 What would you like to know about the internationalization process at UMD?

Q8 Please offer below any additional thoughts you have about internationalizing the UMD campus:
Appendix G
Student Feedback Summary

The student feedback summarized below is a compilation of two sources of information. First, 30 international students completed a reflective assignment in one section of the UMD Seminar course in spring 2013. The assignment asked students what advice they would give to incoming international students. Comments from these assignments are integrated into the summary. Second, feedback from focus groups of underrepresented student groups on campus was conducted in October 2010. The focus groups were comprised of African American, Asian/Pacific, Latino/Chicano, American Indian, and International undergraduate and graduate students. The full copy of the focus group report can be found in Appendix X. Feedback from two sources of information is integrated into the summary below:

Strengths
Students liked the small campus feel which enabled them to make strong connections with professors. They appreciated the Multicultural Center location as a gathering point for students of their own and other underrepresented cultures. In addition, students thought there was sufficient intercultural programming on campus. Students noted the efforts of campus administrators to put focus and efforts into creating an atmosphere where diversity was discussed and respected.

Weaknesses
The most common response from students was their dislike of the weather in Duluth, pertaining to the snow and cold. Students also noted the lack of cooking facilities in some of the UMD housing options and the challenge having to eat in the campus dining center. Students wanted more options to have food from their own culture. Many students felt discriminated based on their country of origin. In addition, students cited the lack of ethnic diversity on campus as a weakness.

Opportunities
Students suggested they should have the option to live in apartments or off-campus which allows students to cook their own food (this comment only relates to first-year students who are required to live on campus). Another suggestion was to expand orientation for international students to include more about American life. In conjunction with this orientation, U.S. students could do something similar about international/intercultural
students. There was strong support to expand exposure and programming of the Multicultural Center. Students believed that the Multicultural Center should be a gathering point for all students at UMD. Some students mentioned trainings for teachers on different learning styles for international students. Finally, students strongly agreed about the need to expand access or design of Intercultural Communication course so more students can take advantage of the opportunities in that class. Students want the opportunity to talk about uncomfortable topics such as stereotypes.

Challenges

The major challenge cited by students was about language barriers. Although many students successfully achieve the qualifying TOEFL score, they still struggle with English in their courses, particularly in technical classes. Other comments related to the assumption of racial preference and lower standards for people of color. Overwhelmingly, these students had strong feelings of isolation from other UMD and felt pressure to accommodate and confirm to the dominate culture. Many students felt oppressed by a sense of “white privilege” or a sense of entitlement on the part of white students and faculty. Finally, many students cited the lack of acceptance and safety in the community.