Improving and Assessing Global Learning

Technical Report · January 2013

3 authors:

Hilary Landorf
Florida International University
22 PUBLICATIONS **216** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Stephanie Doscher
Florida International University
9 PUBLICATIONS **113** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Madeleine Green
Teagle Foundation
39 PUBLICATIONS **512** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project   Dissertation View project

Improving and Assessing Global Learning

BY MADELEINE F. GREEN

With Case Studies by:

Jenifer Cushman, Juniata College
Jonathan Gordon, Georgia Institute of Technology
Hilary Landorf and Stephanie Doscher, Florida International University

NAFSA

Association of International Educators

About the Author

Madeleine F. Green is a senior fellow at NAFSA: Association of International Educators and at the International Association of Universities (IAU); she also serves as senior program consultant at the Teagle Foundation. Until 2010, she served as vice president for International Initiatives at the American Council on Education (ACE). She was awarded 2010 Charles Klasek Award by the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) for outstanding service to the field of international education administration. She has served as interim president of Mount Vernon College and as a member of the governing boards for Juniata College, Sweetbriar College, and Wilson College, as well as for national and international organizations. Green is the author of numerous publications on issues in higher education policy, leadership and management, and internationalization. She holds a PhD from Columbia University and a BA from Harvard University, both in French literature.

About NAFSA

NAFSA is an association of individuals worldwide advancing international education and exchange and global workforce development. NAFSA serves international educators and their institutions and organizations by establishing principles of good practice, providing training and professional development opportunities, providing networking opportunities, and advocating for international education. For more information about NAFSA, visit www.nafsa.org

Notice of Liability

Acceptable Use Guidelines

NAFSA

**Association of
International Educators**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IMPROVING AND ASSESSING GLOBAL LEARNING

BY MADELEINE F. GREEN

Measuring Impact

Most discussions of internationalization center on what institutions *do,* such as what education abroad programs they offer, how they attract and educate international students, and what elements of the curriculum have an international or global focus. Institutions that are serious about internationalization often include specific goals in their strategic plans and measure their progress accordingly, most often in quantitative terms. Thus, typical measures of internationalization are numbers of international agreements or research projects, numbers of students going abroad, numbers of international students, number or percentage of course offerings that have a global or international focus, or student enrollments in such courses or majors. Measuring institutional performance is frequently linked to accountability for boards, legislatures, and accreditors.

Measuring institutional activities—whether they are *inputs* (e.g. the number of courses with an international or global focus) or *outputs* (e.g. number and proportion of students enrolled in courses with an international/ global focus)—only tells a part of the story. The most important question is the "so what?" question: What is the impact of these activities on the quality of learning, research, or outreach? Of central importance is the impact on students. How much, and what kind of learning does a particular course, program, or experience produce? The existence of a given set of institutional activities, and/or participation rates in various courses or programs, does not truly tell institutions what students are learning. For example, an institution may see rising study abroad participation, but that increase may or may not relate to the program's quality or its impact on students. Similarly, the creation of new internationally focused courses or programs does not ensure that students will acquire global competencies by taking them.

This publication focuses on institutional efforts to improve and assess student global learning. It is a companion publication to *Measuring and Assessing Inter-nationalization*, which considers both measurements of institutional performance in internationalization, and student learning assessments. With respect to learning assessment, the earlier publication covered the following topics: rationales for assessment; developing an assessment process; crafting learning outcomes; designing a process to develop learning outcomes; selecting assessment methods; developing rubrics; and using assessment for program improvement.[1]

The section, "An Overview of the Process for Assessing and Improving Global Learning," on page 6 of this publication, briefly summarizes the key points of the companion piece to provide a quick review for the reader, as well as a conceptual framework for the ensuing descriptions and analysis. This publication deepens that approach by looking in detail at initiatives undertaken by three quite different institutions: Florida International University (FIU), Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech), and Juniata College. It looks across the institutions to compare their approaches, and extracts lessons learned. Additionally, key individuals from each of the institutions have authored case studies which provide an institutional narrative.

These three institutions were selected because they were nationally recognized for excellence in internationalization and assessment. Juniata was recognized by NAFSA in 2012 with its Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization; Georgia Tech received the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) award for assessment in 2012; and Florida International University has been nationally visible for its new Global Learning for Global Citizenship initiative, featured in publications by various associations and *Inside Higher Ed.* Additionally, they represent different missions and institutional types: Georgia Tech is a medium-sized public research university focused on engineering; Florida International University is a large urban public research university; and Juniata College is a small private liberal arts college in Pennsylvania.

The Heart of the Matter: Improving Learning

Higher education's intense focus on improving learning is not new, dating back at least 25 years. In 1990, Ernest Boyer's seminal publication *Scholarship Reconsidered* expanded the definition of research to include scholarship that tied theory to practice, the application of research, and inquiry about teaching.[2] Five years later, Robert Barr and John Tagg offered compelling language to describe a shift from an *instruction paradigm* to a *learning paradigm.*

> A paradigm shift is taking hold in American higher education. In its briefest form, the paradigm that has governed our colleges is this: A college is an institution that exists to provide instruction. Subtly but profoundly we are shifting to a new paradigm: that of a college as an institution that exists to produce learning. This shift changes everything.[3]

The national and institutional dialogue on improving learning has advanced considerably over the past two decades. Nearly every institution has an office that provides support to faculty to help them be more effective teachers. Some doctoral programs now include courses or workshops that acknowledge that future teachers require preparation for the classroom. Every institution takes teaching excellence into account to some extent in promotion and tenure decision. Even research universities, where research is still the coin of the realm in career advancement, assign a higher value to teaching today than they did in the past. Pedagogy has changed considerably, and many faculty have diversified their teaching from straight lecture to "high impact practices"[4] such as freshman seminars, capstone courses, learning communities, collaborative assignments, writing-intensive courses, service and community-based learning, diversity/global learning, and internships.

Assessment of student learning has evolved in tandem with the focus on improving teaching and learning. Assessment sheds light on what works and what does not, and how this understanding can be used for improvement. As Catherine Palomba and Trudy Banta aptly put it: "Assessment enables educators to examine whether the curriculum makes sense in its entirety and whether students, as a result of all their experiences, have the knowledge, skills, and values that graduates should possess."[5]

At some institutions, teaching and learning is a topic of scholarly inquiry, giving faculty an opportunity to discuss current research and the literature on learning styles, metacognition, and disciplinary-based approaches to effective teaching, and apply this knowledge to their own classrooms. A vast literature on assessment of student learning has evolved, and international educators would do well to learn the basics.

It is important to note, however, that in spite of the progress made, there is evidence that that U.S. higher education is not producing graduates with high-level analytical skills, and that measuring learning is still in its early stages. The public and policymakers complain about the high cost relative to the value; employers are frequently dissatisfied with college graduates' skills. In their widely cited book *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses,* Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa report that students are graduating college "without measurable gains in general skills" (critical thinking, complex reasoning, and writing) as assessed by a standardized testing instrument, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA).[6]

Although regional and some specialized accreditors require institutions to set learning goals and show evidence that they are measuring them, progress on this front is slow at many campuses, and proceeding at very different speeds in different departments and schools. Professional schools lead the way. Many faculty are hard pressed to find time to do the extra work expected by assessment efforts, especially the time needed to develop the required expertise. Some faculty object to assessment for intellectual, rather than practical reasons, maintaining that they already do assessment when they grade exams and papers, and that a more formal, bureaucratic approach imposed by administrators and accreditors adds no value to the teaching and learning process. Thus, assessment that is not faculty owned and faculty driven is unlikely to succeed.

We begin exploring the journeys of our three profiled institutions by reviewing the basic steps in the process of assessing and improving student learning.

An Overview of the Process to Assess and Enhance Student Learning[7]

Improving student learning is an institutional commitment, requiring wide participation, time, and resources. Although individual faculty members and staff can be very intentional and effective in improving student learning within their particular courses or initiatives, it requires a concerted effort of many players to actually know the effectiveness of a program or activity (e.g. education abroad, general education, or the major), or judge outcomes beyond those of individual courses. The

first step is to assemble a group to lead the effort. The composition of the "right" group will vary by institution, and is usually some combination of faculty, staff, assessment experts, and institutional researchers, with broad representation across departments and units. The work of this group should be closely aligned with other campus assessment efforts.

The foundational work of this group is to identify student learning outcomes, called learning goals by some. Although it can be a time-consuming process, finding agreement on student learning outcomes is fundamental to assessment, as is crafting them so that they are measurable. The process of developing global learning outcomes represents an opportunity for a broad spectrum of faculty and staff to consider fundamental issues about what constitutes global learning and how it aligns with other academic goals.

The next step is often mapping the learning opportunities (e.g. courses, education abroad, co-curricular programs) that would enable students to acquire the desired skills and competencies. Such an exercise will illuminate whether there are actually sufficient opportunities for students to acquire a particular skill or competency, such as developing the ability to work in multicultural teams. The map will also guide which learning opportunities will be used as sites for assessment. For example, if developing an awareness of cultural differences is a learning goal, the group may choose to start by selecting education abroad for assessment of student achievement of that goal. If a number of courses already exist that are likely to address the desired learning outcome, the process may look somewhat different. [8]

Then, the group will decide what data to gather and/or what tools to use to assess student learning. Here, there are many choices. Some measures are *direct,* that is, they measure student mastery of desired skills and competencies. Examples include student work such as tests, portfolios, papers, or projects. Or, measures may be *indirect,* capturing student opinions or perceptions, judgments of others on students' abilities, or information about students' choices. Examples include surveys, interviews, focus groups, self-assessments, and job placement data. Well-known instruments that are indirect measures of global student learning are the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) used by Georgia Tech, and the Global Perception Inventory (GPI), used by Florida International University. Indirect measures are easier to implement, but are less informative than direct measures. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) oral proficiency test, used

by Georgia Tech, is a direct measure. Juniata uses a test developed by three associations to investigate impact of study abroad. This test combines direct and indirect measures. (For a brief description of these instruments, please see the text box on page 15.) Assessment experts agree on the importance of using multiple measures to assess any given outcome, so as to provide a richer picture of the learning and to triangulate the results provided by the different tools.

Data gathered from the various assessments are sometimes entered into a database, or created in one. Analyzing the data gathered from these various measures requires focusing on a few specific questions in order to avoid being overwhelmed by the possibilities of querying the data for too many things all at once. The most important step in this continuous process is disseminating the findings and discussing their meaning and implications for improving student learning. In this step especially, assessment becomes a form of intellectual inquiry, encompassing discussions of how students learn as well as effective teaching strategies. By putting the emphasis here, assessment becomes a means to the shared goal of ensuring that students learn.

The Importance of Institutional Context

As the diversity of these three global learning initiatives illustrates, every institution finds its own path. As Yves Berthelot, Georgia Tech associate provost for International Initiatives put it, "What we did works well for us"—but he would hesitate to suggest their way to others. Institutional size, control, and mission matter. A large proportion of Georgia Tech's graduates are engineers, so for them, internationalizing the major and professional practice was a top priority. FIU, meanwhile, wanted to ensure that all students were prepared as global citizens, and saw the dual route of achieving global learning through both general education and upper division courses as the surest way to reach all students. Scale and resources also matter. Georgia Tech's Office of Assessment is staffed by five people, and FIU's Office of Global Learning Initiatives has a staff of four. Juniata draws on the capacities of its institutional research officer and its assistant provost for assessment as well as a shoe-string Center for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Both FIU and Georgia Tech made major investments in their respective global initiatives: FIU allocated $4.11 million over seven years and Georgia Tech budgeted approximately $1 million for each year over the five-year life of the QEP, with much of the required ongoing funding absorbed into its regular budget. Juniata's steady progress shows that a

Three Institutional Approaches to Global Learning: A Snapshot

The three institutions profiled in this essay, Florida International University (FIU), the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech), and Juniata College are very different institutions. FIU is a large public research university located in Miami, and more than 80 percent of its 50,000 students are racial or ethnic minorities. Georgia Tech is a research-intensive university with a special focus on technology and engineering, with 21,000 students, including 7,000 graduate students. A liberal arts college of 1,600 students located in Central Pennsylvania, Juniata serves many first-generation college students. Each institution's approach to global learning is grounded in its mission and history and shaped by a combination of circumstance and culture.

Georgia Institute of Technology: The International Plan

Planning for Georgia Tech's International Plan (IP) began in 2003; it was formally launched in 2005. The reaccreditation process for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) included a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that had a special focus on internationalization, with the IP as the vehicle for a major new initiative to enhance internationalization at Georgia Tech. The IP is an option for students in nearly all undergraduate majors to integrate international knowledge and experiences into their studies. It includes the following components: demonstrated second language proficiency; coursework in international subjects (including one course each in international relations, global economics, and a course devoted to a specific country or region, as well as an integrative capstone course or experience); and work, research, or study abroad totaling 26 weeks. Important features of the program are (1) that each department chooses to opt into the IP program and customize its approach to the overall template, and (2) the IP emphasizes global competency within the context of the student's major. Professor Howard A. Rollins, one of the architects of the program, described it as "... not a new degree, a co-major, a minor, or a certificate program. Instead, it is a modification to each disciplinary degree in which a 'designator' has been added to the disciplinary degree."[9] The program is designed around four learning outcomes, and assessment is led by the Office of Assessment.

Florida International University: Global Learning for Global Citizenship

As was the case for Georgia Tech, global learning is the focus of FIU's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for their reaffirmation of accreditation by SACS. Although FIU is diverse and international by virtue of its location and its faculty and student body, it identified what they called "an internationalization gap"—"that diverse, global aspect wasn't actually being put to use for student learning."[10] Launched in 2010, "Global Learning for Global Citizenship" is a curricular and co-curricular initiative to "prepare all FIU graduates for citizenship in a highly interconnected world."[11] The global learning initiative is based on three global learning outcomes, and is centered around a requirement that all undergraduates take a minimum of two courses designated by a faculty senate committee as "global learning courses"—one foundation course as part of general education, and one discipline-specific course in the context of students' majors. Students are also required to participate in globally and internationally focused co-curricular activities.

The initiative began with a call for team-taught courses with a global focus, from which six were selected and expanded over time; now there are 33 courses available at the foundation level, and 94 in the disciplines. Faculty can choose to create or revise courses to gain the global designation, and they are well supported in a series of workshops that provide them with the tools for course design and assessment. Faculty development has been a key component of the global learning initiative, as have high-impact teaching strategies such as team-based learning. Student learning assessment is conducted by the Office of Global Learning Initiatives as well as individual faculty in their courses.

Juniata College: A Long-Standing Focus on Internationalization

Unlike Georgia Tech and FIU, Juniata College cannot point to a single global learning initiative with a clear beginning point. Rather, this liberal arts college has had a long-standing international focus; in this respect, it is like many other institutions, where internationalization has grown organically over time. Internationalization became a strategic priority in the 1993 institutional plan, and since then, it has been a prominent aspect of Juniata's mission and identity. In 2009, a strategic plan for inter-

nationalization ("The Global Engagement Initiative") was created to provide a larger vision for internationalization that would link the local and the global, establish priorities, and engender greater coherence and coordination among the many efforts across the campus.

Global learning takes many forms at Juniata. Its curricular focus includes a general education course requirement of two courses with "international" (I) designation and one with a "cultural analysis" (CA) designation. Additionally, students may design their own majors (called Programs of Emphasis or POEs,) facilitating the integration of an international and interdisciplinary dimension as well as study abroad. Many students engage in global learning through education abroad: 41 percent of 2012 graduates studied abroad. Campus diversity is enhanced by 10 percent international student enrollment; international students have U.S. room-mates. Co-curricular learning opportunities include a living-learning language and intercultural community, and the Language in Motion program (which enables Juniata students to share their language expertise with students at local schools.)

Assessment has evolved over time. In 2005, a faculty committee developed a list of " Desirable Intercultural Competencies," which were then mapped across the activities of the Center for International Education. Current work, led by a faculty committee called the Intercultural Learning Assessment Committee, centers on making these competencies measurable and assessing them in selected courses; assessment of study abroad learning outcomes is also underway. Assessment is faculty driven and faculty-led, supported by the Intercultural Learning Assessment Committee and the James J. Lakso Center for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL Center).

small tuition-dependent college with far fewer financial or human resources to devote to internationalization or assessment can still reap considerable benefits from small investments.

In spite of obvious differences, there also are important similarities among the three institutions' journeys. Each had a long-standing interest in internationalization; their initiatives did not spring from nowhere. In each case, an inclusive, faculty-driven process was key to success. For Juniata and FIU, faculty development is a central element; revising courses and rethinking assessment are made immeasurably easier and more intellectually interesting for faculty when they can engage in a learning community and benefit from peer learning. A closer look at the specific contexts for internationalization and assessment at each institution reveals important similarities in the elements of a propitious climate for enhancing and assessing internationalization.

The Context for Internationalization

All three institutions had an ongoing interest in internationalization and a robust set of global learning opportunities for students. However, over time, each realized that a mix of activities, no matter how plentiful, needed to be aligned with a focus on what students were learning.

Georgia Tech's international focus was evidenced by an already high rate of participation in study abroad and its founding of a campus in Metz, France in 1989. Now called Georgia Tech Lorraine, that campus began as a collaboration with selected French universities to offer dual master's degrees in electrical engineering; it has continually expanded its mission and offerings since its founding. Prior to launching the International Plan, approximately 34 percent of baccalaureate recipients reported having international experience, either study, work or research abroad[12]— admirable numbers for a public research university with a focus on technology and engineering. However, nearly four-fifths of the students going abroad were doing so in faculty-led, short-term programs, and some faculty were not convinced that these were producing the kind of global competence that longer-term immersion is likely to produce.[13] Thus, extended experiences abroad using the language of the host country became an important feature of the IP.

The second factor shaping Georgia Tech's thinking was the importance of integrating global learning into the major, with the goal of producing graduates with an understanding of how their discipline is practiced in another country. As a science and engineering-focused university, this was a significant goal; more than half the total graduates were in the College of Engineering. Prior to the IP, Georgia Tech students were offered a large menu of international options, but these were poorly integrated into the major, and "there was no general consensus across colleges and even among disciplines within a

college about what such a coherent and integrated program would look like."[14] Thus, for Georgia Tech, the design of the IP was strongly tied to integrating global learning into the major and future professional practice. Georgia Tech is certainly not alone in seeking to find common definitions and coherent strategies. The piecemeal approach, without agreed upon learning goals or agreement on what constitutes evidence of their accomplishment, is common across all types of institutions, and many with rich histories of internationalization are working to create greater coherence across the campus.

Finally, as an institution focused on technology and engineering, Georgia Tech took what some described as a problem-solving approach to the IP. As one Georgia Tech administrator put it, the attitude was "let's do it and change course if we have to."

At FIU, "international" is literally FIU's middle name, and greater international understanding was articulated as one of the founding purposes of the school, which opened its doors in 1972. "International" was one of five strategic themes for the 1996-2000 strategic plan, one of six in the subsequent 2000-2010 plan, and was reaffirmed in its current strategic plan, *Worlds Ahead, 2010-2015*.[15] Located in the international and diverse city of Miami (with the highest concentration of foreign-born residents in the United States—nearly 60 percent), important aspects of FIU were already internationalized. Faculty hailed from some 42 countries. Among the distinctive international programs was the School for International and Public Affairs, created in 2009 with eight departments and housing numerous existing areas studies programs and research institutes.

The gap FIU identified was global student learning. An analysis of 57 academic program evaluation reports noted that although all the programs used the term "international" to highlight curriculum, research, or program activities, only 17 had an internationalized learning outcome.[16] In a word, global learning was not an intentional part of the curriculum. As Provost Douglas Wartzok put it, "Being in Miami, you have an incredible mix of nationalities; you can just walk around campus and feel that you're at an international university. But we weren't sure that the feeling went any further than that, in that students were actually being academically engaged in understanding global issues."[17]

Juniata, too, had a long history of internationalization, beginning with curricular requirements in the 1970s, and gaining renewed momentum with its inclusion in the 1993 plan. Juniata has long considered internationalization as a signature aspect of the College, and their achievements were recognized in 2012 by NAFSA with its Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization. Forty-one percent of its 2012 graduates studied abroad, which is especially noteworthy since 35 percent of students major in the sciences, and a significant proportion of students are first-generation college students. Every major offers at least one study abroad program with one of Juniata's 41 partner institutions. As a small college, the challenge for Juniata was not to do more, but to align the various efforts around learning outcomes.

The institutions' success with internationalization does not mean that all were in favor. There were heated debates at Georgia Tech around the design of the IP. Some thought the language proficiency requirement was overkill. Some wanted an initiative that would reach all undergraduates, not just those who chose the IP and those in department that opted in. Others questioned the value added of education abroad for their particular discipline. At FIU, according to one individual involved from the outset, many were initially skeptical. Some thought the global learning initiative was too big an undertaking; others thought it should be ambitious and deep. Getting different groups on campus to talk to one another was challenging. But once the design was in place, positive attitudes prevailed and the focus was on good implementation.

The Context for Assessment

Assessing global learning needs to be grounded in the larger context of institutional assessment efforts and culture. Although it may be unrealistic to expect that most faculty will be enthusiastic about assessment, for some, engaging intellectually in the scholarship of teaching and learning can provide legitimacy for assessment and make it a form of inquiry rather than an exercise in compliance. Institutions that have done some of this groundwork and achieved acceptance by a critical group of faculty are well positioned to assess global learning. All three institutions profiled here had track records with assessment in which they could situate their assessment of global learning.

As profiled in the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) 2011 case study, Juniata's assessment efforts are centered at the faculty level.[18] It has a history of using both institution-wide and classroom assessments. On the institutional front, is has administered the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) every year since 2005 as part of the Council of Independent Colleges CLA consortium, using the results to improve student learning. It has administered the

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) every two to three years since 2000, and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey every year since 2000.

Central to program and course assessment is the faculty-led James J. Lakso Center for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL Center). Developed with a grant from the Teagle Foundation in 2008, its leadership rotates among faculty members. Interested faculty apply to be members of the three-person board and commit to three years of involvement, serving as director-designate in the first year (with one course release time during that year), director in the second year (with half-time release), and past director in the third (with one course release time in the final year). Board members are expected work on a project related to the scholarship of teaching and learning. The SoTL Center hosts faculty brown bags twice a month—supported by the College—around important readings or findings from faculty projects, and also provides summer grants and creates learning communities. Faculty participation has been enthusiastic. Of the 102 full-time faculty and 117 FTE faculty, approximately 25 percent attended every lunch and 69 percent attended at least one lunch in 2010-11.[19] Heartening to less-resourced colleges is that fact that the SoTL Center is run without permanent staffing, on an annual budget of $15,000 (excluding release time for the board members).

At FIU, the creation of the global learning outcomes at the time of the SACS re-affirmation coincided with an institution-wide rethinking of assessment. The assessment proposed and implemented for the global learning initiative followed existing procedures across the university for assessing learning outcomes. Furthermore, the global learning outcomes developed by FIU were intentionally aligned with statewide learning outcomes, known as the Academic Compact. Like all programs, the Office of Global Learning Initiatives submits a Program Outcome Assessment to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research at the beginning of the academic year. At the end of the year, the program submits a Program Outcomes Assessment Form. Using an existing assessment process serves to integrate the assessment of global learning into the ongoing processes of the university, minimizing both the perception and the reality of global learning as an "add-on."

Developing Learning Goals

Clear and measurable goals are the essential foundation for assessment. Achieving institutional consensus on goals may take a good bit of time even at a small college, requiring both sufficient breadth in their conceptualization to include various disciplines and programs and sufficient consultation in the process to maximize buy-in. Some institutions start with an existing list, such as ones published by the American Council on Education (ACE) or the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).[20] One technique is to use a ranking document to see where there is agreement on important outcomes.[21]

All three institutions cited here used an inclusive and consultative process to develop their student learning outcomes. Georgia Tech and FIU developed global learning goals specifically in relation to the QEP and the founding of their new initiatives. Juniata's approach is perhaps more typical—a wide variety of internationally and globally focused learning opportunities existed across campus, and the learning outcomes were developed as an overlay to bring greater alignment and coherence to existing courses and programs, as well as to facilitate assessment.

FIU began its planning process with the question "As global citizens, what should FIU graduates know and be able to do?" To answer this question, FIU engaged in an extensive process of consultations, lasting from fall 2008 to summer 2009. As noted in FIU's QEP report, the Office of Global Learning Initiatives was charged with leading the effort and consulted "faculty and student focus groups, faculty assemblies of the eleven colleges and schools that enroll undergraduates, the SGA, the Faculty Senate, Student Affairs directors, members of the President's Council and the FIU Foundation, the Board of Trustees, the QEP Development Team, the QEP Design Team, and the SACS Leadership Team."[22] The three global learning outcomes that now frame the global learning initiative were reduced from about a dozen. The result was three broad outcomes that are easily understood and applicable to a wide range of courses and co-curricular activities (see sidebar: *FIU Global Learning Outcomes*).

FIU Global Learning Outcomes

- **Global Awareness:** Knowledge of the interrelatedness of local, global, international, and intercultural issues, trends, and systems.
- **Global Perspective:** The ability to conduct a multi-perspective analysis of local, global, international, and intercultural problems.
- **Global Engagement:** Willingness to engage in local, global, international, and intercultural problem solving.

Georgia Tech's planning effort was led by a university-wide "International Plan Steering Committee," chaired by a faculty member who was also the director of International Education. It included representatives from each of the 12 interested academic units from all six colleges, as well as two administrators from the provost's office. The committee met once or twice a month for 18 months to develop the IP, which was approved by all appropriate faculty committees in 2005.

Georgia Tech Learning Outcomes

Second Language Proficiency
- Communicate in a second language.

Comparative Global Knowledge
- Demonstrate knowledge about their culture within a global and comparative context.
- Demonstrate knowledge of global issues, processes, trends, and systems.
- Demonstrate knowledge of at least one other culture, nation, or region, such as beliefs, values, perspectives, practices, and products.

Intercultural Assimilation and Sensitivity
- Readily use second language skills and/or knowledge of other cultures to extend their access to information, experiences, and understanding.
- Convey an appreciation for different cultures in terms of language, art, history, etc.
- Interact comfortably with persons in a different cultural environment and be able to seek out further international or intercultural opportunities.

Global Disciplinary Practice
- Use cultural frames of reference and alternate perspectives to think critically and solve problems within the discipline in the context of at least one other culture, nation, or region.
- Collaborate professionally with persons of different cultures and function effectively in multicultural work environments.

Juniata College developed its *Desirable Intercultural Competencies* in 2005 as part of the process of conducting a campus-wide review for participation in the American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Laboratory. Although they were used to map the activities of the Center for International Education, they were not used as a basis for assessment until their Intercultural Learning Assessment Committee restarted its work in 2011. In 2013, Juniata translated the Desirable Intercultural Competencies into a rubric (retitled "Desired Intercultural Competencies") with measurable outcomes that aligned with the more general knowledge, skills, and attitudes outlined in the earlier document.[23] To do this, Juniata produced a document that correlated each of the measurable outcomes to one or more of the earlier list of Desired Intercultural Competencies. After two semesters of meetings in which the rubrics were developed, followed by a faculty training workshop, faculty members teaching I- and CA-designated courses have self-identified to apply them in their courses.

Each institution framed its outcomes differently: Juniata starting with familiar framework of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, then translating them into measurable skills using Bloom's Taxonomy; Georgia Tech using a mix of specifics (i.e., language proficiency) with broader categories of knowledge and practice; and FIU with very capacious categories of awareness, perspectives, and engagement, also using Bloom's Taxonomy in the rubrics. Although there is a high degree of overlap, the three approaches are framed differently.

Engaging the Faculty

Regardless of size or mission, the cornerstones of any academic initiative are faculty leadership, participation, and buy-in. Global learning is no exception. Faculty involvement from the outset is crucial; they must be the central architect of any academic initiative. In this arena, there is high convergence among the three institutions.

FIU and Georgia Tech began their QEP processes with a wide call for proposals. At FIU, the call for proposals was issued by the SACS Leadership Team, established in 2007 by the president. The team consisted of a group of faculty and administrators who established a process for selecting the QEP topic. They issued a university-wide call for proposals, which were then discussed in open forums led by the SACS director and evaluated by the Joint Faculty Senate/Administrative Strategic Planning Committee. That committee made recommendations to the provost about the QEP topic. The three final proposals were widely vetted through a series of forums and focus groups, and the Office of Planning and Institutional Research conducted a study to determine the alignment of the proposed topics with FIU's teaching, research, and service missions.[24]

At Georgia Tech, a working group was formed to develop ideas for the QEP focus. It began with a retreat in 2003, where the group identified three potential areas; four more areas were added later. Throughout 2004, seven teams met to develop their ideas into proposals, which were in turn considered by a larger university body, called the Council for Institutional and Academic Program Review and Accreditation, and the coordinating group for the SACS reaccreditation, known as the Leadership Team.[25] The latter group selected three themes, which were merged into two: the International Plan was one, and "undergraduate research" the other. The 31-member IP planning committee, composed largely of faculty, asked each of the six deans to nominate representatives of interested departments. The 12 who volunteered were largely the point-persons for undergraduate education in their departments, and according to its chair, Professor Howard A. Rollins, they were charged with consultation with their departments and appropriate college committees. Additionally, the committee reported regularly to the provost. Approval of the program was undertaken by each department. The provost funded faculty travel for departments who were still skeptical to visit academic departments abroad that might receive Georgia Tech students. As one of the architects of the IP put it, "we weren't trying to force this on anyone." But once momentum was gathered, faculty and student interest created greater interest and greater demand.

Faculty engagement does not stop with the design process. New approaches require ongoing faculty and staff development and dialogue. At FIU, faculty and staff development was an integral part of the plan for the global learning initiative, and ongoing workshops still provide extensive support for faculty to develop syllabi, use active learning strategies, and engage in assessment. In the first phase of the FIU initiative, six team-taught courses were selected among a group of proposals as the first wave of new foundation courses to be taught. The 18 individuals were paid to attend a six-week course of brainstorming, training, and peer learning. As one faculty member in this workshop explained, "[This experience] gave me a mid-career tune-up … Once the courses got launched, there was some powerful teaching in the group." He observed that as the GL-designated courses spread into the disciplines and more faculty got involved, interest spread. The beauty of the initiative, he added, was that "no one had to do this; it was not a mandate." Faculty development continues at FIU as new faculty offer GL courses,

while experienced ones offer insight while continuing to learn from their peers.

At Georgia Tech, the IP is overseen by a faculty committee. Additionally, in 2011, a task force was created by the vice provost for International Initiatives to conduct a detailed evaluation of the IP. The taskforce was populated with faculty and staff with international education responsibilities, and closely examined enrollment patterns and assessment data regarding the learning outcomes of IP students. The taskforce recommended several modifications to the IP that were subsequently approved by the larger International Plan Committee (IPC).

With fewer faculty and administration to get the work done, faculty participation (with the oft-cited danger of faculty burnout) is a hallmark of liberal arts colleges, and Juniata is no exception. Over the years, internationalization as well as assessment efforts have been faculty-driven. As noted, leadership for the James J. Lakso Center for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is shared among faculty who rotate as head of the Center, and participation at its regular events is remarkably high. Key faculty committees were engaged in producing the 2005 list of Desired Intercultural Competencies, the 2013 measurable outcomes and rubrics, and the 2009 Global Engagement Initiative.

Identifying and Creating Learning Opportunities

Expanding and deepening global learning usually involves a combination of identifying and making visible existing opportunities, creating new courses or programs, and modifying existing ones. Creating new courses and programs is the most expensive route to any academic innovation; additionally, this strategy (unless carefully integrated into existing initiatives) risks being an add-on that will not further internationalization of existing courses and programs or engage a wide group of faculty. Infusing existing courses and programs with a global or international dimension is time-consuming, but has a lasting effect on the curriculum. Since modifying the content of existing courses is the prerogative of faculty, it is important that faculty be given the opportunity to participate, sit on the sidelines in a wait-and-see position, or opt out.

At Georgia Tech, the major components of the IP are: language proficiency; required courses with an international focus (including a capstone course that integrates disciplinary and global practice in the context of the major); and study, work, or research abroad. Georgia

Tech's approach was to expand existing opportunities in language study and education abroad, and make visible the course offerings that fulfilled the requirement. Only the capstone course with a global focus was new. Students had opportunities to study a foreign language prior to the IP, but the initiative raised the stakes significantly. The language requirement for the IP was the subject of considerable debate during the design period at Georgia Tech, and when it was decided upon, required an important financial investment to expand language offerings. Additionally, the new element required demonstration of proficiency through ACTFL testing for students to qualify for the IP designation. (See page 17 for subsequent modification of IP language options).

IP students at Georgia Tech are required to take one course in international relations, one in global economics, and one focusing on a country or region. Departments submit courses to the IPC for approval in each category. To implement such a new requirement, an institution would generally draw on existing courses, though it would not preclude the creation of new ones. The capstone course, as originally conceived, was to be planned by departments for groups of students moving through the IP as a cohort. Since that has turned out not to be the case, departments are revising existing upper-capstone courses to provide flexible opportunities for capstone experiences aimed at individual or small groups of students.

In the realm of study abroad at Georgia Tech, many opportunities existed, but the IP set ambitious thresholds of 26 weeks of study, research, or work abroad, generally in a foreign language. Immersion is of high value, and students can count only one faculty-led program toward their 26-week requirement. Similarly, the requirement of proficiency rather than seat time for foreign language study is a bold step that few institutions have taken. The International Plan: Language Proficient designation on the graduate's transcript requires a minimum of "Intermediate High" for European languages, and "Intermediate Mid" for Asian languages, Arabic, and Russian.

Initially, FIU's principal strategy was to create new courses. The provost issued a competitive call for team-taught interdisciplinary courses; six were selected. As the initiative matured, the existing courses that were modified to align with the learning outcomes became the mainstay of the global learning curriculum. Additionally, the requirement that courses be team-taught was dropped. Ultimately, all GL courses incorporate the following: global learning course outcomes; diverse global, international, and intercultural content; active learning strategies, and authentic assessments. Students also participate in a variety of globally focused co-curricular initiatives, such as a regular campus-wide event called Tuesday Times Roundtable (a weekly series of multi-perspective discussions of New York Times' articles with a global focus), and international service learning opportunities.

The current range of designated foundation and discipline-specific global learning courses represent a mixture of newly developed courses and ones that have been revised to include the required components. In their workshops on "Backwards Curriculum Design," FIU helps faculty design or modify courses by starting with the desired outcomes and results, determining acceptable evidence of competency in the outcomes (assessment), and then planning the learning experiences and the instruction. All global learning foundation and discipline-specific courses are approved using the Faculty Senate's curriculum review process.

Juniata's current strategy is to align existing courses with the Desired Intercultural Competencies. Following a recent workshop, faculty volunteers teaching courses in the general education program with the "I" or "CA" designation will take the rubrics, determine which outcomes apply to their course, and determine assessment methods.

Selecting Assessment Instruments and Conducting the Assessment

Assessment begins by asking what questions should be addressed in the evaluation process, and deciding on appropriate assessment instrument(s) to answer the questions. Creating or selecting the appropriate instrument can be a daunting task; it is advisable to seek help of experts (certainly at the institution, and sometimes beyond it). Some institutions conduct an inventory of existing assessment tools to see if there are appropriate ones which already exist. Course-embedded assessments or e-portfolios generally use rubrics (rating scales) that are developed in-house, based on the particular goals the institution has identified. Georgia Tech's assessment tools are aligned with specific goals. (Please see chart on page 30 of Georgia Tech Case Study and page 16.) As noted earlier, assessments may be direct or indirect, with direct measures both more difficult to create and sometimes more complicated to administer; however, they are more revealing about actual learning. It is additionally important to use multiple assessments to triangulate results, as do each of our three profiled institutions.

A first choice for institutions to make is whether to create its own tools or use existing ones. The case study institutions did both. Georgia Tech chose the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) in 2005 because of the paucity of other validated instruments available at the time. It has created, according to Assessment Director Jonathan Gordon, what is probably the largest single institutional database for the IDI. Florida International University chose the Global Perspectives Index (GPI), more recently available, and at a lower cost. Juniata is using an instrument to assess study abroad learning outcomes that was developed by the Great Lakes Colleges Association, the Associated Colleges of the South, and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest.

Additionally, Georgia Tech created its own Global Knowledge Inventory and pre- and post-survey for study abroad students; FIU created its own Case Response Assessment and course assessment instrument; and Juniata developed a rubric for faculty to use in their global learning courses.

Instruments to Assess Global Learning

The Intercultural Development Inventory

The IDI is a 50-item, theory-based instrument that can be taken either in paper and pencil form or online. The IDI is currently in fifteen languages (Arabic, Bahasa Indonesian, Chinese, Czech, English, Finnish, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish). The test was developed by Mitchell Hammer, who owns and operates IDI, LLC. In order to use the IDI, assessors must attend a three-day training seminar and enter into a licensing agreement. The instrument can generate an in-depth graphic profile of an individual's or groups' predominant level of intercultural competence, along with a detailed textual interpretation of that level of intercultural development and associated transitional issues.

The Global Perspective Inventory

Developed by Larry Braskamp, the GPI measures how a student thinks, views himself or herself as a person with a cultural heritage, and relates to others from other cultures, backgrounds, and values. It reflects how students are responding to three major questions: *How do I know?, Who am I?, and How do I relate to others?* The GPI consists of three different forms: **General,** for students at any stage of their college journey and also as the pretest for a study abroad experience; **New Student,** for students entering college for the first time, with questions about their high school experiences; and **Study Abroad,** for students who have completed a study abroad program, with specific questions about their experiences and engagement abroad.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Test of Oral Proficiency

ACTFL publishes guidelines for proficiency in speaking, writing and listening. It offers oral proficiency testing in more than 100 languages and written proficiency tests in 18 languages. According to the ACTFL website, "The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) is a valid and reliable means of assessing how well a person speaks a language. It is a 20-30 minute face-to-face or telephonic interview between a certified ACTFL tester and an examinee. The interview is interactive and continuously adapts to the interests and abilities of the speaker. The speaker's performance is compared to the criteria outlined in the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 – Speaking* or the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable Language Skill Level Descriptors – Speaking. Assessors are required to take a four-day training workshop."

The Study Abroad Assessment of the Great Lakes Colleges Association, The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, and the Associated Colleges of the South

With support from the Teagle Foundation, the three associations developed "Liberal Education and Study Abroad: Assessing Learning Outcomes to Improve Quality." As part of the project, the three consortia created *Learning from Study Abroad* (LSA) pre- and post-experience survey instruments to assess both the characteristics of off-campus study programs and the impact of study abroad on the acquisition of key liberal arts learning outcomes.

Georgia Tech uses four major assessment instruments to measure student achievement of its four learning goals: the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Interview; its own Global Knowledge Inventory to test students' comparative global knowledge pre- and post-abroad experience; the Intercultural Development Inventory to test intercultural assimilation and sensitivity as well as students' abilities to exercise their discipline in a global context; and a pre- and post-survey for study abroad and international internship students. Additionally, the university uses supervisor reports of international internship students, student and employer focus groups, and reflective capstone essays. Finally, Georgia Tech and Juniata take advantage of assessment tools already in use at the institution, such as CIRP, NSSE, and CLA, thus expanding their sources of information.

The ACTFL oral assessment, a widely used and externally validated tool, is administered to Georgia Tech students who are just returning from a study abroad experience or just prior to graduation. The Global Knowledge Inventory, a 30-item multiple choice test, was developed by an interdisciplinary team of Georgia Tech faculty. It was designed to measure the "general global knowledge"—the type of knowledge that would be gained from coursework, travel experience, and lifelong learning"[26]— of IP students against a control group of students who did not engage in international experiences. As of 2011, the GKI had been "piloted with 644 undergraduate students in international relations, global economics, and global business management courses."[27] After some refinements, it was administered to 111 graduating seniors, including those who had studied or worked abroad and those who had not. Finally, Georgia Tech used the CIRP Freshman Survey to compare IP students to others in terms of demographics, curricular plans, goals, and aspirations.

Florida International University uses multiple instruments, including the GPI, course-embedded assessments, and a pre- and posttest administered twice to a sample of students. The Case Response Assessment (CRA) is administered to 10 percent of incoming freshmen and transfer students and 10 percent of graduating seniors. Developed by FIU, the CRA is a "complex, interdisciplinary case study"[28] that students read and then respond to with two essays that correspond to two of FIU's specified outcomes, global awareness and global perspective. A panel of trained faculty raters evaluates students' essays on a scale from zero to four using two FIU-developed rubrics, one for each outcome. The holistic rubrics' five levels (none; knowledge or comprehension; application; analysis; and synthesis/evaluation) align with Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Development.[29] The minimum criterion success is defined as a rubric score of three, representing the cognitive level of analysis.

FIU also uses the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) to assess student achievement of the three outcomes. A study by the Office of Global Learning Initiatives showed that the three domains assessed by this instrument—cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal—are highly correlated to the three FIU outcomes: global awareness, global perspective, and global engagement.

A third and important strategy for assessing global student learning is conducted at the course level. Each FIU global learning course has an assessment plan created by the faculty member and approved by the Faculty Senate curriculum committee. Included in the plan are the "outcomes, the planned assessment activities or artifacts, evaluation methods, minimum criteria for success, and the student sample size."[30] At the end of the semester, faculty members report on assessment results and use this information to make continuous improvements. The Faculty Senate curriculum committee reviews them to ensure that the courses are adhering to their stated objectives, assessments, content, and use of active learning strategies, or "fidelity of implementation."

Juniata has tried different approaches to assessment over time. Initially, it focused its attention on using the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and on the outcomes of study abroad. Juniata's Intercultural Learning Assessment Committee (ILAC) began with a pre- and posttest of study abroad developed by a Juniata faculty member. That questionnaire examined 15 educational goals of students planning to study abroad with those who were not. The findings were inconclusive due to the fact that pre-test alone was administered once.

Juniata is currently using an instrument developed by the Great Lakes Colleges Association, the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, and the Associated Colleges of the South to document the effect of study abroad on liberal arts educational objectives; it consists of a pre- and posttest that combines students' self-reports on experiences and learning and scenarios and questions that gauge intercultural learning.[31] The questionnaire assesses two outcomes of study abroad associated with liberal education: critical thinking (including reasoning and reflecting) and the development of engaged

citizenship (acting). In fall 2011, 24 Juniata students preparing to study abroad took the pre-test, and that same group took the posttest the following fall. The college is awaiting the analysis of these results, and has administered the pretest to two additional groups of departing students.

Additionally, Juniata faculty is now using the list of Desired Intercultural Competencies, translated into measurable outcomes, and rubrics (see Appendices A-B), to help align their courses to those outcomes and assess student achievement with a scale of 1 (inadequate) to 4 (extensive).

Measuring Results and Using Data for Improvement

Having begun in 2005, Georgia Tech has the longest experience with its initiative and assessment. It incorporated the assessment design in the IP plan as it was being developed and has consistently used the results of its various assessments to improve the program.

From the outset of the implementation of the IP, Georgia Tech has collected outcomes and other data and disseminated them broadly. The IP has been successful in generating significant student interest in the program, with 1,712 students having enrolled as of 2013.[32] It has also been successful in student achievement of the student learning goals, as elaborated below. Additionally, data shows that the IP has heightened overall student interest in language study, as well as education abroad, even outside the IP. Analysis of results of the CIRP survey, comparing IP and other Georgia Tech students, revealed that "the profile of IP freshmen was more similar to students attending very high-selectivity private institutions than high-selectivity public schools."[33] Clearly, this has implications for Georgia Tech's recruitment strategy.

For the five years of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) was administered as a pre-test to incoming Georgia Tech first-year students. As of March 2011, according to the QEP Fifth Year Interim Impact Report, 3,781 students completed the instrument as a pre-test, and 685 completed the posttest version of the IDI. As of 2013, 1,389 students have been matched from first-year to graduation. Students were grouped into four experience categories: no study abroad experience; participants in faculty-led, short-term study abroad programs; semester abroad participants; and International Plan (IP) graduates.

Comparisons of students who worked or studied abroad with those who did not showed significant gains on the General Self-Efficacy Scale, a set of questions designed to assess an individual's ability to cope with stressful life events. They made "gains in self-reported competence to practice their discipline in different social or cultural settings, understanding of the host culture's beliefs and values, and the impact of the students' professional practice on the host country's society and culture. These self-reported results were reinforced by the direct assessment of the supervisors of student internship participants.[34] Additionally, "[r]esults using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to control for differences in scores for freshmen demonstrated significantly higher gains in intercultural sensitivity for IP graduates compared with gains made by students who participated in faculty-led summer abroad programs and those who had a single semester of international engagement."[35] Results from the IDI which showed that students in semester-long programs made higher gains than those in summer programs were also shared with students and employers to encourage pursuit of the longer experience. Results of the Global Knowledge Inventory showed that "IP students perform mathematically better than students with no international experience,"[36] but the differences were not statistically significant.

Student feedback was also used to make program adjustments. Many students asked to go to multiple abroad sites, rather than a single one as envisioned by the architects of the IP. Students may now petition the IP committee to undertake study abroad in two countries if they can justify the intellectual coherence of their plan.

Language testing has produced important information that has been used to make modifications to the IP as well. A task force created to evaluate the IP program after five years was concerned by the low completion rate of IP students, with only 20 percent graduating with the IP designation. From both the data and focus groups, the language proficiency requirement was identified as a barrier. As of 2012, only 131 students took the proficiency test, of which 72 percent have received the required level of competence.[37] Although the pass rate was high, the proportion of IP students taking the test was not. Thus, the taskforce recommended the IP create two different transcript designators: "IP" for those who do not take or pass the proficiency examination (but who are still required to take four semesters of language) and "IP: Language Proficient."

A final change recommended by the task force concerned the building a sense of a community among IP

students by creating an orientation course for freshmen, which would include topics in intercultural communication.

Advising has also been shaped by assessment data. According to Jonathan Gordon, "[r]esults from the pre- and post-experience abroad survey were used to make changes in advising information given to students about what to expect with certain foreign exchange partners, and to more organized preparation for some faculty-led study abroad programs."[38] The institution also used feedback from focus groups and internship abroad supervisors to shape advising for international internship students. Because students were not moving through the program as a cohort, but rather in small numbers scattered in different majors, some rethinking of the capstone course was required. As a result, departments are incorporating integrative learning experiences into other senior-level courses or relying on other forms of evidence of the mastery of desired skills such as integrative essays.

At FIU, the use of assessment data, although preliminary, is already underway. Since the first administration of the GPI was in fall 2010 and the first cohort of students going through the GLI initiative will not graduate until spring 2014, assessment results are preliminary. Results collected to date suggest that "students, regardless of their class level, have more difficulty achieving high levels of global perspective than global awareness."[39] Another finding was that FIU students scored lower than national norm in the in the GPI scale of Knowing, which aligns with FIU's global awareness outcome. This finding suggests that when students enter the university, they have trouble understanding the importance of cultural contexts in "judging what it is important to know and value."[40] As Landorf and Doscher note in their case study, students' comparatively low scores on this particular cognitive attribute may indicate the source of their cognitive difficulty with analyzing issues from perspectives other their own. Faculty assessments have corroborated the findings of the GPI that students have more difficulty developing a global perspective than they do global awareness.

As a result, the Office of Global Learning Initiatives is "working closely with faculty to infuse courses with targeted activities requiring students to evaluate issues based on complex cultural contexts, and has increased partnerships with [the] student affairs department and community organizations to offer co-curricular cultural programming."[41] Additionally, some faculty are working to sequence the outcomes in their courses in a develop-

mental way, so that students begin by acquiring global knowledge and then move on to using multiple cultural or analytical perspectives. Increasing active learning strategies such as field research and team-based learning also strengthens students' global perspective and engagement.

Faculty conversations about the data gathered across multiple sections of a course are important to help see what works. Many global learning foundations courses have multiple sections. Some have a designated course coordinator who reviews learning outcomes and assessments across sections. The Office of Global Learning Initiatives organizes conversations with global learning faculty every semester to look at learning outcomes, and discuss successful practices.

Because Juniata is in the early stages of systematic assessment across the institution, it is not yet at the point of integrating findings into institutional strategies. Earlier experiences suggest that these habits have already been developed, however. For example, findings from the 2008 NSSE indicated that Juniata was less successful than the national average in engaging students with issues of difference. A task force that was created partially in response to this finding articulated a strategic plan for internationalization, called the Global Engagement Initiative; a central focus of the document was the creation of a Global Village Living and Learning Community, integrating "models of traditional language houses and international houses with multi-cultural and multiethnic residence options." Additionally it includes language floors. In its third year of existence in 2012-2013, the Global Village as a student learning opportunity is under scrutiny, and faculty advisers are testing and finalizing assessment tools to measure the learning outcomes identified for Global Village residents.

Successes and Challenges

The experiences of the three institutions support the conventional wisdom on the change process and good practice in assessment. With regard to process, the institutions created inclusive campus-wide discussions, and provided many opportunities for faculty and staff to engage in the creation of their global learning initiatives. They built on their strengths, whether that was a strong study abroad program, interest in the major, or a faculty focus on excellent teaching. The three institutions began by engaging those faculty and staff who were most interested and ready to try a new approach or opportunity, and garnered more support for their

initiatives as they progressed, and as faculty and staff who were convinced on their worthiness communicated this to their colleagues. Communication and dialogue throughout the process enabled various stakeholders to understand the initiative and connect to it as they wished. If a change does not "make sense" to individuals, they may go through the motions without really changing their mental models. Faculty and staff development, then, become an essential part of the change process. Many faculty find the interdisciplinary conversations generated by global learning initiatives to be a source of stimulation, as they do conversations with disciplinary colleagues about the global dimensions of their fields.

Support from top leaders, too, was as important as building grassroots support. At FIU and Georgia Tech, provostial support for global learning as a focus for the QEP was essential, as was the willingness of these leaders to make major financial investments in implementation. At Juniata, the provost and president were strong supporters of comprehensive internationalization, and the provost, after whom the Center for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)is now named, was a key supporter of assessment and faculty development. When three-year foundation funding for the start-up of the SoTL center ended, the provost saw that funding was available for its continuance.

These ingredients of a successful change process—wide consultation and building grassroots support; good communication; and leadership from the top—are quite familiar to anyone who has experienced change or reviewed the change literature. Because life on the ground is much more nuanced than summaries or principles express— shaped by individual personalities, institutional histories and traditions, unforeseen events at the institution or beyond, and politics— these change strategies are much more complicated and difficult to implement than to state. The narrative of change is clearer after the fact, when patterns as well as successes and failures become evident.

On the assessment side, the institutions paid attention both to the process and the product in crafting the global learning outcomes that would serve as the basis for their assessments. These outcomes were translated into measurable goals, using rubrics expressing progressive levels of mastery of the knowledge, skills, and capacities they had identified as outcomes. In creating their new global learning initiatives, FIU and Georgia Tech developed their assessment plans up front, integrating them into the implementation process, and

using data and information gathered to guide them as the program unfolded. All the institutions made use of existing approaches to assessment, with Juniata using NSSE, the CLA, and CIRP; Georgia Tech using CIRP; and FIU using the course-embedded assessment process previously established. They also created their own assessment documents that fit with their goals and culture. The three case studies confirm the wisdom of using multiple assessments to provide different kinds of information and to enable triangulation of the findings from the various instruments. Some of the assessments were carried out by a central office (the Office of Assessment at Georgia Tech and the Office of Global Learning Initiatives at FIU), thus sharing the assessment burden.

The institutions were also aware of the importance of faculty development as a key element of successful assessment. The language of assessment is foreign to most faculty and the concepts need to be understandable in terms of their daily lives in the classroom and connections made between traditional grading practices and the more detailed and often transparent ones associated with assessment of student learning outcomes. And finally, and perhaps most importantly, each institution, in its own way, used information from assessment for program improvement. Georgia Tech, with its full five years of experience with the IP, demonstrates how data from multiple assessments inform program improvement and adjustments. FIU, although only two and a half years into the global learning initiative, has already strengthened its co-curriculum and worked with faculty on sequencing mastery of global learning outcomes in a developmental manner.

No change follows a linear or predictable course. There are always surprises and unanticipated events. Sometimes it is simply more difficult to implement some aspect of an initiative. Georgia Tech found that language proficiency was a stumbling block; FIU found that the students had difficulty achieving a global perspective. Staff turnover caused Juniata to stall in applying its Desired Intercultural Competencies. Flexibility is a hallmark of successful innovation. Georgia Tech had to change course with respect to the capstone course. FIU experienced some budget reductions and had to figure out how to sustain the program with fewer resources.

Surprises or unforeseen results can also be positive. A strong international program can further an institution's reputation and market niche and be a positive in recruiting. All three institutions have received national recognition for their efforts in assessment and/

or internationalization. Georgia Tech has found that language enrollments outside the IP have increased, as has participation in study abroad. The work abroad office that was created through the IP has led to considerable growth in students taking internships abroad, even without the special funding incentives they enjoyed early on.

Some of the challenges can be found in the nature of assessment. Many faculty consider assessment a burden that distracts them from the true work of teaching and scholarship. FIU keeps up a "consistent dialogue with global learning faculty, staff, and students concerning 'what works and what doesn't,"[42] offering sessions at the beginning and end of each semester to provide forums for faculty to exchange experiences and learning. Juniata has a high level of participation in its ongoing brown bag discussions of faculty work through the SoTL Center. "Ongoing" is the operative concept here.

Sustaining a new approach, even if it seems firmly embedded in the institution, can be difficult. Resources are always a challenge, and unexpected cuts can affect any program. FIU's Hilary Landorf notes the issue of fidelity of implementation. As the program matures, and the original faculty creating GLI courses moves on while new faculty join the initiative, how can FIU ensure that their courses continue to adhere faithfully to the goals and approaches as originally conceived? Ultimately it cannot, Landorf observes, without ongoing faculty development.[43]

As institutions see the growing importance of global learning as a key feature of a quality education that prepares students for life and work, they will have to ask themselves the key questions: What are goals for our students; what opportunities do we provide for students to achieve them; and how do we know we are succeeding? The journey to answer these questions will be challenging, but essential for the future success of institutions and their students.

Methodology:

This essay is based on the three case studies prepared by Jenifer Cushman, Jonathan Gordon, and Hilary Landorf and Stephanie Doscher. Additionally, I conducted interviews with three key faculty and staff whom the case study authors identified on their campuses, and reviewed campus websites and relevant documentation.

Section 1: Endnotes

1. For additional resources, see also *Assessment and Evaluation for International Educators* (Washington D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2009); The American Council on Education website for a guide to assessing international learning outcomes; and Musil, Caryn. *Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice*. (Washington D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2006).

2. Boyer, Ernest. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

3. Barr, Robert, and John Tagg. "From Teaching to Learning—A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education." *Change* 27 no. 6 (1995): 12-25, reprinted http://www.ius.edu/ilte/pdf/BarrTagg.pdf.

4. Kuh, George. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Washington D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2008. http://www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm.

5. Palomba, Catherine and Banta, Trudy. *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

6. Arum, Richard and Josipa Roksa. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 38.

7. This section is adapted from Green, Madeleine. "Developing an Assessment Process." *Measuring and Assessing Internationalization*. NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2012.

8. FIU's second step is to determine what constitutes acceptable evidence of achieving the outcome. The third step is to plan the learning experiences or instruction. Juniata has used an iterative process, identifying courses that contain their specified "Desired Intercultural Competencies," creating a rubric, and then adjusting courses to align with the measurable outcomes.

9. Rollins, Howard. "Georgia Tech's Comprehensive and Integrated Approach to Developing Global Competence." In *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: The Quest for Global Citizenship*. ed. Ross Lewin. New York: Routledge, 2009.

10. AAC&U News. "Global Learning for Global Citizenship at Florida International University." December 2011. Retrieved from: http://www.aacu.org/aacu_news/aacunews11/december11/feature.cfm.

11. Landorf, Hilary and Doscher, Stephanie. "Promoting Engagement in Curriculum Internationalization." IIE Networker (Spring 2012): 28.

12. Rollins, p 424.

13. Rollins, p. 424.

14. Rollins, p. 425.

15. Florida International University. *Quality Enhancement Plan: Global Learning for Global Citizenship*. (2010): 5. Retrieved from: http://goglobal.fiu.edu/SiteCollectionDocuments/QEP_Report-Final.pdf

16. Ibid, 6-7.

17. Redden, Elizabeth. "The 'I' in FIU." *Inside Higher Ed,* February 20, 2013. Retrieved from: http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/02/20/florida-international-university-attempts-infuse-global-learning-across-curriculum.

18. Jankowski, Natasha. *Juniata College: Faculty-Led Assessment*. National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, July 2011. Retrieved from http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/documents/JuniataCaseStudy.pdf.

19. Dunwoody, Philip, et al. "Case Study of a Shoe-String SoTL Center." *International Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 6, no. 1 (January 2012). Retrieved from: http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v6n1/essays_about_sotl/PDFs/Dunwoody%20et%20al.pdf.

20. See Olson, Christa L., Madeleine Green, and Barbara Hill. *A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization*. Washington DC: American Council on Education (2006): 88-104; and Musil, Caryn. *Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities (2006): 12-13.

21. Olson, C., Green, M. and Hill, B. op. cit. (2006): 93-95.

22. Florida International University, *Quality Enhancement Plan,* p. 22.

23. See Appendix B, draft rubric, Juniata College Desired Intercultural Competencies.

24. Further detail on the process is included in FIU's *Quality Enhancement Plan: Global Learning for Global Citizenship,* pp. 2-11, retrieved from http://goglobal.fiu.edu/SiteCollectionDocuments/QEP_Report-Final.pdf

25. Further detail on the process is included in Georgia Tech's QEP document, pp. 9-17, retrieved from https://www.assessment.gatech.edu/wp-content/uploads/qep.pdf.

26. Georgia Institute of Technology. *Strengthening the Global Competence and Research Experiences of Undergraduate Students: Fifth Year Interim Report.* (March 2011): 7.

27. Ibid, p. 7.

28. Landorf, Hilary and Stephanie Doscher. FIU Case Study., p. 37.

29. Bloom, Benjamin. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain.* New York, NY: David McKay, 1956.

30. Landorf and Doscher, p. 38.

31. Further information on the instrument and the project is available at http://www.teaglefoundation.org/teagle/media/library/documents/learning/2008_liberal-education-and-study-abroad.pdf?ext=.pdf.

32. Personal Communication, Amy Henry, executive director, Office of International Education at Georgia Tech, May 13, 2013.

33. Ibid, p. 7.

34. Gordon, Jonathan. Georgia Tech Case Study (2013): p. 31.

35. Ibid, p. 31.

36. Ibid, p. 31.

37. As elaborated on page 17, many students chose not to take the test, so that the program was ultimately modified to include two types of IP designations: a "language proficient" designation, and a simple IP designation.

38. Gordon case study (2013): pp. 32-33.

39. Landorf and Doscher case study (2013) p. 38.

40. Braskamp, Larry. *Interpretive Guide and Norms for Global Perspective Inventory (GPI):* 2012. Retrieved from http://gpi.central.edu/supportDocs/Interpretative_guide.pdf, cited by Landorf and Doscher (2013): 38.

41. Landorf and Doscher case study (2013): 38.

42. Landorf and Doscher case study (2013): 39.

43. Landorf and Doscher case study (2013): 40.

CASE STUDIES

JUNIATA COLLEGE
Assessing Global Learning: Lessons from the Field
By Jenifer Cushman, Juniata College

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Assessing Global Learning: Lessons from the Field
By Jonathan Gordon, Georgia Institute of Technology

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
Assessing Global Learning: Lessons from the Field
By Hilary Landorf and Stephanie Doscher, Florida International University

NAFSA

Association of International Educators

JUNIATA COLLEGE
Assessing Global Learning: Lessons from the Field
By Jenifer Cushman, dean, Juniata Center for International Education

Introduction

Juniata College, a small, science-focused liberal arts institution of 1600 undergraduate students in the Appalachian Mountains of central Pennsylvania seems an unlikely candidate for global engagement and assessment of global learning outcomes. Yet for some thirty years, Juniata has excelled in its international efforts, including international student enrollment growth, internationalization of the curriculum, cultures, and languages taught across the curriculum, and increasing study abroad numbers. Winner of the 2012 NAFSA Senator Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization, Juniata achieved 10 percent international student enrollment and 41 percent study abroad rates for its 2012 graduates, and is recognized by IIE's Open Doors[1] as among the highest numbers of participants in long-term study abroad in baccalaureate colleges, in spite of its small size.

Juniata's focus on internationalization emerges from its mission to prepare students for "ethical leadership in the global community."[2] The core curriculum[3] aims for student engagement in a number of global learning areas, including aesthetic appreciation of cultural production, understanding international perspectives, and exploration of social behavior, values, and the processes of the natural world, as well as interdisciplinary, international, and cultural analysis. Juniata students must take 6 credits (usually 2 courses) in each of the "FISHN" designations, which stand for fine arts, international, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences, respectively. The "I" designation came about when the college initiated the integration of international elements in its core curriculum in the 1970s, and allows the presentation of global issues in one of three ways: "(1) The course introduces students to the history, art, literature, philosophy, or civic life of people of different nationalities. (2) The course requires students to think and express themselves in a language other than English. (3) The course examines international social, material, cultural, or intellectual exchange at a systemic level."[4]

In addition to the FISHN core courses, students must also take one of the courses found across campus designated as "CA," or Cultural Analysis, that deal with human culture in its various forms (e.g., philosophic, literary, artistic, economic, social, political, scientific). Such courses focus on "the thoughts and behaviors of individuals and groups and how relationships between ideas and institutions have shaped societies. Approaches include examining the historical development of a given culture over time; analyzing encounters or conflicts between two cultures or societies; and studying the variety of interactions among individuals and sub-groups within a given culture or society."[5]

This identification of global learning in the mission and its presence in the core curriculum have led to the development of a wide variety of global student learning opportunities However, as at many institutions, until fairly recently many of these learning opportunities were introduced unsystematically, without clearly drawing lines between specific outcomes and particular opportunities, and with little attention to measuring the direct effects of these efforts on student learning at the institutional level. Because the assessment

that was occurring was mostly at the classroom and program level, there was little understanding of how the institution as a whole fostered student learning. Moreover, the practice of assessing student learning primarily in the classroom meant that knowledge about—and to a certain extent, attitudes toward—the world have been the focus, rather than the development of skills and competencies students were developing, particularly through such experiential and global learning opportunities as study abroad.

Global Learning Opportunities

Students have many different ways to engage in global learning. In addition to the core curriculum, Juniata offers students the opportunity to undertake interdisciplinary study, through its "Program of Emphasis" (POE) alternative to majors and minors. The two-adviser system enables students to work with their advisers to craft a course of study that engages more holistically with the world, and enables the integration of courses taken abroad into their POE. Juniata's study abroad opportunities are primarily through exchange agreements, and the institution encourages faculty members and departments to collaborate closely with specific international partners, and to compare curricula and course preparation to foster the greatest possible integration of study abroad courses into the POE as possible.

Before students go abroad and after they return, they can engage with experiential global learning opportunities on campus such as the award-winning *Language in Motion* program, which enables Juniata students to share their language expertise with students at local schools. The Global Village living and learning community provides an opportunity for students to consider their relationship to the world in a residential environment.

Assessment Culture

Juniata takes assessment seriously. The College uses a variety of assessment measures at the course, program, and institutional levels. NSSE has provided periodic institutional snapshots of student perceptions of their learning. Featured as a "data-rich college" in the NSSE 2011 Annual Results, senior administrators at Juniata are described as "firm believers in gathering as much data as possible to inform their planning efforts."[6]

The James J. Lakso Center for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning[7] (SoTL) has been crucial in fostering Juniata's culture of assessment. Established with support from the Teagle Foundation, SoTL "promotes professional development related to evidence-based practice in higher education."[8] Juniata's SoTL Center has been recognized by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) for its faculty-driven, "evidence-based teaching[9]" approach to the scholarship of teaching and learning, and many faculty and staff employ the "implement–measure–change–implement" loop to improve their offerings. Although the assessment of global learning outcomes is a relatively recent effort at Juniata, it has gained momentum in a short amount of time and builds on a solid foundation of assessment initiatives.

Global Learning Assessment

The need to identify and assess global learning outcomes more intentionally first became apparent after the 2002-2003 decennial accreditation review visit by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. As one of three focus areas selected by Juniata for the self-study (along with "The First Year" and "Student Engagement"), "Internationalization" was identified as a priority for evaluation and strategic growth. The International Education Committee (IEC), composed of faculty, staff, and students, was formed around this time, originally to advise the campus community generally on issues of international education and programs. It has since evolved to serve more practical functions, including setting study abroad policies and procedures, and voting on student petitions.

Because the self-study process resulted in a long list of action items to be undertaken with regard to internationalism, and because the visiting team recognized that the College needed "to work to improve actual support for internationalization to supplement structures and policies that are already in place,"[10] it recommended that the Center for Internationalization (CIE) be among the first administrative units to be evaluated as part of the College's assessment efforts.[11] To implement the recommendation of the Middle States team, Juniata participated in the American Council on Education Internationalization Laboratory[12] in 2005. While conducting the self-study for the ACE review, the IEC members began to realize that there was a lack of understanding

at the institutional level about what students were developing in terms of skills and competencies, compared to the knowledge and attitudes that were being assessed at the course and program level. As part of the campus-wide review process, the IEC identified intercultural competencies desirable for all Juniata graduates (see Appendix I). To understand the international office's contribution to this specific set of institutional learning outcomes, these competencies were than mapped along the programs of the efforts of the CIE.[13] This work was expanded in spring 2013, when the process of mapping intercultural competencies more broadly across the curriculum and campus began.

The 2008 Juniata institutional strategic plan[14] identified a number of specific areas of development, including the establishment of living and learning world language residences. Additionally, a task force was established by the president to focus on diversity and international initiatives that would strengthen their combined contribution to global learning. That task force was convened partially in response to NSSE results that suggested Juniata was less successful in engaging students with difference than the national average. The task force called for the foundation of a Global Village Living and Learning Community that would integrate language houses into a larger intercultural living vision. It also called for a focus on assessing a specific realm of global learning (intercultural learning) through the formation of an Intercultural Learning Assessment Committee (ILAC).

ILAC began meeting in 2008-2009, with representation from the Center for International Education, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Institutional Research, International Studies, Psychology, and World Languages and Cultures. The committee came up with a plan to assess the extent to which Juniata students were acquiring the Desirable Intercultural Competencies articulated in 2005. It identified appropriate tools to assess the competencies, undertook an assessment process, and finally suggested how the College could best improve that learning. To identify appropriate tools, ILAC began by reviewing existing assessment resources and models for intercultural learning.[15] At the same time, in order to get an initial, manageable snapshot of student attitudes, ILAC administered to students preparing to study abroad, and to a control group, a survey that had been de-

veloped years prior by Juniata psychology professor David Drews. The tool centered on attitude changes toward educational goals in students who studied abroad, and was considered to be a first step toward a broader institutional assessment of intercultural competencies in all graduates. Focusing on attitudinal differences between students who planned to go abroad and those who do not, the survey asked students from the two populations to rate the importance of 15 possible educational goals.

Because of staff changes in the international office over the next two years, the survey was not administered again; indeed, ILAC did not meet again until 2011-2012. In 2011, Juniata was invited by the Great Lakes College Association (GLCA) to use a Teagle-funded study abroad learning assessment tool they had developed to document the effects of study abroad on liberal arts educational objectives.[16] Called the *Student Learning Outcomes from Study Abroad Scale* (SLOSAS), the pre- and post-questionnaires "…were developed over 18 months utilizing teams from GLCA, ACM, and ACS colleges, followed by the work of intercultural experts, and pilot testing with 270 students. The work began with an analysis of liberal arts mission statements from 42 colleges to identify central liberal arts goals. Consistent with writings about the philosophy of the liberal arts the dimensions to be measured fall into two, broad, conceptual categories…"[17] including critical thinking (reasoning, reflecting) and engaged citizenship (acting). The alignment with Juniata's *Think–Evolve–Act* tagline was unmistakable, and the Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes targeted in the GLCA instrument aligned well with the Juniata desirable intercultural competencies. Indeed, in the process of mapping where learning of desirable intercultural competencies happens across campus, ILAC has also mapped the competencies to the GLCA tool.

During fall 2011, the first group of 24 students preparing to study abroad took the pre-test; fall 2012, those same students took the posttest, while two other groups (spring 2012 and fall 2012) had taken the pre-test. The posttest results from the first group have not yet been received, but it is hoped that the comparative results over time may provide insight into which intercultural competencies are being developed through the experience of studying abroad at Juniata.

Most recently, ILAC has begun working with the SoTL Center and the Provost's office in preparation for the Middle States accreditation visit, to apply its work to the Juniata core curriculum. Now, ten years after the initial focus on internationalization as a special topic, Juniata is again undergoing accreditation review, and the assessment of the core curriculum is stimulating the next, more coherent and intentional phase of the assessment of global learning outcomes.

ILAC began meeting again during 2011-2012, shifting its focus from assessing intercultural learning during study abroad to global learning outcomes in the general education curriculum. As a first step, and at the recommendation of consultant Dr. Darla Deardorff, ILAC first attempted to operationalize the list of Desirable Intercultural Competencies. Drawing from a number of resources in the field, ILAC utilized Bloom's Taxonomy[18] to draft a rubric (Appendix II).

ILAC shared its rubric in a SoTL presentation in fall 2012, and in January 2013 sponsored a faculty workshop facilitated by Darla Deardorff for instructors of classes carrying the Cultural Analysis (CA) and International (I) designations. In spring 2013, workshop participants will use the rubric to align desired student learning outcomes with course goals, and "fill in the blanks" as to what competence at different levels looks like. The College's goal is to apply the rubric across multiple programs at Juniata, including the curriculum, study abroad (by cross-mapping the rubric to the GLCA tool), diversity office programming, and service-learning projects. It is anticipated that the process currently being followed for assessing intercultural competencies will be used for other global learning outcomes in the core curriculum and across campus.

Although institution-wide assessment of students' intercultural competencies is still in progress, assessment of student learning in study abroad was the original focus of ILAC, and is currently in its second phase with the GLCA tool. A fairly recent opportunity, learning in the Global Village is only this year undergoing systematic evaluation. WLC faculty members have developed an assessment tool to administer to residents before and after their participation, and a SoTL presentation in April 2013 will present those efforts. Assessment of the impact on student learning of a much older learning opportunity, Language in Motion, began as a SoTL project in 2007. Through tracking participant logs since fall 2000, assessment reveals students self-report increases in understanding of global diversity and openness to learning, for example.[19]

Lessons Learned

One of the most persistent obstacles to assessment at Juniata is the diversity and decentralization of efforts that contribute to student learning. Thus, obtaining an overview of the terrain is fraught with complications, and coordination and promotion of efforts can be tricky. So many good efforts are occurring across campus that it is hard to know how best to coordinate them, to bring them together into an assessable form. The Deardorff workshop in January 2013 revealed the need for instructors of general education courses with the same designations to have a forum to identify and develop common learning outcomes. As at many institutions, lack of time and resources are a major issue, given the other pressing daily duties staff face. Additionally, with so many different constituencies involved, there are challenges in bringing together all those who should have a voice, and in reaching anything close to consensus once those stakeholders are gathered together.

Nevertheless, assessment is worth the effort to overcome challenges. Since the first step in assessment is to identify desired outcomes, once campus stakeholders engage in an intentional review of current practices with attention to what students are learning and what they should be learning, understanding where the campus is and where it should be in terms of comprehensive internationalization becomes much more manageable. The assessment effort can result in a series of concrete steps, and a clear focus, for initiatives and priorities. It helps us know where we are, where we want to be, and how to realize it when we get there.

While the editor selected and invited each case study author to write about their respective organization and program for the purpose of showcasing a variety of successful models to readers, neither the editor nor NAFSA is responsible for the content of their case presentation. The contributing authors are solely responsible for the content of their cases.

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Assessing Global Learning: Lessons from the Field

By Jonathan Gordon, director, Georgia Tech Office of Assessment

Introduction

The Georgia Institute of Technology, known as Georgia Tech or the "Institute," is a public doctoral institution classified with a "very high research activity" status by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It enrolls approximately 21,000 students, of which roughly 14,000 are undergraduates. The Institute extends a global reach, with campuses in France and Singapore, research centers in Ireland and Costa Rica, and joint degree programs with two prominent Chinese universities. Georgia Tech students are presented with myriad international opportunities, including short- and long-term study abroad programs, a robust work-abroad program, and international research opportunities.

The Georgia Tech International Plan is an option for students in most undergraduate majors to integrate international knowledge and experiences into their studies. It goes beyond traditional internationalization approaches by tying together second language proficiency, coursework in international subjects, and significant international experiences, and by integrating this package into a student's academic major to produce graduates able to practice their discipline in a global context. Assessment of the International Plan's learning outcomes has involved multiple approaches to defining and measuring global competence and has led to a longitudinal research program to track the development of intercultural communication skills over the course of the entire baccalaureate program of study.

Institutional History, Climate and Practice of Assessment

Institutional effectiveness is at the heart of the Georgia Tech strategic plan, and assessment is a widely utilized tool to continuously improve the ways in which it pursues its academic mission. While assessment of student learning outcomes in Georgia Tech degree programs predates the IP, assessment of co-curricular activities such as undergraduate research, co-operative education, and international education is a more recent phenomenon at Georgia Tech. With respect to study abroad, previous assessment efforts centered on student satisfaction, although formative feedback for program improvement was also routinely collected by staff in the Office of International Education. The creation of the Georgia Tech International Plan (IP) in 2005 provided an ideal opportunity to articulate learning outcomes for students' international experiences and to conduct formative and summative assessment of the major components of global education within the Institute.

Articulating Global Learning Outcomes: Product and Process

Georgia Tech has had a long history of encouraging student participation in international activities—in the 2003-04 academic year, 33.7 percent of baccalaureate recipients reported some sort of international experience—either study, work, or research abroad. However, faculty and administrators across the campus felt the need to both broaden and deepen the exposure of students to the world outside the United States so that graduates would be better

equipped to function effectively internationally. The 2005 launch of the International Plan was linked directly to the Institute's strategic plan. The intention of the IP was to go beyond traditional approaches to international education in two ways: first, in offering a comprehensive and coherent program that would focus on second language proficiency, coursework in international subjects, and significant international experiences; secondly, the plan was designed to be integrated into the students' majors, so that students would learn about the practice of their major within an international context.

The IP was created as part of Georgia Tech's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), and was included in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools 2005 Reaffirmation process.[20] The plan was developed over the course of two years by a 31-member steering committee comprised primarily of faculty. Assessment experts were included in the early stages of planning, which greatly facilitated the design of the subsequent assessment and evaluation activities. A five-year budget was established for the plan (at approximately $1 million per year), along with a separate budget (of approximately $50,000 per year) devoted to assessment activities. A set of four broad learning outcomes and 11 specific learning outcomes were developed for the International Plan that were adapted from the American Council on Education (ACE) Working Group on International Learning. These learning outcomes were published in the QEP document, communicated across the campus, and disseminated at a variety of professional conferences engaged in foreign language pedagogy and international education (e.g., International Studies Association, AIEA, Forum on Education Abroad, NAFSA). The outcomes are described in Table 1.

As initially conceived, the IP included 26 weeks of study, research or work abroad, nine credit hours of coursework in international relations, global economics, and comparative cultural studies, a minimum level of proficiency in a foreign language (normally "Intermediate High" on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview), and a capstone course that integrated disciplinary and global practice in the context of the student's major. Upon completion of these requirements, graduates would receive an "International Plan" designator on their Bachelor of Science degree.

Identifying and Creating Learning Opportunities for Students

Implementation of the IP was overseen by the International Plan Committee (IPC), a faculty-led group. Institutional efforts to provide a global learning curriculum for students were broad and multifaceted. In terms of abroad opportunities, staff in the Office of International Education worked with GT faculty to expand student exchange partnerships with foreign universities. GT-Lorraine (Georgia Tech's European campus in Metz, France) enhanced its semester programs to provide more opportunities for students who wished to study there. Two staff positions were added to the GT Division of Professional Practice to create the Work Abroad program.

GT faculty were also directly involved in IP implementation. Several members of the faculty-led International Plan Committee participated in overseas trips to visit potential student exchange partners with the goal of identifying curricular matches between GT and its international partners. Particular care was used to address concerns regarding faculty quality, appropriate teaching facilities, and academic rigor before transfer credit would be accepted by the GT faculty. Course development grants were offered to faculty to assist them in modifying or developing new courses that would help IP students meet their global coursework requirements. In the School of Modern Languages, additional instructor positions were created in anticipation of increased enrollment demand, and the number of languages offered increased. Finally, faculty within each academic discipline needed to define the nature of the capstone course required of IP majors. In the engineering context, this was accomplished by integrating the global experiences of the IP students into the required engineering design capstone. Other programs created specific assignments related to senior-level seminars that required IP students to integrate their global and disciplinary perspectives.

Assessment Tools and Processes

Assessment of many of the learning outcomes was challenging, as the IP was considered an innovative departure from traditional education abroad programs. There were few proven approaches to assessment of concepts such as intercultural competence or global disciplinary practice. Those

Table 1: Excerpt of Assessment Plan, Georgia Institute of Technology			
Second Language Proficiency	**Comparative Global Knowledge**	**Intercultural Assimilation and Sensitivity**	**Global Disciplinary Practice**
Communicate in a second language.	Demonstrate knowledge about cultures within a global and comparative context.	Readily use second language skills and/or knowledge of other cultures to extend their access to information, experiences, and understanding.	Use cultural frames of reference and alternate perspectives to think critically and solve problems within the discipline in the context of at least one other culture, nation, or region.
	Demonstrate knowledge of global issues, processes, trends, and systems.	Convey an appreciation for different cultures in terms of language, art, history, etc. Interact comfortably with persons in a different cultural environment and be able to seek out further international or intercultural opportunities.	Collaborate professionally with persons of different cultures, and function effectively in multicultural work environments.
	Demonstrate knowledge of at least one other culture, nation, or region, such as beliefs, values, perspectives, practices, and products.	Accept cultural differences and tolerate cultural ambiguity.	
		Comfortably assimilate within other cultures.	
ASSESSMENT TOOLS			
ACTFL-Oral Proficiency Interview	Global Knowledge Inventory; pre/post surveys of international experiences	Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI); supervisor reports of international internship students; capstone experience reflective essays	Intercultural Development Inventory; supervisor reports of international internship students; capstone projects

involved in the IP chose to look upon the challenge as an opportunity, not just to provide evaluative feedback to the Institute, but to conduct a longitudinal research program that could offer empirically grounded insights to the larger community of international education and intercultural communications scholars and practitioners. The assessment plan utilized several tools already in use at GT, such as a longitudinal survey regime that included the CIRP Freshman Survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), exit and alumni surveys, and new pre/post surveys on international work and study abroad experiences.

The latter utilized the externally validated General Self-Efficacy Scale, a set of questions designed to assess an individual's ability to cope with stressful life events (Schwarzer and Jerusalem 1995).

Second language competence was measured by the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) produced by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). An interdisciplinary team of GT faculty developed a Global Knowledge Inventory (GKI), designed to measure comparative global knowledge of IP students against a control group of students who did not engage in international experiences. Finally, an externally normed and vali-

dated instrument, the Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman 2003) was employed to measure the intercultural sensitivity of IP students against students who engaged in less-intensive international experiences, as well as students who did not engage in any international activities.

All assessment activities and preliminary results were collected and disseminated to the campus via annual progress reports prepared by QEP staff, and detailed findings were shared with relevant stakeholders such as the faculty-led International Plan Committee, the School of Modern Languages, the Office of International Education, and the Division of Professional Practice.

Evidence of student success in meeting learning outcomes was gauged at various times during their programs of study:

- **Foreign language competence** was measured by the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview either upon return from a foreign sojourn or just prior to graduation. Depending on the foreign language, students were required to obtain a competency level of at least "Intermediate-High" (for French, German, Russian, or Spanish) or "Intermediate-Mid" (for Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, or Korean) in order to fulfill the IP requirement. As of 2012, a total of 131 students have taken the test, of which 71.8 percent have achieved the required level of competence.

- **After pilot testing,** the Global Knowledge Inventory was administered to groups of graduating seniors in the IP, as well as graduating seniors with lower levels of foreign exposure (one semester abroad, faculty-led programs, and no abroad experiences). Overall performance, as well as performance on international systems, international political economy, and comparative politics/culture subscales was analyzed. Results indicated that IP students scored mathematically higher than other groups, although the differences were not statistically significant.

- **Pre/post surveys** of students who either studied or worked abroad found significant gains on the General Self-Efficacy Scale, as well as gains in self-reported competence to practice their discipline in different social or cultural settings, as well as an increased understanding of the host culture's beliefs and values and the impact of the students' professional practice on the host country's society and culture. These self-reported results were reinforced by the direct assessment of the supervisors of student internship participants. In comparing domestic and international managers' evaluations of student performance, student interns working abroad had significantly higher levels of preparation in understanding the impact of disciplinary-specific solutions in a global and societal context, and in knowledge of contemporary issues within the discipline.

- **As noted above,** assessment of intercultural sensitivity was measured using a longitudinal study of student performance on the Intercultural Development Inventory. All GT freshmen matriculating AY 2006-2008 were asked to complete the inventory and were invited to complete the instrument again just prior to graduation. To date, 1,389 students have been matched from first-year to graduation. In analyzing the results, students were placed into one of four experience categories: no study abroad experience; faculty-led (short-term) study abroad programs; semester abroad participants; and International Plan graduates.[21] Results using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) to control for differences in scores for freshmen demonstrated significantly higher gains in intercultural sensitivity for IP graduates compared with gains made in students who participated in faculty-led summer abroad programs and those who had a single semester of international engagement. However, no significant differences were found between IP graduates and students who had multiple semester experiences abroad. This raised the possibility that gains in intercultural sensitivity were more a function of the time spent abroad, rather than the degree of language fluency (a specific requirement of the IP) acquired by the student. This latter finding was considered in improvement efforts of the International Plan addressed below.

In addition to assessment of learning outcomes, the IP was served by a variety of other measures aimed at gauging success in recruitment and retention of students. For example, a survey administered

in all foreign language courses was administered to determine student interest in enrolling in the IP. The names of interested students were forwarded to faculty and advisers in the students' majors so they could be provided with further information about the plan. This survey also provided faculty in the School of Modern Languages with necessary information to properly plan appropriate course offerings and allowed IP staff to determine in which areas of the world students intended to work or study. The CIRP-Freshman Survey was used to highlight differences in terms of demographics, curricular plans, goals and aspirations of IP students, and the rest of the GT population. Analysis of these results demonstrated some very interesting differences among students. Indeed, the profile of IP freshmen was more similar to students attending very-high selectivity private institutions than high-selectivity public schools (of which GT is included as a member). Since an implicit goal of the International Plan was to attract extremely high-caliber students who might otherwise attend private very-high selectivity colleges and universities, this finding was particularly gratifying to GT administrators.

Using the Results

I. INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC ABOUT OUTCOMES

Stakeholders both internal and external to Georgia Tech have been regularly informed about the progress made in implementing the International Plan, as well as the assessment activities and outcomes achieved by its students. At the outset, the International Plan's strategic goals, learning outcomes, and assessment plans were codified in a publication that was distributed to the Institute's leadership group (the Georgia Tech Executive Board), academic deans, faculty governance bodies (e.g., the Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate), as well as to the Georgia Tech external advisory board. Each summer, an annual report on the International Plan was published that included progress made toward program milestones (such as student participation, partnerships and exchanges with foreign universities, new international internship opportunities, and development of new globally focused courses.) In addition, the report included a section that describes the assessment activities conducted during the previous academic year as well as relevant findings related to the IP's student learning outcomes. These annual reports were distributed to the Institute leadership, to faculty stakeholders, and to IP students through the plan's website. Presentations on the plan's progress in achieving its strategic goals as well as its learning outcomes were made to the Executive Board and the academic deans in 2007 (the midpoint of the five-year Quality Enhancement Plan), and again to these groups and the external advisory board in 2010 (at the end of the QEP's reporting period).[22]

Because of the innovative nature of the IP, Georgia Tech has actively engaged with the wider academic community to describe our approach to strengthening the global competence of our students and to share our approach to assessing our progress in achieving our goals. Georgia Tech administrators and faculty have presented the International Plan, its associated assessment activities, and results in a variety of conferences and symposia. Additionally, the work done by Georgia Tech with its International Plan has been recognized through the 2010 Andrew Heiskell Award for Innovation in International Education by the Institute of International Education, as well as the 2012 Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) Award for Outstanding Institutional Practice in Student Learning Outcomes.

While the five-year Quality Enhancement Plan has been completed, the International Plan and the assessment of its learning outcomes continue. Foreign language testing and pre/post surveys of student abroad experiences continue to be conducted, and the use of the Global Knowledge Inventory is being modified to measure general education outcomes across the Institute. It is expected that once data collection for the longitudinal research using the Intercultural Development Inventory is completed, the resulting dataset will represent the largest single-institutional study using this instrument. Preliminary results from this study have been shared at academic and professional conferences, and it is expected that the research will continue to highlight important relationships between curricular and co-curricular activities, and their impact on intercultural competence.

II. USING OUTCOMES FOR IMPROVEMENT

The information gained through the use of assessment of the International Plan has been acted upon by many of the principals involved in the program. Results from the pre/post study abroad experience

were used to make changes in advising information given to students about what to expect with certain foreign exchange partners and for more organized preparation for some faculty-led study abroad programs. Feedback from focus groups conducted with international recruiters and from the supervisors of work abroad students was channeled into advising international internship students—particularly in terms of the specific skills demanded of student workers by employers and information about the best way for students to communicate their international experiences to recruiters. Evidence collected from the Intercultural Development Inventory has demonstrated that students participating in full-semester abroad programs (16 weeks) have higher gains in intercultural sensitivity than students who participate in summer (8-10 week) programs. This evidence was shared by the GT Division of Professional Practice to inform both students and employers that semester programs are better models for international immersion. Early results from the ACTFL test of language proficiency found a disproportionate number of students who took the exam in French were not achieving the required level of proficiency to complete the International Plan. A detailed examination of results determined that students enrolled in a particular exchange program tended to underperform on the test. This finding led to closer scrutiny of the particular program and to changes in the advisement of students by encouraging additional language coursework to supplement their language skills.

While the International Plan was originated under a five-year Quality Enhancement Plan, it was never meant to be a closed-ended project. Because the IP is a degree-long experience, it has taken some time to collect enough longitudinal information to incorporate our knowledge about student learning outcomes into program modifications. Few major modifications to the plan were contemplated during its first five years, largely to ensure a degree of stability for students moving through the program. However, in 2011 a taskforce was enlisted to conduct a detailed evaluation of the IP as currently implemented. The taskforce considered detailed information on recruitment, retention, progression and graduation, as well as the attainment of the learning outcomes specified by the IP.

Of particular concern to the taskforce was the low retention rate of IP students. Only about 20 percent of students who enrolled in the IP were graduating with the designator. Language proficiency (as measured by pass rates on the ACTFL) was identified as one of the barriers to program completion. At the same time, an examination of gains made in intercultural sensitivity (as measured by the longitudinal study of IDI scores) revealed no statistical relationship between language training and intercultural development. Qualitative data obtained from several focus groups of IP students revealed that some students felt that second language skills acted as a constraint on the types of foreign experiences they pursued, and sometimes conflicted with their desire to explore their disciplines in a global context. As a result of these findings, the taskforce recommended that the IP be modified to create two different IP transcript designators: those who do not pass or choose not to attempt the ACTFL test will be certified as "International Plan," while those who pass the ACTFL examination will be certified as "International Plan: Language Proficient." All IP students will be required to complete at least four semesters of foreign language training. It is hoped that these changes will increase retention and completion rates in the International Plan, while giving students the flexibility to pursue foreign study or work in more than one area of the world. The effects of these changes will be closely monitored in the coming years.

Another change recommended by the taskforce involved the development of a special freshman orientation course that would allow IP students to develop a sense of camaraderie and would introduce them to topics in intercultural communication. This solution was suggested based on both feedback from students obtained in focus groups and analysis of preliminary results from the IDI test that revealed only small differences in intercultural sensitivity gains made by IP students, compared with non-IP students who participated in multiple semester-long programs. It is hoped that by focusing intercultural communications theory explicitly on IP students, these students will be able to process their international experiences more completely and will produce further differentiation on their IDI scores when compared with other international programs of study.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

As noted above, the fact that the IP was a departure from traditional approaches to international education meant that there were few proven models for assessment of the articulated learning outcomes.

For example, in 2005 there were very few validated instruments to measure intercultural sensitivity or competence. Many of the instruments used for the assessment were developed in-house. Fortunately, today there are more choices available to institutions that seek to measure these abilities. One of the major advantages to this assessment project is that fact that the learning outcomes and the evaluation strategies were incorporated early in the program's design. As a result, there was a shared set of expectations between those charged with program implementation and professionals responsible for assessment. While the assessment approach was decided upon early in the implementation, it needed to be flexible to accommodate changes in the way in which the IP was implemented. For example, the original vision was that the capstone projects would be evaluated by a panel of faculty members. However, as the IP developed, it became apparent that the way in which students moved through the program was less of a cohort proceeding *en masse* but rather small numbers of students proceeding through each major in a less coordinated fashion. As a result, it was necessary to redeploy the available assessment resources away from the capstones and rely on other forms of evidence of mastery of the desired skills.

Another important detail of the IP assessment plan was the utilization of already existing data collection activities, such as freshman and exit surveys. In some cases, students who studied abroad (or intended to) could be readily identified on these surveys and their results could be compared to those who did not travel. In other cases, it was relatively easy to add a few additional questions to the surveys to directly address issues of concern for IP managers. Avoiding having to "reinvent the wheel" considerably lessened the effort necessary to conduct a successful evaluation. Finally, the ability to properly identify the appropriate students to survey/interview and when they should be contacted required close coordination between program managers and evaluators. Assessment activities were greatly facilitated by excellent communication and a productive working relationship between the Office of Assessment and the Office of International Education. Although the formal evaluation of the International Plan has concluded, these offices continue to collaborate to assess the outcomes of the IP as well as other international education opportunities available to students at Georgia Tech.

References

Schwarzer, Ralf, and Matthias Jerusalem. "Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale." In *Measures in Health Psychology: A User's Portfolio. Causal and Control Beliefs,* eds. J. Weinman, S. Wright, and M. Johnston (Windsor, England: NFER-NELSON, 1995), 35-37.

Hammer, Mitchell, Milton Bennett, and Richard Wiseman. "Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27 no. 4 (2003): 421-443.

CASE STUDY

While the editor selected and invited each case study author to write about their respective organization and program for the purpose of showcasing a variety of successful models to readers, neither the editor nor NAFSA is responsible for the content of their case presentation. The contributing authors are solely responsible for the content of their cases.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
Assessing Global Learning: Lessons from the Field

By Hilary Landorf, director, and Stephanie Doscher, associate director
FIU Office of Global Learning Initiatives

Introduction

Promotion of greater international understanding is one of Florida International University's (FIU) founding purposes. FIU students live and learn in the global city of Miami, Florida; yet prior to 2010, it was possible for them to have graduated from the university without having been subject to a formal global educational requirement. To address this contradiction, FIU spent three years developing "Global Learning for Global Citizenship," a ten-year, 4.11 million dollar initiative that provides every undergraduate with multiple educational opportunities to achieve the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of global citizenship through global learning. The heart of the initiative is a requirement that all FIU students take at least two global learning courses prior to graduation: one interdisciplinary foundations course as part of their university core curriculum (UCC) sequence, and a second discipline-specific global learning course in the context of their major program of study. All FIU global learning courses address three learning outcomes—global awareness, global perspective, and global engagement— through diverse international and intercultural content, active learning strategies, and authentic assessments. Students also participate in integrated co-curricular global learning opportunities, ranging from intercultural discussion series to international service trips, designed to extend and enrich classroom global learning.

Developing FIU's Global Learning Initiative

"Global Learning for Global Citizenship" was shaped by a university-wide exploration of three essential questions.

1. **As global citizens, what should FIU graduates know and be able to do?** Miami is home to FIU, the city's only public research university. It is also home to the highest concentration (58.1 percent) of foreign-born residents in the U.S. (United States Census Bureau 2012) and more than 1,100 multinational corporations (The Beacon Council 2012). FIU's location at a global crossroads imbues it with a special responsibility to prepare all undergraduates to live and work successfully in highly diverse and fluid settings. To address all students' needs, FIU's global learning outcomes define specific competencies of global citizenship, are relevant to all disciplines, and are flexibly applicable to emergent conditions of life in the twenty-first century.

2. **How will FIU know if students are achieving the global learning outcomes?** Comprehensive global learning assessment is vital to the fulfillment of FIU's obligation to its students. Valid and reliable assessment data is also necessary for accountability to external stakeholders such as taxpayers and accrediting agencies. FIU balances its need for assessment data that broadly portrays graduates' achievement of global

learning outcomes with its need for information that enables faculty and students to make meaningful, incremental adjustments for continuous improvement.

3. **What kinds of global learning experiences should FIU provide for its students?** The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) defines global learning as the process by which students are prepared to fulfill their civic responsibilities in a diverse and interconnected world (Hovland 2006). Given FIU's global learning outcomes and its unique geographic and socioeconomic context, FIU has defined the kinds of content, pedagogical strategies, and activities that should comprise the process of global learning at FIU.

Hundreds of students, faculty, staff, administrators, community members, and alumni considered these questions in discussions led by FIU's Office of Global Learning Initiatives (OGLI). These discussions were essential in building institutional support for "Global Learning for Global Citizenship" and resulted in the development and design of the initiative's major components: an integrated global learning curriculum and co-curriculum, faculty and staff development, and a comprehensive assessment plan. FIU achieved overlapping consensus concerning its global learning outcomes through an 18 month-long process of participatory dialogue and democratic deliberation (Landorf and Doscher 2012).

FIU's Global Learning Outcomes

The OGLI engaged diverse stakeholders in an exploration of potential learning outcomes through focus groups, open forum discussions, open-ended interviews, meetings, and surveys. After an initial brainstorming period at each face-to-face encounter, the OGLI shared responses from other stakeholders in order to facilitate conversation across groups. In this way, agreement developed around three outcomes determined central to the practice of global citizenship:

- **Global Awareness:** Knowledge of the interrelatedness of local, global, international, and intercultural issues, trends, and systems.
- **Global Perspective:** The ability to conduct a multi-perspective analysis of local, global, international, and intercultural problems.

- **Global Engagement:** Willingness to engage in local, global, international, and intercultural problem solving.

A multiplicity of stakeholders voiced the need for FIU graduates to be aware of prevailing world conditions, and echoed Nussbaum's (2004) contention that citizens cannot function on the basis of factual knowledge alone. Twenty-first century citizens must also possess global awareness, an understanding of the world's complexity that enables people to connect the dots between and among seemingly isolated events (Adams and Carfagna 2006). Additionally, FIU stakeholders consistently expressed the need for students to acquire a global perspective, a cognitive agility that allows them to view issues through multiple social, political, cultural, and disciplinary lenses. Beyond this, the FIU community voiced a shared commitment to educate students for active citizenship. While clearly stipulating that the university should dictate neither what students should think nor how they should behave, participants drew a sharp distinction between knowing how to navigate the world's conditions and global engagement, the inclination to assist in solving local, global, international, and intercultural problems.

FIU's Global Learning Courses and Activities

As of fall 2012, 121 global learning foundations and discipline-specific courses have been approved through the Faculty Senate curriculum review process. All global learning courses are either newly developed or existing courses that have been revised to include required components: global learning course outcomes; diverse global, international, and intercultural content; active learning strategies; and authentic assessments. In addition to these components, foundations courses include an integrated co-curricular activity and deal with complex themes best understood through multiple disciplinary lenses. Courses such as "Artistic Expression in a Global Society," "International Nutrition, Public Health, and Economic Development," and "The Global Scientific Revolution and its Impact on Quality of Life" set the stage for students to make interdisciplinary connections throughout their university career. In turn, discipline-specific courses provide students with a global view of their field of study. These courses are available in nearly every academic department, and

range from "Technology in the Global Arena" and "Geography of Global Change" to "Social Responsibility in the Hospitality Industry." Each semester additional courses are developed and/or revised, and approved for global learning designation in response to increased student and faculty calls for a thoroughly globalized learning experience.

The Division of Student Affairs sponsors numerous global learning activities throughout the year. International and cultural clubs and organizations, international volunteering and internship opportunities, lectures, panel discussions, and annual Diversity and International Education weeks engage students from different majors and backgrounds in challenging, eye-opening social and scholarly experiences. The Tuesday Times Roundtable series is FIU's signature co-curricular global learning activity. Scores of participants gather each week over lunch for thought-provoking discussion of *New York Times* articles on global issues. A wide range of faculty, staff, and community leaders moderate these discussions, which take place on FIU's main campuses.

Since fall 2009, the OGLI has facilitated monthly workshops for faculty and staff redesigning or developing new global learning courses and activities. These interdisciplinary, interdepartmental workshops engage participants in active, problem-based learning strategies that can also be implemented with students, moving them towards new perspectives on effective content and pedagogy. A significant part of the workshops is devoted to drafting course and activity outcomes and assessments. These address content that is specific to the discipline, but are aligned with FIU's global learning outcomes. Each global learning opportunity is viewed as an important contribution to the development of students' global outlook.

Assessing Global Learning at FIU

FIU has developed multiple methods for estimating the impact of the global learning initiative on students' learning over the short and long term. To gauge the influence of individual courses, faculty and staff conduct assessments of global learning course outcomes every semester. FIU also conducts an annual pretest/posttest study to determine the initiative's overall influence. Over the ten years of the initiative (2010-2020), FIU will analyze assessment results in the context of new data and the expansion and improvement of courses, constructing an increasingly comprehensive and nuanced understanding of students' responses to global learning and their achievement of the global learning outcomes.

Pretest/Posttest Assessment of FIU's Global Learning Outcomes. FIU's pretest/posttest study enables the university to estimate the value-added impact of the global learning initiative on undergraduate education. The study involves two assessment activities delivered annually as pretests to 10 percent samples of incoming freshmen and transfer students and as posttests to a 10 percent sample of graduating seniors. One of the activities, the institutionally-developed Case Response Assessment (CRA) directly measures students' global awareness and global perspective. The CRA prompts students to read a complex, interdisciplinary case study and respond to two essay prompts corresponding to global awareness and global perspective. A panel of trained faculty raters evaluates students' essays on a scale from zero to four using two FIU-developed rubrics, one for each outcome. The holistic rubrics' five levels align with Bloom's (1956) Taxonomy of Cognitive Development. FIU defines the minimum criterion for success on activity as a rubric score of three, which represents the cognitive level of analysis. Results of a quasi-experimental study comparing average learning gains of students enrolled in global learning and non-global learning courses demonstrated that the rubrics yield valid and highly reliable measures of students' global awareness and perspective (Doscher 2012).

FIU uses the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) (Braskamp, Braskamp, and Merrill 2009) to indirectly assess all three outcomes: global awareness, global perspective, and global engagement. This survey instrument requires respondents to rank 48 statements on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; and Strongly Disagree). The GPI assesses students' development and acquisition of three interconnected domains—cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal—each of which is divided into two scales. In order to determine the instrument's construct validity as an assessment of FIU's global learning outcomes, the OGLI developed a table of specifications survey wherein internal and external experts were asked to rate GPI items for correspondence with each outcome. Results indicated that the GPI's cognitive scales aligned closely with the global awareness outcome, its intrapersonal

scales with the global perspective outcome, and its interpersonal scales with the global engagement outcome.

FIU will only be able to gauge the full value-added impact of the global learning initiative when the first student cohort subject to the requirement begins to graduate in spring 2014. However, general response trend analyses of pretest and baseline results collected since 2010 have yielded some important findings. CRA results indicate that students, regardless of their class level, have more difficulty achieving high levels of global perspective than global awareness. Additionally, pretest GPI results for freshmen and transfers and posttest baseline results for seniors indicate that all class level groups scored higher than the 2011-12 established national norm (Braskamp 2012) on all scales except that of "Knowing" in the Cognitive domain. Braskamp defines "Knowing" as the "complexity of one's view of the importance of cultural contexts when judging what is important to know and value" (Braskamp 2012, 2). Although items in this scale have been determined to align with the global awareness outcome, students' comparatively low scores on this particular cognitive attribute may indicate the source of their difficulty with analyzing issues from perspectives other than their own. In a small-scale study comparing pretest/posttest GPI scores of freshmen students who took at least one global learning course during AY 2011-12 with those who didn't, FIU found that the global learning course had a statistically significant positive impact on students' Cognitive-Knowing scale scores. In response to these results, the OGLI is working closely with faculty to infuse courses with targeted activities requiring students to evaluate issues based on complex cultural contexts, and has increased partnerships with Student Affairs departments and community organizations to offer co-curricular cultural programming.

Assessment of FIU's Global Learning Course Outcomes. Along with a syllabus, Faculty Senate curriculum committees review a comprehensive assessment plan prepared by the faculty member when considering the course for global learning designation. This document includes the global learning course outcomes, planned assessment activities or artifacts, evaluation methods, minimum criteria for success, and the student sample size. Faculty members use this document to report assessment results and make suggestions for continuous improvement

at the end of every semester the course is taught. The OGLI collects and analyzes course syllabi and assessment reports and a Faculty Senate committee uses them to assess the courses' ongoing fidelity of implementation, i.e. adherence to global learning course outcomes, assessments, content, and active learning strategies.

Confirming findings from the pretest/posttest study, faculty report that students have more difficulty developing a global perspective than they do global awareness. Some faculty have observed that these outcomes may be developmentally related, finding that students must achieve some measure of global awareness before they see the need and value to approaching issues from other points of view. They also note challenges in terms of the discomfort students often feel with cognitive dissonance and cultural contrast associated with achieving a global perspective. With these results in mind, some faculty members have begun sequencing content and activities with a developmental approach to global learning outcomes. Courses begin with students building global awareness through the exploration of interrelated dynamics influencing the topic of study. With this background knowledge, students are prepared to build a global perspective by investigating these complex issues from multiple cultural or analytical viewpoints. These outcomes are then strengthened by engaging students in group problem-solving related to the topic. Faculty report that instructional strategies such as field research, volunteering and service learning, team-based learning (Michaelsen, Knight, and Fink 2004), and the case method of instruction have led to increased development of global perspective and engagement. Faculty observe that these pedagogies, successful as they may be, are also time- and resource-intensive, and demand additional resources and support from academic programs, Student Affairs departments, and the OGLI. This is one of several continuing challenges with which FIU is contending as it seeks to continuously improve students' global learning.

Challenges

Having overcome the initial obstacle of instituting undergraduate curriculum reform, FIU's foremost challenge now concerns the long-term fidelity of its growing suite of global learning-designated courses. Fidelity of implementation has a direct impact

on student learning. Global learning courses were specifically engineered to develop students' global awareness, perspective, and engagement. Faculty members who designed the courses engaged in extensive professional development and coaching through the OGLI, and, as originally conceived, these courses were approved through a comprehensive Faculty Senate vetting process. How can the university now ensure that students continue to benefit over the long term from the substantial global learning components built into course syllabi? Fidelity is particularly endangered when original faculty members move on to other teaching assignments. To address this challenge, the OGLI has expanded its professional development offerings to include workshops targeting instructors inheriting courses from first-generation global learning faculty. It is essential that differentiated professional development continue for the duration of the initiative to allow for reflection and continuous improvement. Faculty members also need to be rewarded for the substantive improvements they implement as a result of professional development, i.e. the additional time, effort, and creativity exerted to engage all students in multi-perspective problem solving in a global context. FIU has developed specific procedures to assess and improve the long-term fidelity of global learning courses. The university must allocate sufficient human and financial resources to carry out this responsibility even when its primary focus turns to other initiatives.

As for assessing the global learning outcomes, the university faces two interrelated challenges. One concerns incentivizing graduating seniors to put forth their best effort when they take the assessments. Although FIU will not be able to begin analyzing students' value-added learning gains until spring 2013—when the first students subject to the global learning requirement graduate —the university collects baseline data on seniors who currently complete the global learning assessments as part of their graduation packet. Two years of baseline data reveal a trend that seniors score lower on the assessments than do incoming freshmen or transfer students. Out of concern that seniors' low motivation may threaten the validity of their scores, the university is exploring alternative contexts in which to gauge students' development of global citizenship. These may include course-embedded capstone assessments that offer more authentic, high-stakes opportunities for students to demonstrate their global awareness, perspective, and engagement.

Connected to the question of optimal assessment conditions is how best to balance the allocation of resources needed to implement broad program-level assessment with meaningful analysis of course-level assessment results. Global learning course assessment provides essential feedback concerning the relative contribution that specific teaching and assessment strategies make toward students' achievement of the global learning outcomes. FIU considers each global learning experience an incremental step in student development; the story behind students' global awareness, perspective, and engagement posttest scores at graduation may ultimately lie within both the cumulative effect of multiple global learning opportunities and the power of individual, highly effective educational practices. Yet at the course level, motivating and supporting reluctant faculty members who consider assessment a distractor rather than a contributor to student learning is a resource-intensive process. As noted in Measuring and Assessing Internationalization (Green 2012), "many faculty members do not see assessment as adding value to their work, and indeed see it as busywork imposed by administrators." The OGLI has found that consistent dialogue with global learning faculty, staff, and students concerning what works and what doesn't is key to finding meaning in assessment results, improving the quality of assessments, and using results to improve content and pedagogy. To that end, the OGLI offers discussion sessions at the beginning and end of each semester to guide faculty through the global learning course assessment process and facilitate reflection on successes and challenges. Participants commend the sessions' usefulness, citing opportunities to meet with and learn from faculty members across disciplines struggling with similar issues. Despite these successful results, the OGLI remains constrained in its ability to provide enough support to faculty through coaching and dialogue, as well as in the timely collection, analysis, and dissemination of course assessment results. The office's limited human resources are prioritized to carry out FIU's global learning pretest/posttest assessment study, the results of which must be reported to the university's accrediting body in 2015.

Conclusion

In the implementation of its 10-year global learning initiative, FIU recommitted itself to living up to its middle name and founding purposes. To make good on this commitment, it is essential that the university keep its finger on the pulse of what students are learning, the circumstances that facilitate learning, and the incremental and cumulative impacts of the initiative on students' global capacities. Continual multi-method assessment of FIU's global learning efforts is not only necessary to justify the expenditure of scarce public resources, but it is also the most effective means of keeping the university on a steady path toward achieving its most important goal, the sound education of its students.

References

Adams, J. Michael, and Angelo Carfagna. *Coming of Age in a Globalized World.* Bloomfield, IL: Kumarian Press, 2006.

The Beacon Council. "International Companies." The Beacon Council, 2012. http://www.beaconcouncil.com/web/Content.aspx?Page=international Companies.

Bloom, Benjamin S. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain.* New York, NY: David McKay, 1956.

Braskamp, Larry, David C. Braskamp, Kelly C. Merrill, and Mark Engberg. *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its Purpose, Construction, Potential Uses, and Psychometric Characteristics.* Chicago: Global Perspective Institute, 2012. https://gpi.central.edu/supportDocs/manual.pdf.

Global Perspective Institute. *Interpretive Guide and Norms for Global Perspective Inventory (GPI).* Chicago: Global Perspective Institute, 2012. https://gpi.central.edu/supportDocs/Interpretative_guide.pdf

Doscher, Stephanie P. "The Development of Rubrics to Measure Undergraduate Students' Global Awareness and Global Perspective: A Validity Study." EdD thesis, Florida International University, 2012. ProQuest (AAT 3517005).

Green, Madeleine F. *Measuring and Assessing Internationalization.* Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, 2012.

Hovland, Kevin. *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006.

Landorf, Hilary, and Stephanie Paul Doscher. "Global Learning for Global Citizenship." In *Human Development and Capabilities Re-imagining the University of the Twenty-First Century,* edited by Alejandra Boni and Melanie Walker. New York: Routledge Press, 2013.

Michaelsen, Larry K., Arletta B. Knight, and L. D. Fink, eds. *Team-Based Learning: A Transformative Use of Small Groups in College Teaching.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2004.

Nussbaum, Martha. "Liberal Education and Global Community." *Liberal Education* 90, no. 4 (2004): 42-48.

United States Census Bureau. "State & County Quick Facts." United States Census Bureau, 2012. http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/12/1245000.html.

Section 2: Endnotes

1. Institute of International Education. (2012). "Leading Institutions by Long-term Duration of Study Abroad and Institutional Type, 2010/11." *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange.* Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/opendoors.
2. "Mission," Juniata College, accessed May 21, 2013. http://www.juniata.edu/about/mission.html.
3. "Core Requirements," Juniata College, accessed May 21, 2013. http://www.juniata.edu/services/registrar/catalog/requirements.html.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. "NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice," *Fostering Student Engagement Campuswide: Annual Results 2011,* National Survey of Student Engagement (2011): 27. http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2011_Results/pdf/NSSE_2011_Annual_Results.pdf#page=27.
7. "James J. Lasko Center for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," Juniata College, accessed May 21, 2013. http://www.juniata.edu/services/sotl/.
8. Ibid.
9. http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/documents/CrossCase_FINAL.pdf; see also Jankowski, N. (2011, July). Juniata College: Faculty led assessment (NILOA Examples of Good Assessment Practice). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. Retrieved from http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/JuniataCaseStudy.html and http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/documents/JuniataCaseStudy.pdf.
10. "Juniata College—Middle States Visiting Team Report," http://www.juniata.edu/services/provost/middlestates/msateamreport.pdf (March 2003): 6.
11. Ibid.
12. "ACE Internationalization Laboratory," American Council on Education, accessed May 21, 2013. http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/ACE-Internationalization-Laboratory.aspx.
13. A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization, American Council on Education (2006): 113.
14. "2008 Strategic Plan," Juniata College, accessed May 21, 2013. http://www.juniata.edu/president/strategicplan.html.
15. Including AAC&U's Essential Learning Outcomes http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm; the ACE Guide to Assessing International Learning; The Forum on Education Abroad's Guide to Outcomes Assessment in Education Abroad (Bolen 2007) http://www.forumea.org/research-outcomes_assess_guide.cfm; NAFSA's Assessment and Evaluation for International Educators http://www.nafsa.org/resourcelibrary/default.aspx?id=22092; and SAGE publications by Darla Deardorff, especially The Handbook of Intercultural Competence (Deardorff 2009), http://www.sagepub.com/books/Book232239.
16. GLCA Briefing on Study Abroad Project (September 2009): 1.
17. Ibid 2.
18. "Bloom's Taxonomy," personal webpage, Richard C. Overbaugh, Old Dominion University, accessed May 21, 2013. http://ww2.odu.edu/educ/roverbau/Bloom/blooms_taxonomy.htm.
19. January 2013 Language in Motion SoTL presentation, Juniata College.
20. A complete version of the QEP and its assessment plan is available at: https://www.assessment.gatech.edu/wp-content/uploads/qep.pdf.
21. The IDI produces a normed Developmental Orientation Score between 55–145, with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Students in the IP gained 16.1 points on the IDI over the course of the program, while semester abroad students gained only 3.4 points. Students with no abroad experiences gained only 0.70 on the instrument.
22. The 2010 document can be found here: http://www.facultygovernance.gatech.edu/EB2011-113010-M-Attach2b.pdf.

APPENDIX A
Juniata College Desirable Intercultural Competencies

Knowledge

1. Awareness of the complexity and interdependency of world events and issues.
2. Knowledge of world geography and of the global environment, conditions, issues, and events.
3. Knowledge of one's own culture and history and at least one other culture and history.
4. Understanding of historical, political, religious, and economic forces which have shaped the current world system.
5. Understanding of the diversity and commonalities found in the world in terms of values, beliefs, ideas, and worldviews.

Attitudes

1. Openness to learning, intellectual curiosity, and a positive orientation to new opportunities, ideas, and ways of thinking.
2. Openness to the artistic and cultural expressions of one's own and other cultures.
3. Sensitivity and respect for personal and cultural differences and a commitment to responsible global citizenship.

4. Empathy or the ability to view the world and one's and others' place in it from multiple perspectives.

Skills

1. Information access and research skills to enhance the ability of students to learn about the world.
2. Communication skills and strategies, including the ability to use another language to interact effectively with people from other cultures.
3. Coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and ambiguous situations.
4. Critical and comparative thinking skills, including the ability to think creatively and to integrate knowledge about other cultures into a coherent and inclusive worldview.
5. The ability to respond aesthetically and to interpret creatively the artistic and cultural expressions of other cultures.
6. The ability to critique one's own cultural values and biases by comparing and contrasting them with those of other cultures.

	4 Extensive	3 Moderate	2 Minimal	1 Inadequate
REMEMBER				
Locate different countries or culturally unified regions on a map				
Name facts about different cultures				
Match cultural products to origins				
UNDERSTAND				
Summarize some of the historical, political, religious, or economic forces that have shaped the world				
Give examples of the diversity and commonalities found in the world in terms of values, beliefs, or ideas				
Explain the significance of cultural artifacts				
Demonstrate an understanding of one's own culture				
APPLY				
Map the complexity and relationship of world events and issues				
Communicate with native speakers of a second language				
Follow directions or find out what is necessary to succeed in a foreign institution				
Access information to learn about the world or intercultural issues				

	4 Extensive	3 Moderate	2 Minimal	1 Inadequate
ANALYZE				
Compare and contrast different worldviews or cultural perspectives				
Investigate unfamiliar ideas or ways of thinking				
Infer ideas or meaning from the cultural production or artifacts of other cultures				
Integrate understanding gained from study abroad or intercultural experience				
EVALUATE				
Critique one's own cultural values and biases				
Debate the complex causes or consequences of global issues or events				
Weigh the merits or pertinence of various arguments about global problems and solutions				
Discuss and evaluate cultural productions				
CREATE				
Respond to hypothetical situations in culturally authentic contexts				
Imagine how the world could or should be different				
Generate and participate in discussions on abstract topics on global perspectives or issues				
Write, produce, or create new cultural products				

NAFSA

**Association of
International Educators**

1307 New York Avenue, NW

Suite 800

Washington, DC 20005-4701 USA

www.nafsa.org