

**Southeast Missouri State University's  
Comprehensive Internationalization Committee Self-Study  
As guided by the American Council on Education (ACE)**

The following is a self-study of Southeast Missouri State's current engagement in comprehensive internationalization. In order to conduct this study, individuals from the Comprehensive Internationalization team was divided into six different sub-committees. Each sub-committee was given the task of conducting their own research into the current state of international engagement at Southeast in regard to their own specific topic. The topics assigned to each sub-committee were based on ACE's six pillars of comprehensive internationalization. Thus, the six topics of examination for each of the sub-committees were:

- 1. Articulated institutional commitment & administrative structures and staffing**
- 2. Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes**
- 3. Faculty policies and practices**
- 4. Outgoing student mobility (i.e., study/education abroad)**
- 5. Incoming student mobility (i.e., international students)**
- 6. Collaborations and partnerships**

Each sub-committee was asked to develop a series of questions that they wanted to answer, in order to guide their research. In presenting their findings, each sub-committee was subsequently asked to provide answers to their guiding questions, followed by a SWOT (Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats) analysis of their topic. Likewise, a campus survey was administered near the end of the 2017 Spring Semester. The response rate was relatively low and thus the findings cannot be deemed statistically significant. Nevertheless, there are certain general inferences that can be made from the committee's research. The motivation behind each of the six pillars, the guiding questions & answers, and the SWOT analyses provided by each sub-committee are provided as follows:

---

## **Pillar 1: Articulated Institutional Commitment & Administrative Structures and Staffing**

“Strategic planning involving key stakeholders articulates an institution’s commitment to internationalization and provides a roadmap for implementation. Formal assessment mechanisms reinforce this commitment by framing explicit goals and holding the institution accountable for accomplishing them. The involvement of top leaders, and appropriate administrative and reporting structures form an essential framework for implementing internationalization.”

*Source - <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>*

ACE recommendations in these areas include:

- **Strategic planning.** Internationalization is prioritized in mission statements and institution-wide strategic plans and through explicit internationalization plans.
- **Internationalization committee.** A steering committee comprised of representatives from across the campus is designated to oversee implementation of internationalization initiatives.
- **Campus stakeholders.** Focus groups, surveys and open discussions convey priorities, address concerns and gain buy-in by students, faculty, staff and other stakeholders.
- **Assessment.** Following from articulated goals, progress and outcomes of internationalization are formally measured and assessed.
- **Senior leadership.** The president and CAO are committed to internationalization and are engaged in the process from the start.
- **International office.** An office or offices are designated to coordinate campus-wide internationalization activities. The faculty or staff member primarily responsible for internationalization reports to the CAO or president.

Given these guiding principles, the committee identified the following five questions. The associated responses follow immediately afterward:

*1. To what extent is SEMO’s support for comprehensive internationalization evident and shared publicly (e.g. messaging, marketing materials, etc.)?*

- A sense of comprehensive internationalization is alluded to University’s current strategic plan *value statement*, which reads “Southeast Missouri State University values access to high quality, affordable education with a broadly representative student body, faculty,

and staff that respects and **celebrates a diverse learning community in a global society.**”

- Comprehensive internationalization is also often discussed by upper administration in public settings. President Vargas featured participation in the Comprehensive Internationalization Laboratory in his 2016-2017 “The State of the University Address” at the Faculty/Staff Convocation. He is regularly in attendance to support international-related student activities, and recently successfully advocated for the creation of a new space for international programs. Further, the vice-presidents demonstrate a commitment to their support of comprehensive internationalization through their words and actions. The Southeast website is accessible with current information and contains links to international education, services, and study abroad. International students are also prominently displayed in on-campus marketing materials, whether it be on the website, public signage, or print materials. There is also a strong social media presence.

*2. Is staffing in various administrative offices across campus adequate for meeting the needs of international students?*

- Though the Office of International Education and Services (OIES) office has grown over the last three years, and the University added staff to support student orientation and advising, there is some sense among international students that OIES is not adequately staffed to meet their unique needs. Programs for international students also have increased. In addition, international students can feel service and administrative offices on-campus are not sensitive to their questions or concerns, such as financial, advising, and housing (i.e. meal plans might be confusing to international students).
- At the College level, staffing numbers is also a problem. HCB does more exchanges and short term programs than anywhere else on campus, plus administers a major and a minor (with all associated advising and recruiting obligations) yet has only ¼ faculty release and ½ admin release.

*3. To what extent do university staff members have intercultural/global competencies that would help them be more effective in working with international students and colleagues?*

- Staff members have indicated an interest in learning more about international experiences, but few know how to develop such opportunities. There is a feeling that the educational experience at Southeast successfully develops global competencies in our graduates. However, the University needs additional effort in providing staff members with intercultural/global competencies to more effectively work with international students.

*4. What types of training and professional development opportunities are available to staff to help them with the goals of comprehensive internationalization?*

- The International Office offers training to units when requested. The Office of Instructional Technology has devoted several workshops to *Internationalization* topics.

Additional instruction could be provided by key faculty members who have experience in this area.

*5. What formal opportunities are there for administration and staff to have international experiences?*

- Members of the administration (along with faculty and staff) have made forays to areas where strategic partnerships were discussed and developed. One example is that President Carlos Vargas and a group of faculty and staff recently visited Universidad Católica Santa María La Antigua and Universidad Especializada de las Américas, both in Panama City, Panama, and Universidad de Iberoamérica in Tibas, Costa Rica, along with other nearby educational institutions. The trip was part of an effort to strengthen relationships with universities and Southeast alumni in Latin America. The intent was to explore and begin establishing collaborative efforts to increase research and study-abroad opportunities for students and faculty in education, health studies, agriculture, and other disciplines. The visits also laid the groundwork to encourage students from Latin America to study at Southeast.
- Members of the staff from the International Office make strategic recruiting and informational visits to key geographic regions, to attract students.

-----

## **SWOT Analysis: Articulated institutional commitment & administrative structures and staffing**

### **Strengths**

- Leadership commitment
- International student presence on-campus
- Interest among staff for international experiences
- Point person for international structure
- Expertise available to conduct cultural competence training and workshops
- Active international student population
- Developed website to promote international commitment
- University community support of international students
- Centralization of training and development in Human Resources and investment in technology and personnel to enhance training.

### **Weaknesses**

- Lack of centralization for study abroad information dissemination
- Ambiguity in the process of international opportunities
- Lack of consistency in some operations and processes among the programs promoting

internationalization.

- Resource constraints (time and budget)
- Lack of marketing materials promoting internationalization
- Lack of general education and program learning outcomes supporting global engagement.

### **Opportunities**

- Use of analytics to improve websites
- Willingness of staff to participate in international experiences
- Expertise to streamline and centralize the process
- Expertise to create online training and workshops
- Further engage the strong university marketing and communication unit in this area
- Develop additional courses and academic minors supporting global engagement.

### **Threats**

- National attitudes and climate for diversity and immigration policy
- Regional climate towards diverse populations.
- Declining enrollment of international students
- Competing interests in the purpose of general education.
- Decline in revenue. Future funding will be allocated to support program enhancements that are considered central to the mission.

## Pillar 2: Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes

“As a core purpose of higher education, student learning is a critical element of internationalization. An internationalized curriculum and co-curriculum ensure that all students are exposed to international perspectives and build global competence. Globally-focused student learning outcomes articulate specific knowledge and skills to be addressed in courses and programs.”

*Source - <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>*

ACE recommendations in these areas include:

- **General education requirements.** Courses that focus on foreign language, regional studies and global issues are included in undergraduate general education requirements.
- **Internationalized courses in the disciplines.** Courses within each major incorporate international perspectives and highlight global issues in the field.
- **Co-curriculum.** Programs and activities address global issues, reinforce international elements of the curriculum, facilitate discussion and interaction among students of different backgrounds and support the integration and success of international students on campus.
- **Student learning outcomes.** Internationally-focused competencies are included in campus-wide student learning outcome goals and assessments.
- **Technology.** Technology is used in innovative ways to enhance global learning, e.g. through joint coursework and interactions with students and faculty abroad.

Given these guiding principles, the committee identified the following questions. The associated responses follow immediately afterward:

- 1. How do Southeast students gain global competencies through the curriculum?*
- 2. Does the curriculum encourage all majors to incorporate minors and electives with global focus into their four-year study plans?*
- 3. Do all majors include opportunities for students to gain a global perspective from their disciplinary point of view?*

These three related issues were lumped together, as they cross similar issues.

There are definitely certain majors/programs that address these issues well. Just as “one” example, in the **Harrison College of Business**:

- At the undergraduate level, there is a major and a minor in “International Business”.
- All HCB students, regardless of major, are required to take at least one course in an “international” area. (*These include course options such as, International Accounting, International Economics, International Finance, International Management, International Marketing and International Business.*)
- Students in a number of other HCB majors are required to have a “*Real Life Experience*” which is satisfied by either a study abroad experience or an internship.
- At the MBA level, all students are provided 12 hours outside of the general, core requirements, through which they formulate an “option”. One of these options is “International Business”. Students who choose other options, also have access to these courses, as electives.

Likewise (*needless to say*) the **Foreign Language** programs have an extensive coverage in this area.

Also, outside of the Business and Language programs, there are numerous courses within other majors and programs, which list an *international/global* component to them. In the course listings in the Undergraduate Bulletin, it was found that the following majors/programs have such courses:

- Agriculture
- Art
- Biology
- Communication Studies
- Construction Management
- Education / International Education
- Environmental Science
- Fashion Merchandising
- History
- Manufacturing
- Mass Communications
- Music
- Political Science
- Sports Management
- University Studies (various courses)

It is acknowledged that there is undoubtedly international/global coverage in other courses that do not explicitly state this information in the course catalog. However, at the same time, many of these courses are *electives* that are available, but not required of the students.

*4. Does the general education curriculum successfully develop global competencies in all students?*

As it was noted, there are “University Studies” courses that have international/global component in their catalog descriptions. (Actually eight are listed.) However, given that the University Studies requirements have been recently eliminated, it is quite possible that in the future these courses may not be offered with the same frequency.

*5. What non- or co-curricular opportunities exist to increase global competency?*

General findings

- *Some* Southeast students can go through their entire academic career without having targeted instruction about the world beyond our campus.
  - The theme of internationalization in the curriculum is very decentralized and sporadic
- There is therefore, no culture of “global competency” in curricula
  - What is it?
  - Why is it valued?
- There is general support for including greater opportunities for global competency, but the hurdles are great, the financial and time costs high, and the incentives are little.

-----

**SWOT Analysis: Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes**

**Strengths**

- There is overall Faculty and Staff Support for a more Global Curriculum.
- The diversity of students and faculty help to increase global competency.
- All colleges publicly express support internationalization in web and print media.

**Weaknesses**

- There is no formal University-wide expectation of global perspective within curricula.
- There is a lack of systemic resources and organization to assist faculty and staff in integrating or marketing global competencies into the curriculum.
- There are insufficient funding opportunities to encourage international experiences for students.

## **Opportunities**

- The ongoing review of the University Studies Curriculum can address some of the curricular issues.
- Potential revisions of Degree Programs/Degree Options can take place.
- Global perspective instruction can be integrated into freshman/transfer orientation or UI 100.
- We can better define and disseminate the benefits of global competency.

## **Threats**

- Increasing demands of external accreditors that more strictly impact curricula
- Declining funding support for global competencies at home and abroad
- Larger social and political forces within the United States and Missouri

### **Pillar 3: Faculty policies and practices**

“As the primary drivers of teaching and research, faculty play a pivotal role in campus internationalization. Institutional policies and support mechanisms ensure that faculty have opportunities to develop international competence and are able to maximize the impact of these experiences on student learning.”

Source - <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>

ACE recommendations in these areas include:

- **Tenure and promotion policies.** Tenure codes state explicitly that international work and experience should be considered in tenure and promotion decisions.
- **Hiring guidelines.** International background, experience and interests are among the criteria upon which faculty candidates are evaluated.
- **Faculty mobility.** Faculty have opportunities to teach, conduct research and attend conferences abroad. Administrative and funding mechanisms support faculty participation in outside programs (e.g. Fulbright).
- **On-campus professional development.** Workshops, seminars and other programs help faculty build international competence and incorporate international perspectives into their teaching.

Given these guiding principles, the committee identified the following questions. The associated responses follow immediately afterward:

*1. What are the greatest strengths of the SEMO faculty that support global learning?*

- There are indications that the Southeast Faculty is supportive of a Strong Globally-Oriented Curriculum. There was a favorable response to the idea that it is important for the curriculum to have Course Learning Objectives (CLOs) related to the development of global competencies. Certainly one can imagine that some disciplines are inherently not oriented toward global activity, due to subject matter or accreditation issues. However, many departmental curriculums currently have CLOs related to the development of global competencies. Several others consider that they “should have” CLOs that are related to global competence, however they are not currently in place.
- The Faculty also appear to believe that Southeast is preparing their graduates to be “Globally Competent.”

2. *In what areas do the SEMO faculty need more support to improve their engagement with global learning?*

- In addressing this question, we would first like to note the resources and entities that are currently in place to assist in this area. There are several resources that have been created to guide faculty as they plan Student Study Abroad Programs. These are housed on the Provost's website (*under the "Faculty" tab*) and under the heading of "**Study Abroad Planning Documents**". The four documents are:

1. Study Abroad Faculty Guide – (*officially, "Study Abroad Handbook", Created by, International Task Force Committee; Endorsed by Academic Council, October 2015*)

- *While well intentioned, this guidebook has resulted in faculty members offering faculty-led programs, who are not sufficiently experienced in planning them. This has often come with the aid of an outside tour company (such as EF Tours.) External companies result in much higher prices for our students, and thus eliminate many potential students from participating due to the price barrier. There is significant expertise on campus through those who are have years of experience conducting these programs. As an institution, we should draw on that experience. External companies should only be used as a last resort.*
- *Likewise, the rigor of the instruction in this area should be addressed. Although the process of learning can be somewhat different, the same standards of rigor should apply for all courses of instruction.*
- *The short-term programs certainly increase the accessibility to students, as many students can-not (or will-not) spend a complete semester away. However, there is little interest, from faculty, in encouraging students to participate in a **semester abroad program**. A semester abroad is a much richer experience than a week or two travelling with other SEMO students! Emphasis solely on Faculty-led programs to the detriment of semester abroad possibilities is a problem.*

2. Administrative Procedure – Policy guidance on tuition, salaries, student fees, and travel Expenses

3. Student Program Fee Calculation Sheet

4. Program Fee Calculation

- *While the before mentioned items are currently in place, the documents and processes are strongly in need of review. Particularly timely, would be a discussion on the allocation and use of the funds that are generated through study abroad activities.*

-----

- Additionally, numerous departments, committees or initiatives have been designed to promote and assist with internationalization efforts. Two examples are provided below. It should be noted, however, that although these committees exist, there seems to be very limited activity around them in the past several years.

-----

### **International Council ... (last met???)**

**Charge:** The purpose of this committee is to advise in the development of international initiatives as identified in the International Strategic Plan and to assist the Office of International Programs with long-range planning to internationalize the University experience. This committee receives reports and recommendations needing further action from the other committees. Using the reports and recommendations, it participates in strategic planning for International Programs, reviews and advises on the forwarding of recommendations to others in the University community, and receives and disseminates to the appropriate committees, suggestions and ideas from others. (The committee reviews its charge each year and recommends appropriate changes to the Provost.)

**Membership:** A faculty representative nominated by each of the five colleges; a Representative nominated by Student Development; Office of Admissions; TESOL/ESOL; two undergraduate students: one international student and one student with study abroad experience nominated by the President of Student Government; and one international graduate student nominated by the Graduate Student Government College, Polytechnic Studies, Student Development, and committee representatives serve three-year terms. Student representatives serve one-year terms. Non-rotating members include the Dean of the College of Business, the Registrar, the Director of International Programs, and the Assistant Director of International Programs. The Provost appoints all nominees.

-----

### **International Programs Planning Committee ... (last met???)**

**Charge:** The purpose of this committee is to advise the Executive Director in developing and implementing international initiatives as identified through the strategic planning process. This committee receives reports related to globalization initiatives and makes recommendations to the university, for further consideration.

**Membership:** A faculty representative from the five colleges will be nominated by the Dean to serve three-year terms. Non-rotating members include the Associate Vice

President for Enrollment Management and the Executive Director of International Education & Services. Other non-rotating members will be nominated from Student Financial Services by the Vice President of Finance and Administration; and Registrar's office, Residence Life, Admissions, and Campus Life nominated by the Vice President of Enrollment Management and Student Success. The college/school Directors of International Programs will serve as non-rotating members. One international undergraduate student nominated by the President of Student Government and one international graduate student nominated by the Dean of Graduate Studies will serve one-year terms. The Director of Intensive English Program and each of the three International Education Advisors will serve as ex-officio members. The Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success appoints all nominees. The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management will serve as chair. The Provost will appoint an Academic Affairs representative to serve as co-chair.

-----

- Faculty and staff are also offered occasional in-house professional development opportunities. Recent examples are:

**The Office of Instructional Technology** has devoted several workshops to aid Faculty in the International/Globalization Area. These include topics such as:

- Winter 2016 – Faculty Development Day – “Teaching the International Student”
  - Spring 2016 – Take-Away Friday – “Culturally Responsive Teaching”
  - Spring 2017 – Take-Away Friday – “Ask Verona: Supervising Study Abroad”
- 
- Another important tool in preparing faculty to engage with global learning is the **2016 President’s Task Force on Diversity Education**. To progress in our thoughts and actions as a campus community, the Task Force emphasizes the importance of increasing cultural competence as a University community. Cultural competence refers to an ability to interact effectively with people of different cultures and socioeconomic backgrounds. The following initiatives are recommended as preliminary recommendations of that task force:
    - Develop college-level diversity action plans
    - Adopt culturally responsive teaching methods
    - Improve career development, mentorship and networking opportunities for Underserved student populations
    - Increase awareness and encourage participation in undergraduate research opportunities among underserved student populations
    - Use existing programs to build the cultural competence of new students

- Use existing organizations and diversity initiatives to raise the cultural competence of the campus community
- *SEMO faculty mentioned several areas in which more support could enhance their engagement with global learning:*
  - Financial – There was an indication that financial resources are a barrier.
  - Information – Some believe that information needs to be more centralized and communicated through marketing, possibly a fair.
  - Training and professional development – Some faculty find it difficult to incorporate internalization/globalization into the classroom without additional training and/or development.
  - Support from administration – as it pertains to rewards for globalization initiatives.

3. *Are there faculty from particular academic units that need more support to improve global learning for their students?*

- Currently, there are pockets of academic units (Business, Modern Languages, Health, Human Performance & Recreation and Theater, *are some*) that have expertise in global learning. Possibly collaborating with these units may help other units who may want to get started or improve their global learning.
- Marketing these opportunities and providing information across campus on the on programs that Southeast currently has, can also help..

4. *Is the tenure, promotion and recognition system for faculty work, properly calibrated to account for global engagement of the faculty in teaching, scholarship, and service?*

- The Tenure and Promotion documents of the 30 academic departments were examined. There were only three of those, which had specific criteria that addressed global/international engagement in teaching, scholarship and service.
  - Most notably, the Department of Art uses a point-system in their assessment of activities, in which some accomplishments are assigned higher points than others.
  - Only one departmental Tenure and Promotion document had a unique category for “*teaching abroad.*” This is the Department of English.
- There were many other instances of the word “international” in the 30 T&P documents, but these almost exclusively came in the area of “Professional Development”, when describing the type of journal in which a publication could appear. All of these occurrences reflected the equality, “International Journal = National Journal”. Given that this is rather common and that it does not necessarily reflect on the scope of the actual product, minimal consideration was given to these occurrences.

- Nevertheless, this relative lack of attention that the criteria in these 30 documents give to the “international/global” area, does not indicate that such faculty activities are not acknowledged and rewarded by Tenure and Promotion Committees. The areas of expertise of some faculty members naturally lead their activity in this direction.

5. *Which are the first priorities in terms of investing in faculty development for global learning?*

- Finding financial support for faculty
- Providing professional development training
- Making sure that faculty are rewarded for the extraordinary effort that some of these activities entail.
- Creating opportunities to collaborate with faculty on global learning

-----

## **SWOT Analysis: Faculty Policies and Practices**

### **Strengths**

- Leadership commitment from engaged faculty
- Significant expertise in certain areas of campus in delivering international programs
- Strong curriculum identifies global learning
- Develop global competencies in our graduates
- Education at Southeast prepares global leaders

### **Weaknesses**

- Lack of resources (time and budget)
- Lack of centralized area to get information
- “International” committees are not active
- Lack of attention given to semester-long student experiences
- Lack of Tenure & Promotion incentives for faculty to engage in international activities.

### **Opportunities**

- Willingness of faculty to participate in international experiences
- We could promote the idea among faculty that those who conduct short-term programs, have the responsibility to also promote semester-long programs within their area.
- Work on increased partnerships.

## **Threats**

- Political climate regarding internationalization policies.
- Declining enrollment of international students

## **Pillar 4: Student mobility – outgoing (i.e., study/education abroad)**

“Student mobility, which (in this instance) refers ... to the outward flow of domestic students to other countries to engage in an education abroad experience ... is often a focus of internationalization efforts. Orientations, re-entry programs and other support structures and activities help facilitate student adjustment and maximize learning.”

Source - <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>

ACE recommendations in these areas include:

- **Credit transfer policies.** Students can easily earn credit for study abroad through approved programs.
- **Financial aid and funding.** Student financial aid is applied to approved study abroad programs, and resources are available to help students locate additional funding. Scholarships and other funding are available for international students.
- **Orientation and re-entry programs.** Orientation and re-entry programs help students maximize learning during study abroad, and integrate knowledge gained into their overall program of study. Academic and cultural orientation sessions are provided to all incoming international students.
- **Ongoing support and programs for international students.** Academic and social support structures and programs facilitate international students’ full integration into campus life.

Given these guiding principles, the committee identified the following questions. The associated responses follow immediately afterward:

1. *What are the challenges to getting more students to earn credits abroad?*
  2. *What would we need to do to get more students abroad for full semesters?*
- The challenges to getting more Southeast students to earn credits abroad are multiple. By far, the most popular way that Southeast students go abroad is through short-term faculty-led programs. For example, in 2014-2015, Southeast sent 164 students abroad, 94% (n=154) of which were on short-term faculty-led programs. In 2015-2016, Southeast sent 176 students abroad, 88% (n=154) of which were on short-term faculty-led programs.
  - As stated elsewhere in this document some obvious reasons that students do not go abroad are: employment obligations, the lack of proper monetary resources, fear, general

apathy, etc. However, there are certainly things that we can do to improve certain processes and therefore **remove obstacles** from the paths of our students.

- The University could review policies on transfer of *credits* vs. *grades*, and if we are to continue to transfer grades, then a review of grade parity issues is necessary. (e.g. We give about 30%-40% As. Yet students who are in the top 15% at their host institution have that grade transferred in as a B.) This discourages outbound participation by our “best and brightest”, who are afraid of damaging their high GPAs that are necessary for future endeavors, or perhaps losing a scholarship due to lower grades being transferred in from overseas.
- There are also problems with advising and enrollment. Students sometimes have difficulty enrolling in courses where the pre-requisites were completed overseas, but the grades have not yet posted to their SEMO degree audit.
- Students sometimes face problems after they complete their study abroad semester, as it pertains to the transfer of credits back from their host institution. For example, although policies and deadlines in the Registrar’s Office work very well for courses that are taken from Southeast’s campus, they do not always fit well with study abroad students. This is especially true as it pertains to transcript policies and enforcement of graduation deadlines.
- While understanding the significant challenges that are evident university-wide during lean budgetary times, the increased bureaucracy in the approval process for faculty led trips, has resulted in a significant workload increase for those who are developing such programs. While well intentioned, budgets for such programs are being evaluated by some who lack a full understanding of the intricacies of such programs.

3. *What global learning goals are we hoping to achieve by sending students abroad?*

4. *What do we do to ensure that SEMO’s study abroad programs develop global citizens?*

- Some basic learning goals and objectives that are promoted in Southeast’s Study Abroad experiences are:

### **Learning Objectives**

- Gaining discipline-specific knowledge (*which specifically includes Language Skills for the Modern Language students*)
- Intercultural awareness and competence
- Recognition of global issues
- Ability to weigh opposing viewpoints on global issues

- Interest in community service and involvement
  - Appreciation of differences
  - New perspective on the U.S. and its role in the world
- Specifically, the Course Learning Objectives (CLOs) from the International Business “*Transcultural Experience*” course are listed below.
    - Define the concept of national culture and explain how various national cultures can be distinguished from each other
    - Demonstrate an understanding of how history, religion, art, etc., influences culture
    - Create a portfolio describing the cultural values of the culture(s) to be visited and their relationship to art, literature, history, religion, architecture, technology etc.

-----

### **SWOT analysis of: *Pillar 4: Student mobility – outgoing***

#### **Strengths**

- Overall perceptions of study abroad programs are positive.
- Former program participants express favorable attitudes and positive word-of-mouth towards their study abroad experiences.
- Domestic students have positive attitudes towards interacting socially with international students and are therefore sometimes encouraged to study abroad.

#### **Weaknesses**

- Internationalization/global competencies taught in the classroom/incorporated in the curriculum needs improvement.
- Overall lack of program awareness.
- Lack of accessibility to information and resources.
- Faculty and advisors do not always disseminate study abroad information to their students, well.
- The lack of training for faculty wishing to offer a faculty-led program abroad.
- There could sometimes be more institutional flexibility in providing solutions for the students who elect to study abroad. It is great to have “domestic” rules that work for our students, but sometimes we need to think outside of that box when providing opportunities for international study.
- Lack of scholarships and other incentives.

## **Opportunity**

- The International Education & Services website has undergone positive changes in the past year. It could be further improved to communicate needed information to students regarding the various options they may have to study abroad. .
- The regional campuses are underserved. There could be more outreach to them.
- Southeast could increase marketing efforts at community college partners.

## **Threat**

- Many students will not consider the idea of studying abroad, because of reasons such as family obligations, work commitments, lack of funding/support, no perceived benefit, fear or disinterest in leaving the country.
- In some areas, there is an insufficient number of faculty and/or staff that focuses on incoming and outgoing student affairs.
- Elimination of upper level UI courses/hour requirements will likely have a negative impact on study abroad participation

## Pillar 5: Student mobility – incoming (i.e. international students)

“Student mobility, which (in this instance) refers to ... the **inward flow of international students to study at U.S. campuses** ... is often a focus of internationalization efforts. Orientations, re-entry programs and other support structures and activities help facilitate student adjustment and maximize learning.”

Source - <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>

ACE recommendations in these areas include:

- **Credit transfer policies** - Students can easily earn credit for study abroad through approved programs.
- **Financial aid and funding** - Student financial aid is applied to approved study abroad programs, and resources are available to help students locate additional funding. Scholarships and other funding are available for international students.
- **Orientation and re-entry programs** - Orientation and re-entry programs help students maximize learning during study abroad, and integrate knowledge gained into their overall program of study. Academic and cultural orientation sessions are provided to all incoming international students.
- **Ongoing support and programs for international students** - Academic and social support structures and programs facilitate international students' full integration into campus life.

Given these guiding principles, the committee identified the following questions. The associated responses follow immediately afterward:

### *1. What are the challenges to enrolling more international students at SEMO?*

There are multiple challenges that Southeast, like all universities, faces in an attempt to enroll more international students. These challenges can be broadly categorized in one of two areas – internal and external. Internal challenges are those that are due to the structure of the university and are largely issues that we have the ability to control. External challenges, on the other hand, are those outside the realm of the institution and are things that we as an institution are largely powerless to control. Below is a basic list of the internal and external challenges to enrolling more students at SEMO:

Internal:

- Scholarships must be available to international students at all levels (e.g., graduate, undergraduate, IEP)
- Limited number of student employment opportunities
- Need for better integration of international students into the campus and community
- Need for more meaningful internship opportunities

- Lack of intercultural competence on the part of some faculty, staff, and community members
- Lack of training to help faculty and staff interact more effectively and meaningfully with international students
- Few professional incentives for faculty to be engaged internationally

External:

- Geographical location of Cape Girardeau
- Lack of regional resources to support non-U.S. residents
- Lack of work and internship opportunities
- The current U.S. political environment and perception to prospective students

*2. What do we need to do to help international students who are enrolled to retain and be successful?*

The following is a list of things that Southeast needs that were deemed to be useful in helping us enroll and retain international students:

- Continually articulate and demonstrate the value that international students bring to the campus and community. All too often, the perceived value of international students is seen in economic terms, but it is important that this group of students is seen as valuable contributors to the learning and cultural environments, and as equals to domestic students in all ways.
- Scholarships must be available to international students at all levels (e.g., graduate, undergraduate, IEP)
- More student employment and Graduate Assistantships available to international students
- Culturally appropriate personal, professional, and academic advising
- Training for faculty on how to involve and integrate international students into the classroom.
- Train faculty to be more adept at facilitating interaction between international and domestic students
- More opportunities (both formal and informal) to connect international students with domestic students and community-members
- Provide international students with host-family living opportunities
- Increased outreach to educate faculty and staff on appropriate and effective communication with international students.
- Create more incentives for faculty and staff to develop intercultural competence
- Enhanced new and ongoing international student orientation
- Increased career service support

3. *What needs to be done to support faculty and staff working with an increasing number of international students?*

- Develop intercultural competencies on the part of faculty and staff
- Impart upon the campus community the benefit of having international students
- Cultural training regarding the benefit of difference
- Training in specific strategies to help address issues when working with international students
- Incentivize international engagement through promotion and tenure

4. *How can SEMO maximize the integration of international students so that American students can best learn from their peers from around the world?*

- Again, there is a need to change the narrative of what our international students are and what their value is to the campus and community
- Work to make study abroad more accessible and acceptable
- Create curricular and social opportunities that purposefully bring the groups together
- Educate the community regarding how to work with international students

5. *What is the current situation status of incoming, “Exchange Students” (as opposed to the incoming degree-seeking students, who are acknowledged more prominently in this pillar)?*

- Specific challenges facing incoming exchange students include the lack of appropriate housing. Offering dormitory housing in a room shared by an 18 year old freshman is not really appealing to a 24 year old student from Germany! (*Just an example...*) Imbalance of numbers in fall and spring further complicates off-campus housing options.
- There is also the problem (not mentioned elsewhere) of parity under exchange agreements. All exchange agreements work on a headcount parity. Yet the University assesses parity in terms of the balance in the Colleges’ exchange tuition account. Headcount does not equal tuition equivalence.
- Support to facilitate and simplify the recruiting of incoming exchange students and placement in classes is hampered by unwillingness by some departments to provide support. For example, a request for multiple copies of the University Bulletin to be provided to our exchange partner schools, so they could more adequately advise their students as to what classes to take here, was denied. Bulletins are only provided to Department Chairs and their administrative assistants. There was no understanding of what is involved in getting incoming exchange students enrolled and how “*it’s on the web-page*” is not a great response to pass onto our exchange partners.
- In several offices, the philosophy seems to be narrowly guided by how processes can be simplified in save work in that office, rather than a holistic approach to streamline the whole process.

- There is still an aversion – a “not invented here” mentality – to accommodate different processes and deadlines employed by different exchange partners. A “*have them do it our way*”, mentality prevails. (As examples; the perceived need to standardize MOUs mentioned elsewhere, unwavering inflexibility regarding differing deadlines, etc.)

-----

## **SWOT analysis: Student mobility – incoming (i.e. international students)**

### **Strengths**

- **Services:** The University has made great strides to improve services to our international student population. IEP and IES have both worked diligently to improve international student orientation. Students have sessions regarding many topics ranging from financial literacy, health insurance, tutorial services, cultural norms, etc. Student Government has also assisted greatly in funding many cultural events sponsored by international student groups. New UI 100 sections for international students have also been created to better integrate the students.
- **Faculty:** The university has made great efforts to start to engage faculty in the topic of international students’ education. Faculty Institutes have dedicated time to training faculty to work with international students. IES has prepared a training session for faculty and staff and it has been well-received.
- **Community:** The community has been very supportive of the international student population. Many religious organizations and local businesses have stepped forward to assist in providing space and time for the international student organizations. Many individuals have also provided their time to help international students.

### **Weaknesses**

- **Services:** The lack of personnel and budget hinders the amount of services that can be offered to international students. The admissions process is still insufficient, under-funded, under-staffed and under-resourced. Availability of scholarships is not communicated sufficiently. There is no process for international students to demonstrate financial need i.e. FAFSA. There is a lack of integration of international students into the campus community as a whole. In many offices staffs are not trained to work with international students. Current application process is not easily accessible to students and is confusing.
- **Faculty:** Faculty are not trained enough to work with international student populations. Many faculty who have gone abroad, have done so for purposes of tourism rather than education.
- **Community:** The community as a whole is under-engaged in the incorporation of the international student population. There is a lack of opportunities for the community to interact with the international students. There is no office that ensures fair interaction between the international students and local businesses, particularly landlords.

## Opportunities

It should be noted that open, administrative support is absolutely necessary in any opportunity. Training sessions that engage the individual in discussions of cultural competence are necessary.

- Services: Put international admissions in admissions. Talk to the staff of IES and IEP and ask what would be the most beneficial use of time, staff and resources. Provide more sufficient and attractive facilities with greater visibility. According to the survey students rated their recommendation of the university lower than their experiences. Develop methods to increase persistence to graduation. Provide more on-campus work and internship opportunities.
- Faculty: The Provost's Office, Deans, Chairs, Teaching Workshops, etc. are crucial in engaging faculty. Making internationalization an initiative is necessary and training at ALL levels is necessary. Integrate internationalization into all faculty processes, i.e. hiring, curriculum etc. According to the survey faculty mentioned that more knowledge about opportunities and processes, along with funds, would encourage them to travel more, which could improve their ability to work with international students. Moreover, faculty seemed to consider internationalization only as a study abroad issue. Greater awareness is necessary
- Community: Create events that expose the community to our students in a socially engaging manner. Create an alumni network. According to the survey students were very much in favor of having opportunities to interact with domestic students. Develop a closer relationship between the alumni office and the University Foundation to foster stronger ties to international alums, helping increase scholarship, work and mentoring opportunities.

## Threats

It should be noted that a lack of empathy and flexibility is a threat in all areas of student interaction. Other notable threats are decreases in university funding, shortages of "top-to-bottom" administrative engagement, and shifts in U.S. attitudes concerning internationalization. Specific consequences of these actions include:

- Services: Students will choose institutions that have better organization and better student engagement. The lack of funds for professional development for IES staff hinders recruitment, retention and persistence.
- Faculty: Students will choose other institutions if the faculty at SEMO gain a reputation of being uncaring. A lack of understanding how to work with diverse populations is a detriment at all levels, from the classroom to the cafeteria.
- Community: Negative perceptions in the community can affect how international students are treated in the community and affect the services they receive. It also affects how students are treated when socially interacting in the community.

## Pillar 6: Partnerships and agreements

“Establishing and managing successful collaborations and partnerships abroad is a key aspect of internationalization for many institutions. Such relationships can provide international experiences for students and faculty, enhance the curriculum, generate revenue, and raise the visibility of institutions at home and around the world.”

Source - <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>

ACE recommends a **4-step approach for creating and managing international partnerships:**

- **Step 1: Strategic planning.** Partnerships and collaborations should be based on a careful planning process that clarifies international goals and objectives, particularly with respect to student learning outcomes. International collaborations should align with overall institutional mission and priorities, and should take into account availability of financial and personnel resources.
- **Step 2: Review possible structures.** International collaboration can take many forms, and institutions should become familiar with a variety of options before talking to potential partners. Some modes of engagement will likely emerge as a better institutional fit than others; some may be rejected outright, and others may only be appropriate for partners that meet certain criteria.
- **Step 3: Identify potential partners.** It is important to analyze the higher education context in target countries, including policies, priorities, structure, and operations. A careful analysis can eliminate certain types of institutions as potential partners and make others a higher priority. Peer institutions in the U.S. can provide useful information on potential partners abroad, and conferences often include opportunities for direct networking with institutional representatives from other countries.
- **Step 4: On-going management.** As partnerships proliferate, institutions may find themselves with too many MOUs – often of varying scope and effectiveness. Another common situation is for partnerships based on a personal connection to dissipate once that connection is no longer active. Centralized coordination, engaging a broader base of faculty support, and designating certain relationships as “strategic” can help mitigate these issues.

Given these guiding principles, the committee identified the following questions. The associated responses follow immediately afterward:

*1. Who are SEMO’s partners around the world collaborating in the area of global learning?*

- **Bi-lateral Agreements** - Southeast enjoys numerous partners around the world with whom we collaborate in the area of global learning. In terms of partnerships with institutions of higher education, we have: 42 active bi-lateral agreements in 26 different countries. These partnerships were designed to facilitate multiple types of collaboration,

including faculty and student exchange, collaborative research, joint degree programs, and other endeavors. They are:

<b>Continents</b>	<b># of institutions</b>
Europe	17
Asia	14
North America	6
South America	4
Africa	1
Australia	0

- **Consortium Partners** - Additionally, we are members of the *Magellan Exchange* consortium, which consists of other institutions of higher education around the world to participate in student exchanges. These were traditionally centered in the area of Business Study, however partners are increasingly offering non-business subjects in English. Therefore, opportunities in other disciplines have developed:

<b>Continents</b>	<b>Countries</b>
<b>Europe (14)</b>	Austria (1)
	Belgium (2)
	Denmark (1)
	Finland (2)
	France (2)
	Germany (2)
	the Netherlands (2)
	Serbia (2)
	Spain (1)
<b>Central American / Mexican (2)</b>	Costa Rica (1)
	Mexico (1)

<b>Asia (1)</b>	South Korea (1)
* There are 17 U.S. Partners in Magellan, in addition to the schools listed above. However, they are not the focus of this study, as we are concerned with the schools from which we would receive students.	

- **Joint Degree Programs**

- Southeast has entered into eight agreements with undergraduate institutions to develop joint degree programs, often referred to 2+2, or 3+1 agreements. These agreements specify that a student will do a set number of credits at one institution, then transfer to the other, sometimes earning degrees from both. Such agreement have been in China (n=3), Denmark, Pakistan, South Korea, Ukraine, and West Indies.
- The Harrison College of Business also has agreements with two German universities for Dual Master's Degree Programs.
  - These universities are *Aachen University of Applied Sciences* and *Hochschule Schmalkalden*.
  - The dual degrees are: **Master of International Business and Economics** (German University) and **MBA** (Southeast).

- **Recruitment Partners**

- To assist with international student enrollment, Southeast has utilized numerous recruitment agents. Agents are paid a commission for student they help enroll at Southeast. Before now, Southeast has not had agreements with agencies, so it is hard to know how many agencies with whom we have worked (~230 unique Banner agency codes). The following are the agencies who have enrolled more than 20 students since Fall 2012:

<b>Agent Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Agent Location</b>	<b>Total students since Fall 2012</b>
China Industrial Cooperatives Assoc.	China	Beijing	<b>302</b>

Exclusive Education Expert	Nepal	Kathmandu	<b>56</b>
Dikshya International	Nepal	Kathmandu	<b>54</b>
Progressive Academy	Sri Lanka	Colombo	<b>51</b>
Mohan Overseas	India	Hyderabad	<b>47</b>
Bradford Education Consultancy	Nepal	Kathmandu	<b>40</b>
EDU Consultancy	Nepal	Kathmandu	<b>40</b>
Mentors Education	Bangladesh	Dhaka	<b>38</b>
Beijing USC	China	Beijing	<b>33</b>

2. *What is the process by which we add new global partners and remove old ineffective partners?*

3. *What are the criteria by which decisions are made about who our partners should be?*

- There is no standard process by which we add new global partners and remove old ones. Likewise, there appears to be very little *standardization* of criteria regarding who our partners should be. There has been no *standardized* guidelines for developing an MOU or other agreement outlining expectations and details of the partnership.
- This “non-standardization” may very well be the preferred approach. Generally, these decisions seem to be initiated at the college/program level and are reflective of existing or potential collaborative relationships. Just as we have certain criteria that Southeast would like to satisfy in such agreements, so do many of our partners. Therefore, these arrangements have historically been the product of discussion and negotiation between the relevant parties. There should certainly be the understanding that such discussions would include the relevant Southeast parties at the college/program level and then be forwarded to the appropriate administrative officer for review.
- Reasons for wanting to establish partnerships range from the general purposes of increasing global awareness and understanding other cultures, while a few are more focused on specific departmental objectives such as earning an MA TESOL degree from Southeast and studying community health initiatives. Other factors that are important in establishing a partnership include budget, funding, student interest, collaborative partnerships, etc.
- As this relates to “Exchange Partnerships” (as it was noted in Pillar 5) one of the most important considerations must be the ability to maintain parity over a period of time.

4. *Do our current partners address the needs of the entire university? Where are the strengths and weaknesses?*

- In a word, “no”. While we do have several active, thriving partnerships, they tend to be

limited to certain programs. Few partnerships were found to provide a campus-wide benefit. One possible explanation for this is that many faculty, staff, and students expressed that there is not enough clear information available about collaborations and partnerships. People do not seem to know where to find information.

- However, another problem has been that where exchange opportunities do exist, there has *sometimes* been a lack of interest in expanding them to other areas. For example, the Magellan Exchange (while traditionally centered on the business area) contains partners with strong *engineering/industrial engineering/science/computer/art programs*, Attempts to engage these areas in active participation has yielded little response.

#### STRENGTHS:

- Long-standing partnerships with RIBE, Magellan, other groups.
- Faculty with long-term knowledge and international contacts

#### WEAKNESSES:

- Responsibilities for administering partnership agreements not clearly defined
- No defined review/evaluation process for existing arrangements
- Marketing – poor exposure of partnership opportunities to faculty, staff, and students
- Insufficient interest in some areas, in publicizing the opportunities that are available.
- Utilizing international student/faculty/staff population about studying and traveling abroad
- Not enabling people with international contacts to leverage their relationships

#### 5. *What are the challenges to maintaining healthy partnerships outside the university that support the university's global learning goals?*

- Faculty have a sense of being “micro-managed” in the administrative processes for international endeavors, which is a roadblock to participation
- Lack of understanding of the approval process and proposal timeframe
- Lack of sabbatical opportunities for faculty/office coverage for staff exchanges
- Lack of knowledge about opportunities, perceived language barriers, and prohibitive cost of international travel
- Myths prohibiting students from studying abroad (cost, delayed graduation, safety, language barrier). Current advising (both formal and informal) does not adequately dispel these myths.
- Lack of resources to identify and take advantage of internal and external funding
- No incentives for engaging in partnerships

-----

## SWOT Analysis: Partnerships and Agreements

### Strengths

- A decent amount of historic international engagement. There are certainly pockets on campus with significant amounts of experience and success in international endeavors
- Instances of international engagement through partnerships can be found in all colleges across campus

### Weaknesses

- Lack of visibility of partnerships
- Lack of knowledge of opportunities from partnerships
- Lack of understanding on how to initiate an international partnership
- No clearly defined objectives for many partnerships, nor evaluation process
- Unable to leverage the valuable international relationships many faculty members have
- Lack of sabbatical opportunities makes it difficult for faculty members to engage internationally

### Opportunities

- Centralizing the *information dissemination* on partnership/agreement administration and study abroad, in order to better advise students, promote opportunities, and ensure quality of programs. Continued decentralization of the actual processes, can effectively draw upon the knowledge of the respective academic units.
- To take advantage of the current interest found in international engagement and increase the opportunities for faculty, staff, and students.
- Working with a prospect pool of international and study abroad alumni willing to support current and future partnership opportunities
- Create a clear process for establishing, maintaining, and evaluating international partnerships
- Southeast Partnership Scholarship approved to help balance student exchanges

### Threats

- (again) Elimination of upper level UI courses/hour requirements will likely have a negative impact on study abroad participation
- Partnerships often require an upfront commitment/investment. This is hampered by limited resources due to budget cuts and enrollment decreases.
- Perceptions of global uncertainties (travel/tourism, terrorism, economics, politics, social issues)

## Conclusion: Recurring themes

- There is a strong leadership commitment from the upper-levels of the administration for all forms of international education.
- The university community as a whole is found to be supportive of the idea of “comprehensive internationalization.”
- The university tends to communicate international information in a decentralized manner, with rules and policies that vary by department, that are inconsistently communicated and enforced, and that are sometimes contradictory to the practices of other departments.
- There is a lack of clearly defined processes for creating internationally-focused programs. For those interested in engagement, there is no clear direction for them on “what to do” or “where to go” to get this information.
- The dissemination of information to students, as it pertains to internationally-related programs and/or processes, is seen as “scattered. Having a central point where a student can come and be directed to more specific programs could develop consistency, create familiarity, and reflect common-sense.
- A Centralized Office could also direct people to appropriate college-based offices for other purposes. A key could be to strengthen the commitment from all colleges, having them appoint a study abroad coordinator for their majors, rather than adding more staff to a centralized office.
- In the Faculty (and staff) there are disparate levels of knowledge and expertise in the study abroad areas. Some have amassed knowledge through many years of activity, while some are enthusiastic to be more engaged, but they lack the requisite experience. There is a great potential to leverage the institutional expertise that we have and to create opportunities for others, through training, workshops and collaboration.
- There could perhaps be more institutional flexibility in providing solutions and removing obstacles for Southeast students who elect to study abroad. We have many excellent rules and deadlines that work quite well for on-campus students. However, we could perhaps think “outside of that box” as we try to provide opportunities for Southeast students to study abroad.
- There are certainly external threats on the “university/internationalization” horizon, as attitudes towards international and diverse populations are becoming decreasingly positive in some circles. Likewise the resources (both state funding and tuition dollars) that the university has to address such issues have become scarcer, thus creating additional challenges.
- Nevertheless, there are many opportunities that have been identified, which can counter these challenges. Some of these opportunities include the aforementioned *centralization of information* and the *coordinated dissemination of knowledge*. Likewise, better incentives can be provided to all, students, staff and faculty to encourage activity in this area. As it was noted, there is a willingness and commitment on many levels to improve

our Southeast “internationalization” experience. Identifying “where we are” as we have done in this self-study, can certainly be the first BIG step, in leading us in that direction.