Assessment of CUSP II – Goal 4
Internationalization

Progress Report
Spring 2007

Committee Members:
JoAnn Aviel, Linda Buckley, Sarah Curtis ,Sung Hu, Marilyn Jackson, Hafez Modizadeh,
Kasra Vazarghani, Nancy Wylie

Goal 4

San Francisco State University provides its students, faculty, and staff with international experiences, perspectives, and competencies.

Objectives:

1. SFSU infuses international content into its curriculum.

2. SFSU promotes study abroad for students and international exchange for faculty as priorities for internationalization.

3. SFSU engages international students and scholars as important resources for internationalization.

4. SFSU ensures campus-wide support of internationalization at all levels of the institution.

Recommendations

Internationalizing the Curricula

1. Create an international/global graduation requirement.

    a. Short-Term:

    If the present graduation requirements stay the same, we recommend that students take one course that is designed as "international" (on the model of the CESD requirement) in order to graduate. A list of courses would be determined by an appropriate governing body (such as the AUCIP or a Senate committee) upon a syllabus review.

    b. Long Term:

    If the present graduation requirements do not stay the same, we recommend that the Graduation Requirements Task Force integrate international, intercultural, and global learning into the new requirements.

    *   One element of this requirement would be a course that focuses on knowledge. Some of the possible alternatives might include (but are not limited to): a lower-division course required of all students on global issues; an assigned book for all entering students on an international topic, followed by discussion sections; a sequence of upper-division courses focusing on international, intercultural, and global topics.

    *   A second element of this requirement would be an experiential component and could include both short-term and long-term study abroad; summer internships with specific international companies and NGOs; a UN course conference.

    *   The development of these elements will require the active involvement of faculty and substantial support for the faculty who develop the courses.

2. Recommend that the Senate institute a language requirement for a language other than English for students earning the BA degree.

3. Allocate resources for faculty participation in internationalizing the curricula.

4. Support the creation of a department liaison for each academic department to assist in advising of students interested in pursuing their department-related studies on study abroad. This liaison would also interface with OIP to receive up-dated information relating to study abroad, and to report back department-related concerns and questions.

5. Establish an All-University Committee on Internationalizing the Curriculum. This committee should establish student learning outcomes for the experiential learning experiences and determine an assessment of these outcomes.

Internationalizing the Campus

1. Make the Office of International Programs the central, one-stop location for all things international, and consider revisions of the admissions process for international students.

2. Make OIP the resource for any campus groups that would like to develop an international partner. The Associate Vice President of Academic Planning should be included in these discussions.

3. Support the creation of college liaison staff to each college to assist application, enrollment, and special needs of international students.

4. Working with ORSP, institute an organized annual analysis of governmental and non-governmental funding opportunities for international grants and contracts.

5. Create an international faculty community

a. Reinstitute the Phi Beta Delta fraternity as a way of recognizing and encouraging faculty and student work in the international arena.

b. Create a data base for tracking faculty research abroad.

6. Create tuition scholarships and housing assistance for some international students

7. Increase international marketing efforts

a. Improve the SFSU homepage and college and department homepages to make them more user-friendly for international students.

b. Design department specific advertising brochures.

c. Create a 10-12 minute informational CD for international audiences.

8. Create a larger cadre of faculty/staff representatives who will visit university campuses outside the United States with priority placed on institutions of higher education who presently serve as SFSU partners. Faculty conducting on-site visits to partner institutions would contribute to the prudent (and required) monitoring of department-designated study abroad programs.

Progress Report
2006 - 2007

Introduction

It is not surprising that internationalization is a strategic priority at San Francisco State University. According to *Open Doors* published by the Institute for International Exchange, SFSU enrolls more international students than any other master's degree-granting institution in the United States, which today translates to over 2,000 students from 94 countries. In addition, over the past 5 years, the University has more than doubled its numbers in the Study Abroad Program, sending students to over 21 countries annually. Our current curricula include over 300 courses in the GE that have some international content, and many additional courses in the majors. Sixty-five percent of our students speak a language other than English, and 95% are in favor of a second language graduation requirement (PULSE, Spring 2007); sixty-three percent of the faculty participate in internationally-oriented activities monthly and approximately 200 faculty members have identified themselves as global scholars. SFSU is one of 14 US institutions that houses a Confucius Institute, a center that promotes Chinese language and cultural study. We have growing programs in regional studies (i.e., Europe, Africa, Latin America, pacific Asia and have recently added areas in Middle Eastern/Islamic and South Asian Studies. In many respects, SF State is well on its way to becoming a highly internationalized campus. Our research on this strategic planning goal indicates that the current thinking and activities on campus collect around two issues: 1) internationalizing the curricula and 2) internationalizing the campus.

Internationalizing the Curricula

When the CUSP II strategic plan was written, the thrust of internationalization was conceptualized in terms of the curricular aspects of the goal. All but one of the objectives for this strategic planning goal are related to curricula, which is consistent with current thinking on internationalizing universities. One major focus of this thrust is the Study Abroad program, which has been enormously successful at SF State, doubling its participation over the past five years and exceeding all other CSU campuses in terms of the number of students involved in

long-term study abroad. While we celebrate that success and need continue to maintain our leadership, it is clear that Study Abroad has its own limitations in the role of campus internationalization. According to the 2005 *Open Doors Report* from the Institute for International Exchange (IIE), less than 1% of all students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities study abroad for a semester or more. Clearly, broadening the scope of international activities to include curricula is key to achieving the original intent of this strategic planning goal. This effort will require more than adding some courses. As the American Council on Education (ACE) suggests, a high level of internationalization will require a new mindset, significant curricular reform and intentional strategies. Decisions will need to be made with regard to adding courses, infusing international content, and making use of the international expertise of professors and students. Student learning outcomes will need to be developed for internationalization, and we will need to find a way to assess those outcomes. The institution will have to become explicit about what an internationalized campus will look like, what an internationalized student will know, and the attitudes that he or she will carry. Moreover, the institution will need to allocate the resources necessary for achieving this goal.

As a committee, we have spent considerable time discussing the definition of "internationalization." These conversations have brought us at least to a preliminary sense of what it means to internationalize a university. It means integrating multi-national, multi-cultural, and global perspectives into university functions, including teaching, professional, and service activities. The goal is to develop students' ability to solve problems effectively across cultural and national boundaries. That is, to develop students' knowledge, skills and capacity to live and work in the contemporary global environment.

There are three types of international issues that university graduates should understand and appreciate:

- International-national differences such as politics, economics, policies, legal systems, education, human rights, professional practices, etc.
- Intercultural – cultural differences in language, religion, social practices, values, customs, philosophy, humor, etc.

- Global – issues that are not country or culture-specific: eco-systems, pollution, diseases, natural resources, global interdependence, etc.

The word "international" is often used to refer to all three. To internationalize an academic program is, therefore, to integrate international perspectives into its curriculum so graduates of the program will be sensitive to national and cultural differences and have an understanding of global issues and their impacts, especially in relationship to their field of study. Thus, all graduates must possess a basic understanding of some aspects of international, intercultural, and global issues and skills or experiences in communicating and living/working with people of different nationalities.

The best way to internationalize a curriculum is by integrating international content into the entire curriculum coupled with study/work abroad programs. However, due to curricular constraints, lack of faculty interest, and lack of resources, there is usually a huge gap between aspiration and reality. Thus, most universities resort to some compromising, short-term solutions. One of these solutions is to require one or two courses in either GE or the major with "international content."

To internationalize, SFSU may also have to start with a short-term solution and move gradually toward the integration model. Even though the focus is on student learning, integrating international content into the curriculum cannot be accomplished without the active participation of all (or almost all) faculty. Thus, resources must be provided for faculty education and development. The campus must create an environment that values and supports activities that enhance understanding of international and global issues.

The work of the Graduation Requirements Task Force provides an unusual opportunity, however, to integrate international content while re-imagining the curriculum. Some of these ways might include (but are not limited to): a lower-division course required of all students on global issues; an assigned book for all entering students on an international topic, followed by discussion sections; a sequence of upper-division courses focusing on international, intercultural, and global topics; increased language study (including perhaps a foreign-language requirement, especially for BAs); a capstone course on issues facing the world today, an introductory course

taught by faculty from across the university to introduce current international issues; a 2-unit BSS course open to everyone, which will feature guest lectures on specific themes; a course in intercultural communications. All of these possibilities suggest a more dynamic, more forward-thinking curriculum than we presently offer.

<u>Internationalizing the Campus</u>

Internationalizing the campus is a different, and in some respects, a more complicated enterprise. Our research indicates that the quality of this effort will depend upon our ability to integrate the many activities that will be initiated. Isolated activities are beneficial to some, but the synergy created by the integration of activities is the mark of a truly international campus. For example, activities and programs here at SFSU can lead to partnerships abroad creating opportunities for both faculty and students on both sides, which can lead to further associations. Each association can invite and incubate the next project.

The University has recently reorganized and expanded its focus on international education with the creation of the Division of International Education (DIE) and the appointment of an AVP for that division. The Office of International Programs now falls under that division and there is currently a search for a new director of OIP. We believe these changes will improve the overall management of internationalization endeavors, and there is much to be done. For example, we do not have an accurate inventory of faculty who work abroad, their areas of expertise, and the geographical areas that they frequent. In addition, we have no way of determining the level of interest among departments with regard to establishing programmatic partnerships or even of tracking the currently existing partnerships. With the expansion of OIP, it should be possible to concentrate campus activities centrally, and thus the University should be able to better assist campus faculty and groups who would like to develop international partners.

Our research indicates that the process must be deliberate and that progress will be incremental. We already know that some departments and faculty embrace internationalization, but others will probably only join the effort as they see relevance and opportunities. Assigning a staff liaison between OIP and each college would facilitate departmental understanding and participation in both study abroad and international student scholar issues. Moreover, it is likely that co-curricular and service learning opportunities will be easier to initiate than curricular change. These are the "low-hanging fruit," and should be harvested first and showcased as successes. Such efforts would include the reinstitution of Phi Beta Delta, a national faculty fraternity that promotes international exchange and recognizes the accomplishments of global scholars. In addition, a larger cadre of faculty/staff is needed to help manage study abroad programs and

assist in student recruitment. The network of associations that develop through the integration of activities can create a self-sustaining culture of internationalization.

The issue of increasing the number of international students on the SF State campus was not specifically included in the objectives of this goal during the development of CUSP II. However, this issue has become strategically important over the past three years. Since 2003, there has been a dramatic decrease in degree seeking international students at SFSU from 2,175 to 1,492 by spring 2006. Our research indicates that there are both external and internal factors related to the changes in this population. It is commonly known that US federal restrictions following the 911 attack have made it very difficult for students from some countries to obtain student visas. In addition, a number of other countries (e.g. Australia and UK) have initiated aggressive recruitment efforts to attract students who are interested in university education abroad. These are the most likely external factors. However, our review of available data indicates that the current status of this population may be due also to internal barriers.

Open Doors not withstanding, San Francisco State University no longer enrolls the largest number of international students in our type of institution. As the table on the next page indicates, CSU Chancellor's Office data shows that we are actually third in the CSU system in terms of the number of international students and fourth in terms of the percentage of international students in the total student population.

San Francisco State University Non- Resident Alien Enrollment Fall 2001- Fall 2006						
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
SFSU	2163(2166)	2230(2191)	2267(2217)	1985(1917)	1780(1705)	1792(1612)
East Bay	1235	1378	1272	1086	942	919
San Jose	1907	2376	5474[1]	2254	2269	2393
LA	996	1172	1140	300	942	1372
LB	1883	1890	1836	1724	1728	1843
Non-Resident Enrollment as a Percentage of Total						
SFSU	8.1	7.9	7.6	6.9	6.1	6
East Bay	9.3	9.9	9.5	8.3	7.5	7.2
San Jose	6.8	7.8	18.9	7.8	7.6	8.1
LA	4.8	5.6	5.5	1.5	4.7	6.7
LB	5.7	5.5	5.3	5.1	5	5.2
Total						
SFSU	26866	28378	29686	28804	28950	29628
East Bay	13240	13876	13455	13061	12535	12706
San Jose	28007	30350	28932	29044	29975	29604
LA	20675	21099	20637	20307	20034	20565
LB	33259	34566	34725	33479	34547	35574

All data from CSU Office of the Chancellor
Data in parenthesis is from SFSU budget and planning office

It is interesting to note that all of the top five campuses with regard to international enrollment took a dive in 2004. However, all of the other four campuses have steadily recovered, and three have surpassed their 2003 enrollment numbers. This fact has led SF State admissions offices to examine their policies and practices in order to eliminate any possible internal barriers to international student enrollment. Over the past year, both Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Offices have taken a number of steps to improve our responsiveness to international applications. For example, the Office for Undergraduate Admissions has extended the deadline for international applicants to May 1st and they have also begun to accept lower division transfer applications for international students from non-system schools. This office has also reclassified two staff position specifically to handle international applications and has added an IT consultant to provide a variety of IT support dedicated to international applicants and students.

---

[1] There appears to be a mistake here in this number. However, this is CSU system data and we are unable to verify the validity of this number.

In similar fashion, the Office of Graduate Admissions has instituted "Promise Letters," which allow applicants who are missing certain documents to submit a letter promising that they will submit the documents at a future date. They have also begun to use express delivery of admissions and visa documents by applicant request via international delivery services such as DHL and UPS. Like Undergraduate admissions, Graduate Admissions has also added dedicated staff to deal with international applications. A skilled International Admissions Specialist has been hired to expedite international admissions processes, and an application processor has also been added to coordinate directly with the International Specialist on application input.

Since language issues often present barriers for international applicants, both Graduate and Undergraduate admissions have begun to work more closely in collaboration with the American Language Institute (ALI) to address these issues. The University has begun to grant Conditional Admissions for students transferring from ALI to University degree programs. Graduate Studies has also instituted procedures to allow ALI students to apply to graduate programs without having to reorder and submit new transcripts.

These measures appear to have had a positive impact on the number of international students enrolling at SFSU. However, the coordination of these activities still remains fragmented. There continue to be four separate entities at SFSU that issue I-20s, all with differing policies and requirements. This overlap leads to confusion, misunderstandings and conflict among the four offices. With graduate applications, problems persist in moving applications through the pipeline in a timely manner and knowing where an application stands in the pipeline at any point in time. The frustrations over the time involved in these admissions processes need to be balanced against the care goes into the process in both Graduate Admissions and Undergraduate Admissions. A number of universities have quickly increased their international numbers by relaxing admissions standards. Clearly the current work-flow for international admissions is lengthy and rather convoluted. However, before we make any changes in this process, we need to be clear on how far the institution is willing to go in possibly compromising the quality of our student body to achieve FTES goals.

In addition to the issue of simply processing applications, other aspects of increasing the international population should be given careful consideration. As our international population has begun to build again, the University has been reminded of the challenges that accompany a large international population. Sudden changes in the global economy or in political alignments can have a dramatic impact on enrollments and consequently on resources. In addition, some departments and colleges maintain a disproportionate number of visa students, which can both benefit and challenge faculty and students. An increase in this population can create the need for more services for students, and if not handled carefully can result in cross-cultural misunderstanding and a sense of isolation among both domestic and international students.

A further complication is the potential tension between the presence of international students as a revenue generating proposition and the academic issues related to their contribution as a learning resource for the domestic population. Needless to say, we are a part of the CSU, and the fees of these students must be a net benefit to the institution. At the same time, if the rationale for their presence is seen to benefit the academic program, more investment in integrating these students into campus life will be necessary. In the long term, the dual goals of this population can become mutually beneficial. For example, the development of programs to integrate international students into campus can serve as an intercultural training ground for both the domestic and international populations. Similarly, partnerships with other institutions provide valuable learning and research opportunities for our own faculty while creating goodwill.

A further issue mentioned in the strategic plan is the balancing of countries that send students here. Currently, most international students come from wealthier nations. Because of our institutional commitment to diversity and also due to our concern for enriching the SFSU educational experience, it would be desirable to further diversify this population of students. Our analysis, unfortunately, indicates that we will need to bring our present international population up to the 2004 level and stabilize it before we can afford to attempt to diversify the countries and majors of these incoming students. Even then, it will probably be difficult to recruit students from specific countries or fields of study unless we provide attractive financial packages with tuition scholarships and housing allowances. Thus, the issue of diversity in the international student population (Outcome #6) will be a long-term goal rather than a short-term issue. In the

future, it would be optimal to be able to plan for the proportion of international students brought from specific global areas and also for the departments where they will study. Although this goal is future-oriented, we should begin now developing strategies that would allow us to plan in this intentional manner.

Conclusion

The strategic planning working group recommends Goal 4 on Internationalization as one of the themes for the next WASC review. Because the goal is a major element in the SFSU strategic plan, as a WASC theme it would demonstrate the institution's commitment to strategic thinking, which is one of the four WASC standards. In addition, the objectives of the goal address both the institutional level and the classroom. From the institutional perspective, the goal commits us to developing a culture of international and global perspectives throughout the University community. At the classroom level, it attempts to ensure that all students will develop specific learning outcomes regarding global/international awareness. This attention to both levels of university life is something that WASC will be looking for.

By the time of the WASC site visit, we will be able to demonstrate that we have made progress on achieving some of the major outcomes for this goal. For example, we have already expanded our study abroad program in the way that was outlined in the CUSP II strategic plan. At the same time, there are also attainable goals that we have not completed and that could constitute researchable projects within the WASC review. Internationalizing the curricula is an ambitious and attainable project that would demonstrate our commitment to this goal. For all of these reasons, internationalization would offer a well-structured theme for the WASC review.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
Assessment Data on Goal 4 Outcomes

Outcome 1: **All graduates will demonstrate knowledge of international issues and**
skills in integrating with cultures other than their own.

We have indirect evidence for support of this outcome.

- 95% of students believe that their course work at SF State has helped them understand the connection between global issues and their daily life. (PULSE 2007)

- 65% think that SF State course work increased their understanding of global issues beyond U.S. borders (PULSE 2004)

- 60.5% think that SF State course work increased their understanding of global issues beyond U.S. borders. (PULSE 2000)

- 97.2% of students surveyed agree or strongly agree that they like learning about issues from the point of view of different cultures (PULSE 2000)

- 28% of students have taken more than 5 classes that focus on issues of globalization or internationalization. 8% have taken 4 or 5 classes. 18% have taken 1 to 3 classes of this sort. Thus, 54% of SF State students have taken at least one class that focuses on internationalization or globalization. (PULSE 2007)

- Currently there are over 300 courses that have some international content in Segment II and Segment III of GE. There are many more additional courses at the upper-division level.

- A number of programs on campus offer international tracks.

<u>Assessment:</u>

We currently do not have any policy or requirement in place that would lead students to this outcome. The first step toward fulfilling this outcome involves establishing an academic requirement that would lead to this learning and then determining how to assess the requirement.

Outcome 2:   One-third of all graduates will have significant international experience, with the number of students in formal study-abroad programs doubling.

<u>Long Term Study Abroad Students</u>

2000-2001:   133
2001-2002:   164
2002-2003:   191
2003-2004:   190
2004-2005:   213
2005-2006:   231
2006-2007:   300

Note: These numbers reflect state funded study abroad. They do not include CEL and faculty led intersession groups.

In addition to the hard data, the 2004 PULSE survey reveals that 79.7% of the respondents would participate in study-abroad if resources permitted. In the 2007 PULSE survey, that figure rose to 95.4%.   The Office of International Programs reports that direct funding for study abroad is usually less of a problem than students actually realize.

<u>Assessment:</u>

Over the past five years, this goal has been achieved. However, the goal should be maintained and tracked as we move forward with the expectation that the numbers will double again in the coming five years.

Outcome 3: Two-thirds of all graduates will be able to communicate in more than one language.

- According to surveys of students, the University is near fulfillment of this goal.

    o 60% of students surveyed say they can communicate in a language other than English (PULSE 2004)

    o 65% of students speak a language other than English as their first language. (PULSE 2007)

- It is interesting that students are more strongly committed to this goal than are faculty. For example, 95% of students surveyed (PULSE 2007) felt that the University should have a foreign language requirement while only 27% of faculty felt that there should be such a requirement.

Assessment:

The University has not fully achieved this goal though progress has been made. In general, the committee thinks that this outcome is important, and that achieving a certain skill level is an essential part in defining this requirement.

Outcome 4: Half of the University's faculty will have significant international experience or expertise.

Evidence indicates that enormous work is currently underway in support of this outcome.

- 175 faculty and staff have had significant international professional experience according to OIP data, and we expect there are far more than we have on record.
- Faculty and staff have worked in over 100 countries around the world.
- Over 100 sponsoring agencies have supported the international work of our faculty and staff
- 63% of faculty participate in internationally oriented activities monthly or more often. 83% of faculty participate in internationally oriented activities quarterly or more often.

We need a better way of collecting this data. It's hard to know exactly how close we are to achieving this goal because we do not have a centralized on-going data collection process. We currently do not have an on-going international faculty organization that could help us support and recognize this work.

Outcome 5: There will be more diversity in study-abroad participants, locations and disciplines covered.

- SFSU has increased the number of countries to which study abroad students are sent.

- Currently, students are stationed in 21 countries.

- Men are still in the minority among study abroad students. There is greater diversity among SFSU study abroad students than is found in the total CSU study abroad population.

- The science fields continue to lag behind other fields sending students to study abroad. This is probably related to the high number of units required for science programs and the rigid sequencing of courses required to major in these fields. It is probably unproductive to pursue recruiting students from these fields. Recruitment efforts need to be strategic.

Assessment:

This outcome may be best delayed until we reach other more pressing outcomes.

Outcome 6: There will be more diversity in international student/scholar origins and their fields of study at SFSU.

- According to *Open Doors*, SFSU has the largest number of international students in the country for a Master's granting institution.

- SF State has more than the national average of international students.

- The top ten majors for international students at SFSU:

    1. Business (623)
    2. Computer Science (78)
    3. Biology (61)
    4. Psychology (56)
    5. Engineering (54)
    6. Cinema (50)
    7. English (TESOL) (46)
    8. International Relations (46)
    9. Radio & TV (41)
    10. Industrial Arts (41)
    11. Early Childhood Ed (39)
    12. Economics (35)

    Fields not included in the 10 above that most often request information from OIP:

    1. Arts (all creative arts)
    2. Astrophysics/Astronomy
    3. Child and Adolescent Development
    4. Communicative Disorders
    5. Communication Studies
    6. Dietetics
    7. Environmental Studies
    8. Health Education
    9. Educational Technology
    10. Kinesiology
    11. Museum Studies
    12. Physical Therapy

- All of the areas above are perhaps fields that need to be targeted in the recruitment of students. Also, these departments may need assistance in facilitating the enrollment of international students.

Possible Actions:

- Become more intentional in recruitment of international students and scholars.*
- Target specific geographical areas for recruitment of students and scholars.*
- Target specific fields for recruitment of students and scholars.*
- Offer students fee waivers for 1 semester for students in strategic fields or geographic areas.
- Develop housing assistance for international students and scholars in strategic fields or geographic areas.*
- Balance the enrollment of international students in strategic fields.*
- Increase the number of international students from Third World and Developing Countries.*
- Maintain an enticing website that also gives clear descriptions about the program, especially what is needed to apply. Keep an international prospective.
- Create attractive, but simple brochures/flyers to promote programs
- Answer or forward emails from prospective students, applicants and admitted students.
- Allow international students to pay for classes using VISA . This is apparently a major stumbling block in international enrollment.

*These actions are more second-level suggestions and should come later. They will require that more immediate needs are addressed first.

Assessment:

In general, this entire goal should be delayed until overall international student enrollment increases beyond the 2003 level. In addition, we need more complete information with regard to international scholars before any actions can be taken in that area.

Outcome 7: International students and scholars will play a prominent role in campus internationalization.

Assessment:

Currently, there is no plan for using the knowledge and expertise of the visiting scholars and students on campus.   This area has not been undertaken by OIP because they have not had the resources to implement additional duties. In order to fulfill this outcome, there needs to be an organized and strategic plan for employing these resources which might include:

- Social Events
- Conferences
- Panel Discussions on current international issues
- Development of a Center for International Scholars and Students

Strategy 1:   Integrate international components into the curriculum.

Assessment

The Office of International Programs currently offers mini-grants to faculty who will integrate an international component into a course that does not now have such a component. At present, this appears to be the only intentional effort to internationalize the curricula.

Strategy 2:   Engage international students and scholars as resources in teaching, learning, and community life.

Assessment

There is currently no organized programming for taking advantage of the potential learning experiences that could be afforded through international students and visiting scholars.

Strategy 3:   Require a second language for graduation in disciplines with an international focus.

Assessment

No attempt has been made to introduce a foreign language requirement among any group of students.

Strategy 4:   Increase faculty international expertise through participation in international seminars, conferences, exchanges, and professional travel.

Assessment

OIP has begun developing a database of faculty who participate in professional international activities. These data suggest that there are many faculty who are active internationally. However, no resources have been allocated responding specifically to this strategy.

Strategy 5:   Reward faculty contributions in internationalization.

Assessment

No resources have been allocated responding specifically to this strategy.

Strategy 6: **Review campus policies, procedures, practices, and priorities to ensure support for internationalization.**

Assessment

- The University Police Department and the University Health clinic have policies related to working with international students. These policies refer largely to language issues.
- The Housing office provides an orientation each year for entering international students.
- The Office of International Programs provides and orientation program for entering international students.
- The Admissions Offices have specialists for international students.

The student services provided to international students is developing. Services around admissions and English language assistance has improved markedly over the past year. Assistance for securing off-campus housing is in need of development, and all services for visiting scholars needs more focused attention.

Strategy 7: **Create a community advisory board and increase fund-raising efforts to support international education.**

Assessment

The Associate Vice President for International Education is currently in discussion with the University Development Office regarding fund raising.