

# Quality Enhancement Plan

in Support of

## Compliance Certification

Anderson University  
316 Boulevard  
Anderson, South Carolina 29621

Submitted to the  
Commission on Colleges  
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools  
1866 Southern Lane  
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

On-Site Committee Visit February 26-28, 2008

December 7, 2007

Dr. Ann Chard  
Vice President  
Commission on Colleges  
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools  
1866 Southern Lane  
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

Dear Ann:

We are pleased to submit our Quality Enhancement Plan, "Global Engagement: Anderson University Abroad," as a key part of Anderson University's 2008 SACS-COC reaffirmation. This plan is a result of a two-year, institution-wide effort. It describes a timely and promising set of initiatives to improve the quality of our undergraduate experience in strategically important areas. Anderson University is committed to this Quality Enhancement Plan as outlined in this proposal.

We believe our Quality Enhancement Plan is a major component of our efforts to move us toward our vision of being a *premier* teaching university.

We look forward to the visit of our Reaffirmation Committee February 26-28, 2007.

Sincerely,



Evans P. Whitaker  
*President*

c: Members of the On-Site Committee  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Senior Leadership Team  
Professor Susan Wooten, SACS Liaison  
Professor Peter Kaniaris, QEP

Anderson University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), Global Engagement: Anderson University Abroad, is the result of the collaboration of many individuals and groups on the campus. Special recognition is due to the members of the QEP Team who worked throughout spring and early summer 2007 conducting primary research, debating and refining learning outcomes for the program, developing a financial model that would sustain the program, and crafting an assessment plan to evaluate the program.

Mr. Peter Kaniaris, *Chair*  
Professor of Art  
Director of the Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence

Dr. Jane Cahaly  
Assistant Professor of Education  
Director of International Programs

Dr. Ryan Neal  
Assistant Professor of Religion  
*Primary QEP Author*

Dr. Richard Williamson  
Professor of Music

Dr. Margarit Gray  
Associate Professor of Biology

Dr. Bill Laing  
Assistant Professor of Management

Dr. Bob Cline  
Vice President for Christian Life

Dr. Margaret Wooten, Professor of English, made valuable contributions to the success of the project by serving as the editor of the QEP report.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Topic Selection.....	3
Topic Rationale.....	6
QEP Description: Anderson University Abroad.....	13
Institutional Capability and Sustainability.....	21
Program Management.....	23
Structured QEP Program Assessment.....	26
Conclusion.....	36
References.....	37

## Appendices

A – February 2006 Faculty Newsletter .....	45
B – April 2006 Faculty Meeting Handout.....	51
C – Initial List of QEP Topics from College Brainstorming Sessions.....	57
D – October 2006 Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee Handout.....	61
E – Final Three Topics for QEP .....	63
F – January 2007 QEP Topic Announcement .....	65
G – International Program History .....	67
H – International Missions Involvement.....	69
I – Draft of Course Proposal Form for QEP Courses .....	71
J – Learning Outcomes Survey .....	73
K – QEP Financial Model.....	75
L – National Survey of Student Engagement.....	77
M – IDEA Course Rating System – Student Rating Form .....	81

## INTRODUCTION

Anderson University has adopted Global Engagement: Anderson University Abroad as the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The program provides short-term (7-14 days) learning abroad experiences as an integral component of a 3-credit course. The QEP initiative is a pilot effort establishing a wider range of access for students to learn about the implications of global interdependence through a short-term study abroad experience in an elective general education course. These courses offer the opportunity to utilize the world as a valuable learning environment, by providing immediate and direct contextual frames of reference for understanding global interdependence. The QEP centers on one initiative that impacts the entire campus by reaching across the University community and involving the key constituencies and stakeholders that are most directly invested in student learning: faculty, students, library professionals, the Christian life division, the Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence, and personnel in student services and in student development.

The University's commitment to undertake this long-term initiative --Anderson University Abroad-- to enhance student learning through international engagement comes from the convergence of many factors. Historically, the University has provided periodic academic international courses of study, and because of its Christian heritage has long promoted mission work locally, nationally, and internationally. The University's current Strategic Plan calls for the creation of a more comprehensive campus-wide study abroad program. Anderson University Abroad clearly aligns with the University's mission and values as well as with strategies and priorities from this strategic plan. The opportunity to develop a QEP has provided the necessary impetus for creating the program. Note that throughout the QEP, study abroad is a generic term identified as an educational program that occurs outside the United States (Kitsantas & Meyers, 2001).

### **Preparing Students for Globalization**

Society is coming to terms with the emerging truth that the "world is flat": the technological revolutions in communication and travel have turned planet earth into a "global village" comprising six billion people. With the dawn of a new century the perceived distance between the United States and other countries and cultures has been radically diminished. The results, while still emerging, are clear: globalization affects society on all levels. Indeed, the Association of American Colleges and Universities

(AAC&U) has labeled the 21<sup>st</sup> century the “new global century,” citing wide-ranging ramifications: “The world is being dramatically reshaped by scientific and technological innovations, global interdependence, cross-cultural encounters, and changes in the balance of economic and political power” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007, p. 2).

On a global level, the interdependence and interconnectedness of peoples and nations around the world have increased rapidly due to the current rate of exchange of ideas and information. Globalization reduces trade barriers and opens up new international markets, growing the economy to a worldwide scale (Brown, 2003). Post 9/11, the extent of global interdependence cannot be denied as the wide-ranging pervasiveness and depth of interconnectedness is revealed. In turn, a college education becomes increasingly more important from the perspective of employment, commerce, education, and technology (to name a few) (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Institutions of higher learning are obligated to increase student awareness and perception of the implications of the “new global century” (Bok, 2005). “In an increasingly interdependent world, [international education] is essential to fostering the global and cross-cultural knowledge and understanding necessary for effective U.S. leadership, competitiveness, and security” (About international education, 2006). In short, in the future the norm will be “interdependence rather than insularity” (AAC&U, 2007, p. 2).

In the past, students may have viewed globalization as a distant prospect, convinced that it had not yet had any direct bearing on their lives. At present, even on a local level, signs indicate the naiveté of such a position, since globalization increasingly manifests itself on campus-wide levels (Green, 2002). Increasingly, American students have roommates or classmates from various countries, and as citizens, encounter co-workers, medical personnel, and service people who come from various countries. Commonly, international students’ first language is not English and they may hold different religious beliefs. Consequently, the daunting challenge and urgent questions of preparing educated citizens for understanding and adapting to globalization and interdependence will continue to grow and relentlessly push colleges and universities to provide learning opportunities that prepare graduates for the challenges that await them (Bok, 2005; Green 2002).

Through the QEP Anderson University seeks to address these challenges. One way for higher education to provide a learning experience of the “global village” is to provide, promote, and explore further opportunities for students to live and learn abroad in the

course of their college education (Green 2002). Contextualizing such an experience in the setting of a liberal arts education, with program and course objectives focused on student learning goals, will help the University assess the relative impact such an experience may have on the wider student learning environment and will also have the potential to benefit the University in ways unforeseen.

International study experiences have numerous positive benefits on developing cultural awareness, including increased comprehension of one's own country, one's destination country, and their interrelatedness (Dolby, 2005; Kitsantas & Meyers, 2001; Talburt & Stewart, 1999). The Lincoln Report on Global Studies and National Needs highlights the importance of study abroad in its claim that "overwhelming numbers of graduates who have studied abroad agree that the experience enhanced their interest in academic work, helped them acquire important career 'skill sets,' and continued for decades to influence their perspective on world events" (Global Studies and National Needs, 2005, p.vi). Today's students need exposure to a variety of cultures, customs, and countries, for society at virtually every level continues to increase in diversity (Bok, 2005). Study abroad experiences provide a significant contribution "to the preparation of students to function in a multicultural world and promote international understanding" (Kitsantas 2004, p. 447). Study abroad experiences have a positive effect on academics.(Hadis, 2005; Ryan & Twibell, 2000; Tseng & Newton, 2002).

Developing a climate of interest and inquiry related to global interdependence through Anderson University Abroad is a long-term endeavor for the University, and the QEP helps provide the momentum and resources for the learning community to achieve a broader understanding of interdependence.

## **TOPIC SELECTION**

The following section describes the nature of the involvement of the key stakeholders in the University community as well as the process used to identify the QEP topic.

Professor Susan Wooten, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA) and SACS liaison, guided the topic selection process during the 2006 fall semester. Faculty preparation for this work began in Spring 2006. Materials describing the process were presented to faculty through the February Faculty Newsletter (Appendix A) and a presentation and handout used at the April faculty meeting (Appendix B).The primary

objective of the QEP initiative at this early stage was to solicit potential QEP topics from the various stakeholders. The AVPAA ensured broad support for the chosen topic by granting access and seeking input from every constituency related to the academic mission of the institution. A positive byproduct of this increased exposure was a heightened awareness of the importance of the QEP for the reaffirmation process, the life of the University and student learning.

The general process and the purpose of the QEP, as framed within the accreditation process, were presented to faculty. Guided discussions and brain-storming sessions, which were the first step in the development of the QEP topic, were intended to inspire a variety of nominations. The initial set of discussions occurred within college meetings and among key support staff in Student Development and Christian Life in September and October 2006. These discussions yielded a wide-ranging list (Appendix C) of potential topics. Faculty and staff from the areas listed below were asked to respond to the following prompt, “Over the next five years, if the University invested in one or two ideas that might positively impact student learning, what would you suggest we consider?”

- College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)
- College of Business (COB)
- College of Education (COE)
- College of Visual and Performing Arts (CVPA)
- School of Interior Design (SID)
- Student Development Division
- Christian Life Division

Schools that experience success in international programs have broad support from senior leadership, including commitment of the institution’s resources in a way that supports sustainability and longevity (Green, 2002, p. 17). In this regard Anderson University exhibits great promise, for President Evans Whitaker, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Dr. Danny Parker, and Vice President for Finance and Administration Mr. John Kunst have provided sustained support for developing a more comprehensive study abroad program as envisioned in the QEP. Beginning in October 2006, the University’s Board of Trustees has been kept abreast of the developments in the project by presentations from the AVPAA to the Academic Affairs Committee at each meeting and on occasion to the full Board (Appendix D).

Another key element of successful international study programs is strong and continued faculty support. The University has a history of consistent faculty input, involvement, and collaboration in generating new academic programs. Indeed, the Personnel Handbook states, “The faculty has primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum of Anderson University” (Personnel Handbook, 2007, p. 115). Because the major goal of the QEP is to enhance student learning, the need for faculty buy-in is crucial. Additionally, studies have shown that faculty engagement is a vital key to a program’s sustained success (Green, 2002, p. 18).

Following the initial topic solicitation from faculty and staff, the AVPAA sorted the list of potential ideas according to similarity and prevalence of response in order to identify emerging themes that would yield broad campus support. The dozens of potential topics can be categorized broadly as follows:

- Globalization
- Freshmen Experience, Retention, Student Engagement
- Enhancing Student research
- Building Student skills
- Faculty development
- Miscellaneous

The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA) culled this information and began the process of identifying appropriate QEP topic finalists. Senior administrators continued their consistent support and encouraged the development of a concept that would be attainable, focused, and sustainable. With practical, logistical, and financial implications in mind, along with strong consideration of the overall goals and purposes of the QEP regarding student learning and SACS reaffirmation, the AVPAA presented three concepts as finalists in the selection process: (Appendix E).

- Option A – Global Commitments: Exploring our Global Interdependence
- Option B – Developing Critical Minds for Knowledge Application
- Option C – Aligning Identity with Direction

Faculty, professional staff, and student leaders in the Student Government Association (SGA), discussed each topic at length and engaged in a question-and-answer session before voting. The response was convincing, roughly distributed with 50% favoring Option A, 25% favoring Option B, and 25% favoring Option C.

With the decision input complete and continued affirmation from senior leadership, the final topic was announced in early January 2007 (Appendix F), and then a call went out for faculty and staff volunteers to populate the QEP Team.

## **Topic Rationale**

Among the three QEP topic finalists, only the selected initiative was grounded firmly in the dual rationale of both societal and University interest. Thus, the selection of Global Engagement: Anderson University Abroad as the University's QEP has a two-fold justification: 1. External Support, Trends, and Interest; 2. Internal Support, Needs, and Logic.

### *External Rationale*

Not only has global interdependence increased, but a consistent pattern has also developed over the past few decades: an upward trend in study abroad participation among students in the United States. In AY 2004-2005, 205,983 U.S. students studied abroad for academic credit. This figure is remarkable, representing a yearly increase of 8% and a doubling of the population in eight years. Compared with AY 1994-1995 when 84,403 students studied abroad, the AY 2004-2005 figure represents an increase of 144% over the last decade (Chin & Bhandari, 2006).

Although 205,983 U.S. students studied abroad for academic credit in AY 2004-2005, such a large figure represents only slightly more than 1% of enrolled U.S. students (Institute of International Education, 2006). To increase this percentage, institutions of higher education need to create programmatic, sustained, institution-wide efforts to promote study abroad opportunities for a greater percentage of their student populations.

The rise of American students studying abroad is impressive, and the pace will likely increase. On November 10, 2005, the 109th Congress passed Senate Resolution 308 designating 2006 "The Year of Study Abroad," and thus initiated an emphasis on international study. Indeed, in their report "Global Competence & National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad" (2005), the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program issued a bold vision to "send one million students to study abroad annually in a decade" (Global Competence and National Needs, 2005, p.v). To accomplish this task, colleges and universities need to, at the very least, elevate their percentages. The Lincoln Commission aims to alter the systemic culture of most institutions of higher education regarding study abroad. The Commission seeks a

paradigm shift toward “Making study abroad the norm and not the exception” (Global Competence and National Needs, 2005, p. v). Gains need to be made, since current research “concludes that less than 10 percent of today’s college graduates have the knowledge and experience to make them globally prepared” (AAC&U, 2007, p. 8).

The Anderson University Abroad program commends itself to a variety of stakeholders beyond the University community, namely future employers of Anderson University graduates. As the recognition of the reality of a global culture increases and its importance and implications multiply, employers in our nation will benefit from a rising generation with a stronger awareness and interest in the interdependence of nations.

#### *Internal Rationale*

The University’s QEP initiative has a strong internal logic and a firm foundation that 1) builds on the University’s previous study abroad ventures, 2) affirms and aligns with the University’s core documents, and 3) has deep and broad University support. The confluence of administrative support, faculty buy-in, and student interest led to the obvious selection of Anderson University Abroad as the QEP. The University’s core documents confirmed the topic’s relevance, timeliness, and applicability with multiple connections to the University’s Strategic Plan. There is, arguably, no more appropriate topic for overall quality enhancement that could make a campus-wide impact relevant to key stakeholders at Anderson University. The University’s plan has a high chance of success due to the convergence of seven factors:

- Broad senior leadership support
- Broad faculty support
- The University’s history in international studies
- Relevance to the University’s mission
- Clear alignment with the institution’s short- and long-term goals
- Structured assessment plan
- Substantial institutional financial commitment
- Support from the Board of Trustees

**A Brief History of Anderson University’s International Program**

Anderson University has a thirty-year history of providing occasional engagement with study abroad experiences for academic purposes and an intentional pursuit of Christian ministry opportunities. These efforts have produced a limited impact. Documentation of the low numbers of students engaged is provided by a general education survey used between 2003—2006 on which freshman and senior students provided the following responses to the statement, “I have had experience in study abroad” where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.

	Spring '03	Spring '04	Spring '05	Spring '06
<b>Freshmen</b>	1.24	0.72	0.82	1.28
<b>Seniors</b>	1.59	1.41	0.55	1.45

During the last five years, 214 students have traveled to 18 countries through these experiences. The QEP, which will build on this limited tradition, is designed to offer a more comprehensive and intentional campus ethos which promotes student learning regarding the role, importance, and pervasiveness of global interdependence. When the plan is fully implemented, the same five-year cycle should yield 720 students in study abroad experiences. This projection is significant since the University’s student population is composed of predominantly Upstate natives with approximately 60% of the students enrolling from AGGLOPS (seven counties within a 50 mile radius of campus).

**Academic**

In the beginning, University efforts in international programs centered on faculty travel and teaching which began in 1977. The University’s study abroad involvement expanded to include students in 1985. Since then, occasional study-travel abroad opportunities have been offered by motivated faculty especially in the fine arts and sciences. The destinations have ranged widely ranging from North America to Asia, with opportunities for teaching or studying on six continents (Appendix G). Since 2003, approximately 107 students have participated in short-term study-travel experiences in areas such as biology, education, and the visual and performing arts. This figure is small when compared to the University’s total student population.

In 2003, the growing momentum of these experiences has led to the creation of the Office of International Programs (OIP), the appointment of the first part-time director and the formation of an advisory committee. The establishment of OIP has brought more

consistency to the University's engagement and a deeper commitment among some faculty and staff to participate in overseas experiences. The Director's position will be expanded to full-time by the year of implementation for the QEP. As the OIP matures, it will expand beyond short-term study abroad. The University, which is exploring the potential of creating partnerships with colleges and universities, has already been involved in preliminary discussions with schools in Thailand, Croatia, and China and an agreement has been signed to bring a limited number of Chinese students to our University as full-time degree-seeking students.

### **Ministry**

The other aspect of the University's growth in international experiences is international missions. The University engages in a wide variety (both in length and destination) of opportunities under the auspices of four main bodies: Baptist Collegiate Ministries, the Consortium for Global Education (CGE), local churches, and the International Mission Board. From 2000-2007, 122 students and 18 faculty and staff participated in international mission-focused travel ranging from summer-long placement of student missionaries, to partnerships on trips with churches. The CGE is a group of cooperating Baptist colleges and universities that support education-focused trips around the globe. The University's involvement with CGE has focused on faculty and staff, with 18 having taken trips since 2003 (Appendix H).

### **The QEP's Relationship with Core Documents**

The QEP Team reviewed relevant existing institutional plans and goals found in the University's two core documents: Anderson University's Strategic Plan (Vision 2014) and Anderson University's Mission, Vision and Values Statement. While precise statements are rarely explicit, each document makes the argument that global engagement is salient for student learning and educational formation in the twenty-first century. Together the documents provide under-girding values and commitments that are foundational to the program. A few of the parallels and goals are obvious, even explicit, while others are present, but merely implicit.

### **Vision 2014: AU's Strategic Plan**

Numerous statements in Vision 2014, the University's strategic plan, explicitly emphasize the need for an intentional strategy for educating students in a global context:

- 1.1 Make student learning – the education of the whole student – our top priority
- 1.13 Establish exceptional co-curricular learning opportunities designed to set AU undergraduates apart – such as extraordinary internships, original research projects, international educational travel, and Christian missions
- 2.1 Seek to continuously improve student development programs to enhance Christian life and develop leadership and character development among students
- 3.11 With the Christian faith (see Romans 12:2) and our Baptist tradition as our compass, foster student understanding and discussion of racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity issues in the context of learning settings
- 5 Educate students for global citizenry
- 5.2 Create additional study abroad opportunities and international university partnerships for faculty and students
- 5.3 Develop a viable model for financial accessibility to study abroad for full-time traditional students
- 7 Pursue additional programmatic distinctions that will set Anderson University further apart from other Southern comprehensive colleges and universities
- 7.2 Create an enhanced focus on study abroad and mission work that will allow each AU student that persists past 90 semesters hours with a 2.5 GPA to engage in one of the two options
- 8.1 Affirm the teachings of Jesus Christ with special emphasis on the Great Commandment, the Great Commission, Christian civility, and the Golden Rule

### **Mission, Vision and Values Statement**

**Value:** Commitment to Continuous Quality Improvement

The University prides itself on seeking ways to improve current practices. Though the University has a history of students and faculty studying abroad, the QEP centralizes the management and assessment of global engagement and links these activities to the Institutional Effectiveness process for the University. Educational best practices are limited neither by distance, culture nor ethnicity. International linkages and globally focused curriculum provide an avenue for further research, faculty and program development, and student engagement with those from other cultures.

**Value:** Commitment to Servant Leadership

The QEP seeks to provide opportunities that allow student and faculty alike to see the advantages of “view[ing] events and situations from a broad perspective.”

There is an emerging consensus that identifies both common and best approaches in programs focused on international studies and study abroad. Much of the evidence is grounded in case studies and accompanying reports stating what did and did not work at specific institutions. The QEP Team reviewed programs at several institutions through on-line sources on the college and university websites, including Elon University, Gardner-Webb University, Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech), LaGrange College, Rollins College, Samford University, The University of the South (Sewanee), University of Tampa, University of Tennessee, Union University, and Western Kentucky University. In addition to this digital indirect research, the QEP Team was aware early in their research that a study travel program at Wingate University bore many similarities to some of the ideas that had been expressed on the Anderson University campus.

***Wingate University***

Wingate has extensive experience in all aspects of an international program:

W’International, a program of short-term study abroad, has been central to the school’s ethos since its inception in 1970s.

On April 3, 2007, a contingent of University administration, faculty, and staff (including three QEP Team members) visited Wingate University, in North Carolina to learn about the scale and scope of W’International. Specifically, the Anderson University contingent sought advice on start-up costs, budgetary issues, student financial aid, program implementation, sustainability of the program, assessment of the program and courses, and the real or perceived effect W’International has had on student learning at Wingate. Additionally, the QEP Team was tasked with locating the overall strengths and weaknesses of W’International on its own terms, and the points of similarity that Wingate’s program might have with Anderson University’s program.

The Anderson University delegation met with administrators, faculty and student participants in W’International at Wingate. With three decades of experience, the Wingate representatives were immensely helpful in quickly framing the scope of the issues that would need to be addressed in a short-term travel abroad program. There is much for Anderson University to emulate from this successful program; but based upon Anderson’s strategic goals and campus ethos, it was readily apparent in Anderson’s

Global Engagement program that there would be clear distinctions from W'International. Among the similarities that seemed worth pursuing were the focus on short-term travel, the elective nature of the courses, the commitment to work with upper-level students, the model of pairing a primary faculty member with a teaching aid who might be another faculty member or a staff member, and the commitment to carve-out institutional funding to off-set the program costs while students paid a good-faith program fee to participate. There was also an immediate recognition that the Anderson QEP Team wanted the academic preparation for the trip to have greater emphasis and more academic credit, a higher GPA requirement for participation, the possibility for a missions focus for some trips, and a more consistent fee structure for the travel experiences. There was also recognition that to promote and sustain faculty buy-in and participation, the travel costs for both the trip leader and trip assistant would need to be covered by the University. To emphasize the value the University has placed on the development and delivery of these courses, the program will be initiated with the understanding that these courses will be counted in-load for the primary instructor, and adjunct funds would be appropriated for the teaching assistant.

At the outset of the research, the QEP Team understood that institutional effectiveness processes would have to be incorporated in the plans for the QEP. As the program direction was developed, possible learning outcomes were explored with a strong reliance on studies sponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and Association of International Educators (NAFSA). As the program evolves, it will provide the same type of annual reporting as all academic and support units of the University. The annual institutional effectiveness process requires the collection of data on learning outcomes (for academic programs) and program activities, reflection on the data and program statistics, and use of the information for program improvement. The learning outcomes and assessment model are discussed in a later section of the report.

Another avenue of preparation for development of the Anderson University QEP came through the review of QEP proposals that were available from other institutions including Georgia Southern University, St. Edwards College, University of Central Florida, and Wake Forest University. The QEP Team also reviewed key documents related to QEP development and good practices, common practices, and best practices from the program, workbooks, and proceedings from the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 SACS-COC Summer Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation. Because the University sent small

teams of academic staff and faculty to the Institute in its first two years, a number of helpful resources were available for easy reference.

### **Common Practices Summary**

From the best practices research, the QEP Team identified common practices that would be appropriate for the Anderson Abroad program:

- study abroad without delaying graduation
- earn undergraduate credit (normally 3 hours)
- earn credit for a general elective
- compensate faculty for three-credit hours
- cover travel costs for both lead faculty and trip assistant

The advantages of these points are undeniable, making the University's program appealing, affordable, and attractive to both students and faculty. The major obstacles pertaining to cost and delay in degree completion have been substantially lowered or removed altogether.

### **QEP Description: Anderson University Abroad**

With the current research on successful QEPs in mind, the QEP Team sought to create a plan that focuses on improving student learning and that has four attributes: broad institutional support, a clear focus, sustainability, and a manageable framework for program assessment (Troyer 2006, pp. 2-4, 8; Search 2005, p. 7).

The QEP description is based on sound research, containing suitable and assessable student learning outcomes. The built-in structure of its implementation, maintenance, and management establishes a significant likelihood of success.

### **Overview**

The Anderson University Abroad program offers a short-term learning experience which should significantly increase the popularity of study abroad, offering flexible international study opportunities to students who might otherwise be unable to participate in traditional programs.

Broadly stated, Anderson University Abroad offers a variety of general education courses worth three-credit hours, with a proposed division of two-credit hours for classroom instruction and a one-credit hour travel component/experience. The course instructor is obligated to integrate both elements, ensuring that the classroom instruction and travel component coordinate and align.

Anderson University Abroad allows faculty and staff to pursue areas of interest and/or expertise. Courses must have no prerequisites outside of those expected of any student who has reached the third year of enrollment with progress through the general education requirements. Anderson University Abroad courses can promote different fields of study delivered with traditional content instruction, can be team-taught, and can be interdisciplinary in nature. To promote unique and new offerings, courses that have an interdisciplinary component may be given preference. Some courses may have a focus on missions outreach and service learning for the travel portion of the course, but these courses will still include a two-credit hour academic experience to prepare students for the mission trip. Regardless of course content or subject, the Anderson University Abroad program mandates four universal student learning outcomes, in addition to the discipline-specific course learning outcomes.

To qualify as an Anderson University Abroad course, the initiative mandates the presence of these four criteria:

1. The course must count toward the hours required for graduation and should not be fewer than three credit hours.
2. The course must be a general elective course.
3. The course must include a major assignment that requires meaningful interaction for students once onsite in their destination country.
4. The course must have a structured process of critical reflection on the intellectual and experiential aspects of the course and travel experience.

These four criteria are intended to provide clarity, consistency, and a measure of rigor for the courses in the Anderson Abroad program. The first criterion follows the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program mandate (“Global Competence & National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad” 2005, p. 28). The last three criteria are designed to increase student learning (Banta 2002, p. 197) and are essential for streamlined assessment for the courses specifically, and the program generally.

Viable destinations are ultimately dependent on two key factors outside the University's control: (1) the global economy which directly impacts cost and (2) terrorism which impacts the concern for personal safety for university students and personnel and which affects potential interest in certain regions of the world.

Anderson University Abroad calls for proposals to any destination, except those clearly recognized as hostile areas (Van Der Werf, 2007). A full two-thirds of all U.S. students studying abroad study in Europe (Global Competence & National Needs, 2005, p. 17), and forty-five percent of all U.S. students studying in the perennially popular destinations (United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and France) (Chin & Bhandari, 2006, p. 58), Anderson University Abroad seeks to redress these percentages by offering a variety of destinations and sets the goal of distributing approved trips: 50% Western Europe; 50% non-western European destinations.

The QEP Team has developed a clear procedure for course selection. Faculty will propose courses using a standard course proposal form (Appendix I). After reviewing the applications and conducting interviews with the faculty who initiate the proposal, the Director of the International Programs and the Anderson University Abroad Advisory Committee, comprising faculty, staff, and students who have study abroad experience, will select the courses for each academic year. Factors include: destination, viability (cost, timeframe), interest (real or perceived), course content (similarity to current or future offerings), and faculty expertise and interest.

### **Personnel**

The personnel involved in the Anderson University Abroad program courses include one faculty leader, one travel assistant, and approved students, with an overall student-leadership ratio not to exceed 12:1.

#### Course Participants:

1. Lead Faculty: Eligibility: Full-time Anderson University Faculty, Staff and Administrators are eligible to teach courses (one per course).
2. Travel Assistant: Eligibility: Any approved Anderson University faculty, staff, adjunct or administrator is eligible (one per course). Exceptions to these policies will be made by the Director of International Programs, in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs. Travel assistants principally provide administrative support to the Lead Faculty in preparation for and during the travel experience. They will be encouraged to attend most class meetings.

3. Eligible students: Juniors (60+ hours earned) with a minimum GPA of 2.5 who are enrolled as full-time Anderson University students. Transfer students must have completed 30 hours at AU in order to be eligible. Also, students enrolled in the ACCEL program are eligible. A separate fee schedule will be developed for both transfer and ACCEL students who have not made an equal contribution to University operations. The Junior year is the typical and historical timeframe for study abroad opportunities. While the popularity of the typical “Junior year abroad” has waned in recent years, juniors still lead the way in foreign study of any length over the past decade (Chin & Bhandari, 2006, p. 62). The goal for the program when fully implemented is to enroll 50% of the junior class in Anderson University Abroad courses.

### **Classroom-based Instruction**

In the semester preceding travel, the course will meet the equivalent of two hours per week. This structure allows for adequate learning of the specific discipline and relevant information pertaining to the travel component. Thus, this time is to be used for course content and the dissemination of information regarding the country of destination, including pre-travel assessment.

### **Travel Component**

The Anderson University Abroad program provides short-term (7-14 days) learning abroad experiences as listed below:

- Academic courses with an international field experience
- International Missions Trips with academic preparation components

Anderson University Abroad courses offer a unique advantage by offering a short-term travel experience directly relevant to the instructional component of the course. At the time of course proposal, the Lead Faculty will propose suitable time frames for the travel experience, but the Anderson Abroad Program will focus on utilizing time periods corresponding with University school breaks, such as Spring break, Winter break, or summer months to decrease class disruptions and scheduling conflicts.

### **Cost**

To enroll in the Anderson University Abroad course, each student will be required to pay a one-time program fee of approximately \$1,000 which will vary by the actual expenses associated with a specific trip. This fee will cover the student’s transportation, lodging,

some meals, and most touring, but participants should be prepared to pay individually for the following items: some meals, ground transportation, tips, souvenirs, and touring/entrances not covered in the itinerary.

### **Compensation**

Lead Faculty and Travel Assistants will not be charged for trip costs: flights, transfers, lodging, meals, etc. Lead Faculty will be compensated. Anderson University Abroad courses will count as in-load courses for full-time faculty; non- full-time faculty trip leaders will be paid for three credit hours. Travel Assistants' major expenses are covered by the University, but they do not receive further compensation for teaching.

Faculty may apply for faculty development funds in order to research a site prior to leading students to the destination or to continue research at the destination after students return home. The University will pay for the cost of a faculty member's visa where visas are required.

### **Course Selection**

The Director of International Programs will serve as the Program Director for the Anderson University Abroad Program. In consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs, an Anderson Abroad Advisory Council will be appointed and charged with reviewing course proposals and selecting the courses to be offered each year. The Advisory Council will include faculty, staff, and students who have study abroad experience. Course proposals will be submitted at least eighteen months prior to the planned travel. The Advisory Council will review proposals from faculty and select those courses for the next round of offerings using the following criteria:

- Cross-cultural emphasis
- Clarity of proposal
- Strategies for addressing program outcomes
- Faculty qualifications
- Assessment plan
- Interactivity/Service components
- Pre-planning and research presented
- Connections to agencies/organizations/entities
- Student appeal
- Safety

Once a course has been approved by the Advisory Council, it must still go through the normal procedure for adoption by the faculty. It will be the responsibility of the Director of International Programs to forward a formal course proposal to the Academic Programs and Policy Committee for their approval before the course is sent to the faculty for final adoption.

Although a full-range of program policies is yet to be developed, the following concerns for course viability will guide implementation decisions:

- Maximum course capacity of 24 students per class – student teacher ratio approximately 12:1 (includes travel assistant)
- Minimum class size: 6 students – no Travel Assistant

Anderson University seeks continually to offer new and engaging international experiences for its students; consequently, the University will offer primarily new Anderson Abroad courses each academic year. However, the yearly schedule may include a small number of previously offered courses (e.g. 4 new / 2 previous). With this in mind, courses may be offered up to 3 consecutive years; after 3 years, a one-year hiatus must be taken. Exceptions to this policy will be made through the Office of Academic Affairs.

### **Length of Travel Experience**

Approved QEP trips will average between 7-14 days in length. The most recent data from the Institute of International Education (IIE), as published in *Open Doors*, shows that the largest growth area is short-term study (Chin & Bhandari, 2006, pp. 18, 61). In keeping with this trend, the University's QEP initially focuses on short-term experiences, which coheres with current practices for the majority (56% in AY 2004-2005) of current study abroad programs (Institute of International Education, 2006; Hulstrand 2006, p. 48).

Especially for a pilot program, some key factors make short-term opportunities more likely to succeed by decreasing potential conflicts pertaining to:

- Financial obligations
- Maintaining employment
- Personal and family obligations
- Educational goals (specifically: expected graduation date).

These factors underscore the overall value of flexibly scheduled short-term trips. Beyond the advantages to students, there are numerous logistical and practical benefits for the institution. Because short-term trips provide greater flexibility for course offerings, with winter, summer, and spring breaks being potential timeframes to minimize disruption of set course sequences and graduation plans, short term trips utilize the best strategies for meeting set goals and promoting long-term success (Green & Siaya, 2005, p. 4; Huebner 2006, p. 21). Additionally, short-term trips provide the initial impetus for a wider range of students to begin the process of being more aware of global interdependence and becoming more globally-minded: “Fostering a globally sensitive public ... requires not so much that French-lit majors spend a year in Paris but that pre-med, pre-law and pre-business students are exposed to the sudden jolt of seeing their home culture in a new perspective, of encountering a different, wider world” (Huebner 2006, p.21).

Compared with semester-long programs, short-term programs do not offer immersion in the destination country, but there are benefits to students who experience a short-term international course. In this regard Anderson University is committed to offering short-term study abroad opportunities to many who might have none otherwise (Green, 2002, p. 19). While numerous studies show that longer trips maximize overall benefits to the participants, there are clear benefits to the institution’s pilot program of short-term travel experiences (Zielinski 2007). Indeed, even a very short experience studying abroad can influence a variety of cross-cultural indicators: level of emotional resilience, flexibility and openness, perceptual acuity, personal autonomy, and the overall level of cross-cultural adaptability of the students (Zielinski 2007). Also, the University’s program is inherently flexible to allow expansion in both number and length of Anderson University Abroad courses in the future with demand and cost being key factors in any subsequent permutations of the initial program. These factors combine to help promote active participation of students and faculty, alike.

### **Program Mission Statement**

Anderson University seeks to enhance students’ knowledge of global interdependence within a Christian perspective through international learning experiences.

### **Student Learning Outcomes**

The goal of the QEP initiative is to offer a wide-range of courses in the Anderson University Abroad program. Eventually, each of the colleges and the School of Interior Design, along with the Christian Life division of the University, will offer courses of study.

Each course will have a set of learning outcomes specific to the instruction or travel experience component of the course. In addition to these subject-specific outcomes is a universal set of learning outcomes, deemed essential for all students. These outcomes will be measured in assessment components of the program, and will play a role in determining the effectiveness of the QEP program for student learning across the University.

To enhance campus-wide engagement and support for the program, the QEP Team, administrative staff, faculty, trustees, athletic staff, student leaders, and two community advisory boards provided valuable input by completing a ranking document (Appendix J).<sup>1</sup> The ranking document allowed individuals to gauge support for various potential student learning outcomes from a list that supported the University's mission and reflected research-based best practices. The ranking document helped to provide feedback on the learning outcomes from key constituencies and, in the end, guided refinement of the statements on learning outcomes for future courses.

Upon completion of the Global Studies experience, the student should be able to:

- Demonstrate knowledge of their home culture and the culture of the destination
- Demonstrate knowledge of global issues and interdependency among nations
- Demonstrate recognition of cultural differences and analyze the application of Christian virtue and character through personal self-reflection
- Use knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically and interpret issues

The strength of mandating a universal set of learning outcomes for all Anderson University Abroad courses is a constant thread through the various courses, while it simplifies and centralizes the assessment of key learning outcomes pertaining directly to the student learning emphasis of the QEP. The inclusion of additional subject-specific learning outcomes prevents a rigid “one-size-fits-all” program. The result is that each Anderson University Abroad course will have both a fixed set of learning outcomes and a set of subject-specific learning outcomes, thus achieving a balance of consistency and flexibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Anderson University Ranking Document is an edited version of the American Council on Education Ranking document, edited and used by permission.

## INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

The University recognizes that the most significant barrier to studying abroad is financial (Global Competence & National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad, 2005, p. 18). With this in mind, the administration has committed to the viability of the plan's implementation and maintenance. A chief concern for maintaining student interest is affordability. The University will defray a percentage of the trip cost through a subsidy passed on to participating students. Students may use sources of financial aid to pay the program fee, but they may not use Anderson University aid to pay the program fee.

From the outset, the University administration has ensured that the selection of an appropriate QEP topic was viable when measured against the University's financial resources. In order for the QEP initiative to be sustainable, it must not disrupt the healthy financial stability of the University. Because cost is often the key obstacle for student participation in studying abroad, the President is committed to lowering the financial barrier for students to participate. The administration's financial commitment to the health and viability of the QEP will result in substantially lower student outlays for those enrolling in approved Anderson University Abroad courses. According to financial projections a student can expect to pay approximately \$1,000 with some variation in cost based upon the actual expenses for an Anderson University Abroad trip. While this is not an insignificant price, it is clearly much lower than the "true" cost of the trip. With a long-term commitment to the QEP's financial viability, the University is intent on cost containment to promote study abroad opportunities.

While the administration has provided a sound financial base for the program, it has also taken steps to ensure its long-term financial stability as a vital initiative supporting the mission of the institution within the scope of its wider programs by allocating funds to a specific line-item in the annual budget.

For initial program start-up, both President Whitaker and Mr. John Kunst, Vice President for Finance and Administration, have provided assurance for meeting the financial budgetary requirements. Mr. Kunst has made significant contributions in the refinement of the financial model which was developed by the QEP Team in consultation with Mr. Kunst (Appendix K). Beyond the program budget, the University has already demonstrated support by shifting the Director of International Programs from a half-time to a full-time position beginning Fall 2008 to allow sufficient time for detailed

development of the program prior to implementation. During the actual year of implementation, appropriate line items in the operating budget will be established to handle receipts and disbursements of funds. The amount provided will depend upon the number of courses offered and the destinations of the specific trips, but at present the start-up plan anticipates the following activities and costs in the start-up years:

**Cost Estimate for Implementation**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Trips</b>	<b>Student Fees (est.)</b>	<b>University Allocation</b>
2010-2011	Minimum of 2	\$48,000	\$85,710
2011-2012	Minimum of 3	\$72,000	\$128,565
2012-2013	Minimum of 4	\$96,000	\$171,420
2013-2014	6 Trips	\$144,000	\$257,130
Total AU Cost for Full Implementation			\$471,996

The plan earmarks institutional funds to

- Supplement student program fees for the study abroad program,
- Provide adjunct replacement wages, and
- Support the travel cost of faculty and travel assistants.

The University is conscious of the long-term financial outlay involved in sustaining the Anderson University Abroad program. For each Anderson University Abroad course, the University’s QEP explicitly affirms and meets these two major criteria set forth by the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (Global Studies and National Needs, 2005, 28:

- 1) The experience ... merits and earns academic credit accepted by the home institution.
- 2) Earned credit must count toward the hours required for graduation and should not be fewer than three credit hours.

This “irreducible minimum” of three credit hours fundamentally supports the academic rigor and integrity of the program. Furthermore, a three hour credit structure is grounded in simplicity, for faculty loads typically operate using three as the multiplier (e.g., 6, 9,

or 12), and the vast majority of courses offerings are worth three credit hours, especially within the general education listings.

The benefit of meeting the two Lincoln Commission criteria is the possibility of securing federal funding for the program despite the fact that federal spending levels for international education have been low. The Lincoln Commission's Recommendation V. outlines the current figures for U.S. federal funding for study abroad programs which begin with \$50m (2007-08) with scheduled annual increases, and end with a final annual total of \$125m in AY 2011-12 (and successive years) (Global Competence and National Needs, 2005, p. xii). The University is especially interested in securing a source of funding to support participation by our most needy students for whom the \$1,000 program fee and other out-of-pocket expenses would present an overwhelming barrier.

## **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

The QEP Management Plan contains two parts: (1) program management and (2) program oversight. Program management includes these day-to-day operations of the QEP project:

- Travel component details: airline and lodging
- Logistics and problem-solving
- Budget oversight and planning

Program oversight includes these duties, related to annual program maintenance:

- Course review
- Course selection
- Course assessment
- Program assessment

For program implementation, the Director of International Programs will fulfill both roles of program management and oversight with consultation from the Anderson University Abroad Advisory Council.

### **Program Implementation**

Jane Cahaly, Professor of Education and Director of International Studies, will implement, direct, and maintain the Anderson University Abroad Program, in conjunction with the Anderson Abroad Advisory Council. This decision was grounded partly in the best practice of the need for direct and continued faculty involvement (Green 2002, pp. 18-19). Consolidating program oversight helps to ensure clarity in the program's focus, purpose, and travel plans (Van Der Werf, 2007). Dr. Cahaly has served as the Director of Teacher Education at Anderson University for four years, and prior to her tenure at Anderson she had extensive international programming and travel experience as director of a state-wide K-12 international school partnership program and as coordinator of area Sister-City programs. Dr. Cahaly, who is also certified as an NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) Examiner, has served on several accreditation teams. Additionally, she has been integrally involved in the development of the assessment system for the College of Education and analysis of this system for accreditation purposes. Dr. Cahaly is a member of the NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and she has been involved at the state, national, and international levels.

The Anderson Abroad Advisory Council will be populated by faculty, staff, and students with study abroad experience. It will annually review all course proposals and select those to be included in the following year's offerings, review and suggest amendments to program policies, and analyze assessment data on the student learning outcomes to measure the success of the program. Council membership will be recommended by the Director of International Programs with approval from the Office of Academic Affairs. As with all new courses at the University, once course proposals are approved by the Advisory Council they will be sent directly to the Academic Programs and Policies Committee for approval before they are presented to the full faculty for action. Beyond the need to align the course approval process with the University's standard practices, this process offers the added benefit of keeping the program in front of faculty as they are engaged in reviewing and voting on course proposals.

**QEP Timeline**

The QEP will be implemented in phases as noted in the following table.

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Activities</b>
Spring 2008  Summer 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare questions for Lead Evaluator during On-site visit</li> <li>• Host SACS on-site visit in February</li> <li>• Develop responses to concerns raised in On-site Committee report</li> <li>• Present final QEP document for official affirmation for SACS-COC</li> </ul>
Fall 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director of International Programs (DIP) initiates work on program policies and guidelines.</li> <li>• International Advisory Council (IAC) is formed.</li> <li>• SACS takes final vote on QEP in December.</li> </ul>
Spring 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director of IP completes policies and guidelines for program with review by IAC</li> <li>• Resources for program assessment are developed by DIP</li> <li>• Director of International Programs initiates call for faculty Global Engagement proposals prior to summer break</li> </ul>
Fall 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals for travel courses are accepted by Director and Advisory Council.</li> <li>• Selection of three International Studies pilot courses</li> <li>• IAC and Director of IP work on program assessment model</li> </ul>
Spring 2010  Sum/Fall 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish and promote courses that will be available in spring 2011</li> <li>• Interested students pre-register their interest for courses</li> <li>• Students are selected for course participation by March, prior to Spring Break.</li> <li>• Lead Faculty and travel assistants for selected courses begin logistics planning with Director of IP.</li> <li>• Specific travel arrangements are completed - dates, hotels, etc.</li> <li>• Faculty Leaders and Travel Assistants meet with students</li> <li>• Payment and passport deadlines are observed.</li> </ul>

Spring 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The University initiates course offerings with student assessment measures prior to travel.</li> <li>• First groups travel abroad.</li> <li>• Course and student assessment measures are put in place, post travel</li> <li>• QEP program is assessed by Director of International Programs and the International Advisory Council (IAC)</li> </ul>
AY 2010-2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-3 travel groups: entire year</li> </ul>
AY 2011-2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3-4 travel groups: entire year (maximum: 4)</li> <li>• Goal: 60%-40% split among Western and non-Western destinations</li> </ul>
AY 2012-2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-6 travel groups: entire year (maximum: 6)</li> <li>• Goal: 50%-50% split among Western and non-Western destinations</li> </ul>
AY 2013-2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 travel groups: entire year (maximum: 6)</li> <li>• Goal: 50%-50% split among Western and non-Western destinations</li> <li>• File Impact Report on QEP with SACS-COC</li> </ul>

### STRUCTURED QEP PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

As previously noted, the Director of the International Programs program has extensive experience in international travel for educational purposes and in assessment. The structured assessment plan identifies the approaches that will be used to determine whether student learning has improved, whether and at what level course objectives are being met, and whether the plan is accomplishing its goals.

The Director of the International Programs (DIP) and the Anderson University Abroad Advisory Council will complete an annual assessment of the courses and the program. This information will be included in the annual Academic Support Unit report filed by the DIP as part of the University's campus-wide institutional effectiveness (IE) process. The focus of the IE process is to use data to analyze programs and guide program improvement.

The University follows the four-step model of assessment (Suskie, 2004, p.4; figure 1.1):

1. Establish learning goals
2. Provide learning opportunities
3. Assess Student Learning
4. Use the Results

### **Course Assessment Measures**

Following best practices from a variety of studies on numerous study abroad programs, each course will have

- Pre-departure preparation (Hulstrand 2006, 50; Kitsantas & Meyers 2001) and
- Pre- and post-test (Hadis 2005).

The Anderson University Abroad Program has in place a mixture of direct and indirect measures for assessing learning outcomes. The majority of the assessment measurements will be made during the on-campus portion of the courses, and these will be coupled with assignments during travel and instruments utilized after the completion of travel component.

The following list provides brief explanations of each measure utilized for assessing the educational outcomes:

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)  
Beginning in 2005 the University initiated a triennial administration of NSSE for freshmen and seniors. Several items on the survey relate to interactions with people of other cultures or diverse perspectives along with a direct question on participation in study abroad. The test administrations from 2005 [Why 2005?]and 2008 will provide baseline data, and the 2011 administration will carry responses from students who have been a part of the initial Anderson Abroad courses (Appendix L)

- Pre-Test & Post-Test

Currently, the QEP Team is exploring which instrument is preferable for a pre- and post-test. One of the instruments under consideration is the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI). The CCAI measures key areas of one's ability to adapt to another culture on four scales (Vangent, 2007):

1. Emotional Resilience (ER) Scale - Helps measure the degree to which an individual can rebound and react positively to new experiences
2. Flexibility/Openness (FO) Scale - Helps measure the extent to which a person enjoys the different ways of thinking and behaving that are typically encountered in the cross-cultural experience.
3. Perceptual Acuity (PAC) Scale - Helps measure the extent to which a person pays attention to and accurately perceives various aspects of the environment.
4. Personal Autonomy (PA) Scale - Helps measure the extent to which an individual has developed both a personal system of values and beliefs and respect others and their value system.

The advantage of using such a system is the ability to test all students, including all program participants and some non-program participants to track the effect of the travel component on student learning over many years. The primary disadvantage is the cost of utilizing the instrument.

- Individual Development & Educational Assessment (IDEA)

IDEA is a course rating system used campus-wide in all courses. The QEP Team has identified IDEA learning objectives that correspond to the Anderson Abroad universal program objectives. Additional IDEA objectives may be chosen by the professor based on the discipline content, but this system will provide feedback for each individual course and data from all of the classes can be aggregated and viewed for program feedback (Appendix M).

- ePortfolio

The College of Education has successfully integrated the use of an online ePortfolio system into the assessment of student performance and learner outcomes. The system provides students with the opportunity to collect, organize, and reflect upon artifacts from their classes and field experiences, and it assists the faculty assessment process. Multiple sets of performance standards are integrated into the system and

assistance is provided for the development and application of grading rubrics. The ability to aggregate the evaluation data is a substantial advantage of the ePortfolio system that will greatly strengthen the assessment of the learner outcomes of Anderson Abroad program. Artifacts for the Anderson University Abroad ePortfolio might include pictures, videos, graphs, journals, music, reflections, and essays. The students can keep the ePortfolio as a record of their travels. The University will retain the right to use the portfolios for overall program assessment and program promotion. If this were universally adopted for the Anderson University Abroad program, then the University would need to purchase one-year portfolio subscriptions to the service for those not already in the College of Education.

- Reflection Essay

Study abroad experiences commonly produce mixed emotions, thoughts, and new frameworks of learning. Though most students embarking on a study abroad experience anticipate a passive learning experience, they quickly become active learners promoting confidence, maturity, empathy and self-reflection. (Gray, Murdock, & Stebbins, 2002, 45). Journals and written reports are widely accepted ways to encourage and assess student reflection on their travel experiences (Wessel, 2007, pp. 76, 83). Another means of promoting reflection through essays written in response to questions pertaining to the travel component of the course. Assessment rubrics will be developed and training provided to instructors to develop appropriate and reliable assessments of attitudinal changes resulting from the course.

As noted in the chart below, the Anderson University Abroad outcomes can be measured through a variety of means.

**QEP Educational Outcomes Chart**

**Course Assessment Measures**

<b>Educational Outcome</b>	<b>Direct Measures</b>	<b>Indirect Measure</b>
Demonstrates knowledge of their home culture and the culture of the destination	Pre-Test (TBD) Post-Test ePortfolio	NSSE Survey (1u, 2a, 11l) IDEA (Objective 1 & 7)
Demonstrates knowledge of global issues and interdependency among nations	Pre-Test Post-Test ePortfolio	Reflection Essay
Demonstrates recognition of cultural differences and analyzes the application of Christian virtue and character through personal self-reflection	ePortfolio	Reflection Essay Trip Journals IDEA (Objectives 1 and/or 7 and/or 11 NSSE (11.1) CCAI ?(Pre and Post-Test)
Uses knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically and interpret issues	Pre-Test Post-Test ePortfolio	Reflection Essay NSSE Survey (1e, 1u, 1v, 6e) IDEA (11)

**Planning for Learning and Outcome Assessment\* / Learning Outcome #1**

What learning outcome are we seeking?	How will we know this outcome when we see it? That is, what will the students know or be able to do upon its completion?	How will students learn these things (in class or out of class)? What types of learning activities will be appropriate?	How can we assess student learning for this outcome? That is, what evidence will we provide to demonstrate what students know and can do?
Sample Outcomes	Sample Performance Indicators	Sample Learning Opportunity	Sample Assessment Methods
Demonstrate knowledge of their home culture and the culture of the destination	<p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and organize cultural artifacts</li> <li>• Self-assess knowledge of their culture</li> <li>• Self-assess knowledge of the destination country culture</li> </ul>	<p><u>Pre-experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Orientation</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Reading</li> </ul> <p><u>Experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• Cultural Interaction</li> <li>• Field Opportunities</li> </ul>	<p><u>Direct</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Artifacts</li> <li>• E-Portfolio</li> </ul>
			<p><u>Indirect</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-Test Cultural Inventory</li> <li>• Post-Test Cultural Inventory</li> <li>• Exit Survey</li> </ul>

**Planning for Learning and Outcome Assessment\* / Learning Outcome #2**

<p>What learning outcome are we seeking?</p>	<p>How will we know this outcome when we see it? That is, what will the students know or be able to do upon its completion?</p>	<p>How will students learn these things (in class or out of class)? What types of learning activities will be appropriate?</p>	<p>How can we assess student learning for this outcome? That is, what evidence will we provide to demonstrate what students know and can do?</p>
<p>Sample Outcomes</p>	<p>Sample Performance Indicators</p>	<p>Sample Learning Opportunity</p>	<p>Sample Assessment Methods</p>
<p>Demonstrate knowledge of global issues and interdependency among nations</p>	<p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain cultural interdependence</li> <li>• Compare and contrast cultural artifacts</li> <li>• Reflect on the impact of cultural interdependences</li> </ul>	<p><u>Pre-experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Orientation</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Reading</li> <li>• Local site visit</li> </ul> <p><u>Experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• Cultural Interaction</li> <li>• Field Opportunities</li> </ul>	<p><u>Direct</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflective essay on interdependence in the Cultural Artifacts e-Portfolio</li> </ul> <p><u>Indirect</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-Test Cultural Inventory</li> <li>• Post-Test Cultural Inventory</li> <li>• Exit Survey</li> </ul>

**Planning for Learning and Outcome Assessment\* / Learning Outcome #3**

What learning outcome are we seeking?	How will we know this outcome when we see it? That is, what will the students know or be able to do upon its completion?	How will students learn these things (in class or out of class)? What types of learning activities will be appropriate?	How can we assess student learning for this outcome? That is, what evidence will we provide to demonstrate what students know and can do?
Sample Outcomes	Sample Performance Indicators	Sample Learning Opportunity	Sample Assessment Methods
Demonstrates recognition of cultural differences and analyzes the application of Christian virtue and character through personal self-reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student interacts with people of the host site</li> <li>• Student indicates desire or willingness to participate in additional international experiences</li> <li>• Student reports changes in attitude or perception regarding host culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field experience</li> <li>• Guest speakers</li> <li>• Class discussion</li> <li>• Study of literature, art, and customs of the host culture</li> </ul>	<p>Direct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Journal</li> <li>• Reflective Essay</li> <li>• CCAI</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Indirect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NSSE (11.1) Exit Survey</li> </ul>

**Planning for Learning and Outcome Assessment\* / Learning Outcome #4**

What learning outcome are we seeking?	How will we know this outcome when we see it? That is, what will the students know or be able to do upon its completion?	How will students learn these things (in class or out of class)? What types of learning activities will be appropriate?	How can we assess student learning for this outcome? That is, what evidence will we provide to demonstrate what students know and can do?
Sample Outcomes	Sample Performance Indicators	Sample Learning Opportunity	Sample Assessment Methods
Uses knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically and interpret issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies and describes different cultural perspectives on selected issues</li> <li>Recognizes issues that might elicit diverse responses across cultures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field experience</li> <li>Class discussion and lectures</li> <li>Guest speakers</li> <li>Readings and materials in other media</li> </ul>	<p>Direct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directed prose essay</li> <li>In-class tests</li> </ul> <p>Indirect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anderson Abroad Course Exit Survey</li> <li>Selected NSSE questions (1.e, 1.u, 1.v; 6.e)</li> </ul>

\* Adapted from ACE Handbook and Trudy Banta

### QEP Program Assessment Measures

Beyond specific and consistent assessment measures for individual course outcomes, aggregate assessment data will be used to analyze the program as a whole with an annual review led by the Director of International Programs in consultation with the Anderson Abroad Advisory Council. The results of this analysis will be reported within the Academic Support Unit report filed annually for International Programs and will be used to foster program improvements. To ensure that the program is still meeting the needs of the University, the assessment structure allows for scheduled alterations to program policies as well as to course objectives. Every three years, the Director and the Advisory Council will evaluate the common learning objectives and make recommendations for changes, as warranted, to the faculty. The full range of program assessment sources is noted in the following table:

Assessment Source	Assessment Measure
Students	Course Exit Survey IDEA Course Rating
Faculty	Assessment Questionnaire and Narrative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness of operational, logistical support</li> <li>• Success at reaching educational outcomes (course / program)</li> <li>• Insights that would enhance achievement of outcomes</li> <li>• Response to students' exit survey</li> </ul>
Director and Advisory Council	IDEA Course Ratings Student Course Exit Survey Faculty Questionnaires and Narrative Evaluation NSSE ePortfolio Samples General Education Survey IE – Annual Academic Support Unit Report

## CONCLUSION

A primary consideration and goal for the QEP is that the plan be sustained after the conclusion of the mandated initiative. It is anticipated that the Anderson University Abroad program will establish the groundwork for an increase in study abroad by creating an institutional culture favoring these experiences and by enhancing expectation of opportunity for students, faculty, and administrative staff.

The process of choosing and developing the QEP involved all appropriate constituencies across the campus including faculty, administrators, professional staff, students, and trustees. The financial model for the program has been developed and has the support of senior administrators.

Anderson University's QEP is ambitious, but focused on student learning and manageable in terms of funding, implementation, management, oversight, and assessment.

## References

- About international education. (2006). *NAFSA: Association of International Educators*. Retrieved March 23, 2007 from [http://www.nafsa.org/about.sec/organization\\_leadership/about\\_international\\_education](http://www.nafsa.org/about.sec/organization_leadership/about_international_education)
- Achterberg, C. (2002). Providing a global perspective: An educator's duty. *About Campus*. January-February, 17-22.
- Armacost, R. L. (2006). QEP Planning and Development Process. SACS-COC Summer Institute, July 30-August 2, 2006.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007). Global learning for the new global century. Washington D.C.
- Austin, J. (2006). Developing the QEP: Planning and Organization Issues. SACS-COC Summer Institute, July 30-August 2, 2006.
- Banta, T. W. (2002). *Building a Scholarship of Assessment* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Black, H, & Duhon, D (2006). Assessing the impact of business study abroad programs on cultural awareness and personal development. *Journal of Education for Business*. January/February, 140-144.
- Bok, D. (2005). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Carlson, J. S., Bum, B. B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1991). Study abroad. The experience of American undergraduates in Western Europe and the United States. Occasional papers on International Educational Exchange: NY.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. Retrieved March 23, 2007 from <http://www.yearofstudyabroad.org/>
- Dolby, N. (2005). Globalisation, identity, and nation: Australian and American undergraduates abroad. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 101-117.
- Durrant, M. B., & Dorisu, C. R. (2007). Study abroad survey instruments: A comparison of survey types and experiences. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 33-53.
- Global Competence & National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad. (2005). Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program

- Goodman, A. E. (2001). The Closing of the American Mind: A Progress Report. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 71, issue 7.
- Gray, K. S., Murdock, G. K., & Stebbins, C. D. (2002). Assessing study abroad's effect on an international mission. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*. May/June, 45-51.
- Green, M. F. (2002). Joining the world: The challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*. May/June, 13-21.
- Green, M. F., & Siaya, L. (2005). Measuring Internationalization at Liberal Arts Colleges. *American Council on Education*, June.
- Hadis, B. F. (2005). Gauging the impact of study abroad: How to overcome the limitations of a single-cell design. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 30(1), 3-19.
- Handbook for reaffirmation for accreditation* (2004). Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges, second printing.
- Hayward, F. M., & Siaya, L. M. (2001). A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education [Electronic Version]. *American Council on Education*, 65.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organisations: Software of the mind* (Revised ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hovland, K. (2006). *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities
- Huebner, L. W. (2006). Foreign exposure. *Connection: The Journal of the New England board of Higher Education*, Fall XXI, no. 2, p. 21
- Hulstrand, J. (2006). Education Abroad: On the Fast Track. *International Educator*, May-June, 46-55.
- Immelman, A, & Schneider, P (1998). Assessing student learning in study-abroad programs: A conceptual framework and methodology for assessing student learning in study-abroad programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Fall, pp. 59-80.
- Ingraham, E. C., & Peterson, D. L. (2004). Assessing the Impact of Study Abroad on Student Learning at Michigan State University. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, X, 83-100.

- Kitsantas A. (2004). "Studying abroad: the role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding." *College Student Journal*, 38.3, 441-453.
- Kitsantas A., & Meyers, J. (2001). Study Abroad: Does it Enhance College Student Cross-Cultural Awareness? Educational Resources Information Center, ED 456 648.
- LaFranchi, H. (2003). Why more students are studying abroad. *Christian Science Monitor*, 95, 3.
- McCabe, L. T. (1994). The development of a global perspective during participation in semester at sea: A comparative global education program. *Educational Review*, 46.3, 275-286.
- McLean, P, Heagney, M, & Gardner, K (2003). Going global: The implications for students with a disability. *Higher Educations Research & Development*. 22, 217-228.
- Muscil, C. M. (2006). *Assessing Global Learning: Matching Good Intentions with Good Practice* (1st ed.). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Olson, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. (2006). *A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn*. American Council on Education, Washington, DC.
- Chin, H-K. K., & Bhandari, R. (2006). *Open doors 2006: Report on international education exchange*. Institute of International Education.
- Anderson University Personnel Handbook. (2007).
- Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* (2006). Interim Edition. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, first printing, revised December 2006.
- Ryan, M. E., & Twibell, R. S. (2000). Concerns, values, stress, coping, health, and educational outcomes of college students who studied abroad *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(4), 409-435.
- Scott, P. (2000). Globalisation and Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4, 8.
- Seah, W. T., & Edwards, J. (2006). Flying in, flying out: offshore teaching in higher education. *Australian Journal of Education*, 50.3 (Nov. 2006), 297-311.

- Search, S. (2005). Linking Accreditation, Quality Enhancement, and Student Learning. SACS-COC Summer Institute, July 24-27, 2005.
- Schapper, J. M., & Mayson, S. E. (2004). Internationalisation of Curricula: An alternative to the Taylorisation of academic work. *Journal of Higher Education and Policy Management*. 26, 189-205.
- Speck, B. W., & Carmical, B. H. (2002). *Internationalizing Higher Education: Building Vital Programs on Campuses* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spencer, S, & Tuma, K. (2002). *The guide to successful short-term programs abroad*. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Summers, T. A. (2005). Linking Accreditation, Quality Enhancement, and Student Learning.” SACS-COC Summer Institute, July 24-27, 2005.
- Suskie, L.(2004)*Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Talburtt, S., & Stewart, M. A. (1999). What’s the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and “living culture.” *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(ii), 163-175.
- Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a Strategy for Internationalisation: Lessons and Practice from Four Universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 149–171.
- Thies, C. G. (2005). “How to make the most of your summer study abroad teaching experience.” *Political Science & Politics*, 38.1, 83-87.
- Tseng, W., & Newton, F. B. (2002). International students’ strategies for well-being. *College Student Journal*, 36(4), 591-597.
- Troyer, D.K. (2006). “QEP: An Evaluator’s Perspective.” SACS-COC Summer Institute, July 30-August 2, 2006.
- Younes, M, & Asay, S (2003). The world as a classroom: The impact of international study experiences on college students. *College Teaching*. 51, 141-147.
- Olsen, C. L. & Kroeger, K. R. (2001, Summer). “Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity”, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5,116-137.
- U.S. Department of Education (2006). *Higher education for a highly competitive world*. Retrieved January 4, 2007, from [www.ed.gov/teachers/how/prep/higher/highered.html](http://www.ed.gov/teachers/how/prep/higher/highered.html)

- Van Der Werf, M. (2007). Riskier business: More colleges offer foreign study in an increasingly dangerous world. How can they ensure students' safety? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. March 20, A1, A30.
- Vangent (2007). Accessed June 20, 2007. <http://www.vangent-hcm.com/Solutions/PerformanceManagement/OrganizationalSurveys/CCAI/>
- Wessel, N. (2007) Integrating Service Learning Into the Study Abroad Program: U.S. Sociology Students in Mexico. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 73–89.
- White House (n.d.). *Opening new markets for America's workers*. Retrieved July 19, 2007, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/internationaltrade>
- Zielinski, A. Z. (2007). *Study Abroad Length of Program Influence on Cross-Cultural Adaptability*. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

