Beginning in March 2001, the Study Abroad Curriculum Integration team collaborated with the University of Minnesota’s Office of Measurement Services to conduct a series of surveys to gather information on student, faculty, and adviser views of study abroad opportunities, perceived barriers to studying abroad, experiences studying abroad or internationally, and demographic information. The surveys were intended to measure the impact and efficacy of the Study Abroad Curriculum Integration initiative being conducted through the University’s Bush Foundation and U.S. Department of Education FIPSE grants.

Data were collected from three cohorts of sophomores and two cohorts of seniors. The average response rate for the sophomore cohorts was 24.5%, and the average response rate for the senior cohorts was 20%. Response rates and sample sizes for each campus are found in Appendix A.

Between academic year 2001-02 and 2003-04, data were collected from faculty and academic advisers who participated in the grant activities. Data were also collected during the same timeframe from faculty members who were not grant participants, in order to establish a control group.

### Senior Results

A total of 920 seniors responded to the October 2002 survey, and 800 seniors responded to the October 2003 survey. The number of seniors who responded for each campus is in Appendix A.

There were 174 senior students of color who responded to the October 2002 survey and 242 who responded to the October 2003 survey. All seniors of color were included in the samples for all surveys. (Ethnicity categories are the official categories of University of Minnesota Reporting.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October 2003</th>
<th>October 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American seniors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian seniors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander seniors</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views and Attitudes toward Studying Abroad

- **60.5%** of seniors (2002) surveyed saw study abroad as a desirable and realistic part of their educational experience. **65.3%** of seniors (2003) saw study abroad as a desirable and realistic part of their educational experience.
- Though, it must also be noted that **21.8%** (2002) and **19.6%** (2003) saw study abroad as a desirable part of the educational experience, but *unrealistic* for students in my discipline.
- Interestingly, **57.4%** (2002) and **59.2%** (2003) feel that it is either important or very important to have the ability to function effectively in another culture.
- **47.4%** of seniors (2002) and **52.3%** of seniors (2003) feel that studying abroad will enhance their ability to think critically and solve problems.
- **41.7%** of the seniors (2002) and **42.1%** of the seniors (2003) agree or strongly agree that studying abroad will help them find a job when they graduate.

**Interesting findings**

- **54.4%** of seniors (2003) in the College of Education and Human Services Professions (CEHSP) on the University of Minnesota, Duluth campus (UMD) agree or strongly agree that studying abroad will help them find a job when they graduate. However, **16%** of seniors (2003) in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) on the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities campus (UMTC) and **24.1%** of the seniors (2003) on the University of Minnesota, Crookston campus (UMC).
- **47.8%** of seniors (2002) and **50.0%** of seniors (2003) felt that studying abroad would enhance their lifelong career opportunities.

**Interesting findings**

- **62.5%** of seniors (2002) and **65.5%** of seniors (2003) in CEHSP felt that studying abroad would enhance their lifelong career opportunities.
- **59.2%** of seniors (2002) and **56.5%** of seniors (2003) in the School of Business and Economics (SBE) at UMD felt that studying abroad would enhance their lifelong career opportunities.
- On the UMTC campus, in CEHD **20%** of the seniors (2002) and **46%** of the seniors (2003) felt that studying abroad would enhance their lifelong career opportunities.
- On the UMTC campus, in the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) **25%** of the seniors (2002) and **38.1%** of the seniors (2003) felt that studying abroad would enhance their lifelong career opportunities.

Plans for Studying Abroad and Language Learning
• **52.3%** of seniors (2002) and **58.9%** of seniors (2003) reported that they had learned a second language or planned on learning a second language while at the University of Minnesota.

• Seniors responded quite differently by campus to the language-learning question:
  - **UMC**: 13% of seniors (2002) and **13.5%** of seniors (2003)
  - **UMD**: 28.2% of seniors (2002) and **32.7%** of seniors (2003)
  - **UMM**: 62.1% of seniors (2002) and **66.4%** of seniors (2003)
  - **UMTC**: 67.9% of seniors (2002) and **65.7%** of seniors (2003)
  - Note that UMC offers no language majors, Spanish courses are offered for general education.

• Of the African American seniors responding, **60%** (2002) and **63.3%** (2003) reported that they had learned a second language or planned on learning a second language.

• Of Asian/Pacific Islander seniors responding, **68.4%** (2002) and **62.3%** (2003) reported that they had learned a second language or planned on learning a second language.

• Of the Chicano/Latino seniors responding, **69.2%** (2002) and **63.6%** (2003) reported that they had learned a second language or planned on learning a second language.

• Seniors of color, overall, reported that **65.5%** (2002) and **62.0%** (2003) planned on learning or had learned a second language.

• While at the University of Minnesota, **26.3%** of the seniors in both Oct 2002 and 2003 reported that they had studied abroad or planned on studying abroad for credit for a semester or more.

• There are some interesting responses by campus and some ethnic groups when seniors were asked if they had studied abroad or planned on studying abroad for credit for a semester or more:
  - **UMC**: 3.7% (2002) and **8.1%** (2003)
  - **UMD**: 26.7% (2002) and **29.1%** (2003)
  - **UMM**: 33.7% (2002) and **29.8%** (2003)
  - **UMTC**: 27.2% (2002) and **26.1%** (2003)
  - Asian/Pacific Islander seniors **28.6%** (2002) and **30.4%** (2003)
  - Chicano/Latino seniors **30.8%** (2002) and **36.4%** (2003)
• Overall, 24% (2002) and 27.6% (2003) of senior students of color reported that they had planned on studying abroad or had studied abroad for a semester or more.

• In addition, 18.8% of seniors (2002) and 27.5% of seniors reported that they had studied abroad or planned on studying abroad for credit for a short-term program (3-6 weeks). Interestingly, at UMM 29.5% of seniors (2002) and 36.6% of the seniors (2003) reported that they had or planned on studying abroad for credit for a short-term program. UMM’s primary study abroad offerings are short-term.

• 62.5% of seniors (2002) and 67.8% of seniors (2003) either planned on traveling and visiting another country or had traveled to another country while being a University of Minnesota student.

Barriers to Study Abroad

Barriers to studying abroad are listed in descending order of importance as reported by those students who were surveyed.

Cost
• 74.9% of seniors (2002) and 74.4% of seniors (2003) gave or frequently gave cost as a barrier to studying abroad.

Delay of graduation
• 47.7% of seniors (2002) and 44.1% of seniors (2003) gave or frequently gave delay of graduation as a barrier to studying abroad.

• Interesting findings

• Students in several colleges felt that this barrier (delay in graduation) was far greater of a barrier than the general population.
• UMTC College of Education and Human Development: 71.4% (2002), 70.9% (2003) (21:920, 24:800 response rate) (Students enter this college as juniors.)
• UMTC Institute of Technology: 56.7% (2002), 47.9% (2003) (67:920, 92:800 response rate) (This college administers the science and engineering degree programs.)
• UMD College of Science and Engineering: 56.6% (2002), 53.9% (2003) (53:920, 26:800 response rate)

Time away from family and friends
• 39.0% (2002) and 39.5% (2003) gave or frequently gave time away from family and friends as a barrier to studying abroad.

Time away from on-campus studies
• 36.4% (2002) and 35.7% (2003) gave of frequently gave time away from campus studies as a barrier to studying abroad.
Concern about applying credit to requirements

- 33.3 % (2002) and 33.2% (2003) gave or frequently gave concern about applying credits to requirements as a barrier to studying abroad.

• Interesting findings

- Again, in a few colleges, more seniors had a concern about applying credit to requirements:
  - UMD College of Science and Engineering: 41.5% (2002), 50% (2003)
  - UMTC Institute of Technology: 44.7% (2002), 39.2% (2003)
  - UMD School of Fine Arts: 42.3% (2002), 66.7% (2003)

Advising

- 42.6 % of seniors (2002) and 47.8% of seniors (2003) have had an adviser or professor encourage them to study abroad. Responses by campus per year are:
  - UMC 37% (2002) and 40.5% (2003)
  - UMD 39.2% (2002) and 51.8% (2003)
  - UMM 50.5% (2002) and 64.1 % (2003)
  - UMTC 43.5% (2002) and 43.5% (2003)

- 47.1% (2002) and 49.6% (2003) of seniors of color reported that they had an adviser or professor encourage them to study abroad.
  - American Indian seniors 55.0% (2002) and 72.7% (2003)
  - Asian/Pacific Islander seniors 51.0% (2002) and 52.9% (2003)
  - Chicano/Latino seniors 53.8% (2002) and 39.2% (2003)

- In addition to this 40.1% of seniors in 2002 and 42.9% of seniors in 2003 had asked an adviser or professor about studying abroad. Responses by campus per year are:
  - UMC 27.8% (2002) and 24.3% (2003)
  - UMD 35.5% (2002) and 48.2% (2003)
  - UMM 44.2% (2002) and 60.3% (2003)
  - UMTC 43.3% (2002) and 38.7% (2003)

- 43.0% (2002) and 44.6% (2003) of seniors of color had asked an adviser or professor about studying abroad.
  - African American seniors 50.0% (2002) and 33.3% (2003)
  - American Indian seniors 35.0% (2002) and 50.0% (2003)
  - Asian/Pacific Islander seniors 43.9% (2002) and 49.3% (2003)
• Chicano/Latino seniors **38.5%** (2002) and **36.7%** (2003)

### Sophomore Results

Initially, sophomores (2001-02 academic year cohort) were surveyed at the end of their sophomore year (May 2002). With a low response rate (17%), we realized that the end of the school year was simply too busy for students to take a survey. Thus, we moved the survey to earlier in the second semester of the sophomore year (March 2003) for the following year’s cohort (2002-03 cohort). This yielded a response rate of 26%. In both instances, we had significant sample sizes out of the total sophomore student body from which to survey students. (Cohort I, sample size = 2800:8192, Cohort II, sample size = 3000:8334.)

For the 2003-04 sophomore cohort, we administered the survey in November 2003, the first semester of the sophomore year. This was in order to have data collected and analyzed by the end of the spring semester 2004, which coincided with the conclusion of our grants and our conference to dissemination our model of curriculum integration. Even though we had a significant sample size (Cohort III, sample size = 4000:9032) and acceptable response rate (23%), we have noticed a slight “dip” in overall responses to many questions. We have determined that surveying sophomores in the second semester of their sophomore year allows students to develop beyond the first year in college, and go through 2 cycles of academic advising. In the future, we will survey sophomores in mid-term of their second semester.

This is an example of how our evaluation process is guiding the creation and fine-tuning of our curriculum integration work. Our grant period has allowed for this experimentation. During 2004-05, we hope to finalize our methodology so that we have an instrument and methodology that can be used for years to come to determine the long-term changes in students’ opinions and behaviors about study abroad.

A total of 473 sophomores responded to the May 2002 survey, 782 to the March 2003 survey, and 920 to the November 2003 survey. The number of sophomores who responded for each campus is in Appendix A.

There were 71 students of color who responded to the May 2002 survey, 140 to the March 2003 survey, and 255 to the November 2003 survey. All sophomores of color on all four campuses were included in the samples for each survey. (Ethnicity categories are the official categories of University of Minnesota Reporting.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May 2002</th>
<th>March 2003</th>
<th>November 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American sophomores</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian sophomores</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander sophomores</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino sophomores</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Views and Attitudes toward Studying Abroad

- Of the sophomores who responded, 58.3% (May 2002), 66.6% (Mar 2003), and 63.8% (Nov 2003) saw study abroad as a desirable and realistic part of their educational experience.

- Though, it must be noted that 25.4% (May 2002), 21.4% (Mar 2003), and 19.9% (Nov 2003) saw study abroad as a desirable and unrealistic part of their educational experience.

- 59.1% (May 2002), 65.1% (Mar 2003), and 65.2% (Nov 2003) feel that it is either important or very important to have the ability to function effectively in another culture.

- 45.4% (May 2002), 51.4% (Mar 2003), and 51.9% (Nov 2003) agree or strongly agree that studying abroad will enhance their ability to think critically and solve problems.

- 46.7% (May 2002), 51.7% (Mar 2003), and 48.4% (Nov 2003) agree or strongly agree that studying abroad will help them find a job when they graduate.

- 50.9% (May 2002), 55.1% (Mar 2003), and 52.6% (Nov 2003) agree or strongly agree that studying abroad will enhance their lifelong career opportunities.

Plans for Studying Abroad and Language Learning

- Of the sophomores who responded, 48% (May 2002), 55.5% (March 2003) and 60.9% (Nov 2003) reported that they had learned a second language or planned on learning a second language while students at the University of Minnesota. Campus responses are as follows.

  - UMD 28.1% (May 2002) 29.6% (Mar 2003) and 31.7% (Nov 2003)
  - UMM 80.9% (May 2002) 63.9% (Mar 2003) and 64.5% (Nov 2003)
  - UMTC 60.8% (May 2002) 66.0% (Mar 2003) and 64.5% (Nov 2003)

- Sophomores of color reported that 62.5% (May 2002), 62.0% (Mar 2003) and 61.0% (Nov 2003) had learned a second language or planned on learning a second language while students at the University of Minnesota. Responses by two ethnic groups were notable.

  - African American sophomores 66.7% (May 2002), 65.9% (Mar 2003) and 72.0% (Nov 2003)
  - Asian/Pacific Islander sophomores 52.6% (May 2002), 55.4% (Mar 2003) and 61.1% (Nov 2003)
• Of the sophomores who responded, **32.6%** (May 2002), **41.3%** (Mar 2003) and **39.6%** (Nov 2003) reported that they had or planned on studying abroad for credit for a semester or more while at the University of Minnesota.

  • UMC 0% (May 2002) **22.7%** (Mar 2003) and **19.5%** (Nov 2003)
  • UMD 33.5% (May 2002) **40.9%** (Mar 2003) and **42.1%** (Nov 2003).
  • UMM 34% (May 2002) **47.2%** (Mar 2003) and **38.0%** (Nov 2003)
  • UMTC 33% (May 2002) **41.9%** (Mar 2003) and **40.7%** (Nov 2003)

• Sophomores of color reported that **38.9%** (May 2002), **44.3%** (Mar 2003), and **43.0%** (Nov 2003) planned or had studied abroad for a semester or more while at the University of Minnesota. Responses by three ethnic groups were notable.

  • African American sophomores 26.7% (May 2002), **41.5%** (Mar 2003), and **40.0%** (Nov 2003)
  • Asian/Pacific Islander sophomores 42.1% (May 2002), **50.0%** (Mar 2003), and **41.4%** (Nov 2003)
  • Chicano/Latino sophomores 66.7% (May 2002), **36.4%** (Mar 2003), and **54.5%** (Nov 2003)

• Sophomores who responded reported that **23.7%** (May 2002), **35.5%** (Mar 2003) and **37.4%** (Nov 2003) planned on or already had studied abroad with a short-term program.

*Barriers to Study Abroad*

Barriers to studying abroad are listed in descending order of importance as reported by those students who were surveyed.

**Cost**

  • 71.7% (May 2002), **67.5%** (Mar 2003) and **68.5%** (Nov 2003) gave or frequently gave cost as a barrier to studying abroad.

**Time away from family and friends**

  • 45.7% (May 2002), **40.8%** (Mar 2003) and **42.4%** (Nov 2003) gave or frequently gave time away from family and friends as a barrier to studying abroad.

**Delay of graduation**

  • 45.2% (May 2002), **38.7%** (Mar 2003), and **38.0%** (Nov 2003) gave or frequently gave delay of graduation as a barrier to studying abroad.

  • **Interesting finding**
  • Sophomores in the College of Science and Engineering (UMD) found this to be an even greater barrier: **55.1%** (May 2002), **51.2%** (March 2003), and **56.6%** (Nov 2003).
Time away from on-campus studies
• 41.2% (May 2002), 36.7% (Mar 2003), 36.4% (Nov 2003) gave or frequently gave time away from campus studies as a barrier to studying abroad.

Concern about applying credit to requirements
• 39.2% (May 2002), 36.9% (Mar 2003), and 32.9% (Nov 2003) gave or frequently gave concern about applying credits to requirements as a barrier to studying abroad.

Advising
• 39.8% (May 2002), 50.6% (Mar 2003), and 48.9% (Nov 2003) have had an adviser or professor encourage them to studying abroad.
• In addition to this 34.8% (May 2002), 41.4% (Mar 2003) and 41.4% (Nov 2003) had asked an adviser or professor about studying abroad.

Faculty and Adviser Survey Results
From 2001-2004 there were two surveys given to Non-Participating Faculty and Adviser, January 2002 (n=115) and November 2003 (n=182), and two surveys given to Participating Faculty and Advisers August 2001 - January 2002 (n=224), and January 2004 (n=104). Participants included those who had been involved in one of the curricular working groups of the Bush Foundation grant: Freshman and Sophomore Advising Group (FSA, Major Advising Groups I or II (MAG I, MAG II), or Undergraduate Department and Discipline Representatives (UDDR). August 2001-January 2002 data included participants in the three working groups, FSA, MAG I, and UDDR, which began their curriculum integration work in the first year of the Bush Foundation grant. Major Advising Group II (MAGII) began its work in 2002-03.

Non-Participating Faculty and Advisers
Views and Attitudes toward Studying Abroad
• 66.1% (2002) and 60.4% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers saw study abroad as desirable and realistic part of the educational experience for students.
• In addition, 16.5% (2002) and 19.2% (2003) felt that study abroad is an essential part of the educational experience.
• 38.2% (2002) and 31.9% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers felt that second language competency is either important or very important.
• Interestingly, 60.9% (2002) and 59.9% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers believe that the ability to function effectively in another culture is important or very important for students in their given professional field of study.
• 40% (2002) and 44.5% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers agreed or strongly agreed that study abroad would help students find a better job when they graduate.
• In addition, 67% (2002) of non-participating faculty and advisers and 68.7% (2003) agreed or strongly agreed that study abroad enhances an undergraduates lifelong career opportunities.

Barriers to Study Abroad

Cost
• 65.2% (2002) and 58.9% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers reported that students gave or frequently gave “cost” as a barrier to study abroad.

Time away from on-campus studies
• 46.3% (2002) and 48.9% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers reported that students gave or frequently gave “time away from on-campus studies” as a barrier to study abroad.

Delay in graduation
• 45.7% (2002) and 48.9% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “delay in graduation” as a barrier to study abroad.

Time away from family and friends
• 41.9% (2002) and 30.7% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “time away from family and friends” as a barrier for students to study abroad.

Concern about applying credit to requirements
• 40.9% (2002) and 35.5% (2003) of non-participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “concern about applying credit to requirements” as a barrier for students to study abroad.

Interesting finding
• When non-participating faculty and advisers were asked whether or not students could use credit earned through study abroad towards requirements in their department, 72.2% (2002) and 66.5% (2003) said YES, only 7.8% (2002) and 8.2% (2003) said NO. The remaining respondents were UNCERTAIN, 20% (2002) and 23.6% (2003).

Advising

When non-participants (2003) were asked to “What degree do you encourage your students to study abroad?” 30.2% said that they strongly encouraged their students to study abroad, 40.1% said that they encouraged their students to study abroad and 24.7% said that they were neutral towards their students about study abroad.
In addition in Nov 2003, non-participating faculty and advisers were asked how frequently students asked them about study abroad, without prompting. 3.3% reported very frequently, 12.6% frequently, 32.4% sometimes, 30.8% infrequently, and 17.0% never.

**Participating Faculty and Advisers**

- **58.1%** (2002) and **54.8%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers saw study abroad as desirable and realistic part of the educational experience for students.
- In addition, **20.1%** (2002) and **30.8%** (2003) felt that study abroad is an essential part of the educational experience.
- **30.8%** (2002) of participating faculty and advisers and **44.2%** (2004) felt that second language competency is either important or very important.
- Interestingly, **59.9%** (2002) and **69.3%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers believe that the ability to function effectively in another culture is important or very important for students in their given professional field of study.
- **48.7%** (2002) and **68.3%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers agreed or strongly agreed that study abroad would help students find a better job when they graduate.
- In addition, **70.6%** (2002) and **85.6%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers agreed or strongly agreed that study abroad enhances an undergraduates lifelong career opportunities.

**Barriers to Study Abroad**

**Cost**
- **78%** (2002) and **82.7%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “cost” as a barrier to study abroad.

**Time away from on-campus studies**
- **31.1%** (2002) and **45.5%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “time away from on-campus studies” as a barrier to study abroad.

**Delay in graduation**
- **41.5%** (2002) and **51%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “delay in graduation” as a barrier to study abroad.

**Time away from family and friends**
- **22.8%** (2002) and **44.0%** (2004) of participating faculty and advisers reported that students frequently gave or gave “time away from family and friends” as a barrier for students to study abroad.

**Concern about applying credit to requirements**
• 40.7% (2002) of participating faculty and advisers and 32.0% (2004) gave or frequently gave concern about applying credit to requirements as a barrier for students to study abroad.

• Interesting finding

• When participating faculty and advisers were asked whether or not students could use credit earned through study abroad towards requirements in their department, 56.7 % (2002) and 84.6% (2004) said YES, only 3.1% (2002) and 5.8% (2004) said No.

• The remaining respondents were UNCERTAIN but the drop was significant over time, 35.7% (2002) and 5.8% (2004).

Advising

When asked in Jan 2004 to “What degree do you encourage your students to study abroad?” 65.4% said that they strongly encouraged their students to study abroad, 27.9% said that they encouraged their students to study abroad and 2.9% said that they were neutral towards their students about study abroad.

In addition in Jan 2004, participating faculty and advisers were asked how frequently students asked them about study abroad, without prompting. 13.5% reported very frequently, 26.9% frequently, 40.4% sometimes, 12.5% infrequently, and 2.9% never.

Evaluation of Faculty and Adviser Workshops

From the beginning of the Bush Foundation grant supported workshops in September 2001, evaluations have been conducted in order to provide continuous process improvement of the curriculum integration initiative.

Workshops include: Major Advising Group II Retreat (September 2002), Freshman/Sophomore Advising Retreat (October 2002), Major Advising Group II workshop (March 2003), Freshman/Sophomore Advising workshop (April 2003), Major Advising Group II workshop (Sept 2003), and the Major Advising Group II (February 2004). An “End-of-Process” evaluation was conducted when the Freshman/Sophomore Advising group (Spring 2003) and the Major Advising Group II group (February 2004) completed their series of workshops.

Briefly, some of the more important results from these evaluations are as follows.
The **Major Advising Group 2 Retreat** (September 2002) was reported as being useful, helpful, relevant, and meaningful to participants. The Overview on Curriculum Integration presentation was the best received.

The **Freshman/Sophomore Advising Retreat** (October 2002) was well received in all respects, in terms of content, organization, location, and networking with Curriculum Integration specialists and other colleagues. The session on Maximizing Study Abroad: Student Strategies for Language and Culture Learning was particularly well received.

The **Major Advising Group 2 Workshop** (March 2003) provided a rich source of qualitative data. The responses to the following questions illustrate some of the most effective tools being used in this process.

**What were the learning experiences that most helped your understanding of study abroad curriculum integration efforts?**
- Presentations on faculty group site visits to see study abroad programs
- realization of integration as a holistic rather than just a purely academic process
- process for matching courses with corresponding international universities

**What was your reaction to the three-part process of curriculum integration?**
- Good structuring advice
- very helpful for me to package my thinking

**What are some specific ways to implement curriculum integration into your respective departments?**
- develop advising sheets and have more study abroad information available in the advisers office
- initiate a study abroad peer mentor program, display with literature and map showing where students have gone, and working with faculty to create research opportunities
- determine course equivalents in advance for all identified programs
- gather information about unique opportunities utilizing faculty’s international connections
- identify part in calendar where majors could best study abroad
- faculty could invite returning students to share global perspectives to course content

**What content would you like to see in future meetings?**
- specific information on how to plug students into scholarships, ideas that worked in other places
- how to convince colleagues of these ideas
- how to incorporate the study abroad processes into ongoing and new-hire training of faculty, staff, and directors (i.e., how can we ensure the curriculum integration efforts are institutionalized, part of the university’s infrastructure, and continues with new groups of staff/faculty/students and not just a one-time intervention?)

**Freshman/Sophomore Advising Workshop (April 4, 2003)**
The comments from the evaluation forms distributed at this event also provided a rich source for qualitative feedback. The following section reflects the comments of participants regarding some of the issues that were of most interest to the grant process.

What are your own or your department’s next steps for study abroad curriculum integration?
- matching course needs and strengths to institutions
- find new ways to present information to students
- develop more wide ranging programs that incorporate opportunities within and outside major discipline requirements
- nurture a strong core of dedicated individuals to these goals
- select creative ideas ‘picked up’ at Bush-sponsored events regarding announcing opportunities, supporting students, incorporating into classes, etc.
- possibly getting our alumni involved
- internship/experiential opportunity development in new entrepreneurship degree program

How should the Study Abroad Office ideally continue working with your unit?
- audit our process at least annually for compliance and improvement
- sponsor activities aimed at perpetuating the collaboration
- have Study Abroad staff visit our staff meetings to keep us informed on programs
- doing presentations together to facilitate campus involvement
- development of internet/website to provide updates
- help us keep motivated and on track
- Visit us!

What type of ongoing training do you want?
- adviser training
- orientation session to inform people about resources and support
- training new staff
- meet once or twice a year with reps from other units to learn what they are doing to encourage study abroad
- keeping us updated through email
- yearly in-service to talk about new programs, procedures and progress

Major Advising Group II (September 19th, 2003)

What progress has your unit made with study abroad curriculum integration since the beginning of this project?
- more awareness unit-wide of how study abroad works
- greater familiarity with web advising tools
- have identified more academic programs that fit needs of department
- planned and developed major advising sheets
- setting up an adviser liaison and site visits by advisers, tremendous enthusiasm
• developed fact sheet including selection of programs to highlight in our curriculum though, slow progress, but there is hope
• communicating to students the value of learning abroad
• developed faculty involvement in creating early learn abroad experiences.

Major Advising Group II (February 6th, 2003)

What has been implemented in your department or on your campus with regard to Curriculum Integration (or Internationalizing the Curriculum) in your unit?
• major advising sheets
• staff members participating in workshops to give input on information sheets
• addressing barrier issues directly to students
• international curriculum plan for majors
• planning tools/workshops have been created
• advising support
• facilitated presentation by returnees

Describe any barriers that you feel are hindering or have hindered the success of the Curriculum Integration within your unit?
• fitting Study Abroad into academic plans
• concern that students studying abroad are taking important revenue away from departments.
• people (students, faculty, advisors & others) who still do not see the value of study abroad.
• resources & funding, departmental support
• keeping new advisors updated on SA info
• mixed signals from Deans
• not enough priority given to learning abroad in our institutional goals & purpose
• lack of time

What could the study abroad office on your campus do that would be most beneficial in your continued effort to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum in your unit?
• enhance database of students broken down by major and/or student advising office
• continue to do what you are doing, continue to collaborate and involve everyone
• keep leading the effort
• work on developing access to financial aid
• keep the communication going between faculty on coordinate campuses
• help to create goals and action plans and follow up to keep up motivation
• build support and enthusiasm among faculty

How has what you learned through the Curriculum Integration process and retreats SPECIFICALLY helped you in your work with your students or faculty?
• has helped me to answer difficult questions and made me aware of more resources available
• re-energize myself, talk with students, faculty, and staff about programs they have experienced
know more about how programs work, the issues that face students thus I have gained confidence and authority in the area of study abroad. I was also able to participate in a site visit—wow!

- finance aspects
- more informed about the processes & logistics of pre-planning as well as what goes on while students are abroad & upon return
- advise students of the opportunity and benefits to studying abroad

**End-of-Process Evaluation of Freshman/Sophomore Advising Group (Spring 2003)**

These evaluations were distributed to participants before the event in order for them to have time to reflectively answer the questions. Their responses summarized their cumulative experiences (Spring 2003) and were quite insightful. Five general questions were asked of the participants:

*Timing of retreats/events for Curriculum Integration (intervals in between, pros/cons of longer/shorter events)*

For the most part, participants felt the interval between events was appropriate and allowed them to complete necessary activities as well as allowed them time to process the information and integrate it into their work.

Shorter length events were easier to fit into their campus schedules but longer events seem to give those who attended a more meaningful experience, partly attributed to those events were off campus and away from the usual distractions.

Off campus retreats also provided a more relaxed atmosphere and gave participants more quality time to network. Positive aspects often included longer and more in-depth conversations with study abroad staff and peers, and negative aspects included travel time to longer off-site retreats.

*What are the advantages/disadvantages of meeting/working with other campuses/departments?*

Advantages almost always included the richness of ideas from peers and staff from other campuses, the potential for networking with like-minded individuals, ability to coordinate better for accomplishing tasks, and peer pressure and the knowledge that their peers are moving forward with this process. Faculty and advisers very few disadvantages. One adviser reported the differences between campuses and that smaller campuses had different issues than the larger Twin Cities campus.

*How did the overall content of retreats contributed to your role with curriculum integration (content level, pacing, amount, appropriateness, etc.)?*

The new information obtained from the retreats helped many advisers and faculty in their roles of informing and disseminating information to students. The content also answered
many of their own questions about study abroad. Others reported the content and ideas from the retreat made them more motivated.

**How have activities been relevant to your given role within Curriculum Integration?**

Many had reported the knowledge obtained from study abroad sessions/retreats have had a direct bearing on their work. They now give much greater emphasis to discussing study abroad opportunities where in the past they gave little attention. They also reported being more enthused and comfortable when discussing these issues with students. Several stated they now wanted a study abroad site visit themselves and that their own interest in this area has increased. Overall, advisers have become convinced that a study abroad experience is a valuable component of an undergraduate education. It appears they not only disseminate this information but for many they have internalized the value of the curriculum integration efforts.

**What could Study Abroad staff have done differently between retreats/workshops for assistance support with curriculum integration?**

Some comments included: more updates about success stories, increased contact via emails or short meetings (once a month), developing practical ways we can actually put the strategies we learned into action, and brief check-ins via email to ensure loose ends/questions have been addressed. Over all the comments were very positive regarding the performance of the Study Abroad staff.

**End-of-Process Evaluation for Major Advising Group II (February 2004)**

**Timing of retreats/events for Curriculum Integration (intervals in between, pros/cons of longer/ shorter events)**

Overall faculty and advisers felt the timing of the retreats to be extremely beneficial in processing the information given at each event. Several especially enjoyed having down time at the retreats to informally chats with colleagues. Here are several comments from participants:

What I liked about the events and timing of the events was that the longer retreats allowed us to meet and establish personal and working relationships with colleagues from all over campus.

The intervals between retreats seemed appropriate for accomplishing tasks. A smaller campus-specific working group that met once a month might have been a nice addition in order for me to keep my curriculum integration tasks fresh in my mind.

The longer events helped me to think about long-term planning and how to go about starting curriculum integration. The shorter events were helpful in keeping
me on task, re-thinking major advising sheets, and giving me new ideas for developing the sheet.

What are the advantages/disadvantages of meeting/working with other campuses/departments?

Overall faculty and advisers agreed that meeting with other campuses has allowed them to develop relationships and have certain dialogues that would never have been fostered had they not attended these meetings. In addition, many stated that they found it to be highly advantageous to be able to learn from other’s experiences. Again here are some of the faculties’ and advisers’ own words:

This was one of the biggest reasons for a successful meeting. Visiting, listening and sharing what each is doing and thoughts were extremely helpful.

It really helps to see what other offices & campuses are doing, fuels more ideas for us. It’s nice on a broader level to meet people whose names we only hear.. putting faces to names.

I absolutely love meeting people from other colleges and departments. Our office is busy enough that those contacts don’t happen unless we arrange them. For social contact, professional networking, and getting information from a different point of view.

It was extremely useful to see that we all recognize the value of study abroad. It was great to hear the different insights as to how experiences enrich all academic pursuits. It is easy to get tunnel vision in our various fields.

I think they were great networking experiences. I hope to continue some of these relationships. I think by meeting and networking with people that new ideas were formed and that mentorship opportunities really happened.

How did the overall content of retreats contributed to your role with curriculum integration (content level, pacing, amount, appropriateness, etc.)?

Some felt that the content of the retreats and meetings had very appropriate content level and the an adequate amount of time for small group conversation, though several participants felt that the pace was a little slow at times. Several responses give light to these statements:

I have been asked to take the lead and put the program together for our major. Since the meeting we have put our program together and it is off to the press for students to see.

I feel that the pacing is a little slow sometimes and due to the uniqueness of the program the appropriateness was not always what I wished for. However, I am
sure that for most programs the content was very close to what they were trying to accomplish.

I have come to realize how important it is to make sure our students get this experience.

More than anything it was helpful to creatively solve problems and think about how more students can study abroad.

*How have activities been relevant to your given role within Curriculum Integration?*

Extremely relevant! I am the study abroad adviser for Spanish and am in the process of initiating numerous “projects” via the web to facilitate the process for students. The info from the retreats was helpful in my advising, as are advising sheets coming out of the work with the project.

I feel that my involvement has inspired me to change/add to the way that the Department communicates study abroad opportunities to undergraduate students. It has also offered me the opportunity to lean about a particular aspect of faculty members’ work.

They have empowered me to make suggestions to my department’s faculty, and to ask them for suggestions both for encouraging students to study abroad and to how they might alter their courses’ academic objectives knowing that some students will have had planned to Study Abroad.

*What could Study Abroad staff have done differently between retreats/workshops for assistance support with curriculum integration?*

Many responded with comments such as, your study abroad staff members have been great, they (curriculum integration staff) have been extremely helpful, and they (CI staff) have been incredibly supportive and receptive to what we are doing and have been doing on our campus. A few suggestions from faculty and participant were:

I think as an office we should have had someone from curriculum integration or the study abroad office come to one of our staff meetings when we got our new staff members.

It would be nice to have a way to identify students who have been involved in study abroad. If we could be provided with a list of our students who did study abroad we might be able to use these students to promote their experiences.

One suggestion is to have the study abroad staff present information to departments at a departmental faculty meeting - that way it could involve more faculty.
Faculty Participants in Internationalizing On-Campus Courses

Workshops were held in 2002-03 and 2003-04 for faculty wishing to internationalize their courses. Through a competitive application process, 13 faculty members participated in the 2002-03 cohort and 13 faculty members participated in the 2003-04 cohort. During this process, courses ranging from nursing to horticulture and architecture to economics were “internationalized.” The unique pedagogy of the workshops, a reflective process focusing on pedagogical philosophies and styles, yielded a significant professional development experience for the majority of participants.

This has been the most rewarding grant experience of my career. I have benefited from many kinds of grants and awards for both research and curricular development. This grant is in a class by itself for the simple reason that it has a soul. To the instructors I owe much admiration and appreciation, despite the hard work (or because of it, I should say).

As a conscientious educator wanting to open the world up to students, to ignite their excitement and instill a lifelong curiosity for learning about the world, it is reassuring to participate in workshops with colleagues who share similar goals. The opportunity to gather with like-minded educators, exploring ways to shift the patterns of thinking of students, to expand the student's understanding of the world and the many cultural frames of reference helped me think through new approaches to introducing topics. For contemplating integration of international into a course of study, there is no better way than gathering with a multi-disciplinary group of peers in a semi-structured workshop environment listening to concepts, approaches or stories from the classroom to generate creative energy for my own work.

I particularly enjoyed meeting faculty from very diverse disciplines and from different campuses all equally passionate about expanding the horizons of the teaching universe to include international perspectives. The balance in the workshop sessions of intellectually rewarding discussions with conversations, enactments and events that touched the heart was gratifying to me since in the end as teachers I believe we must affect not just the intellect but the heart and soul of students if we are to inspire them to help make change in the world.

Evaluation Conclusion

The words of faculty and advisers who have participated in the Curriculum Integration initiative perhaps best summarize the impact that this work is having on our four University of Minnesota campuses.
I was committed to the goals of this project. What surprised me most was the effectiveness of the retreats for increasing awareness of and support from faculty. Having this in place helped us make great strides on the Morris campus.

I will be able to find specific programs that will most benefit my students in their University of Minnesota degree program.

I initially thought that integrating study abroad in our degree programs could be really hard because of the wide diversity of our programs. What I’ve learned is that you look at and focus on the underlying reasons we want students to study abroad and not just think about the specifics of the major.

Study abroad is increasingly prominent in our student contacts. We’re continuing to make study abroad a key component of the undergrad experience. We’re making the expectations in our orientations, student appointments, web materials, and handouts.

Our advisers have greater awareness of all the different types of study abroad programs available to students. Advisors are more knowledgeable about study abroad procedures and planning process.

Study abroad is now a regular discussion agenda item our department meetings.

I have gained confidence and authority in the area of study abroad.

We have been able to engage faculty DIRECTLY in the process.

I can now advise my students on a much more realistic level regarding the costs of study abroad. I have learned about the myths and realities of study abroad that allows me to better advise my students.

My participation here has fostered and strengthened my belief that university education in general must engage in the pursuit I find essential to architectural education: not a constant pursuit of the next "solution" or the "right answer," but rather a continual and adaptable development of the ability to make sense of one's surroundings in order to successfully act within and upon them.

The participation in this program was a wonderful and rewarding experience. It broadened my understanding of what "internationalizing" means. Previously, I understood this process merely as the incorporation of international case studies into the course content. What I have learned now is that "internationalization" is a much broader strategy to revise not only course content but to rethink pedagogy, classroom dynamics, and assessment strategies. In an internationalized course, students should be exposed to different approaches to discussion, problem solving and policy making in my discipline and gain an understanding and appreciation of often conflicting cultural perspectives on solving ecological problems.
For more information, contact Gayle Woodruff (gwoodruf@umn.edu), Curriculum Integration Evaluation Director, Thomas Dohm Ph.D. (dohmx004@umn.edu) Director of the Office for Measurement Services, or Rhiannon Williams (will1395@umn.edu), Curriculum Integration Research Assistant.
Student Survey Response Rates, Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Survey Sample Size</th>
<th>Total Enrollments</th>
<th>Total Responses (Rate)</th>
<th>Responses Crookston (UMC)</th>
<th>Responses Duluth (UMD)</th>
<th>Responses Morris (UMM)</th>
<th>Responses Twin Cities (UMTC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore I May 2002</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>8192</td>
<td>473 (17%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore II March 2003</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>8334</td>
<td>782 (26%)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore III November 2003</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>9032</td>
<td>920 (23%)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior I October 2002</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>11,429</td>
<td>920 (20%)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior II October 2003</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>11,968</td>
<td>800 (20%)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>