

SIG Final Report Format

Date: 08/08/2015

A. Name & Title of Principal Investigators (include Department & College Affiliation)

<u>Name & Title of Principal Investigator(s)</u>	<u>Department & College Affiliation</u>
Sabine H. Smith, Professor of German	Foreign Languages, CHSS
Joe Terantino, Director, FLRC	Foreign Languages, CHSS
Dan Paracka, Director, Academic Initiatives, DGA	Interdisciplinary Studies, CHSS, DGA

B. Project/Program Name: Interdisciplinary Teaching and Assessment of Intercultural Competence

C. Project ID: Not found

D. Dates Covered by this Report: July 1, 2014 – June 31, 2015

E. Type of Grant: Campus Internationalization Prize

F. Total Amount of Funding Awarded: \$45K

G. Total Amount of Funding Covered by this Report: \$45K

H. Report Certification:

I confirm that the information contained within this associated report for SIG Initiative funding is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further confirm my intention to continue implementation of this award according to the policies and procedures of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and Kennesaw State University.

<u>Name & Title of Principal Investigator(s)</u>	<u>Signature of Agreement</u>	<u>Date</u>
Sabine H. Smith, Professor of German	<i>Sabine H. Smith</i>	8/14/2015
Joe Terantino, Director, FLRC	<i>Joe Terantino</i>	8/14/2015
Dan Paracka, Director, Academic Initiatives, DGA	Dan Paracka	8/14/2015

**Final written reports are due by August 15 for all awards*

Narrative:

1. Please describe the activities completed in support of the stated goals and objectives/outcomes for this grant. If your award required quarterly reports, please describe both the activities completed in the past quarter and the overall progress made toward the stated goals and objectives.

We met almost all deliverables as outlined in the project plan for the fourth quarter:

- A comprehensive website (linked from DGA website) was developed for the purpose of providing information related to the mission and implementation of the ITAIC project and public access to the learning modules created through the initiative:

<http://dga.kennesaw.edu/content/itaic>

- Three student focus groups were conducted (n = 47) to elicit feedback about the role of international education at KSU; student demographics were noted and thematic strands in student responses were summarized for analysis at a later time; 44 students received stipends.

- Two intercultural scholars provided an end-of-project external review of the ITAIC project's work, identifying achievements, opportunities, and future directions;

- The budget was managed well; with the approval by the project advisor, grant funds were used to purchase research materials (sets of 4 for most books) in order to allow the three Co-PIs to continue the research agenda with access to most recent scholarship, and to begin collating items for public access – either in a DGA office or in the KSU library;

- Seven Faculty “Expert Multipliers” (Ems) from seven academic departments and five colleges) and 23 Departmental Designees (DDs) from fourteen departments and eight colleges continued and completed the work begun in the 3rd quarter of the funding period. The 7 EMs were cohort members of the 1st and 2nd quarters of the ITAIC project, and based on directions provided by the Co-PIs, they developed and implemented six KSU campus-wide workshops and informational sessions related to interdisciplinary intercultural competence. Attended by the “Departmental Designees” and additional KSU faculty, the sessions were attended by audiences ranging from 4 to 15. The 7 EMs were incentivized by \$ 500 stipends, and the 23 Faculty DDs were awarded a book prize for attending the EMs’ workshops and for subsequently relaying the information back to their home departments (see feedback).

- The Co-PIs and three KSU faculty members (cohort members of the 1st and 2nd quarter who also served as EMs or DDs) attended a two-day retreat May 1-2, 2015, to collate and analyze the data at our disposition, and to identify next steps. We collaboratively analyzed all modules and module reports; discussed the 28 dimensions and their applicability to the KSU context; reviewed qualitative data generated via the student focus group interviews; reviewed survey results from the film series questionnaire and the global learning questionnaire (distributed in 2005 and in 2015); identified research materials for purchase and a research agenda for a range of scholarly venues for presentations and publications.

- The Co-PIs wrote the end-year report.

In addition to the fourth quarter deliverables, throughout the entire ITAIC project:

- 20 KSU faculty plus 3 co-PIs attended the 2-day ITAIC workshop and 22 online modules were developed and were piloted in KSU classrooms.
 - Additionally, each faculty participant adapted and implemented one of their fellow participants’ modules (20 modules x 2 implementations each = 40 total modules implemented. Estimating an average of 25 students per class x 40 = 1,000 KSU students impacted directly by materials created through the ITAIC project.
- A variety of IC-related resource materials and assessment items were researched and purchased for work by KSU faculty related to the ITAIC project and to aid in establishing an ITAIC library

on campus.

- Drs. Darla Deardorff and Alvino Fantini served as external reviewers at roughly the mid- and end points of the ITAIC project.

2. What impact did your grant make toward advancing KSU's Strategic Plan for Internationalization? If your award required quarterly reports, please describe both the impact this past quarter as well as the overall impact.

In the 4th quarter of the ITAIC project we aimed to further disseminate ITAIC-based materials and to more explicitly incorporate the KSU student voice in our overall project (by examining the student survey on global learning and by analyzing the data generated by the three student focus group interviews). The ITAIC website was publicized as a platform for making the learning modules accessible to KSU faculty and other interested scholars. The 7 Expert Multipliers and 23 Department Designees were recruited to relay information about ITAIC to additional KSU academic departments prior not engaged in the cohorts of the 1st and 2nd quarter..

Additionally, the 1st – 3rd quarters also contributed to the advancement of interdisciplinary intercultural competence at KSU:

First, it should be noted that roughly 40 modules, based on various intercultural competence themes and disciplines, were implemented in a wide variety of KSU courses. Various assessment tools were also utilized to gather data results and pending findings will inform future work on teaching and assessment of intercultural competence.

Second, given the mandate to recruit stakeholders from across campus, we were successful in recruiting 20 faculty participants from 7 KSU colleges (University College, Humanities and Social Science, Coles, Bagwell, Wellstar, Arts, and Math & Science) and a wide range of disciplines: i.e. anthropology & geography, art & design, computer sciences, conflict management, first-year & transition studies, foreign languages, inclusive education, and university studies. Thus, we were successful in recruiting from a wide variety of colleges and departments.

Third, 70+ attendees (incl. 3 external community members in the field of intercultural competence participated in the programming facilitated by Darla Deardorff and Alvino Fantini.

3. Were there any unanticipated results, either positive or negative, that you have not already described above or in previous quarterly reports? If yes, please describe the implications as well as possibilities for follow-on programs/projects.

In the 4th quarter of the ITAIC project we were pleasantly surprised by the depth and substance evidenced by the participants' comments from the student focus groups (although the students were self-selecting and thus cannot be considered representative of the KSU student body). With regard to the overall implications of incorporating the student voice, it became apparent that many students are genuinely interested in international education and intercultural learning at KSU. In addition, their opinions seemed to reinforce some of the ideas previously generated through the ITAIC review of learning modules and the external reviewers' feedback. In particular, all participants refer to a general need to make international education and intercultural learning more experiential and varied in terms of utilizing a range of assignments and assessments that allow students to better personalize their learning, and to link learning more intentionally with the local and global communities.

With regard to the 1st – 3rd quarters:

- We did not anticipate a lower than expected application rate among faculty peers. The change in BoR policy regarding stipends was also not anticipated and possibly impacted faculty recruitment.
- We did not anticipate that some faculty participants would not complete the work required to receive the \$1,000 stipend during the 1st and 2nd quarter cohorts. Therefore, several reallocations of the budget funds were needed through the subsequent quarters of the ITAIC project.
- We did not anticipate the significant administrative burden on our staff for processing stipends for faculty, staff, and students. Recent BoR-mandated requirements and changes necessitated time-consuming processes, and we will recommend that the staff time commitment must be addressed in future grants.

Budget Report

**This is not a request for payment. This report should only reflect costs already submitted for payment through IGI and how the actual cost of items may have differed from the expected costs listed in your proposal.*

Please see **updates and notes here** as of 8/14/15

Expenditure category	DGA funds request	Funds from other sources	Total ITAIC funds spent
Work group stipends for KSU faculty interested in developing IC assessments and modules, 1 st quarter	\$ 40,000 (10 x \$1,000.00) 8 x \$1,000.00 → \$ 2 K available → 1 more likely to be paid	\$5,250.00 Research & Creative Activity of co-PIs' workloads (2.5% of total workload) to conduct work groups Dr. Dan Paracka (\$2,050.00) Dr. Sabine Smith (\$1,450.00) Dr. Joe Terantino (\$1,750.00)	\$8,000.00
Instructional designers to create online modules, 1 st and 2 nd quarters	\$1,000.00 DLC instructional designer (20 hours x \$50.00)	+ \$ 900.00 DLC (38 hours) \$500.00 CHSS instructional designer (10 hours x \$50.00) \$500.00 Coles College of Business instructional designer (10 hours x \$50.00)	\$1,000.00
Access to films, events, and community engagement projects	\$1,500.00 for films, event/speaker support → 1,500.00 available	\$1,500.00 \$ 1,307.50 Access to films purchased through Annual Country Study Program \$1,500.00 Event/Speaker support through Annual Country Study Program \$ 2,000.00 200.00 Event support through Center for Student Leadership and \$ 1 K via	

Comment [j1]: While not all were paid, participants attended, created modules, implemented modules - but did not write the final report or implement a second module

Comment [j2]: Funds were not needed as per Dan Paracka. Funds were used for 3rd and 4th quarter expenses.

Comment [j3]: Was this a typo in the original budget?

		Residence Life for food during film festival \$3,000.00 Access to film and film purchases through Sturgis Library	
Faculty stipends to incentivize development and piloting IC assessments and modules, 2 nd quarter	\$ 10,000.00 (9x \$1,000.00) → 2,000.00 available		\$9,000.00
Archival web site development and maintenance over the year	\$1,000.00 DLC instructional designer → 1 K available here	\$500.00 CHSS instructional designer (10 hours x \$50.00)	
Stipends for KSU “Expert Multipliers” for 3 rd quarter	\$8,000.00 (16 7x \$500.00)	\$5,250.00 Research & Creative Activity of co-PIs’ workloads (see above)	\$ 3,500.00
KSU student stipends for participation in focus groups focused on completion of IC modules, throughout the year	\$2,000.00 \$2,250.00 (40 44 x \$50.00)		\$2,200.00
External peer review, advocacy, consulting via on-campus visits throughout the year	\$8,000.00 → \$ 7,000.00 Formal commitments were made in 1st and 2 nd quarters to Deardorff and Fantini for \$ 3,500.00 flat fee each; → \$ 1,000.00 available here		\$ 7,000.00
Miscellaneous supplies: Photocopies Paper, paper clips, tape, tacks, staples		\$1,000.00 through contributing programs (CSL, DFL, FLRC, IGI, and PEGS) \$250.00 through	

Comment [j4]: See comment j1 above re faculty-created modules

Comment [j5]: Funds not used for 2nd quarter cohort

Comment [j6]: Student sessions were scheduled for 4th quarter

		contributing programs (CSL, DFL, FLRC, IGI, and PEGS)	
IC-related materials:	\$3,500.00		\$ 2,136.94
Loaner books for 1 st and 2 nd quarter cohort participants	→ book purchases made in 1 st quarter for \$ 2,136.94;		
IC-related materials:	\$3,500.00		\$ 2,140.79
Books for cohort participants	→ book purchases made in 3rd quarter for 23 DDs and cohort members		
Books for research agenda	book sets x 4 = \$ 3,532.68		\$ 3,624.62
Hilton Conference Ctr			\$2,180.00
End-year external reviews by Fantini and/or Deardorff	Payment to each of \$ 1,618.00		\$ 5,047.65 \$4,217.00
Totals	\$45,000.00	\$21,250.00	\$ 45,000.00
		\$21,157.50	\$44,999.35
Remaining funds to be spent		+ \$ 92.50	\$ 0.00 \$0.65

Budget Narrative

Use this space to explain clearly your use of funds for the duration of this program/project, as well as how and why your actual use of funds differed from your expected use of funds.

We revised the budget from the original submission to reflect the reduced award amount (\$45 K instead of \$50 K). Additionally, we adjusted the budget due to the limited number of 1st cohort participants and faculty Expert Multipliers (EMs) in the 3rd quarter, which resulted in fewer stipends to be disbursed for the first and third quarters and in fewer textbooks that needed to be purchased in the first quarter. A total of four faculty participants did not complete the 1st and 2nd quarter work and did not qualify for the stipends.

We also adjusted the budget to allow for higher honoraria to be paid to external reviewers who provided us with two reports each (see attached).

In view of a significant excess of funds, we purchased another set of ten ICC books for cohort participants who used “loaner books” before; we anticipate that owning the books that they used on loan previously will allow them to continue their work with support from recent scholarship. Book prizes for “Departmental Designees” were purchased and distributed during the third quarter. Additionally, we purchased four sets of research materials for the three Co-PIs and for a yet-to-be determined location to serve as a seed resource library. These materials will ensure that the Co-PIs can advance the research agenda connected with the ITAIC project.

The small-group retreat, as part of an additional adjustment from the original budget proposal, served us well to draft the final report, to discuss and begin to identify grant opportunities, conference paper proposals, and concept outlines of scholarly papers of publishable quality.

Assessment

1. Describe progress made toward the Assessment Plan outlined in your proposal. Refer to the specific metrics listed in your proposal as a means to assessing and evaluating project outcomes at the end of the funding period. Explain if and how the results of the project/program differed from your expectations, as well as the implications of these differences.

First quarter metrics: (July 1, 2014 - October 1, 2014) (updates as of 12/31/2014):

- Metric 1: Number of IC activities and modules created through the initial workshop.
 - 12 initial modules were created as part of the initial workshop.
- Metric 2: Number of colleges/departments/programs represented by faculty participation in the workshop and pilot phases.
 - 5 KSU colleges were represented by faculty participation in the workshop: University College (3), Humanities and Social Science (3), Coles (2), Bagwell (1), and Wellstar (1).
- Metric 3: Number of academic disciplines represented in modules.
 - 11 academic disciplines were represented in the modules, including but not limited to: anthropology, early childhood education, foreign languages, interdisciplinary studies, and leadership.
- Metric 4: Successful purchase of films, textbooks, and other supplies as detailed in the proposal.
 - Textbooks and supplies in support of the ITAIC workshops were purchased; however, purchasing of films was delayed until the major expenditures of the project were verified.
- Metric 5: Successful creation of IC website.
 - A D2L course shell was created to share and store relevant files and information that will contribute to the public website; however, thus far, creating the formal website has been intentionally postponed until there are enough intercultural competence-based modules and materials to post online, and until our external reviewers have had a chance to express their opinions as to best practices in the modules.
- Metric 6: Successful budget management as detailed in the proposal.
 - The budget was successfully managed. Several changes were made and several expenditures from the first quarter were paid out in the beginning of the second quarter as a means to ensure workshop participants' accountability.
- Metric 7: Successful completion of external review.
 - Darla Deardorff has and will continue to provide external review of our work. Currently, we are anticipating her formal report and evaluation of the intercultural competence-based modules completed to date.

Second quarter (October 1, 2014 – January 1, 2015):

- Metric 1: Number of IC activities and modules created.
 - 10 initial modules were created as part of the 2nd cohort workshop.
- Metric 2: Number of colleges/departments/programs represented by faculty participation in the workshop and pilot phases.
 - 5 KSU colleges were represented by faculty participation in the workshop: Humanities and Social Science (4), University College (3), Science and Mathematics (1), Bagwell (1), and Arts (1).
- Metric 3: Number of academic disciplines represented in modules.
 - 8 academic disciplines were represented in the modules, including but not limited to:

anthropology, art & design, computer sciences, first-year and transition studies, foreign languages, geography, sociology.

- Metric 4: Successful purchase of films, textbooks, and other supplies as detailed in the proposal.
 - Texts and supplies in support of the ITAIC workshops were recycled; purchasing of additional books and films was delayed until the major expenditures of the project have been verified. Additional book purchases are earmarked for “Departmental Designees” during the 3rd quarter. Film purchases for the Year of the Arabian Peninsula Film Festival were made by collaborating partners at no cost to the project.
- Metric 5: Successful website management.
 - The D2L course shell was updated to share and store relevant files and information that will contribute to the public website; however, thus far, creating the formal website has been intentionally postponed until there are enough intercultural competence-based modules and materials to post online, and until updates to extant modules have been completed and reflect recommendations made by our external reviewers.
- Metric 6: Successful budget management as detailed in the proposal.
 - The budget was successfully managed. Several changes were made and several expenditures from the first and second quarters will be paid out in the beginning of the third quarter as a means to ensure workshop participants’ accountability. Funding from collaborating partners was secured at no cost to the project.
- Metric 7: Successful completion of external review.
 - Darla Deardorff and Alvino Fantini provided external review of our work. Currently, we are anticipating Darla’s final draft of the formal report (by early 1/15). Fantini’s review was completed upon his on-Campus visit.

Third quarter (January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015):

- Metric 1: Number of IC activities and modules piloted.
 - 44 individual modules have been created/modified and piloted as part of the 1st and 2nd cohort workshops.
 - 7 faculty Multipliers have given 14 campus-wide workshops and/or presentations related to the ITAIC project and their individual modules.
 - 21 Departmental Designees have attended the Multiplier sessions and reported back to their departments.
- Metric 2: Number of academic disciplines represented.
 - The faculty participants who served as Multipliers and Departmental Designees represented at least 16 academic disciplines, including but not limited to: anthropology, art & design, communication, computer sciences, construction management, digital writing and media arts, first-year and transition studies, foreign languages, geography, interdisciplinary studies, management & entrepreneurship, nursing, psychology, secondary & middle grades education, and sociology.
- Metric 3: Successful website management.
 - The ITAIC website was created and is now available online at <http://dga.kennesaw.edu/content/itaic>. The site is intended to make our project and the materials created available to the public, especially to KSU faculty.
- Metric 4: Successful budget management as detailed in the proposal.

- The budget was successfully managed. Several changes were made and several expenditures from the first and second quarters were paid out in the third quarter after faculty participants completed work. In addition, several third quarter expenses will be paid out in the fourth quarter.
- Metric 5: Successful completion of external review.
 - Darla Deardorff provided a final report for her external review of our work. See attached.

4. Fourth quarter (April 1, 2015 - June 30, 2015):

- Metric 1: Work team of eight KSU faculty implement IC assessment instruments and modules; summative assessment and reporting
 - Five KSU faculty (EMs and DDs) provided summative feedback on their experiences in writing;
 - Seven EMs and DDs attended a summative assessment and reporting meeting;
 - At the two-day retreat, a team of six KSU faculty reviewed all modules and module reports, and documentation related to IC assessment (28 dimensions; global learning survey; student focus group data); the retreat generated a corpus of documents that were submitted to the two external reviewers
 - Two external reviewers generated summative reports with recommendations on dissemination of the ITAIC work begun and sustainability of the work and research agenda
- Metric 2: Completion of website development and maintenance for the grant-funded project period
 - While the website is completed and accessible, ongoing work is required
- Metric 3: Three focus group meetings and interviews with students to elicit feedback
 - 47 students attended three meetings and were remunerated for their services; data was recorded individually by the facilitators, shared during the retreat, and reviewed by all retreat participants.
- Metric 4: One - two intercultural scholars provide external review
 - Two external reviewers were secured and submitted summative feedback on the project.
- Metric 5: Co-PIs write the end-year report
 - Completed ☺

2. If applicable, attach a copy of any assessment tool/instrument used for this project/program.

See attachments: pre-workshop survey, post-workshop survey, module lesson plan template, module report template, module evaluation rubric, global learning survey, film survey, and focus group questions.

3. If applicable, describe any data results collected and analyzed.

1. Pre-Workshop Surveys/post-workshop survey
Identifying 28 dimensions data, prioritized by faculty. Broad definitions for culture and IC. Satisfaction with the workshop.
2. Workshops

Need for assessment work. The workshops addressed attendees' interests and expertises with a broad range of information, i.e. on interdisciplinarity, best practices of teaching, assessment, and on theoretical concepts of intercultural competence. Power Points and a variety of materials and handouts are available upon request.

3. Modules (design)

Darla Deardorff's rubric for her review served us well, and we adapted it for our end-year work. Her review alerted us to the need for contextual information on the modules at the beginning, and she referenced exemplary modules. She also pointed out the need for including a variety of assessments, to understand the purpose of assessments, and to critically review intercultural competence assessment. The review work completed at the end of the first and second design phase and the review work completed at the retreat allowed us to summarize and synthesize findings from the module design work. Notable is that a variety of disciplines were represented, and that, by virtue of our project design, many modules were adopted and adapted interdisciplinarily.

4. External Reviewers

Please find attached the reviewers' documents that stress the need for including in our assessment work scholarship-based models and rubrics; that emphasize the experiential nature of developing intercultural competence and the process- rather than product-focused approach in assessment; that recommend use of multiple assessments over time; that allow for assessment of multiple perspectives; that assess interaction, allow for choices among assignments that meet students at their level of IC.

5. Expert Multipliers (EMs) & Departmental Designees (DDs)

Based on meeting notes and guidelines created for EMs, EMs used their own modules as a means of communicating what the project accomplished. Rich multiplication and dissemination of information across disciplines occurred. DDs were a means of disseminating information throughout the university. However, feedback by EMs and DDs was limited and varied due to an absence of specifying deliverables and accountability for EMs and DDs.

6. Global Learning Survey

Ongoing statistical analysis is required as the survey will be implemented – with a need to compare data with previous survey results. There will be the need to assess the prioritization of 28 dimensions.

7. Film Event Survey

Films were appreciated by students – despite low numbers in student attendance. Feedback provides evidence that film is useful for intercultural learning. Films were perceived as popular and accessible. Ongoing assessment will require revisions of the survey for future use with the possible goal of re-implementing the survey in academic courses.

8. Student Focus Groups

As per handouts and observation notes, the group interviews yielded valuable data which triangulate and reinforce findings from previous components of the project. They demonstrate that seeds planted over the last 10 years are making an impact, and that students

request more experiential, interactive, and real-world learning opportunities that develop their intercultural competence.

4. Describe the long-term impact of the project/program.

Dissemination opportunities of ITAIC-related information abound and are feasible via the ITAIC website, faculty participation at professional conferences, and faculty-produced publications and grants. Examples are the approval of the next year-long SIG project, which will continue the ITAIC work begun with a focus on online modules for pre- during- and post-experience study abroad learning modules for intercultural learning (both culture-general and culture-specific), and the inauguration of a symposium/conference at KSU in Spring 2016. As per the co-PIs, the faculty/staff/student participants, and the external reviewers, continuity and sustainability are a challenge. However, the foundations are laid, broad interest has been ascertained, and the seeds of a website with resources and a library collection may lead to institutionalization, possibly via an office for the development of intercultural competence. Publications and external grants will be necessary to ensure continuity as will be human resources and leadership to maintain and update websites and infrastructure of information dissemination around ITAIC.