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The Mellon Fellows Community Initiative (MFCI) was created by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Salzburg Global Seminar (SGS) in January 2008. The goals were (1) to enable select colleges and universities affiliated with the Appalachian College Association (ACA) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to incorporate the concept of global citizenship in teaching and learning on their campuses and (2) to lay the groundwork for meaningful and long-term cooperation between the institutions involved. Thirty-six institutions (21 ACAs and 15 HBCUs) were engaged in developing and implementing individual and collaborative projects designed to enhance their institutions’ capacity to serve as sites for global citizenship over the course of the project, which ran from January 2008 to December 2011 with a one year extension to 2012.

The Mellon Foundation and SGS selected ACAs and HBCUs because of their shared history in meeting the needs of their local populations, educating specific student bodies, and overcoming resource challenges. While at first glance these two institutional groups seem distinctly different, this initiative illuminated a multitude of shared experiences. This report evaluates the MFCI project through the eyes of institutional participants and MFCI program coordinators and faculty members. The aim of the report is to illustrate the degree to which the proposed goals of the initiative have been met and projects have been successfully implemented on HBCU and ACA campuses.

**MFCI PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

**MFCI Design:** Participation in the MFCI was based on a competitive application process decided by the SGS staff. Teams selected to participate committed to supporting global education projects on their campus and embarking on two week-long sessions to Salzburg, Austria within a two-year period. In addition to these sessions, the MFCI also offered all cohorts a total of four optional US workshops (2-3 days each) addressing themes pertinent to the advancement and implementation of their projects. A weeklong session on global citizenship for students from MFCI partner institutions was also offered, allowing one to two students from each participating institution to travel to Salzburg.

**MFCI Teams:** There were three cohorts in the MFCI: Cohort 1-2007, Cohort 2-2008, and Cohort 3-2009. Once selected, institutions chose a team of three members—ideally one professor, one senior-level institutional leader, and one administrator associated with global initiatives on the campus. MFCI required at least one member from senior campus leadership. With staff turnover and other extenuating circumstances, team composition changed at times, but most institutions tried to keep continuity in the members who attended MFCI sessions.

**MFCI Funding:** The Mellon Foundation was the sole external funding source for the MFCI. Total funding amounted to nearly $1.1 million over a five-year period from 2007 to 2012. Participating colleges and universities were expected to partially subsidize the costs of meetings by funding one of the three participants as a means of demonstrating institutional commitment to the initiative. Institutions collectively contributed approximately $300,000 for a total MFCI budget of over $1.4 million.

As an incentive for successfully completing their project plans, institutional teams were also awarded one mini-grant after the first meeting in Salzburg and another mini-grant after the second meeting in
Salzburg. All funds were designated to assist with developing and implementing project plans on the participating campuses. Cohort 1 received a mini-grant in the amount of $2,000 after the first and second meetings; Cohort 2 and Cohort 3 received a mini-grant in the amount of $1,500 after each meeting.

GOALS OF THE MFCI EVALUATION

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the impact of the MFCI experience on global education initiatives at participating campuses by considering the following questions:

1. How has the MFCI enabled participating institutions to be better positioned and equipped to champion global education issues?
2. How has the MFCI contributed to advancing curricular change and/or providing new co-curricular opportunities to students in the field of global education?
3. To what extent have partnerships to promote global citizenship education been strengthened across institutions?

This report will address these questions by examining the design, implementation, and outcomes of the MFCI program:

1. **Design**: How did the program design contribute to the program’s overarching goals via project outcomes and participant learning experiences?
2. **Implementation**: What factors positively or negatively contributed to the execution of an institution’s project?
3. **Outcomes**: In what ways have project outcomes differed or aligned with the initial project intentions?

The report will address these questions on two levels (1) at the MFCI program level (i.e., the SGS coordination) and (2) at the institutional project level (i.e., ACAs and HBCUs). Doing so will offer program coordinators, the Mellon Foundation, and institutional partners a better understanding of the project as a whole and provide recommendations for the future.
EVALUATION METHODS

The evaluation design uses formative and summative data in order to provide feedback on both program implementation and outcomes. It is important to note, however, this evaluation was conducted at the conclusion of the project, not on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the formative results on the implementation of the project will be analyzed in the context of the project’s end rather than throughout the life of the project. Additionally, the student trip to Salzburg was not included in the scope of this evaluation.

DEFINITIONS

Various terms are used throughout this evaluation. To ensure understanding, these terms are defined below.

MFCI program coordinators: The two core program coordinators of the MFCI grant and staff of the Salzburg Global Seminar, Dr. Jochen Fried and David Goldman.

Institutional participants: Members of the MFCI teams from HBCUs and ACAs. Typically they include an institutional leader, a professor, and one administrator. These three terms (professor, institutional leader, and administrator) will be used only in terms of institutional participants for this report. Institutional participants who occupy the role of faculty member at their institution will be referred to as professors to distinguish them from the MFCI faculty members.

MFCI faculty member: Speakers, lecturers, and/or support members of MFCI who actively led portions of the Salzburg seminars and US workshops.

DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

This evaluation utilized three forms of data collection: interview, survey, and document analyses.

Interviews: Interviews were conducted with institutional participants, MFCI program coordinators and MFCI faculty members between November 2012 and February 2013 for a total of 26 interviews. Interviewees included:

- Twelve in-person institutional interviews in Raleigh, NC at the MFCI US Workshop hosted by North Carolina Central University.
- Two in-person MFCI program coordinator interviews in Salzburg, Austria at the Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Eight institutional and four MFCI faculty telephone/Skype interviews in Washington, DC in the office of the Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Interview protocols are available in Appendix A (institutional interviews) and Appendix B (MFCI faculty interviews). The in-person MFCI program coordinator interviews involved a two-day discussion of the entire project and therefore did not follow a specific interview protocol.

Each interview was digitally recorded and transcribed semi-verbatim. All interview data were then coded into matrices cross-referencing institutions’ responses with the core evaluation questions.
**Surveys:** Survey data were collected in January and February 2013 via SurveyMonkey.com. The survey yield was 16.7 percent with 29 surveys returned of the 173 sent to institutional participants across all 36 campuses (see Appendix C for survey instrument). The majority of responses were submitted by ACAs (83 percent), with the remainder submitted by HBCUs (13 percent). The respondents included:

- 72.4% professors
- 24.1% institutional leadership (Dean, Associate Vice President, Assistant Vice President, other)
- 10.3% high-level leadership (President, Vice President, other)
- 6.9% university administrator (student affairs or academic affairs)
- 6.9% other (e.g., participants with multiple titles including institutional leader and professor)

Survey quantitative data were analyzed for descriptive statistics and qualitative responses were coded into matrices similar to those developed for the interview protocols.

**Documents:** All MFCI documents analyzed were received directly from MFCI program coordinators at SGS for the purpose of this evaluation. The documents included six institutional examples each of (1) the first MFCI project proposals written by institutional teams in Salzburg, (2) follow-up project proposals from institutional teams submitted during the second Salzburg trip, and (3) institutional teams’ SWOT analyses. These six institutional examples were organized into three categories as designated by MFCI program coordinators: High, Medium, and Low. High-level proposals were defined as those with a well-thought out plan that was feasible and well-organized for implementation. Medium-level proposals were defined as those with a strong plan but identifiable challenges to overcome in terms of feasibility and implementation. Low-level proposals were defined as those that from the start were not as well-constructed or fully clear in terms of implementation.

In addition, evaluators reviewed all MFCI grant proposals, interim reports, and final reports submitted by SGS to the Mellon Foundation associated with all three cohorts of MFCI as well as the Global Education Consortium (GEC). GEC proposals were supplemental grant proposals to the Mellon Foundation for the purpose of funding MFCI US-based workshops, this evaluation, and potentially the infrastructure for a future MFCI consortium. The future MFCI consortium is currently under discussion but has not yet come to fruition.

Data from all documents were coded into relevant matrices, which cross-referenced project components alongside core evaluation questions. The institutional proposals were further stratified as mentioned into high, medium, and low levels and analyzed in comparison to one another as examples of each level of involvement, planning, and implementation.

The triangulation of data from multiple sources provided greater depth and breadth of information for the external evaluators to understand the full scope of the projects and to better analyze the design, implementation, and outcomes as they relate to the original project goals.
PROGRAM DESIGN

How did the program design contribute to the program’s overarching goals via project outcomes and participant learning experiences?

MFCI PROGRAM DESIGN

This section describes and evaluates the program design at the MFCI level and then separately at the institutional level. For the MFCI level, the top three factors that most contributed to project successes as identified by the survey are presented with interview data to support them. On the institutional level, high, medium and low proposal examples are analyzed with an evaluation of the differences in proposal design.

MFCI Salzburg Seminars

As mentioned, there were three cohorts of institutional teams over the course of the program. Cohort teams participated in their two Salzburg experiences together—a first seminar at the beginning of the project and a second seminar a year later. Sessions at both Salzburg seminars were devoted to explaining the notion of global citizenship and its relevance to contemporary undergraduate education.

At the first seminar, each team developed the global education project plan for their campus. The goal was to help teams take their plans from an initial idea to actionable implementation by defining the need for and benefit of the project on their campus, developing an institution-specific strategy, and demonstrating the project’s viability and long-term sustainability. In the second seminar, institutions reported on their progress, shared lessons learned, and solicited feedback from other participants. Both seminars also allowed for formal and informal interactions among participants, thereby facilitating deeper cooperative bonds within and across institutions. Table 1 shows the variety of sessions and topical areas presented in Salzburg.

Table 1: Key Components of the Salzburg Global Seminar in Austria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary across all MFCI cohorts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Lecture and Discussion Topic Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-making and peace-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign wealth funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ways to promote the sharing of art and artifacts around the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to combat climate change at local and regional levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of women and civil society in peace-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Institutional Breakout Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss project ideas with other institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on topical areas discussed throughout seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Team Presentations and Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In first meeting: Constructing project ideas and presenting initial plans to larger group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In second meeting: Updating project ideas and presenting progress to larger group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical Discussion Examples and Networking Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating work in the area of global education into the accreditation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, funding, and administration of expanded study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International service learning opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement or augmentation of core curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors courses to include global foci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MFCI US Workshops
In addition to the Salzburg sessions, the MFCI also offered a total of four shorter US-based workshops (2-3 days each) addressing themes pertinent to the implementation of the projects (see Table 2). The US-based workshops were voluntary and open to all MFCI cohorts. Their purpose for participants was to further advance their networking opportunities, project development, and exchange of ideas. Each US-based workshop was hosted by a MFCI participating institution and alternated between HBCUs and ACAs.

Table 2: MFCI Global Education Workshops hosted in the United States
Summary across all workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US Workshop Locations and Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse College, March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis and Elkins College, November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University, March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Central University, November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US Workshop Select Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Education Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Common Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION OF THE MFCI PROGRAM DESIGN
The overarching goals of the MFCI program were (1) to enable select ACAs and HBCUs to incorporate the concept of global citizenship into teaching and learning at their respective campuses and (2) to lay groundwork for meaningful and long-term cooperation between the institutions involved. The program designed to accomplish these goals incorporated in-depth learning and networking events both in Austria and the United States with a cohort model to provide group support and a sense of participant cohesion. Data from interviews, survey results, and document analyses provide the context for the evaluation of the MFCI program design for both the Salzburg seminars and the US workshops.

According to the SGS coordinators, the goal of the MFCI program design was capacity building for the participating institutions. To that end, the SGS coordinators sought to empower institutions to create and lead projects that were applicable to their own institutional culture and context. MFCI program sessions, activities, and correspondence were intended to provide knowledge to aid in the development and implementation efforts on participants’ campuses. It was not the intent of program coordinators to intensely manage campus activities throughout the life of the project but instead to serve as a resource when needed. As such, campus leaders managed their projects independently in a manner consistent with their own needs, resources, and institutional context.

MFCI Salzburg Seminars
Based on the results of the survey, institutional respondents indicated the aspects of the Salzburg that most contributed to the success of their projects were: (1) seminar faculty/speakers (23.5%), (2) the opportunity to network with other institutional leaders and professors (21%), and (3) the Mellon Funds for travel and mini-grants (18.6%). (See Figure 1). Other important factors included program coordination (9.2%), learning about global education (7.9%), team time with campus colleagues (6.6%), and international exposure in Salzburg (6.6%) (See Figure 1). The two factors that were least significant to the experience were the program readings prior to arrival and program handouts, both resulting in a
0% response rate. The top three survey findings as well as the “other” contributing factors illustrated in Figure 1 were supported by the institutional interviews as outlined in the following section.

**Figure 1: MFCI practices in Salzburg that most contributed to project successes**

*Note: Not applicable (6.6% in pink) applies to those survey respondents who did not travel to Salzburg but were involved in the project on campus.*

**Seminar Faculty and Speakers.** Respondents appreciated MFCI faculty and speakers’ (23.5%) vast knowledge of global issues and the way they supported professors and administrators to grow as advocates for and scholars of global education. In their role as speakers, the MFCI faculty offered a new knowledge base on global education for all participants. As one participant said:

*There were a lot of interesting speakers that gave us insight into areas that I wouldn’t normally make use of my time [to learn about]. As an English professor I wouldn’t naturally go to research certain areas; I was able to make connections with these new topics.*

In addition, MFCI seminar faculty and speakers helped teams to articulate their goals and to create valuable plans for moving forward in the context of this new knowledge.

*In Salzburg, we came up with an excellent definition of global citizenship...and brought it back. [As a result], we [now] challenge to engage with cultures different from our own, produce more sophisticated students. We wanted to create buy-in across our campus and began working with the director of the global center by conducting listening sessions across campus to talk to professors about what they were already doing that was incorporating these concepts of global citizenship and what would they envision was possible to do.*

Another participant shared how seminar faculty and speakers provided information that was both relevant and timely, thereby immediately supporting their efforts.

*All a great learning experience, handled time well, topics always had immediate value. Sometimes in other programs, it’s a long time to see the value of the information to your own situation and in Salzburg you got the sense that all felt there was immediate relevancy.*

The MFCI faculty and speakers, therefore, as illustrated both in the survey and interviews, created a shared culture in Salzburg that offered a space for institutions to gain new knowledge on global
education and build a skill set that helped them to articulate future plans—all in a manner relevant to the unique ACA and HBCU institutional contexts.

**Networking.** Institutional participants said they highly valued networking with and learning from the MFCI faculty and other participants (21%). When networking with one another, team members especially enjoyed and benefited from discovering the unique similarities between ACAs and HBCUs. They also appreciated learning about the global education initiatives at other institutions, and sharing ideas on how to globally enhance their curricula. In interviews, many participants shared that networking was very meaningful to their MFCI experience and in fact often their favorite aspect. They shared:

*My favorite part of MFCI was getting to know the different people at the different schools. HBCUs know each other. This helps us to understand schools that are doing like-minded work - ACAs and HBCUs - and come together.*

*The opportunity to network and make friends and build relationships with people and to do it around matters that we’ve committed to and are passionate about would be the main benefit.*

*Professionally having the opportunity to be with like-minded academics and getting to know them [and] getting ideas. Building relationships with schools that we may not have otherwise.*

Participants also shared that networking in a closed environment in Salzburg created strong bonds between cohort members and offered a special experience within which to concentrate their efforts and learn from one another. Networking happened throughout the Salzburg experience both formally in shared sessions, but also over the dinner table and excursions into the city of Salzburg.

**Mellon Funds.** Mellon Funds (18.6% response) are monies that supported both institutional travel to Salzburg and the mini-grants for project implementation. Interviewees shared their gratitude for Mellon Funds again and again. One participant explained:

*I’m very grateful for the opportunities that Mellon has provided to make this program go...I’ve benefited even more than other people because of my heavy involvement. It has made a difference for a college like this that is underfunded and Mellon has been a huge help. I want them to know, “Thank you, Mellon!”*

Another participant explained the huge impact Mellon funds made on his campus. He stated:

*I would like Mellon to know that we truly appreciate. It’s not just money, not frivolous money; it really does make a difference. If you see what people have done on their campuses, it makes a huge difference. Now a lot of campuses are developing systems. It gave us much more of a core focus. You see where the campuses and students are improving. It is making a difference in their lives. It’s improved our faculty and staff.*

Many of these institutions face significant financial challenges and participants explained that the additional Mellon funds provided to the teams for both travel and mini-grants offered them opportunities that would have not been otherwise possible.
Other Factors. The five additional factors identified in the survey from Figure 1—program coordination (9.2%), learning about global education (7.9%), team time with campus colleagues (6.6%), and international exposure in Salzburg (6.6%)—were also supported by the interviews.

Participants appreciated the MFCI program coordination (9.2%) in terms of logistical planning but also as a space for learning about global education (7.9%) and international exposure (6.6%). It was clear from interviews that participants felt the Salzburg program was well-planned with targeted and purposeful capacity-building activities, reflecting the SGS’ 60+ years of experience working with 25,000 fellows from 156 countries (Salzburg Seminar Grant proposal, 2007). The Salzburg Global Seminar location at the Schloss Leopoldskron not only gave campus teams the dedicated time and space to create and innovate relative to their global education projects, it also provided a significant international experience for them to share with their own campuses - the first such experience for a number of participants.

In terms of the individuals who made the MFCI coordination happen, many interviewees commended Jochen and David for the important role they played in their MFCI experience and appreciated how they supported their efforts throughout the life of the project. As one participant noted:

Jochen and David are very approachable. They’re so helpful and... you know you are supported. You want to honor the space by giving them the best that you have.

Finally, participants appreciated the time that they were able to take in collaborating with their own campuses colleagues (6.6%), as their busy lives on campus do not always allow for it. Very often, MFCI participants saw one another occasionally at meetings and collaborated rarely when at “home.” Through the Salzburg week-long seminar, they were able to create new bonds with their fellow colleagues and envision global education for their campus together.

Overall, participants shared a great deal of satisfaction with the Salzburg experience. One professor felt “very empowered by the trip to Salzburg,” and as result, returned to campus refreshed and renewed for global education work. Another professor stated:

It helped to validate you as a global citizenship expert. It was great to learn what we learned in that environment. It helped all of us to be inspired.

Across interviews this level of inspiration equated to motivation for action upon return to campus. It enabled institutions to share their excitement and energy for global education work with their colleagues and offer tangible ideas for implementation for their institution’s proposal.

MFCI US WORKSHOPS
The US workshops were an opportunity to supplement the Salzburg seminars without the added time and cost of traveling to Austria. For those respondents who attended US workshops, the top three factors that most contributed to their projects’ success were: (1) SGS faculty and staff (26.8%), (2) networking with participants from other institutions (17.9%), (3) visiting and learning from other campuses and observing their global education work firsthand (16.4%) (See Figure 2). Additional factors that contributed to the success of the MFCI US workshops included: collaboration with campus colleagues (9%), learning about global education (9%), and Mellon Funds (9%). Again, interview findings supported the survey data.
Important to note, 11.9% of respondents did not attend any of the optional US based workshops. Reasons cited included the inability of professors to cancel their classes to attend the seminars, the lack of funding for travel, and the workshop locations as too far to justify the trip.

**Figure 2: MFCI practices in the US workshops that most contributed to project success**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other campuses</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not attend</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with campus colleagues</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about global education</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Funds</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFCI Faculty and SGS Staff</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MFCI Faculty and SGS Staff**
The MFCI faculty and SGS staff (26.8%) played an important role in the US workshops and participants appreciated their ability to frame new topics and advance their knowledge on global issues. The faculty and staff led all the plenary sessions and through topical speeches sought to support teams in their continual advancement of projects.

*It’s been an incredible experience, the organization of it. The timing of it, once to two times a year, the full week-long workshop where they got to know each other and the follow up workshops, that’s been the right amount of time. It’s good to do it at different schools so you can see the different communities.*

Specifically the SGS staff were also commended by participants. As one team member said:

*David and Jochen know how to facilitate meetings masterfully. They have done a great job.*

*Jochen, David, and Sharon provide an infrastructure and welcoming that you don’t get in a lot of other consortiums, workshops. They engage you in a way that helps you do your best work.*

MFCI program coordination at US workshops was designed to have campuses continue their MFCI collaborations and learning opportunities while bringing the Austria experience to them. Participants appreciated the guidance and support of SGS staff and the opportunity to host the SGS Austria team in the US.

**Networking**
Similar to Salzburg, the U.S. workshops were an opportunity to learn from fellow MFCI participants and network (17.9%). The U.S. workshops allowed for more institutional team members beyond the original three to engage in the MFCI project without the cost of traveling abroad. One institutional participant shared on their team:
We have had five different professors who attended the SGS seminar and workshops—all serve on the global awareness committee on campus.

With a core goal of MFCI to build collaborations between ACAs and HBCUs, it is not surprising that networking has been a top theme in both the US workshops and the Salzburg seminar. Networking has offered participants new professional connections and opportunities to learn from one another.

**Visiting and Learning from Other Campuses**

Every workshop was hosted on either a HBCU or ACA campus. Participants benefited from visiting the different campus environments (16.4%) and being able to see MFCI projects in progress. Host institutions also mentioned their excitement in sharing their campus environment with MFCI colleagues. One professor indicated that the best part of the workshops was:

*Spending time on different campuses and meeting with faculty.*

Another professor shared that visiting other campuses provided another cultural experience for them by seeing different campus environments from their own.

*Encouraged us to think about significance of other perspectives you don’t have to go across the world to expand your cultural understanding.*

These cross-cultural meetings were learning opportunities among institutions.

**Other factors**

The four additional factors from US workshops that contributed to project successes included: collaboration with campus colleagues (9%), new knowledge on global education (9%), and Mellon Funds (9%), as illustrated in Figure 2.

As always, interviewees appreciated the opportunity to further gain new knowledge on global education (9%). Also, institutions appreciated bringing more campus colleagues than in Salzburg to build greater energy towards global education on their campus as mentioned above. Therefore, the US-based workshops offered more flexibility for institutions to network with their campus colleagues (9%) and to expand the number of institutional “cheerleaders” for global education—all very valuable to their projects. One participant explained:

*There have been different faculty members who have come to the workshops. The campus is now exposed and that’s helpful.*

In terms of Mellon Funds (9%), in some cases institutions were responsible for their US travel costs, but in other instances they may have used a small portion of their Mellon funds to supplement their travel costs. For institutions with very little additional funding for professional development and travel, this funding was very helpful to the projects.

***

Overall, participant experiences in the Salzburg seminars and the US workshops were positive and constructive. However, some interviewees felt that the US workshops were not as beneficial as they could have been to their projects. One participant explained that the workshop topics did not always
apply to where their team was in terms of implementing their project, but some of the material covered was applicable and integrated into their project at a later time.

Also, participants felt that the in-person interaction of the US workshops - as well as the Salzburg seminars - was more beneficial than the written materials provided, although those were helpful for context as well. Both program readings prior to arrival and program handouts received a 0% response rate on the survey for their contribution to project successes.

Finally, although not a planned feature of the MFCI program design, some participants indicated a desire for more follow-up after the seminars and workshops. They expressed wanting more feedback on their progress throughout the life of the project either during the follow-up US workshops or through more individual contact with teams throughout their grant period.

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM DESIGN

MFCI Guidance for Proposals
As an impetus for proposal design, MFCI faculty and program coordinators offered institutional teams directed guidance at the Salzburg seminars. One MFCI faculty member interviewed for this evaluation offered a cohesive outline for helping teams to conceptualize their global education projects and create their proposals. This example functions as an illustration of MFCI support for institutions’ program design and serves as a backdrop for understanding the proposals in the following section. The faculty member asked each institution to:

1. Tie the global education project to your core institution values or mission (e.g. social justice, education for life, community engagement).

2. Choose a framework such as “local/global:” What happens globally will have an impact locally and vice versa. Make connections between “local” and “global” issues through history, economics, immigration patterns, etc. This exercise doesn’t require travel.

3. Draw on experiences in your own communities as well as in other regional institutions. Consider what you can do together that you cannot do individually. This project is an opportunity to create new knowledge, share rich histories and experiences, and link back to global citizenship.

Within this MFCI framework, the institutions created proposals to integrate these ideas into their projects and tried to construct plans that fit within their institutional context, looked both globally and locally either in the institution or the local community, and then sought opportunities for collaborations within the campus community or off-campus. With the support of the MFCI framework via program coordinators and MFCI faculty, most institutions felt that they were able to build solid proposals, even if they later experienced issues with implementation. As one survey respondent stated:

_MFCI has realistic goals. You can't change a culture overnight, but MFCI gave us some useful tools._
Features of the Institutional Projects: A Sample
For the institutional project design, each team first incorporated MFCI suggestions into the initial construction of their project proposals like the ones outlined above and then personalized them to their own campus, based on institutional culture and mission as well as the level of support and resources available to implement their plans.

Project proposals differed greatly across institutions. So too, the institutions differed in the quality of their project plans. As noted previously, MFCI program coordinators provided evaluators with six examples of project proposals organized into three categories: High, Medium, and Low. High-level proposals were defined as those with a well-thought out plan that was feasible and well-organized for implementation. Medium-level proposals were defined as those with a strong plan but identifiable challenges to overcome in terms of feasibility and implementation. Low-level proposals were defined as those that from the start were not as well-constructed or fully clear in terms of implementation.

The following three institutional examples of high-, medium-, and low-level proposals (see Tables 3, 4, and 5) provide descriptions for initial proposals from the first meetings in Salzburg and then the follow-up proposals from the second meeting in Salzburg twelve months later. The proposed activities are then organized further into the following categories based on MFCI’s overarching goals: championing global education, curricular and co-curricular activities, and partnerships.

Table 3: High-Level Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Champion Global Education</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Create student dialogues about citizenship approach to global issues—hopefully in international study</td>
<td>-Convened focus groups of faculty who have had international experience to refine definition of global citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Explore ways of first facilitating that discussion and then opening more distant doors for students to pursue international dialogues.</td>
<td>-Met with Executive Council to explore funding options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Worked with IA Office to find funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Engaged the Board, faculty, and administration in the action plan and implementation of global education on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Developed a core definition for global education on campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Explore ways to fully incorporate citizenship into our new core curriculum</td>
<td>-Worked with divisional chairs to offer potential institutional abroad options within their divisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Show more dependence on the travel experience and less on the classroom experience</td>
<td>-Work with Divisional Chairs on study abroad courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The new Core also has a domestic travel experience that will be phased into accommodate the entire first year class each year Try to implement one or more of the following ideas:</td>
<td>-Piloted development of GC certificate program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Focus on an issue that is particularly relevant in a culture outside the United States or</td>
<td>-Created new foreign language requirement for all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Explain international relations and how these relationships form our response to other cultures and peoples or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Focus on cross-cultural comparisons within a particular discipline, field, or profession or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Examine issues of international importance and the global implications of these issues OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Examine a culture outside the United States in depth from a disciplinary or multi-disciplinary perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Develop learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Encouraging students to combine directed study on campus with travel in both domestic and foreign venues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Faculty from [a HBCU] and [an ACA] explore ways to connect each other’s students</td>
<td>-Identified potential partnerships with fellow MFCI institutions and made contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Medium Level Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Champion Global Education</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Meet with the new Global Diversity campus committee to define ‘global citizen’</td>
<td>-Meeting scheduled with the new Global Diversity campus committee to define ‘global citizen’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Development of an introductory course: “Global Identity: Why in the World Do We Think and Act the Way We Do?”</td>
<td>-Explore new opportunities for cross-cultural experiences in China</td>
<td>-Two Liberal Arts 101 courses are being taught based on the ‘cultural identity’ focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Develop cross-cultural experiences--can be through study abroad, mission trips abroad or with projects or programs with other ethnic or cultural groups in the local community, state, or nation</td>
<td>-Evaluate the effectiveness of the LA 101 courses by meetings with the faculty teaching the two courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Explore new opportunities for cross-cultural experiences in China; Two Liberal Arts 101 courses are being taught based on the ‘cultural identity’ focus</td>
<td>-Increasing global and multidisciplinary instruction in courses set up. Ex: Three liberal arts courses for freshman had a more global focus; new cross-cultural international programs in S. Korea and India; New Honors course fall 2009 with Global Issues focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evaluate the effectiveness of the LA 101 courses by meetings with the faculty teaching the two courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Collaborate with another MFCI institution</td>
<td>-Attended an initial visit to [other MFCI institution] to meet with faculty teaching their ‘Self Identity’ course. Met with faculty, discussed their general education course, received a syllabus of their course, discussed outcomes from the course they have taught, heard suggestions on how to structure our course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Low Level Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Champion Global Education</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Faculty diversity training</td>
<td>-As a result of the new global living-learning community, the participants have convened on a regular basis for civic engagement and global dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Internationalize the existing curriculum through special topics course for all students and majors</td>
<td>-As a result of the new global living-learning community, the participants have convened on a regular basis for civic engagement and global dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Create a global living-learning community</td>
<td>-Programming, like celebrating international studies with a forum that resulted from ten students receiving or showed documentation that they go their passports. In partnership with UNA-USA and the [local] County Chapter of Sister Cities, this institutions’ Model UN served as host for the 2009 International Showcase where different cultures were highlighted in dances/performances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Mock UN simulation</td>
<td>-[The institution] hosted Model UN Conference delegation of over 120 students around theme of environmental sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Civic components with local schools</td>
<td>-College students plan to show their passports at the next mentoring meeting with the [a local] Middle School students as a means of encouraging them to look forward to traveling internationally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Campus wide events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Mentor in residence program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Discussions/planning of an international house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Follow-Up Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-The institution’s Model UN, student org, [a local] Middle School, &amp; the Links Inc. worked together on this project, but little was done w/ other international partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM DESIGN
The following evaluation is in the context of the institutional examples in Table 3, 4, and 5.

Champion Global Education
In terms of championing for global education, the teams with “medium-” and “high-level” proposals built in time to engage their campus communities. The “high-level” team in particular connected with campus constituents through faculty and student dialogues, and presentations to top leadership. The “medium-level” team worked mostly through collaborations with on-campus committees. As a result, they were able to co-construct the global education experience across the institution and not just as a MFCI team. The “low-level” team did engage their local community with specific co-curricular activities and met with a targeted group of living-learning community participants around issues of global engagement but did not necessarily propose time for across campus discussions or committee meetings. The process of championing for global education on a campus emerged as essential to laying the foundation for projects to succeed. A MFCI faculty member explained that the institutions that invested the most time gaining buy-in from the entire campus community were the most successful in their work, not only at the design stage but also during implementation.

Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities
The “high-level” institutions clearly outlined their objectives and action steps for how they would implement curricular and co-curricular global citizenship initiatives on their campus through existing programs and course offerings. The “medium-level” institutions, while often undertaking similar activities to the “high-level” institutions, outlined curricular and co-curricular objectives that were broader in scope and as a result less clearly defined. Both “high-” and “medium-level” proposals designed their work in terms of cross-cultural opportunities for students in which coursework and study away/abroad activities opened their students to new experiences. For curricular options, “high” and “medium” institutions offered a combination of foreign language, global courses, and international experiential courses. For co-curricular experiences, these institutions encouraged students to participate in international and domestic travel as well as the campus’ international awareness initiatives. By contrast, the “low-level” institutions offered open-ended ideas in their plans such as “internationalize the existing curriculum” which were not sufficiently operationalized in terms of who would do it, how they would do it, and when they would do it. Also, the “low-level” co-curricular plans were one-time events outside the campus community involving a few select students. The intentions across all levels of projects were all quite similar—to improve global citizenship via curricular and co-curricular activities on their campus—but the planning as outlined in their proposals were distinctly different.

Partnerships
Additionally, “medium-” and “high-level” proposals benefitted from collaborations with fellow ACA and HBCU project participants in developing their plans. “Medium-” and “high-level” proposals demonstrated plans for collaboration through sharing syllabi, visiting partner campuses, and coordinating programs. The “low-level” proposal specifically stated that they had not been successful in creating such partnerships. MFCI program coordinators encouraged participants to create partner projects such as joint study abroad programs, student/professor exchanges, and shared speaker series to better support each institution’s efforts. Even when partnerships did not fully come to fruition to the extent intended, the planning and connections between campuses were a beneficial part of the networking process.

***
In conclusion, the results of the evaluation show that the institutions that were highly engaged at the outset and were able to outline a clear, coherent plan were also the most engaged throughout the project and often successful despite barriers. In addition, more specific program plans in the early stages of projects offered more tangible ways to implement once individuals returned to campus. Future programming should provide institutions with examples of previous efforts, such as these high-, medium-, and low-level plans with the associated outcomes to help participants construct feasible plans. To that end, one institutional participant requested that MFCI provide “more information from the previous years’ participants as to what they were doing and what was working and not working.”

Doing so would provide models for learning and troubleshooting design issues early on. Creating strong project proposals also depends on the institutional representatives in attendance, the capacity of the institution to implement strategies, and the institution’s willingness to buy into the ideas from the start, which will be discussed further in the implementation section.
IMPLEMENTATION

What factors positively or negatively contributed to the execution of an institution’s project?

For the purpose of this evaluation, the implementation phase is defined as HBCU/ACA project activities after MFCI teams returned to their individual campuses from the first Salzburg meeting and began to formally implement their global education plans. The implementation phase is organized into the following areas: (1) co-curricular activities, (2) curricular activities, and (3) partnerships between ACAs and HBCUs. The MFCI program level, therefore, is not discussed in detail in this section, only the institutional project level.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Co-Curricular Activities
Co-curricular activities are defined as any student program that supports the efforts of curricular work but offers an enrichment program outside the classroom. The majority of MFCI institutions interviewed implemented at least one co-curricular activity as part of their project. For many of the institutions, these programs were a logical starting place for their MFCI projects because co-curricular activities take students outside their comfort zone (either physically or intellectually) and engage them in intercultural experiences both on- and off-campus.

Table 6: Examples of Institutional-Level MFCI Co-Curricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Campus Co-Curricular Activities</th>
<th>Off-Campus Co-Curricular Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International student organizations</td>
<td>Study abroad (international travel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for global education and citizenship</td>
<td>Study away (domestic travel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide discussions about global education</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In developing their co-curricular plans, institutions first assessed their starting place. They posed questions such as: Are we improving upon a program already in place or do we need to create new programs? For those enhancing existing programs, their implementation required revising current policies, reviewing and/or refreshing content, and encouraging more students to participate, including coordinating with students at other institutions as well. For those creating new programs, institutions needed to determine resource availability, generate professor and student interest, and prepare a clear plan for executing the new co-curricular activities.

Curricular Activities
Curricular activities for this project were global education initiatives integrated into courses at the college or university. MFCI institutions chose to integrate global education in two ways: (1) enhancing or creating select global courses or (2) developing a collection of global courses or curricular tracks resulting in a global certificate or academic concentration. Curricular activities differed across institutions; the most common reason for variation was the institution’s starting point prior to MFCI. Many institutions sought to internationalize the curriculum as a whole. For some that meant starting from scratch; for others it meant coordinating their already established efforts.

Select Global Courses. For newly created or revised international courses, some institutions chose to implement global education as a part of their General Education Requirements by designating the course with a “G” for global and requiring students to choose a certain number of credits towards graduation. In order to accomplish this shift, MFCI teams encouraged on-campus professors to develop
their courses to meet the new or revised student learning outcomes for global awareness. At one institution they were even able to provide professors with financial incentives to globalize their courses. At most institutions, however, this was not possible and institutions therefore had to work to incentivize professors through other means such as being a part of the greater purpose and enhancing their courses to provide a more robust student experience.

Examples of global education courses varied. One institution started a Cultural Diversity Course, which explored students’ personal ethnic/racial identities situated within intercultural contexts. Another required an African Diaspora course for all students. Another institution created a new online study abroad course for students to connect with fellow study abroad classmates during their travels. This course was a reflective course for students to share their international experiences with one another while studying abroad in an effort to compare and contrast their cultural encounters. And finally, one institution created a global living-learning community that integrated one course with a living environment focused on global issues.

Collection of Global Courses. For some institutions, an international certificate or concentration program worked well within their curriculum to implement their global reform efforts. Most often, the international certificate or concentration required that students enroll in (1) language courses not always required in the general curriculum and (2) multiple courses with global perspectives. In addition, students were highly encouraged or required to participate in a study abroad experience. At one institution, a global certificate was an opportunity to further encourage interdisciplinary studies for students and faculty around issues of global education. Of the institutions interviewed, five colleges/universities implemented a global citizen/education certificate or concentration program.

Partnerships
The partnerships built between ACA and HBCU institutions evolved in the following ways: (1) partnerships between just ACAs, (2) between just HBCUs, or (3) between HBCUs and ACAs together. The teams’ intentions were to formally create programs, engage in joint study abroad programs, and/or build formal collaborations between faculty and students at the institutions in order to exchange ideas. The ultimate goal was to build lasting partnerships between the HBCUs and ACAs as a cross-cultural learning experience.

In interviews, institutions shared that they began planning partnerships across teams and had the best of intentions to incorporate them into their projects. However, they did not always accomplish this goal. Two formal partnerships were established through MFCI, however, and they sustained their efforts throughout the life of the project. The first was the collaboration between King College (ACA)¹ and Bennett College (HBCU) honors program, where students shared in study abroad opportunities and visited one another’s campuses during breaks. The other partnership was between Wheeling Jesuit University (ACA) and the University of the District of Columbia (HBCU); both schools collaborated on a study abroad trip to Mexico. Otherwise, the projects that intended to create official partnerships were not able to sustain these efforts for many reasons outlined in the following section.

¹ King College is now King University.
EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

This section explores the institutional factors that contributed to the successes and challenges experienced in implementing their co-curricular, curricular, and partnership activities. According to the survey results, the top three institutional factors that contributed to project success were leadership buy-in (24.9%), faculty enthusiasm (24.9%), and alignment with institutional mission and vision (22.3%).

The “other” factors that played an important role in project implementation included alignment with strategic initiatives (12.3%), student interest (9.6%), financial incentives (4.9%), and other (1%), as illustrated in Figure 3. Both the successes and challenges from each area (when data are available) are outlined below. Finally, other implementation issues are described qualitatively, illuminating findings from survey responses and interviews.

**Figure 3: Institutional factors that most contributed MFCI project success**

Leadership Buy-In

Institutions that were able to gain a high level of buy-in from their leadership (24.9%) were well supported in their efforts, which often equated to successful implementation. One institutional participant stated:

*The Dean has been very supportive and the President has been supportive as well, at least in speaking publicly about the initiative, talking positively about it.*

Leadership buy-in meant that institutional leaders spoke publicly about the global education initiatives, supported the efforts of MFCI teams with either funding or other internal incentives, and offered their approval for global education on their campuses. The importance of gaining buy-in from upper-level leadership at a college or university was vital to program successes.

Institutions that were not able to accomplish this type of buy-in faced many challenges. One institution explained that because of turnover in upper-level leadership, and the fact that new leadership had its own new agenda that was ambivalent to global education work, their efforts were not sustainable. A common theme across interviews was the turnover rate of leadership and staff at HBCUs and ACAs. This created a distinct challenge for institutions to keep global education as a central focus when so many other demands were deemed more urgent. Often, there was one great advocate for the global

\[2\] Other (1%) stated that their plan was “revamped due to staff changes.”
education initiative at the head of the college or university - a Provost, President, Vice President or even a top-level professor - who led the charge but then left the institution before the project ended. In their absence, the projects lost momentum and required that the institution almost start over or restart the efforts from a less energized place.

At one institution, they saw turnover among four different Provosts over the course of the project, which required a new iteration of the initiative with every Provost and eventually ended with the MFCI project dissipating completely. At another institution, when a new President was hired, the project team was told that this initiative was no longer an institutional priority. For those engaged from the beginning, this was a huge disappointment. But without the buy-in from upper-level leadership, it was impossible for them to go forward implementing initiatives. One institutional participant stated:

*I think the intent of this phase of the project, to increase awareness and encourage the development of global citizenship curriculum was successful on many campuses, but not on my campus. My institution sent people, and I was one of them, to most of the workshops in Salzburg and in the US, but unfortunately very little was done with it on my campus. Poor leadership on my campus contributed to this, but it was not the fault of the project. Funds for implementation were the crucial component that my campus lacked.*

**Faculty Enthusiasm**

In terms of faculty enthusiasm (24.9%), many of the participants in this evaluation were professors who served as “cheerleaders” for the MFCI projects on their campus. They were able to champion for global issues and their passion for global education came through in their interviews and surveys. One respondent explained:

*It was such a rich experience. The opportunity to engage each other’s stories, to reshape our own in response, to refine our ideas/share best practices, to sharpen our own global citizenship and cultural awareness as we work to encourage the same in our students. Powerful and transformative.*

Another professor shared:

*We deeply appreciate the considerations and support offered by the MFCI Global Initiative. For many of us, the experiences have changed the way we view the global world and how U.S. identity plays a role in how others perceive us.*

These professors are at the core of these MFCI projects, implementing the curricular and co-curricular change as well as building partnerships. Their enthusiasm is what has guided these projects from the beginning. Some professors shared that it was not always easy to get non-MFCI team members excited about these new initiatives. Two MFCI participants cited that they had hoped for:

*More participation from the faculty at my institution.*

*Additional institutional support and additional funding from the institution. Greater faculty buy-in.*

Professors at HBCUs/ACAs are often overburdened with high teaching loads and other institutional leadership responsibilities. Most MFCI teams interviewed felt that the integration of global initiatives
was generally well received by their professors. But they did face some resistance usually due to the additional time it required for professors to plan new courses, not the degree by which they valued global education and its role in students’ learning. One participant stated:

There was quite a large gap between the ideas of what we wanted to do and what we could actually do.

Once some teams returned to campus, life became very busy and it was more difficult to take the time to dedicate to their MFCI project. Professors really wanted to do more but without the buy-in from leadership and their own lack of time, they found it difficult to try to create projects that were not valued. One respondent explained that their “project had to be significantly scaled down in order to implement.”

Alignment with Mission and Vision
The importance of the project’s alignment with mission and vision (22.3%) was a common factor across all institutions. In some cases, institutions were undergoing a mission and/or vision revision in which the professors who were members of the MFCI teams fought to ensure that global awareness was included in a restructured institutional statement. In other instances, the MFCI projects already aligned with the established mission and vision for the college or university and the projects merely provided a much more guided approach to ensuring that global education was more integrated into the campus culture.

Other Factors
Additional factors affecting the success of institutional projects were alignment with strategic initiatives (12.3%), student interest (9.6%), and financial incentives (4.9%).

Strategic Initiatives. Many ACA and HBCU institutions utilized their MFCI project ideas to improve their Quality Enhancement Plans (QEP) for institutional accreditation and their college/university’s strategic plans—all forward looking, strategic initiatives (12.3%). As one participant stated, “For the QEP, MFCI was invaluable.”

Another participant shared how they integrated their MFCI project into their QEP:

The QEP for SACS accreditation was experiential learning and now we have an actual budget to send students abroad each semester. There are a number of trips planned in the coming months [for the] experiential learning program [with] students going to Haiti, going to China, going to Belize.

MFCI projects offered an opportunity for institutions to outline learning outcomes and assessment measures as required by their Quality Enhancement Plan within the context of global education.3

Strategic planning was also an important piece for institutions seeking to build a culture around global education and into their institutions plans for the future. For one institution, a participant cited that a great victory resulting from their MFCI project was including global education into the institution’s strategic plan.

3 For more information about QEP, see SACS accreditation guidelines http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/Quality%20Enhancement%20Plan%20Guidelines.pdf
[We] got global education into strategic plan. What we wanted to attract here. [We] worked really hard to get those words in there specifically.

Student Interest. Student interest (9.6%) was essential for any of these initiatives to come to fruition, as they were key components in curricular changes and participation in study abroad programs. Some institutions included a student member on global awareness committees; others found that students were champions for the project after attending Salzburg themselves in the special weeklong student session for MFCI institutions. On campus, curricular and co-curricular activities were only successful with substantial student interest. But, some institutions faced challenges to student interest, especially for study abroad programs.

Student aversion to study abroad was a common challenge. Students showed concern for both cost and fear of unknown experiences. First, cost was a barrier for many ACA and HBCU students who already face financial challenges as first-generation, low-income students. And, unfortunately, the institutions typically did not have the means to supplement the costs. As a result, study abroad trips often would not have enough students enroll to make them happen. Second, participants mentioned their students had an aversion to travel abroad because they feared the unknown. One MFCI participant explained:

[My] job was to relieve fears of study abroad [because] a lot of our campus is first generation and a lot of them were very fearful of going on study abroad because they had not thought it was even a possibility before.

Together, both cost and fear were two barriers to overcome to encourage participation in these MFCI project activities.

Financial Incentives. The financial incentives (4.9%) provided to each team following their proposals in Salzburg ($2000 for cohort 1; $1500 for cohorts 2 & 3) were very motivating for teams to use for the implementation of their projects. As mentioned, HBCU and ACA participants shared the financial challenges many of their institutions face and the financial incentives such as the mini-grants were a selling point for their campuses upon returning from Salzburg and supported institutional efforts vastly.

***

Many MFCI participants shared in their interviews and survey responses that they were surprised by the positive response from their institutions, students, and fellow professors. In fact, it typically exceeded their expectations. Institutional participants shared the following comments about their successes in implementing their projects:

I think the reality superseded the intent. My institution received assistance in developing an internationalization plan that helped to provide a system when we did not have one.

Ours exceeded our expectations. The MFCI really sparked a tremendous difference on our campus.

I am very pleased with what we were able to accomplish through this project - particularly with regard to the creation of a class, now part of our core curriculum that focuses on cultural identity development.
The intent very closely compared to the reality. We discussed possible projects that we could implement on our campuses and we then followed through with the implementation.

OUTCOMES

In what ways have project outcomes differed or aligned with the initial project intentions?

This section explores how MFCI program and institutional project outcomes differed from or aligned with their original intent. Included are separate descriptions of the goals and outcomes of the MFCI program and the institutional projects as well as separate evaluations of the MFCI program and institutional project outcomes framed in terms of the three core MFCI goals related to (1) championing global issues, (2) advancing curricular and co-curricular global activities, and (3) fostering institutional partnerships to promote global citizenship.

Generally, MFCI program outcomes often aligned well with the original proposal, resulting in program intentions mirroring reality. The institutional project outcomes, however, varied greatly. On one end of the spectrum, there were institutional projects that were very successful and actually exceeded initial expectations. On the other end, there were two institutions that had to completely revise their initial plans and/or abandon pursuit of new global education initiatives at this time. As such, the intent often differed from the reality on the institutional level.

DESCRIPTION OF MFCI PROGRAM GOALS AND OUTCOMES

Over a three-year period, SGS wrote three different grant proposals to the Mellon Foundation for the MFCI project. The original and subsequent grant proposal documents focused on engaging HBCUs and ACAs in global education experiences that would advance campus efforts. The specific proposed goals from the grant documents themselves are illustrated in Table 6. Following, the evaluation of MFCI proposal outcomes offers insight into the intent versus reality, supported by participant interviews, survey results, and document analyses.

Table 7: MFCI Grant Proposal Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Grant Proposal 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A first MFCI cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support the participation of approximately 20 faculty members from HBCUs and ACAs at sessions of the Salzburg Seminar in 2007, 2008, and 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Further strengthen institutional linkages of the HBCU and ACA colleges and universities who participate in the Mellon Fellowship Program through our ISP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support the SGS’s capacity building efforts to develop and build global networks that include all alumni and their continued intellectual interest, commitment and engagement beyond their Salzburg experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Grant Proposal 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A second MFCI cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To enhance the institutional impact of the Mellon Fellowship Program and build on the success of the initial session of the Mellon Fellow Community Initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two special sessions for the new cohort in January 2009 and January 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Grant Proposal 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A third MFCI cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus workshops in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US coordination and dissemination activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A Global Citizenship seminar for students from MFCI institutions, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A formative evaluation of the MFCI with a forward planning focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF THE MFCI PROPOSAL OUTCOMES
The three main MFCI objectives—championing for global issues, advancing curricular and co-curricular activities, and building partnerships between ACA and HBCU institutions—are at the core of the overarching MFCI grant proposals described in Table 7. The following section analyzes the degree to which the proposed activities met these three objectives.

Championing Global Issues
MFCI program coordinators, faculty, and speakers were the catalyst for championing global issues throughout the entire experience. As illustrated in previous sections, the proposed goal to support ACAs and HBCUs to develop their leadership on and capacity for global education was clearly met through (1) the people (MFCI faculty, speakers, program coordinators), (2) the meetings (seminars, workshops), (3) the support (proposal writing, group presentations, networking), and (4) the information provided on global education (speeches, discussions, handouts). The MFCI program supported teams by expanding their international knowledge base and by creating space to develop their institutional projects. Championing global issues was at the core of all SGS activities, and as evidenced by this evaluation, the intent and reality were well-aligned.

Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities
The degree to which the outcomes of the curricular and co-curricular activities differed from their intent is best illustrated at the institutional project level as discussed below. However, it is important to note that MFCI activities in the Salzburg seminar and US workshops were intended to contribute significantly to the project design, implementation, and subsequent outcomes for each institution. As previously illustrated, participants felt that MFCI activities and staff provided the structure and support necessary for these institutions to succeed in developing their projects. However, some institutions did desire additional support through more frequent follow-up and/or more detailed examples of previous institutional efforts from MFCI.

Partnerships
The intention on the part of MFCI to support institutional linkages between HBCUs and ACAs was evident in the Salzburg seminars and US workshops. As previously discussed, participants were appreciative to MFCI for the opportunity to network and build relationships with colleagues across institutions during these activities. One participant explained that the trip to Austria offered time to “get together and talk about matters of teaching, learning and [the] connectiveness of the world.”

While institutional partnerships were unevenly implemented across the teams, the partnerships that were created were a result of MFCI-supported efforts. As discussed earlier, some teams were highly successful in creating joint study abroad programs or other shared experiences for their faculty and students, while others mostly made professional connections that expanded their knowledge on global education. Regardless, the conversations that participants had with one another around global issues, the professional relationships they built, and the opportunities afforded to the students to study abroad in Salzburg and beyond offered sharing, understanding, and another level of intercultural competence for all involved. Undoubtedly, all institutions were at some level able to promote global education on their campus as a result of the MFCI-coordinated experiences and their cohort connections.
DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT GOALS AND OUTCOMES

Each institution determined their own global education goals and the degree to which their outcomes mirrored their intent ranged with respect to their projects. Outlined below are three examples of institutional stories constructed from participant interviews that present the relationship between project intent and outcomes as an illustration of the project progression over time.

Institution A: Exceeded Expectations

Institution A decided to start their project with an assessment of where they were in terms of global education. In the past, Institution A had engaged in more “random acts of globalization” and, with their involvement in MFCl, they sought to better coordinate them. Upon returning from Salzburg, representatives from this institution conducted a survey of students, professors, and staff on global education to inform their efforts. From there, the team created a comprehensive plan for their new global initiative, including a global education course added to the general education requirements, a new Global Studies concentration, and encouragement for students to study abroad. The institution claimed that students who engaged in international experiences on their campus were more marketable with respect to jobs after graduation.

In terms of partnerships, Institution A tried to work with other ACAs and HBCUs, but their efforts were not successful. However, the institutional representative indicated that they were still planning to try to create such partnerships to further their efforts. For instance, they would like to set up a program to visit other campuses for a week to learn about other HBCUs and ACAs.

Overall, the participant shared that their successes from this project exceeded their expectations and their campus is much more internationally-minded today than before MFCl. They plan to continue their efforts to further develop and enhance the global education experience for their students, and they are thankful for their MFCl experience as the catalyst for these changes.

Institution B: Progress Made, Striving for More

Institution B began their project with the goal of globalizing their entire curriculum. Drawing directly on their experiences in Salzburg, the team was able to create a language of global citizenship and to build a much broader base of knowledge about internationalization on their campus. Importantly, they were able to gain buy-in from the leadership of the university via the Dean and the President, and the professors associated with the SGS enjoyed a higher level of prestige on campus, which led to more faculty applying to the SGS fellows program each year. Students from this campus also were able to participate in the Salzburg experience, returning with much enthusiasm and working to advance globalization efforts on campus. The students even remained in contact with other ACA and HBCU students through Facebook and spring break visits.

As the project progressed, however, the initial goal of globalizing the entire curriculum lost some of its momentum because professors were pulled to other responsibilities and not all proposed ideas were implemented as planned. By the second year of the program, participants shifted their focus to the creation of a Global Perspectives certificate rather than a full globalization of the curriculum. To date, there has been only one graduate with a Global Perspectives certificate at this institution. Other efforts

---

4 SGS fellows program refers to the SGS programming independent of the MFCl experience.
have been made to add global learning outcomes to general education requirements though, and more is hoped for in the future. Overall, participants felt they had made significant strides on their campus, but definitely felt there were more efforts to be made and continue to strive for more.

**Institution C: End of the Road**

Institution C started their project strong with faculty enthusiasm, leadership buy-in, and a plan for implementing their work. Before the project began, they had “pockets” of people doing global initiatives on campus, but no centralized way to support faculty or students on global education. They decided to work towards not only improving study abroad but also encouraging professors to integrate global initiatives into their curriculum.

Their first act to accomplish these goals was to establish a centralized office called the global community center. They were able to secure management for the center and the staff member began to coordinate the study abroad program by creating a policy manual and helping students prepare for the experience by coordinating speakers and courses. The staffer also worked with students to find partner institutions for semesters abroad. Unfortunately after the second year of MFCI, the college faced financial difficulties, and with the appointment of new leadership, decided to cut funding for the global community center. But, as the participants explained, the “faculty had committed to this for years, felt passionately, and didn’t throw the cards in yet.” The professors tried to keep the momentum going without the institutional support and actually wrote a grant for global programming. They also used their Mellon funding to support professors in course development and global citizenship trainings. Then, the professors were all asked to move to a 5-4 teaching load from a 4-4 teaching load, and professors who had been on board in the past, decided they had nothing more to give to this initiative.

Today, all that is left of the original project is the global education task force appointed by the provost to integrate global education, which recently approved a global education certificate program. Also, the professor interviewed continues to lead the study abroad efforts on the campus in partnership with one other professor, and together they continue to integrate global awareness into their curriculum. Otherwise, there is no other concerted effort on their campus. The participant explained “[it was a] major blow for everyone involved.”

**EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT OUTCOMES**

Each institutional example above offers an in-depth story of project outcomes across the spectrum. Interview and survey results also supported the range of outcomes illustrated throughout this report. Participants interviewed across projects indicated that while outcomes were measureable at this point in their work, integrating global education and changing a campus culture does not “happen overnight.” Globalizing these unique campuses involves a deep process, and is often met with unforeseen challenges. And yet, the accomplishments of many of these institutions have been promising to date, including:

- Creating a new language around global citizenship on campus
- Generating enthusiasm towards global education throughout the faculty
- Staffing new offices or committees to support global education efforts
- Reforming courses to focus on international issues
- Developing new academic programs (e.g. certificates, concentrations) on global education
- Institutionalizing global education into mission statements, quality enhancement plans, and/or strategic plans
- Developing new professional relationships across institutions
Here, these outcomes of the institutional projects are explored further with respect to the three major goals of the MFCI program as previously noted.

**Championing Global Issues**

It is evident that involvement in MFCI either served as the catalyst for new interest and programs on campus or served as a vibrant enhancement to the existing work of most participating institutions. Through the MFCI seminars and workshops, institutional participants said they gained new knowledge and tools to develop their global education efforts. MFCI took participants out of their disciplinary “box” and enabled them to look at global issues from different vantage points. Many participants indicated that without the MFCI grant they would never had made the progress they were able to make at their institutions. The manner by which these changes were implemented and the outcomes across institutions varied, but the overall intent to internationalize the student and professorial experience at ACAs and HBCUs was consistent and enthusiastic throughout the program.

Specifically, in terms of the three institutional examples, each institution championed for global issues on their campus from the beginning of their projects. Institution A first assessed where they were and opened a campus-wide discussion on global education through administering a survey and creating a campus-wide global plan. Institution B was successful in championing for global issues with the co-construction of a definition for global citizenship and gaining buy-in from upper-level leadership. Institution C worked tirelessly to champion for global issues on their campus and their efforts were met with both success and failure. As examples representative sample of the range of MFCI projects, these narratives provide a story for how institutional teams went about their efforts and the successes and challenges they faced in accomplishing them.

**Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities**

Each and every MFCI institution implemented either curricular or co-curricular activities or both on their campus. This outcome is detailed throughout the evaluation and is illustrated well through the voices of the participants, their proposed plans, the implementation of their work, and the many successful outcomes experienced even amid challenges. In the examples above, institutions integrated certificate programs as well as international courses into their curriculum. In addition, they enhanced study abroad programs for students. Beyond these three examples, institutional outcomes to improve global education through curricular and co-curricular changes were the most successful aspect of the MFCI project. Institutions were able to lay out tangible plans in Salzburg, work with professors on campus to integrate global initiatives, and the outcomes were praised by participants at most institutions.

**Partnerships**

Although formal partnerships did occur in several instances, institutional partnerships across all projects were by far the weakest and least realized area of the MFCI project. Frequently cited reasons for the lack of partnerships were the high work demands on individuals once returning to their institutions and the lack of time available to formally create partnerships and follow through with the collaborative plans proposed in Salzburg. ACA schools indicated that they were already close to one another prior to the MFCI project, and that their collaborations neither increased nor decreased as a result of MFCI. Instead, ACA partnerships were maintained and provided another component to their work together. A reason often offered for the lack of collaboration between HBCUs and ACAs was geographic location. The ACAs by nature are close to one another along the Appalachian Mountains. The HBCUs, on the other hand, are often quite far from other MFCI institutions. As a result, many of the partnership intentions did not come to fruition. One institution stated that MFCI was a:
Good foundation and introduction to other universities, [but] would like more accountability from the participants on demonstrating meaningful collaborations.

***

Overall, the institutional teams participating in MFCI were able to create waves of change on their campuses. Post-MFCI participation, teams felt that they had advanced global awareness and impact on their campus. In some instances, this change was dramatic with the formation of new programs and a new global mindedness on campus. In other instances, the change was small and gradual over time with the effects shown through small incremental successes. Each change was contextual, but despite the challenges, institutional participants were able to incorporate global education on their campus in some way. Therefore, while the institutional outcomes did not always align with the project intent, they did meet the overarching goals of MFCI in terms of championing global issues, integrating global education in curricular and co-curricular programs, and creating partnerships at ACAs and HBCUs.
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The Mellon Fellows Community Initiative offered participating HBCUs and ACAs a unique opportunity to embark on an intellectual journey of global education. Through their work, institutional partners sought to engage and change their campus communities to be more globally aware and purposeful in building international opportunities for students. The design, implementation, and outcomes of the MFCI experience illustrate the extensive efforts of these teams to shift their institutional paradigms from domestic to international. It was no small feat. This evaluation illuminates these efforts and offers the Mellon Foundation, the Salzburg Global Seminar, and institutional participants greater insight into the depth and breadth of these projects and the distinctive impact they have made for all involved.

To inform future projects similar to MFCI for HBCUs and ACAs, the following section offers recommendations for MFCI program sustainability and institutional project sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MFCI Program Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balance theoretical and practical approaches to global education in the seminars and workshops as participants expressed a desire for more tangible discussions with practical applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schedule one day in each seminar to allow institutions to solely work on their projects and build collaborations across participants; provide examples of previous cohorts’ proposals as guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include workshops on how to obtain internal and external funding for the sustainability of institutional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assign MFCI consultants to institutions based on scope of work and consultant expertise; consultants could also serve as support throughout the grant as well as visit campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require rather than encourage involvement of senior-level leadership in MFCI from the start to address challenges with building and sustaining campus buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue US workshops as an extension of the Salzburg experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require a year of capacity-building activities in which institutions establish sustainable infrastructures; could include grant-writing workshops and discussions on study abroad programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require cross-institutional collaborations as part of the grant and provide a framework to incentivize partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage teams to have 1-2 students from each institution meet on another team’s campus for a workshop/conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creating a Future Consortium</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a consortium that is led by ACA and HBCU leaders and supported by SGS staff and consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For a Consortium to be successful in the future, the value-add, especially for ACA schools, would need to be clear and attractive since ACA already has their own consortium, pay fees for it, and collaborate on international opportunities as a result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain the involvement of the SGS program coordinators in the Consortium as they provide much cohesion and direction according to participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Identify a point person or institution to continue and shepherd the work in the Consortium.
- Designate an MFCI institution “headquarters” in the US, alternating campuses every two years
- Host an annual conference on global education with past participants and beyond
- Invite MFCI representatives and/or participants to present at ACA and HBCU conferences

**Resources**
- Develop common assessment tools or best practices for assessing student learning outcomes.
- Create a communication tool to maintain momentum on the projects such as a listserv, website, or quarterly newsletter
- Develop a compendium of seminar materials available to all participants as an online resource.
- Create a model global certificate program and templates of other best practices for globalization
- Offer any future teams with examples of high, medium, and low project proposals as a model for constructing their own proposals

### Institutional Project Sustainability

#### Project Design
- Identify team leader or co-team leaders to help maintain continuity of stakeholders in the group and momentum for the project
- Get agreement from campus leadership on the initiative in writing from the beginning with a Start and stop date for the grant to ensure continuity under new leadership
- Diversify committed stakeholders including senior-level leadership (require), faculty (multiple disciplines), students, and community partners (especially in “local/global” initiatives)
- Scan institutional landscape for global issues already in existence and make clear action steps for aspirational project ideas, implementation, and aspirations for future outcomes

#### Collaborations & Resources
- Engage global education as part of as many campus meetings, committees, and gatherings as possible to integrate global-mindedness across the campus, not just as a separate initiative
- Encourage involvement from the Board of Directors/Board of Visitors on campus in building a global education initiative for the entire college/university
- Bring students into the process very early, including both underclassmen and upperclassmen. Offer leadership opportunities for students to engage in the process
- Support faculty/staff efforts to engage in global education initiatives through professional development workshops and other suitable and incentivizing activities
- Involve campus public relations and media constituents into the efforts. Create campaigns such as the “Year of Global Education” and highlight the work such as video blogs of student study abroad trips
- Seek outside scholarships and grants for students’ study abroad opportunities to reduce the need for students’ personal funds
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APPENDIX A

Institutional Interview Questions

- Please share with us your name, school, and role at the institution.
  - Tell me how involved you personally have been with MFCI
- How has your participation in MFCI helped you to advocate for global issues on your campus?
  - What factors positively or negatively contributed to the execution of your project?
  - How did your initial design stage in Austria help you to execute your work back home?
- Tell me how your institutional partnerships with ACAs and HBCUs enhanced your efforts to promote global citizenship on your campus.
- How has the MFCI program contributed to advancing curricular change and/or providing co-curricular opportunities to students in the field of global education?
- How did you project outcomes differ or align from your original intent?
- What should “next” look like for the MFCI participants?
- What’s been your favorite part of the MFCI experience?
MFCI Faculty Interview Questions

- Please share with us your name and your affiliation with MFCI.
- As a faculty member, what were your overarching goals when working with MFCI institutions?
- In what ways did you encourage MFCI institutions to advocate for global issues on their campus?
  - For their curriculum
  - For their co-curricular activities
  - For their organizational planning
- Where did you see areas of greatest challenge for institutional leaders/staff?
- How did you observe institutional partnerships form between ACAs and HBCUs at the seminars/workshops?
  - What do you think would help them to be more sustainable in the future?
- When following up with institutions, how did you see project intent differ from project outcomes?
- What do you think are the greatest strengths of the MFCI program?
- What are areas of weakness that could be improved for the future?
APPENDIX C

Survey Questions

The purpose of this survey is to understand the factors that most contributed to the successes and challenges of MFCI project planning and implementation. The responses from this survey will be used to inform the overall evaluation of the MFCI grant to gauge its effectiveness at encouraging global citizenship in teaching and learning and in building partnerships across ACAs and HBCUs. Please feel free to be open and honest. Your thoughtful responses are appreciated and will be kept anonymous.

1. In what institutional type did you participate in the MFCI grant?
   a. ACA
   b. HBCU

2. What is (was) your position at the institution for the MFCI grant? (select all that apply)
   a. Top institutional leadership (President, Vice President)
   b. Institutional Leadership (Dean, Associate or Assistant Vice President, other)
   c. Faculty Member (Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor)
   d. Administrator (Student or Academic Affairs)
   e. Other Role __________________
   f. Comments (Text Box included)

3. What are the top three institutional factors most contributed to your MFCI project successes?
   - Leadership buy-in at the university/college
   - Student interest
   - Faculty enthusiasm
   - Financial incentives
   - Alignment with institutional strategic plan
   - Alignment with institutional mission
   - Alignment with institutional vision
   - Alignment with Quality Enhancement Plan
   - Other __________________________
   - COMMENTS (Text Box included)

4. What are the top 3 MFCI practices in Salzburg most contributed to your project successes?
   - Seminar topical speakers
   - Seminar faculty
   - Program handouts
   - Program readings prior to arrival
   - Opportunities to network with other institutional leaders/faculty members
   - Coordination of the program by Salzburg Global Seminar Staff
   - The space to collaborate with institutional colleagues (from your same campus) on project ideas, deliverables, and plans for implementation
   - Gaining new knowledge about global education
   - International exposure to Salzburg that you could share with your campus
5. What are the top 3 MFCI practices in the US workshops most contributed to your project success?

- Workshop topical speakers
- Workshop faculty
- Program handouts
- Program readings prior to arrival
- Opportunities to network with other institutional leaders/faculty members
- Coordination of the program by Salzburg Global Seminar staff
- The space to collaborate with institutional colleagues (from your same campus) on project ideas, deliverables, and plans for implementation
- Gaining new knowledge about global education
- Opportunities to learn on other ACA/HBCU campuses and see firsthand their global citizenship work and campus
- Cost sharing for travel
- Mini grant for project implementation
- Other __________________________
- Not applicable, I did not attend any US workshops

6. What are the top 3 MFCI practices in Salzburg least contributed to your project success?

- Seminar topical speakers
- Seminar faculty
- Program handouts
- Program readings prior to arrival
- Opportunities to network with other institutional leaders/faculty members
- Coordination of the program by Salzburg Global Seminar Staff
- The space to collaborate with institutional colleagues (from your same campus) on project ideas, deliverables, and plans for implementation
- Gaining new knowledge about global education
- International exposure in Salzburg to share with your campus
- Cost sharing for travel
- Mini grant for project implementation
- Other __________________________
- Not applicable, I did not travel to Salzburg

COMMENTS (Text Box included)
7. What are the top 3 MFCI practices in the US workshops least contributed to your project success?

- Workshop topical speakers
- Workshop faculty
- Program handouts
- Program readings prior to arrival
- Opportunities to network with other institutional leaders/faculty members
- Coordination of the program by Salzburg Global Seminar staff
- The space to collaborate with institutional colleagues (from your same campus) on project ideas, deliverables, and plans for implementation
- Gaining new knowledge about global education
- Opportunities to learn on other ACA/HBCU campuses and see firsthand their global citizenship work and campus
- Cost sharing for travel
- Mini grant for project implementation
- Other ______________________
- Not applicable, I did not attend any US workshops
- COMMENTS (Text Box included)

8. What do you wish you had to support your efforts that were not necessarily available to you for this project?

9. How do you think the intent of your MFCI project compared to its reality?

10. Do you any final thoughts that would assist in our efforts to evaluate the MFCI Global Education Initiative?