

Appendix A

Students attended International Programs breakdown by Ethnicity Spring 2012 - Spring 2018

Number of undergraduate students in the last six years who participated in study abroad program*

Academic Term	Ethnicity	N of Students Attend IP	Total
Spring 2012	Non-resident Alien	12	297
	Hispanic or Latino	34	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	
	Asian	36	
	Black or African American	21	
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	
	White	136	
	Two or more Races	27	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	28	
	Non-resident Alien	11	
Fall 2012	Hispanic or Latino	43	305
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	
	Asian	38	
	Black or African American	14	
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	
	White	156	
	Two or more Races	30	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	12	
	Non-resident Alien	15	
	Hispanic or Latino	47	
Spring 2013	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	332
	Asian	41	
	Black or African American	13	
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	
	White	173	
	Two or more Races	29	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	12	
	Non-resident Alien	16	
	Hispanic or Latino	49	
	Fall 2013	American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian		50	
Black or African American		20	

	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	
	White	166	
	Two or more Races	25	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	18	
	Non-resident Alien	14	
	Hispanic or Latino	50	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	3	
	Asian	52	
Spring 2014	Black or African American	20	344
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	
	White	169	
	Two or more Races	22	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	14	
	Non-resident Alien	5	
	Hispanic or Latino	62	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	
	Asian	57	
Fall 2014	Black or African American	19	344
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	
	White	169	
	Two or more Races	19	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	12	
	Non-resident Alien	6	
	Hispanic or Latino	58	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	
	Asian	53	
Spring 2015	Black or African American	18	344
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	
	White	175	
	Two or more Races	20	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	13	
	Non-resident Alien	9	
	Hispanic or Latino	46	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	
	Asian	31	
Fall 2015	Black or African American	13	333
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	
	White	202	
	Two or more Races	26	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	3	
Spring 2016	Non-resident Alien	14	343

	Hispanic or Latino	45	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	
	Asian	26	
	Black or African American	16	
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	
	White	206	
	Two or more Races	27	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	6	
	Non-resident Alien	25	
	Hispanic or Latino	40	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	
	Asian	30	
Fall 2016	Black or African American	21	325
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	
	White	181	
	Two or more Races	18	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	9	
	Non-resident Alien	22	
	Hispanic or Latino	36	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	
	Asian	31	
Spring 2017	Black or African American	20	317
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	
	White	180	
	Two or more Races	20	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	7	
	Non-resident Alien	17	
	Hispanic or Latino	51	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	
	Asian	22	
Fall 2017	Black or African American	12	331
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	
	White	193	
	Two or more Races	29	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	4	
	Non-resident Alien	21	
	Hispanic or Latino	47	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	
Spring 2018	Asian	24	331
	Black or African American	11	
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	

White	192
Two or more Races	29
Race/ethnicity unknown	5

***International programs include locations: Buenos Aires, Florence, Heidelberg, Lausanne, London, Shanghai and Washington**

IP Program Evaluation Trends through Spring 2018														
<u>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</u>														
1 Percent UNSATISFIED with the academic quality of the courses they took during the semester														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	14%	16%	10%	10%	0%	3%	12.00%	14%	3%	6%	4%	0%	11%	9%
Florence	4%	3%	18%	35%	22%	46%	5%	11%	5%	4%	2%	3%	0%	7%
Heidelberg	4%	7%	2%	0%	8%	8%	31%	24%	19%	17%	25%	25%	35%	29%
Lausanne	18%	11%	27%	19%	14%	28%	10%	0%	9%	8%	16%	20%	13%	22%
London	2%	3%	15%	10%	0%	0%	7%	11%	10%	-	5%	22%	5%	4%
Shanghai	13%	29%	4%	29%	37%	49%	7%	12%	3%	10%	13%	24%	29%	27%
Washington DC					33%	18%	0%	33%	-	9%	6%	25%	8%	10%
2 Percent UNSATISFIED with the quality of the faculty that taught the courses in their program														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	12%	5%	8%	10%	5%	3%	9%	7%	2%	3%	2%	2%	8%	16%
Florence	4%	13%	18%	25%	15%	29%	16%	4%	4%	4%	2%	7%	0%	5%
Heidelberg	0%	0%	2%	0%	4%	6%	18%	10%	10%	5%	15%	10%	10%	17%
Lausanne	6%	2%	20%	15%	14%	24%	5%	4%	1%	2%	12%	8%	11%	15%
London	0%	3%	12%	5%	0%	0%	10%	15%	5%	7%	5%	22%	7%	2%
Shanghai	17%	24%	4%	6%	25%	51%	0%	0%	-	13%	13%	9%	42%	39%
Washington DC					38%	14%	0%	40%	7%	-	6%	19%	8%	17%
3 Percent UNSATISFIED with the quality of the classroom facilities														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	10%	21%	8%	12%	5%	9%	1.50%	3%	2%	5%	2%	4%	2%	4%
Florence	13%	9%	8%	5%	15%	12%	13%	13%	9%	-	10%	7%	26%	10%
Heidelberg	4%	7%	0%	4%	4%	14%	4%	2%	5%	4%	14%	8%	2%	0%
Lausanne	6%	6%	14%	4%	10%	14%	17%	12%	3%	9%	5%	3%	3%	14%
London	0%	3%	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%	5%	4%	0%	7%	2%	0%
Shanghai	0%	10%	0%	3%	23%	13%	24%	21%	34%	22%	11%	30%	4%	15%
Washington DC					6%	0%	0%	0%	-	-	11%	66%	0%	3%
4 Percent UNSATISFIED with the wifi in your facility														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	18%	19%	6%	10%	8%	8%	4%	27%	49%	52%	31%	11%	15%	11%
Florence	25%	9%	8%	9%	20%	19%	16%	89%	93%	2%	2%	48%	11%	7%
Heidelberg	15%	11%	7%	2%	8%	12%	24%	65%	79%	66%	98%	43%	35%	39%
Lausanne	27%	20%	30%	26%	27%	33%	25%	8%	6%	9%	10%	32%	1%	7%
London	7%	3%	12%	5%	2%	5%	20%	7%	86%	20%	12%	11%	20%	11%
Shanghai	35%	38%	21%	21%	23%	43%	12%	91%	62%	80%	77%	79%	50%	69%
Washington DC					5%	14%	28%	47%	13%	30%	39%	25%	27%	7%
5 Percent UNSATISFIED with the ability to access appropriate books, newspapers, and other print media to support the outside research requirements for their classes														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	18%	19%	6%	10%	8%	8%	4%	8%	5%	6%	4%	4%	5%	13%

SPIRITUAL LIFE

	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
10 Percent UNSATISFIED with the overall spiritual life of the program														
Buenos Aires	2%	5%	12%	12%	2%	0%	15%	24%	8%	3%	8%	0%	39%	33%
Florence	10%	16%	21%	35%	15%	21%	31%	37%	7%	12%	4%	0%	30%	29%
Heidelberg	2%	7%	7%	8%	4%	12%	8%	14%	16%	2%	19%	14%	4%	13%
Lausanne	11%	13%	17%	4%	10%	18%	3%	4%	7%	2%	15%	14%	8%	28%
London	15%	24%	12%	12%	0%	0%	4%	15%	7%	11%	25%	31%	0%	9%
Shanghai	4%	24%	4%	3%	12%	16%	10%	5%	7%	16%	13%	9%	25%	15%
Washington DC					17%	23%	17%	33%	20%	39%	33%	56%	35%	17%
11 Percent UNSATISFIED with the quality of weekly Convocation														
Buenos Aires	2%	11%	10%	12%	0%	0%	10%	25%	12%	8%	16%	4%	34%	7%
Florence	10%	9%	21%	21%	15%	14%	36%	30%	5%	6%	2%	0%	19%	26%
Heidelberg	17%	13%	2%	0%	8%	2%	10%	10%	16%	13%	54%	45%	2%	13%
Lausanne	9%	24%	25%	9%	24%	19%	7%	12%	29%	14%	13%	14%	19%	41%
London	12%	15%	5%	5%	2%	0%	0%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	0%	0%
Shanghai	4%	5%	0%	12%	14%	18%	7%	7%	28%	26%	15%	18%	13%	15%
Washington DC					17%	23%	33%	27%	27%	26%	17%	31%	38%	13%
12 Percent UNSATISFIED with the quality of weekly house church														
Buenos Aires	10%	8%	6%	9%	0%	0%	12%	22%	3%	3%	6%	2%	36%	13%
Florence	0%	9%	31%	42%	12%	17%	29%	22%	4%	8%	6%	0%	44%	36%
Heidelberg	4%	9%	48%	2%	2%	6%	6%	10%	12%	2%	8%	8%	20%	15%
Lausanne	4%	2%	16%	11%	8%	22%	0%	0%	1%	3%	14%	16%	8%	17%
London	5%	21%	15%	24%	2%	0%	10%	13%	14%	2%	30%	24%	7%	17%
Shanghai	13%	5%	0%	12%	0%	22%	7%	2%	3%	6%	15%	12%	25%	4%
Washington DC									-	N/A	23%	75%	N/A	N/A
13 Percent who REGULARLY were involved in a small group for spiritual support														
Buenos Aires	68%	76%	43%	71%	55%	60%	54%	54%	71%	69%	63%	76%	20%	18%
Florence	38%	41%	46%	44%	54%	42%	63%	35%	27%	14%	37%	31%	30%	24%
Heidelberg	57%	64%	37%	53%	48%	74%	59%	80%	35%	30%	62%	57%	69%	50%
Lausanne	51%	39%	47%	50%	56%	52%	52%	36%	62%	45%	40%	41%	36%	39%
London	27%	12%	22%	24%	64%	54%	46%	35%	41%	36%	17%	20%	39%	24%
Shanghai	48%	33%	50%	74%	46%	51%	86%	81%	62%	35%	67%	45%	25%	31%
Washington DC						46%	56%	33%	80%	17%	67%	75%	38%	57%
14 Percent UNSATISFIED with the spiritual leadership of the Seaver Visiting Faculty														
Buenos Aires	6%	5%	16%	-	2%	2%	9%	20%	11%	25%	10%	6%	26%	22%
Florence	5%	28%	23%	21%	4%	4%	37.00%	22%	7%	-	6%	41%	56%	29%
Heidelberg	4%	7%	50%	19%	14%	20%	35%	65%	-	8%	2%	0%	12%	52%

Lausanne	6%	4%	25%	32%	8%	14%	5%	4%	-	-	8%	23%	6%	12%
London	7%	6%	7%	12%	0%	0%	20%	13%	16%	4%	27%	31%	0%	22%
Shanghai	17%	0%	0%	0%	2%	58%	2%	5%	3%	3%	15%	6%	46%	31%
Washington DC											12%	25%	-	7%
15 Percent UNSATISFIED with the spiritual leadership of the Program Director														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	2%	5%	12%	28%	3%	16%	21%	37%	6%	9%	14%	7%	26%	33%
Florence	14%	16%	8%	23%	12%	10%	10%	22%	5%	6%	0%	0%	4%	14%
Heidelberg	2%	9%	0%	2%	4%	0%	2%	14%	5%	6%	35%	37%	20%	10%
Lausanne	29%	43%	9%	4%	16%	17%	2%	8%	3%	9%	2%	7%	8%	22%
London	12%	3%	17%	17%	2%	0%	7%	17%	14%	13%	20%	26%	2%	0%
Shanghai	0%	10%	4%	3%	12%	6%	2%	2%	3%	16%	3%	6%	4%	4%
Washington DC					0%	14%	28%	0%	-	22%	12%	6%	12%	10%
COMMUNITY														
16 Percent UNSATISFIED with the residential/student facility														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	6%	8%	6%	16%	0%	7%	4%	3%	8%	2%	2%	0%	0%	4%
Florence	5%	3%	4%	2%	7%	6%	16%	7%	-	-	2%	7%	15%	10%
Heidelberg	4%	7%	11%	2%	10%	20%	2%	6%	9%	6%	6%	2%	0%	8%
Lausanne	0%	4%	8%	8%	8%	3%	3%	4%	3%	5%	0%	2%	11%	14%
London	5%	6%	2%	7%	0%	0%	0%	2%	7%	4%	0%	15%	2%	4%
Shanghai	0%	5%	4%	6%	13%	13%	17%	7%	24%	13%	13%	24%	4%	23%
Washington DC					6%	0%	0%	7%	-	4%	6%	13%	4%	0%
17 Percent UNSATISFIED with the meals provided by the program														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	2%	5%	0%	3%	0%	3%	4%	10%	-	2%	4%	0%	10%	13%
Florence	15%	13%	13%	5%	42%	35%	24%	11%	2%	-	4%	10%	15%	29%
Heidelberg	11%	20%	17%	9%	28%	34%	12%	4%	46%	43%	79%	84%	59%	62%
Lausanne	11%	17%	36%	48%	46%	34%	20%	46%	31%	76%	34%	41%	38%	85%
London	0%	0%	12%	5%	0%	0%	5%	4%	-	2%	7%	6%	5%	0%
Shanghai	4%	19%	11%	15%	7%	6%	0%	0%	17%	3%	8%	9%	13%	8%
Washington DC					22%	15%	6%	0%	7%	13%	17%	13%	35%	7%
18 Percent UNSATISFIED with the monthly amount on their Stored Value Card (H, La, Lo, BA, S)														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	31%	29%	25%	31%	26%	16%	31%	29%	18%	15%	8%	4%	15%	18%
Florence	60%	0%	N/A	N/A	59%	56%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Heidelberg	27%	42%	13%	11%	12%	10%	14%	16%	30%	14%	25%	14%	18%	6%
Lausanne	43%	48%	23%	13%	71%	57%	80%	79%	72%	70%	25%	27%	48%	69%
London	29%	6%	37%	24%	9%	22%	7%	13%	26%	26%	15%	35%	N/A	24%
Shanghai	48%	48%	21%	18%	41%	29%	26%	12%	31%	26%	39%	27%	38%	20%
Washington DC					11%	32%	22%	7%	34%	13%	39%	19%	69%	17%
19 Percent UNSATISFIED with the Director's efforts to build a strong sense of community among students														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18

Buenos Aires	2%	3%	0%	16%	0%	3%	14%	29%	8%	8%	6%	0%	15%	31%
Florence	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	10%	5%	24%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%	2%
Heidelberg	2%	9%	2%	4%	4%	2%	4%	2%	5%	9%	43%	36%	6%	4%
Lausanne	19%	32%	22%	9%	14%	21%	2%	17%	3%	11%	0%	3%	10%	27%
London	12%	3%	20%	15%	0%	0%	0%	17%	5%	7%	25%	27%	0%	0%
Shanghai	0%	29%	7%	0%	23%	20%	2%	2%	3%	25%	13%	12%	4%	12%
Washington DC					0%	18%	33%	7%	7%	17%	17%	13%	12%	10%
20 Percent UNSATISFIED with the participation of the Malibu Faculty family in the life of the community														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	4%	11%	16%	-	2%	2%	12%	8%	14%	28%	0%	11%	8%	11%
Florence	15%	47%	17%	33%	4%	4%	14%	20%	2%	2%	4%	52%	45%	38%
Heidelberg	4%	9%	35%	13%	6%	22%	41%	63%	-	15%	6%	4%	0%	63%
Lausanne	2%	2%	17%	20%	10%	17%	8%	0%	1%	-	5%	11%	8%	20%
London	2%	3%	10%	5%	0%	0%	10%	17%	38%	2%	17%	35%	0%	4%
Shanghai	13%	0%	7%	0%	7%	60%	5%	2%	-	3%	13%	15%	33%	31%
Washington DC					0%	18%	33%	7%	7%	N/A	12%	19%	-	-
21 Percent who said discipline and enforcement of community standards were consistent and fair SOME OF THE TIME or RARELY														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	2%	11%	0%	9%	3%	3%	11%	22%	3%	15%	23%	7%	13%	24%
Florence	5%	9%	10%	36%	10%	21%	16%	17%	11%	22%	6%	14%	11%	31%
Heidelberg	0%	13%	2%	2%	14%	34%	0%	2%	7%	3%	10%	18%	6%	4%
Lausanne	6%	17%	9%	20%	6%	8%	10%	38%	-	23%	2%	10%	24%	35%
London	5%	12%	37%	20%	0%	2%	10%	17%	10%	13%	17%	50%	2%	7%
Shanghai	4%	14%	25%	26%	25%	20%	2%	7%	10%	35%	21%	21%	8%	16%
Washington DC					17%	27%	11%	0%	27%	9%	0%	50%	15%	3%
22 Percent who had a cell phone (either just wifi or data included) this semester														
	Fall '15	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18						
Buenos Aires	94%	97%	-	-	98%	98%	98%	98%						
Florence	84%	98%	-	-	98%	100%	96%	100%						
Heidelberg	80%	96%	-	-	96%	98%	96%	96%						
Lausanne	84%	100%	-	-	97%	97%	97%	97%						
London	93%	98%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%						
Shanghai	83%	100%	-	-	97%	100%	96%	100%						
Washington DC	93%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%						
23 Percent who reported having 5 or more alcoholic drinks in one sitting, at least one or more times in the last 2 weeks														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	19%	23%	39%	29%	20%	25%	32.80%	34%	17%	17%	26%	36%	23%	20%
Florence	28%	28%	20%	33%	19%	22%	14%	17%	33%	29%	30%	31%	37%	36%
Heidelberg	17%	42%	37%	40%	18%	28%	24%	20%	35%	38%	27%	39%	33%	40%
Lausanne	21%	33%	34%	33%	29%	34%	12%	42%	23%	30%	23%	44%	44%	39%
London	29%	64%	15%	44%	29%	26%	24%	48%	15%	33%	24%	23%	22%	28%
Shanghai	37%	57%	43%	23%	16%	24%	26%	28%	45%	48%	36%	15%	25%	27%
Washington DC					6%	0%	0%	0%	7%	4%	0%	0%	0%	10%

ENGAGEMENT WITH LOCAL COMMUNITY

24	Percentage of students who got to know 5 or more people outside of their program from their host city														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18	
Buenos Aires	32%	47%	51%	38%	50%	39%	61%	61%	39%	44%	67%	50%	46%	56%	
Florence	32%	41%	50%	55%	61%	63%	57%	54%	49%	63%	60%	72%	44%	43%	
Heidelberg	44%	42%	37%	36%	8%	22%	8%	22%	44%	26%	27%	20%	27%	25%	
Lausanne	29%	56%	11%	11%	20%	22%	10%	4%	13%	20%	16%	8%	23%	12%	
London	37%	36%	42%	46%	38%	35%	22%	37%	38%	36%	32%	74%	42%	35%	
Shanghai	61%	48%	54%	59%	41%	38%	33%	35%	55%	42%	51%	64%	38%	46%	
Washington DC					61%	73%	61%	67%	33%	65%	83%	88%	62%	57%	

25	Percent UNSATISFIED with opportunities offered by their program to serve or engage people in the city														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18	
Buenos Aires	13%	5%	0%	14%	14%	16%	11%	14%	5%	8%	6%	16%	17%	29%	
Florence	0%	13%	10%	5%	2%	6%	3%	4%	-	2%	4%	0%	16%	7%	
Heidelberg	4%	20%	9%	15%	8%	32%	6%	12%	12%	15%	37%	47%	12%	13%	
Lausanne	33%	33%	23%	51%	36%	31%	47%	33%	37%	58%	43%	60%	34%	53%	
London	35%	36%	34%	46%	35%	40%	49%	70%	39%	44%	45%	49%	24%	20%	
Shanghai	4%	29%	32%	12%	21%	11%	7%	14%	-	31%	18%	21%	13%	44%	
Washington DC					39%	24%	28%	14%	40%	30%	18%	19%	16%	23%	

PERSONNEL

26	Percent UNSATISFIED with the way the Program Director ran the program														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18	
Buenos Aires	0%	5%	2%	10%	0%	5%	6%	29%	5%	6%	6%	0%	12%	14%	
Florence	16%	6%	4%	7%	7%	14%	8%	15%	-	4%	0%	0%	0%	2%	
Heidelberg	4%	11%	2%	4%	2%	2%	0%	4%	9%	11%	39%	35%	20%	2%	
Lausanne	6%	28%	8%	4%	12%	20%	0%	8%	-	9%	2%	8%	9%	23%	
London	0%	3%	15%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%	-	-	8%	27%	5%	0%	
Shanghai	0%	19%	7%	0%	14%	11%	0%	2%	3%	26%	3%	3%	4%	8%	
Washington DC					0%	14%	33%	7%	-	9%	6%	6%	0%	3%	

27	Percent who AGREED that the Program Director demonstrated concern for individuals in the program														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18	
Buenos Aires	100%	97%	100%	88%	100%	94%	95%	81%	98%	97%	98%	98%	95%	96%	
Florence	100%	91%	96%	95%	93%	92%	97%	85%	100%	96%	100%	100%	96%	98%	
Heidelberg	100%	100%	100%	94%	98%	100%	96%	96%	95%	96%	100%	69%	90%	96%	
Lausanne	92%	76%	94%	96%	86%	76%	100%	100%	97%	94%	100%	92%	96%	83%	
London	100%	100%	81%	95%	100%	100%	98%	96%	100%	96%	95%	96%	98%	100%	
Shanghai	100%	91%	100%	97%	82%	80%	100%	98%	97%	81%	97%	100%	100%	92%	
Washington DC					100%	91%	78%	100%	100%	100%	94%	100%	96%	97%	

28	Percent who said the Program Director was UNAPPROACHABLE														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18	
Buenos Aires	0%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	7%	-	3%	0%	0%	2%	15%	
Florence	11%	6%	8%	3%	14%	15%	8%	15%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Heidelberg	2%	4%	4%	8%	2%	4%	4%	4%	9%	9%	19%	16%	10%	2%	
Lausanne	4%	28%	6%	6%	14%	18%	0%	4%	1%	8%	2%	3%	1%	12%	
London	0%	0%	5%	7%	0%	0%	0%	7%	-	2%	5%	7%	0%	0%	

Shanghai	0%	14%	0%	3%	7%	0%	0%	0%	7%	10%	0%	0%	3%	4%
Washington DC					0%	10%	39%	0%	-	-	6%	0%	0%	0%
29 Percent UNSATISFIED with the other program staff (Asst. Director, Program Asst., etc.)														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	0%	5%	0%	0%	2%	5%	3%	3%	11%	6%	-	0%	2%	2%
Florence	5%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	3%	0%	-	2%	-	4%	11%	13%
Heidelberg	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	0%
Lausanne	0%	6%	8%	9%	4%	7%	7%	46%	-	10%	7%	0%	4%	10%
London	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	-	-	0%	17%	0%
Shanghai	0%	0%	0%	3%	5%	6%	0%	0%	-	-	3%	9%	4%	6%
Washington DC					23%	10%	6%	0%	53%	4%	6%	0%	8%	0%
30 Percent UNSATISFIED with the preparation from the Malibu IP Office														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	4%	11%	8%	14%	17%	25%	38%	44%	23%	28%	-	-	-	18%
Florence	42%	-	21%	24%	29%	33%	30%	39%	38%	39%	-	-	-	20%
Heidelberg	16%	-	13%	17%	16%	24%	16%	16%	33%	38%	-	-	-	16%
Lausanne	37%	-	30%	28%	43%	52%	45%	63%	32%	36%	-	-	-	26%
London	5%	-	17%	24%	5%	14%	49%	50%	21%	24%	-	-	-	17%
Shanghai	35%	5%	7%	21%	16%	11%	26%	26%	55%	45%	-	-	-	18%
Washington DC					28%	23%	28%	50%	47%	39%	-	-	-	33%
31 Percent UNSATISFIED with the Language Intensive Training at the beginning of the semester?														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	9%	5%	6%	3%	16%	15%	11%	14%	2%	8%	4%	7%	7%	7%
Florence	21%	13%	40%	43%	12%	12%	14%	13%	N/A	2%	2%	0%	7%	12%
Heidelberg	4%	11%	13%	11%	6%	2%	4%	4%	N/A	7%	19%	18%	12%	10%
Lausanne	6%	13%	22%	17%	10%	14%	25%	17%	N/A	21%	25%	31%	16%	23%
London	0%	-	N/A	N/A	0%	0%	N/A	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shanghai	17%	29%	18%	21%	9%	20%	10%	5%	N/A	16%	16%	18%	8%	23%
Washington DC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32 Percent UNSATISFIED with the local Program Orientation they received when they arrived overseas														
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18
Buenos Aires	0%	8%	2%	7%	8%	6%	9%	19%	17%	8%	2%	5%	13%	11%
Florence	11%	13%	4%	7%	4%	6%	5%	4%	2%	2%	0%	4%	4%	2%
Heidelberg	2%	11%	7%	8%	4%	2%	2%	2%	35%	9%	21%	10%	6%	6%
Lausanne	0%	4%	6%	15%	8%	14%	8%	4%	6%	9%	10%	10%	17%	16%
London	0%	3%	7%	0%	0%	2%	2%	4%	5%	-	0%	2%	2%	2%
Shanghai	0%	43%	4%	3%	7%	6%	0%	0%	3%	19%	3%	9%	8%	17%
Washington DC	-	-	-	-	6%	-	0%	0%	-	9%	17%	7%	4%	0%
33 Percent UNSATISFIED with the safety information and precautions provided by your program														
	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18								
Buenos Aires	6%	9%	10%	9%	4%	9%								
Florence	2%	2%	0%	3%	0%	5%								
Heidelberg		3%	21%	8%	4%	17%								

Lausanne	7%	12%	5%	5%	0%	30%												
London	12%	11%	5%	15%	17%	2%												
Shanghai	7%	6%	3%	24%	0%	23%												
Washington DC	7%	-	17%	0%	4%	0%												
34 Percent UNSATISFIED with the the knowledge of what to do in case of an emergency																		
	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18												
Buenos Aires	17%	14%	19%	20%	7%	11%												
Florence	7%	-	6%	7%	4%	12%												
Heidelberg	2%	13%	25%	24%	6%	27%												
Lausanne	18%	22%	0%	3%	4%	30%												
London	19%	17%	17%	17%	24%	7%												
Shanghai	17%	13%	5%	9%	0%	4%												
Washington DC	7%	-	6%	0%	19%	0%												
35 Percent UNSATISFIED with the job their RA's did during the semester																		
	Fall '11	Spring '12	Fall '12	Spring '13	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Spring '15	Fall '15	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18				
Buenos Aires	4%	0%	2%	3%	3%	0%	12%	14%	2%	-	2%	0%	12%	16%				
Florence	11%	13%	4%	26%	0%	2%	49%	52%	-	-	2%	3%	18%	21%				
Heidelberg	2%	11%	2%	4%	16%	18%	2%	4%	9%	-	8%	4%	2%	2%				
Lausanne	0%	4%	13%	11%	8%	14%	0%	0%	1%	9%	2%	2%	25%	28%				
London	7%	9%	12%	17%	0%	7%	29%	15%	5%	15%	12%	4%	0%	0%				
Shanghai	26%	19%	25%	24%	5%	4%	5%	9%	20%	29%	13%	9%	4%	12%				
Washington DC	-	-	-	-	0%	14%	11%	7%	20%	17%	17%	44%	12%	10%				
36 Percentage who utilized the local health counselor for your program																		
	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18													
Buenos Aires	22%	31%	17%	18%	18%													
Florence	8%	12%	17%	27%	12%													
Heidelberg	21%	19%	16%	16%	23%													
Lausanne	23%	17%	28%	17%	17%													
London	36%	2%	13%	17%	9%													
Shanghai	2%	15%	28%	15%	19%													
Washington DC	4%	6%	19%	10%	10%													
37 Percentage who were unsatisfied with the local mental health counselor for your program																		
	Spring '16	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18													
Buenos Aires	7%	35%	21%	11%	14%													
Florence	-	2%	0%	0%	5%													
Heidelberg	-	7%	2%	3%	10%													
Lausanne	2%	4%	2%	0%	0%													
London	-	3%	6%	0%	2%													
Shanghai	-	-	6%	0%	12%													
Washington DC	5%	6%	0%	5%	3%													
38 What is the best estimate of the amount of your personal spending this semester on travel, hostels/hotels, weekend meals, etc.?																		
	Fall '13	Spring '14	Fall '14	Fall '15	Fall '16	Spring '17	Fall '17	Spring '18										
	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Median	Range	Median	Range	Median	Range	Median	Range	Median
Buenos Aires	\$700-\$3,500	\$2,000.00	\$300-\$6000	\$1,815.00	\$600-\$5000	\$2,000.00	\$500-\$5500	\$2,210.00	\$500-\$10000	\$2,000.00	\$300-\$5000	\$2,200.00	\$500-\$3000	\$1,000	\$100-\$10,000	\$2,000.00		
Florence	\$250-\$25,000	\$2,500.00	\$800-\$7000	\$3,000.00	\$600-\$4500	\$3,000.00			\$500-\$10000	\$3,000.00	\$1500-\$12000	\$5,250.00	\$300-\$6000	\$2,000	\$1500-\$10,000	\$2,000.00		

Appendix C



Pepperdine University

Global Perspective Inventory General Form Report

May 2016

Introduction

Thank you for participating in the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI). The Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University would like to express our appreciation for your support, interest, and participation in the GPI.

The GPI assesses a global and holistic view of student learning and development and the importance of the campus environment in fostering holistic student development. The GPI measures how students think, view themselves as people with cultural heritage, and relate to others from other cultures, backgrounds and values. Your involvement, along with the involvement of other institutions, allows us to not only provide data for institutional improvement, but also continue exploration into interventions and strategies that will inform a national conversation on ways to strengthen global learning. The data in this report allow your campus to make empirically informed decisions and improve your students' learning; the research emerging from this project informs good practice for the development of a global perspective for students.

Along with this report, your institution receives a student dataset that can be used to contribute to understanding how experiences vary within and across groups, analyzing assets and gaps in curricular and co-curricular offerings, confirming or challenging existing beliefs about the student experience, making decisions about resources and future areas of work, and enhancing the educational experience of students.

Again, we thank you for your participation in this study and we encourage your future involvement with the GPI. If you have any questions, please contact the RISE office at (515) 294-6234 or email (gpi@iastate.edu).

Sincerely,

Robert D. Reason
Professor of Education
Iowa State University

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	ii
Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Respondent Characteristics (cont.).....	5
Global Perspective Inventory Scales	6
Table 1: Cognitive Knowing.....	8
Table 2: Cognitive Knowledge	9
Table 3: Intrapersonal Affect.....	10
Table 4: Intrapersonal Identity	10
Table 5: Interpersonal Social Responsibility.....	11
Table 6: Interpersonal Social Interaction.....	11
Table 7: Other Items Not Corresponding to a Scale.....	12
General Form Questions.....	13
Table 8: College Course Enrollment	14
Table 9: Faculty Interactions Outside of Class.....	15
Table 10: Faculty Fostering Multiple Perspectives	15
Table 11: Participation in planned events in college	16
Table 12: Student Initiated Involvement.....	17
Table 13: Community Scale.....	18

Respondent Characteristics

	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Gender		
Male	113	31%
Female	246	68%
Transgender/Gender Nonconforming	1	<1%
Rather Not Say	3	1%
Total	363	100%
Class Year		
First Year	341	94%
Sophomore	16	4%
Junior	6	2%
Senior	-	-
Graduate Student	-	-
Total	363	100%
Race		
American Indian	2	1%
Asian American/Asian	52	14%
African-American/Black	23	6%
Hispanic/Latino	26	7%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	<1%
White/Caucasian	219	60%
Multiracial	40	11%
Total	363	100%
American/International Student		
American student at an American college/university	334	92%
Non-American student at an American college/university	29	8%
Other	-	-
Total	363	100%

Respondent Characteristics (cont.)

	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Parental Education		
Less than high school	7	2%
High school graduate	36	10%
Some college	18	5%
Associate's degree	6	2%
Bachelor's degree	130	36%
Some graduate school	12	3%
Graduate degree (Master's, Doctorate, MD, JD, etc)	151	41%
Do not know	4	1%
Total	364	100%
Major Category		
Agriculture and Natural Resources	-	-
Art and Humanities	25	7%
Business	99	27%
Communications or Journalism	59	16%
Education or Social Work	8	2%
Engineering	1	<1%
Health and Medical Professions	32	9%
Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, or Mathematics	27	7%
Social Science	55	15%
Other Field	57	16%
Total	363	100%
Did you begin college at this institution?		
Yes	344	95%
No	20	5%
Total	364	100%
Prior to this term, how many quarters or semesters have you studied abroad?		
None	319	89%
A short term experience (summer/winter term)	17	5%
One	8	2%
Two	6	2%
More than two	9	3%
Total	359	100%
Have you ever participated in a living-learning community?		
No	301	84%
Yes	57	16%
Total	358	100%

GPI Scales

The GPI measures global learning across three dimensions: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal.

Cognitive Dimension. One's knowledge and understanding of what is true and important to know. From a global perspective taking viewpoint, it includes viewing knowledge and knowing with greater complexity and taking into account multiple cultural perspectives. Reliance on external authorities to have absolute truth gives way to commitment in relativism when making commitments within the context of uncertainty.

- **Knowing Scale.** Degree of complexity of one's views of the importance of cultural context in judging what is important to know and value.
- **Knowledge Scale.** Degree of understanding and awareness of various cultures and their impact on our global society and level of proficiency in more than one language.

Intrapersonal Dimension. Intrapersonal development focuses on one becoming more aware of and integrating one's personal values and self-identity into one's personhood. From a global perspective taking viewpoint, it reflects one's sense of self-direction and purpose in one's life, becoming more self-aware of one's strengths, values, and personal characteristics and sense of self, and viewing one's development in terms of one's self-identity. It incorporates different and often conflicting ideas about who one is living in an increasingly multicultural world.

- **Identity Scale.** Level of awareness of one's unique identity and degree of acceptance of one's ethnic, racial, and gender dimensions of one's identity.
- **Affect Scale.** Level of respect for and acceptance of cultural perspectives different from one's own and degree of emotional confidence when living in complex situations, which reflects an "emotional intelligence" that is important in one's processing encounters with other cultures.

Interpersonal Dimension. Interpersonal development focuses on one willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others. From a global perspective taking viewpoint, it includes being able to view others differently and relating to others in terms of moving from dependency to independence to interdependence, which is considered the most mature perspective in effectively living in a global society.

- **Social Responsibility Scale.** Level of interdependence and social concern for others.
- **Social Interaction Scale.** Degree of engagement with others who are different from oneself and degree of cultural sensitivity in living in pluralistic settings.

National Norms. For the purposes of this report, all national norms are calculated using data collected since 2013.

Table 1: Cognitive Knowing

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
Cognitive Knowing Scale							3.47	3.51
When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach. (R)	362 100%	16 4%	56 15%	170 47%	67 19%	53 15%	2.77	3.02
Some people have culture and others do not. (R)	362 100%	113 31%	124 34%	64 18%	41 11%	20 6%	3.74	3.63
In different settings what is right and what is wrong is simple to determine (R)	362 100%	13 4%	95 26%	110 30%	111 31%	33 9%	2.85	2.85
I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	362 100%	- -	5 1%	37 10%	198 55%	122 34%	4.21	4.15
I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	356 100%	- -	5 1%	62 17%	195 55%	94 26%	4.06	3.95
I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world (R)	361 100%	36 10%	113 31%	130 36%	59 16%	23 6%	3.22	3.43
I rarely question what I have been taught and the world around me (R)	363 100%	61 17%	134 37%	97 27%	51 14%	20 6%	3.45	3.51

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 2: Cognitive Knowledge

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
Cognitive Knowledge Scale							3.82	3.71
I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	360 100%	8 2%	32 9%	72 20%	174 48%	74 21%	3.76	3.58
I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	359 100%	3 1%	28 8%	89 25%	184 51%	55 15%	3.72	3.65
I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	362 100%	4 1%	16 4%	72 20%	188 52%	82 23%	3.91	3.82
I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	361 100%	- -	19 5%	108 30%	174 48%	60 17%	3.76	3.69
I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	359 100%	2 1%	14 4%	83 23%	164 46%	96 27%	3.94	3.83

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 3: Intrapersonal Affect

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
Intrapersonal Affect Scale							4.22	4.11
I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	360 100%	- -	4 1%	55 15%	189 52%	112 31%	4.14	4.14
I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	359 100%	1 *	16 4%	51 14%	183 51%	108 30%	4.06	3.99
I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions	361 100%	- -	5 1%	25 7%	154 43%	177 49%	4.39	4.35
I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences	363 100%	- -	- -	34 9%	137 38%	192 53%	4.44	4.31
I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	363 100%	1 *	7 2%	66 18%	185 51%	104 29%	4.06	4.14

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 4: Intrapersonal Identity

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
Intrapersonal Identity Scale							4.18	4.18
I have a definite purpose in my life.	362 100%	2 1%	13 4%	49 14%	139 38%	159 44%	4.22	4.15
I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	361 100%	- -	3 1%	22 6%	185 51%	151 42%	4.34	4.23
I know who I am as a person.	359 100%	1 *	9 3%	49 14%	181 50%	119 33%	4.14	4.23
I am willing to defend my views when they differ from others.	360 100%	- -	5 1%	63 18%	195 54%	97 27%	4.07	4.04
I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	359 100%	- -	6 2%	61 17%	179 50%	113 31%	4.11	4.01
I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	358 100%	- -	7 2%	56 16%	160 45%	135 38%	4.18	3.98

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 5: Interpersonal Social Responsibility

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
Interpersonal Social Responsibility Scale							3.84	3.69
I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	360 100%	- -	4 1%	55 15%	189 52%	112 31%	3.82	3.82
I work for the rights of others.	359 100%	1 *	16 4%	51 14%	183 51%	108 30%	3.84	3.68
I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.	361 100%	- -	5 1%	25 7%	154 43%	177 49%	3.94	3.50
I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	363 100%	- -	- -	34 9%	137 38%	192 53%	3.93	3.94
Volunteering is not an important priority in my life. (R)	363 100%	1 *	7 2%	66 18%	185 51%	104 29%	3.69	3.51

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 6: Interpersonal Social Interaction

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
Interpersonal Social Interaction Scale							3.63	3.34
Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background. (R)	361 100%	20 6%	92 25%	78 22%	130 36%	41 11%	2.78	2.57
I frequently interact with people from a race/ethnic group different from my own.	361 100%	5 1%	7 2%	48 13%	151 42%	150 42%	4.20	3.72
I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	362 100%	2 1%	15 4%	127 35%	133 37%	85 23%	3.78	3.54
I frequently interact with people from a country different from my own.	362 100%	5 1%	35 10%	100 28%	123 34%	99 27%	3.76	3.53

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 7: Items Not Corresponding to a Scale

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
I feel threatened around people from backgrounds different from my own. (R)	359 100%	106 30%	182 51%	45 13%	20 6%	6 2%	4.01	4.00
I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	361 100%	4 1%	26 7%	86 24%	160 44%	85 24%	3.82	3.59
I see myself as a global citizen.	362 100%	- -	14 4%	88 24%	146 40%	114 31%	3.99	3.83

(R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 8: College Course Enrollment

Since coming to college, how many courses have you taken in the area listed below?

	Valid Responses	0	1	2	3	4	5+
Multicultural course addressing issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, or sexual orientation.	356 100%	138 39%	118 33%	67 19%	15 4%	10 3%	8 2%
Foreign language course	355 100%	74 21%	216 61%	31 9%	15 4%	11 3%	8 2%
World history course	354 100%	94 27%	198 56%	38 11%	11 3%	6 2%	7 2%
Service learning course	349 100%	231 66%	79 23%	30 9%	5 1%	2 1%	2 1%
Course focused on significant global/international issues and problems.	354 100%	189 53%	110 31%	33 9%	15 4%	5 1%	2 1%
Course that included opportunities for intensive dialogue among students from different backgrounds and beliefs.	357 100%	120 34%	138 39%	67 19%	15 4%	10 3%	7 2%

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 9: Faculty Interactions Outside of Class

Since coming to college, how often have you experienced the following with your faculty?

	Valid Responses	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Mean	National Norm
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	357 100%	57 16%	88 25%	127 36%	66 18%	19 5%	1.73	1.94
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	357 100%	44 12%	73 20%	151 42%	71 20%	18 5%	1.85	2.09

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 10: Faculty Fostering Multiple Perspectives

Since coming to college, how often have you experienced the following with your faculty?

	Valid Responses	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Mean	National Norm
The faculty challenge students' views and perspectives on a topic during class	357 100%	27 8%	50 14%	148 41%	102 29%	30 8%	2.16	2.29
The faculty presented issues and problems in class from different cultural perspectives	356 100%	24 7%	54 15%	151 42%	96 27%	31 9%	2.16	2.23

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 11: Participation in planned events in college

Since coming to college, how often have you participated in the following?

	Valid Responses	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Mean	National Norm
Events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting your own cultural heritage	356 100%	106 30%	69 19%	104 29%	63 18%	14 4%	1.47	1.67
Events or activities sponsored by groups reflecting a cultural heritage different from your own	357 100%	50 14%	90 25%	146 41%	62 17%	9 3%	1.69	1.56
Religious or Spiritual Activities	357 100%	8 2%	29 8%	82 23%	120 34%	118 33%	2.87	1.54
Leadership programs that stress collaboration and team work	357 100%	52 15%	77 22%	116 32%	72 20%	40 11%	1.92	2.14
Community service activities unrelated to a course	357 100%	39 11%	74 21%	134 38%	68 19%	42 12%	2.00	2.12
Attended a lecture, workshop, or campus discussion on international or global issues	356 100%	58 16%	83 23%	153 43%	41 12%	21 6%	1.67	1.71

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 12: Student Initiated Involvement

Since coming to college, how often have you participated in the following?

	Valid Responses	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Mean	National Norm
Read a newspaper or news magazine (online or in print)	356 100%	42 12%	84 24%	113 32%	64 18%	53 15%	2.01	2.44
Watched news programs on television	355 100%	61 17%	111 31%	100 28%	52 15%	31 9%	1.66	2.27
Followed an international event/crisis (through a newspaper, social media, or other media sources)	355 100%	22 6%	70 20%	120 34%	83 23%	60 17%	2.25	2.43
Discussed current events with other students	353 100%	15 4%	40 11%	127 36%	103 29%	68 19%	2.48	2.49

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Table 13: Community Scale

Please rate your level of agreement with each statement.

	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	National Norm
I have a strong sense of affiliation with my college/university.	357 100%	6 2%	17 5%	58 16%	177 50%	99 28%	3.97	3.77
I feel that my college/university community honors diversity and internationalism.	357 100%	7 2%	26 7%	69 19%	166 46%	89 25%	3.85	4.00
I understand the mission of my college/university.	357 100%	3 1%	11 3%	38 11%	175 49%	130 36%	4.17	3.99
I am both challenged and supported at my college/university.	356 100%	2 1%	6 2%	45 13%	176 49%	127 36%	4.18	4.05
I have been encouraged to develop my strengths and at my college/university.	357 100%	3 1%	5 1%	50 14%	166 46%	133 37%	4.18	4.10
I feel I am part of a close and supportive community of colleagues and friends.	356 100%	9 3%	9 3%	56 16%	146 41%	136 38%	4.10	4.01

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

The Global Perspective Inventory was originally housed at The Global Perspective Institute Inc., which was established in 2008 to study and promote global holistic human development among college students. The Global Perspective Inventory was hosted by Central College in Pella, IA under the direction of Larry Braskamp until 2015 when Iowa State began hosting the GPI.



Pepperdine University

Global Perspective Inventory Study Abroad Form Report

March 2017

Introduction

Thank you for participating in the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI). The Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University would like to express our appreciation for your support, interest, and participation in the GPI.

The GPI assesses a global and holistic view of student learning and development and the importance of the campus environment in fostering holistic student development. The GPI measures how students think; view themselves as people with cultural heritage; and relate to others from other cultures, backgrounds, and values. Your involvement, along with the involvement of other institutions, allows us to not only provide data for institutional improvement, but also continue exploration into interventions and strategies that will inform a national conversation on ways to strengthen global learning. The data in this report allow your campus to make empirically-informed decisions and improve your students' learning; the research emerging from this project informs good practice for the development of a global perspective for students.

Along with this report, your institution receives a student dataset that can be used to contribute to understanding how experiences vary within and across groups, analyzing assets and gaps in curricular and co-curricular offerings, confirming or challenging existing beliefs about student experience, making decisions about resources and future areas of work, and enhancing the educational experience of students.

Again, we thank you for your participation in this study, and we encourage your future involvement with the GPI. If you have any questions, please contact the RISE office at (515) 294-6234 or email (gpi@iastate.edu).

Sincerely,

Robert D. Reason
Professor of Education
Iowa State University

Table of Contents

Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Respondent Characteristics (cont.).....	5
Global Perspective Inventory Scales.....	6
Table 1: Cognitive Knowing.....	8
Table 2: Cognitive Knowledge.....	9
Table 3: Intrapersonal Affect.....	10
Table 4: Intrapersonal Identity.....	11
Table 5: Interpersonal Social Responsibility.....	12
Table 6: Interpersonal Social Interaction.....	13
Table 7: Items Not Corresponding to a Scale.....	14
Study Abroad Form Questions.....	15
Table 8: Intercultural Wonderment.....	16
Table 9: Study Abroad Experiences.....	17
Table 10: Faculty and Staff Influences.....	18
Table 11: Global Competence and Workplace Skills.....	19
Table 12: Items Not Corresponding to a Scale.....	20

Respondent Characteristics

	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	27	22
Female	95	78
Transgender/Gender nonconforming	0	0
Rather Not Say	0	0
Total	122	
Class Year		
First Year	0	0
Sophomore	28	23
Junior	38	31
Senior	54	44
Graduate Student	2	2
Total	122	
Race		
American Indian	0	0
Asian American/Asian	10	8
African-American/Black	4	3
Hispanic/Latino	17	14
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	1
White/Caucasian	72	60
Multiracial	17	14
Total	121	
American/International Student		
American student at an American college/university	115	94
Non-American student at an American college/university	7	6
Other	0	0
Total	122	

Respondent Characteristics (cont.)

	N	Percent
Parental Education		
Less than high school	0	0
High school graduate	7	6
Some college	9	7
Associate's degree	12	10
Bachelor's degree	39	32
Some graduate school	5	4
Graduate degree (Master's, Doctorate, MD, JD, etc)	50	41
Do not know	0	0
Total	122	
Major Category		
Agriculture and Natural Resources	0	0
Art and Humanities	19	16
Business	12	10
Communications or Journalism	21	17
Education or Social Work	3	2
Engineering	1	1
Health and Medical Professions	11	9
Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, or Mathematics	11	9
Social Science	30	25
Other Field	14	11
Total	122	
Did you begin college at this institution?		
Yes	106	87
No	16	13
Total	122	
Prior to this term, how many quarters or semesters have you studied abroad?		
None	14	11
A short term experience (summer/winter term)	52	43
One	6	5
Two	11	9
More than two	39	32
Total	122	
Have you ever participated in a living-learning community?		
No	84	69
Yes	37	31
Total	121	

GPI Scales

The GPI measures global learning across three dimensions: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal.

Cognitive Dimension. One's knowledge and understanding of what is true and important to know. From a global perspective taking viewpoint, it includes viewing knowledge and knowing with greater complexity and taking into account multiple cultural perspectives. Reliance on external authorities to have absolute truth gives way to commitment in relativism when making commitments within the context of uncertainty.

- **Knowing Scale.** Degree of complexity of one's views of the importance of cultural context in judging what is important to know and value.
- **Knowledge Scale.** Degree of understanding and awareness of various cultures and their impact on our global society and level of proficiency in more than one language.

Intrapersonal Dimension. Intrapersonal development focuses on one becoming more aware of and integrating one's personal values and self-identity into one's personhood. From a global perspective taking viewpoint, it reflects one's sense of self-direction and purpose in one's life, becoming more self-aware of one's strengths, values, and personal characteristics and sense of self, and viewing one's development in terms of one's self-identity. It incorporates different and often conflicting ideas about who one is living in an increasingly multicultural world.

- **Identity Scale.** Level of awareness of one's unique identity and degree of acceptance of one's ethnic, racial, and gender dimensions of one's identity.
- **Affect Scale.** Level of respect for and acceptance of cultural perspectives different from one's own and degree of emotional confidence when living in complex situations, which reflects an 'emotional intelligence' that is important in one's processing encounters with other cultures.

Interpersonal Dimension. Interpersonal development focuses on one willingness to interact with persons with different social norms and cultural backgrounds, acceptance of others, and being comfortable when relating to others. From a global perspective taking viewpoint, it includes being able to view others differently and relating to others in terms of moving from dependency to independence to interdependence, which is considered the most mature perspective in effectively living in a global society.

- **Social Responsibility Scale.** Level of interdependence and social concern for others.
- **Social Interaction Scale.** Degree of engagement with others who are different from oneself and degree of cultural sensitivity in living in pluralistic settings.

National Norms. For the purposes of this report, all national norms are calculated using data collected from the GPI New Student form since 2015 (n = 919).

Table 3: Intrapersonal Affect

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Intrapersonal Affect Scale</i>							4.31	0.49	4.19	0.55
I am sensitive to those who are discriminated against.	120	0 0%	0 0%	13 11%	49 41%	58 0%	4.38	0.67	4.11	0.81
I do not feel threatened emotionally when presented with multiple perspectives.	120	1 1%	1 1%	16 13%	66 55%	36 30%	4.13	0.73	4.08	0.80
I am accepting of people with different religious and spiritual traditions.	120	0 0%	1 1%	5 4%	56 47%	58 48%	4.43	0.62	4.40	0.68
I enjoy when my friends from other cultures teach me about our cultural differences.	120	0 0%	0 0%	4 3%	52 43%	64 53%	4.50	0.57	4.28	0.73
I am open to people who strive to live lives very different from my own life style.	120	0 0%	3 2%	14 12%	67 56%	36 30%	4.13	0.71	4.10	0.71

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective. Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 1: Cognitive Knowing

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Cognitive Knowing Scale</i>							3.75	0.55	3.54	0.61
When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach. (R)	121	9 7%	33 27%	48 40%	13 11%	18 15%	3.02	1.13	2.96	1.04
Some people have culture and others do not.	121	57 47%	41 34%	11 9%	5 4%	7 6%	4.12	1.11	3.76	1.18
In different setting what is right and wrong is simple to determine. (R)	121	8 7%	48 40%	34 28%	24 20%	7 6%	3.21	1.03	2.94	1.12
I take into account different perspectives before drawing conclusions about the world around me.	119	0 0%	0 0%	8 7%	64 54%	47 39%	4.33	0.60	4.19	0.71
I consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems.	119	0 0%	1 1%	15 13%	69 58%	34 29%	4.14	0.65	4.03	0.71
I rely primarily on authorities to determine what is true in the world. (R)	119	16 13%	55 46%	29 24%	16 13%	3 3%	3.55	0.97	3.43	1.05
I rarely question what I have been taught about the world around me. (R)	120	28 23%	66 55%	14 12%	8 7%	4 3%	3.88	0.95	3.49	1.11

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective. Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 2: Cognitive Knowledge

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Cognitive Knowledge Scale</i>							3.95	0.59	3.85	0.57
I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.	120	0 0%	7 6%	27 22%	59 49%	27 22%	3.88	0.82	3.78	0.82
I understand the reasons and causes of conflict among nations of different cultures.	120	0 0%	7 6%	29 24%	65 54%	19 16%	3.80	0.77	3.77	0.81
I understand how various cultures of this world interact socially.	119	0 0%	3 3%	23 19%	59 50%	34 29%	4.04	0.76	3.91	0.74
I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.	119	0 0%	6 5%	21 18%	69 58%	23 19%	3.92	0.75	3.82	0.71
I can discuss cultural differences from an informed perspective.	119	0 0%	4 3%	15 13%	66 55%	34 29%	4.09	0.74	3.97	0.75

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective. Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 4: Intrapersonal Identity

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Intrapersonal Identity Scale</i>							4.16	0.54	4.11	0.52
I have a definite purpose in my life.	121	0 0%	5 4%	23 19%	43 36%	50 41%	4.14	0.87	4.13	0.89
I can explain my personal values to people who are different from me.	121	0 0%	1 1%	7 6%	66 55%	47 39%	4.31	0.62	4.30	0.65
I know who I am as a person.	121	0 0%	2 2%	19 16%	61 50%	39 32%	4.13	0.73	4.15	0.78
I am willing to defend my own views when they differ from others.	121	0 0%	4 3%	17 14%	70 58%	30 25%	4.04	0.72	4.00	0.73
I put my beliefs into action by standing up for my principles.	119	0 0%	1 1%	23 19%	62 52%	33 28%	4.07	0.71	4.02	0.70
I am developing a meaningful philosophy of life.	120	0 0%	2 2%	14 12%	57 48%	47 39%	4.24	0.72	4.07	0.74

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective. Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 5: Interpersonal Social Responsibility

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Interpersonal Social Responsibility Scale</i>							3.90	0.52	3.78	0.57
I think of my life in terms of giving back to society.	120	1 1%	5 4%	29 24%	56 47%	29 24%	3.89	0.85	3.80	0.88
I work for the rights of others.	119	1 1%	1 1%	27 23%	61 51%	29 24%	3.97	0.76	3.71	0.78
I put the needs of others about my own personal wants.	120	0 0%	3 2%	33 28%	60 50%	24 20%	3.88	0.75	3.88	0.79
I consciously behave in terms of making a difference.	120	0 0%	2 2%	24 20%	71 59%	23 19%	3.96	0.68	3.86	0.76
Volunteering is not an important priority in my life. (R)	120	25 21%	60 50%	22 18%	10 8%	3 2%	3.78	0.95	3.66	1.06

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective. Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 6: Interpersonal Social Interaction

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Interpersonal Social Interaction Scale</i>							3.67	0.68	3.48	0.66
Most of my friends are from my own ethnic background. (R)	121	10 8%	30 25%	18 15%	51 42%	12 10%	2.79	1.17	2.67	1.03
I frequently interact with people from a race/ethnic group different from my own.	120	0 0%	5 4%	8 7%	66 55%	41 34%	4.19	0.74	4.04	0.84
I intentionally involve people from many cultural backgrounds in my life.	120	1 1%	11 9%	22 18%	53 44%	33 28%	3.88	0.95	3.66	0.89
I frequently interact with people from a country different from my own.	119	0 0%	15 13%	28 24%	45 38%	31 26%	3.77	0.98	3.57	0.97

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective.
Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 7: Items Not Corresponding to a Scale

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
I feel threatened around people from backgrounds different from my own. (R)	121	34 28%	65 54%	14 12%	4 3%	4 3%	4.00	0.91	4.08	0.94
I often get out of my comfort zone to better understand myself.	121	0 0%	7 6%	21 17%	57 47%	36 30%	4.01	0.84	3.69	0.91
I see myself as a global citizen.	119	0 0%	1 1%	20 17%	47 39%	51 43%	4.24	0.76	3.96	0.83

Note: (R): Frequencies are reported as the question is asked. Item and scale means were calculated after reverse scoring. A higher mean indicates a more global perspective. Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 8: Intercultural Wonderment

	N	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
<i>Intercultural Wonderment Scale</i>							3.14	3.14	2.65	1.19
How often did you interact with individuals from the host country outside of the classroom?	120	2 2%	3 2%	30 25%	32 27%	53 44%	3.09	0.97	2.54	1.32
How often did you feel immersed in the culture of the host country?	119	0 0%	7 6%	21 18%	33 28%	58 49%	3.19	0.93	2.73	1.31
How often did you intentionally push yourself out of your comfort zone?	120	0 0%	3 2%	23 19%	44 37%	50 42%	3.18	0.83	2.68	1.28
How often did you explore new habits and behaviors on your own while studying abroad?	119	0 0%	4 3%	25 21%	45 38%	45 38%	3.10	0.85	2.67	1.27

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 9: Study Abroad Experiences

	N	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
How often did you speak in the host country's language in non-language courses?	120	17 14%	25 21%	21 18%	20 17%	37 31%	2.29	1.45	2.25	1.64
How often did you speak in the host country's language outside of the classroom?	120	5 4%	12 10%	25 21%	31 26%	47 39%	2.86	1.17	2.48	1.54
How often did you reflect upon your experiences abroad through writing or journaling as part of a course requirement?	119	21 18%	15 13%	27 23%	28 24%	28 24%	2.23	1.40	2.11	1.48
How often have you shared or discussed with others your experiences abroad?	120	0 0%	0 0%	15 12%	39 32%	66 55%	3.43	0.71	2.93	1.33

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 10: Faculty and Staff Influences

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
I developed a strong relationship with one or more of my faculty while studying abroad.	120	3 2%	9 8%	22 18%	39 32%	47 39%	3.98	1.05	3.56	1.20
The onsite staff abroad took a genuine interest in my development as a person.	118	2 2%	5 4%	12 10%	41 35%	58 49%	4.25	0.93	3.63	1.12
My interactions with the faculty shaped the way I understand the host culture.	117	2 2%	10 9%	18 15%	50 43%	37 32%	3.94	0.99	3.60	1.15
My study abroad instructors challenged me and provided the support I needed for effective learning.	118	3 3%	2 2%	26 22%	49 42%	38 32%	3.99	0.92	3.76	1.11

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 11: Global Competence and Workplace Skills

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
The hands-on experiences in my study abroad classes helped me learn more effectively.	118	0 0%	6 5%	18 15%	52 44%	42 36%	4.10	0.84	3.84	1.10
My study abroad experience taught me what it means to be a globally competent person.	118	0 0%	8 7%	11 9%	49 42%	50 42%	4.19	0.87	3.96	1.09
I have a better understanding of what skills and competencies are required in the global workplace.	118	3 3%	10 8%	21 18%	48 41%	36 31%	3.88	1.02	3.88	1.06
My study abroad experience helped me develop communication skills that will benefit me in the workplace in the future.	118	1 1%	4 3%	15 13%	48 41%	50 42%	4.20	0.85	3.97	1.09
As a result of my study abroad experience, I plan to get involved in professional and/or personal activities related to global issues.	118	1 1%	16 14%	35 30%	28 24%	38 32%	3.73	1.08	3.65	1.13

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

Table 12: Items Not Corresponding to a Scale

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Mean	National Standard Deviation
My study abroad experience 'changed my life.'	118	1 1%	4 3%	20 17%	42 36%	51 43%	4.17	0.89	3.99	1.15
My pre-departure orientation was very useful in preparing me to fit into the host culture.	118	7 6%	16 14%	43 36%	36 31%	16 14%	3.32	1.06	3.34	1.20

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

The Global Perspective Inventory was originally housed at The Global Perspective Institute, Inc., which was established in 2008 to study and promote global holistic human development among college students. The Global Perspective Inventory was hosted by Central College in Pella, IA under the direction of Larry Braskamp until 2015 when Iowa State began hosting the GPI.

Appendix D

International Experience Essays Questions and Rubrics for PLOS 1-8

Intellectual

- 1) Name and briefly describe the major historical events that have shaped this country.
- 2) Briefly describe the major social issues this country is now facing.

Social

- 3) Based on your experience, describe the major cultural differences between Americans and the people of this country. What cultural differences, if any, do you appreciate and why?
- 4) How many people in your host city have you really made an effort to get to know? What have you learned from them? To what extent have your language limitations affected your interactions with people in your host country?

Personal

- 5) Describe the areas of your self-identity where you have grown the most.
- 6) Describe difficult decisions and choices that you made this year. Are you satisfied with those decisions/choices? Why or why not?

Spiritual

- 7) In what ways has your religious faith developed this year?
- 8) Describe specific ways you have given yourself to the needs of others this year?

PLO #1	4	3	2	1
<i>Knowledge of Historical Events</i>	States comprehensive list of significant or major historical events	States a few examples of significant or major historical events	States one example of a significant or major historical event	States no examples of significant or major historical events, only insignificant events
<i>Understanding Historical Events</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of historical events and why they are significant.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of historical events and why they are significant.	Demonstrates partial understanding of historical events and why they are significant.	Demonstrates surface level understanding of historical events (primarily lists them).
<i>Perspective: US-centric vs global</i>	Evaluates and explains the value of global perspectives to historical events	Applies other perspectives when describing events	Identifies multiple perspectives of events	Describes events while maintaining a value preference for their own/US positioning

PLO #2	4	3	2	1
<i>Knowledge of Current Social Issues</i>	States a comprehensive list of current social issues	States a few examples of current social issues	States one example of a current social issue	States no examples of current social issues
<i>Understanding Social Issues</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the historical and contemporary roles of social issues.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the historical and contemporary roles of social issues.	Demonstrates limited understanding of the historical and contemporary roles of social issues.	Demonstrates surface level understanding of social issues (primarily lists them)
<i>Perspective: US-centric vs global</i>	Evaluates and explains the value of global perspectives to social issues	Applies other perspectives when describing social issues	Identifies multiple perspectives of social issues	Describes issues while maintaining a value preference for their own view (USA) positioning

PLO #3	4	3	2	1
<i>Description of Cultural Differences</i>	States comprehensive list of major cultural differences	States a few examples of major cultural differences	States one example of a major cultural difference	States no examples of major cultural differences
<i>Understanding/Appreciation of Cultural Differences</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of cultural differences and a deep appreciation for diversity	Demonstrates adequate understanding of cultural differences and thoughtful appreciation of them	Demonstrates partial understanding of cultural differences and minimal appreciation of them	Demonstrates surface level understanding of differences in culture
<i>Perspective: US-centric vs global</i>	Evaluates and explains the value of global perspectives to differences	Applies other perspectives when describing differences	Identifies multiple perspectives of differences	Describes differences while maintaining a value preference for their own/US positioning

PLO #4	4	3	2	1
<i>Effort in getting to know people in host country</i>	States a comprehensive list of efforts made to know people in host country	States a few examples of efforts made to know people in host country	States one example of an effort made to know people in host country	States no examples of efforts made to know people in host country
<i>Describing what they've learned from people in host country</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated appreciation of differences with intentions to apply them	Applies what they've learned from the people in their host country and applies it to their worldview	Describes example of something they've learned in a thoughtful way	Describes surface level example of something they've learned from natives
<i>Ability to overcome language limitations</i>	States that they were able to fully overcome language limitations to achieve fluency	States that they were able to overcome language limitations to be conversational	States that they were able to minimally overcome language limitations, but mostly struggled to communicate	States that they were not able to overcome language limitations at all

PLO #5	4	3	2	1
<i>Area(s) of Growth</i>	Student reflects deeply on area(s) of self-growth; clearly identifies changes in identity and can identify reasons for change, citing specific events or concepts as examples	Student reflects at a more surface level on area(s) of self-growth; can identify changes in identity and can identify reasons for change, citing specific events or concepts as examples	Student describes area of growth by using examples of past, present, and future	Student identifies an area of self-identity where there has been growth
<i>Connection to Purpose/Vocation</i>	Student discusses in detail how growth has impacted their career goals or vocational purpose with greater depth and clarity	Student discusses in detail how growth has impacted their career goals or vocational purpose	Student articulates a connection between personal growth and future career path or vocational purpose	Student mentions some connection between IP experience and future self
<i>Cultural Self-Awareness</i>	Student articulates growth and incorporates multicultural viewpoints into their response; thinks critically about issues that affected them and the world around them from an unbiased perspective	Student explains how cultural differences have an effect on their growth, and recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases	Student states that cultural immersion has an effect on their growth and shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases	Student mentions that being abroad has an impact on change

PLO #6	4	3	2	1
<i>Describes ethical dilemma</i>	Describes situation, reflects deeply on why it was difficult by evaluating personal morals and growth.	Describes situation and reflects on why it was difficult by evaluating personal morals and values.	Describes a situation and explains superficially why decision or dilemma was difficult.	Identifies a situation but does not explain why decision or dilemma was difficult.
<i>Impact on personal growth</i>	Deeply reflects on growth, and mentions effect on their morals, values, and future self.	Explains growth, describes why or how, and mentions changes in their personal morals or values.	Explains that growth occurred and briefly describes why or how.	Mentions that growth occurred from situation but does not explain why or how.
<i>Cultural Self-Awareness</i>	Student articulates growth and incorporates multicultural viewpoints into their response; thinks critically about issues that affected them and the world around them from an unbiased perspective	Student explains how cultural differences have an effect on their growth, and recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases	Student states that cultural immersion has an effect on their growth and shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases	Student mentions that being abroad has an impact on change

PLO #7	4	3	2	1
<i>Area(s) of Growth</i>	Student identifies multiple ways that their faith has developed, and provides deep and thoughtful explanations.	Student identifies one or more ways they have developed their faith and provides a brief explanation.	Student identifies one or two areas that their religious faith has developed but does not explain the impact.	Student identifies no areas of spiritual growth
<i>Connection to Purpose/Vocation</i>	Student discusses in detail how growth has impacted their career goals or vocational purpose with greater depth and clarity	Student discusses in detail how growth has impacted their career goals or vocational purpose	Student articulates a connection between personal growth and future career path or vocational purpose	Student mentions some connection between IP experience and future self
<i>Cultural Self-Awareness</i>	Student articulates growth and incorporates multicultural viewpoints; thinks critically about issues that affected from an unbiased perspective; sees self in a future role to affect change	Student explains how cultural differences have an effect on their growth, and recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases	Student states that cultural immersion has an effect on their growth and shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases	Student mentions that being abroad has an impact on worldview but doesn't explain why or how

PLO #8	4	3	2	1
<i>Describes ethical dilemma</i>	Describes situation and reflects on why it was difficult by evaluating personal morals and values	Describes a situation and explains superficially why decision or dilemma was difficult	Identifies a situation but does not explain why decision or dilemma was difficult	Can not articulate an ethical dilemma
<i>Impact on personal growth</i>	Deeply reflects on growth, and fully explains effect on their morals, values, and future self	Explains growth, describes why or how, and mentions changes in their personal morals or values	Explains that growth occurred and briefly describes why or how	Mentions that growth occurred from situation but does not explain why or how
<i>Cultural Self-Awareness</i>	Student articulates growth and incorporates multicultural viewpoints into their response; thinks critically about issues that affected them and the world around them from an unbiased perspective	Student explains how cultural differences have an effect on their growth, and recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases	Student states that cultural immersion has an effect on their growth and shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases	Student mentions that being abroad has an impact on worldview but doesn't explain why or how

Appendix E

IP Program Fall 14 & Spring 15 Learning Outcomes

1 I can identify the primary historical events that have shaped my host country.

		Fall 14		Spring 15		Change	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.67	18%	5.05	42%	24%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.28	49%	5.63	65%	16%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.35	49%	5.59	61%	12%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	3.97	11%	4.07	7%	-4%	
(1-6)	London	5.05	32%	5.61	65%	33%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.96	36%	5.44	51%	15%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.37	47%	5.69	69%	22%	
			35%		51%	17%	Average

2 I can identify the major social issues of my host country.

		Fall 14		Spring 15		Change	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.08	33%	5.20	45%	12%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.02	31%	5.43	54%	23%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	4.86	18%	5.31	43%	25%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.31	18%	4.22	7%	-11%	
(1-6)	London	4.73	20%	4.98	33%	13%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.14	29%	5.56	58%	29%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.53	63%	5.75	81%	18%	
			30%		46%	16%	Average

3 I can identify the major cultural differences between the US and my host country.

		Fall 14		Spring 15		Change	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.55	67%	5.73	80%	13%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.82	85%	5.80	85%	0%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.84	86%	5.92	96%	10%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.87	87%	5.67	74%	-13%	
(1-6)	London	5.68	76%	5.78	74%	-2%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.93	93%	5.88	91%	-2%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.84	95%	5.94	94%	-1%	
			84%		85%	1%	Average

7 This semester, I have been responsible about the decisions and choices I have had to make.

		Fall 14		Spring 15			
		<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.38	64%	5.52	70%	6%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.62	74%	5.63	70%	-4%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.67	75%	5.76	76%	1%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.68	74%	5.59	63%	-11%	
(1-6)	London	5.54	66%	5.61	67%	1%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.57	69%	5.84	84%	15%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.84	84%	5.63	69%	-15%	
			72%		71%	-1%	Average

8 This semester, I have significantly "given myself" to the needs of other people.

		Fall 14		Spring 15			
		<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.76	21%	4.75	23%	2%	
(1-6)	Florence	4.90	31%	5.11	28%	-3%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.06	30%	5.02	39%	9%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.23	44%	4.74	22%	-22%	
(1-6)	London	4.71	24%	4.83	26%	2%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.76	29%	5.05	42%	13%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.47	63%	5.19	50%	-13%	
			35%		33%	-2%	Average

9 This semester, my faith has INCREASED

	<u>Fall 14</u>	<u>Spring 15</u>	<u>Change</u>	
Buenos Aires	44%	50%	6%	
Florence	54%	54%	0%	
Heidelberg	49%	63%	14%	
Lausanne	55%	44%	-11%	
London	37%	35%	-2%	
Shanghai	74%	72%	-2%	
Washington DC	47%	56%	9%	
	51%	53%	2%	Average

IP Program Fall 15 & Spring 16 Learning Outcomes

1 I can identify the primary historical events that have shaped my host country.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		Change	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.56	17%	5.18	45%	28%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.55	71%	5.75	77%	6%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.42	53%	5.25	57%	4%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.10	9%	4.35	12%	3%	
(1-6)	London	4.88	31%	5.51	56%	25%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.66	21%	5.23	42%	21%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.13	27%	5.52	65%	38%	
			33%		51%	18%	Average

2 I can identify the major social issues of my host country.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		Change	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.36	47%	5.51	57%	10%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.22	42%	5.42	52%	10%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.30	53%	5.43	58%	5%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.62	19%	4.62	24%	5%	
(1-6)	London	4.74	21%	5.00	31%	10%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.28	41%	5.32	42%	1%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.60	60%	5.57	61%	1%	
			40%		46%	6%	Average

3 I can identify the major cultural differences between the US and my host country.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		Change	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.67	71%	5.83	83%	12%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.80	85%	5.92	94%	9%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.88	88%	5.83	83%	-5%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.69	74%	5.80	83%	9%	
(1-6)	London	5.45	57%	5.80	82%	25%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.72	76%	5.87	87%	11%	
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.80	80%	5.52	65%	-15%	
			76%		82%	7%	Average

4 I have adequately engaged and interacted with the people in my host country.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		
			<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.26	45%	5.35	51%	6%
(1-6)	Florence	5.69	73%	5.77	77%	4%
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.04	42%	4.92	28%	-14%
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.16	12%	4.38	21%	9%
(1-6)	London	5.02	38%	4.96	33%	-5%
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.93	34%	5.16	39%	5%
(1-6)	Washington DC	4.33	13%	4.70	39%	26%
			37%		41%	4%
						Average

5 I could carry on a basic conversation with a person in my host country using their language.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		
			<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.41	58%	5.72	80%	22%
(1-6)	Florence	4.55	44%	5.54	63%	19%
(1-6)	Heidelberg	4.28	21%	4.34	23%	2%
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.15	18%	4.45	27%	9%
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.17	24%	4.35	26%	2%
			33%		44%	11%
						Average

6 This semester, I have gained more confidence about who I am.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		
			<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.97	44%	5.37	62%	18%
(1-6)	Florence	5.62	73%	5.88	88%	15%
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.28	58%	5.43	64%	6%
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.26	53%	5.47	62%	9%
(1-6)	London	5.38	69%	5.71	73%	4%
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.45	55%	5.23	52%	-3%
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.33	53%	5.48	70%	17%
			58%		67%	9%
						Average

7 This semester, I have been responsible about the decisions and choices I have had to make.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		
			<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.45	64%	5.45	58%	-6%
(1-6)	Florence	5.80	85%	5.81	83%	-2%
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.74	79%	5.43	64%	-15%
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.74	75%	5.56	65%	-10%
(1-6)	London	5.62	69%	5.76	78%	9%
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.66	69%	5.52	61%	-8%
(1-6)	Washington DC	5.73	73%	5.74	83%	10%
			73%		70%	-3%
						Average

8 This semester, I have significantly "given myself" to the needs of other people.

		Fall 15		Spring 16		
			<u>Strongly</u>		<u>Strongly</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.82	29%	4.92	26%	-3%
(1-6)	Florence	5.15	36%	5.29	44%	8%
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.05	35%	4.89	26%	-9%
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.93	37%	5.15	41%	4%
(1-6)	London	5.07	40%	5.27	47%	7%
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.72	24%	4.81	26%	2%
(1-6)	Washington DC	4.47	13%	5.04	52%	39%
			31%		37%	7%
						Average

9 This semester, my faith has INCREASED

	<u>Fall 15</u>	<u>Spring 16</u>	<u>Change</u>
Buenos Aires	58%	65%	7%
Florence	51%	48%	-3%
Heidelberg	39%	42%	3%
Lausanne	63%	65%	2%
London	45%	62%	17%
Shanghai	52%	52%	0%
Washington DC	53%	35%	-18%
	52%	53%	1%
			Average

IP Program Fall 16 & Spring 17 Learning Outcomes

1 I can identify the primary historical events that have shaped my host country.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.85	30%	5.09	36%	5%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.50	63%	5.72	86%	23%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.19	46%	5.37	55%	9%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.16	19%	4.37	13%	-6%	
(1-6)	London	5.07	38%	5.35	54%	16%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.59	23%	5.15	52%	28%	
(1-6)	Washington D	5.72	72%	5.88	88%	15%	
			42%		55%	13%	Average

2 I can identify the major social issues of my host country.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	4.87	28%	5.18	44%	16%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.25	42%	5.38	59%	16%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	4.79	35%	5.02	33%	-1%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.16	6%	4.23	6%	0%	
(1-6)	London	5.26	38%	5.22	46%	8%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.03	33%	5.21	36%	3%	
(1-6)	Washington D	5.83	83%	5.88	88%	4%	
			38%		45%	7%	Average

3 I can identify the major cultural differences between the US and my host country.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.77	85%	5.80	82%	-3%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.90	90%	5.93	93%	3%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.75	81%	5.78	84%	4%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.49	67%	5.60	65%	-2%	
(1-6)	London	5.69	74%	5.72	74%	0%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.77	82%	5.73	79%	-3%	
(1-6)	Washington D	5.28	72%	5.38	81%	9%	
			79%		80%	1%	Average

4 I have adequately engaged and interacted with the people in my host country.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.62	72%	5.36	58%	-14%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.63	79%	5.79	83%	4%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	4.39	15%	4.06	16%	0%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.46	13%	3.92	11%	-1%	
(1-6)	London	4.76	43%	4.28	20%	-23%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.03	44%	5.09	48%	5%	
(1-6)	Washington D ^C	5.56	67%	6.00	100%	33%	
			47%		48%	1%	Average

5 I could carry on a basic conversation with a person in my host country using their language.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.51	68%	5.73	73%	5%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.23	52%	5.55	66%	14%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	3.90	13%	4.06	25%	12%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	4.22	24%	4.34	23%	-1%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	4.23	26%	4.42	27%	2%	
			37%		43%	6%	Average

6 This semester, I have gained more confidence about who I am.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.55	70%	5.82	70%	0%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.75	81%	5.83	83%	2%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.19	50%	5.41	63%	13%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.13	51%	5.31	60%	9%	
(1-6)	London	5.31	57%	5.50	67%	10%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.13	51%	5.49	67%	15%	
(1-6)	Washington D ^C	5.61	72%	5.50	63%	-10%	
			62%		67%	6%	Average

7 This semester, I have been responsible about the decisions and choices I have had to make.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.66	74%	5.80	80%	6%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.71	79%	5.86	86%	7%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.60	67%	5.51	67%	-1%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.57	63%	5.66	79%	16%	
(1-6)	London	5.55	62%	5.52	70%	8%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.62	64%	5.61	70%	6%	
(1-6)	Washington D ⁱ	5.61	72%	5.50	69%	-3%	
			69%		74%	5%	Average

8 This semester, I have significantly "given myself" to the needs of other people.

		Fall 16		Spring 17			
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Change</u>	
(1-6)	Buenos Aires	5.13	43%	5.27	44%	1%	
(1-6)	Florence	5.35	56%	5.45	59%	3%	
(1-6)	Heidelberg	5.25	50%	5.06	37%	-13%	
(1-6)	Lausanne	5.08	37%	5.08	37%	1%	
(1-6)	London	4.86	33%	4.67	30%	-3%	
(1-6)	Shanghai	5.18	46%	4.91	30%	-16%	
(1-6)	Washington D ⁱ	5.00	44%	5.25	50%	6%	
			44%		41%	-3%	Average

9 This semester, my faith has INCREASED

	<u>Fall 16</u>	<u>Spring 17</u>	<u>Change</u>	
Buenos Aires	72%	89%	17%	
Florence	71%	72%	1%	
Heidelberg	50%	49%	-1%	
Lausanne	43%	48%	6%	
London	31%	24%	-7%	
Shanghai	77%	48%	-28%	
Washington D ⁱ	33%	69%	35%	
	54%	57%	3%	Average