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Section I: Executive Summary

Through a lengthy institutional-wide effort, Delta State University has identified improving cultural competence as its next QEP topic. While several themes received praise and attention, cultural competence distinguished itself as a timely and relevant topic. Improving cultural competency at Delta State will assist students in discovering and learning about other cultures; understanding cultural biases and differences; improving intercultural communication skills; developing empathic skills; and moving effectively within a globalized society. As the literature suggests, working in an increasingly multicultural society and global economy takes more than just simple interaction. Cultural competence is not innate and cannot be assumed; by taking full advantage of its location, rich history, and bountiful cultural resources, DSU plans to be proactive in improving its students’ worldview.

To achieve these goals, DSU’s QEP Team created three primary student learning outcomes:

1. Describe various aspects of cultural diversity.
2. Articulate a shared understanding and support of cross-cultural experiences.
3. Evaluate cultural perspectives with openness and respect.

To implement the plan, the QEP Team devised four strategies to infuse cultural competency into the undergraduate academic experience from start to finish. In GST 100, mentors will treat the entire course as an intercultural experience while also adding a new feature – a common reading of “Dead Men’s Path” by Chinua Achebe. Additionally, in twenty-one general education courses and fifty-six major-specific courses, academic departments will incorporate cultural competence by creating specific objectives and then evaluating instruction and assessment methods. Finally, the plan will also delve into extracurricular activities through sponsoring, promoting, and creating culturally rich and instructive events on campus.

The assessment plan’s heart lies in the academic departments’ achievement of the SLOs and their use of evaluation results to change or improve their courses. Over the course of the plan, these departmental evaluation reports will be augmented by a number of supplemental reports and surveys to determine the overall plan’s efficacy. A sampling of these items includes the Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey, chairs’ Departmental QEP Reports, and annual reviews by the QEP Director and the QEP Advisory Group.

In conclusion, DSU has created a five-year plan that is relevant and focused on student learning, action items that are logical and thorough, and assessment procedures that are based on effective and best practices.
Section II: Process Used to Develop the QEP

In 2011, DSU’s SACS Leadership Team formed the QEP Leadership Team, a body of 24 faculty, staff, and students, representing all areas of campus (Appendix 1 – Quality Enhancement Plan Leadership Team). This group, commonly referred to as the QEP Team, closely followed the suggested steps outlined by SACS-COC on pages 39-50 in the Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation. From its first meeting in November 2011, the QEP Team followed these guiding principles:

- The QEP action plan must be focused on the improvement of student learning or its environment.
- Broad-based involvement from the entire campus community is necessary and must be self-evident.
- The topic must arise from issues identified through institutional research.
- The plan must be sustainable.

A. Choosing the Topic

The first step, choosing a topic, involved a number of phases (listed in rough chronological order): a review of institutional research; identification of a number of topics relevant to campus; a student focus group; a faculty focus group; formal topic proposals created by members of the QEP Team and additional volunteers from across campus; a review of the proposals by the SACS Leadership Team; and finally, the vote by the QEP Team making “Cultural Awareness” the primary theme for DSU’s next QEP. More detailed information about the identification of the topic can be found in Section III.

B. Campus Feedback and Promotion

Once the QEP Team selected the topic, attention turned again to the entire campus for feedback. Two surveys were administered: one for students, and one for faculty and staff. With students, the QEP Team wanted to gauge their understanding of culture and their thoughts on intercultural issues in higher education. For faculty and staff, the questions were mostly open-
ended and mostly about how cultural awareness could be infused into the curriculum and campus life. The surveys not only helped the team further develop the plan, but they also informed the campus of the QEP’s direction.

In addition to the surveys, the QEP Team also created a web site with a feedback mechanism, and promoted “Cultural Awareness” on the university homepage with the initial catch phrase, “Cultural Awareness, the QEP, and You!” That informational page has since been converted to an FAQ sheet supplementing a wider online presence for the QEP.

After a campus-wide survey and an analysis of various themes and ideas in the fall of 2013, the QEP Committee chose “A World Class Experience: Improving Cultural Competency at DSU” as the title for the project. A subsequent media campaign ensued to promote the QEP and its goals.

C. Literature Review

The literature review, written and directed by Drs. Scott Drury and Julie Speakes, not only provided a strong foundation on which the QEP Team could build, but it also signaled a shift in direction. While “cultural awareness” was the initial theme, the authors actually found that the concept “cultural competency” would serve the DSU community better. For more information on this directional shift, see Section V.

D. The QEP Action Plan Subcommittee

Created shortly after the topic was chosen, the Action Plan Subcommittee took responsibility for creating QEP program goals, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and strategies for action. The full QEP Team reconvened shortly after the subcommittee’s deliberations to complete work on action items, assessment techniques, a timeline, and required financial and human resources.
E. Preparing for Implementation

Throughout the plan’s creation, members of the QEP Team continued to correspond through email and meet with groups to inform them of the QEP’s progress, status, and implementation. Examples of such groups include the College of Arts and Sciences Chairs Council, GST 600 (an orientation seminar for new faculty), Staff Council, the Diversity Committee, Academic Council, the President’s Cabinet, and the Student Government Association.
Section III: Identification of the Topic

After an introductory meeting, the QEP Team began the arduous work of selecting a topic. The team reviewed such documents as the “Maguire Report,” the Student Discovery Assessment by Sungard, notes from the university’s 2010 Retention Conference, Foundations of Excellence Dimension reports, and recommendations from the GST Task Force. After reviewing this material, the QEP Team successfully identified five topics for review: Student Preparation; Student Responsibility; Reading Comprehension; Writing Skills; and Cultural Awareness/Sensitivity (or) Sense of Place.

The next step involved facilitating focus groups: one for students, and one for faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Questions 2a and 2b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both groups were then asked to rank in order of importance the list of topics originally chosen by the QEP Team while also “writing in” any desirable topics discussed during the session. The top three topics, in order, chosen by faculty were writing skills, student preparation, and
student responsibility; the top three for students were student preparation, *advising* (a newly identified topic), and student responsibility (*Appendix 2 – Focus Group Rankings*).

To supplement the outcomes of the focus groups, the QEP Team solicited proposals for four of the original topics\(^1\) plus advising. Volunteer faculty, staff, and students joined the QEP Team in creating these proposals. The QEP Team chair asked each group to consider the following items (thus replicating what a full plan would look like): a full description of the topic including relevance to the campus; SLOs; actions for implementation; identification of necessary resources; and assessment techniques. The SACS Leadership Team then evaluated each proposal using a rubric while also including additional written comments, strengths, and weaknesses (*Appendix 3 – Rubric Summary*). The proposals along with the completed rubrics went back to the QEP Team for a summary evaluation. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of each, members voted to adopt Cultural Awareness as DSU’s next QEP.

While many of these proposal topics, such as reading or writing, are typical QEP frontrunners and common fodder for discussions around academic water coolers, cultural awareness made the most sense for Delta State and easily distinguished itself. The topic’s kernel began with the “Maguire Report,” a consultant’s report, stating quite simply that the “Mississippi Delta [is] a unique resource for discovering America – its political history, the civil rights movement, great literary figures, the birth of the Blues and Rock, and other important features” (Maguire, 2011, p. 5). Similarly, Brown (n.d.) referred to the Delta as a “mindset [that] is the distillation of American culture in its purest form.” The university and the region, as the original topic proposal states, “create such an amazingly rich convergence of history, culture, and diversity” (Cultural Awareness, 2012, p. 1). Discussion of culture and other issues important to the university and region easily transitioned to the broader concerns of cultural awareness and eventually cultural competence. With this QEP, DSU will be able to expand its student body’s worldview by taking full advantage of its location and bountiful resources. Far more than a sensitivity issue, the purposes and necessity of improving cultural competency at Delta State

---

\(^1\) Reading Comprehension, an original topic, ultimately did not garner enough support from the QEP Team to warrant a full proposal.
include discovering and learning about other cultures; understanding cultural biases and differences; improving intercultural communication skills; developing empathic skills; and working and moving effectively within a globalized society. As the literature suggests, DSU must be proactive and not leave this education to chance.

In one proposal review (2012), the university’s then-president, Dr. John Hilpert, commented:

*Issues related to cultural awareness have been underemphasized at Delta State, perhaps because of the richness of diversity that exists naturally on the campus and in the Mississippi Delta. While we have worked at correcting this situation for a number of years, a more visible program with better resources, goals related to learning outcomes, and regular assessments would be far better. Indeed, there is a unique opportunity for Delta State to provide leadership within the higher education community in this area.*

To be sure, cultural competence fits seamlessly with other university initiatives and goals such as one of the university’s *Guiding Principles*, “Respect for People and Ideas” and one of its *Purposes of General Education*, “Cultural Awareness.” This QEP’s focus will also support and enhance the expectations and goals of the university’s Diversity Committee.
Section IV: Literature Review

In the past, there have been few articles on cultural sensitivity in the academic world; however, there has been a recent trend of pertinent research (Sperry & Carson, 2012) filling the void. The purpose of cultural awareness is to look at cultural diversity, notice customs, values, and beliefs without being stereotypically judgmental (Nakabusga & Rittner, 1992). Davies (2012) noted that cultural awareness also includes “people’s socio-economic status, language, gender and religious characteristics (p. 64),” not just race and ethnicity. Useem, Useem, and Donoghue give us a simple, clear definition of culture: “... the learned and shared behavior of a community of interacting human beings ...[that] postulates no racial, national, or ethnic boundaries, and specifies no minimum or maximum numbers. Wherever a group of people are set apart by their different ‘learned and shared behavior,’ a cultural difference exists.” (as cited in Howell, 1982, p. 179).

Literature on cultural diversity emphasizes the need for cultural awareness education, however, few researchers agree on the best method for that education. Nakabusga and Rittner (1992) suggest students look at culture with their own backgrounds in mind while respecting other ethnic backgrounds. Active learning to increase self-awareness and self-examination helps students to learn what their biases are and how those biases affect their thinking and acting (Hepworth, Rooney, & Larson, 2002). Strategies from Devore and Schlesinger (1996) to reach cultural competency include:

(1) recognition of the influence of institutional racism problems; (2) the need to emphasize institutional change approaches; (3) the need to incorporate culturally appropriate practice strategies and interactional styles; and (4) respect for culturally based perspectives as a valid and important component of culturally competent practice.

The term “cultural competence” as a precise and measurable descriptor of intercultural issues dates to the early 1980s (Gallegos et al., 2008) and has been described as “ubiquitous” in human services settings ranging from the applied to education (Johnson & Munch, 2009, p. 51). Sue (2006) described cultural competence (or “cultural competency,” interchangeably) as being
comprised of cultural awareness and beliefs, cultural knowledge, and cultural skills, a definition adopted by the American Psychological Association in 2003. Hansuvadha and Slater (2012) describe cultural competence as a range of “knowledge, behaviors, and dispositions necessary to culturally interact with other cultural groups” (p. 174). Ford and Whiting (2008) have placed cultural competence on the positive end of a continuum that moves from “cultural destructiveness” to “advanced cultural competence,” where “culturally competent individuals or organizations assertively and proactively develop new educational models and approaches based on culture” (p. 106).

Relevant scholarly research on cultural competence has focused broadly on education (Colombo, 2007; De Beuckelaer, Lievens, & Bucker, 2012; Hansuvadha & Slater, 2012; Keengwe, 2010; Paz, 2008; Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009; Tanner & Allen, 2007), education of gifted students (Ford & Whiting, 2008; Henshon, 2008), education of students with disabilities (Harmon, Kasa-Hendrickson, & Neal, 2009), higher education (De Beuckelaer et al, 2012; Kohli, Kohli, & Huber, 2010), and campus law enforcement (Anderson, 2011). Researchers in cultural competence have examined applications of cultural competence in fields such as social work (Allen-Meares, 2008; Gallegos et al., 2008; Johnson & Munch, 2008), counselor training/mental health services (Ilieva & Erguner-Tekinalp, 2012; Sue, 2006), nursing (Scott, 2011), and coaching (Van Horn, 2009).

**Urgency of Cultural Competence Education**

It is worth noting that the *prima facie* value of cultural competence education is not universally accepted. Gallegos et al. (2008) admit that the ephemeral nature of such a construct may defy evaluation and testing. Johnson and Munch (2009) decry “contradictions” in instilling cultural competence (2009) that undermine presumed equality of social work clients and foster spurious heuristics in client treatment. Nevertheless, the general assertions of Gallegos et al. and Johnson and Munch are in the minority. Significant dissent in academe and other areas with respect to the value of cultural competence is scarcer. In fact, Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2007) argue that universities and colleges should promote cultural competence so that
students can “operate effectively in an increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse society and globalised economy” (p. 414).

Sirin et al. (2010) describe the need for teachers’ cultural competence as “urgent” (p. 49). Cultural competence has been espoused more formally in the mission statements of and accrediting bodies of social work programs (Gallegos et al., 2008; Johnson & Munch, 2009), as well as being listed as a formal requirement for funding of service programs (Paz, 2008). Broadly, the value-based perspective of cultural competence has been endorsed in the disciplines of psychotherapy (Sue, 2006), police work (Anderson, 2011), online education (Keengwe, 2010; Rogers, Graham, & Mayes, 2007), assessment (Trimble, Trickett, & Fisher, 2012), and nursing (Scott, 2011).

Recently, authors have asserted explicitly that cultural competence training should be a “requirement” (Allen-Meares, 2008; Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009; Trimble et al., 2012) even in areas not specifically compelled by law or accrediting bodies. The current focus is on cultural competence in education, where precedent exists in training educators in primary and secondary education (Colombo, 2007; Ford & Whiting, 2008; Hansuvadha & Slater, 2012; Harmon, Kasa-Hendrickson, & Neal, 2009; Keengwe, 2010; Paz, 2008; Trimble et al., 2012) and higher education (Anderson, 2011; De Beuckelaer et al., 2012; Ilieva & Erguner-Tekinalp, 2012; Kohli et al., 2010; Ponterotto, Baluch, Greig, & Rivera, 1998; Tharp, 2012). For example, Rogers-Sirin and Sirin (2009) warn against the implications of a static, white, female teaching force in the changing face of student demographics.

**Assessment of Cultural Competence**

**General assessment strategies:** Diagnostic tools in cultural competence often use broad barometers. Johnson and Munch (2009) describe NASW accreditation standards within the field of social work; however, similar concreteness is rarer in education. Cooper, He, and Levin (2011) describe cultural competence in the broad terms of students and primary and secondary educators understanding themselves and each other. Paz (2008) concedes that organizations
must begin with the ability to assess cultural competence, an implicit suggestion that these mechanisms are not widespread.

Ford and Whiting are somewhat more concrete. They have recommended that the organizational spectrum of Cross (1988; as cited in Ford and Whiting, 2008) be applied to individuals. On one end of Cross’s five-part continuum is “cultural destructiveness,” in which a malevolent ignorance prevails about culture and its implications. On the opposite and more refined end is “advanced cultural competence” where “culture is held in the highest regard” (p. 106). Ford and Whiting also refer to Storti’s (1998; as cited in Ford and Whiting, 2008) four-part continuum ranging from “blissful ignorance” of culture to “spontaneous sensitivity” of culture (p. 106).

In a slightly more specific definition of cultural competence involving language, Robinson & Clardy (2011) describe the term “culturally and linguistically diverse” (CLD) to include “all people whose first language or dialect and cultural backgrounds are other than mainstream” (p. 102). Robinson and Clardy assessed teacher education candidates and k-12 teachers to evaluate their work with culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students and peers. Robinson and Clardy (2011) studied this problem using the Critical Race Theory (CRT) to “analyze race and racism at macro and micro levels as it affects our society and our schools/institutions” (Robinson & Clardy, 2011, p. 102).

**Self-report scale:** A more specific useful tool has been advanced by Ponterotto et al. (as cited in Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009). The Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS) is a 20-item self-report scale measuring “teachers’ awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom” among preservice teachers, where preservice teachers rate themselves on a 1-5 Likert scale. Example items include “I can learn a great deal from students with culturally different backgrounds” and “Being multiculturally aware is not relevant for students” (reverse-scored). This scale appears to tap into cultural competence as directly as any discussed thus far, but a subjective self-report scale such as this may have less objective utility than other approaches.
**Broad Recommendations on Improving Cultural Competence**

The United States has been called a melting pot rich in cultural diversity; however, education appears to be homogenous. While the population is changing, the educational system does not seem to be flexible or mindful of the backgrounds of students seeking education. Not all professors have the cultural knowledge and experience of working or teaching in diverse environments (Robinson & Clardy, 2011; Colvin et al., 2007). While the need for cultural diversity awareness is understood, the method to reach that goal is not. “If teacher educators do not value or have experiences with cultural diversity, it is unlikely that they will be able to teach these culturally relevant teaching skills to their teacher education students” (Robinson & Clardy, 2011, p. 109).

**General recommendations on language:** Robinson and Clardy examined how cultural and linguistic diversity is addressed in teacher education programs (2011). They generally recommend coursework “that focuses on effectively teaching culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students [and that] should be required of all teacher education programs due to the growing number of these students in our schools” (Robinson & Clardy, 2011, p. 109).

**General recommendations on structure and coursework:** In tandem with Robinson and Clardy’s general recommendation involving CLD for teacher educators, recommendations about cultural competence exist across the literature in relatively broad veins. Paz (2008) recommends an institutionalization and adaption of service delivery in broad terms for school administrators. Ilieva and Erguner-Tekinalp (2012) discuss specific attributes in online assignments that foster greater cultural competence in nascent counselors. De Beuckelaer et al. (2012) offer a description of the culturally competent student as more likely to succeed in business. Kohli et al. (2010) focus on a narrow graduate student constituency.

**General philosophical recommendations:** Tharp (2012) addressed the current spirit more directly but was also somewhat vague in his recommendations. Tharp’s four recommendations for higher educators include: “1) Being aware of, and owning your social identity and its impact on others; 2) knowing and applying social identity theories; 3) recognizing how multiple social identities and power interface with society on an individual, community, and institutional level;
and 4) carefully considering your approach to curriculum development and facilitation of diversity education.” On the face of it, Tharp’s article appears to be the most neatly reconciled to the current topic but avails few operational definitions to aid the reader or college administrator.

**Specific Exercises and Activities to Improve Cultural Competence**

*The REST*: A particularly specific educational tool within the realm of preservice teacher education is produced by Rogers-Sirin and Sirin (2009; later validated by Sirin et al., 2010). They developed the Racial and Ethical Sensitivity Test (REST). The REST is designed to help teachers recognize intolerance and develops skills related to addressing marginalization of students based on demographics. These skills notably used context-specific vocabulary. Those that performed well on the REST showed greater cultural competence, measured later. Rogers-Sirin and Sirin had educators-in-training address ethically problematic videoed scenarios for preservice secondary school teachers. These scenarios involved a faculty lounge scenario and a students-on-a-basketball-court scenario. In each, overt and subtle racial discrimination occurred, by the authors’ description. Preservice teachers rated the scenarios on a 1-5 scale in terms of how problematic they were, with higher scores diagnosing greater sensitivity to racial discrimination.

*The Self and Other Awareness Project (SOAP)*: Colvin-Burque et al. (2007) described The Self and Other Awareness Project (SOAP) as designed to help educators advance cultural competence. Specifically, the SOAP model includes “diversity and culture, power, inequality, and stratification, minority and majority groups, and prejudice and discrimination” (p. 226). The SOAP model was for an undergraduate minority-grouped course. The object was:

1. to foster students’ ability and willingness to recognize and explore cultural diversity; 2) to facilitate students’ acknowledgement of their own cultural identity; 3) to increase student knowledge related to minority-group concepts, and majority-minority group dynamics; and 4) to develop skills in
cross-cultural communications, in preparation for working in a diverse society (p. 226).

The SOAP model includes a variety of activities including “self-evaluation, large and small group activities, journals, videos, guest speakers and Lensperson assignments (five homework assignments to support cultural competence development” (p. 226). The cultural competencies selected by Colvin-Burque et al. were related to race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ability, or age with particular importance on race. The SOAP project was measured by the Color-Blind Racial attitudes scale (coBRAS) by Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, and Browne (2000). The CoBRAS captured data through an objective, self-administered 20-question survey using the Likert scale. To measure any change, the CoBRAS was given on the first and last day of class in a pre-test/post-test design. The results showed significant differences between the pretest and posttest. Specifically, differences were noted for the following objective areas (in contrast to the subjective TMAS by Ponterotto et al., 1998): Unawareness of racial privilege, unawareness to blatant racial issues, and unawareness to institutional discrimination (Colvin-Burque et al., 2007). Further, the authors noted significant differences between the white students and the black students. White students had higher levels of unawareness of racial privilege, unawareness to blatant racial issues, and unawareness to institutional discrimination when compared to black students on the pretest. The authors note that:

this study provides preliminary empirical evidence regarding the impact of a specific model designed to assist faculty who are educating social work students to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to work successfully with clients from diverse backgrounds (p. 237).

The SOAP study provided a positive change in student awareness of color blind racial attitudes as measured by the CoBRAS survey. This model and survey can be used together to educate students and faculty attitudes in the areas of race, gender, age, ability, religion, ethnicity, and sexual orientation (Colvin-Burque et al., 2007).

*The inclusionary cultural model:* The inclusionary cultural model first uses self-identification of background including childhood memories and traditions. The next step looks
at the perspective of other cultural backgrounds and traditions (Nakabusgu & Rittner, 1992). Nakabusgu and Rittner (1992) noted that most students do not understand how profoundly their cultural backgrounds affect beliefs and decisions. Further students “may have an unrealistic expectation that minority content will teach them sufficient information about specific cultures to enable them to work comfortably with those populations” (p. 4). This thought process allows students to compare other cultures as “most like mine” or “least like mine” which can lead to bias. Intercultural learning is multifaceted. In the inclusionary cultural method, the students examine themselves becoming the subject in the experiment “and cross-learning process to enable them to generalize more didactic material on broad, cultural components” (p. 4). This inclusionary cultural model allows students to “recognize behaviors and attitudes that are culturally influenced regardless of the specific cultural content” (p. 5). The cross cultural approach allows students to learn what shapes their own values and traditions, then learn other cultural backgrounds.

The inclusionary cultural model process is broken down into several steps and can be done in a classroom setting. First students divide by cultural background. Nakabusgu and Rittner (1992) noted that “some students will use only a single ethnic identity (Chinese, Cuban, English, German, Mexican, Puerto Rican) or combined identities (African American, Italian-American, Japanese-Peruvian) while others may include religious affiliations (Irish-Catholic, Guayanese-Hindu, Lebanese-Moslem, New York-Jew, Scottish-German-Southern Baptist), or other combination” (p. 6). The next step requires subgroups for discussion. These small subgroups that students divide up into most closely resemble their own culture. In these small subgroups, students discuss their childhood memories, traditions, and behaviors. Specifically “they are encouraged to try to remember any of the admonitions, sayings, or rhymes they heard as children” (Nakabusgu & Rittner, 1992, p. 7). Students focus on what they were taught. Next, students were asked “to discriminate those behaviors that were most likely family-specific. They discover that, what they thought was cultural may have been family-idiosyncratic in nature. Alternatively, they realize that what they believed were family rules for behavior may
have been culturally consistent with others in their subgroup” (Nakabusgu & Rittner, 1992, p. 7).

In the subgroups students realize how hard it is to determine what is the cultural norm for their backgrounds and what are idiosyncratic behaviors. In the final stage of this exercise, similarities and differences with respect to family responsibilities, roles, religion, and behaviors lead to interactive discussions. From this point, the didactic material on culture is presented. After coming through the inclusionary cultural model, students understand how their own cultural background shaped their lives and how individuals from other cultures evolved from their own experiences as well. It allows students to learn from the known to the unknown and to distinguish between family rules and cultural rules. In turn, this process has “a tremendous impact on attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, actions, feelings, and most importantly, expectations about how others should act, feel, and believe” (Nakabusgu & Rittner, 1992, p. 9). The belief is that once the students have a better understanding of themselves and their background, then the didactic materials about other cultures will be more receptive.

Intergroup Interaction: Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2007) highlight four different case studies at Griffith University in Australia that focus on intercultural exchanges in various settings – from the closely controlled environment of the classroom to the broader campus setting and ultimately to the greater surrounding community. Through films, discussions, group essays, and intercultural interactions, the instructors expect students to “recognise the conscious and unconscious acting out of cultural mores as situational and not necessarily universal” (p. 417). The implications, then, are clear. If culture is learned (or situational), then students can also learn to adapt to different and unfamiliar situations, customs, and people. One problem though, according to Eisenchlas and Trevaskes, is that no one will take ownership of the task: cultural competence is always either someone else’s problem or “taken for granted” (p. 414).
**Future Directions**

Challenges to University administrators in beginning cultural competence initiatives include a lack of precedent and a wide array of operational definitions. While Rogers-Sirin and Sirin (2009), Colvin-Burque et al. (2007), and Nakabusgu and Rittner (1992), are explicit in their methods, their methods have not been ensconced as models for universities to adopt. Rogers-Sirin and Sirin’s REST model, while concrete, is intended for a specific discipline. Broad and less tangible principles, such as those recommended by Tharp (2012), place the onus of program development specifics on the institution. While no one would dispute that carefully considering approaches to curriculum development sounds like a profitable path (among Tharp’s recommendations), Tharp and others are understandably reticent on specifics.

On the positive side, there is an emergent scaffold in the literature from which a committee could construct a plausible, coherent plan using operational definitions of cultural competence, from banal self-reports as described by Ponterotto et al. (1998) to the methods of those described above. Administrators, while preceded by few pioneers, have wide latitude to root initiatives in the best practices of prior studies in a national zeitgeist that is ready to accept cultural competence training.
Section V: Student Learning Outcomes

While much of the research indicates a focus on systemic or organizational cultural competence, Delta State’s focus must be on that of the individual, the student. To create appropriate student learning outcomes, the QEP Action Plan Subcommittee drew inspiration and guidance from several sources:

- “Defining, Assessing, and Documenting Student Learning Outcomes at Delta State University” – This presentation by Dr. Thomas Cleary on March 1, 2013 highlighted (among other things) the “products” of higher education and the basis for student learning outcomes:
  1. Cognitive development (Knowledge)
  2. Behavioral development (Skills)
  3. Affective development (Attitude)
- *Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric* – Created by the Association of American Colleges and Schools (AACU), this rubric provided cogent talking points and inspiration for the discussions.
- *Bloom’s Taxonomy of Measurable Verbs* – A key document in this exercise, Bloom’s Taxonomy served as the catalyst for the shape that the outcomes would eventually take.
- Literature review for this QEP – the literature review created a breakthrough of sorts by shifting the QEP’s emphasis from “cultural awareness” to “cultural competence.” While “awareness” mainly represents sensitivity issues, “competence” focuses on awareness, knowledge, and skills, thus allowing for specific measurable opportunities in the curriculum. This “new” focus opens up more opportunities for departments to explore, and it creates more concrete assessment capabilities.

From these four sources, the Action Plan Subcommittee created the following three outcomes:

1. Describe various aspects of cultural diversity.
   - *Examples*: Learning about other cultures; understanding cultural biases and differences
2. Articulate a shared understanding and support of cross-cultural experiences.
   - *Examples:* Improving intercultural communication; working within a globalized society/economy

3. Evaluate cultural perspectives with openness and respect.
   - *Examples:* Developing empathic skills

These outcomes work in conjunction with the accepted definitions of “culture” and “cultural competence” and with the desire to give all departments and units autonomy in exploring intercultural issues within their own disciplines. To aid in the development and furtherance of the learning outcomes, the subcommittee also identified three broad goals of the QEP:

1. Provide opportunities for students to explore their own cultural communities.
2. Provide opportunities for students to experience, understand, and appreciate other cultures.
3. Provide opportunities to enhance students’ cross-cultural communication and interaction skills.
Section VI: Actions to be Implemented

To meet the broad goals of the QEP, the QEP Team devised four strategies to assist the university in incorporating cultural competence at DSU, the intent being that cultural competence and its products will become a part of the fabric of the undergraduate college experience from beginning to end.

Strategy 1 – Introduce cultural awareness exercises and activities into the First-Year Experience

According to the university’s catalog, the Bulletin, GST 100, a one-hour freshmen orientation course, is designed in part to help students “adjust responsibly to the individual and interpersonal challenges presented by collegiate life.” This course fosters a sense of community and eases DSU’s new students into the campus culture; it is therefore the perfect vehicle to introduce cultural competence to freshmen in a reliable and consistent manner.

The QEP Team has developed two methods for introducing cultural competence to this group. One is a survey, while the other is a common reading experience, which will be a new required session for GST 100.

1. The Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey is a simple Likert scale designed to assess students’ attitudes towards communicating and associating with diverse populations. This survey will be administered twice during the semester: once at the beginning of the course, and once at the end. This instrument measures the entire GST experience and not simply the newly introduced session dealing with cultural competence. See below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. It is important that I associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with people whose ideas and backgrounds differ from mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Being exposed to others who are different helps me understand myself better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Understanding diverse people and cultures is an important part of my college experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. I value opinions and perspectives different from my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. DSU should make every effort to encourage and promote communication among different cultural groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The common reading delves deeper into intercultural relations. Building on the idea that a common reading experience “brings people closer together as a community by creating common ground for discussion” (Ferguson 2006), GST mentors will lead their sections through a reading of the short story, “Dead Men’s Path” by Chinua Achebe. This story not only introduces students to various types of culture, but it also broaches the issue of communicating with and understanding others and the pitfalls associated with the failure to achieve cultural competence. After an evaluative period, other readings
may be considered in subsequent years. The QEP Team is developing a guide for GST mentors to facilitate the common reading session.

**Strategy 2 – Incorporate or enhance cultural competence threads in a range of general education courses**

Every General Education course that currently identifies Cultural Awareness as a competency\(^2\) is automatically included in the QEP plan. Of the fifty-two available General Education courses, twenty-one courses have Cultural Awareness as a competency\(^3\) (Appendix 4 – List of General Education Courses). Departments are taking a close look at these courses and examining just exactly how cultural competence fits as a component. This strategy requires that faculty members be intentional in their efforts when creating or assessing exercises. Instructors will account for objectives, instructional methods, assignments, and assessment methods. Departments will be required to complete the annual QEP Outcomes for General Education Courses Table (Appendix 5 – QEP Outcomes for General Education Courses Table). These tables generally record the following:

- The specified outcome (Column A)
- Description of how each course will achieve selected SLOs, including coursework, data collection, and analysis (Column B)
- Results of the Evaluation (Column C)
- Use of Evaluation Results (Column D)

In Fall 2013, departments submitted partial tables showing how each course initially plans to achieve the SLOs, and then collect and analyze data.

---

\(^2\) Cultural Awareness is currently one of ten possible competencies associated with General Education courses.

\(^3\) There are actually fifty-six General Education courses offered at DSU; however, ANT 101 and MUS 117 are currently not being offered, and ART 401 and 402 are for Art majors only.
Strategy 3 – Incorporate or enhance cultural competence threads in selected upper-level courses of all degree programs

For all degree programs, departments will identify upper-level courses that are relevant to the QEP. These upper-level courses are, for the most part, 300 or 400 level courses or core courses in the specific major. Departments must allow for the same considerations as with the Gen Ed courses (objectives, methods, assignments, assessment techniques). They will also be required to complete the annual QEP Outcomes for Upper-Level Courses Table (Appendix 6 – QEP Outcomes for Upper-Level Courses Table).

While the QEP Team did not set a maximum number of upper-level courses for each degree program, they did ask departments to identify at least one required (or core) course, or a battery of electives that are taught at least once every two years. This procedure is intended to ensure that every student in every degree program will be exposed to the concept of cultural competence.

During a lengthy process in Fall 2013, departmental curriculum committees identified over fifty upper-level courses to participate in the QEP (Appendix 7 – List of Upper-level Courses). As with the Gen Ed courses, departments submitted partial tables showing how each course initially plans to achieve the SLOs, and then collect and analyze data. In some ways, Strategy #3 created a more intellectually rigorous process than the other strategies. With the Gen Ed courses, chairs and curriculum committees already knew which courses had to be included (those that identified Cultural Awareness as a competency); however, with the upper-level courses, faculty members examined every required, core, or elective course in their respective programs to determine where and how cultural competency fit best.

Through the lengthy communication with departments and learning of their unique situations, the QEP Team made some revisions to its initial requests:

1. Departments may choose to include a course more than once if it satisfies requirements in multiple degree programs (e.g. Many business degree programs share MGT 300 as a core course, so a number of departments in the College of Business have chosen that course as the one they will use for the QEP).
2. For those degree programs with low enrollment, many of the upper-division courses are not taught as frequently as those in the more populated degree programs; therefore, some departments have chosen “lower-level” core courses as their QEP selection(s).

The QEP Outcomes for Upper-Level Courses Table and the QEP Outcomes for General Education Courses Table will collectively be called the QEP Outcomes Tables.

**Strategy 4 – Enhance the offerings of culturally rich events on campus**

The QEP Director will work with various groups (such as the Diversity Committee, SGA, and International Student Services) to develop strategies for the development of relevant events; monitor the organization and coordination of relevant events; and coordinate with all departments and units on campus to ensure that all relevant calendared activities are appropriately designated as QEP-related (i.e. an event that relates to intercultural issues). If so designated, these events will be tagged and tracked with one of the QEP program goals or student learning outcomes. All tagged events will be eligible for sponsorship and funding.

**Supporting Actions**

- DSU will administer an annual QEP Survey to freshmen and seniors. This survey, similar to the one given after the QEP topic was chosen, intends to capture students’ mindsets – their understanding of culture, their beliefs, and their thoughts on cultural competence issues at Delta State. The results, compared year to year, will indicate the plan’s effectiveness and will provide direction for future programming. This survey is not intended to be a longitudinal study; rather, it is an independent sample that will compare freshmen to freshmen and seniors to seniors. Freshmen will be chosen from a sample of the participating Gen Ed courses. Seniors will be chosen from a sample of the participating upper-level courses. The hypothesis is that over time, while the freshmen sample will likely remain relatively unchanged, the senior sample will demonstrate improvement in the area of cultural competence (Appendix 8 – QEP Survey).
DSU will also plan and host regular events (at least two annually) on cultural competency. One such event will serve as a “best practices” workshop intended to assist faculty in incorporating cultural competency into courses, while another such event, available to the entire campus, will generally focus on understanding intercultural issues and improving cultural competency skills.
Section VII: Organizational Structure

While the entire university has a stake in this plan, the QEP Team has identified a number of individuals or groups that will have direct responsibility in overseeing, running, or evaluating this plan.

- **QEP Director**
  - Coordinates all QEP efforts
  - Ensures that all reports are completed and submitted on time
  - Compiles chairs’ *Departmental QEP Reports*
  - Administers QEP Survey
  - Tabulates *Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey* responses
  - Tracks campus events with campus-wide support
  - Completes and submits annual report to SACS Liaison (see Section IX for more information on this report)

- **SACS Liaison**
  - Monitors the entire plan for compliance
  - Appoints members of the QEP Advisory Group (explained below and in Section VIII)

- **Academic Departments**
  - Annually Review Gen Ed and Upper-level course selections
  - (Department chairs) Submit *QEP Outcomes Tables* to the QEP Director
  - (Department chairs) Submit a *Departmental QEP Report* to the QEP Director (see Section IX for more information on the *Departmental QEP Report*).
  - (Faculty members) Make changes to courses based on analysis of the *QEP Outcomes Tables*

- **GST Mentors**
  - Administer the *Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey* to all GST 100 sections
  - Lead sections through a reading of “Dead Men’s Path” by Chinua Achebe
• QEP Advisory Group
  o Plans at least two workshops/presentations annually
  o Reviews QEP Director’s annual report
  o Reviews submitted QEP Outcomes Tables
  o Reviews Departmental QEP Reports
  o Makes recommendations to academic departments regarding course selections and assessment techniques
  o Completes and submits annual report to SACS Liaison (see Section IX for more information on this report)

• All University Departments, Units, Committees, and Organizations
  o Work with the QEP Director to plan, identify, and tag appropriate calendared events
Section VIII: Resources

One of the hallmarks of a successful QEP is its sustainability – of human, physical, and financial resources. This QEP has an annual budget set aside of approximately $77,000.00 for a minimum of five years. While this plan will take full advantage of existing resources, one new position and one new committee with unique responsibilities have been created.

- QEP Director – The individual in this ½-time position doubles as the Assessment and Planning Specialist, also a ½-time position.
- QEP Advisory Group – Introduced in Section VII, this group will consist of members from various interested parties such as the General Education Committee, QEP Team, Student Affairs, SGA, Diversity Committee, and academic departmental liaisons.

The table below indicates expected and budgeted expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Director – Salary + Fringe</td>
<td>$42,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual (external evaluation, consultants)</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities (supplies)</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (publicity, branding)</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development funds (Research, Presentations, Training)</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IX: Assessment Strategies

The QEP Team has developed a number of assessment strategies to ensure that all broad program goals and SLOs are successfully met. Assessment will be the responsibility of academic departments, faculty, the QEP Advisory Group, and the QEP Director.

QEP Outcomes Tables (for Upper-Level Courses and General Education Courses)

Since the success of this plan depends on what happens in the classroom, how and to what degree competence is assessed will rest primarily with academic departments – the faculty. The QEP Outcomes Table will be the reporting tool. As discussed in Section VI, the tables chart the following:

- Specified Outcomes (Column A)
- Methods, data collection, and analysis (Column B)
- Results of evaluation (Column C)
- Use of evaluation results (Column D)

Rather than accepting the static “No Changes” or “No Recommendations,” the QEP Team expects to see much activity in Column D as an indication of growth and adaptability and a sign of departments’ level of involvement in the plan.

Departmental QEP Report

This annual report, submitted by academic departmental chairs to the QEP Director, will serve two purposes:

- Feedback – Open communication is a necessity. While faculty and chairs will always have the opportunity to comment and make suggestions, the Departmental QEP Report will serve as the authoritative feedback mechanism for faculty (e.g. What works? What does not work? Should SLOs be changed?).
- Course Review – Departments will annually review both Gen Ed and upper-level course selections and make recommendations for change. This review will provide departments the opportunity to add or to remove courses from the QEP program. Choosing the right or best courses for this plan is vital and cannot happen without regular faculty input.
**Annual Report of the QEP Director**

The QEP Director will create an annual report to the SACS Liaison (also distributed to academic departments and the QEP Advisory Group) including the following: brief summary of *QEP Outcomes Tables*; summary of the results of the *QEP Survey* and *Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey*; tabulation of evaluation forms of workshops/presentations; and tabulation of campus events.

**Annual Report of the QEP Advisory Group**

The QEP Advisory Group’s report to the SACS Liaison (also distributed to academic departments and QEP Director) will include a detailed analysis of *QEP Outcomes Tables*; suggestions to departments of changes to course methodologies; significant findings from the *Departmental QEP Report*; findings from the *QEP Survey* and the *Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey*; and recommendations to the SACS Liaison for changes to the QEP.

**Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey**

This tool, used twice during the semester, will assess students’ attitudes towards communicating and associating with diverse populations and will serve as the assessment tool for the GST 100 freshmen experience. See Section VI for more detailed information of this instrument.

**QEP Survey**

Although the *QEP Outcomes Tables* will be the primary assessment vehicles, DSU needs to hear from students as well. Given to both freshmen and seniors, the survey results will have programming and planning implications for the entire plan. Results will be shared with faculty through the *Annual Report of the QEP Advisory Group*. See Section VI for more detailed information on the *QEP Survey*. 
### Section X: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Activity</th>
<th>Individual(s)/Group(s) Responsible</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Advisory Group appointed</td>
<td>SACS Liaison</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP implementation</td>
<td>Entire Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey given</em></td>
<td>QEP Director; GST Mentors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/presentations planned</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Survey administered</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Outcomes Tables submitted to QEP Director</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental QEP Report submitted to QEP Director</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Best Practices” workshop</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence campus presentation</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report submitted to SACS Liaison</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of QEP Director’s Annual Report</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of <em>QEP Outcomes Tables and Spring Reports</em></td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Annual Report submitted to SACS Liaison</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Activity</td>
<td>Individual(s)/Group(s) Responsible</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Advisory Group appointed</td>
<td>SACS Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP implementation</td>
<td>Entire Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Cultural Competence Survey given</td>
<td>QEP Director; GST Mentors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/presentations planned</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Survey administered</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Outcomes Tables submitted to QEP Director</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental QEP Report submitted to QEP Director</td>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Best Practices workshop”</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence campus presentation</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report submitted to SACS Liaison</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of QEP Director’s Annual Report</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of QEP Outcomes Tables and Spring Reports</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Annual Report submitted to SACS Liaison</td>
<td>QEP Advisory Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# APPENDIX 1

## Quality Enhancement Plan Leadership Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Office/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Craft (S)</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Bowles (S)</td>
<td>Institutional Grants</td>
<td>Student Business Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Houston (S)</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Student Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Margaret Mullins (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling Center And Student Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Houston (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hankins (E)</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Shultz (F)</td>
<td>Languages And Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Mark (F)</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Freda Stewart (F)</td>
<td>Social Sciences/History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Drury (F)</td>
<td>Counselor Education and Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Webster (F)</td>
<td>Acc, Cis, Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Speakes (F)</td>
<td>Commercial Aviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Hochadel (F)</td>
<td>Mgt/Mkt/Bus Adm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janye Long (F)</td>
<td>Mgt/Mkt/Bus Adm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanika Simmons (F)</td>
<td>Counselor Education And Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Hartley (F)</td>
<td>Teacher Education, Leadership, And</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Bingham (F)</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Salinece (E)</td>
<td>Robert E. Smith School Of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jol Phillips (F)</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Moon (S)</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Communication And Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bouse (S)</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Alumni-Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cassibry (Stu)</td>
<td>Student Body</td>
<td>Student Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Barber (Stu)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F, Faculty); (S, Staff); (Stu, Student)
APPENDIX 2
Focus Group Rankings – Faculty

Participants were asked to rank their top three topics in order of highest priority (1 being the highest). Italicized topics are write-ins resulting from the focus group discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness/Sensitivity Or Sense of Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Preparation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required GST 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Comps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Value of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Focus Group Rankings – Students

Participants were asked to rank their top three topics in order of highest priority (1 being the highest). Italicized topics are write-ins resulting from the focus group discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness/Sensitivity Or Sense of Place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Preparation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3
Rubric Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This QEP proposal...</td>
<td>Excellent = 3  Satisfactory = 2  Not Adequate = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is consistent with our institution’s Mission and Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Academic Advising = 19  Student Preparation = 19  Cultural Awareness = 17  Writing = 16  Student Responsibility = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will have a significant impact on student learning</td>
<td>Student Preparation = 12  Academic Advising = 11  Cultural Awareness = 10  Writing = 9  Student Responsibility = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes measurable student learning</td>
<td>Academic Advising = 10  Student Preparation = 10  Student Responsibility = 9  Writing = 8  Cultural Awareness = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has identified specific measures and tools to assess student learning</td>
<td>Student Responsibility = 12  Academic Advising = 11  Cultural Awareness = 10  Student Preparation = 10  Writing = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has clearly defined ideas for a successful assessment plan</td>
<td>Student Responsibility = 11  Writing = 9  Academic Advising = 8  Student Preparation = 8  Cultural Awareness = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highlights opportunities to build on current institutional initiatives and resources</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness = 17  Student Responsibility = 15  Student Preparation = 15  Academic Advising = 14  Writing = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a well-developed and realistic budget for what is proposed</td>
<td>Writing =10  Cultural Awareness = 8  Student Preparation =7  Student Responsibility = 4  Academic Advising = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takes demonstrated “best practices” into account</td>
<td>Academic Advising = 15  Cultural Awareness = 11  Student Responsibility = 10  Student Preparation = 9  Writing = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is of a scope that will be able to be implemented effectively and will obtain meaningful results</td>
<td>Academic Advising = 11  Cultural Awareness = 11  Student Responsibility = 10  Student Preparation = 9  Writing = 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from UNA process documents (April 2012)
Totals

Total Score  (Excellent – 3; Satisfactory – 2; Not Adequate – 0)

- Academic Advising – 101
- Cultural Awareness – 99
- Student Preparation – 99
- Student Responsibility – 92
- Writing – 85

Total Score by Certain Categories* (Same Point Scale as Above)

- Student Preparation – 48
- Cultural Awareness – 47
- Writing – 47
- Academic Advising – 45
- Student Responsibility – 42

* SACS identifies certain characteristics that define a “good,” or successful, QEP. These characteristics are specifically represented by the following categories in the rubric:

- Significant impact on student learning
- Includes measureable SLOs
- Has identified specific measures and tools for assessment
- Well-developed budget
- Is of a scope that will be able to be implemented …
APPENDIX 4
List of General Education Courses
(Currently Identifying Cultural Awareness as a Competency)

ART 101 – Introduction to Art
CEL 300 – Human Growth and Development
COM 101 – Public Speaking
COM 202 – Interpersonal Communication
ENG 203 – Introduction to Literature (short story/novel)
ENG 204 – Introduction to Literature (poetry/drama)
ENG 206 – World Literature Survey
FRE 101 – Elementary French
GEO 201 – Introduction to Human Geography
GEO 303 – World Regional Geography
MUS 114 – Music in American Culture
MUS 115 – Experiencing Music
MUS 116 – The History of Rock and Roll
PHI 201 – Introduction to Philosophy
PSC 201 – American National Government
SHS 360 – American Sign Language
SOC 101 – Principles of Sociology
SPA 101 – Elementary Spanish
SWO 101 – Volunteering in the Community
SWO 300 – Human Diversity
THE 225 – Introduction to Theatre
### APPENDIX 5

**QEP Outcomes for General Education Course ______ (insert course discipline/number)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. QEP Outcome</th>
<th>B. Data Collection &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>C. Results of Evaluation</th>
<th>D. Use of Evaluation Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>For each outcome that you address below, fill in all boxes of that row (for each gen ed course with “cultural awareness” as a “purpose,” departments must choose at least one of the three outcomes listed; use N/A as appropriate for those not covered)</em></td>
<td>1. What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Set benchmarks (ex. ---% of students will achieve ---) 2. Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be/have been collected 3. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</td>
<td>What were the findings of the analysis? (How many students are achieving at the level of competency previously set for this outcome?)</td>
<td>1. List specific recommendations. 2. Describe changes in course(s) that are proposed or made as a result of the QEP learning outcome assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Describe various aspects of cultural diversity [*knowledge*]

- Articulate a shared understanding and support of cross-cultural experiences [*skills*]

- Evaluate cultural perspectives with openness and respect [*attitude*]
## APPENDIX 6

### QEP Outcomes for Upper Level Course _______ (insert course discipline/number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. QEP Outcome</th>
<th>B. Data Collection &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>C. Results of Evaluation</th>
<th>D. Use of Evaluation Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>For each outcome that you address below, fill in all boxes of that row (for each upper level course with cultural competency as a thread, departments must choose at least one of the three outcomes listed; use N/A as appropriate for those not covered)</em></td>
<td><em>1. What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Set benchmarks (ex. ---% of students will achieve ---) 2. Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be/have been collected 3. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</em></td>
<td><em>What were the findings of the analysis? (How many students are achieving at the level of competency previously set for this outcome?)</em></td>
<td><em>1. List specific recommendations. 2. Describe changes in course(s) that are proposed or made as a result of the QEP learning outcome assessment process.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe various aspects of cultural diversity [knowledge]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate a shared understanding and support of cross-cultural experiences [skills]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate cultural perspectives with openness and respect [attitude]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7
List of Upper-level Courses

ART 401 – Art History Survey I
ART 402 – Art History Survey II
ART 419 – Women in the Arts
BIO 300 – Cell Biology
BIO 301 - Ecology
BIO 328 - Genetics
BIS 300 – Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies
CAV 373 – Human Factors in Aviation
CEL 497 – Diagnosis and Evaluation of Student Achievement in the Elementary School
CHE 440 - Biochemistry
COM 325 – Intercultural Communication
CRJ 405 – Introduction to Criminological Theory
DMI 302 – History of Recorded Music
ENG 313 – American Literature
ENG 406 – History and Grammars of the English Language
FCS 447 – Professional Development
FCS 480 – Senior Seminar in Dietetics
FRE 201 – Intermediate French
FRE 202 – Intermediate French
GEO 201 – Introduction to Human Geography
HIS 457 – The New South, 1865 - Present
HIS 492 – Special Topics in History
HSE 458 – Organization and Administration in Athletic Training
JOU 303 – History of Journalism
MAT 405 – History of Mathematics
MAT 490 – Senior Seminar in Mathematics
MGT 300 – Principles of Management
MUS 301 – Music of the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Baroque Periods
MUS 302 – Music of the Classic, Romantic, and Contemporary Periods
NUR 302 – Fundamentals of Client Care
NUR 303 – Health Assessment
NUR 304 - Pharmacology
NUR 305 – Nursing the Adult Client I
NUR 306 – Nursing the Adult Client II
NUR 312 (BSN) – Basic Pathophysiology
NUR 312 (RN – BSN) – Basic Pathophysiology
NUR 333 – Health Assessment Practicum
NUR 335 – Nursing the Adult Client I Practicum
NUR 336 – Nursing the Adult Client II Practicum
NUR 403 (BSN) – Community Health Nursing
NUR 403 (RN – BSN) – Community Health Nursing
NUR 408 – Nursing Synthesis
NUR 443 (BSN) – Community Health Nursing Practicum
NUR 443 (RN – BSN) – Community Health Nursing Practicum
PER 300 – History and Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education
PER 460 – Exercise Testing
PHI 406 - Ethics
PSC 360 – Comparative Politics
PSC 406 – State and Local Government
PSC 431 – Classical to Medieval Political Theory
PSY 307 – Developmental Psychology
SHS 300 – Introduction to the Speech and Hearing Sciences
SOC 456 – Race, Class, and Gender
SPA 403 – Spanish Conversation
SWO 481 – Integrative Seminar
THE 320 – History of the Theatre
### Appendix 8
**QEP Survey**

1. When you think of culture, what do you consider? (Choose all that apply)
- [ ] Race
- [ ] Language, Signs, and Symbols
- [ ] Food
- [ ] Clothes/Furniture/Transportation (personal effects)
- [ ] Rituals/Ceremonies
- [ ] Religious Beliefs or Values
- [ ] Art, Music, Dance
- [ ] Other, please specify ____________

2a. In general, describe the extent of your interaction with people who are different from you in the following ways **BEFORE** coming to college (please choose the appropriate box).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>Very Frequently (Daily)</th>
<th>Frequently (at least once a week)</th>
<th>Occasionally (at least once a month)</th>
<th>Rarely (less than once a month)</th>
<th>Very Rarely (less than twice a year)</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Different races and ethnicities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Different religions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Different sexual orientations</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Different social classes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Different nationalities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) People with physical disabilities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) People with cognitive disabilities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2b. In general, describe the extent of your interaction with people who are different from you in the following ways while at DSU (please choose the appropriate box).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Frequently (Daily)</th>
<th>Frequently (at least once a week)</th>
<th>Occasionally (at least once a month)</th>
<th>Rarely (less than once a month)</th>
<th>Very Rarely (no more than twice a year)</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Different races and ethnicities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Different religions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Different sexual orientations</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Different social classes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Different nationalities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) People with physical disabilities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) People with cognitive disabilities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide a response to each of the following statements by choosing the appropriate rating for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. DSU encourages intercultural communications and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DSU has provided multiple opportunities that have prepared me to understand diverse people and cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural awareness and intercultural interaction are relevant to my degree program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cultural awareness and intercultural interaction are relevant to my overall college experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The culture to which I associate most strongly is well represented on the DSU campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students should make every effort to embrace varied cultural perspectives and opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is important to me to have friends and colleagues who are of a different racial/ethnic background, religious affiliation, socio-economic background, sexual, or political orientation than me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When relating to others, cultural differences are not hard to overcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I try to consider other points of view when interacting with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can clearly define characteristics of my own culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I can clearly define the characteristics of cultures other than my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I consider myself to be culturally competent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Please read the following statements and assign an appropriate rating for the result of such an action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improve climate considerably</th>
<th>Improve climate somewhat</th>
<th>No change in climate</th>
<th>Worsen climate somewhat</th>
<th>Worsen climate considerably</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Providing more workshops, events, or programs to help the DSU community become more aware and responsive to the differences of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. DSU requiring all students to take general education courses that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives on cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DSU requiring all students to participate in a first year experience program that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives on cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DSU requiring all students to take at least one course in their major that focuses on issues, research, and perspectives on cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What do you think is a good way to incorporate cultural studies or intercultural communication on campus? (Choose all that apply)

- [ ] Taking a course dealing specifically with cultural studies for my major or discipline
- [ ] Reading a novel about other cultures
- [ ] Watching a movie
- [ ] Attending a campus event focusing on multicultural or different (outside of my own) ideas
- [ ] Writing an essay about a cross-cultural experience or class project
- [ ] Participating in group projects/presentations
- [ ] Participating in a DSU-sponsored travel course
- [ ] Attending an arts, music, dance or performance event
17. Overall, considering as a group all the courses you are currently taking, how often would you say that you are exposed to cultural studies or intercultural communication in your class work?

☐ Often (3-5 times a semester)
☐ Sometimes (1-2 times a semester)
☐ Seldom (once a year)
☐ Never

18. How satisfied are you with your campus experience/environment regarding cultural studies or intercultural communication at DSU? (Mark one)

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ Neutral
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

19. In what year of college are you?

☐ 1st Year
☐ 2nd Year
☐ 3rd Year
☐ 4th Year
☐ 5th + Year

20. Gender

☐ Male
☐ Female

21. Ethnicity

Do you identify as Hispanic or Latino?

☐ Yes
☐ No

22. Please select the racial category with which you most closely identify -- Choose all that apply

☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian
☐ Black or African American
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ White
☐ Other: (Please specify) ___________________________
23. Are you an international student?

☐ Yes
☐ No

24. If yes, please list your national origin ______________________

25. Family income

☐ Less than 35,000
☐ 35,000-49,999
☐ 50,000-74,999
☐ 75,000-99,999
☐ 100,000-149,999
☐ 150,000-199,999
☐ 200,000 or more

26a. Do you affiliate yourself with a particular religion? (if no, skip to Question 8)

☐ Yes
☐ No

26b. Religious affiliation

☐ Catholic
☐ Protestant
☐ Hindu
☐ Jewish
☐ Muslim
☐ Other (please specify)

26c. My religious beliefs influence my acceptance of others (choose only one)

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

27. Do you live on campus?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Comments: