



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges

Asbury University
Quality Enhancement Plan
The Imago Dei Initiative: Embracing Cultural Responsibility
September 18, 2019

Asbury University
One Macklem Drive
Wilmore, KY 40390
asbury.edu

Andrea Edin, *Institutional Accreditation Liaison*
(859) 858-3511, x2130

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	2
II. Project Topic and Selection Process	4
Topic Overview	4
Committee Formation and Data Review	5
Project Topic and Selection Process	6
Revisions Since the On-Site Visit	10
QEP Oversight Committee	11
III. Literature Review	12
IV. Student Learning Outcomes	21
V. Project Actions and Initiatives	22
Element I	22
Element II	24
Element III	25
VI. Assessment Plan	28
Level One: Student Learning at Course Level	28
Level Two: Student Learning at the Institutional Level	29
Level Three: Overall Success of the QEP at the Project Level	32
VII. Budget	35
VIII. Appendices	37
Appendix A Definitions for Cultural Responsibility	37
Appendix B Guiding Bibliography for Literature Review	39
Appendix C Syllabus for CCE 150	41
Appendix D Faculty Roster for CCE 150 Instructors	48
Appendix E Foundations General Education Program Sheet	51
Appendix F Summary of Revisions to QEP Since the On-Site Visit	53

Executive Summary

The Asbury University 2019-2029 Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), *The Imago Dei Initiative: Embracing Cultural Responsibility*, aims to foster and cultivate cultural competency as an institutional initiative. After an exhaustive review of relevant data about campus needs beginning in February of 2017, and in conjunction with our institution's 5-year Strategic Priorities document, Imagine2022, our QEP committee concluded that cultural responsibility, as an area of focus, was both relevant and necessary.

Having settled on this topic, and after further discussion of the themes emerging from our data, the committee chose the following student learning outcomes for the project:

- I. Knowledge
 - a. Students will articulate a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity
 - b. Students will be able to define cultural responsibility
 - c. Students will demonstrate understanding of one's own cultural identity
 - d. Students will be able to interpret one's own direct experience of cultural identity
- II. Skills
 - a. Students will demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions
 - b. Students will be able to effectively engage cultures outside their own
 - c. Students will conduct self-appraisal to enhance cultural awareness
- III. Attitudes
 - a. Students will display humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions

After articulating desired student learning outcomes, our QEP committee solicited project ideas from the University community, and selected two of these proposals to inform our planning. Following months of additional discussion and in light of the recommendations of the SACSCOC On-Site Committee, our QEP committee here proposes an array of activities as a means to successfully address and fulfill these student learning outcomes. These activities include:

- I. The addition of a credit-bearing cultural engagement requirement to the University's Foundations general education program;
- II. The development of an academic curriculum to equip students with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes of cultural responsibility; and
- III. The formation of an administrative unit to assist with project implementation, analyze activities and consider additional steps to promote cultural responsibility.

These activities are consonant with, and motivated by, our school's theological understanding grounded within the Wesleyan tradition. Specifically, we believe that all humans bear God's image, that we are both relationally constituted and situated in differing contexts that shape our understanding of the social order, and that the cultivation of "cultural responsibility," wherein

we understand and appreciate each other not simply as individuals but as products of these differing cultural contexts, is an earthly development of a heavenly reality. Scripture teaches that humans of every “tongue, tribe, and nation” will exist side-by-side in communal love and worship under the lordship of Christ.

Project Topic and Selection Process

Topic Overview

The QEP topic we have chosen is *cultural responsibility*, an area of focus for institutional emphasis as part of our 2017-2022 strategic plan. The common terms that comprise this expression (“cultural”; “responsibility”) risk harboring a variety of understandings and meanings, thus complicating a robust notion, understood by all, that can meaningfully inform institutional practice and/or decision-making.

We begin with the understanding that cultural responsibility is an *attitude* that governs our posture towards people, places, and things outside our regular realm of experience or understanding. Such a posture recognizes that cultural heterogeneity offers meaningful opportunities for realization, understanding, and fulfillment in others. Moreover, as all persons bear God’s image, knowing more of *the* other invites an opportunity to know more of *the* Creator.

In addition to an attitude, we also understand cultural responsibility as a suite of *competencies*—awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to intersect with others “who are culturally different from self in meaningful, relevant and productive ways.”¹ This consists of content knowledge of various cultural groups, behaviors that allow us to apply cultural awareness and knowledge meaningfully, and the ability to communicate across cultures in verbal and non-verbal ways.²

While cultural responsibility affords instrumental value in an increasingly diverse, globalized commercial marketplace (navigating multi-cultural workspaces, links to external assets, information diffusion, reciprocity, etc.), we equally recognize the inherent value of the other as an image bearer of our Creator, thus endowed with inherent dignity. John Wesley writes:

Let us renounce that bigotry and party zeal which would contract our hearts into an insensibility for all the human race, but a small number whose sentiments and practices are so much our own, that our love to them is but self-love reflected. With an honest openness of mind let us always remember that kindred between man and man, and cultivate that happy instinct whereby, in the original constitution of our nature, God has strongly bound us to each other.³

We echo Wesley’s recognition that we are “relationally constituted” beings. Thus, the development of our cultural responsibility will increase proportionate to our understanding of

¹ Pope, Raechele L., Amy L. Reynolds, and John A. Mueller. 2004. *Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (Page 13).

² *Ibid.*, p. 15

³ Wesley, John. n.d. "John Wesley’s Explanatory Notes." *Luke 10 Bible Commentary-Christianity.com* Verse 37.

the eternal bond we share with others—a “happy instinct” we aim to cultivate within this project.

Committee Formation and Data Review

The QEP Committee is composed of the following committee members (in alphabetical order):

Co-Chairs:

- Kevin Brown, Associate Dean, Dayton School of Business, and Associate Professor of Business
- Steve Clements, Dean, College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, and Associate Professor of Political Science

Current Committee Members:

- Stephanie Beltran, Student Congress Vice President for Student Intercultural Programs
- Benjamin Campbell, Student; Student Body President
- Andrea Edin, Institutional Accreditation Liaison
- Josh Fee, Dean of Adult and Online Learning
- Esther Jadhav, Assistant Vice President for Intercultural Affairs
- Kim Okesson, Associate Director for Undergraduate Admissions
- Erin Penner, Associate Professor of English; Chair of IDAC Committee
- Will Shouse, Head Coach, Men’s Basketball Team
- Kirk Sims, Assistant Professor of Intercultural Studies
- Paul Stephens, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Effectiveness
- Timothy Wooster, Asbury University Provost

Former Committee Members:

- Bonnie Banker, Asbury University Interim Provost (*interim appointment*)
- Standia Civil, Student Congress Vice President for Student Intercultural Programs
- Jon Kulaga, Asbury University Provost (*exited to another institution*)
- Nick Placido, Associate Professor of Social Work and Chair of IDAC Committee (*chair tenure concluded*)
- Tim Shell, Student; Student Body President (*graduated*)
- Michele Wells, Associate Professor of Social Work; MSW Program Coordinator (*exited to another institution*)

These individuals were strategically selected based upon their existing campus leadership roles, strategic competencies relative to the QEP, and representation across Asbury programs.

For our inaugural committee meeting, the purpose and process of the QEP was defined, which specifically included the information gathering process necessary to identify the topical guidelines for our established area of concentration.

The committee considered internal data, external data, and existing literature in our initial evaluations. Internal data included Asbury University's 2014 College Senior Survey, 2016 Student Satisfaction Inventory, and the 2015 QEP Impact Report, excerpted from Asbury University's 5th Year Report.

The committee then brought into discussions Asbury University's 2017-2022 Strategic Priorities document and its relationship to our data findings. We asked, is there consonance between what the existing data might reveal about campus needs and our strategic institutional trajectory? In March of 2017, the committee put specific language to core concepts emerging from the pre-existing data. Emerging themes included:

- Instructor knowledge, instruction, and course content is of primary importance to our students.
- There are gaps between major knowledge and problem solving competencies.
- Lower than average pluralistic orientation; not possessing the skills necessary to navigate a diverse society.

In April of 2017, we administered a campus wide survey based upon the topics from the aforementioned data analysis. The survey was sent to Asbury students (traditional undergraduate; graduate; adult and professional studies students), staff, and faculty. Moreover, data output was scrutinized to ensure the sample possessed adequate representation across race and gender.

Notably, findings from the survey reinforced common themes relating to cultural competence:

- Cultural competency is limited at Asbury currently
- Diversity/cross-cultural interaction is limited at Asbury currently
- Graduates are not sufficiently prepared to enter the world
- Essential for dialogue, cultural impact
- Essential to Christianity
- Essential for employment
- Current cross-cultural requirement not sufficient

Project Topic Selection Process

On April 28th, 2017, our committee officially endorsed "cultural responsibility" as our QEP area of focus. Based upon our data analysis, the perceived need for a more robust student experience in relation to cultural responsibility, and given the consonance with the third initiative of Asbury's five-year strategic plan ("Embrace"), choosing cultural responsibility as a directional focus for our QEP initiative was fitting.

In the latter part of April 2017, the committee began identifying student learning outcomes for the project based upon the information and data we had reviewed, and discussed how to seek suggestions for pursuing these outcomes from the wider university community in a Request for Proposals (RFP). The RFP would specifically solicit ideas for projects, activities, and programs to

best achieve the student learning outcomes. These outcomes would be measured across three discrete areas, knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values. Initial brainstorming produced the following ideas:

Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes/Values
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cultural intelligence (beyond my own culture) • cultural awareness (of my own culture) as a paradigm; that I have a culture, bias • history • have a direct experience of another culture • diversity within local, North American context (Asbury has traditionally engaged in global culture via missions; not many, if any, other universities have connected global and local) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • empathy • communication • adaptability • listening • “going abroad” abilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • empathy • sensitivity • humility • openness • theological beliefs • Welcome-ness of cultural responsibility ideology

In September 2017, the RFP was released to all faculty, staff, and students via a survey on the Qualtrics technology platform. The campus was given a deadline for submissions and offered a cash prize of \$500 for the winning proposal. In the request, we included narrative statements that best captured the area of focus and identified our learning outcomes, still in their infancy. We wanted our communication to be as complete and clear as possible to make the RFP accessible across all groups of participants.

Two reminders were sent prior to the deadline, and when the solicitation closed on October 20, 2017, we had collected 20 proposals. The committee created a rubric by which to evaluate the proposals on an individual basis, which measured across five different categories:

- Proposal is clear
- Proposal sufficiently addresses the student learning outcomes and addresses QEP goals across attitudes, skills, and values
- Proposal is measurable
- Proposal is practical and realistic
- Overall: Proposal's capacity to sufficiently address the QEP

In November 2017, committee members completed their individual rankings and then met to choose, through a majority vote, the proposal that best addressed the student learning outcomes. As it turned out, two proposals emerged in a tie, and in January 2018, the committee voted to announce both as winners and divide the cash prize between the authors.

In review of the proposals, however, the committee determined that while the winning proposals would inform the QEP programming directions, the committee itself would retain control of the broader project, and would not simply adopt wholesale the content of the preeminent proposals. No one proposal fully addressed the learning outcomes sufficiently, and in that light, we considered again what the true aim of our QEP should be.

The committee met in February and March of 2018 to determine how best to meaningfully and strategically incorporate dimensions of the proposals into campus-wide action steps for our QEP. Consideration was given as to what constituents of the University community the project would focus on: According to the data, what are the primary areas for growth? What can we address at this time? What can we resource? What will most improve the quality of Asbury at the institutional level?

After much discussion, a sub-committee of QEP members was appointed to identify components and actions that would illustrate our commitment to cultural responsibility at Asbury University. In late March 2018, the whole committee re-convened to finalize the list of project essentials. We identified goals for both the institution on the whole and its community members. Under the University Strategic Plan, the institution committed to enhancing hospitality on campus, to diversifying the student body, faculty, and staff, and to presenting a clear theological premise underlying these pursuits. These enhancements would provide the necessary environment for Asbury's community members to develop appropriately.

Development of the Institution	
Shared understanding of Mission Centric, Gospel Centric Precept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theological statement constructed, distributed, communicated, exegeted regularly
Uniformity, clarity of nomenclature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural awareness, responsibility, competency, justice, equity, race, ethnicity
Advance as a Culturally Hospitable Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze conditions/experiences of success, respond accordingly • Culturally responsive pedagogy • Celebrate cultures (displays, festivals, food, etc)
Progress Toward a Representative Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students • Staff • Faculty
Development of Community Members	
Core Values Communicated, Fostered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gospel-humility • Thoughtful approaches to privilege • Value biblical heterogeneity
Cultural Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One's Own Culture: Demonstrate understanding of one's own cultural identity; interpret and articulate one's own direct experience of cultural identity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture of Others: Awareness of differing world views, systems, means of doing life; Appreciation of differing world views, systems; Pursuit of understanding
Intersection of Cultures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Display humility in inter- and intra- cultural interactions • Recognition, comprehension of: unconscious bias, unintended racism, micro aggressions, appropriation • Conduct self-appraisal to enhance awareness of cultural influence, bias, perspective, perception, etc. • Avoid assumptions where they might be unfounded • Effectively engage cultures outside of one's own • Demonstrate empathy in interpersonal interactions • Identify influences of cultures: macro and micro levels

The strategic institutional environment goals extend to all constituents of the University, including all students (residential, online; undergraduate, graduate, adult learners). However, thoughtful discussion determined that because the needs of our community members vary greatly, implementing the goals for their development would require more tightly targeted actions. The decision was made to focus the QEP primarily on traditional undergraduate students, through academic coursework in the general education program. The rationale for this decision was 1) driven by assessment data showing greatest need for growth among this population; 2) lowest levels of demographic diversity among this population; and 3) opportunities for effective impact and increased student learning within existing graduation requirements. The committee especially sought to avoid burdening any student population with the addition of costly requirements.

With the project topic and larger goals selected, in October 2018, we turned to discussion of the programmatic features of the QEP, as well as next steps and implementation. The committee discussed the nomination of a QEP Lead Evaluator and the development of project deliverables, an internal marketing plan, and a budget. Sample videos of internal QEP marketing spots from other schools and universities were provided to the group. In December 2018, the student learning outcomes were finalized and mapped to the project goals.

In January 2019, a subcommittee was assigned the task of constructing the final report to be sent to SACSCOC in preparation for the April On-Site Committee Visit. Drafting resulted in a more simplified plan, with reduced redundancy and a more realistic and manageable assessment plan of activities; and ultimately, we arrived upon a more targeted understanding of cultural responsibility. Lastly, the committee turned its sights upon seeking a project name to capture the spirit of cultural responsibility. Current Asbury Student Body President and QEP Committee member Benjamin Campbell sent a campus wide email to students to solicit potential project names, again offering a cash prize to the winning submission.

In February 2019, the committee reviewed the names provided by students and discussed which best portrayed the essence of cultural responsibility as we have defined it. Student Ben Okenge

was awarded a \$100 gift card for supplying the name *Imago Dei*. The decision was made to adopt the following: *The Imago Dei Initiative: Embracing Cultural Integrity* (since retitled to *The Imago Dei Initiative: Embracing Cultural Responsibility*)

In anticipation of the April 2019 On-Site Review, the QEP Committee then sought faculty approval of the curricular revisions *Imago Dei* outlines and turned its sights on publicizing *Imago Dei* to the University community. On March 6, 2019, the Provost dedicated a portion of his chapel message to announce the project topic and its key points to the student body. And on March 28, 2019, the committee held a forum for deeper discussion with faculty regarding the project's origin, process of development and future implementation.

Revisions to the QEP Since the On-Site Visit

The On-Site Visit Committee reviewed the *Imago Dei Initiative* in April 2019 and provided three recommendations. Firstly, they recommended we concentrate more closely upon the student learning objectives. Secondly, they recommended we commit adequate resources to implement and complete the QEP, providing an accurately-scaled budgetary plan through the fifth-year cycle review. And lastly, they recommended we revise our assessment plan with clearer links to the student learning outcomes.

In response, the QEP Committee has made the determination to narrow the focus of the *Imago Dei Initiative*. The previous iteration of the plan included three primary elements. Element 1 contained the academic heart of the plan, while Elements 2 and 3 (which flowed from existing objectives of the University Strategic Plan) were crafted to enhance the campus learning environment in support of Element 1.

Elements 2 and 3 have been removed from the plan, and steps have been taken to strengthen the remaining Element 1. The Committee has thus narrowed its QEP objectives to the following:

- I. The addition of a credit-bearing cultural engagement requirement to the University's Foundations general education program;
- II. The development of an academic curriculum to equip students with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes of cultural responsibility; and
- III. The formation of an administrative unit to assist with project implementation, analyze activities and consider additional steps to promote cultural responsibility.

The faculty members of the QEP Committee were charged with the creation of the academic curriculum. The resulting academic course, CCE 150 Cultural Engagement and Responsibility, will provide the academic content for students to learn the principles of cultural responsibility and develop its necessary skills, while also providing real-life opportunity for intercultural engagement and reflection. The policies, syllabus, and content for CCE 150 have been developed, are in the final stages of institutional faculty and administrative review, and are scheduled for full implementation Fall 2020.

In light of the recommendations, the committee also gave considerable discussion to the learning outcomes. The previous plan contained eight student learning outcomes, as well as a secondary set of institutional environment outcomes. The QEP Committee determined to narrow the plan to only include the student learning outcomes. All content and assignments of CCE 150 now align to the student learning outcomes. The assessment plan has also been revised to align with this concentrated focus, as has resourcing for the first five years of the plan.

QEP Oversight Committee

Beginning in the fall of 2019, Asbury University will take its next steps toward implementing this QEP under the guidance of an Oversight Committee that includes the following individuals, identified to provide leadership and coordination for the work specified in this document.

QEP Director

- Esther Jadhav, Chair of Oversight Committee and Assistant Vice President for Intercultural Affairs

QEP Oversight Committee Membership

- Kim Okesson, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Adjunct Faculty for Intercultural Communication
- Erin Penner, Associate Professor of English and Chair of the Intercultural Development and Awareness Committee
- Kirk Sims, Assistant Professor of Intercultural Studies
- Paul Stephens, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Effectiveness
- Timothy Wooster, University Provost
- Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director (*administrative position to be developed through Imago Dei*)
- Asbury Student Congress representative

This group may also include other faculty and staff as chosen by the Provost or President. As chair, the QEP Director will steward and advance the institutional vision for cultural responsibility. The Director will supervise the work of the committee and review with the Provost any recommendations for change the QEP oversight brings to pass.

Literature Review

Introduction

As Asbury University prepares to enhance cultural responsibility through this QEP, we offer comments here on how Asbury understands this phrase conceptually, so that we can ground our actions in academic discourse. As a faith-based institution that desires to build upon its Christian identity, a logical starting point for us is a theological perspective for this project. Christian theology has many bases upon which *cultural responsibility* could be built. One that has emerged over the last few generations and is congruent with a secular understanding of human dignity is the concept of *imago Dei*. The notion of *imago Dei* affirms that all persons are of sacred worth, and, naturally, the cultures individuals are embedded within are important.

Cultural competence and responsibility have further justifications from which an institution of higher education can build. In addition to theological reasons, demographic, technological, economic and interpersonal reasons abound for a university that

equips students, through academic excellence and spiritual vitality, for lifelong learning, leadership and service to the professions, society, the family and the Church, preparing them to engage their cultures and advance the cause of Christ around the world.⁴

An institution of higher education that prepares students to engage cultures, and not simply to assimilate students into one specific culture, should embrace a broad-minded orientation regarding cultures. This approach will give students permission to embrace their cultural backgrounds and make use of their own agency of incorporating additional elements of other cultures as they interact with them.

Asbury's distinct identity also give insights into ways in which the university has thrived at embracing cultural diversity. For example, from its inception the University has welcomed students from around the world and has also sent students to many nations for the purposes of ministry, non-profit work, and commerce. Yet Asbury also has points for improvement as it prepares students for the world beyond its classrooms here in the early 21st century. The focus of this QEP demonstrates a deep commitment to enhance these competencies for Asbury's students. We explore below what we mean by "cultural responsibility."

Imago Dei

A basis for this discussion should actually take us back to the beginning of our theological narrative. In the first chapter of Genesis, we are told,

⁴ Asbury University. "Asbury University Mission Statement." Asbury University, <https://www.asbury.edu/life/resources/handbook-community-life/au-mission-statement/>.

Then God said, 'Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.'

So God created humankind in his image,
in the image of God he created them;
male and female he created them.⁵

Over the last few decades, Christian theology has had a renewal of thought around embracing the fact that all persons are created in the image of God. This concept is often used interchangeably with the Latin form, *imago Dei*. As Chris Wright puts it, "the image of God is not so much something we *possess*, as *what we are*...it is definitive of what it means to be human."⁶ Wright goes on to expand this by saying:

1. All human beings are addressable to God,
2. All human beings are accountable to God,
3. All human beings have dignity and equality, and
4. The biblical gospel fits all.⁷

Wright's third point is of special note to our committee's perspective. If all persons are created in God's image, then the people of God are called to treat all persons with sacred worth, regardless of their background, race, ethnicity, or culture. This has been seen in the correlations between the universality of human dignity⁸ and the *imago Dei*.⁹ If all persons are created in the image of God and are thus born into the context of cultures, then the church is called to meet them in their cultural milieu. Wright declares, "Anything that denies other human beings their dignity or fails to show respect, interest and informed understanding for all that they hold precious is actually a failure of love."¹⁰ Daniel Groody points out

Imago Dei is a two-edged sword that positively functions as an affirmation of the value and worth of every person, and evaluates and challenges any tendencies to dominate or

⁵ Genesis 1:26-27, NRSV.

⁶ Wright, Christopher J. H. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*. Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2006, p. 421. Italics in original.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 422-425.

⁸ For a widely held secular position, refer to United Nations. *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. General Assembly Resolution 217 A. United Nations General Assembly, Paris: United Nations, 1948. "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

⁹ Moltmann has been a champion of this connection in theological circles. Chapman, G. Clarke. "On Being Human: Moltmann's Anthropology of Hope." *The Asbury Theological Journal* 55, no. 1 (2000): 69-84.

¹⁰ Wright, p. 424.

oppress the poor and needy, or degrade through various manifestations of racism, nativism, and xenophobia.¹¹

Fully embracing a theology of the *imago Dei* challenges any cultural hierarchy and encourages an equal footing of cultures, and therefore, all people are to be treated as individuals created in the image of God. If someone is Other, we are still called to treat her or him as a fellow person created in the image of God.¹²

Eschatological vision

Christian theology does not simply look back to the origins of humanity, it also looks to the reality of things to come. People of faith are working in anticipation of our eternal destiny and seek to actualize this eschatological vision in this epoch of the Holy Spirit where we do believe that sanctification is possible in this life.¹³ John's Revelation communicates the eternal reality.

After this I looked, and there was a great multitude that no one could count, from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, robed in white, with palm branches in their hands.¹⁴

It was clear to the Apostle John that people from every cultural background will be gathered together before the Lord. If this is our future reality, we could begin to live into this same embrace of cultural diversity in this day. Asbury University theology professor Dr. Chris Bounds has elucidated this eschatological vision from a Wesleyan theological perspective. Speaking specifically about how we interact with those from other religions, but which has a correlation to other cultures, he points out that a Wesleyan perspective is predisposed to openness, for it "opens the Church to the grace, beauty and truth found in other religions and cultures through the Holy Spirit" and it "provides a vision of mutual relationships of self-giving love."¹⁵

Self-giving love calls the people of God to be welcoming to those who are from different cultures.¹⁶ Unity, and not uniformity is the call we see from Jesus and Paul.¹⁷ *The Cape Town Commitment*, a document that emerged from the Third Lausanne Congress on World

¹¹ Groody, Daniel G. "Crossing the Divide: Foundations of a Theology of Migration and Refugees." *Theological Studies* 70, no. 3 (2009), p. 648.

¹² Livermore, David A. *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

¹³ This is particularly the case in the Wesleyan Holiness theological tradition.

¹⁴ Revelation 7:9, NRSV.

¹⁵ Bounds, Christopher. "Wesleyan Eschatological Implications for the Church's Engagement with Other Religions." In *Thirteenth Institute: The Oxford Institute of Methodist Theological Studies*, 2013, pp. 11-12.

¹⁶ For instance, Leviticus 19:33-34 states: "When an alien resides with you in your land, you shall not oppress the alien. The alien who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the alien as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God." And Jesus plainly states in Matthew 25:35 "I was a stranger and you welcomed me." (NRSV).

¹⁷ E.g., John 17:21 and Galatians 3:28.

Evangelization points out that “Ethnic diversity is the gift of God in creation and will be preserved in the new creation.”¹⁸

Defining culture

Many of the academic disciplines taught at Asbury have much invested in the concept of culture. Some have a need to identify discreet phenomena, while others seek to operationalize interactions between different groups of people. Some trends do come up in defining culture in the different disciplines. A few attributes from across the social scientific and communication disciplines tend to occur in various definitions, namely that culture is shared, learned, represents values, and gives a framework for both interpreting one’s world and living in it.

From missiological anthropology, Paul Hiebert offers a concise definition. Culture is

the more or less integrated systems of ideas, feelings, and values and their associated patterns of behavior and products shared by a group of people who organize and regulate what they think, feel, and do.¹⁹

This definition shall serve as a working definition for our discussions.

Imperatives for cross-cultural competence

Beyond some of the theological justifications, Asbury has multiple reasons to seek to implement its strategic plan as the institution sees to “Provide thought- and action- leadership on advancing cultural competency.”²⁰ As Asbury University students encounter the world upon graduation, they will need to be aware of cultural dynamics that demonstrate imperatives for competence in this area.

Lustig and Koester articulate major imperatives for *intercultural competence*. The first is *demographic*, for we are “currently in the midst of what is perhaps the largest and most extensive wave of cultural mixing in recorded history,”²¹ stemming from the explosion of global commercial expansion following the end of the Cold War, now being enhanced by the flow of workers across national borders and by the visibility of global developments provided by the internet. Projections also show the United States is on a trajectory to become a majority-minority country by 2045.²² Another reason for equipping our students with cross-cultural

¹⁸ The Lausanne Movement. "The Cape Town Commitment." The Lausanne Movement, <http://www.lausanne.org/en/documents/ctcommitment.html>, Part 1, ¶ 1, § B.

¹⁹ Hiebert, Paul G. *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1985.

²⁰ Asbury University. "Imagine2022." Asbury University, <https://www.asbury.edu/about/offices/administration/iesp/imagine2022/>.

²¹ Lustig, Myron W., and Jolene Koester. *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures*. Seventh Edition ed. Hoboken: Pearson, 2013, p. 3.

²² United States Census Bureau. "Race and Hispanic Origin of the Native and Foreign: Projections for the United States: 2017-2060." Washington: United States Census Bureau, 2017.

competencies is *technological*. As Thomas Friedman articulated a dozen years ago, the world is being flattened,²³ particularly regarding ways information and travel are available to the masses. Another consideration is *economic*. One significant explanation is how much contact people have with goods and services produced in different cultures and the rapid growth of international trade. International trade with the United States had tripled every decade since the 1960s.²⁴

Cross-cultural interactions and identity

The degree of cultural immersion an individual might encounter can vary greatly, from a one-time encounter in another part of a city, to a two-week vacation overseas, to emigrating to another country and seeking to embrace a new life amongst a people completely different from oneself. For those who may find themselves immersed in another cultural context, some approaches are healthier for the person who may need to negotiate cultural identities. Rejecting either one's home culture (sometimes called "going native") or a new culture is not always healthy and does not demonstrate a commitment to the *imago Dei* imparted on all people. Some may compartmentalize cultures, but they find themselves being one type of person in one cultural context and a completely different one in another context. For long-term emotional health when one embraces another culture, it is best for people to voluntarily integrate the new identity alongside the former identity.²⁵

Multicultural theory

Asbury University's aim through a project like this is not to require people to reject their culture by assimilating into one particular culture, but to create an environment whereby all cultures can be celebrated and given permission to be expressed. Often when members of cultural minorities are in the midst of a different/majority culture, they feel pressure through explicit and implicit means to expect such people to assimilate into the majority culture. Assimilation is "giving up the original culture identity and moving into full participation in the new culture."²⁶ However, the "enforcement of uniformity discredits the uniqueness of each individual created in the image and likeness of God."²⁷ As a setting in which students will typically relate to Asbury for a few years, often during a liminal time in their lives, the objective is not to require conformity to a single culture, but to learn and develop in the context of multiple cultures. A common understanding in the United States has been to work towards "melting pot" environments. In an

²³ Friedman, Thomas L. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. 1st further updated and expanded hardcover ed. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.

²⁴ Lustig, Myron W., and Jolene Koester. *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures*. Seventh Edition ed. Hoboken: Pearson, 2013, p. 9.

²⁵ Kim, Young Yun. *Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross-Cultural Adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2001; Hiebert, Paul G., and Young Hertig. "Asian Immigrants in American Cities." *Urban Mission*, no. March (1993): 15-24; Livermore, David A. *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009, 239-240.

²⁶ Jandt, Fred Edmund. *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community*. Eighth edition. ed. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016, G-1.

²⁷ WCC Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. "Together Towards Life: Mission and Evangelism in Changing Landscapes." Crete, Greece: World Council of Churches, 2012, ¶ 99.

ideal world of a melting pot, everyone is expected to relinquish some degree of cultural identity with an intent to form something new altogether. However, in practice, a melting pot approach has often been seen as “a more subtle, multidimensional, and normatively ambivalent concept of assimilation”²⁸ where the majority culture dominates.²⁹

Philosophically, a context where people from all cultures could be given permission and liberty to flourish is a multicultural one. Multiculturalism “is the recognition that several different cultures can exist in the same environment and benefit each other.”³⁰ Many approaches to multiculturalism are practiced, but multicultural contexts should have some key components. In developing the conditions for a multicultural setting to thrive, Schreiter posits a community must first have *recognition of diversity*, then move on to *respect for difference*, and eventually setting up *a forum for cooperation and communication*.³¹ All of these will be addressed through this QEP.

We note here that allowing people from different cultures to express themselves does not imply that everything in every culture is equally valid. All cultures have elements that must be addressed as they encounter the Word of God.³² As part of a robust Christian liberal arts education, students will be given tools to contextualize the Gospel in their cultures. Arguing for a multicultural setting does not advocate cultural relativism.

Some degree of acculturation³³ may be necessary for students to thrive in a North American university setting.

Contextual background

As Asbury looks to the future, it has had some great exposure to diversity, but Asbury has not always fully lived into the vision of the Imagine2022 strategic plan. Asbury desires to become more of a “Christian community that practices hospitality, mutuality, redemptive social action,

²⁸ Brubaker, Rogers. "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, no. 1 (2005), p. 8.

²⁹ Crowder, George. *Theories of Multiculturalism: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013; Kim, Young Yun. *Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross-Cultural Adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2001; Jandt, Fred Edmund. *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community*. Eighth edition. ed. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016, G-4;

³⁰ Rogers, Everett M., and Thomas M. Steinfatt. *Intercultural Communication*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press, Inc., 1999, p. 267.

³¹ Schreiter, Robert J. *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local*. Faith and Cultures Series. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1997, p. 95.

³² Keller, Timothy. *Center Church: Doing Balanced, Gospel-Centered Ministry in Your City*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012; Whiteman, Darrell L. "Response to Paul G. Hiebert: "The Gospel in Human Contexts: Changing Perceptions of Contextualization"." In *Missionshift: Global Mission Issues in the Third Millennium*, edited by David J. Hesselgrave and Ed Stetzer. Nashville, Tenn.: B&H Academic, 2010, p. 119; Bevens, Stephen B. *Models of Contextual Theology, Revised and Expanded Edition*. Faith and Cultures Series. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2004, pp. 117-137.

³³ “Acculturation is the process through which an individual is socialized into a new culture while retaining many elements of a previous culture.” Rogers and Steinfatt, p. 265.

and grace-filled reconciliation.”³⁴ As one walks the halls of the lower level of Hughes Auditorium, one will find collages of all graduating classes over the institution’s past. Within the first three decades of its existence, a noticeable proportion of Asian students were present.³⁵ A long-standing commitment to cross-cultural mission work is deep in the DNA of Asbury University. Starting in 1908, Asbury has had some annual iteration of what is now called the Great Commission Congress that desires “A larger remnant of the campus community committing to a lifetime of cross-cultural and international Great Commission service.”³⁶ As they leave chapel, students are reminded of Asbury’s missionary legacy through a memorial remembering alumni missionary martyrs who died in far off lands.³⁷

One name that must be mentioned in Asbury’s narrative of intercultural interactions is Dr. E. Stanley Jones, a Methodist minister and missionary who had significant influence in his adopted home of India, and through his writings and journeys back to the United States was a voice calling the church and Asbury to treat all people with dignity and equality. Higher education was legally segregated in Kentucky up until 1950 when the Day Law was repealed.³⁸ It was not until 1962 when Asbury College fully integrated. It was in this twelve-year period in which Jones resigned his position on the Board of Trustees in protest of Asbury’s Christian witness.³⁹

Asbury has seen a rise in students from minority culture backgrounds. As of the 2018-19 academic year, 16.82 percent of all enrolled students are either non-white or international students. A challenge will be to create some parity with employees where 6.06 percent of faculty and 2.90 percent of staff belonging to these same minority categories.⁴⁰ However, Asbury is demonstrating a commitment to addressing deficiencies and enhancing through a renewed emphasis on cultural responsibility.

Cultural responsibility

For our QEP, Asbury has chosen to utilize the language of *cultural responsibility* for a means of addressing and enhancing the experiences and learning outcomes of Asbury University students.

³⁴ Asbury University. "Imagine2022." Asbury University, <https://www.asbury.edu/about/offices/administration/iesp/imagine2022/>.

³⁵ In the Class of 1919 photo, 4/18 graduates (22.22%) had last names of Asian provenance. (Chan, Suzuki, Yum, Funanda.)

³⁶ Asbury University. "Great Commission Congress." Asbury University, <https://www.asbury.edu/about/spiritual-vitality/chapel/great-commission-congress/>.

³⁷ The narthex of Hughes Auditorium, Asbury’s chapel, has a plaque in memory of graduates who died as missionaries in contexts listed as South Africa, Vietnam, Belgian Congo, and Zaire.

³⁸ Woods, Curtis, John Wilsey, Kevin Jones, Jarvis Williams, Matthew J. Hall, and Gregory Will. "Report on Slavery and Racism in the History of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary." The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018, p 61, *Berea College V. Kentucky*, 211 U.S. 45 Brewer, David Josiah (1908).

³⁹ Swartz, David R. "Christ of the American Road: E. Stanley Jones, India, and Civil Rights." *Journal of American Studies* 51, no. 4 (2017): 1117-38.

⁴⁰ Intercultural Development and Awareness Committee. "Demographic Reality Cultural/Ethnic Minorities at Asbury University, December 2018." Asbury University, 2019. These student numbers have generally been on the rise over the last few years, and Asbury may soon have another graduating class that matches the proportions of the 1919 graduating class (22.22% international or cultural minorities), q.v.

Although this specific language has been utilized in academic circles for the obligations one may have to one's own culture,⁴¹ or pedagogically being responsive to the cultural background of the students being educated,⁴² we will use it more along the lines of the literature pertaining to *cultural intelligence*, *intercultural competence*, or *cross-cultural competence*.

Intercultural competence is "the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately with people of cultures other than one's own."⁴³ Moreau, Campbell, and Greener point out that it is a collection of abilities, primarily to "adjust well by coping effectively with culture stress and dealing with adaptation...facilitate adjustment and manage stress...[and] to carry out one's assigned task—that is professional competency and actual job performance."⁴⁴ *Intercultural competence* is very similar to how Johnson, Lenartowicz, and Apud define *cross-cultural competence* as

an individual's effectiveness in drawing upon a set of knowledge, skills, and personal attributes in order to work successfully with people from different national cultural backgrounds at home or abroad.⁴⁵

Likewise, another term in the literature is *cultural intelligence*, which David Livermore says requires four major attributes for consideration, chiefly, knowledge, interpretive, perseverance, and behavioral qualities.⁴⁶ He says that *cultural intelligence* "is meta-framework that measures and explains one's ability to reach across the chasm of cultural difference in ways that are loving and respectful."⁴⁷ Peterson uses this same term to describe an

ability to engage in a set of behaviors that uses skills ... and qualities ... that are tuned appropriately to the culture-based values and attitudes of the people with whom one interacts.⁴⁸

⁴¹ Fishman, Joshua A. *Ideology, Society & Language: The Odyssey of Nathan Birnbaum*. Ann Arbor: Karoma, 1987; Benmayor, R. "Narrating Cultural Citizenship: Oral Histories of First-Generation College Students of Mexican Origin." *Social Justice* 29, no. 4 (2002): 96-121; Harley, Debra A. "Maids of Academe: African American Women Faculty at Predominately White Institutions." *Journal of African American Studies* 12, no. 19-36 (2007). It could also be associated with a political ideology. Haltinner, Kristin. "Individual Responsibility, Culture, or State Organized Enslavement? How Tea Party Activists Frame Racial Inequality." *Sociological Perspectives* 59, no. 2 (2016): 395-417.

⁴² Riebe-Estrella, Gary. "The Challenge of Ministerial Formation." *Missiology* XX, no. 3 (1992): 269-74.

⁴³ Jandt, Fred Edmund. *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community*. Eighth edition. ed. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016, p. G-4.

⁴⁴ Moreau, A. Scott, Evvy Hay Campbell, and Susan Greener. *Effective Intercultural Communication: A Christian Perspective*. Encountering Mission. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2014, p. 227.

⁴⁵ Johnson, James P., Tomasz Lenartowicz, and Salvador Apud. "Cross-Cultural Competence in International Business: Toward a Definition and a Model." *Journal of International Business Studies* 37, no. 4 (2006): 525-43.

⁴⁶ Livermore, David A. *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009, p. 55.

⁴⁷ Livermore, David A. *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009, p. 257.

⁴⁸ Peterson, Brooks. *Cultural Intelligence: A Guide to Working with People from Other Cultures*. Boston: Intercultural Press, 2004, p. 89.

These streams of *intercultural competence*, *cross-cultural competence*, and *cultural intelligence* shape and enhance knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors. So that people may have healthy interactions among people in cross-cultural and multicultural settings and in the world beyond, Asbury will seek to apply its terminology of *cultural responsibility*, which is used in the strategic plan, Imagine2022.⁴⁹

Initiative III in Imagine2022 demonstrates this reality:

Cultivate a culturally responsible Christian community that practices hospitality, mutuality, redemptive social action, and grace-filled reconciliation.

- Provide thought- and action- leadership on advancing cultural competency.
 - Communicate importance of cultural and ethnic diversity in spiritual and moral growth.
 - Assess and develop culturally responsive programs and initiatives to support diversity as crucial aspect of embodied Christian community.
- Create conditions for and model intercultural engagement.
 - Increase knowledge and importance of diversity to advance change that reflects cultural humility.
 - Increase faculty, staff, and student representation from under-represented groups.
 - Leverage resources for intercultural awareness and knowledge.
- Develop and maintain conducive environment for experienced equity.
 - Practice culturally responsive pedagogy.
 - Assess and develop analytics for under-represented populations.⁵⁰

Concluding Thoughts

As Asbury enters into this quality enhancement project, Asbury will seek to live into being a grace-filled community that equips its students to engage a diverse world. The impetus for this project comes out of the theological position of *Imago Dei*, but external justifications are also present. Asbury will create a robust multicultural environment committed to living into its eschatological reality where those “from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages will be standing before the throne and before the Lamb.”⁵¹

The bibliography for our theoretical, conceptual and theological understanding of cultural responsibility can be found in Appendix B.

⁴⁹ Asbury University. "Imagine2022." Asbury University, <https://www.asbury.edu/about/offices/administration/iesp/imagine2022/>.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Revelation 7:9, NRSV.

Student Learning Outcomes

We have identified eight student learning outcomes for *Imago Dei*. These have been carefully selected and are categorized under the headings of knowledge, skills, and attitudes:

- I. Knowledge
 - a. Students will articulate a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity
 - b. Students will be able to define cultural responsibility
 - c. Students will demonstrate understanding of one's own cultural identity
 - d. Students will be able to interpret one's own direct experience of cultural identity
- II. Skills
 - a. Students will demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions
 - b. Students will be able to effectively engage cultures outside their own
 - c. Students will conduct self-appraisal to enhance cultural awareness
- III. Attitudes
 - a. Students will display humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions

These learning outcomes are the fruit of much discussion and review by the committee.

The knowledge outcomes are designed to provide students with basic cultural intelligence. This is a two-pronged approach. Central to the mission of the Asbury University is the integration of faith and learning. Students will be presented with a Biblical interpretation of cultural intelligence that is both academically sound and in keeping with the Wesleyan-Holiness theological heritage of the institution. As a result, they will be able to articulate the theological importance of cultural diversity and also be able to speak to their own cultural identity as individuals.

The skills outcomes are designed to accompany the knowledge outcomes. Elements and activities of the plan provide a "laboratory" for developing and practicing behaviors which coincide with increasing cultural intelligence, such as awareness and the ability to navigate a culture different from one's own. Working together, the intelligence and the behavior ideally will progress toward a more mature, culturally responsible student body. It is the ultimate aim of the project to produce students who embrace the knowledge and skills they acquire. This is represented in the sole attitude outcome, the cultivation of cultural humility.

Project Actions and Initiatives

Proposed Project Elements

Having articulated these student learning outcomes to result from enhancing cultural responsibility on our campus, we now turn to the specific programmatic elements our committee believes will best accomplish these outcomes. We summarize these below, and will flesh them out in greater detail in the pages that follow:

- I. The addition of a credit-bearing cultural engagement requirement to the University's Foundations general education program;
- II. The development of an academic curriculum to equip students with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes of cultural responsibility; and
- III. The formation of an administrative unit to assist with project implementation, analyze activities and consider additional steps to promote cultural responsibility.

We discuss next these major activities, and then offer considerations around how a QEP Oversight Committee can effectively manage and coordinate them. In each, we provide institutional background to outline how our proposed additions fit into the long-term strategic development of Asbury University.

Element I. The addition of a credit-bearing cultural engagement requirement to the University's Foundations general education program.

Following Asbury University's 2009 decennial SACSCOC visit, and a two-year internal review process that ensued, Asbury's faculty approved a reorganization of our general education curriculum (termed "Foundations"). This work entailed moving existing and new courses under five broad student learning outcome areas and establishing a narrative framework for understanding the relationship of these outcomes to Asbury University's liberal arts mission and theological orientation.

The third area of the revised foundational curriculum is entitled *Engaging Society and Global Responsibility* and relates most directly to our chosen QEP topic of cultural responsibility. The identified student learning outcome for this area is, "Students will demonstrate how key concepts from the social and behavioral sciences help to identify and address real-world problems of human persons, communities, and nations, including the origin of such problems."

The general education requirements for traditional undergraduate students are slightly different than those required of our Adult Professional Studies (APS) online degree completion students. Operating under the same framework and learning outcomes, traditional undergraduate students are also asked to complete a foreign language requirement and a cross-cultural

experience requirement (CCE) prior to graduation. APS students are exempt for these requirements.

Currently, traditional undergraduates must complete the following to fulfill the *Engaging Society and Global Responsibility* area:

- Complete 3 credit hours of history (American history or Western Civilization)
- Complete 3 credit hours of social science (Economics, Political Science, Psychology, or Sociology)
- Complete 9 credit hours of foreign language (Chinese, French, Greek, Hebrew, Latin, or Spanish)
- Complete CCE 073 cross-cultural engagement requirement (0 credit hours)

To satisfy the existing CCE requirement, they must spend a minimum of seven consecutive days and six nights in an approved cross-cultural setting and must complete related reading and writing assignments. Students have many different options for fulfilling this requirement—they may participate, for example, in a church or organization-sponsored missions trip, a trip abroad led by one or more faculty members, or a trip taken by an athletic team. There are various domestic travel options available as well, to take advantage of the many cultural minority communities located across the US. And it is also possible for students to substitute a course option if they are unable for valid reasons to undertake a travel option. Guidelines for completing the CCE requirement successfully are published in the University Bulletin and on the university website: <https://www.asbury.edu/academics/resources/geo/cross-cultural-engagement/>.

Assessment data for our traditional undergraduates indicates, however, that student learning in the third outcome area is lower than all other areas in the general education program.

Table 1. General Education Proficiency Assessment Mean Scores of Freshmen and Seniors, Associated Gains 2011-17

	Freshmen Average 2011-16	Senior Average 2012-17	Value Added
SLO 1: Christian Faith & Culture	48.6%	62.3%	13.7%
SLO 2: Human Thought & Creative Expression	52.9%	61.8%	8.9%
SLO 3: Society & Global Responsibility	43.2%	53.1%	9.9%
SLO 4: Quantitative & Critical Literacy	60.8%	65.3%	4.5%
SLO 5: Natural World & Environment	52.5%	60.3%	7.8%
Overall	50.4%	59.0%	8.6%

This data, along with several additional measures and reports, was considered by the committee in conjunction with the unanimity of the university community’s interest in enhancing its cultural responsibility. It became clear that *knowledge* was needed as well as skills, attitudes, and a hospitable institutional environment, and that the CCE requirement was insufficient in its current format to address that need. One such voice calling for the transformation of the CCE

requirement was Tina Wei Smith, former Global Engagement Office director and manager of student completion of the CCE. Smith's proposal to move the CCE to a credit-bearing requirement of the foundations curriculum was one of the co-winners of our RFP contest, and so the committee took these recommendations seriously as part of its deliberations.

The committee determined ultimately that a redesign of the CCE from mere graduation requirement check-off to a credit-bearing, academic component of the general education program, with greater faculty oversight and better outcomes assessment, would provide an ideal opportunity to address this knowledge deficiency. This element of our QEP, in other words, will serve both to enhance cultural responsibility on the part of our students as well as to shore up learning outcomes in an area of our general education program that data show is relatively weak.

The new CCE requirement, which will be renamed as CCE 150 Cultural Engagement and Responsibility, is being proposed to the faculty as a 1 credit hour requirement, housed under the *Engaging Society and Global Responsibility* section of the general education program as before, but with substantial modifications.

- CCE 150 will involve an academic course covering the topic of cultural responsibility and its practices, which will be completed prior to the field experience, i.e. the cross-cultural or travel portion of the requirement, wherein the behaviors and knowledges gained in the course component can be practiced.
- Students will follow the course with an approved field experience, similar to the minimum travel experience embedded in our existing requirement. In addition to completing the classroom portion of the course, the field experience component must be completed within 12 months of CCE 150 for the student to fully satisfy the cross-cultural graduation requirement.

Element II. The development of an academic curriculum to equip students with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes of cultural responsibility.

The curriculum for CCE 150 has been designed by a subgroup of the QEP Committee membership. Each individual holds appropriate graduate-level credentials in the field of Intercultural Studies and is academically qualified to both develop the coursework as well as teach its content. As this course is the primary vehicle for enhancing our students' cultural responsibility and comprises the heart of the *Imago Dei* project, careful consideration was taken in its development.

Practically, its aim is to educate and train students in anticipation of their selected cross-cultural immersion experience, providing the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to enter another culture and reflect thoughtfully upon it. It was created with the mission of the University in mind: "To equip students for leadership and service to the professions, society, the family and the Church, preparing them to engage their cultures and advance the cause of Christ around the world."

The course objectives for CCE 150 include:

- Preparing students to understand their own ethnicity and cultural background;
- Equipping students to identify cultural differences; and
- Preparing students to adapt, understand, and communicate across cultural boundaries; and
- Preparing students to fulfill their CCE graduation requirement in a culturally responsible way.

Like a lecture and lab, CCE 150 contains two main, complementing components. Firstly, students will complete an academic course in-seat. Assignments, which include reading materials and reports, class participation exercises, reflection papers, and an external pre-post cultural intelligence assessment, are all aligned to the student learning outcomes comprising the *Imago Dei* project. Students will complete these requirements of CCE 150 over the course of a semester. Students will read as text for class David Livermore's *Cultural Intelligence* which provides students with an introduction to how cultures are different and how we can navigate these cultural differences through CQ drive (how can I adapt), knowledge (how is this similar to my other experiences), strategy (how can I plan), action (how do I behave) given our unique cultural and ethnic identities to become productive and contributing members of our world community.

Secondly, students will also be required to complete the culminating, cross-cultural immersion experience. Within 6 months of completing the semester's work, students will be required to submit their choice of experience sites and to complete administrative paperwork. Within an additional 6 months (a total of 12 months since the completion of CCE 150), they will be required to undertake the experience and complete a subsequent reflection paper which will integrate theory from the coursework with practice. The immersion experience and reflection paper are also aligned to the student learning outcomes of the *Imago Dei* project.

Failure to meet these deadlines or to successfully complete the academic assignments will result in a failing grade for CCE 150, and students will be required to repeat CCE 150 as a graduation requirement. The syllabus for CCE 150 has been drafted for consideration and final approval by the Asbury faculty this coming fall, with implementation scheduled for Fall 2020.

Element III. The formation of an administrative unit to assist with project implementation, assessment, and analysis and to consider additional steps to promote cultural responsibility.

CCE 150, as an academic course, will be taught by qualified faculty from the field of Intercultural Studies. CCE 150 will be required of traditional undergraduate students only, and we anticipate offering 10 sections each semester, in order to keep classes at an optimum size for participation and learning. The University currently has a pool of six such faculty members to draw upon for classroom instruction (see Appendix D for this faculty roster) and will be recruiting additional adjuncts as needed.

To assist with the administrative responsibilities accompanying CCE 150, *Imago Dei* also contains plans for the establishment of an administrative unit. Comprising this unit will be the Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director, a member of the faculty from the field of Intercultural Studies. This individual will bear the responsibility of grading the final reflection papers (which will be submitted by students as much as 12 months after the classroom portion has concluded) and program assessment. The Program Director will provide curricular oversight for the CCE in collaboration with the academic departments in order to advance the University's vision of cultural responsibility. The Program Director will also be tasked with recruiting and training the teaching faculty of CCE 150, will sit on the QEP Oversight Committee and will receive a two-course load (6 credit hour) release for their administrative duties.

The unit will also employ a full-time staff member, the Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Coordinator, who will report directly to the QEP Director. The Coordinator will assist students as they identify their experience site, complete the needed forms and paperwork, and complete the cross-cultural graduation requirement.

In addition, the budget for *Imago Dei* includes a line for future graduate assistants. Should the Program Director require additional support, particularly with grading responsibilities, qualified graduate teaching assistants from Asbury Theological Seminary's Intercultural Studies doctoral program will be employed. The QEP Oversight Committee will consider these hires in its regular review of assessment data.

As indicated previously in the "Project Topic and Selection Process" portion of this proposal (Section II), leadership for the *Imago Dei* project will rest on the shoulders of the QEP Oversight Committee, to be chaired by QEP Director and Assistant Vice President of Intercultural Affairs, Esther Jadhav. Beginning Fall 2019, the committee membership will be made up of the following individuals:

- Esther Jadhav, QEP Director/Chair of Oversight Committee and Assistant Vice President of Intercultural Affairs
- Kim Okesson, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Adjunct Faculty for Intercultural Communication
- Erin Penner, Associate Professor of English and Chair of the Intercultural Development and Awareness Committee
- Kirk Sims, Assistant Professor of Intercultural Studies
- Paul Stephens, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Effectiveness
- Timothy Wooster, University Provost
- Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director
- Asbury Student Congress representative

This committee is charged with the review and analysis of the assessment results collected under *Imago Dei*. Upon regular data review, the primary responsibilities of the QEP Oversight Committee will be:

- To determine whether the student learning outcomes are being satisfactorily met;
- To monitor the implementation of project actions and determine if they are sufficient to support student learning needs;
- To monitor budget needs and implementation;
- To propose data-driven changes or additions to the project and its elements, as necessary; and
- To determine and report upon the overall success level of the *Imago Dei* project.

As chair, the QEP Director will steward and advance the institutional vision for cultural responsibility. The Director will supervise the work of the committee and review with the Provost any recommendations for change the QEP oversight brings to pass. The details of the QEP assessment plan, including the established benchmarks and targets, are laid out and discussed fully in the Assessment Plan section (Section VI) of this document.

Adding It All Up

Our QEP committee has reached consensus that these activities—adding a credit-bearing CCE requirement to the Foundations program for traditional undergraduate students; developing an academic curriculum to equip them with the essential knowledge, skills, and attitudes of cultural responsibility; and establishing the administrative infrastructures necessary to effectively implement, manage, and assess the *Imago Dei* vision—will best enable our institution to make progress around this critical strategic initiative.

As *Imago Dei* is implemented over the coming years, we anticipate a salutary transformation of our institution. On the one hand, we expect Asbury University to continue offering a challenging liberal arts education from the vantage point of its Wesleyan-Holiness theological heritage, as it has done over many years. On the other, we expect the institution increasingly to reflect the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity of both the United States and the global international order, and to do so in a fashion that embraces individual and cultural differences as reflective of the beauty of the variety of God’s creation.

Because this array of efforts will be coordinated by the QEP Oversight Committee, and because the overall project is commensurate with our institutional theological orientation, we believe this project will position Asbury University to achieve our student learning outcomes and foster a new appreciation from the entire community for God-sponsored human variation.

Assessment Plan

To evaluate progress in fulfilling our established student learning outcomes, we have established the following assessment plan. The ensuing cyclical measures will provide insight into desired progress and opportunities for continuous improvements, as well as producing requisite evidence of the project’s impact.

The QEP Director provides ultimate oversight of the specified assessment endeavors and ensuing modes of continuous improvement. The teaching faculty of CCE 150, the QEP Oversight Committee, the Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director, and Institutional Effectiveness personnel will carry out key supportive roles to this process.

Asbury will use a three-level approach of assessing effectiveness, progress, and impact of the QEP.

Level One: Student Learning at the Course Level

The first level of assessment of student learning along the identified projects outcomes will occur within the CCE 150 course. The QEP Committee has established measures and appropriate target benchmarks and mapped these measures and benchmarks to their specific project outcomes. Within CCE 150, embedded course assignments and evaluations represent tailored mechanisms of evaluating student demonstration of QEP learning outcomes. A map of project/course outcomes, means of measurement, identified assessment targets, and specified sequencing is provided below.

Student Learning Outcomes	Nature of Assessment	Assessment Target
I. Knowledge		
a. Students will articulate a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity	Reading Report	85% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above articulation of a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity
b. Students will be able to define cultural responsibility	Final CCE Paper	90% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above definition of cultural responsibility
c. Students will demonstrate understanding of one’s own cultural identity	Cultural Intelligence Pre/Post Assessment	90% of students will demonstrate growth on the CQ Knowledge subscale (Section A) from the pre- to post assessment

	Cultural identity paper	85% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above understanding of one's own cultural identity
d. Students will be able to interpret one's own direct experience of cultural identity	Cultural identity paper	85% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above direct experience of cultural identity
	Cultural Intelligence Pre/Post Assessment	90% of students will demonstrate growth on the CQ Knowledge subscale (Section B) from the pre- to post assessment
II. Skills		
a. Students will demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions	Class exercises	80% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above demonstration of empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions
	Final CCE Paper	90% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above level of empathy and awareness
b. Students will be able to better engage cultures outside their own	Class exercises	80% of students will demonstrate satisfactory of above engagement of cultures outside of their own
	Final CCE Paper	90% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above level of empathy and awareness
c. Students will conduct self-appraisal to enhance cultural awareness	Class exercises	80% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above capacity for self-appraisal in a cross cultural context
	Final CCE Paper	90% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above level of empathy and awareness
III. Attitudes		
a. Students will display humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions	Class exercises	80% of students will demonstrate humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions
	Final CCE Paper	90% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory or above level of empathy and awareness

Level Two: Student Learning at the Institutional Level

To further evaluate and provide insights and evidence of the QEP's impact on student learning, additional measurement will be conducted at the institutional level. This added endeavor will

assess student learning along identified outcomes beyond the course, thereby providing enhanced clarity of the project’s impact. Institutional level measurement will occur via three assessments.

First, the General Education Proficiency Assessment (GEPA) is an internal, direct measure of Asbury’s Foundations general education program. Utilizing five subscales that coincide with the five student learning outcomes of the Foundations Program, the GEPA will be expanded to represent the inclusion of CCE 150 as a requirement within the Foundations, specifically within Outcome #3 (Engaging Society & Global Responsibility). This expansion will constitute added items that are directly derived from learning along the QEP Project Knowledge Outcomes, accomplished within CCE 150.

As the GEPA is administered to entering students during new student orientation programming and again to upper-class students, annual pre/post analysis is conducted to evaluate student growth along the Foundations Outcomes. Specific, focused analysis will be conducted on the QEP-item subscale to evaluate student growth. The modified GEPA will be administered to entering students in the Fall of 2019. Additionally, the modified version will be administered to upper-class students in the Spring of 2020, providing baseline data. Analysis of GEPA comparison of scores of exiting cohorts relative to entering cohorts will further assess student growth and project impact. The five-year mean of growth across Foundations Student Learning Outcomes is 8.6%. Further, the highest value added score among the five Foundations Learning Outcomes is 13.7%. The committee has established an appropriately aggressive benchmark of 14.0% value added growth for the QEP-item subscale.

**Pre/Post Value Added
(2011-2017)**

SLO 1: Christian Faith & Culture	13.70%
SLO 2: Human Thought & Creative Expression	8.90%
SLO 3: Society & Global Responsibility	9.90%
SLO 4: Quantitative & Critical Literacy	4.50%
SLO 5: Natural World & Environment	7.80%
Overall	8.60%
SLO 3.1: Imago Dei Subscale Target	14.00%

Secondly, the Cultural Responsibility Formation Assessment (CRFA) is an internal, direct measure of student self-perception of skills and attitudes of cultural responsibility. The CRFA will be administered and analyzed annually beginning in the 2019-20 academic year. Designed as a pre/post assessment, the CRFA will be administered to entering and exiting students. An initial pilot version was administered to exiting students in the Spring of 2019. The CRFA subscales pertain to identified QEP Outcomes: self-perception of skill and personal attitude toward cultural responsibility. The QEP Oversight Committee has established a target of all items achieving a grand-post-mean score of 3.55 (4-point scale) and a grand-mean of the percentage of respondents noting “Strongly Agree” of 55%. These figures were derived from analysis of the

2019 pilot administration, results of which appear below, in the pursuit of aggressive, realistic achievement targets.

	Pilot Mean	% Endorsing "Strongly Agree"
CRFA Subscale of Self-Perception of Skill	3.36	42.6%
I can recognize cultural and ethnic assumptions.	3.30	38.0%
I am able to recognize bias-what it is and its effects.	3.33	39.3%
I am able to demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions	3.43	48.3%
I am able to effectively engage cultures outside of my own.	3.37	44.0%
I am able to conduct self-appraisal to enhance awareness of cultural influence, bias, and perception.	3.35	43.5%
CRFA Subscale of Self-Perception Personal Attitude toward Cultural Responsibility	3.52	55.3%
I value individuals from other cultures and ethnicities.	3.62	64.7%
I am able to see from and appreciate another's cultural and ethnic prospective.	3.42	45.9%

Third, the Asbury Alumni Survey will be utilized to evaluate impact of the QEP. The Asbury Alumni Survey, administered every three years, includes items designed to measure overall effectiveness of fulfilling the institutional mission. As it relates to the chosen QEP specifically, the item, "Please indicate how well your experiences at Asbury equipped you for the following:" the six subsequent prompts includes "To engage the cultures around you." Analysis of this specific item will be included in the evaluation of the impact of the QEP. Specifically, the 2016 administration showed this prompt to be the lowest among this battery of prompts pertaining to overall institutional mission. Additional baseline data will be collected in the September 2019 administration of the survey.

In the future, disaggregation analysis will be conducted to compare alumni who experienced the QEP initiative with statistically significant differences anticipated. Given the tri-annual sequencing of the Asbury Alumni Survey, the aforementioned items will be included into the existing, annual Six Month Placement Survey, conducted by the Center for Career and Calling, in years in which the Alumni Survey is not administered. This data captured from recent graduates will allow for timely, valuable feedback of project impact and effectiveness. The identified target for this specific item is a mean of 4.85 (6-point scale) with 71.0% selecting either "Very Well Prepared" or "Prepared." This target was selected as it represents bringing the item on engagement of cultures around you in line with other five items within this bank of items.

Please indicate how well your experiences at Asbury equipped you for a lifetime of learning, leadership and service for the following:		
Question	Baseline Mean	"Very Well Prepared" + "Prepared"
Society	4.71	65.1%
Family	4.89	72.0%
The Church	5.00	76.2%
Please indicate how well your experiences at Asbury equipped you for the following:		
Question	Baseline Mean	"Very Well Prepared" + "Prepared"
To engage the cultures around you	4.55	56.9%
To engage the cultures around you (QEP Target)	4.85	71.0%
To advance the cause of Christ around the world	4.84	71.5%
For life in general	4.73	66.0%

Level Three: Overall Success of the QEP at the Project Level

These data collections will coincide with regular review of the findings, subsequent analysis and evaluation relative to program outcomes, and strategized means of continuous improvement of outcome realization. All of these items will be documented within existing institutional effectiveness structures. The QEP Committee, under the leadership of the QEP Director, holds responsibility for this process.

Internal reporting and documentation will be grafted into existing institutional effectiveness processes and systems. Asbury currently utilizes the WEAVEOnline platform to facilitate and house annual assessment and subsequent unit-level planning across academic, student support, and administrative support areas. A QEP report will be constructed within this system for annual completion beginning in the Summer of 2021. As with all unit-level reports the QEP Annual Report will include the reporting of measures and findings relative to stated targets. Success at achieving identified targets along each measure will be evaluated. Further, the report will include a series of analysis questions which will serve as prompts to identify realized strengths and opportunities for continuous improvement. Finally, the report will contain identified action plans which represent the identification and updating of all activities requisite in the pursuit of continuous improvement in the achievement of identified outcomes. Budget implications will also be documented through these processes. These completed annual reports will be warehoused within existing IE systems with copies being provided to the President, Provost, and Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities for review.

Additionally, the annually produced *Annual Report of Institutional Progress*, outlined along the elements of the institutional Strategic Plan, will be expanded to include reporting of progress along QEP outcomes. A printed copy of the report is provided to Cabinet Officers and members

of the Board of Trustees each October and an electronic copy is available on the institutional student achievement webpage.

The operationalized cycle of gathering, analyzing, reporting, and utilizing the data findings of the assessment plan involves multiple stakeholders with responsibilities to the assessment needs of the project. Specific duties related to level one of the assessment strategy are as follows:

Teaching faculty of each section of CCE 150:

- Complete the course faculty onboarding process to review learning outcomes of the course and assessment needs and expectations. Specific review of course grading rubrics will be included.
- Utilize provided grading rubrics to evaluate student achievement within each specified assignment.
- Tabulate collective course-level performance along identified assessment targets.
- Report to the Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director all assessment findings for each section taught.

Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director:

- Provide and facilitate the faculty onboarding process including review of learning outcomes, course assessment, section faculty reporting expectations.
- Compile course-section level findings, produce findings along assessment targets each semester.
- Provide leadership in the grading of the final CCE paper for all students.

QEP Director (Chair of QEP Oversight Committee):

- Distribute and provide leadership to the review process of findings by the QEP Oversight Committee.
- Complete institutional annual report on the QEP project including:
 - The provision of annual data findings relative to targets
 - Thorough analysis of findings
 - Documentation of identified needed adjustments and ensuring actions taken
- Provide leadership to Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director and course faculty in the execution of identified modifications.

QEP Oversight Committee:

- Review annual assessment findings
- Collaboratively support the QEP Director in the following:
 - Through the review of findings relative to targets, measures, and identified outcomes, thoroughly analyze the QEP.
 - Identify opportunities for continuous improvement and identify means of implementation.

Provost:

- Review annual reporting of QEP progress.
- Represent ongoing QEP resource needs in budgeting process.

AVP of Institutional Research and Effectiveness:

- Serve as an active, contributing member of the QEP Oversight Committee providing specific support to all assessment needs
- Level One (Course Assessments)
 - Provide support as needed to QEP Director in the analysis of course section level and summative analysis of all stated measures
- Level Two (Institution Level Assessments)
 - Annually oversee administration of the General Education Proficiency Assessment (Pre/Post) and report pertinent findings to the QEP Director
 - Annually oversee administration of the Cultural Responsibility Formation Assessment (Pre/Post) and report pertinent findings to the QEP Director
 - With the Director of Alumni Relations, oversee tri-annual administration of the Alumni Survey.
 - With the Director of Career and Calling, oversee, as necessary, the inclusion of QEP related items in the Six Month Placement Survey.
 - Provide needed findings and analysis of the above to the QEP Director.
- Level Three (QEP Program Assessment)
 - Support activity related to completing the collective analysis, reporting, and documentation.
 - Ensure QEP is included within *Annual Report of Institutional Progress* beginning in the Fall of 2021.

BUDGET

To implement *Imago Dei*, the QEP Committee has developed an annual budget which will guide operations until the project's fifth-year cycle review. The budgeting process was spearheaded by the QEP Director and Provost. It has been reviewed, discussed, and endorsed by the president's cabinet and delineates adequate resourcing committed by the University for the project's needs.

The budget below contains two categories of funding. The first, entitled "Institutional Budgeted Expenditures for QEP," presents the institutional resources directly budgeted for the QEP. This category includes the personnel who will shepherd the QEP through leadership (AVP of Intercultural Affairs/QEP Director; Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director), through instruction (CCE 150 teaching faculty) and by administrative support (FT Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Coordinator; PT staff assistant; and graduate assistants, as needed). It also includes the resources necessary for CCE operations, such as internal marketing, campus programming, and faculty development. These operational monies are scaled to increase over the five-year period in anticipation of rising costs.

Key features of the QEP Budget:

- addition of ten sections of a 1-credit CCE course each semester at faculty instruction cost of \$1000 per section
- addition of two 3-credit course reassignments for the Cultural Engagement and Responsibility Program Director at the adjunct cost of \$2880 per course
- addition of PT Grad Assistants starting in year 2 and reaching \$5000 by year 5
- modest increases in CCE Operational budget reaching \$5000 by year 5
- Faculty development initiatives to expand the number of faculty equipped to teach CCE 150
- Intercultural campus programming to provide opportunities for students returning from their CCE experiences to contribute to campus initiatives and shape campus culture

The second category of funding (entitled "Additional Institutional Capacity in support of CCE") presented in the budget describes institutional resources in support of the QEP's objectives. These services and programs provide the capacity needed for the students to complete the cross-cultural experience and contribute to the development of cultural responsibility on the campus at large under the auspices of the University Strategic Plan, to which the QEP also contributes. This section of the budget demonstrates the institution's fuller financial commitment towards the QEP and its capacity to undergird it.

QEP CCE 5-Year Budget (fixed for years 6-10)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Institutional Budgeted Expenditures for QEP	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Salary & Benefits					
Staffing*	\$152,200	\$152,200	\$152,200	\$152,200	\$152,200
Faculty Load (20 1-credit sections per year)	\$21,600	\$21,600	\$21,600	\$21,600	\$21,600
Program Director (2 course equivalence)	\$6,221	\$6,221	\$6,221	\$6,221	\$6,221
PT CCE Grad Assistant Staffing		\$3,780	\$4,320	\$4,860	\$5,400
Operations					
CCE Operations	\$4,500	\$5,500	\$7,000	\$8,000	\$9,000
Faculty Development on CCE SLOs		\$2,500	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$5,000
Total QEP Budgeted Staffing & Operations	\$184,521	\$191,801	\$194,341	\$196,881	\$199,421
Additional Institutional Capacity in support of CCE					
AU Sponsored Study Abroad in support of CCE**	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
PT -> FT Study Abroad Coordinator			\$19,440	\$19,440	\$48,960
Study Abroad Marketing and Recruiting	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$8,000
China Study Abroad Operations	\$105,000		\$105,000		\$105,000
France Study Abroad Operations		\$200,000		\$200,000	
New Area(s) Study Abroad Operations				\$50,000	\$75,000
External student participation in Study Abroad [!]	-\$8,000	-\$12,000	-\$20,000	-\$28,000	-\$36,000
Study Abroad Budget Total	\$100,000	\$192,000	\$109,440	\$247,440	\$200,960
Funded Expenditures***	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Confucius Institute	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Central Europe Summer Course Trip	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Embrace Conference [#]	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Other funded experiences Expenditure	\$89,000	\$89,000	\$89,000	\$89,000	\$89,000
Grand Total Institutional Budget & Related Capacity	\$373,521	\$472,801	\$392,781	\$533,321	\$489,381
* Staffing: AVP Intercultural Affairs, FT Coordinator, 1 PT Assistant					
** These are in addition to a myriad of options through other agencies such as the CCCU-Best-Semester					
*** Typical pass-through expense for programming and trips from external funding or revenue generated through fundraising or fees.					
[#] Embrace conference sponsored by student government from student fees					
[!] Each participating external student yields on average \$4000 in net revenue, 9 external students by year 5					

APPENDIX A

Definitions for Cultural Responsibility

Key terminology, as understood by Asbury University for use in the *Imago Dei* QEP:

- Cultural diversity: Cultural diversity demonstrates the many ways through which the image of God has been imparted upon all people, for they receive the Gospel of the Bible through their culture and language. All persons are created in the image of God, and our eschatological vision is that “people from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages” will be gathered around the Lamb. (Rev. 7:9) In this in-between time, we seek to acknowledge and celebrate cultural differences.
- Cultural intelligence: A meta-framework that measures and explains one’s ability to reach across the chasm of cultural difference in ways that are loving and respectful. (Livermore, p. 257) *or* the ability to engage in a set of behaviors that uses skills ... and qualities ... that are tuned appropriately to the culture-based values and attitudes of the people with whom one interacts. (Peterson, p. 89)
- Cultural responsibility: We first understand cultural responsibility as an attitude of posture or humility towards people, places, and things outside our regular realm of experience or understanding. Second, cultural responsibility is a suite of competencies necessary to intersect with others who are different from us in meaningful and productive ways. Such competencies include awareness, knowledge, and skills. Finally, our understanding of cultural responsibility is motivated by a particular theological understanding of all persons being made in God’s image (*Imago Dei*).
- Hospitality: Employing the definition put forth by Christine Pohl, “Hospitality is not so much a task as it is a way of living our lives and sharing ourselves. Although it involves responsibility and faithful performance of duties, hospitality emerges from a grateful heart; it is first a response of love and gratitude for God’s love and welcome to us. ... [O]ffering hospitality requires both courage and humility. It involves not only a willingness to take some risks in welcoming others, but it also requires the kind of courage that lives close to our limits, continually pressing against the possible, yet always aware of the incompleteness and the inadequacy of our own responses. At the same time, living so close to the edge of sufficient resources increases our dependence on and our awareness of God’s interventions and provision.”⁵² (Pohl 2002, pp. 37,41)

⁵² Pohl, Christine D. "Hospitality, a Practice and a Way of Life." *Vision*, no. Spring (2002): 34-43.

- Humility: Seeking to take on the attitude of Jesus (Phil 2:4-11) whereby the needs of others are put in a central place.
- Imago Dei: The theological premise that all persons are created in the image of God and are of sacred worth.
- Inter-cultural interactions: Communication between people and groups of diverse culture, subculture or subgroup identifications. (Jandt, p. G-4)
- Intra-cultural interactions: Communication between people of the same culture or subculture.

APPENDIX B

Guiding Bibliography for Literature Review

- Asbury University. (n.d.). Asbury University Mission Statement. Retrieved from <https://www.asbury.edu/life/resources/handbook-community-life/au-mission-statement/>.
- Asbury University. (n.d.). Great Commission Congress. Retrieved from <https://www.asbury.edu/about/spiritual-vitality/chapel/great-commission-congress/>.
- Asbury University. (n.d.). Imagine2022. Retrieved from <https://www.asbury.edu/about/offices/administration/iesp/imagine2022/>.
- Benmayor, R. (2002). Narrating Cultural Citizenship: Oral Histories of First-Generation College Students of Mexican Origin. *Social Justice*, 29(4), 96-121.
- Bevans, S. B. (2004). *Models of Contextual Theology*, Revised and Expanded Edition. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books.
- Bounds, C. (2013). Wesleyan Eschatological Implications for the Church's Engagement with Other Religions. *The Thirteenth Oxford Institute of Methodist Theological Studies*.
- Brubaker, R. (2005). The 'Diaspora' Diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1).
- Campbell, E. H., & Greener, S. (2014). *Effective Intercultural Communication: A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Chapman, G. C. (2000). On Being Human: Moltmann's Anthropology of Hope. *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 55(1), 69-84.
- Crowder, G. (2013). *Theories of Multiculturalism: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1987). *Ideology, Society & Language: The Odyssey of Nathan Birnbaum*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Friedman, T. (2007). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Groody, D. G. (2009). Crossing the Divide: Foundations of a Theology of Migration and Refugees. *Theological Studies*, 70(3).
- Haltinner, K. (2016). Individual Responsibility, Culture, or State Organized Enslavement? How Tea Party Activists Frame Racial Inequality. *Sociological Perspectives*, 59(2), 395-417.
- Harley, D. A. (2007). Maids of Academe: African American Women Faculty at Predominately White Institutions. *Journal of African American Studies*, 12, 19-36.
- Hiebert, P. G. (1985). *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Hiebert, P. G., & Hertig, Y. (1993). Asian Immigrants in American Cities. *Urban Mission*, 15-24.
- Jandt, F. E. (2016). *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community* (8th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

- Johnson, J. P., Lenartowicz, T., & Apud, S. (2006). Cross-Cultural Competence in International Business: Toward a Definition and a Model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(4), 525-43.
- Keller, T. (2012). *Center Church: Doing Balanced, Gospel-Centered Ministry in Your City*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2001). *Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross-Cultural Adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Livermore, D. A. (2009). *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2013). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures* (7th ed.). Hoboken: Pearson.
- Peterson, B. (2004). *Cultural Intelligence: A Guide to Working with People From Other Cultures*. Boston: Intercultural Press.
- Pohl, Christine D. "Hospitality, a Practice and a Way of Life." *Vision*, no. Spring (2002): 34-43.
- Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2004). *Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Riebe-Estrella, G. (1992). The Challenge of Ministerial Formation. *Missiology*, 20(2), 269-274.
- Rogers, E. M., & Steinfatt, T. M. (1999). *Intercultural Communication*. Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Schreiter, R. J. (1997). *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Swartz, D. R. (2017). Christ of the American Road: E. Stanley Jones, India, and Civil Rights. *Journal of American Studies*, 51(4), 1117-38.
- The Lausanne Movement. (n.d.). *The Capetown Commitment*. Retrieved from <http://www.lausanne.org/en/documents/ctcommitment.html>
- US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Race and Hispanic Origin of the Native and Foreign: Projections for the United States: 2017-2060*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2017/demo/popproj/2017-summary-tables.html>
- WCC Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. (2012). *Together Towards Life: Mission and Evangelism in Changing Landscapes*. Crete, Greece. Retrieved from <https://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/commissions/mission-and-evangelism/together-towards-life-mission-and-evangelism-in-changing-landscapes>
- Wesley, J. (n.d.). *John Wesley's Explanatory Notes. Luke 10 Bible Commentary-Christianity.com, Verse 37*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianity.com/bible/commentary.php?com=wes&b=42&c=10>
- Whiteman, D. . (2010). Response to Paul G. Hiebert: 'The Gospel in Human Contexts: Changing Perceptions of Contextualization'. In D. J. Hesselgrave, & E. Stetzer (Eds.), *Missionshift: Global Mission Issues in the Third Millennium* (pp. Nashville, TN). B&H Academic.
- Woods, C., Wilsey, J., Jones, K., Williams, J., Hall, M. J., & Will, G. (2018, December). *Report on Slavery and Racism in the History of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*. Retrieved from <http://www.sbts.edu/southern-project/>
- Wright, C. J. (2006). *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*. Nottingham: Intervarsity Press.

APPENDIX C

Syllabus for CCE 150



ASBURY UNIVERSITY

Academic Excellence & Spiritual Vitality

CCE 150 CULTURAL ENGAGEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY

FALL 2020

BASIC INFORMATION

Course: CCE 150: Cultural Engagement and Responsibility

Section: Section designation

Credit hours: 1

Location: Classroom

Time: Day[s], Time[s]

Instructor: Name, Title

Office location: Office location

Office hours: Office hours

Phone Number: 859.858.3511

Email Address: e-mail address @asbury.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

CCE 150 (1) Cultural Engagement and Responsibility —This course will prepare students to understand their own ethnicity and cultural background. Additionally, students will be equipped to identify cultural realities and be prepared to adapt, understand, and communicate across cultural boundaries. This course brings the mission of Asbury University to equip students for leadership and service to the professions, society, the family and the Church, preparing them to engage their cultures and advance the cause of Christ around the world into clear focus. Finally, this course will prepare students to fulfill their CCE graduation requirement in a culturally responsible way.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

CCE 150 Cultural Engagement and Responsibility is a key component of Asbury's institution-wide initiative, Embrace. This course is developed to enhance the student's learning experience at Asbury. The following is a representation of the learning outcomes:

Student Learning Outcomes	Content delivery	Nature of assessment	Timing of assessment
I. Knowledge			
a. Students will articulate a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity	Class session	Reading Report	Class session
b. Students will be able to define cultural responsibility	Class session	Included in Final CCE Paper	Class session
c. Students will demonstrate understanding of one's own cultural identity	Class session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CQ Pre/Post Assessment • Cultural identity paper 	Class session
d. Students will be able to interpret one's own direct experience of cultural identity	Class session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CQ Pre/Post Assessment • Cultural identity paper 	Class session
II. Skills			
a. Students will demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions	Class session CCE	Class exercises Final CCE Paper	Class session CCE
b. Students will be able to better engage cultures outside their own	Class session CCE	Class exercises Final CCE Paper	Class session CCE
c. Students will conduct self-appraisal to enhance cultural awareness	Class session CCE	Final CCE Paper	After CCE
III. Attitudes			
a. Students will display humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions	CCE	Final CCE Paper Class exercises	After CCE

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS

1. Livermore, David A. *Cultural Intelligence: Improving Your CQ to Engage Our Multicultural World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
2. Additional readings may be assigned and distributed through Discovery or in class.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. **Cultural Intelligence assessment:** The Livermore book has an assessment tool that can help you gauge your understanding of intercultural competence. You will complete this at the beginning and at the conclusion of the semester to assist in self-awareness of areas in which you could grow. Upon satisfactory completion you will receive full credit for the pre and post CQ assessment.
2. **Cultural identity reflection paper:** You will be expected to reflect on your own personal cultural identity in the form of a 3-4 page paper. In addition to defining your cultural identity, you will reflect on the influences that have shaped your values and your perceptions of reality.
3. **Readings & Reading Reports:** You will be expected to complete the assigned readings for the assigned class sessions and fill out a reading report on each assigned reading. A template will be provided. You

will be asked to summarize the passage, provide an insight from that assigned reading, and propose a take away from that reading.

4. **Class participation:** Class participation is an essential part of this course. You will share insights in class and as well as in small groups. When short articles or case studies are distributed before or during class for discussion, you will be expected to be prepared to make contributions. We will also have some role-playing games in some sessions.
5. **Cultural Immersion Experience:** This requirement will be completed through a domestic or international cultural engagement experience. Your Final Cross-cultural engagement paper will be based on this experience. Details of this will be provided in class.
6. **Final Cross-cultural engagement paper:** You will write a 4-6 page paper reflecting on an intercultural interaction. We will discuss this assignment in class.

OTHER EXPECTATION THAT MAY AFFECT YOUR GRADE

Attendance:

- 1 unexcused absence is allowed without penalty.
- Three tardy attendances will be considered one unexcused absence.
- Each unexcused absence beyond the one permitted will reduce the final grade by 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g. A- to B+).

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND GRADING CRITERIA

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>% of grade</i>	Letter grades will be assigned according to the following point values:			
Completing the CQ Pre-assessment tool	5	93-100	A	73-76.99	C
Cultural Identity Reflection Paper	10	90-92.99	A-	70-72.99	C-
Readings & Reading Reports	20	87-89.99	B+	60-69.99	D
Class participation	15	83-86.99	B	0-59.99	F
Final CCE Paper	45	80-82.99	B-		
Completing the CQ Post-assessment tool	5	77-79.99	C+		
Total	100				

Unless you will be able to complete your cross-cultural engagement before the end of the class, you will be assigned a grade of IP (in progress) at the end of the semester. You will be given 12 months from the end of the semester to satisfy the outstanding assignment. Once this is rectified, you will be assigned the appropriate grade retroactively to the semester in which CCE 150 was completed. If you fail to satisfy the requirements within the 12-month span, your IP grade will be converted to an F, and you will be required to retake CCE 150.

Late assignments will be reduced by a full letter grade for each day they are late.

ELECTRONIC DEVICES

Computers, tablets, and mobile phones are allowed in class with certain conditions. They may be used to take notes, access articles we may be discussing in class, or access a Bible app because we are looking at the Scriptures.

COPYRIGHT ISSUES

During the course, you will be given digital or print copies or access to articles, chapters, or videos. Please do not reproduce or redistribute any of these without first talking with your instructor. Of course, if it is located on a website that is not accessed by a password, you are free to share the link. In other words, do not distribute things located on Discovery.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICIES AND CONSEQUENCES (STATEMENT FROM THE BULLETIN)

“**Academic dishonesty** can be defined as any type of cheating relative to a formal academic requirement. Academic dishonesty is typically thought of first as plagiarism. Plagiarism, whether intentionally or unintentionally, is the use of another’s ideas, words, thoughts, or organization without appropriate credit and documentation given. Other examples include, but are not limited to, unauthorized collaborations, fabrications of data, unauthorized access to sources on an exam, excessive revision by someone other than the student, and re-use of previous work without permission. See ‘Academic Integrity’ in the Bulletin for detail and information about consequences and appeals.” Please, be a person of integrity. If you have questions about this, please talk with your instructor.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Please contact the Director of Academic Accessibility Resources if you have any questions or concerns about receiving your academic accommodation at academicaccessibility@asbury.edu.

Week #	Date	Topics	Assignments
1	Aug 21	Course overview Foundations for Cultural Engagement & Responsibility (Theological, Practical)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Part 1 intro • Read: Chapter 1 • Complete the CQ Pre-assessment tool
2	Aug 28	Foundations for Cultural Engagement & Responsibility (Theological, Practical)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring completed CQ test to class (Appendix B in Livermore) • Read: Chapter 2 • Read: Chapter 3 • Read: <i>The Mission of God</i>, pp. 421-428 (pdf available on Discovery)
3	Sep 4	Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Part 2 Introduction • Read: Chapter 4 • Read: Chapter 5
4	Sep 11	Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Identity Paper Due • Read: Chapter 7 • Read: Chapter 9
5	Sep 18	Worldview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: article on worldview (pdf available on Discovery)
6	Sep 25	Cultural Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Chapter 8
7	Oct 2	Cultural Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: article by Hofstede or Mayers (pdf available on Discovery)
8	Oct 9	Intercultural Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Chapter 7
9	Oct 16	Intercultural Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Chapter 14
10	Oct 23	Intercultural Communication	
11	Oct 30	Awareness and Empathy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Part 3 Introduction • Read: Chapter 9
12	Nov 6	Culture Shock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Chapter 13
13	Nov 13	Culture Shock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: article on culture shock (pdf available on Discovery)
14	Nov 20	Category Width	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Chapter 10 • Read: Chapter 11
15	Nov 27	Cultural Intelligence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: Chapter 15
16	Dec 4		
	Final Exam	A voluntary time to interact about CCE procedures will take place during the exam period assigned to this class	
Within 6 months from completion of course		Proposal	Proposal for your cross-cultural engagement must be completed and approved before you embark on the assignment Forms are on the website

Within 12 months from comp- letion of course		Final Cross-cultural Engagement Paper Post Assessment	<p>You must have a substantive cross-cultural encounter and write the reflection paper integrating theory from this class.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the CQ Post-assessment tool
--	--	---	--

Note: The schedule is subject to minor changes. Any alterations to the schedule will be duly communicated in class, by e-mail, and/or on Discovery.

APPENDIX D

Faculty Roster of CCE 150 Instructors

Faculty Roster Form Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

Name of Institution: Asbury University

Name of Primary Department, Academic Program, or Discipline: CCE 150

Academic Term(s) Included: Fall 2020, Spring 2021

Date Form Completed: August 2019

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT Including Term, Course Number & Title, Credit Hours (D, UN, UT, G)	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK Relevant to Courses Taught, Including Institution & Major List specific graduate coursework, if needed	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS Related to Courses Taught
Hull, Brian (F)	Fall 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) Spring 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) 	B.A., Philosophy and Religion, Olivet Nazarene University Master of Religious Education, Christian Education with Youth Ministry Diploma, Nazarene Theological Seminary Ph.D., Intercultural Studies, Asbury Theological Seminary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QEP Director and Oversight Committee Chair • Assistant Vice President of Intercultural Affairs, Asbury University
Jadhav, Esther (P)	Fall 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) Spring 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) 	B.A., Anthropology and Sociology, St. Xavier's College, University of Mumbai Th.M., World Missions and Evangelism, Asbury Theological Seminary M.Div., Asbury Theological Seminary Ph.D., Intercultural Studies, Asbury Theological Seminary (in progress) B.A., Communications, Trinity International University	
Okesson, Kim (P)	Fall 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) Spring 2021		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) 	<p>M.A., Intercultural Studies, Wheaton Graduate School</p> <p>Ph.D., Communications, Regent University (in progress)</p>	
Sims, Kirk (F)	<p>Fall 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) <p>Spring 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) 	<p>A.A., Liberal Arts, Reinhardt College</p> <p>A.B., Political Science, University of Georgia</p> <p>M.Div., Asbury Theological Seminary</p> <p>Ph.D., Middlesex University (England), Oxford Centre for Mission Studies; Dissertation: Dynamics of International Mission in the Methodist Church Ghana</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review by Josef Silny & Associates concluded the Ph.D. is the equivalent of the U.S. degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Religious Studies earned at a regionally accredited institution of higher education in the United States • Dissertation relates to Mission Studies, World Christianity, African Studies, Methodist Studies, and Migration Studies
	<p>Weaver-Swartz, Lisa (P)</p> <p>Fall 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) <p>Spring 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) 	<p>A.A., Worship, Rosedale Bible College</p> <p>B.A., Sociology, Bethel College</p> <p>M.A., Sociology, University of Notre Dame</p> <p>Ph.D., Sociology, University of Notre Dame</p>	
Zonio, Henry (P)	<p>Fall 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) <p>Spring 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCE 150 (1, UT) 	<p>B.A., Biochemistry, Asbury University</p> <p>M.A., Sociology, San Jose State University</p> <p>Ph.D., Sociology, University of Kentucky (in progress)</p>	

APPENDIX E

Foundations General Education Program Sheet



2020-21 Proposed

FOUNDATIONS - Required for all Traditional Undergraduate Degrees

Academic Affairs and the Liberal Arts Council

FOUNDATIONS REQUIREMENT (50) (May vary 44-59 due to placement or *prerequisite requirements)

To graduate must complete all major requirements, Foundations, and electives needed for **124 hour minimum** bachelor's degree requirement, or for 60 hour minimum associate degree requirement. **Students with waivers of any Foundations requirement must still meet the minimum credits required for graduation**

Introduction - required for new first time, full time college students and new freshmen transfers.

__ 1 LA 100 Engaging Liberal Arts

SLO 1: Integrating Christian Faith & Cult. (12)

Complete biblical studies:

__ 3 NT 100 Und New Testament

__ 3 OT 100 Und Old Testament

Complete one philosophy:

__ 3 PHL 200 Intro to Philosophy

PHL 231 Ethics

Complete theology:

__ 3 TH 250 Foundations of Christian Thought

Plus every semester:

__ 0 CH 021 Chapel Attendance
(Automatically added to schedule each semester)

SLO 2: Discovering Human Thought & Creative Expression (12-15)

Complete one fine arts:

ART 100 Understanding Art

ART 251 or 252 Art History

__ 3 FA 100 Music & Art Appreciation

MHL 251, 252, or 353 Music History

MUS 100 Understanding Music

Satisfy two college writing requirements:

__ 3* ENG 100 College Writing I

*May be waived by English score of ACT 22, pre-2016 SAT 510, new SAT Reading 28 or higher. [ENG 100 cannot satisfy LA enrichment.]

__ 3 ENG 110 College Writing II

ENG 151 Adv. College Writing[^]

[^]If English score of ACT 27, pre-2016 SAT 660, new SAT Reading 35 or higher complete ENG 151.

Complete literature:

__ 3 ENG 205 Literature & Culture

Complete one public speaking:

__ 3 COM 130 Cultural Influence of Media

COM 150 Public Speaking

SLO 3: Engaging Society & Global Responsibility (6-15)

Complete one history:

HIS 101 Western Civ I

__ 3 HIS 102 Western Civ II

HIS 201 U.S. History to 1876

HIS 202 U.S. History Since 1876

Complete one social science:

ECN 100 Principles of Economics

PS 101 American Politics & Gov

__ 3 PSY 101 General Psychology

SOC 100 Intro Sociology

SOC 112 Intro Anthropology

Complete foreign language:

Satisfy the 201 level in one language by course or placement (3)

CHN, FRN, GRK, HEB, LAT, OR SPN

__ 3* ___ 101 _____

__ 3* ___ 102 _____

__ 3 ___ 201 _____

*Language 101 and 102 may be waived based on language placement test results. [Language not required of School of Education B.S. majors]

Fulfill Cross-Cultural Engagement:

__ 1 CCE 150 Cross-Cultural Engagement & Responsibility

[Not required for Associate's degree]

(See <https://www.asbury.edu/academics/resources/geo/cross-cultural-engagement/>)

SLO 4: Achieving Quantitative & Critical Literacy (3-6)

Complete quantitative requirement:

MAT 118 & 119 Math that Matters I & II (6)*

__ 3-6* MAT 120 or above (3-4)

CSC 121 or above (4)

[College Algebra & Pre-calculus do not satisfy the requirement.]

*If ACT/SAT/new SAT Math score of ACT 21, pre-2016 SAT 500, new SAT 530 or lower complete sequence MAT 118/119. [MAT 118 cannot satisfy LA enrichment.]

SLO 5: Searching the Natural World and the Environment (6)

Complete one science with lab (4 credits total):

__ 3-4 BIO/CHE/ESC/PHY _____ (lecture)

__ 0-1 BIO/CHE/ESC/PHY _____ (lab)

Complete health and physical activity

__ 1 PED 100 Theory of Wellness

__ 1 PE _____ Physical Activity

[Limit of 4.0 credits of PE may count towards degree total, and no more than 2.0 credits of the PE can be from Varsity Sports participation.]

In addition

Complete 3 Credits in LIBERAL ARTS ENRICHMENT:

Choose any **ONE** 3 credit course from those listed above, not otherwise required, and **not in major** (may also use a Foreign Language course 202 or above). [ENG100 and MAT118 may not be used here.]

__ 3 _____

APPENDIX F

Summary of Revisions to QEP Since the On-Site Visit

In careful consideration of the recommendations received from the On-Site Visit Committee, the following revisions have been made to *The Imago Dei Initiative*.

	Updated QEP	Initial QEP Proposal	Summary of Revisions
Project Title	<i>The Imago Dei Initiative: Embracing Cultural Responsibility</i>	<i>The Imago Dei Initiative: Embracing Cultural Integrity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Integrity” rephrased as “Responsibility” in updated QEP.
Project Leadership	Esther Jadhav, AVP for Intercultural Affairs at Asbury University, selected as QEP Director.	QEP Director to be determined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QEP Director selected.
Project Elements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The addition of a credit-bearing cultural engagement requirement to the University’s Foundations general education program; II. The development of an academic curriculum to equip students with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes of cultural responsibility; and III. The formation of an administrative unit to assist with project implementation, analyze activities and consider additional 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The addition of a credit-bearing cultural engagement requirement to the Foundations curriculum, combined with development of a more robust study abroad or domestic internship effort. II. Instituting an array of planned activities to improve cultural hospitality and responsibility on Asbury’s campus. III. The strategic structure and support of an ongoing faculty development initiative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elements II and III from initial QEP proposal have been removed. • Element I from initial QEP proposal has been expanded and enhanced in updated QEP to focus more closely on student learning.

	steps to promote cultural responsibility.	around culturally responsible pedagogy.	
Student Learning Outcomes	<p>I. Knowledge</p> <p>a. Students will articulate a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity</p> <p>b. Students will be able to define cultural responsibility</p> <p>c. Students will demonstrate understanding of one's own cultural identity</p> <p>d. Students will be able to interpret one's own direct experience of cultural identity</p> <p>II. Skills</p> <p>a. Students will demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions</p> <p>b. Students will be able to effectively engage cultures outside their own</p> <p>c. Students will conduct self-appraisal to enhance cultural awareness</p> <p>III. Attitudes</p> <p>a. Students will display humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions</p>	<p>I. Knowledge</p> <p>a. Students will articulate a Biblical understanding of cultural diversity</p> <p>b. Students will be able to define cultural responsibility</p> <p>c. Students will demonstrate understanding of one's own cultural identity</p> <p>d. Students will be able to interpret one's own direct experience of cultural identity</p> <p>II. Skills</p> <p>a. Students will demonstrate empathy and awareness in interpersonal interactions</p> <p>b. Students will be able to effectively engage cultures outside their own</p> <p>c. Students will conduct self-appraisal to enhance cultural awareness</p> <p>III. Attitudes</p> <p>a. Students will display humility in inter- and intra-cultural interactions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No revisions.

Institutional Environment Outcomes	None	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. To progress toward a representative, equitable community <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To analyze conditions and experiences of success b. To utilize chapel and campus programming to inculcate appropriate interactions with others c. To celebrate cultures II. To equip faculty with culturally responsive pedagogy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Institutional Environment Outcomes from initial QEP removed to focus more closely on student learning.
Assessment Plan	<p>Assessment occurs at three levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student learning at the course level (CCE 150) 2. Student learning at the institutional level 3. Overall Success of the QEP at the Project Level 	<p>Six key measures were identified to assess both student learning and institutional environment outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course artifacts embedded in the redesigned CCE requirement 2. Cultural Responsibility Formation Assessment 3. Student focus groups 4. External, benchmarked surveys 5. Course evaluations 6. Student, faculty, staff demographic data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All measures assessing institutional environment outcomes have been removed. • All measures in updated QEP proposal assess project's impact upon student learning.

<p>Budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual budget presented for 2020-21 to 2024-25 academic years • QEP Budget presents staffing and operational resources in direct support of student learning objectives • Budget presents additional institutional resources which provide capacity for students to complete CCE requirement, to demonstrate full adequacy of QEP resourcing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual budget presented for 2020-21 to 2022-23 academic years • QEP Budget presents resources in direct support of student learning objectives and QEP institutional environment outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated annual budget plans for five academic years. • Updated budget resources staffing and operational needs of student learning outcomes only. • All previous QEP budget lines in support of institutional environment outcomes have been removed.
----------------------	--	--	---