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Analysis of the nine categories of data gathered for this study suggests some basic conclusions on the ranking of the University of Florida International Center (UFIC) compared to the six other selected sample universities.

1: Organizational structure of international unit.
The organizational structure, or placement, of an institution is indicative of its importance to an academic institution. The data shows that, although the international units differ between institutions, like UFIC, all are located under the Office of the Provost, and so are ranked in the upper organizational structure of each university.

2: Head of international unit.
The data shows that each international unit is headed by a Dean, Director or Assistant Vice Provost, all of whom report directly to the Office of the Provost.

3: Staffing of international unit: a) Total, b) Study Abroad, c) International Students and Scholars.
Data for total staffing shows that UFIC, with 27 permanent personnel, is about average among the selected examples (Fig. 1). Disparities are Michigan State with 83 staff, and the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities with 95 staff. However, staffing for the international units in these two universities represent the sum of a number of component units grouped under the umbrella of their international services. For example, figures for Minnesota include staff from 6 different, independent units, all of which provide some form of international outputs but which do not include Study Abroad or International Student and Scholar Services. (See also hardcopy for breakdown of the 6 units). All other International Units, including UFIC, consist mainly of Study Abroad staff and International

Figure 1: Staffing
Students and Scholars Staff. For the number of staff employed in Study Abroad and as International Students and Scholars Staff, UFIC, as for the other institutions, shows a higher percentage of its staff working in the Study Abroad, with the exception of North Carolina State.

4: Study Abroad programs per annum: a) Student exchange, b) Faculty led, c) Other independent.

a) Analysis of the data (Fig. 2) suggests that, for student exchange programs, UF (with 56 programs) compares favorably with the other universities, with the exception of the University of Texas, which falls above average with 166 such programs. This can, however, be attributed to the fact that Texas has the largest student population (see also questions 5), compared to the other universities.

b) Data for Faculty Led programs shows that, in comparison with the other institutions of similar student population (e.g. Michigan State with 44,000 students, 108 faculty led programs; Ohio State University with 48,000 students, 30+ faculty led programs; University of Minnesota with 45,500 students, 30 faculty led programs), UF falls slightly below average with a total student population of 46,000 and 22 Faculty Led programs. Michigan State ranks above average with 108 programs in 57 different countries, compared to all of the universities, including Texas, which has the largest student population (50,600) and 27 programs.

c) For Independent Programs, data was unavailable for North Carolina State. However, UF ranks well above average with 70 independent programs, second only to Texas with its 310 affiliated programs. The programs offered by Texas constitute those that the University helps sponsor or administer, but which it does not wholly control (see also hard copy for details). With the exception of Texas, UF shows a strong emphasis on independent programs.

Note: N. Carolina = Unknown
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5: Total number of students enrolled (including international students).
Data for the total number of students enrolled at each university shows that the UF has the third largest student population (46,000) after Texas, with 50,600 students, and Ohio State with 48,000 students. North Carolina State University is the smallest with 27,000 students.

6: Non-immigrant international students enrolled.
When compared with total student population (above), the numbers of non-immigrant students enrolled show that the larger the total population, the larger the number of international students enrolled. UF is the third largest school according to student population and, similarly, has the third largest international student population. Overall, the number of international students ranges from 4,535 at Texas, to 2,100 at North Carolina State. UF ranks favorably with 3,884 international students enrolled.

7: Study Abroad students sent overseas per annum.
Although placing sixth in the number of international students enrolled, Michigan State has the largest number of Study Abroad students per annum (2,058). UF sends abroad approximately 1,200 students per annum, comparing well with the Illinois (1,337), Ohio State (1,106), and Minnesota (1,058) and Texas (1,633). N. Carolina State sends the least number of students abroad each year (600).

8: Number of Title IV Centers.
Michigan leads the sample universities with a total of 6 Title VI centers. Minnesota has the fewest Title VI Centers: 2. University of Florida has 3 Title VI centers lying, therefore, just below the remaining universities with from 4 to 6 centers.

Discussion
In general, UF (UFIC) compares favorably with the other 6 sample universities and their respective international units. UF enjoys a moderately high international student enrollment. According to the 2001 Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange, the economic impact of foreign students on the U.S. is considerable. UF international student enrollment is, therefore, important. Similarly, UF Study Abroad figures compare well with the other selected universities. Further, compared to the other international unit web sites, that of UFIC is well laid out, logically presented, and has more than adequate content. This is an important because this is not true of many of the other six samples. This was also reflected, to some extent, in the definite need to contact these schools directly for data for this study (particularly for Michigan State, Illinois, and Minnesota).

Based on this study, areas for improvement at UF, promoted by UFIC, could include increasing faculty led Study Abroad programs, the addition of further Title VI centers, and encouraging expanded international student enrollment.