

USG Study Abroad Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 10, 2003

Foundation Board Room

Macon State College

10:00 a.m.--1:00 p.m.

Executive Summary

The Study Abroad Committee of the System Council for International Education met as a Committee of the whole on Friday, January 10, 2003 at Macon State College. The Study Abroad Committee is open to all interested faculty and staff of the University System of Georgia. The Council consists of thirty-four representatives appointed by the presidents of each USG institution along with the chairs of the World Regional Councils. Richard Sutton, the System's Director of International Programs and Services, and Nancy Shumaker, chair of the Study Abroad Committee, co-chaired the meeting.

Attendance

Present at the meeting were:

Claude Perkins, Albany State University

James Anderson, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Janis Reid, Atlanta Metropolitan College

Lisa Mallory, Atlanta Metropolitan College

Chris Bourdouvalis, Augusta State University

Robert Welborn, Clayton College and State University

Shirley Oakley, Coastal Georgia Community College

Neal McCrillis, Columbus State University

Beth Biron, Dalton State College

Mid Brock, Darton College

Martha Hughes, East Georgia College

Virginia Carson, Floyd College

Alberta Johnson, Floyd College

Gerald McIntosh, Fort Valley State University

Chaudron Gille, Gainesville College

Dwight Call, Georgia College and State University

Harriet Nichols, Georgia Perimeter College

Nancy Shumaker, Georgia Southern University

Philip Szmedra, Georgia Southwestern State University

Leigh Essex Walker, Georgia State University

Doug Podoll, Georgia State University

Karen Guffey, Gordon College

Tom Keene, Kennesaw State University

Jim Decker, Macon State College
Beverly Tarver, Medical College of Georgia
John Ricks, Middle Georgia College
Brian Murphy, North Georgia College and State University
Cornelius St. Mark, Savannah State University
Carl McDonald, South Georgia College
William Schaniel, State University of West Georgia
Fausto Sarmiento, The University of Georgia
Lindsey Parsons, The University of Georgia
Andrea Kiely, The University of Georgia
Deborah Faucher, The University of Georgia
Tracy Harrington, Valdosta State University
David Starling, Valdosta State University
Howard Potts, Waycross College
Richard Sutton, University System of Georgia
Susan Leisure, University System of Georgia
Sue Sugarman, University System of Georgia
Alison McCubbin, University System of Georgia

I. Overview of January 8, 2003 Presentation to the Board of Regents on Study Abroad

Dr. Sutton read to the committee the presentation about study abroad in the University System that had been made to the Board of Regents at the Strategic Planning Committee Meeting on January 8. He reported that the Board's response to the presentation had been positive and that there was no challenge to the matters presented. The text of this speech and the slides will be posted on the OIE website.

Question arising from the presentation:

Is Board approval required for increases in student fees?

- Board approval is required for mandatory campuswide fee increases.
- Redirection of funds as part of student activity fees does not require approval from the Board.
- A service fee as part of study abroad program fees does not require Board approval.

II. Determining the Parameters for the System's New 4% Study Abroad Target

A. Definitional Variables

Dr. Sutton reported that 4% was not addressed in the Board presentation because the System is not yet at a stage where it can demonstrate how the target will be reached. There are still issues about how the figure will be defined.

The goal will be measured as % of undergraduate students only. The target will eventually be

restated from a percentage of *enrollment* to a percentage of *degrees earned*. Yet to be determined are the base year (2001-02 or 2002-03) to use and whether the base year will be held constant through the entire strategic planning period (2007) or whether it will be increased each term.

Matters under consideration:

- Full-time enrollment vs. total enrollment – the Chancellor is sympathetic to the idea of full-time enrollment.

B. Establishing the base for calculating participation

Options for determining *enrollment* base:

Total undergraduate headcount

Full-time students (headcount)

Full-time equivalency

Process for determining *graduation* base:

Associates & bachelor's degrees awarded in year X

C. Types of experiences that could count toward participation targets

Up to this point, we have been considering only those students who go abroad for a credit experience. We have the opportunity to consider other types of experience including those listed below:

Credit coursework

Non-credit

Internships

Other experiential

University -sponsored extracurricular

Other sponsored extracurricular

Independent travel

Service Learning

Some of the difficulties mentioned by the committee in counting experience other than travel involving course credit were:

- the difficulties of monitoring and accounting for the travel
- whether there are issues of liability and insurance if the program is in some way sponsored by the institution
- the validity of independent travel
- the issue of quality
- the fact that “study abroad” implies a learning experience abroad with some kind of outcome that can be assessed. It is not just “experience” abroad
- the programs led by faculty members who refuse to award credit for the course, e.g. art club going to

Paris

There was concern about separating study abroad from the core mission of the institutions, the academic mission. Including other experiences abroad as “study” abroad may be counter-productive by fostering the idea that study abroad is extraneous or a luxury rather than a part of learning.

General comments from the members:

- Instead of looking at ways to increase the percentage of study abroad participation, if a particular program is valid, we should find a way to award academic credit, even if it is only one credit hour (ie, a service learning experience or an independent travel experience where the student is required to report to a faculty member at the home campus).
- The question was raised as to whether the System Office of International Education could issue a clarification on the types of experiences that would be considered study abroad experiences.

The majority of the committee expressed the belief that it was preferable to retain the requirement that the travel be for credit in order to be considered as a study abroad experience. Institutions should be encouraged to find ways to give credit for experiences abroad that may not constitute a “typical” study abroad program. Institutions should look to find a way to award credit for extra-curricular activities abroad. A request was made that the system should consider counting the experience as “study abroad” if there is a clear educational benefit or if credit was granted at another institution.

III. Adopting Institutional Target

Dr. Sutton reported that how we choose to define a study abroad participant will later determine the way that the degree of success in attaining the System goal is measured. The System office is working with the institutions to develop institutional targets that will bring us somewhere close to the Board’s total goal for the System. The 2007 institutional targets do not add up to a total 4% for the University System yet. Some institutions have made solid and ambitious projections, and some institutions have not. Funding support may be tied to aspirational goals and actual performance. Actual number targets will have to be reported to the Board in May where institutional targets will be presented.

IV. Institutional Strategies for Achieving Institutional Targets

Institutional profiles of student population
Analysis of study abroad participants

Each institution, in addition to having a participant goal, will be required to have a plan for how they will achieve the target.

Susan Leisure will prepare an analysis of each institution’s study abroad performance for the past two years from the study abroad data. The analysis will include participation by major, class, region of the world, etc. Susan Leisure and Sue Sugarman will prepare some suggestions for each institution about how

they may increase the number of study abroad participants. They are happy to work with individual institutions on these suggestions.

The question was raised as to whether the Regents have approved a specific policy for reaching this target or whether it was way of judging the overall effectiveness of our presidents. Dr. Sutton stated that at this stage the intention is that institutions will be asked to set targets and to provide a plan for how they intend to meet that target. If the goal does not meet certain level, or there is no plan to achieve the goal, then institutions may lose the chance for funding. The OIE will work with sector-driven targets. Institutions are encouraged to use the targets and plans as a form of leverage on their campus.

It is intended that by the end of the month there will be direction about what exactly is to be measured. A member of the committee suggested that the institutional plan needs to include a change in the culture of study abroad so that faculty are rewarded for participation in study abroad. It would be helpful if faculty study abroad participation could be counted toward tenure and promotion. Dr Sutton responded that at this stage the Board will not mandate that faculty tenure should take into account study abroad.

The following questions were raised from committee members about study abroad culture:

- Can institutions consider what is done to promote, encourage or recognize the way faculty can be rewarded?

- How can we “sell” young faculty, deans and academic administrators on the worthiness of study abroad? What can we do to promote or publicize ways faculty can be encouraged and rewarded to participate in study abroad?

The European Council has worked on compensation for faculty and a lot of progress has been made in this area. At Valdosta there is a proposal to identify junior faculty as International Associates. A Faculty Academy may also be a way of pursuing recognition for faculty who participate in study abroad. Participation in the academy may contribute to the tenure process. There is a system in Pennsylvania for developing such training programs.

V. Program Development Issues

Collaboration
Length of program
Priority locations
Priority disciplines

There is endorsement of priorities for collaboration, the creation of larger programs and longer programs, programs in underserved locations and less represented disciplines. The SCIE should clarify parameters and priorities in order to allow us to build capacity over a sequence of years. The SCIE also needs to

decide how existing USG resources should be channeled toward programs that will allow committee members to leverage additional support at the campus level. This has been done previously with program support for self-contained operations. The System OIE would like to address this in broader terms.

VI. Funding Models to Support Programs (Options)

- Subsidies for self-contained programs
- Subsidies for collaborative programs
- Other subsidies for priority programs
- Best practices awards for degree programs with integrated study abroad
- Cost recovery/credit extension fee model

Dr. Sutton reported that these funds may be used in areas where they are most needed. The System is prepared to support institutions that are able to contribute an equal amount of support. This kind of funding would not be tied to students per se but to development of programs that fit institutional strategies for increasing study abroad numbers. Each year, certain areas would be given preference in receiving funding. The funding would not be continuing base-budget funding but it would be a way to leverage institutional for funds. There is the potential for multi-campus collaborations.

There will be some funds available for Spring 2003. Greater funds will be available in FY04. Nominations for FY04 will probably be called for at the end of the spring semester. The type of funding will be for program-support rather than funds directed at students. The intention of this type of support would be to lower the cost of the program for all students. How the funds are applied is up to the discretion of the institution.

A study abroad listserv will be created (SAC-SCIE-L@uga.edu). If you wish to be included on this listserv, contact Alison McCubbin at: alison.mccubbin@usg.edu

After input from this meeting, draft guidelines for program support applications will be formulated next week. An important issue will be how the funding will help increase program numbers.

The issue of registration in collaborative programs (students registering at their own campus) is being addressed. The impact of registration difficulties is recognized as an impediment to building participant numbers. The Chancellor has asked that this problem be addressed within the year. For the EU certificate, students register on their home campus and the registration fee is then transferred to the EU. The intention is that there be a systemwide collaborative electronic registration. There will be a bonus for collaboration.

UGA has a Costa Rica facility, which it would like to make available to other institutions.

The *cost-recovery fee* model was mentioned to the Board with no objections. Monies paid in fees would go directly to the program rather than to the university in general. If cost recovery is used, the eligibility for state formula funding is lost, which is a drawback for many campuses. The model may be worthwhile if a

program is not getting any institutional support.

Comments by members of the committee:

- An alternative would be to have fees paid into the general budget but have the business office then funnel this money to the study abroad program.
- The Kennesaw model, where the business office gives funding to the International Office according to fees paid into study abroad programs, was cited as a desirable practice for funding study abroad programs. The money paid to faculty for instruction does not come out of departmental budgets but rather from the International Office budget.
- The campuses, through the Study Abroad Committee and the Faculty and Curriculum Committee, can formulate a list of best practices and ways of eliminating obstacles. This could then be presented to the Chancellor for endorsement to then be sent back to the institutions as a form of policy encouragement. This could perhaps be brought to the Academic Affairs committee.

VII. Funding Models to Support Students (options)

Private Funds:	Scholarships
	Endowments
	Grants
Fees:	Dedicated student activity fee
	Participation fees
State appropriations:	Work/internship positions in programs abroad
	Dedicated work/internships on campus prior to going abroad
	Travel grants
	Dedicated Regents study abroad scholarships

Dr. Sutton reported that Regents Scholarship money is drying up. In order to stretch the amount available, the System office has determined that it will limit the amount that will be awarded in the current year and then stretch it to the following year. It is not expected that the funds will be available beyond next year. In order to explore external funding, we would need to have the full backing of the Board, which we do not have at this stage.

More restrictions will be put on the scholarships. Scholarships will be awarded

- only to students who have never been abroad before,
- to students who have exceptional academic merit, and to those who
- to students who have need based on evidence of their current eligibility for financial aid

Fewer total dollars will be awarded, and campuses that have not proposed institutional targets beyond their actual current participant numbers will not be eligible for these funds.

Consideration will be given for a 1:3 matching funding ratio if campuses are willing to do this.

Other ways of channeling funding to students that will have a matching component (but will be less restrictive) are:

1. Regents Study Abroad Service Learning Travel Grant perhaps called Georgia Ambassadors. A campus would identify a service-learning activity for which the BOR could then reimburse participants for the cost of their travel. This is a legitimate use of state funds. Reimbursement funds from the OIE would come at the end of the program. The service would be in addition to study for credit.
2. Work experience for students abroad – this allows for hiring of additional students while abroad.
3. Employ students as global ambassadors working towards study abroad on campus prior to their experience abroad. The intention would be to hold part of their wages and channel it toward payment for their study abroad program. There are legal problems with withholding funds contingent on study abroad if the student does not travel. They would still be entitled to the funding.

The OIE is trying to find a way to bring financial support for study abroad programs to about \$100,000 from the System. This would be an augmentation of funds to allow institutions to get more money to the students.

It would not be required that specific students be mentioned when applying for funding. When the funds are actually transferred, details about specific students will need to be provided.

Question from a member of the committee:

Can there be funding for release time for faculty to recruit? Susan Leisure noted that if money is given to faculty and used for course buy-out, the campus is entitled to at least 20% of that funding.

Dr. Sutton noted that with these new programs there is greater flexibility of funding sources. Funding is not required to come solely from Foundation funds. Regular institutional budgets, program revenue accounts, and any valid state source would also be a potential source. The intent is to leverage campus funding. Matching funds need not be limited to monies raised from federal funds, e.g. international grants. Federally funded work-study may be excluded but all federal funds should not be excluded.

There was concern that, in the current budget situation, there may not be funds available on campus to

match the funds. Several members of the committee expressed the belief that they would be able to apply for the funds for this current year.

Questions to the Committee from Dr. Sutton

Q. How many of these programs can be set up per campus, and how many can be administered?

Q. Will the students be receptive to the idea of creating this larger menu and trying to find other ways that students can be supported?

Can students work for more than two or three semesters?

Benefits of these new funding programs: makes students commit to a study abroad program early, foundations are not the sole source for funds, and more students will be promoting study abroad on campus, (a big help in recruiting).

There was some concern that some schools just do not have funds for faculty , and therefore difficult to pitch requests for matching funds; committee members were encouraged to start small and then allow these programs to grow. On the issue of corporate funding, Dr. Sutton stated that Coca-Cola has provided us with funds for the past three years. There are issues about getting the System committed to a high level of fund raising. We are waiting to get the Chancellor and a couple of Regents on board to make those kinds of pitches. Otherwise the institutions do better than the Board at fund raising. At the moment we are trying to prioritize the use of dollars that we do have access to and look at how we can get those productively turned toward this priority.

Guidelines will be put together and a call for requests will be made for this spring for FY03 for funds to be spent by the end of June and then there will be another request for FY04 dollars.

The working programs will be the immediate benefactors of these new programs. Service learning projects would have to be under the institution's sponsorship.

Question from a member of the committee:

Would a club that promotes international travel be eligible for matching grants? Dr. Sutton stated that matching grants would not be organizations but for funding of individuals.

Fewer restrictions will be on the work-study matching funds than on scholarships.

Money needs to be allocated this spring and campuses will need to disburse funds by June 30. Committee members will need to talk to you're the campus business office about how the procedures surrounding the expenditure of the money. The intention is to have funds on the table for program support and student support for this spring, this fiscal year, and then money for next fiscal year. There is no new money coming into this, and the budget committee will have to reallocate current funding and redirect the money toward program support.

Students could earn \$500 a semester (combined BOR match and institutional match), so if a student worked for a year, he would receive \$1,000 in support. The money is taxable. If student is paid as a consultant, the student is responsible for paying taxes if they earn more than \$600 a year. The school would not be required to take the money out of their wages.

Money will be awarded to the institution, and at the end of the fiscal year, the institution will need to report details on the students who were supported by these funding programs.

VIII. Budget Reallocation Strategies

Options for FY03 programs

Options for FY04 programs

Each institution, in addition to having a target or number, will be required to have a plan for how they will achieve the target.

IX. Changes in Study Abroad Catalog & Program Review Process

Production of the University System catalog will now be coordinated by the System office. The System office is very grateful to UGA for the years of service they have provided in producing the catalog. Committee members were reminded that the System Office must receive a copy of the Institutional approval of any new programs before they can be included in the catalog. Program review will be suspended at this stage in order to channel funds into the new study abroad funding models. Program approval guidelines are in the study abroad handbook.

X. Study Abroad Workshops vs. Annual Conference

The Study Abroad Conference has been held annually for many years and we are looking at different ways to approach the topics of this conference. We are considering a series of smaller workshops that may be more targeted to different aspects of study abroad evaluation or assessment. The faculty development academy idea may be incorporated into these new workshops. Dr. Sutton encouraged feedback as to how this might be approached.

Comments from the committee:

- It is good to target different aspects of the population.
- It is important to get feedback about the needs surrounding study abroad.
- Perhaps a longer program, such as a regional conference, could be planned, possibly in conjunction with the GAIE.
- Design a workshop and bring it to campuses.

Dr. Sutton recognized UGA for its work in organizing the study abroad orientation for the University System, which will now be organized by Kennesaw. Sue and Susan will function as consultants and will assist in

designing and executing the study abroad orientation.

XI. **GSU Fee Proposal**

Georgia State University is moving ahead with a plan to institute a campus-wide fee for international issues on campus. The proposal will go to the Board of Regents in April.

XII. **Adjournment - Next meeting**

The next meeting of the SCIE will be on February 21 at Jekyll Island. The next meeting for the Study Abroad Committee will be announced at a later date.

© Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia

270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30334

U.S.A.