

Response to the External Reviewer's Report on the Self-Study of International Education June 29, 2010

Members of the International Education Committee (IEC) as well as others involved in the self-study thank the external reviewers for providing the number and variety of recommendations made, as well as the timing of implementing these recommendations. We concur with the external reviewers that “the Self-Study be made widely available to all constituencies of the DePauw community and that it serve as a central reference for future planning and development of international programs.” Because this self-study is so broad, both in topic and in departmental involvement, we agree with the external reviewers that “the significant next steps in the process should take place with more deliberation and more mid- and long-term planning than has characterized the initial stages.” To do so, it is important that members from across the University be involved, most notably the President, his cabinet and Academic Council. To help guide all of us through this strategic planning phase, below we respond to the recommendations made by the external reviewers with both definitive next steps and questions to be asked.

- I. With regard to **off-campus study**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations, both of which are currently topics of conversation in the IEC.
- “This centralization of advising for off-campus study [within the CIEE] should be continued but efforts should be made to engage faculty more consistently to include discussion of study abroad when advising students and in becoming more familiar with the specific academic aspects of recommended programs of study abroad.” (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)
 - “The committee recommends that the application reading process be redesigned so that it is no longer the primary responsibility of the IEC.” (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)

a. *Program review & approval process:*

Currently, programs are reviewed on a regular basis through CIEE staff members and faculty members visiting programs, evaluations of the program and experience by students having attended a program, and (on occasion) external reviews of programs. The list is approved by the IEC each fall, usually only with minor modifications. Modifications are a result of program reviews, tuition cost of a program, recent participation trends in the program, or some combination of these three. The review uses the following resources and information to determine approval of a program:

- The criteria for approving off-campus study programs, as established by the IEC in March 2008; these criteria include areas of educational value, opportunities for cultural immersion, opportunity for personal development, opportunities for synthesized reflection, health and safety, and cost of the program. (for a full description of criteria, see <http://www.depauw.edu/univ/international/OCS/documents.asp>)
- Brochures and information gathered from colleagues at other universities
- The information the students submit about a specific program they are considering (for non-approved programs)
- Survey and feedback from students who've participated in the programs in the past

The current process works, but could be improved with additional program review. As a goal over the next year or two, the faculty liaison from each department (see proposal in “Advising Process”) who is familiar with programs relevant to his/her department will be involved in a review process. Also, over the next year or two, we will redesign the student evaluation to reflect what departments

and faculty members feel is helpful in the advising and program review process. In addition the GLCA deans and presidents recently (April 2010) agreed that off-campus study staff on GLCA campuses would collaborate on program review and site visits, sharing and accepting reports and recommendations for consideration of approving programs for their individual campuses.

b. Advising process

Currently, students interested in off-campus study are required to have one advising appointment with an off-campus study advisor in the CIEE. Some students have multiple appointments, but at the minimum, students receive advising on the application process, including all financial, credit and logistical information, on the programs on which they can study, and on their academic and personal goals and interests as they relate to off-campus study. Students also receive advising from their advisors and other faculty members with whom they work. The extent and topics of advising they receive from faculty members varies widely. Because of the application deadlines and timelines, many students are choosing a major and major advisor at the same time they are submitting their application. As a result, many students do not have in-depth conversations with someone from their area of study before selecting an off-campus program and submitting an application.

The current process of advising from off-campus study advisors works well. However, it would be ideal to have greater faculty involvement in advising students on off-campus study. One of the things that is often lacking in a student's application is a developed connection between what a student is studying and where they intend to study off campus. Students applying to study off campus have not yet had upper level or in-depth training in their area of focus, so it is reasonable to think they cannot yet articulate a developed rationale or connection between their studies and the location. They can make some progress, however, but to do so, they need more consultation and advising from someone within their area of study.

Starting in fall 2010 the off-campus study staff will work with each department have at least one faculty member who is the off-campus study liaison. This individual would receive training and information from the off-campus study staff on the application process and philosophy behind off-campus study. Students who have not yet declared a major or who might want to focus on something off-campus that is not specifically within their major will have access to the departmental liaison. Clearly, students should speak with as many faculty members as possible, but this would help initiate greater discussion between students and faculty members on the topic of their academic goals for off-campus study. While this does not resolve the issue of selecting a major and major advisor at the same time as submitting an application to study off campus, it would help by providing a general advisor within areas of academic specialization to help students think more critically about their off-campus study goals.

c. Application content

The current application contains demographic information, information specific to the program(s) the student wishes to study on, a statement of intent, a major advisor form, a faculty recommendation form, a language recommendation form, a budget worksheet and a liability form. There does not need to be substantial change to the application, though the IEC will continue to review the content and endorse it on a yearly basis.

d. Application review process

Currently, the set of applications received are divided into three groups, so each application is read by two faculty members and an OCS advisor. The decision is one of consensus based on the comments made by each reader, with greater weight given to faculty comments. This process tends to take 2-3 weeks for all 9 individuals involved to read the set of applications. With membership changing every

year, the recurring problem is for faculty members on the IEC to know what it is they are looking for and be in agreement as a committee on the minimum standards of the application.

Starting in fall 2010, the members of the off-campus study staff will be responsible for reading and evaluating off-campus study applications. This would alleviate the burden on the faculty members of the IEC and reduce the fluctuation and breadth of rationale for approving (or not) students to be off campus. All decisions and the rationale for the decisions would be shared with the IEC (in terms of approve, rewrite, deny, rankings based on enrollment limit) prior to student notification. Students who are asked to rewrite their application will be required to meet with an off-campus study faculty liaison to further discuss their academic goals, as well as continue to meet with an off-campus study advisor. In any case where the IEC had questions, the applications could be reviewed by the IEC. The full IEC or a subcommittee of IEC could be responsible for this.

The assumption in this process is that members of the off-campus study staff are qualified to make evaluations of off-campus study applications, based on the criteria set forth and approved by the IEC and based on their professional training and experience. In cases where students contest the decision, we propose creating a clear procedure by which students can do so. This would likely involve the IEC as the first step to reviewing the application and decision made. This would be similar to the current appeals process, though perhaps modified slightly to reflect the new review process.

II. With regard to **international students**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- “Admissions work with the Coordinator for English Language Support and the English department to look for ways to more accurately assess the English skills of international applicants that may not rely solely on standardized test scores.” (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)
- “The University adopt a broad-based strategy to include students, faculty, staff, and alumni to address the issues of international student integration into the campus community.” (Developmental phase of 2-5 years, some new or reallocated resources)
- “Admissions puts a greater emphasis on diversifying the demographics of DePauw’s international population than on increasing the overall population of international students. To do so, the President should give Admissions a directive of both the total international students it wishes to annually matriculate, and the kind of diversity of the classes desired.” (Visionary phase of 4-8 years, will require new resources)

These recommendations deserve careful consideration, but they are beyond the sole purview of the IEC. Due to the broad nature of the recruitment and acclimation of international students into the general curriculum and culture at DePauw, these recommendations will require the input of multiple constituencies.

There is some overlap with the first bullet of this recommendation with that made in part III (below). Because of the questions surrounding the scope of the coordinator’s position, we recommend that the work done with the Admission office to assess English proficiency be done in consultation with the Dean of Academic Life, the new supervisor of the Coordinator, and in context of addressing other issues regarding English language support. Conversations have already begun to adjust the way English language support is delivered to non-native speakers of English. A pilot program utilizing tutors in specific disciplines to assist non-native speakers of English will be implemented with assistance from the coordinator of the English language support program, the English Department, Competency Centers (Q,

W and S), and disciplines identified by non-native speakers of English as high need: economics, chemistry, biology, psychology and others where tutors are available.

The International Education Committee will meet with the new Vice President of Admissions to better understand the current strategy of recruiting international students. It is expected that from this, the IEC will be better suited to recommend how we wish to diversify future classes of international students. It is also expected that this will help the Office of Admission better understand the immigration and curricular needs of our international students. This is particularly important for those who are non-native speakers of English as it is imperative that students entering into DePauw are prepared for instruction in English. As such, the IEC will explore the minimum English language entrance scores (TOEFL and IELTS) required and work with the Office of Admission to make any determined changes.

Over the past year, the Vice President of Student Life coordinated a review of student retention, of which international students was one demographic group. This study determined international students are staying at DePauw, though the figures have only just begun to take into account the growth in the international student population. It is noted that it will be important to carefully monitor retention of international students over the next several years to determine the specific reasons international students stay or leave and how this relates to admission practices as well as academic and student life.

As part of the ongoing efforts to integrate international students into the campus community, International Student Services has been recently realigned (summer 2010) to be part of Student Life. While a good part of the work done with international students is academic related, the advising and support of students outside of the academic realm can be better done in collaboration and conjunction with other student life advising. This move will help members of the International Student Services staff better know and understand the process and policies of Student Life areas, such as housing, spiritual life, and student programming; it will also further advance the work done over the past few years to push the support of international student services into the offices across campus, rather than relying on the International Student Services staff to provide advice and support on all areas of the campus.

An additional area that needs to be addressed but will take support from the Office of the President and the new Vice President of Alumni and Development is the connection of the alumni office with our current and alumni international students. International students often hear they are at DePauw because of the push to internationalize, but they also need to hear that they are truly welcomed and part of the DePauw family. As we move forward, and more students graduate over the next several years, it will be important that we have well-established communication and tracking networks so that when our international alumni are capable of giving back, the University is in a position to reach out to them.

III. With regard to **English language support for non-native speakers of English**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- “The Coordinator for English Language Support report to the chair of the English department and, in addition to teaching duties, be charged with overseeing the coordination of the support program with CIEE, the Writing Center, the Academic Resource Center, and with those departments in which international students cluster.” (Developmental phase of 2-5 years, some new or reallocated resources)

Currently, the Coordinator position is a staff position with part-time instructor responsibilities in the department of English. In the time in which we have had an increased international student population and the Coordinator, there have been as many questions raised as new services provided. There has been greater attention to tutoring non-native speakers, placing them in appropriate English writing courses, and collaborating with faculty members teaching students who are non-native speakers of English. However, we have yet to fully address several things, including:

- How do our processes for determining and using admission scores, language assessment scores (upon arrival), English course placements, and tutoring services impact student progress? How do these processes fit together, do they meet the needs of students as we've determined them, and how are we evaluating these processes?
- We know students need more than just academic writing assistance (through formal courses or tutoring). They need help in other styles of writing, such as cover letters, statements of intent for scholarship or program applications, and informal writing (e.g., emails) that are within an American cultural context.
- They also need help in speaking, both informally and formally. We've made good progress here with the Speaking Center tutors, but again, how are we evaluating the impact of these services.

We recognize that the offering of these services needs to happen in multiple areas across campus. Without further determination of what specifically students need and an assessment of what we are doing thus far, we believe it is premature to relocate the Coordinator's position to that of the English department. The realignment of the Coordinator's position to report directly to the Dean of Academic Life should allow for this recommendation to be discussed as well as the issues listed above be addressed. At this time, we recommend further conversation take place amongst all involved parties and that it be connected with other intellectual life conversations.

IV. With regard to **leadership and communication of international education**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- "The University should seek ways to clarify the delegation of responsibilities associated with international education and work to ensure more effective communication among all constituencies." (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)
- "Information regarding all aspects of international education should be centralized in the CIEE and available through its website with appropriate links to other offices." (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)
- "That the Vice-President for Academic Affairs should oversee planning for international education." (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)

As the International Education Committee removes application review from its responsibilities, it can be a central figure in identifying how international education can be brought to the forefront of academic and co-curricular life at DePauw University. This conversation can be in tandem to the ongoing Intellectual Life discussions. With additional time and resources, the IEC will put the clarification and communication of the goals of international education at the top of its agenda for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Beginning with the academic year 2010-2011, the Center for International & Experiential Education will be merged with Career Services and Civic Engagement programs to create a new organization: Civic Global & Professional Opportunities. The combination of these programs will bring more services related to experiential and international education to students in a central location. Many of the opportunities currently offered are decentralized, but with a similar goal of promoting experiential learning including international education. The centralized location of such an office will allow for more visibility of programming, and access for more students previously unaware of international education opportunities on campus. It is the hope that not only students will enjoy the new space and service, but faculty will also utilize the resources available to them in incorporating international themes and topics into courses and faculty/student research opportunities.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs is the logical position for the oversight of international education at DePauw University as it relates to academic life. As international education reaches all aspects of the University community, it will also be important to include Student Life in the conversations associated with promoting international education. The addition of International Student Services in the division of Student Life and the Office of Multicultural and International Life will be a bridge into advocating for international students and promoting co-curricular international activities on campus.

V. With regard to **integrating internationalization into the University's mission**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- “The International Learning Goals become a more active part of curricular planning for the purpose of integrating them in ways that will ensure that DePauw graduates will fulfill the aspirations of the University's mission.” (Developmental phase of 2-5 years, some new or reallocated resources)
- “The integration of internationalization requires a central campus location where domestic students can engage easily with international students and from which all information about international issues is disseminated.” (Visionary phase of 4-8 years, will require new resources)

The ongoing Intellectual Life discussions designed to make deliberate connections between academic life and co-curricular life is the ideal forum for bringing the international learning goals to the forefront of curricular planning. As these discussions go forward it will be important for the new Civic Global and Professional Opportunities program and the upper administration to foster new proposals with an international focus as curriculum changes come forward.

With the creation of the Civic Global & Professional Opportunities program and its physical space within the Memorial Union Building will bring international and experiential education to the students in a central location. International Student Services will also be in the same physical space, but under the umbrella of Student Life, further integrating the international student program with the general campus student services.

The International Education Committee will also include the integration of internationalization into the general curriculum to its agenda for the 2010-2011 academic year and beyond. Specifically, this will include working with with appropriate faculty governance committees to build in standards and expectations when new courses are created. It will also include exploring the creation of criteria to the departmental review process to ensure a system of assessment of the international learning goals.

Beyond the curriculum, other areas that deserve attention are the processes, budgetary structure and priorities in developing student and faculty exchanges, which allows DePauw students and faculty members to have international experiences elsewhere as well as on campus with the presence of visiting international scholars. (Faculty exchanges are discussed further in section VIII.) Also beyond the curriculum is the engagement with the international communities in and around Greencastle. What role do international students play, what role do students who have studied abroad play, what role to faculty members with international experiences play, what can the community contribute and how can we support each other are all questions to be explored.

VI. With regard to **Winter Term**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- “The winter term be integrated into the DePauw curriculum, specifically that development and approval of programs/courses becomes a departmental responsibility and that each winter term experience is graded instead of assigning pass/fail.” (Developmental phase of 2-5 years, some new or reallocated resources)

We believe this recommendation should be shared with the existing Winter Term Working Group to be part of the ongoing conversations about Winter Term. Because of the unknowns about Winter Term at this time, we find it more appropriate to make note of several comments made by the external reviewers:

- “Given that several faculty members commented on the difficulty of evaluating students in a winter term service course, faculty may wish to explore how other institutions design such courses specifically for a grade.” The following website was provided as a resource: <http://www.curricularengagement.com/Publications.html>
- “Some faculty seemed baffled by the development of third party provider’s role in winter term international programs or the prevalence of risk management discussions with faculty leaders. However, this practice follows standards of best practice as published by The Form on Education Abroad and NAFSA: Association of International Educators.”

We agree with the reviewers that we must come to “some standardization and agreement about the role of winter term international courses.” Clearly, we need to determine the purpose of Winter Term and the curricular and administrative aspects that result, but we also need to determine how Winter Term contributes to the internationalization of our University, at the student level, the faculty level and the staff level. There needs to be careful consideration of the overlap of Winter Term with faculty development and the integration of internationalization into the University’s mission.

We also wish to note the administrative considerations to remember as a result of any changes to Winter Term. Without knowing what Winter Term will actually look like, it is impossible to say how we need to change things administratively. Nonetheless, as the faculty discusses the purpose and nature of Winter Term, the following administrative aspects to Winter Term should be considered.

a. Registration Process

Currently, the Durham House acts as the registrar for Winter Term. Students participating in any of the four off-campus options are registered by staff members in the Durham House. This happens on various timelines and in various ways according to the timelines and requirements of each off-campus option. Durham House staff also register semester off-campus students (off-campus study, Management Fellows, Media Fellows, Science Research Fellows, independent internship semesters) for Winter Term credit.

- For on-campus courses, the Durham House handles the collection of course descriptions, posts them on the WT website, handles room requests from faculty members and gives the necessary information to the registrar’s office to load into a WT SOC page. The Durham House portion of the work is all done individually by email or paper, not in an online system as with semester courses. Students request courses and make course adjustments through the normal e-services process. After the registration process and adjustment period is closed for on-campus courses the only way for a student to make changes is via e-mail back and forth with the faculty and a staff member in the Durham House. Once the change is approved a staff member in the Durham House has to make the change via e-services.
- We currently withhold registration for off-campus students as an incentive to get required paperwork (e.g., liability, learning contracts) and orientation attendance; it’s possible to withhold credit after completion of the program, but this would probably not work with faculty who’ve said they’ve completed all requirements for the course. These requirements are a result of consultation with the University attorney as well as published guidelines from professional organizations dedicated in promoting best practices in off campus and experiential education opportunities (NAFSA and The Forum). Removal of any incentive for students to complete requirements will undo much of the work done to mitigate the liability exposure to the University when sponsoring off campus programming. There must be a way to mandate submission of

required forms and orientation attendance, whether it's part of the registration process or not; this may mean more faculty involvement in administrative aspects of WT, though we know this is not preferable.

- The timing of when to post off-campus and on-campus courses is important. Some WT courses could connect to fall semester courses, while others could connect to spring semester courses, so the posting of WT courses should coincide with fall semester and/or spring semester advising. Off-campus courses, in particular, need to be approved in early spring semester in order for there to be time to develop the course over the summer and fall semesters.
- We need to consider deadlines for students to adjust their WT schedules so that they do not bypass any requisite work (academic or administrative) for participation in a WT course. This also is important with regard to faculty-led courses, as there are financial deadlines and implications to the students and the University that need to be adhered to. We would recommend September for faculty-led courses because of the schedule in making vendor payments.
- How do first year students get included in off-campus courses; are spaces reserved for them and when do they fall into the registration process? How do faculty members screen participants in their off-campus courses? Should all registration for faculty-led courses be by SPAC only? We remind you that having an application process for any kind of off-campus study course adheres to established best practices within the field of study abroad.
- Durham House staff members need access to class rosters and be able to monitor add/drops (in an effort to track forms, monitor payments to travel providers, etc.)
- Currently, withdrawals from off-campus courses must be in writing and the date we receive it in writing is the date refunds are determined. The drop/withdrawal process needs to ensure that Durham House staff are notified of drops as soon as they occur so we can meet any withdrawal deadlines. Discussion needs to take place if students must also withdraw in writing to the travel provider. The main issue here is timing and refunds; if we don't meet deadlines, who is responsible for costs – the student or DePauw?
- What about May projects? When do they register for these – with spring courses? Timing of registration will impact the financial support process. Currently, we have all students applied and awarded with financial support at the same time; moving registration to spring would mean we have to reserve an estimated dollar amount to award to May projects. In some ways this makes more sense, but determining how much to reserve for May projects will need discussion and exploration.
- We currently cap the number of students on faculty-led courses due to cost and liability issues; how will this be handled if the system is more in the hands of faculty? Can we continue to place an institutional cap on these courses?

b. *Finances*

This is a *substantial* piece of the workload for Winter Term and is somewhat different than the typical vendor payments that support staff members regularly do.

- A LOT of time is spent working with travel providers and making vendor payments (and following up). A lot of time is also spent working with our accounting office on what's the correct way to pay certain providers. Examples: check, credit card payment or wire transfer.
- A part of the financial oversight is review of contracts; there needs to be consistency and expertise in reviewing travel provider contracts.
- For consistency and adherence to offering affordable programs, someone needs to be able to check each budget and know how each compares to the others.
- Trying to keep budgets low (affordable projects) – a good amount of work is spent helping faculty members maintain their projects within established budget guidelines. It's important to offer quality programs, but with increasing costs, it's important to be sure the design of courses is done with the quality and low costs in mind.

- Handling and helping to reconcile cash advances; requesting commercial cards and knowing the standard limits of cards and how changes work. Consistency again is the key word.
- Many, many hours are spent on reviewing leader reconciliations and student financial support reconciliations. Consistent review is necessary to ensure University business expense policy is being followed.
- There are significant differences in spending policies for WT than for regular courses. Some departments won't be familiar with rules of spending and we do not have consistency across departments. For example: faculty do not have per diems for travel off campus, alcohol cannot be purchased with student funds. If WT off campus projects continue to be funded exclusively with student funds, we would imagine these policies would stay in place.
- Secretaries already have enough to do and often feel pressured to do as asked by faculty members; it's important to have a person or office that has the authority to uphold University/WT expense policies. Because consistency is so important to maintaining financial and accounting procedures when it comes to student funds, one person or office should have the authority to uphold University/WT expense policies.
- The handling of both student charges and credits should be done with the same people who make payments to vendors to ensure proper budgeting and expense tracking. Financial support needs to be done by a central office (see below).
- Administration of \$15 per student fee for emergency fund – needs to be centralized and have people who know the whole scope of all projects addressing emergencies if something needs to be spent.
- On-campus courses also have costs. Currently the Durham House maintains a small budget to subsidize course costs and handles the charging of student accounts for the remainder of expenses. This is a lengthy process, starting in November and continuing through March to ensure all expenses are accounted for before charging students. Either departments need to budget themselves for expenses related to on-campus courses or there needs to be a central place to administer these costs and financial support. Should more local field trips take place within on-campus courses, then there will be additional costs either to the students or the University.

c. *Financial Support*

- To ensure accessibility and equity, there must be a common set of criteria and a common process for handling requests and awards.
- Some of the financial support we have for Winter Term is from endowed funds, which require specific actions and communication to development/financial aid. Centralizing the awarding of stewardship awards is needed to keep this processes as streamlined as possible. Timing and communication of availability of financial support is important; if there's no central control, more students may come in late for funds. Strict deadlines are needed to avoid latecomers from requesting funding from limited resources.
- Need to determine how to allocate funds for May projects depending on when students register for these. Currently, we have all students applied and awarded with financial support at the same time; moving registration to spring would mean we have to reserve an estimated dollar amount to award to May projects. In some ways this makes more sense, but determining how much to reserve for May projects will need discussion and exploration.
- Some of the financial support we have is through a special application process, not specific to an individual course and require faculty review (example: Douglas B. White Memorial Fund). These need to be centrally located.
- The second phase of financial support is for students completing independent study projects, internships, and studies at other schools. Not knowing how these will fit into Winter Term or be organized, should we keep financial support for these activities, it should be centralized. Phase II student financial support is awarded after the student completes their winter term project. This requires students to submit their receipts and a staff member in the Durham House has to review

and approve their receipts. Once this has been done a staff member in the DH requisitions a check for the student. The student is also sent a letter explaining their reimbursement.

d. Risk Management

The Durham House staff is the main group that pays attention to risk management with students traveling off campus for academic credit. This is something that's integral to our professional training and adherence to ethical and best practices within our profession. To not have a centralized focus on risk management severely limits the effectiveness of steps we take to mitigate risk to the University as well as faculty and staff members involved in organizing and conducting off-campus Winter Term courses. Not to mention, this helps ensure students are getting the appropriate information without multiple interpretations from multiple individuals. Risk management includes the training of faculty and staff leaders to design and lead WT courses off campus, work with students doing internships, and work with students doing independent study projects (having students lead other students off campus raises significant liability questions). It also includes required paperwork from students as well as student pre-departure orientation and reentry sessions.

- The biggest risk is having too many people involved (or not); information needs to come from one location.
- There needs to be someone informed about how accident, medical, property, liability insurance works for students and/or employees and be able to liaise between individuals and the insurance company.
- Centralized knowledge and adherence to general health and safety best practices within the field of study abroad is important.
- It's critical that one central place know the details of each program (itineraries, contingencies) in case of emergency.
- There is an established set of "Standards of Good Practice in Short Term Faculty-Led Study Abroad" by the Forum on Education Abroad, which is recognized by the US Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission as the Standards Development Organization (SDO) for education abroad. Durham House staff are aware of these standards and participate in Forum activities and trainings.

e. Advising

The Durham House currently advises on many off-campus opportunities open to DePauw students. The staff must remain knowledgeable about not only the options, but the process, as we advise students on what they are interested in. The primary questions we ask students are about their academic and personal interests, their values, and their ideas for their futures. Not knowing what's available for off-campus opportunities within WT would severely limit our ability to suggest opportunities that make sense to their academic and personal interests.

There have been many comments made about how faculty members do not know what WT is about, what options are open to students and how they don't advise students on what might make most sense for them. While some administrative processes prevent this from happening well (e.g., the timing of when on-campus courses are posted), information about Winter Term, including faculty resources, have long been part of publicly accessible information (see the Winter Term website). There needs to be greater integration of Winter Term choices with semester work done by students. We feel that while Durham House staff members need to continue to be part of the advising process, faculty advisors must take a greater advising role on Winter Term.

f. Student Leadership

Currently, the WTIS programs use the most student leadership. However, in recent years, study projects have taken on student TAs, serving in some leadership capacity. We suggest increasing the use of student leadership for the purpose of supporting student development (remembering many of

these students traveled before and now have an experience to practice what they learned previously) but also to support the faculty member's work in designing and leading courses off campus.

On-campus courses also employ student TAs at times (students are earning WT credit through the independent study option) which, again can support a student's development. The best way to learn is to teach.

- While recruitment and selection of student interns could happen on a course by course basis, there should be some monitoring of the process as to equity in position responsibilities, especially if there is some kind of compensation. (Study and service project interns receive financial support toward the cost of participating in the off-campus course.)
- Training of student leaders, particularly with off-campus courses is critical. This relates back to risk management.

g. *Faculty Development*

- We don't do much but this seems to be central to improving a three-week intensive course, whether on campus or off. What can we learn from how other schools that teach frequently or entirely in a block system manage their faculty workload and student learning and assessment?
- Staff members in the Durham House and Hartman House can lend their expertise and training to faculty as well, in areas such as working with student leaders; pedagogies for on-site experiential learning; and the experiential learning model.
- There seems to be an ongoing debate of academic rigor vs. experiential. Experiential learning is an accepted teaching and learning model that is not separate from academic rigor. Staff members of the Durham House and Hartman House have training and resources on experiential learning and could be helpful in helping the University define Winter Term as an academically rigorous experiential learning opportunity. (Read David A. Kolb's work on *experiential learning*.)

h. *Marketing*

A significant part of the administrative aspect of Winter Term is marketing and recruitment. This happens at Admission events, On-Campus Information Sessions, and the WT Open House (for faculty-led courses). Centralized knowledge about all of the possibilities and details of courses helps in this marketing and recruitment process.

- There is a significant amount of preparation and coordination to hold open house events, so a central location to do this is important (rather than leaving it to individual departments)

i. *General administration*

- A significant chunk of working with faculty-led courses is working with travel providers; organizing visits of providers to campus and liaising between providers and faculty leaders and students.
- Since we work with a lot of program providers, it's important to understand the best practices of doing so, especially as it relates to reviewing contracts, insurance and general expectations of providers.
- A significant part of international travel, both for faculty-led courses and independent study students, is being familiar with the immigration issues and traveling internationally (e.g., resources such as CDC, WHO, currencies, etc.). Staff members who work with international travel are best suited to provide this support.
- However internships continue as part of Winter Term, a significant part of the work is communicating and liaising with hosts. These are often alumni, with whom we want to ensure good working relationships. Consistency in process and messages is critical.

- A lot of time is spent collecting all the required forms for the various projects and checking for accuracy and expired passports, as well as maintaining student and program files and accurate electronic records.

j. Faculty obligations

Currently, the director of the CIEE (Durham House) enters WT credit for faculty members who complete Winter Term courses. She also tracks obligations to be sure faculty members do something in years obligated. There is a lot of communication with the VPAA's office to address alternate arrangements, which are common.

- The biggest issue with respect to obligations seems to be having enough faculty members to offer the courses necessary for anticipated demand. Every year, we rely heavily on faculty members who are not obligated to fulfill some aspect of WT programs. This typically falls in off-campus courses and internship supervision. On-campus courses are mostly done by faculty members who are obligated in the given year.
- Should we want to increase the number of courses on or off campus, we really have to track down faculty members willing to do the work; of course they get a percentage of their salary toward a full year sabbatical, but not all faculty members want this and it's not always incentive enough.
- The recording of and understanding of faculty obligations seems to be confusing for everyone year after year, even those who've been here for some time. Should this continue, it needs to be clarified.
- The system of entering new faculty profiles does not always translate into their WT obligation year being recorded in reports, so some faculty members are missed by the Durham House in years they are obligated to teach.
- There's a question of equity in faculty credit – if a set of faculty leaders rely solely on a travel provider and on-site tour guides to do the planning and lecturing, should they earn the same 3 credits as a set of faculty leaders who do all of their logistical planning themselves and lecturing themselves? This relates to workload between various kinds of courses as well as location and design of courses.
- There are examples of staff members and 5th Year Interns (recent student graduates) teaching on-campus courses and awarding credit; so there's some precedent for staff members teaching Winter Term courses. This should be looked into as an avenue of expanding WT options and addressing the need of sufficient numbers of courses.

k. Faculty committee

Apart from the clear question of who will this committee consist of and to whom will it report, there are a couple of administrative observations to be made:

- The faculty committee could play a more central role in faculty development and communication to faculty about aspects of the WT program; this has not been the case in recent years.
- The faculty committee needs a clear charge and strong leadership; too often, it falls back on the WT administrative staff to lead discussion and direction of the faculty committee; there must be sharing of information and compromise, as well as respect of what both faculty members and administrators bring to the table.
- It is helpful if the faculty committee is aware of the administrative aspects of Winter Term that are handled by the Winter Term staff (or others if that's how things develop), particularly the deadlines of the various components of Winter Term. The faculty's work needs to mesh with the administrative deadlines that exist. These deadlines can and should be addressed with both the faculty committee and administrative staff.
- There's confusion regarding overlap with the International Education Committee – since both committees work on aspects of international programs, there should be overlap at least in common philosophical approaches to designing and offering off-campus programs and certain

aspects of the administrative process (e.g., the application components, pre-departure preparation and re-entry support).

- Depending on how various aspects of WT develop, the committee needs to be aware of broader discussions on internationalization, career development and alumni relations, as WT programs connect to these areas.

VII. With regard to the **International Education Committee**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- “The IEC be re-constituted not as a sub-committee but as a free-standing faculty committee and that its charge be focused more specifically on matters that relate Policy and Procedure to those academic issues that are clearly the purview of the Faculty.” (Consolidation phase of 1-3 years, no or limited new resources)

Currently, the IEC is an executive committee of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP). As such, faculty and student members are elected to the committee by their peers and the committee has its own standing charge. While it does have a parent committee that it may report to and take some direction from, it is currently its own committee that determines its own agendas and workload.

With the most recent revision of the charge of the IEC, there is a much clearer picture of the breadth of things to address within international education at DePauw. However, because of its breadth, we agree with the recommendation that further revision to the committee’s charge take place to clarify what exactly is and should be the purview of the faculty and what exactly is and should be the purview of the administration. This will help with the breadth of responsibility of the committee, but also with the engagement of committee members in that responsibility. Change should be made with some caution at the moment, however, due to the reorganization of several administrative offices that contribute to the breadth of international education at DePauw.

VIII. With regard to **faculty development**, the external reviewers made the following recommendations:

- “Steps be taken to widen and strengthen faculty advocacy of international education through continued incentives for research and travel abroad and through on-campus strategies that will help to underscore international education as a University priority.” (Developmental phase of 2-5 years, some new or reallocated resources)

There is general agreement that more opportunity for faculty development as related to international education is ideal. The IEC will continue to work with the administration to find resources to allocate to site visits, research opportunities abroad, and continue to encourage faculty/student interactions in an international context through faculty led courses and collaborative research abroad. Ideally, additional funds will be made available to support leaves that directly relate to international experiences being integrated into the curriculum, not just international experiences that relate to a research project.

In addition to funding toward sabbaticals, funding and departmental support will be sought to support faculty/scholar exchanges. These exchanges would allow faculty members to provide guest lectures or teach for a semester or year at an international institution during a normal teaching year instead of having to do so during a sabbatical or leave. Currently, faculty members must usually be on sabbatical/leave in order to participate in a teaching position abroad. Having more formal exchanges that can take place outside of the sabbatical/leave cycle would enable faculty members to have the teaching experience

without sacrificing their research time. To do this, however, there needs to be a designated budgetary line to support a faculty replacement or visiting scholar's costs.

With the establishment of international learning goals and continuing focus on sending students abroad during Winter Term, it will be important to develop a process to help faculty members integrate new methods of teaching and evaluation in their on-campus and off-campus courses, as well as methods to help students better connect their off-campus and on-campus experiences. The IEC will work with the Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Academic Life to explore the creation of this workshop.

Beginning in the 2010-2011 academic year, the IEC and the Civic Global and Professional Opportunities program will be piloting a faculty liaison program for students interested in study abroad. Ideally at least one faculty member in each department will have specific knowledge of how study abroad can enhance student studies in that major, and which programs will benefit those students the most. Departments such as Modern Languages, Geosciences, Anthropology, and Communications, have a number of faculty members highly supportive of study abroad and can work well with students in advising them of their options for off campus study. Some training may still be needed to update faculty on specific programs, and as resources become available, site visits would be ideal. The plan is to specifically target faculty in departments where few students currently study abroad.

The Faculty Liaisons will be available for academic study abroad advising. The goal is that faculty can speak directly to how students can identify their academic goals as it may relate to their major, and how study abroad will enhance those goals. Students should meet with these liaisons and supplement faculty recommendations with advising sessions and application review.

Original draft written by Kate Knaul in March 2010

Completed by Mandy Brookins Blinn in June 2010

Edits and comments made by Humberto Barreto, Chair IEC 2010, and distributed for comment to the 2009-10 IEC.

Edits and comments made by Kate Knaul June 14, 2010.

This final response was sent to the 2009-2010 IEC, 2010-2011 IEC, Mandy Brookins Blinn Kelley Hall, and Pedar Foss. It is also available at <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/internationaleducation/internationaleducation.asp>
June 29, 2010