

April 16, 2024

To the SU Faculty Senate:

Below please find the Faculty 6 H Q International Education & R P P L Review of ¶ V international education at SU as per the Senate charge of the following:

The International Education Committee is charged with reviewing the current policies and procedures related to Study Abroad, international exchange, and international student recruitment as well as their implementation and provide a report of their review to the

3. We recommend approval of course content for faculty led programs to remain solely in the hands of faculty (departments and school committees) with no university prescription, in order to ensure all disciplines can facilitate their students to study abroad, with administrative approval continuing to be based on content concerns such as finances and risk management.

We are happy to present at some future date the results of this survey in more detail and hope to send followup surveys in future semesters. For now, we summarize the current state of SU study abroad recommendations.

Eric Liebgold, Ph.D. and Deeya Mitra Ph.D.
 Co-chairs of Faculty Senate IEC
 Salisbury University

SUMMARY OF IEC FINDINGS:

Review of CIE materials regarding International Education at SU:

Student Participation

Lingering effects of Covid have suppressed student participation in international programs. SU student participation is 61.4% of Covid average +/- SE (208 in 2023 vs 339 +/- 23.6). Short term study abroads recovering more quickly than semester long study abroad. Summer study abroad numbers highest since 2014/15 thanks to a Global Seminar by Andrew Martino, Clarke College, the SU In Spain initiative, and 68 V partnership with AIFS Abroad.

Specific sectors of International Education

Study Abroad by SU personnel

Global Seminars Increased enforcement of risk management/procurement regulations and increased safety oversight needed in recent years coupled with high numbers of course cancellations due to low enrollment have made individual trips more difficult/less safe to run and more labor intensive for CIE. Faculty members can still propose courses not taught at SU In Global Campuses. It is expected that these courses are supported by a new in country host institution or a procured travel company or study abroad partner in order to mitigate risk management and procurement issues.

Review of survey of faculty

A survey comprising questions about faculty perspectives on global learning, study abroad, and study away was distributed across schools and through SU publications. A total of 121 (28.5%) faculty completed the survey.

Despite the new (and old) General Education curriculums not specifically including Global Learning Outcomes and instead including parts of their outcomes within other learning outcomes (e.g., Experiential Learning or within some disciplines), a large majority of faculty who UHVS RQGHG FRQVLGHU *OREDO /H DUQLQJ WR EH ³FUXFLDO (82%) as do all deans and school IECs, and most faculty include global learning in their courses

for college education.

The benefits to experiencing global learning are clear. Faculty often used global learning in their courses and widely agreed that study abroad programs have measurable impact. These included students reporting hands-on learning experiences in science, increased cultural awareness, empathy towards other cultures, understanding of global issues addressed in the course, and shedding of ethnocentric tendencies. Additionally, faculty reported positive views of global learning at SU (Figure 2).

Global learning helped their students develop intercultural competence, resilience, and problem-solving skills, while also building supportive social networks and professional relationships. They also gained greater language competency, awareness of environmental challenges, and




Fig. 3. Integration of global learning by department.

Figure 4. Overall effectiveness of study abroad programs at SU.



Figure 5. Word map of concerns expressed by SU faculty generated using NVivo 14

While faculty overwhelmingly touted the benefits of global learning, there is no official, specific, Global Learning Outcomes in the 6-8 Year GenEd plan. It is beyond our purview to determine

what or who should develop these outcomes, but we recommend they be developed. Likewise, all global experiences do not have the same impact. For example, studying abroad for an entire semester is usually much more impactful than a 3-4 week short term winter or summer Global Seminar. The more time a student spends abroad typically leads to more benefits. However, it is obvious that any global learning is beneficial and not all students can partake in longer experiences for academic, financial, and personal reasons.

Global course content in faculty led programs is a major concern by faculty but there is clearly disagreement among schools and schools faculty as to whether global content should be required for global courses. We note from CIE policies that it is ~~currently~~ currently possible to teach courses without global content but to date, no courses have done so. All courses have included global content. If the opportunity for a course to be taught that did not include global content, such as a Mathematics or Physics course, the Faculty Senate EC, notes that many of the general benefits of global learning such as understanding diversity, international and diverse perspectives and cultural awareness, and promoting ~~openness~~ openness, do not require course material to occur. Interactions with non-American students and locals inside AND outside of the classroom, the types of interactions that are inevitable in a foreign locale, are where these experiences occur. Additionally, the CIE has piloted including global learning outcome video discussions prior to/during SU In programs. Does integration of global content into course materials improve this outcome? Undoubtedly. Unfortunately, not all disciplines have a) the potential to include international content.

HTQW LQ WKH VDPH ZD\ VXFK DV VRPH 6
EHLQJ DEOH WR WHDFK 3 JOREDO` YHUVLRQV RI WKHLU VSHI

recommendations aimed to address funding, communication, faculty involvement, and program effectiveness to enhance the study abroad experience for SU students.




Figure 6. View of communication by CIE to faculty.

Figure 7. Word map of recommendations expressed by faculty generated using NVivo 14

Review of solicitation of comments from school IECs and deans:

Budget and expenses

School IECs and faculty, as well as the CIE itself, have noticed recent funding issues and widely and consistently recommended increased funding to the CIE and global learning through increased budgets in lines, and student scholarships, especially in light of decreased post-Covid funding. We, the Faculty Senate IEC, have noticed and strongly echo this need for increased finances to the CIE (through budget and personnel) and to students (via scholarships) to enable student global learning if the administration, like the vast majority of faculty, considers it worthwhile.

Learning Outcomes

There is clearly disagreement among schools and schools faculty as to whether global content should be required for global courses and this is an area of contention that was raised. Two schools and some individual faculty had concerns that SU was trying to increase participation without integration of global material into courses and have stated that they would only like global courses to be taught including global material. However, two other schools and some individual faculty expressed support for individual courses without global content to be taught abroad. We note that approval of course content lies solely in the discretion of departmental, school, and university curriculum committees, where it should be, not at the discretion of administrators like Deas and the CIE, who approve approved courses to be taught abroad based on other factors, such as risk management and finances and these entities should not and cannot infringe on faculty freedom by trying to dictate course content one way or another. Instead, the CIE appears to approach the increasing benefits to global learning outcomes of study abroad courses by enabling, and promoting to faculty, cultural student experiences during their time abroad in foreign countries both within and outside the courses. For example, SU In programs all enable cultural excursions either through universities while students are abroad and require students to take at least basic language courses provided by the foreign university partners in countries where English is not the national language.

Communication

We found confusion among faculty as to reasons that Global Seminar structuring has changed post-Covid including more facilitation/enforcement of risk management and procurement guidelines, both of which make individually organized Global Seminars more difficult without local university or third-party provider assistance. Roll out of the new SU In program communication was flawed to some degree as it was not a substitute for Global Seminars but a replacement for pre-Covid type Global Seminars that were no longer viable due to risk management and procurement issues.

Communication from the CIE about course approvals (course content versus

administrative approval regarding safety and financial viability) need to be clearly stated to faculty initiating study abroad programs.

Communication to departments on the importance of and learning objectives for study abroad, whether or not a discipline has direct links to global learning, needs to be communicated on some level, potentially through the Faculty Senate IEC.

IEC RECOMMENDATIONS:

Budget and Personnel

We recommend increased SU financial and personnel support to the CIE at least to pre Covid levels and further due to increased costs for risk management. SU lacks the financial support that should be provided to help students to partake in global experiences. SU is suffering from missed opportunities at promoting diversity and culture to students by not providing financial support to the CIE and giving them personnel including PIN lines and fulltime positions sufficient to provide risk management and procurement services needed for faculty to teach abroad as well as bring in international scholars and international students to SU.

Student Recruitment (to SU and from SU on study abroad programs)

We recommend that SU provides some need based financial support for students who wish to study abroad via scholarships or grants. There is widespread support among faculty for this with some 612 792 Q q G [(ln [(f)-20(iln [(f) ET Q q 0.00000912 0 612 792 r

