

System Council on International Education - Meeting Agenda

September 24, 1999, 10:30 AM to 3:00 PM
Macon State College, President's Dining Room

The meeting of the System Council for International Education took place on Friday, September 24, 1999, at Macon State College. The Council consists of 34 representatives appointed by the presidents of each USG institution, joined by the chairs of the World Regional Councils and other special committees. Richard C. Sutton, the System's Director of International Programs and Services, chaired the meeting.

Present: Joseph Adams (AASU), Beth Biron (DAL), Dwight Call (GC&SU), Harvey Charles (GIT), David Coker (UGA), James Cook (FLD), Gaye Elder (ABAC), Sidney Davis (SPSU), Gaye Elder (ABAC), Sherry Foster (USG), Chaudron Gille (GAN), Sandra _____ for Tracy Harrington (VSU), Donna Wear for Jeanne Jensen (AUG), Dorothy Joiner (WGC), Watson Holloway (BRK), Thomas Keene (KSU), Leigh Walker for John Hicks (GSU), Jennifer Lund (USG), Neal McCrillis (CSU), Carl McDonald (SGC), Gerald McIntosh (FVS), Brian Murphy (NGC), Harold Nichols (GSW), Harriet Nichols (DEK), Howard Potts (WAY), Janis Reid (AMC), Richard Reiff (UGA), John Ricks (MID), Gwendolyn Sell (MAC), Joseph Silver (SSU), Nancy Shumaker (GSO), Richard Sutton (USG), Stan Webb (BAN), Robert Welborn (CSC.)

Absent: John Derden (EGC), Lovette Elango (KSU), Jerry Hardee (ALS), Amit Singh (DAR), Tina Stern (GPC) who is in Italy this year.

No Longer the CIC representative: Amy Bass (GIT), Patricia Hankins (GDN)

Guests: Charlotte Janis (SPSU), Jackie Singleton (SSU)

I. Welcome and Introductions - 10:45 AM start

Sutton: Welcome and introduction of a few folks. Martin Okafor is the Faculty Associate at the Board of Regents; he is a professor of Physics at GPC. Sherry Foster is our interim administrative assistant. Joanna Scholl is living in Macon, where she followed her fiance who is in medical school.

II. Approval of Minutes

Postponed.

III. Review of International Presentation at May 1999 Board of Regents Meeting

IV. Regents Inquiry on Overseas Properties

Sutton: The Regents received a nicer notebook, I sent you a copy. The Regents particularly liked the campus highlights. As you can see from my remarks that it was to try and take them to another level of thinking. Tough thing now is sustaining the momentum to keep all of these initiatives going. People are pretty worn by that. In the international area we have done a lot to meet the Board goals. We need to

continue to engage their attention and support. (Gerald) McIntosh and (Harold) Nichols and (Pete) Silver were at that meeting.

(Harold) Nichols: It was very good and Sutton did a good job. It's good to have people present and make it real. I thought the students were particularly good. We appreciate your getting the study abroad numbers to us.

Sutton: The only serious inquiry that came up subsequently was about overseas properties. It was an issue that one regent was terribly concerned about it was refocused on the Oxford mansion that Richard Reiff and David Coker bought for themselves.

McIntosh: Why were the international properties an issue?

Sutton: They were concerned about where our money was going.

Silver: Did that tie into concerns about leased properties internationally and domestically? There had been concern that we were leasing properties when we could utilize sister institutions. Maybe this spilled over to the international.

McIntosh: You mentioned contracts. Is there some thinking that the Board will have to review contracts we have for our overseas programs and if so, are we going to have to seek System approval for contracts?

Sutton: It's my sense that there has not been a review of overseas policies. Several institutions have expressed limitations.

Coker: I don't think there's any Board interest in this area. That is basically delegated to the Presidents. Several regents, particularly those who come from a real estate background, any time the L-word, R-word is mentioned, and selected regents get concerned about it. I think there will be additional leasing of property as we expand internationally. The economies of various countries change and the situations at various sites change. They may begin ratcheting up their lease rates and at that point, you have to consider your fiduciary responsibility. If you are going to stay there, then you need to have it affordable. I don't think there's much for them to be responsible. Presidents have broad discretionary authority over funds allocated to the institution. Sometimes they question procedure rather than policy when they get into micromanaging.

V. Regents Focus on Benchmarking and Accountability Indicators

Sutton: They will occur within a Board focus and system approach, yet they will be driven by processes at your institutions. You want to think about ways you will be involved in these processes at your institution. I want to jump to technology and master planning first. It is a big, big, interest of a number of regents. The idea is that the system will develop an approach to technology development and institutions will develop their own master plan on technology. There is a real temptation to ignore the international implications in master planning. For example, if you're operating programs overseas, how will the campus master plan

impact on your overseas initiatives. These are operations that are not tangential to the campus. You will have to decide who and how on your campus to work with on the master plans at your institutions. Each of you will have specific ways this will effect you. The timeline is relatively generous. By spring of this year, they would like to begin master planning at those institutions which are most technologically advanced Tech, UGA, Clayton, . I don't know if you have comments or just want to take it as an advisory. It is to be driven from the AA side of the campus, not the technology side of the campus.

The Board's second focus deals with benchmarking and accountability. Our new Chair Kenneth Cannestra loves data and there is great, great risk in this process to come up with simple measures. On the other hand it is becoming clear that the tendency of academe is to say that what we do is so complex that we just can't measure it. Our task is that they are as meaningful and simple as possible. Janis and Pete, you may want to say something about where you see this process. Jim Mingle head of SHEO out of Denver and a private consulting firm tried to offer ideas of what accountability indicators might be. My thought is this is an opportunity to get several international indicators in place. If we find some ways that we might want to measure ourselves, if we found things we wanted to introduce, then they might be useful as guides. Ex we can be sure that retention rates and graduation rates will be utilized. How do international factors that influence the ways that graduate and retention play out? There are any number of ways that you can play with this. The other issue in this is that each of you will be developing or negotiating comparative institutions. Each group will have an institutional peer group. When you think about it with international dimensions study abroad, international students, the number of international courses you have. You want to consider those peer groups.

Call: Only Georgia institutions?

Sutton: No, the thrust of this is to measure yourself against national indices. You may have your own stories of what you do and don't want to share.

Silver: In terms of Cannestra's background Lockheed. This is not something new for him, this was big for him at Lockheed. The whole accountability thing is from business sector and legislature. In terms of comparative institutions, I'm skiddish. When you think about comparative institutions like mine or Gerald's (McIntosh). You have to look at mission and .It may look as if you are measuring apples and apples, but underneath the surface you will be measuring apples and oranges.

Sutton: Keep atuned to this discussion, to the degree you have input into how this is shaped. You need to think about the national, regional, and state. One that is like you know and one you aspire to be. If you aspire and don't have the resources to make that happen, there are ramifications. There will be budget considerations.

Reid: Similar to Pete's particulary to comparative Big conference in Columbus recently on Program Review and will be coming up with a template on what each institutions will do. It is very real and will move forward.

Sutton: Anyone else? Let's think for a few minutes if there are international measures you want. Factors we could link.

Silver: Skiddish to micromanage Look at the dollars and cents that have been put into international and what is the impact. I would be afraid to do this at the microlevel.

(Harold) Nichols: It seems that what may be more important is to try to get the aspiring peer groups to have good international strength. The choice of peer institutions becomes very critical one.

McIntosh: How has international fostered collaboration across institutions to stretch institutional resources?

Sutton: That's good, but how are we going to put it into an accountability measure?

Keene: I want to go back to the study abroad and retention. I agree with Pete's (Silver) thought that looking at Study Abroad rates with general graduation rates. If we want to look good whatever the validity look at individuals who have studied abroad who graduate and could probably have some good numbers. Inspiring and .

Shumaker: Would that follow through to those who go on to higher degrees? The percentage that go on to graduate school?

Silver: Not to disagree with my colleague - is it the Study Abroad that did this validity are there some validity question while it might look good, we need to defend that position.

Keene: Even if small number of students study abroad it might still be useful.

Shumaker: Is there any way you can use international population? Some kind of factor more international students and study abroad link.

Keene: Waivers, we did a multiplier effect. It was substantial amount of money economic impact on the state.

Gille: Would the indicators chosen be institutional versus system? If the campus has no dorms or cafeteria, for example.

Nichols (Harriet): One would be resources what resources actually exist - human and monetary. Look at the Olympics impact on Atlanta. Program activities could be counted. What kind of leadership have you had? There are some more precise kinds of things that could be measured.

Davis: There's got to be an aggregate system-wide effort, but it is important that an institution also has some benchmarking that you can measure, number of credit hours in language instruction relatively easy to develop.

Biron: Another important thing is the level of institutional contribution. What part of the institutional budget is devoted to international release time, money to come to meetings?

Sutton: Do you have accountability that measures inputs or. As Sid mentioned, some of this data we provided to the Board. Part of the challenge we can measure what we do. Seems to me there are two potentials, one, some indicators that make us look good, and two, come up with data that would be really useful to us.

McIntosh: That's why it is important what resources are .

Biron: It helps.

Welburn: It would help us show the impact.

Reiff: If there was some way to monitor the diversity of students and locales; are we really making headway in this arena? It might be worth putting some money to actually determine if students become more flexible thinkers, better problem solvers.

Sutton: I'm hearing some sentiment that this could be a positive. If you did not know where this was leading, what would be good input and output measures, Sid, Nancy, Gerald, Harriet?

Silver: One more comment, another flag of caution when we deal with indicators and outcome measures, we need to know intent. It would be a real huge mistake if the front-end intentions are quite different. One institution decides they want to be international and makes the commitment on the front end. Comparative disadvantage.

Sutton: We can explore it, look at these kinds of issues. Part of our strategy is to stay involved in key Board discussions.

McIntosh: We need a Chair.

Sutton: I will ask Sid to Chair it.

VI. BOR Central Office Staffing Changes / Interim Senior Vice Chancellor

Sutton: A quick update on things in the Central Office. Senior Vice Chancellor Muyskens Chief Executive Officer and Dean of the Faculty at the Gwinnett Center. By being in the System, he will continue to play a role and perhaps have some involvement in things international. In the mean time we have an interim Senior Vice Chancellor Behruz Sethna who is very involved in International, but his key assignments are in benchmarking and master-planning. That could all influence how things will unfold. I have no reason to think anything adverse will occur. We have had a sympathetic ear this past year for monies that were not specifically budgeted.

Another change is an experiment: Jennifer is primarily located at Georgia Perimeter College, where she is

doing lots of campus based activity. I think this will be very positive. One of the things she is working on, the prime driver System says we want 2% abroad. We want to put some muscle behind that effort and have targeted seven campuses to build study abroad. I'll talk about that initiative a little later when we get to that agenda item.

Another change is we have a faculty associate appointed in the language and technology area. He works with Sam Marinov. That is Dezso Benedek. He is very talented. He has been in the newspapers for a hunger strike.

Two other appointments: Dan Papp has been appointed to head the Yamacraw initiative. It is to align business, industry, and education in Georgia. Not to create a second Silicon Valley, but illusions to that. It does not have immediate implications at the moment. Madelyn Hanes has been appointed as the Chancellor's special assistant. She has a strong international interest; she was a campus dean in the Penn State system.

VII. New Program Approval & Program Review Processes

Sutton: These efforts provide the context under which we are looking at Study abroad approval. We delayed because we wanted to work within the constructs of broad program approval. Program approval will be linked more closely to data justification. After the program is launched after three years, a report back to the Central Office about how the program is doing is needed.. The Program Review Process that will be newly implemented is a system-wide view of how programs will be reviewed once they exist. What does that mean for new study abroad programs and existing study abroad programs? If it plays out as it appears, we think it will lead to a less cumbersome process. It may lead to more forewarning of programs connected to the campus's strategic plan. A lot of times programs are developed because the opportunity is there.

Keene: It sounds like a five-year plan to me.

Sutton: I don't think it is that bad. Each institution updates its strategic plan each year.

Is that too cumbersome?

Coker: It is for me. It seems heavy-handed to all of the institutions that have faculty review to have someone from off-campus sanction a program like May-mester. If it passes through faculty review, it will be, "Daddy, can we do it?" I'm not going to play the game of study abroad programs. You have to have systematic approval. Once it happens, further steps seem bureaucratic.

McIntosh: If we are going to move in that direction, then we need a directive from Central to Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs about it.

Sutton: Let's go back to why we are at this point. Remember that Board policy requires this new study abroad review process.

Call: I agree with Dave that endorsing the study abroad guidelines as a system would need certification of adherence to those guidelines.

Sutton: What I was trying to say is this is a way to monitor program duplication on a systemwide level.

Biron: Two points I agree with David: we need to have some kind of agreement for the transfer of credit for study abroad from one institution to another.

Janis: Are you including exchanges?

Sutton: Yes.

Janis: When you have done it one year, is it new? Also, is there is a format for what the criteria should be?

Silver: This whole context is really driven by two areas: the authority of the Board to review programs and thorough institutional effectiveness. I happen to serve on the committee. Realistically, the BOPR does not have the staff to police the programs in the state anyway. They would develop a template and have certification at the institutional level. Program review with certain variables with a trigger on campus to have external review. This goes back to our initial discussion. I've been removed from the Central Office for two years, but the OPB did a desktop review of programs. We need to make sure it works for us in international.

Keene: First, program duplication. It seems it makes a great deal of sense if three institutions want a medical school versus three institutions with a program in Italy. It is a mistake to interfere with study abroad. Faculty as entrepreneurs stay out of the way and let them go. If strategic planning some years earlier means we have to know several years out if it is beyond the general.

Shumaker: I want to echo. Study Abroad is very faculty driven. Some will remain as long-standing programs. If there is program duplication, the stronger programs will survive. I think the well will dry up if we have to plan years in advance. If the institution does its job, the integrity of the program will remain. We would see programs expand. The more hoops people go through, the more likely they will decide not to do it.

Sutton: I want to hear someone say that we don't. Rick says we will need more programs to serve the students we expect to serve. We need to encourage entrepreneurship. Program duplication is different; conversely, we have four schools with programs in the same city in Italy are their aspects of that.

Keene: Three or four years ago I would have been right on board. The faculty's energy is the single most overwhelmingly key ingredient. Four years ago we had 25 in study abroad; now we have four times that. I would never have imagined that level.

Welburn: A school with no history of Study Abroad until 1998, I am trying to build up a cadre of faculty at

my school. Their enthusiasm is the absolutely key ingredient.

Biron: I agree completely with that. On the other hand, we need to be sure the programs are sound academically. There is a danger in that enthusiasm that faculty might propose things that are.

Webb: At Bainbridge the faculty wanted to go to Yucatan: two archeological sites and five bars.

Shumaker: I agree with that you put onus on institution. Academic integrity has to be maintained. Put the onus on the institution to handle that. I've had people come and say, "I want to do this tour on art in Italy."

Nick: The institutional processes should be able to take care of the processes.

Coker: I support a post-audit review. Basically, what we have is a pre-audit at the institution. If you want to post-audit, we ought to be able to submit. I agree with Tom, I don't think we have unnecessary duplication. We set a goal of having 50% of students studying abroad by 2010. We have far too many needs to put up unnecessary hurdles.

Sutton: No one has any concerns about program duplication.

Coker: My feeling on that is that it is focused on the exception rather than the rule. Deal with it as an exception. We should not set policy based on the exceptional case. Faculty exchange does not need system approval

VIII. Foreign Language & Technology Initiative

Sutton: I would like to go for a system-wide application for a Title VI and maybe an FIPSI. What I don't want to do is run head to head with any institutional proposals. Do you know there would be any conflicts?

McIntosh: Savannah State University, Kennesaw State University, and Fort Valley State University with a focus on African studies.

Sutton: Raj at Columbus State University is putting together one on conferencing and curriculum development.

Keene: Is FIPSI still in business? We thought they were gone.

Shumaker: We have been looking for something for language laboratory upgrades and hardware.

Sutton: Gerald is there a lead institution?

McIntosh: The University of Georgia; Lioba Moshi will be the lead writer.

IX. Proposed University System of Georgia / Spanish Ministry of Education Linkage Agreement

Sutton: I hope you have had a moment to look over this proposal. This proposal comes to us from the

Spanish Ministry of Education. We asked them if there are opportunities for collaboration on a program that provides native Spanish teachers for Georgia's public schools. They came back with a fairly substantial proposal for six years. They would like to move forward with the signing relatively soon. They expect a visit from the Spanish ambassador in early June. Are there any problems with this agreement that would affect your institutions?

Coker: Several comments. 1.1.5 is fairly substantive for our institutions to pay the visiting teachers salary. There would be discussion needed on the campus. It also speaks of seniority. We need to talk about seniority and promotion and tenure. That may have meaning here unless you are interim faculty. It would behoove us to get promotion. 2.3, I don't know if it is degree or non-degree seeking students. There's a distinction on there for being admitted. Three appears to be degree seeking. There is a meaningful differential between these two variables of students. 2.4 Scholarships, is that to the out bound or inbound student teacher. It will be a difficult sale to offer scholarships to an in-bound students when we don't have enough to support our own study abroad programs. 4.4 definitive costs, tuition, lodging, accommodation, fairly substantive costs. 5.3 You can recognize the courses, but you would have to provide lead time for course approval for credit. You can't move forward. 9.1 encourages language be added; any termination would not affect any active participant in the program.

Silver: All the things 1.1.2 stipulates is for a minimum for an academic year. It is far more suitable for a one semester.

Holloway: Would this apply to two-year schools?

Sutton: Let me back up and give a couple of history pieces. The Spanish Ministry of Education and the Global Partnerships initiative is a separate agreement between the Spanish Ministry and Kennesaw State University. It was done out of foreign language and I had very little involvement for the expansion of Spanish language instruction. It provides for collaboration. Each of these areas would be defined in greater detail. No institution would be obligated to participate in any way. We could negotiate different agreements. Could your campuses benefit from additional language faculty? The Department of Education got involved because they were short of Spanish teachers. Is there benefit for exchange with Spain?

McIntosh: I don't know how systemwide exchanges work.

Keene: Who or where is the secretariat?

Sutton: I think we would look to a campus for a base, probably Kennesaw.

Joiner: I would have a caution to bringing over foreign language faculty. They were all total flakes. What they did in the classroom was abysmal.

Shumaker: We do some of that with Tas and we really have to monitor who we bring over.

Call: There has to be someone responsible for training on-site. How many system-wide agreements do we

have?

Sutton: This is the first one that has come in during my tenure.

Call: The reason that I ask, is to make certain that someone is responsible. Jiangsu is directly related to the EC and the Northumbria is directly related to the ECF.

Sutton: It was presented to us as a top-level proposal.

Welburn: Is there some funding that would follow the adoption of this proposal? Or would it be something we would adopt as a charitable act out of our hide.

Sutton: The Spanish Ministry is prepared to fund.

Welburn: But not the BOR.

Sutton: They might once Spanish ministry is involved. Right now it's unfunded.

Reiff: Assuming we could address the concerns and caveats, our romance language department has been grappling with the tremendous growth in Spanish language opportunities. You mentioned also professional development opportunities for faculty could be good. In terms of direct exchange for students, study abroad would perhaps work better since students over there are having trouble getting the money for one-to-one exchange.

Sutton: It seems the kind of thing that would work well for systems to be involved in Ministries. We would keep the memorandum as generic as possible. Is that reasonable?

McIntosh: The flagship is very attractive to the students to the US flagship institutions.

Sutton: Is it reasonable to get back to me within two weeks October 8th?

X. Program Development Strategies/Strategic Planning

Sutton: Despite the entrepreneurial efforts of faculty, it does not lead us to put our most strategic foot forward. We have taken the approach this past year to fund a variety of initiatives and put funding into all world regions. They must be collaborative and have potential for growth and development in the future. Soon the question will be what are the System priorities. If the Board of Regents came and said, "We want to launch a \$10 million initiative," we want to be prepared. I want to devote a substantial amount of time to this at our next meeting.

Webb: One of the things that Richard suggested was trying to make study abroad attractive to a broader base of students.

Sutton: That I can see as a goal. You can also look at it in terms of diversity.

Murphy: I think it would be logical to set up a few priorities and establish priorities within each category. Study abroad, curricular infusion, faculty development.

XI. **Budget Investments**

Sutton: Prioritizing leads to the next item budget. A quick review of last year: I thought we were extremely successful in capturing money that was not ours. We got about a third of the teaching and learning. We were able to fund fifty Chancellor's awards. We funded a lot of new initiatives, Africa, health professions, etc.

Look at this coming year. We have asked for some continuing funds for collaborative programs that came with a letter from Dr. Muyskens. We are asking for \$150,000 to continue those projects. If we do, those will be current year funds. We would get them earlier in the year. There is no guarantee that all of those projects would be re-funded. Persons would not automatically get re-funded. There is a thought that there are too many new initiatives that are not getting results. Some of these projects have only been going a few months. We are going to have a smaller allocation for Chancellor's Awards; that allocation is reduced by half as the money has gone to other programs.

XII. **Global Partnerships Program**

Sutton: We have \$100,000 additional dollars for Global Partnerships program. We may try to develop grants in specific areas. If we give campuses six weeks to develop a proposal, we can get some pretty good things. The deadline would be early to mid-November. The hope is that we would get the proposals reviewed and funding out by the start of spring semester. In addition I want to mention a couple of other funding possibilities in the future. The teaching and learning grants will not be offered. The main point is they are moving grants away from individual grants. We have a chance to influence that discussion. I am hoping we can inject an international dynamism into that discussion. They are talking about the allocation of FY2001 the following year; there is \$400,000 on the table. There is some current faculty development money on the table - it is a bit more restricted in that it comes under the Distinguished Professor area. If funds are made available, we have a shot of getting some of that money. I do not have a sense of the guidelines, but think about faculty development for some money that may become available.

Call: I wonder if there is a report of the Global Partnerships progress, the projects titles, funding. I was one of the readers and I don't know which were funded. I think it would be helpful as we weigh where money should go.

Sutton: In the flurry of activity . I'm sorry. To recap we were able to support some projects with language components. I will try to get that out to you.

Keene: What are the characteristics of the grant for funding?

Sutton: The money for teaching and learning competition in the spring for \$400,000 will not be awarded as

in the past. We know it will be awarded for faculty development that results in a teaching and learning perspective.

Coker: Based on our difficulties with the Global Partnerships last year, I think we should give all of those funds for a contract for services which lifts off the awesome responsibility to construct a project that is forced into finishing with a report by June 30, 1999. It's a good tool and we should be using it the "fee for services."

Sutton: It does that and it is much more specific for outcomes. Maybe they don't want them out there.

Coker: Life is difficult. They may be reluctant, but it doesn't create a new financial tool. They know how to do it. On the Academic side of the house we talk about a grant. You cannot talk about a grant and ask for a contract. I am suggesting we talk about a contract rather than a grant.

Sutton: We would like to look at a competition next spring for the following year.

McIntosh: As part of the earlier discussion, did I hear you talk about continuation of funding?

Sutton: I did talk about AF Latin American studies and Russian studies, the procedures for that we don't know.

McIntosh: Another comment regarding professional development. It seems we ought to do something with faculty and staff who have been on the seminars. I think having the seminar participants come back together to see how their learnings are infused would be productive.

Sutton: I would be happy to receive the proposal.

XIII. International Student Issues

Sutton: Regarding the international admissions, we did raise the TOEFL score.

Gille: 523? Am I correct that if an institution has .

Sutton: I have no idea about when or where that (ESL system approval) will come about. All ESL programs or learning support options will need to be recertified.

Shumaker: That request will be made to us?

Sutton: It will come through my office; I was hoping it would go somewhere else. One last thing about international students you as the representative need to make sure that someone is keeping accurate records and supplying that information to the IIE.

Lund: The IIE sends out forms that need to be returned to adequately track these students.

Nichols (Harold): Not all of the data comes from one source.

Shumaker: Are we the responsible for the form being submitted?

Sutton: We are asking you to oversee the form getting to the individual that has the information.

Nichols (Harold): We need to know who the form is going to and is it working.

Call: And send it to schools where it is not working. We will assist IIE; when is the report due?

Lund: I'll try to get a print-out from IIE to ascertain exactly to whom the reports are being mailed and what the deadline is for submission.

XIV. **Study Abroad Issues**

Sutton: New procedures are in effect for this year. The deadlines are common. The campuses must decide how to nominate for scholarships. We will be giving you a template about what we need . We'll keep it as simple as possible. We will rely on your judgements on the campus level following our guidelines. It then becomes a numbers game at that point. How many students are you willing to nominate and match and then how far on our list? This gets more fun this year. We do have \$50,000 from the AIFS for this year. We are under favorable consideration from Coca-Cola Foundation but do not have a commitment yet. We do not know how many awards to make but be as optimistic as possible. The immediate question is for spring.

One complicating factor is the negotiation of the AIFS contract. They have placed some new restrictions. \$1,000 for semester length programs and \$500 for programs of 4 weeks or more. AIFS will not fund programs of less than 4 weeks.

Janis: If you have short-term 4 week programs, the institution would pay \$250 and AIFS money would be \$250?

Sutton: We want to insure campus process.

Call: Two comments. One thing that has to be determined is the definition of a semester. The other comment that I had to make is that we maintain the \$1,000 level because I think it is only grants of that size that enable students to go.

Shumaker: I agree.

Nick: AIFS dollars can only play for 4 weeks or more.

Biron: Will the application be on-line?

Coker: What is the AIFS definition of a semester?

Sutton: This gives us appropriate flexibility. I would envision a semester as ten weeks or longer. You may be sending a student only there ten weeks.

Coker: They recognize the effect on their part. They too offer full-blown summer programs. The academic term in the summer differs from the others. Would they accept the full academic term?

Welburn: So for a scholarship if it's for the summer term, will we be able to get full funding?

Sutton: We might be able to.

Sandra: Let me ask again for clarification. There is a possibility still that we might have other monies?

Nick: I'm still trying to clarify. Is the total award limit \$500?

Sutton: This gets us into another question about the amount of awards. What about programs of less than four weeks? Would that money be best used in other programs?

Welburn: I don't think the small awards will make much difference. Last year my school got \$2,000 and the Central Office gave \$2,000.

Biron: \$500, Harold, Nancy.

Sell: You are putting us back twenty years.

McIntosh: You limit sites, also.

Nichols (Harold): A \$500 award is only worth something if the student can finance the balance.

Beth: We will be shortchanging.

Sutton: That is a strong breaking point. How many are in favor of keeping the larger amount?

- Lots of yeses-

Sell: None of ours would have gone otherwise.

Shumaker: None.

Sell: This knocks everybody but the big universities out. The less affluent students may not be able to raise the additional funds. The length of program may not matter; it is the cost.

Holloway: Length of time is very important at two-year when they have to leave jobs, but that's what they want to do. If they are pushed into longer programs.

Potts: Yes, the trip is nine days, the class is for a whole semester on campus, but the trip is a critical part of campus.

Call: Hypothetically, we should fund programs, whether you have a semester program or a nine day program.

Nick: It seems to me the fewer restrictions the money comes to the campus with the better.

Lund: The initial stance was no money except \$1,000 for 8, 18 for \$500 for less.

Coker: Is there another possibility to the way you presented? I prefer the model for flexibility at the institution.

Sutton: I am intrigued by your reaction. I would have thought you would want to grow the number of awards.

We are going to work with seven campuses [Georgia Southern, Augusta State, Columbus State, Fort Valley State, Georgia College and State, North Georgia College and State, and West Georgia] to target development and recruitment in study abroad and financing study abroad. These should emerge as a system specialist.

Shumaker: Lots of students live off campus and say, "I have to pay rent whether I am there or not. I cannot sublease."

Janis: How were those institutions identified?

Sutton: They had a capacity for growth in a quick turn around time. They should be able to get 2%.

Janis: Will it be shared?

Sutton: Yes. This comes at a high personal cost to me. On data collection for Study Abroad, we do need you to be the responsible party for data collection. Anticipate that this will happen again with some specificity.

A 14 year old student at ASU wants to study abroad. The key question in our initial review is what kind of screening and review do you have for studying abroad? How many students have you turned away?

Biron: The EC programs say no one under 18 years of age.

Shumaker: We had a high school student at Georgia Southern.

Janis: I saw a minutes that said that the Georgia Tech disciplinary cannot be denied.

Holloway: Post-secondary options under 18 would be hard to do.

Sutton: Regarding the Web site, we'll try to get it updated as soon as possible.

XV. Update on Reciprocal Exchange Procedures

Sutton: I think we are going to do something soon. Those of you that have it worked out on your campus, continue to do so. We are trying to avoid the use of out-of-state fee waivers. I think that is a waste of those waivers.

XVI. Faculty Development Seminars

Sutton: We are thinking of a rotating seminar. The important change is that if you have had a Chancellor's Award, you cannot get one again.

Biron: We did have the training seminar. I thought we were training people to develop more seminars.

Sutton: We need to continue training the faculty for the future seminars. We are not backing off of having that training. What we are looking at is there are other programs going on. One sponsored by ABAC, one by CSU. There are some other ways faculty development can be supported.

If we do indeed have three seminars with \$25,000 total, if we do two on an annual basis. Maybe identify a little more money for the three for the coming year. I would like the information gathered and disseminated before Christmas. For the Chez seminar we will have to pay for air by early March. We could get the information out by early November.

XVII. Systemwide and Institutional Memberships in International Organizations

Sutton: I would like to see how many memberships we currently have. I would like to explore system-wide memberships and get a handle on this before the end of the semester or early January.

XVIII. EU Center Update

Postponed.

XIX. SCIE Organizational Structure

Postponed

XX. 1999-2000 Schedule of Meetings and Events

Rieff: October 15th Financial Aid for Study Abroad October 15th Bringing in experts from around the country they are going to give us the latest - This is in place of

XXI. Adjournment

We are adjourned.

© **Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia**

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

U.S.A.