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Data Analysis

**Strengths**

Strengths in administrative leadership, staffing and structure in support of internationalization at UM include: the work of faculty, the International Food and Culture Festival, the support of leaders in some schools and colleges, the international travel registry, and the diversity of individuals and units involved in decision-making that affects matters such as internationalization.

**Faculty engagement, entrepreneurialism, creativity and innovation**

UM faculty are engaged in internationalization in a variety of ways: they design, develop, market, administer and lead faculty led study abroad programs; research and design international degree programs; incorporate international components into campus and classroom learning; conduct research and outreach activities overseas; and host and advise students, scholars and professionals who come to UM to learn from them. Many UM faculty share and nurture the foundations of activities that support internationalization.

**International Food and Culture Festival**

The International Food and Culture Festival is a popular and successful annual event in the Missoula community, one of the largest non-athletic events held on campus. It helps to raise awareness in regard to the diverse composition of the Missoula community, and serves as a platform from which
international themes and topics can be discussed and explored. It engages the entire community: young children, K-12 students, parents, UM students (both domestic and international), and others.

**Prioritization and funding for international activities by some deans**

Some schools and colleges have taken steps to support international activities. A specific example is the College of Forestry and Conservation which, among other actions, has established the International Sustainability Fellows program for undergraduate students to learn leadership skills and connect with international partners on natural resource projects.

**International Travel Registry policy**

UM faculty, staff and students are required to use the UM International Travel Registry, which is managed by the Office of International Programs, before traveling abroad. In addition to being a necessary risk management tool, that system also gathers helpful information about the UM community’s international travel on topics such as scale (how many international travelers from the University), destinations, durations abroad, and other topics.

**Many entities are involved in decision-making processes that can support internationalization**

The strong shared governance system at UM is such that a diverse set of campus entities representing students, staff, faculty and administrators are regularly involved in making and backing decisions related to campus-wide initiatives such as internationalization. We consider this a strength because if a decision gains the support of all these groups, it will have a broad foundation upon which to grow.

**Weaknesses**

The weaknesses we identified fit into three general categories: lack of financial resources to support internationalization, lack of clear communication articulating UM’s goals for internationalization, and lack of coordination amongst stakeholders who pursue activities related to internationalization in a variety of disparate ways.

**Lack of financial resources to support internationalization**

Our data collection conversations revealed the unanimous sentiment that there is a widespread lack of funds to support and sustain every level of activity in the realm of internationalization at the University of Montana.

Lack of funding is a fundamental part of another weakness identified, the nearly total1 lack of staffing and administrative structure to serve and support internationalization-related activities within UM’s schools and colleges.

Lack of funding also relates to another weakness identified: lack of training and professional development opportunities related to internationalization for all UM employees. Classified staff members, in particular, are on the front lines of service to students and serve as the “face” of UM. However, training is needed for all UM employees (not just classified staff) on topics ranging from what office to send students to for a particular problem (basic customer service) to cross-cultural communication and sensitivity, to immigration procedures.

---

1 Nader Shooshtari’s function within the School of Business Administration and Devi Zdziebko’s function within the College of Forestry and Conservation stood out as exceptions.
Lack of clear communication articulating UM’s goals for internationalization prevents administrative leaders and staff from working cohesively toward those goals

The word “global” appears in the title of the University’s strategic plan (UM2020: Building a University for the Global Century) and that plan identifies “Education for the Global Century” and “Discovery and Creativity to Serve Montana and the World” as two of its strategic issues. Despite this, we found consensus that the institution’s vision and goals for internationalization are not clearly articulated. There were diverging opinions on how that vision and goals should be communicated – some thought a Presidential pronouncement would be necessary; others thought a collective, more inclusive strategy (perhaps this iLab process) might be used to develop UM’s vision and goals. There was general consensus that a clear vision and set of goals would help UM obtain stronger engagement from its administrators, faculty, staff and students in support of internationalization. A clear vision and set of goals would help campus leaders set the course for internationalization in their sectors, schools, colleges and offices, and help them work together to achieve them.

Another weakness related to lack of communication is lack of clear guidance about administrative processes related to internationalization. The lack of shared goals for internationalization leads to a set of disparate and sometimes counterproductive administrative processes that cause confusion and frustration for faculty, staff and students.

The Global Leadership Initiative stands out as an example of a program related to internationalization that would greatly benefit from the articulation of a clear vision and set of goals for UM’s internationalization. While the GLI is one of UM’s newest, most distinguished and exciting programs, the fact that it has no academic home and functions outside of regular academic funding and reporting lines has created a set of detrimental perceptions about the program. Its lack of academic home leads to difficulties in obtaining credibility and approvals through the University’s regular curriculum review processes; the fact that it’s entirely donor-funded leads to doubts about its longevity and rumors that it’s not really a priority because it hasn’t been attributed a more stable, permanent funding line. A clearly articulated, shared understanding of the GLI’s place within the vision and goals for UM’s internationalization would allow the GLI to gain a stronger foothold within the institution.

Lack of coordination related to internationalization

Overall, our data collection discussions revealed widespread consensus on two points: UM has too many institutional partnerships; and UM has too many study abroad programs.

The Office for International Programs recently undertook a review of all of UM’s institutional partnerships and designed a process for suggesting new partnerships be formed. Some suggested that it would be preferable to cultivate a handful of very strong partnerships than engage in many relationships that consist of little more than a Memorandum of Understanding.

Study abroad programs are available to UM students in the form of exchanges with partner universities, exchanges conducted through International Student Exchange Programs (ISEP), an outside organization, and faculty-led study abroad programs created and organized by UM faculty members. Study abroad programs are growing in number and have begun to compete with one another for students. Collaboration, cooperation and coordination are needed to eliminate this type of internal competition, perceived as frustrating and counterproductive.

---

2 The recent awarding of a rubric for GLI is a positive development in this respect.
**Opportunities**
The diversity of interests, motivations and available resources sets the stage for many constituents and stakeholders to make contributions towards internationalization. The University of Montana has many untapped opportunities to enhance and expand the role and scope of international education on campus.

**Internationally Engaged Faculty and Staff**
First and foremost, the role of faculty and staff in international programs is a *sine qua non*. A directory of UM employees with international experiences will enable the institution to increase international visibility and identify persons with relevant knowledge and cross-cultural competencies. A campus-wide resource information and communication network could then be established and centrally administered. Such a resource would help improve advising with a view to internationalization - students on study abroad would complete their degree requirements without delays by covering General Education credits and advise international students to enroll in appropriate courses that make their education relevant to the needs of their home countries. With a strong Native American Studies program at UM we should also strive to connect with indigenous groups internationally.

We need to cultivate relationships with exchange visitors on campus, UM alums and affiliates internationally, as well as retirees who travel overseas, in order to enhance marketing, recruitment, alumni relations and fundraising efforts and raise the visibility of UM.

**International Students are an Important Resource**
Increases in international enrollments not only contribute to the revenue base of the University but bring more diversity and cross-cultural competencies to our campus. The presence of international students and scholars offers us the opportunity to design innovative, cross-cultural programs and provide structured social activities to help them become more actively engaged with both the campus and community. “Making the Most of Intercultural Interactions,” a GLI Capstone project submitted last spring, could inform future decisions related to integrating international students to the UM community (see appendix). In addition, part of a new international student fee will fund proposals from the different nationality clubs when they plan celebrations and make a concerted effort to invite domestic students, as well as staff and faculty, to attend. Events like the Chinese New Year, African Film Series, Eid al-Fitr Muslim holiday, Persian Norooz New Year observance, Griz for UNICEF banquet, Japanese Sushi Making, etc., should not be limited to members of the nationality clubs alone. The extra funding will allow expansion of such events where domestic students can get exposure to different cultures and customs and help foreign students foster friendships with Americans.

**Missoula International Expertise, UM Experts and UM Employee databases**
These are three separate efforts underway to centralize information about UM employees and their expertise, including expertise related to internationalization. These efforts are a step in the right direction in terms of helping catalog and promote knowledge and competencies related to internationalization on campus, in Missoula, and beyond.

**International advisors’ network**
Building on the iTeam initiative and modeled on VETS office trainings, the Office for Student Success is developing a series of trainings for advisors and faculty members who work with international students to create a network of support for international students in terms of academic advising. This fairly new initiative will be fully developed and implemented over the course of the next academic year.
Challenges
There are numerous challenges facing UM in administrative leadership, structure, and staffing: in particular, the constant challenge of minimizing fees and complicated procedures; the challenges for students, faculty and campus leadership navigating a dispersed structure for internationalization; and uncertainty about future academic calendars.

Minimizing fees, complicated procedures, and paperwork
Our data collection revealed the constant challenge of the costs of international activity. From a student’s point of view, any additional fee to participate in study abroad opportunities can discourage or prohibitively constrain participation. While each fee may seem small but necessary, the cumulative burden inevitably falls on the student. Similarly, confusing and complicated procedures (e.g. application software such as StudioAbroad) may be discouraging participation. There were several comments about the increasing difficulty of procedures for study abroad.

It was quite frequently noted that international experiences need to be better integrated into courses of study, particularly so that students can still graduate in a timely manner. Encouraging, accurate study abroad advising is needed to assist students in not losing time towards graduation: one example would be encouraging short-term programs during Wintersession or May/early June; another would be facilitating study abroad courses be approved to as General Education requirements. Secondly, degree programs/maps could be structurally designed to encourage and recognize study abroad as an important and central component (rather than as an add-on).

Faculty would greatly benefit from a decrease in confusing bureaucracy, regulation and paperwork for international activity. The more time and effort that it takes to get international activity documented, approved, and credentialed, the less time that faculty have for creatively developing their academic, research, or outreach programs. Offices such as Human Resource Services and Business Services (who must implement sometimes poorly designed state and federal guidelines) can unreasonably delay and complicate faculty international activity. The use of external sponsors to manage logistics (accommodations, transportation, in-country support, etc.) by a number of study abroad programs is cited as a successful strategy to allow program directors and faculty to focus on academic coordination and content.

Confusion regarding dispersed structure and responsibility for international activity
The distributed model for leadership and coordination of international activity is frequently cited as confusing by students, staff, and faculty. The Office of International Programs tends to focus most on academic components (admissions, outgoing programs, and exchanges), Foreign Student and Scholar Services tends to focus most on support services for international students (housing, dining, health care, recreation, etc.) as well as assisting students, faculty, and visiting scholars with immigration-related issues, and the Mansfield Center tends to focus most on events (conferences, workshops, forums, institutes, etc.). These three units report to different Vice Presidents (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs) and having different funding lines. However, while there may have been historical reasons for this structure primarily by function, today all three units, now do aspects of all three functions (academic, support services, and programming). In addition, the Office for Student Success and various advisors within some schools and colleges also provide advising to international students and domestic students wishing to study abroad.
There is also a profound challenge for students, staff, and faculty in engaging with a large number of international degree programs (such as International Development Studies, International Conservation and Development, Global Public Health, Global Youth Development, International Business, etc.) as well as a significant number of area studies programs such as East Asian Studies, South and Southeast Asian Studies, Central and Southwest Asian Studies, Latin American Studies (some of which are academic minors and/or degrees). These degree programs and area studies programs don’t coordinate with one another and appear to overlap in some instances and compete with each other. It is not generally understood why so many of these programs coexist and how they relate to one another.

**Uncertainty regarding academic calendars**

Perhaps reflecting the timing of our data collection efforts which coincided with campus-wide discussions regarding the future of Wintersession and Summer Session, the challenge of fitting international activity within future academic calendars was identified. The logistics and expense of international programs necessitates longer time periods than may be possible with shortened Wintersessions. International programs may also have longer lead times in order to successfully secure facilities and recruit students, thus looking for greater predictability of future calendars.
Recommendations related to Administrative Leadership, Staffing and Structure

**ONE STOP SHOP FOR STUDENT SERVICES**

Create a one-stop shop for all internationalization-related student services in the Lomasson Center (study abroad, GLI, OAE) as a complement to the existing student services offices already located there (FSSS, OSS, Registrar, Graduate School, Financial Aid, Business Services). This has been suggested in the past (see appendix).

**IMPROVE COORDINATION**

Improve administrative coordination of internationalization functions at UM including, but not limited to: recruitment, marketing, enrollment, advising for both international students here and domestic students wishing to study abroad, better integration of international and domestic students on campus, curriculum and co-curriculum development, programming and outreach about international opportunities for faculty, staff and students.

**DESIGNATE SPECIFIC DUTIES TO FACULTY AND STAFF**

Like in the School of Business Administration, designate a senior faculty member or experienced administrator as the point person for internationalization in every school and college (e.g. leading curriculum development, negotiating faculty involvement, encouraging and advocating for international research/outreach...). Like in the College of Forestry & Conservation, identify and assign duties to a staff member to provide administrative support, general coordination and advising related to internationalization.

**INTERNATIONALIZATION NETWORK/COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE**

Create a strong network of UM employees dedicated to internationalization composed of the abovementioned senior leaders and administrative staff from the schools and colleges in addition to others who share responsibility for internationalization in a variety of contexts: student affairs, administration & finance, research & creative scholarship, alumni relations, the UM Foundation. Similar to the FAM group in Academic Affairs, the formation of this community of practice related to internationalization would result in better communication, coordination, and information sharing across sectors in support of internationalization at UM.

**EMPLOYEE TRAINING & AWARENESS**

Develop faculty and staff awareness about internationalization at UM through tailored, continuous professional development opportunities. Build on existing efforts to broaden faculty and staff perspectives on internationalization and develop knowledge of on-campus resources. Develop communication strategies to broaden and deepen faculty and staff understanding of how internationalization is structured at UM by identifying all internationalization-related offices, people, and functions and how they relate to each other. Connect the Missoula International Experts and UM Experts databases to this outreach initiative.
STAFF ATTITUDES MAKE A DIFFERENCE
Start collecting data on UM staff attitudes toward and perceptions of internationalization. When funding becomes available, revive the staff short term international activity grant program and promote it so that staff members take better advantage of this opportunity than in the recent past.

MORE AUTHORITY TO INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE
Assign more authority to the International Committee and modify its membership to achieve broader campus representation. Define and increase the responsibility and accountability of the International Committee as the leading body for campus internationalization. Connect the International Committee with the network of employees working to support internationalization described in recommendation #4. Articulate the International Committee’s reporting line and relationships to other shared governance bodies such as Faculty and Staff Senate, ASUM, the Diversity Advisory Council, Academic Officers, etc.

DIRECTORY OF GRIZ ABROAD
Develop a directory of all UM alumni, affiliates, and potential donors abroad and actively pursue and/or renew relationships with them.

CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE RISK MANAGEMENT
Bolster UM’s international risk management strategy by 1) continuing to enforce requirements laid out in the UM international travel registry policy 2) updating that policy based on current best practices for international higher education risk management 3) developing a system to track all international visitors to campus at any given time for safety (as well as the benefit of the campus community), and 4) creating an international risk officer position within OIP to help UM address international risk, health and safety for students and faculty travelling and collaborating overseas, as well as overseas crisis management, export controls, etc. (see appendix for sample job description).

Other recommendations

SHORT STUDY ABROAD WORKS WELL FOR SOME STUDENTS
Maintain UM’s commitment to study abroad programs of shorter duration as they are more accessible for some students and serve as an on-ramp for longer study abroad and international travel afterwards.
Data Collection
See appendix for the data from which we developed the summaries that follow.

Where does primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?
Academic Officers, campus-wide faculty meetings, Financial Aid, Foreign Student and Student Scholar Services (FSSS), Global Leadership Initiative (GLI), International Committee, Mansfield Center, Office for Academic Enrichment, Office of International Programs (OIP), Office of the Provost, Student Affairs Officers, UM Foundation, Undergraduate Advising Center

Summary of findings:
Having senior faculty leadership within a College or School is hugely impactful.
- With responsibility to keep up with & share best and most current practices in international education
  - Encourages greater faculty input, collaboration and commitment
  - Leads to much increased activity, with time and direction to grow new academic programs, as well as to integrate within existing academic programs
  - With an emphasis towards maintaining on-time graduation
  - Better and closer support for faculty and students
  - Puts international activity front & center in Colleges & Schools, not in some distant, centralized office
  - Can be tied in with existing College/School communications & marketing
  - Better tied into unit-based fundraising (e.g. for scholarships, funding for program development)
  - Better able to guide proposals through ASCRC/Grad. Council and Faculty Senate
  - Better leverage for existing research & outreach/extension activities
  - Better monitoring of partners (sponsors, hosts, funding agencies, etc.)

OIP, FSSS & Mansfield Center co-existing is a major challenge
- Reporting to different Vice-Presidents (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs), with different funding lines
- May have historically made sense, but less so today to structure by function as all three now do aspects of all three sets of functions
  - OIP focuses on: academic (admissions, programs, partnerships & exchanges)
  - FSSS focuses on: services (visas, housing, dining, health care, recreation, etc.)
  - Mansfield Center focuses on: events (conferences, workshops, forums, institutes, etc.)
- Perceived duplication of efforts, accompanied by general consensus that collaboration improving
- Inconsistency across bodies, with students unsure where to go for assistance
- Could have direct line to/from President, who sets overall campus priority for internationalization
- Less consensus on desirable unified location (Academic Affairs or Student Affairs or autonomous under new Vice President for International Activities)
- Consistency & co-ordination of incoming international student academic advising needs to improve
• Perception that international students don’t know where to go and sometimes get conflicting advice
  o E.g. from FSSS, OIP, OSS, Admissions, schools and colleges, Curry Health Center, Financial Aid, Graduate School, Residence Life, Scholarships, Disability Services for Students
• One-stop shop (one geographic location, such as an International Center), could be advantageous so that students don’t have to go to two or three different offices for answers and assistance

The Global Leadership Initiative (GLI) is controversial
• It is unclear how it fits within existing programs, authority & structure
• May have taken some of the “energy and clarity” away from internationalization
• Demonstrates that academic learning outcomes/processes must come first
• Unclear what “global learning” is going on, particularly given retention problems
• Uncertain status of interdisciplinary program that doesn’t have an academic home
• Self-funded program may not show true University commitment
• Unclear relationship with regional programs such as East Asian Studies, South and Southeast Asian Studies, Central and Southwest Asian Studies, Latin American Studies
• Too many global partnerships (e.g. exchange programs)
• Most have poorly defined objectives and measured outcomes
• Impossible for a campus our size to foster and maintain so many
• A good number established for distinct purposes by a single faculty member (who may now have left campus)
• Too many programs/exchanges in some regions (e.g. Latin America) without consideration or monitoring of quality control
  o Students may be assuming UM endorses and verifies the rigor and value of every program

What are the communication or coordination lines to ensure community wide awareness, synergy and mutual support?
Mansfield Center, OIP, Office of the Provost, Office for Academic Enrichment, GLI, Student Affairs Officers, Academic Officers, Undergraduate Advising Center, International Committee, Faculty-led program directors, Financial Aid, UM Foundation and FSSS

Summary of findings:
Increased and improved internal communication/coordination amongst individual UM employees, UM offices, and governing bodies, is needed.
• There is a set of offices and people performing internationalization-related functions on campus. (OIP, FSSS, Enrollment Services, Academic Units, OAE, GLI, UAC, etc.) Relationships and connections within this set of offices and people are complex. Communication between these offices and people has improved recently (examples: Foreign Student Coordinating Committee, iTeam), but could become even more streamlined, effective and efficient. Coordination needs to improve as well, and efforts are being made to do so (new student orientation, advising).
• In addition, communication and coordination between the set of offices and people described above and other offices, groups and people who make decisions that affect internationalization (Faculty Senate committees, ASUM, Business Services, Human Resource Services) needs to
improve so that these decision-makers are aware of the effect their decisions might have on internationalization (curriculum and credit-transfer decisions, travel expense reimbursement policy changes, visa procurement procedures, etc.). A clear and comprehensive internationalization strategy/policy for the UM campus (the outcome of the iLab process) would help inform the decisions these groups and people make as concerns internationalization at UM, based on the level of importance/priority it ultimately occupies, campus-wide.

- Also, communication and coordination between the set of offices and people described in the first bullet point and offices carrying out functions that serve the entire student body / all of campus could improve so that there is increased awareness on campus about the campus’ goals for internationalization in general, and so that the needs of specific groups on campus (international students and scholars, domestic students planning to go abroad or returning from time spent abroad) are appropriately met. Some all-campus entities demonstrate awareness and sensitivity to international visitors, UM Dining providing halal meat options for example. One example was given that showed need for improvement: training Curry Health Center staff to respond appropriately to students from different places and cultures, such as Saudi Arabia.

- Most respondents agreed that the Office of International Programs needs to take the lead on administering internationalization activities, communications and coordination on campus. The idea of creating a university committee to oversee and coordinate international activities was also put forth (it was generally acknowledged that the role of the International Committee is unclear to most, and that a group with more authority and less of an advisory role is needed.)

- Faculty leading study abroad programs acknowledged that lately steps have been taken to better coordinate administrative processes for travel abroad for UM students and faculty in the form of the Travel Registry and OIP’s Faculty Directed or Affiliated Study Abroad Program Application. They all expressed frustration with the fact that to lead these programs, faculty have to do all of the work involved and agreed that creating some centralized administrative support for faculty-led programs would be beneficial. They also acknowledged that there is growing competition between study-abroad programs for a limited number of students. Coordination is needed in that respect, too.

**Internal communication/coordination from UM offices with internationalization functions toward students is critical and needs drastic improvement.**

- Students are very confused about who does what on campus. Decentralized offices combined with students’ typical aversion to attend information sessions and read emails leads to disorganization and communication breakdown.

- Advising of students needs to improve - both for international students at UM and for domestic students interested in study abroad.
  - International students need help picking classes appropriate to their language skill level and other needs (tailored to the individual and their academic / programmatic needs).
  - Lack of clear connection between and support for students’ degree paths and study abroad opportunities diminishes the numbers of domestic students who study abroad. Many students express an interest in study abroad upon arrival at UM, but interest peters out / some departments dissuade students from doing so because that will likely prevent them from graduating within 4 years. Credit transfer matters need to be simplified and advising needs to be more robust. More information on the non-academic implications of study abroad such as its real cost, etc. needs to be made available to both students and parents.
• More feedback from students experiencing all aspects of internationalization (international students at UM; UM students going abroad; on-campus experience (curricular and co-curricular components)) should be gathered and used to effect change and improve the student experience.
• Domestic students returning to UM from study abroad experiences find that others don’t want to hear about their experiences. They tend to gather together for mutual support. It is hard for them to comfortably, proactively share their experiences abroad and feel like they are “giving back” to campus.

Communication and coordination related to integrating international visitors into campus life must improve.
• How can we take better advantage of the presence of international visitors on our campus? Sometimes groups visit classes or give presentations, but this seems to happen on an ad hoc basis (for example, Humphrey Fellow presentations at Jeannette Rankin Peace Center last year; FSSS relationship with the Missoula Speakers’ Bureau) and is not centrally coordinated. Can some sort of on-campus visitor directory be created and maintained? FSSS provides an annual report of visiting scholars by visa type to the Department of State and IIE, but there is no on-campus system to share constantly updated information about who is visiting, from where, for what purpose and for how long.
• Some of our international visitors who are indigenous peoples in their parts of the world would have a lot in common with the Native Americans on our campus. How can we bring these groups together?

External communication and coordination exist to various degrees but could improve to support overall internationalization at UM.
• The International Culture and Food Festival, organized by FSSS and the International Student Association, is a major event in the Missoula community every month of March. It is one of the largest non-sporting public events at UM and in Missoula and generates awareness and goodwill towards international students.
• The Mansfield Center and OIP also conduct outreach programs in the community and throughout Montana. In Missoula, people seek out UM for international-related matters because the University is such a dominant, visible component of our community.
• Many MOLLI courses have an international component and this program is very successful. (Some MOLLI students are studying abroad alongside UM students in Vienna next year.)
• A systematically updated directory of UM constituents abroad would be very desirable for anyone from UM traveling abroad. According to the UMF, alumni/potential donor base is very limited at this time.

**What are the staffing arrangements and reporting lines? How well are they working?**

OIP, Office of Academic Enrichment, Enrollment Services, GLI, Graduate School, School of Extended & Lifelong Learning, International Committee, Faculty-led program directors, Financial Aid, and FSSS

**Summary of findings:**

Different Reporting Lines Exist for International Activities
• Different offices report to different VPs and follow different practices and direction from above
• OIP initiatives, such as exchange programs, are under the direction of the Associate Provost for Global Century Education
• FSSS is a unit within the Student Affairs Division. Its mission is to provide critical services and expertise in meeting the needs of international students and offering them opportunities for co-curricular activities and integration into the life of the campus
• International student admissions should go over to OIP\(^3\), especially since international student recruitment is now there. Also admissions and evaluation function should stay together
• Directors of Faculty-led programs state that faculty leaders do everything: host families, students, money, etc. Business Services is very hard to work with which hurts relationships with partners, recruitment of students, etc.
• The administrative structure and application process is confusing to study abroad students which discourages them from completing and submitting study abroad applications
• For logistics, Davidson Honors College (DHC) works through EF tours so staff members don’t have to handle anything. School of Business Administration also uses a contractor for logistics.
• Different models, where faculty do everything, to outsourcing logistics and making contracted agreements may result in higher cost for the students
• Admission of graduate students happens at the departmental level with varying responsiveness
• Collaboration of Graduate school, (Admissions and Human Resource Services) with FSSS which provides DSO and immigration services
• Perception that certain units with internationalization functions have too many staff, that duplication of efforts is taking place and could be restructured with an eye to efficiency.

Faculty and other Stakeholders Vary in their Expectations and Attitudes Toward Internationalization
• Too much emphasis on OIP initiatives and not enough on other university opportunities
• Unclear how exchange programs reflect college/degree priorities
• DHC programs have been advised not to compete with other UM programs, for example those dealing with Ireland
• When UM students go abroad for a semester, whether on faculty-led study abroad programs or via ISEP or at a partner university, numbers decline in Modern Languages and Literatures (MCLL) classrooms. This is detrimental to the department
• General decline in study abroad programs correlates with a decline in language majors
• Spending time abroad is decisive in a student’s choice of language as a major
• In terms of faculty, MCLL doesn’t have enough faculty to be offering faculty-led study abroad programs on a regular basis AND teach course at UM on a regular basis. MCLL is not filling faculty lines fast enough to ensure study abroad program frequency and quality
• Uncertainty about Wintersession schedule adds more instability to FLSAP planning for the future

What governance structures support internationalization? How well are they working?
OIP, Office for Academic Enrichment, GLI, School of Extended & Lifelong Learning, Student Affairs Officers, Undergraduate Advising Center, International Committee, Faculty-led study abroad program directors, Financial Aid, FSSS

\(^3\) This suggestion was made during data collection; it is the authors’ understanding that such a change has recently been made.
Summary of findings:

Many entities are involved in different aspects of internationalization governance.

- Collaborators include: the International Committee, the International Student Coordinating Committee, Academic Officers, President’s Cabinet and others.
  - Those groups and others meet and can make recommendations about matters related to internationalization (Cabinet ultimately approves University policies).
- ASCRC, General Education Committee, Writing Committee, and the Graduate Council have the power to approve or reject plans that impact internationalization (e.g. English language proficiency requirements, writing requirements, course and program development, etc.).
- Understanding how to negotiate the online space is a key to internationalization, which is how students communicate today. Online learning is contemporary, and an important aspect of internationalization.
- GLI committees are new and support internationalization
- The OIP-FSSS-OSS coordination committee supports internationalization.
- Because many units on campus (both academic and non-academic) play a critical role in achieving the goals of campus internationalization “to centralize or not are not viable options.”

The existing internationalization governance structure is not effective. The existing structure produces challenges that impede internationalization.

- The International Committee needs to apply greater emphasis on academic leadership and strategic oversight and less on ‘busy work’.
- The Associate Provost (for Global Century Education) has a presence at the Academic Officer’s meetings, so his voice is there, but is he active on other university committees (e.g. ASCRC, Grad. Council, Research & Creative Scholarship)?
- The International Committee could have more input and collaboration from deans & faculty (it is currently dominated by OIP).
- There is a chance for online education to help internationalize the University.
- International education administration is organized in silos and there is a lack of staff representation within international education administration at UM.
- What sort of commitment or support to an effort (regarding internationalization) is leadership putting in place? Is it consistent?
- There is a perception that ASCRC does not support internationalization.
- Permanent course numbers being eliminated and replaced by bag numbers, which “will kill study abroad.” Students can only take a certain number of bag courses. This will look bad on their transcript if they want to apply to grad school.
- Trying to get appropriate number of credits for a course (especially a faculty-led study abroad course), getting permanent course numbers, getting cross-listing, showing certain numbers of contact hours, etc. are difficult steps.
- Flexibility within schools and colleges is needed (especially in regard to faculty-led study abroad courses).
  - SOBA, for example, teaches 3+3 course loads. The dean won’t pay more for more work. Need for a policy where faculty are paid a prorated amount.
- There is a perception that the International Committee has an advisory role but no real power.
- There is a perception that the Faculty Senate wields a lot of power concerning internationalization.
Leadership, collaboration and change are needed to articulate a clearer vision of internationalization at the University. There are committees and structures already in place that leadership could task to provide that clearer vision.

- The more strongly something is worded (in regard to international education being an institutional priority), the better.
- Policies that govern international education (e.g. risk management) are not an academic freedom issue.
- No formal governance structure at UM directly supports internationalization.
- Oversight of internationally-themed academic programs (International Development Studies, International Conservation and Development, International Business Program, Global Public Health, Global Youth Development) needs to be separated from OIP and have more campus-wide academic coordination.
- Does ASUM have a committee focused on internationalization?
- What is Diversity Advisory Council’s role? Sometimes students perform at its meetings, but how does it influence internationalization at UM?
- Should there be a campus-wide governance committee for internationalization?
- The “matrix management organization” structure/model would be the best fit as it would recognize UM’s context of collective engagement and responsibility, making the academic, and support service units would be effectively engaged in the process of internationalization.
  - …the essential elements of this model would be communication and coordination with direct collaborative crosswalks among contributors.

What policies or practices (related to this subcommittee) hinder internationalization efforts at this institution?

OIP, campus-wide faculty meetings, Office of the Provost, Office for Academic Enrichment, Enrollment Services, Graduate School, Academic Officers, Undergraduate Advising Center, International Committee, Faculty-led study abroad program directors, Financial Aid, Business Services, FSSS, and Office of Planning, Budgeting and Analysis (OPBA)

Summary of findings:

Lack of Reciprocal Relationship between Faculty-led study abroad programs and OIP’s Study Abroad Office and Lack of Coordination between Study Abroad Programs and Business Services

- Decentralized structure for faculty-led study abroad programs. It was suggested by some that UM needs to centralize and structure processes for developing and conducting these programs.
- Lack of administrative support for Faculty-led study abroad programs so that professors leading programs are required to do EVERYTHING related to leading the program.
- Recruitment of students (for study abroad) difficult – more coordination is needed
- OIP doesn’t give anything back. Asks faculty to do a lot of work but don’t give much in return.
- Communication is totally lacking between Business Services and Study Abroad programs. Business Services needs information about study abroad programs because it impacts student bills and student financial aid packages
- There doesn’t seem to be any standardization of how study abroad is administered—it seems very reactionary/rushed. There does not seem to be any coordination between what students are paying for in regard to study abroad programs and registration.
• Faculty should instruct students to register to go abroad - set things up ahead of time.
• Study abroad for UM: need more streamlined practices.

Insufficient Resources to Support and Sustain International Education on Campus
• We do not have the necessary level of financial support to internationalize
• If we had greater financial resources we could apply them to student retention and recruitment, support for UM students to study abroad, support for faculty international experiences.
• Don’t endorse/adopt user-pays systems (whereby the students or programs end up paying for centralized services; students are turned off, can’t afford these systems, and many are excluded by higher costs to participate.
• Can there be a system in place to remunerate faculty leaders for Wintersession study abroad programs as faculty leading Wintersession trips can’t receive additional salary for their work (all the preparation, etc.)
• UM has a tendency to take advantage of people’s passions and not remunerate them.
• Fundraising is needed for students to be able to participate in study abroad.
• OIP’s electronic study abroad application system a “nightmare” $50 cost for “a bunch of headaches” per application – seems to be set up for single applications for long term study abroad (ISEP) not FLSAP.
• Financial constraints hinder us in the recruitment and retention of high caliber international students
• Limited financial aid, lack of an on-campus work-study program, and high health insurance costs have a negative impact on foreign students.
• UM does not provide the type of support that other universities provide for visiting scholars and students in the form of housing and meals. Residence Life and Dining Services schedules at the beginning and end of each semester need to better accommodate foreign students in their transition to the University and at departure times (e.g., for Spring Semester new internationals students arrive seven to ten days before the official start of the semester to attend a new foreign student orientation, but there are very limited dining options, especially in the evening. At the end of a semester many are stressed out trying to depart the day after finals since they must vacate their dorm rooms.)
• Federal funding for graduate research, which in the past supported many international students, has decreased.
• If more resources were available to the Graduate School they’d be used for purposes such as to enhance collaboration for international student recruitment.
• From application to admission, there is a challenge (especially in regard to finances) as there is a limited number of assistantships available for international graduate students.
• Motor pool policy doesn’t allow children in UM vehicles which excludes foreign students and scholars with family members to participate in educational fieldtrips. This is an example of how a rule based on saving money for potential tort claims against the University has an undue negative impact on one population we serve.

Divergent Motivations and Rationales Drive Campus Internationalization
• Many do not understand what it means to internationalize the campus
• Internationalization is perceived as idiosyncratic, usually with one faculty member pushing for a particular program. When that faculty member leaves so does the program – it is a moving target.
• There may be a sense the OIP makes decisions and imposes them on campus which isn’t very helpful or encouraging.
• Top-down initiatives from senior administration impede/squash enthusiasm and creativity by academic programs, particularly if a one-size-fits-all approach is implemented
• Senior administration need to emphasize greater communication with campus leadership, such as deans’ offices and faculty.
• The President has his vision but not exactly clear what the actual plan is. Need to make sure everyone has bought into it (the vision).
• The University’s commitment and vision in regard to internationalization is to be welcoming to students and “make it easy” and not referring to academics.
• We don’t have anyone with a campus-wide perspective
• The University would benefit from more cultural sensitivity training - a series of interrelated workshops.
• Introduce a required one or zero credit seminar to facilitate transition of international students from ELI to campus courses. Help place them in courses where they can succeed.
• Incoming and outgoing programs could be unified under the banner of internationalized learning. Little information and/or education on internationalization to domestic students – could be particularly impactful on first year students.
• Policies and practices are not very even across the schools and colleges. Is the organic/grassroots development of international initiatives that is typical of UM a hindrance in itself?
• BANNER cited as a hindrance as it prevents proper reconciliation -- it does not facilitate/support accounting for students abroad vs. students on campus.
• Interdepartmental on-campus faculty-led study abroad programs could be developed if greater coordination and commitment existed between academic departments.
• Perception that many interdisciplinary courses linked to internationalization get eliminated in the curricular review process. In one instance, ASCRC did not approve a 6-credit, 4 week interdisciplinary course. Its members seem not to understand the value of offering such a course. If faculty from different parts of UM teach interdisciplinary courses, these warrant cross-listing to serve students from all over campus. Cross-listing denied.
• Processes in regard to the collection of data about study abroad and international faculty have not been determined; only data collection and analysis model for international students has been launched.
• Efforts to standardize reporting and provide training (about reporting) are underway by the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Analysis.

Does the institution gather information on the attitudes of staff (all non-faculty employees) toward international learning? If so, how is this information used?
Mansfield Center, OIP, Office of the Provost, Office for Academic Enrichment, GLI, School of Extended and Lifelong Learning, Student Affairs Officers, Undergraduate Advising Center, International Committee, Financial Aid, FSSS

Summary of findings:
The institution does not gather information on the attitudes of staff toward international learning.
• It doesn’t, but it should.
• Probably typical of universities elsewhere (the lack of information about the attitudes of staff).
It would be helpful if the institution did gather information on the attitudes of staff toward international learning.

- If it did, we could use this information to create a strategic plan for the future.
- If internationalization is a priority global competency skills need to be built into different departmental policies.

**International learning isn’t everyone’s priority, and its emphasis can be a burden.**

- High priority for Academic Enrichment (and OIP, GLI, FSSS), but not necessarily for other units.
- Endless data collection, imposing burden on other units.
- Few of us now have time for yet another memo, yet another email asking us to provide data – we just don’t have time we need to be attending to our current duties and compile our input for others’ efforts.
- Who has the staff time (and expense) to manage and keep data on staff attitudes about international learning up-to-date? Sometimes invitations to participate in international learning efforts are attended by committees “of the interested” – the usual suspects always attend.

**To what extent does staff (all non-faculty employees) perceive international learning as an important element of the educational process at the institution? What is the evidence?**

Employee Survey, Enrollment Services, Financial Aid, FSSS, GLI, Mansfield Center, OIP, Student Affairs Officers, UM Foundation, Undergraduate Advising Center

**Summary of findings:**

Staff are the frontline “face” of UM

- Staff frequently interact with both incoming and outgoing international as well as domestic students who want to study abroad
- Departments that don’t as often engage international students and/or study abroad are less apt to be informed and able to help
- Too many wrong answers
- Cost of misinformation is high
- Each College/School should have knowledgeable staff member to assist with myriad of pieces

Many staff/support services could improve with better training and systems designed to make international activities easier and more sympathetic to international travel

- Including but also extending beyond obvious
  - e.g. HRS, business services, travel desk
- Some systems (e.g. State of Montana – purchasing, employment, and expenses) weren’t built to encourage or facilitate international travel, and so UM needs to vastly improve interface so that international activity is not discouraged by inappropriate/burdensome paperwork
- Many staff have never left the U.S. and have little experience/awareness of challenges of international travel
- Many staff have little experience/ability to work with different cultures and different languages
  - Diversity training
• Need to strengthen staff exchange program

**Need for staff to embrace and endorse international students, not see them as a difficulty or challenge**

• Increasing numbers of incoming international students
• Should be given same treatment as domestic students, so they don’t feel they are special or different
• Should be equal to other students groups that receive abundant assistance (e.g. Athletics, Veterans, Students with Disabilities, Honors Students, etc.)
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Abstract
In recent decades, there has been a push for internationalization in higher education because many educators believe that cultural diversity is an essential element of the campus environment as universities strive to prepare graduates for a globalizing world. As international education scholar Darla Deardorff (2014) claims, “The question of integrating international and domestic students is an ongoing question that’s been with us for many years and unfortunately I haven’t found any institution that’s yet found the answer.” We aim to make use of untapped opportunities for mutual intercultural learning among students of diverse cultural backgrounds. Specifically, our GLI capstone project involves designing a program that serves to facilitate the development of transnational competence through various kinds of interactions between foreign and U.S. students (Koehn and Rosenau, 2010). Through a student survey and interviews with university program officers and faculty conducted at the University of Montana, we found two main problems: (1) non-engaging intercultural learning environment and (2) a lack of motivation on the part of U.S. students. To address these issues, we explored ways to collaborate with offices on campus that already have relevant programs in place and determined that Student Involvement Network (SIN) would best serve as the home of our program coordinator. Our program design is based on insights from professionals in the field, a literature review, and student survey findings. It involves a systematic three-step process that incorporates educational, social, and community service components that would help participants develop various aspects of transnational competence. Our program uniquely aims first to establish analytic and emotional dimensions of transnational competence as the foundation on which participants can build communicative, functional, and creative competencies. This paper reports on the research and the program development process that we engaged in to address the global problem.

Program Introduction
We aim to design a program that fosters intercultural learning and friendship while facilitating development of transnational competence. From our literature review and stage one and two needs assessment, we realize that intercultural learning is not being achieved by merely bringing people together. As the article The Maturing of Diversity Initiatives on American Campuses states, “Diversity is, above all, a challenge that demands we rethink how we educate students and for what ends” (Musil, 1996). When asked if they believed that diversity on campus had brought about intercultural learning on campus, two of the three staff members interviewed did not provide a definite answer, indicating that the issue is not being fully addressed here at the University of Montana-Missoula. On the basis of our research, we decided that there are four components necessary to facilitate intercultural learning that will lead to the desired transnational competencies. The components are: friendship, social activities, civic engagement, and educational activities.
We aim to create a program that improves the atmosphere on the UM campus and to help enhance intercultural learning among both international and local students. We have developed a plan to incorporate programs that already exists on campus into a larger initiative that would provide a catalyst for intercultural learning. Approaching it in a three step process that includes educational, social, and community service components. Our goal is to help facilitate the development of transnational
competences, particularly Analytic and Emotional to help lay the foundation for further development of Communicative, Functional, and Creative competences.

In order to increase meaningful, educational interactions between international and U.S. students we designed a program that can serve as a catalyst, which in part comes from the order in which students engage in the three program stages. Research demonstrates that an educational setting often eases initial acquaintance, and a social environment would help solidify those connections. Next, a community service activity puts students in an environment representative of real world problem solving.

The first stage in the program is an educational partnership. For example, conversation partners, mutual tutoring, and academic buddies. The goal of this step is to facilitate the development of analytic competence as defined by Koehn and Rosenau (2010). Educational partnership is the first step because an educational environment allows one to nurture analytic competence in a non-threatening structured environment.

The second stage in the program is a social activity. Such as partnering with the Student Recreation Association (SRN) for an outdoor event, and various events organized by campus offices and associations. The goal of this step is to facilitate the development of emotional competence based on meaningful and lasting friendships. A social environment provides a fun environment for development of emotional transnational competence as defined by Koehn and Rosenau but moves beyond a relationship of necessity.

The third stage in the program is collaboration on a civic engagement project. Potential student groups can be recruited through existing student organizations such as Circle K and the Harry Potter Alliance. The Office of Civic Engagement may be a useful resource in arranging such projects. Civic engagement allows one to refine the tools acquired through educational partnership and social environment and to develop functional, communicative, and creative transnational competence as defined by Koehn and Rosenau (2010). This stage synthesizes the first two environments, but adding a constructive aspect. Friendship is an important component of both our program and for a student’s overall success in their academic careers. Direct interaction with cultural others provides an opportunity for developing understanding and mutual respect, key components of analytic and emotional competence. As Siegel-Hawley, at the Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education states, “the skills gained in diverse settings are becoming ever more important in a rapidly changing society” (National Coalition, 2012). We learned through Heather Bruce’s, the Diversity Advisory Council’s co-chair’s, interview that “there have been really difficult reports of ignorance and discrimination against foreign students” at UM. This finding demonstrates the lack of transnational competence and the need for intercultural friendship among students here at the University of Montana-Missoula. We also gathered from our survey that over 50% of International students said that they have difficulty making friends with U.S. students. This finding further supports the need for an environment that fosters intercultural friendship. Through our literature review, we learned that international housing (merely pairing U.S. students and international student roommates) had no statistically significant effect on the friendship patterns of overseas and local students (Bocher, 2014). Through an Oxford study, 70% of foreign students did not have any English friends at all after at least a year in the country (Bocher, 2014). Therefore, we believe that both educational activities and social activities are possible ways to create an environment that is conducive for intercultural friendship development.

**Administrative Structure**

The administrative structure for our program will be housed within the Student Involvement Network (SIN). Which is self-described as “an activities board offering array of programs from workshops, comedy shows, concerts, lectures, guest speakers, films, entertainment, and much more - all with the foundation of learning, leadership, diversity, and fun” (Student Involvement Network, 2014). Their focus on
learning, leadership, diversity, and fun makes SIN a perfect fit for our program. University Center Associate Director, Student Involvement and Communications, Adrianne Donald will supervise the program.

SIN employs five student coordinators, who each have an area and/or program that they focus on while also collaborating with each other. One of these coordinators will be hired to focus on our program. This position will be the lead on recruitment and organization. They will be responsible for making connections with departments across campus to promote participation from a wide variety of student groups. They will have support from the other coordinators as well as other resources housed within SIN.

**Recruitment**

For our program we want to be able to recruit half of the incoming international students and roughly around the same amount of local students. The University of Montana is expected to receive around one thousand international students, and for our program we hope to have five hundred local and five hundred international students involved. We hope to have as many students as possible involved in our program so we have reached out to (SIN) Student Involvement Network. SIN is a program on campus that has the ability to provide email connections with many other programs throughout the University. Our goal is to have two specific coordinators through SIN, an international and a local student, both helping to recruit students using their resources and their connections with other programs on campus. If we are able to finance having more than just these two coordinators, then that is an option that we would like to explore. Having these specific coordinators will help give us better access to recruitment options to help our program have its full potential.

In addition to using SIN we would also like to utilize the help of other branches on campus that deal particularly with international student affairs. We hope that by getting involved with the English Language Institute (ELI), the students involved in this program will be interested in ours, as one of our plans is to eventually offer a tutoring program between local and international students. We are optimistic that through this partnership, local students and international students can improve their various language and communication skills.

The goal of our program is to offer international and local students a chance to create lasting friendships and to connect socially through some type of retreat. This retreat will either be offered at the beginning, middle, or end of the year. Through fundraising and help from the University, we would like to offer our program participates a trip that will really help international and local students to connect. This trip can either be to a national park or something small like a rafting trip. Overall this will help keep people interested and involved in our program that will enhance it all around.

**Conclusion**

The strength of the program we designed, Intercultural Competence Network, lies in its potential to lay a strong foundation for both domestic and international students to develop transnational competence within a fluid framework. The progression of the three stages of our programs, namely from the educational facet to the social facet to the civic facet. These stages parallel the natural progression of learning from knowledge to understanding to application. Housing our program within an existing, integrated network of organizations facilitates not only the collaborative environment we wish to build among existing campus efforts in intercultural learning, but also the largest and most effective outreach to the multitude of students we wish to move through our program at the University of Montana. The partnerships, endeavors, and future expansions of our program will mold a more open, communicative and enabling intercultural environment. It will aid the University of Montana and the Missoula community in putting intercultural interactions toward more effective mutual learning and growth. The
bonds participants and partners will forge through our program will hopefully aid in their future effective and meaningful participation in a globalizing world and marketplace.
UM documentation about physically co-locating student services related to internationalization from 1996, 2002-2005 and 2006

(see next page)
MEMORANDUM

TO: James E. Todd, Vice President, Administration and Finance

FROM: Mark W. Lusk, Director, International Programs

DATE: December 6, 1996

SUBJECT: Lodge Remodeling

Effie Koehn of Foreign Student and Scholar Services and I have been talking about one-stop shopping for international programs and support services. As you know, international programs are spread out all over campus, both physically and programmatically. As you plan the remodeling of the Lodge, please consider locating our two offices in an adjacent or integrated suite. Currently in International Programs there are four employees, two student employees, and one work study student.

Thank you for your consideration.

cc  E. Koehn, Foreign Student and Scholar Services
    Rosemary Keller, Business Services
possibilities for recruitment there, and use of limited funds for Asia travel are planned to follow up on President Dennison’s recent trip through Taiwan and Japan.

**Recommendation 9 – Re-establish an effective and user-friendly “International” button on the UM home page.**

Given the high cost of international student recruitment, it is essential that The University of Montana’s home page be effectively utilized to recruit foreign students. That the web page is a major means of access for recruiting students is evident in the English Language Institute’s recruiting—fully 30% of ELI recruiting come from the Internet. Virtually all incoming foreign students indicate that they have accessed the UM web site in their home country. International students have special needs, and the UM web page currently fails to meet those needs. Currently, prospective international students—who pay out-of-state fees—can only find information pertaining to their enrollment at UM under the “Prospective Students” button. For a non-native English speaker, the meaning of the word “prospective” is unclear, as is the navigation to find appropriate information to attend UM (application process, costs, etc.). A button titled “International” would link to a page that contains a greeting in several major languages and an array of information necessary for incoming foreign students—in essence a “one-stop” user-friendly site to attract and retain foreign student interest in UM. Currently, a subcommittee of the International Committee is meeting to establish a recommendation for the design of such an “International Page” to which an “International” button would link from the UM home page.

**Current Status.** Discussions with Ray Ford indicate that assistance will be provided to International Programs on establishing easier to follow paths through the Internet pages, but the UM home page will not be changed at this time. The discussion will continue to see what options exist. The IC’s Webpage Subcommittee consists of Becky Maier (Foreign Student and Scholar Services), Amy Baty (OIP), and Donovan Lylte (ELI – to be replaced due to Donovan’s departure). Suggested structure for the webpages has been documented and is now under review. See the report of 19 September 2001. MSU pages are also attached for reference to see what our “neighbors” are doing.

In the survey of incoming foreign students, Effie Koehn reports that the most important primary reason for coming is the academic program, with location the next most important reason. And these students find out about UM mostly through UM students, relatives, or friends and equally, through the Internet/UM Webpage. This highlights the importance of the webpage for our “marketing.”

**Recommendation 10 – Co-locate Foreign Student Services and International Programs.**

When space availability permits, it is important that the two major offices serving foreign students be located adjacent to each other – preferably in the Emma Lommasson Center. This would greatly facilitate coordination between the two units and provide foreign students and American students who plan to study abroad with “one-stop shopping.”

The hub of services provided by the two offices will form a locus for internationalization at UM. Should space become available, International Programs could move to the Emma Lommasson Center on a phased basis.
Current Status. Good communication and close working relationships may provide the necessary seamlessness at the present time. It is unlikely that the Lommasson Center could provide the flexible facilities required for project and grant management, even if space were available. Also, Foreign Student Services already requires more space.

Recommendation 11 – Create a Foreign Student Employment Incentive Program (FSEIP) in the UM Foundation that would offer international students the opportunity to earn money to help finance their education.

International students currently can accept only non-work study positions on campus. This largely means that they are confined to employment with Dining Services or Facilities Services, regardless of the particular talents or skills they may possess, and are greatly limited in what they can earn. If an endowment were created in the UM Foundation specifically for this purpose, matching funds could be made available as an incentive to encourage academic departments and other units on campus to hire qualified students. For example, $750 from such an endowment could be used to match $750 from a campus employer, providing $1,500 for each student. This would not only benefit financially needy students, but would also assist departments and other units by having them pay only 50% of actual wages.

Such a program also would have the added advantage of being used as an effective recruitment tool in attracting more foreign students to the University of Montana. With limited sources of existing financial aid and limited job opportunities for non-immigrant visa holders, the proposed program would benefit a larger number of students than a scholarship fund and would demonstrate our commitment to recruiting and retaining foreign students.

Potential donors for this specific program could include UM foreign alumni, American alumni working or living abroad, and businesses engaged in international trade. This recommendation has been made before by the 1997 International Planning Committee and established as a high priority by the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Current Status. This is a high priority that may be enhanced by project development work and increased participation by high-level officials from participating countries (e.g., Saudi Arabia). Meanwhile, the Capital Campaign at the Foundation has targeted Study Abroad as a priority for donations, and the needs assessment for International Programs (generated by the Foundation) shows a total of $1,330,000. A check on donations and commitments will be carried out and reported regularly.

SECTION IV - International Exchanges

The International Planning Committee concurs that new university-to-university linkages and exchanges should grow out of the needs identified in the current strategic planning process rather than out of the personal contacts of faculty members and administrators. The university is ill served by identifying prospective partners on the basis of idiosyncratic factors, because the success of an exchange hinges upon widespread support among faculty and students. The university runs the risk of alienating international partners if it cannot fulfill its promises and sustain a relationship over the long term.
Review and Recommendations for International Education and Programs

The University of Montana-Missoula

December 2006

Ad Hoc Committee for Review of International Programs
Appendix B

Review of Strategic Plan Recommendations from the 2002-2005 Plan

Recommendation 1. In order to accomplish its mission and the many assignments given to it, the Office of International Programs simply must be funded adequately.

Since the 2000-2005 Strategic Plan was written there has been improvement in the funding situation at the Office of International Programs and it is much more capable of fulfilling its obligations.

Funded at appropriate levels are a director, assistant director for budget and finance, a scholar and sponsored students manager, an assistant director for faculty exchange, an assistant director for study abroad, and two interim directors for ELI. These positions need to be continued as institutional responsibilities, but the problems noted five years ago are behind us. We also understand that the project assistant position is not fully funded and this situation should be examined and, if appropriate, full funding provided. In addition, the situation regarding ELI needs to be resolved in terms of permanent staffing for a director. This issue is complex given the discussions going on about whether or not ELI should be housed in an academic department, and if so, the source of salary for the director for the portion of salary supporting department teaching and other activities.

Recommendation 2. The Office of International Programs must be administratively located where it can best meet The University of Montana’s mission and aspiration for international education and where it will have the best opportunity to be nurtured, to be financially supported, to be accorded a status commensurate with its responsibilities, and to flourish.

The issue of where OIP should report has been raised in every review of International Programs over the past ten years. The most prominent suggestions that have been advanced are to have it report to the President, the Provost, or the Vice President for Research and Development. Currently it reports to the Vice President for Research and Development.

While any single reporting line will present some communication and collaboration challenges for a program that cuts across so many aspects of the University, it appears that the current home for OIP and its reporting to the Vice President for Research and Development is working reasonably well. This reporting arrangement has fostered increases in staff and base budget, it has allowed OIPs grant activities to be seamlessly imbedded in normal UM grant procedures and policies, and it has allowed OIP to engage
The notion of an International Student Services Coordinating Committee fits the need for seamless communication and collaboration identified in the discussion under recommendation two. At a minimum this committee should include the OIP Director and Assistant Directors, the Director of Foreign Student and Scholar Services, the Admissions Office Director and International Recruiter, and Director of the English Language Institute. Representation in the area of retention might also be advantageous. The purpose of such a committee is coordination of policies, procedures, activities, and information (much of which comes from external environments). Done well, coordination across these units will be invisible to students and faculty members as they receive all of the services they need from UM.

It appears at this time that the necessary level of coordination has yet to be achieved on campus even though there has been improvement over the past five years.

**Recommendation 5.** Create a coordinating committee to study external funding opportunities among a small group of key individuals from the campus.

Implementation of recommendation five has not been attempted to date.

**Recommendation 6.** Hire a full-time grant writer.

While this recommendation was not fulfilled, several persons have been engaged in grant writing. Otto Koester, particularly, has a substantial part of his time devoted to grant writing and coordination for OIP. Given the number and level of grants submitted and awarded, it might not be necessary to hire a full-time grant writer at this time. Still, it is important to ensure that funding for grant writing activities is on solid footing. Having some expertise regularly available in this area is necessary.

**Recommendation 7.** Establish a full-time position for international student recruiting.

The Office of Admissions has established this position.

**Recommendation 8.** Expand overseas travel for admissions recruiting

There has been a modest expansion in overseas recruiting.

**Recommendation 9.** Re-establish an effective and user-friendly “International” button on the UM home page.

The button on the UM home page has been re-established on the front page, but it diverts one to a page that is not particularly informative.

**Recommendation 10.** Co-locate Foreign Student and Scholar Services Services and International Programs.
This issue is noted above under recommendation two and it relates closely to recommendation four. It has yet to be achieved and might be quite difficult to achieve given facility limitations and the need for some of the critical units to be in close proximity to other units, not directly involved in international student issues. More important than physical location at this time is the recommendation for greater communication and collaboration discussed under recommendation four.

**Recommendation 11.** Create a Foreign Student Employment Incentive Program (FSEIP) in the UM Foundation that would offer international students the opportunity to earn money to help finance their education.

No progress to date, except to place it as a priority item for the current Capital Campaign. Without concerted effort and assignment of responsibility, however, having the item on the Campaign list is not likely to have much effect.

**Recommendation 12.** The IPC strongly reaffirms the existing protocol that requires that all university-to-university level partnerships must be approved by the International Committee, the Academic Officers, and the President.

While this is an endorsement rather than a recommendation, its fulfillment has been instrumental in obtaining considered judgment about appropriate partnerships. It is important to recognize that there are two kinds of agreements that often are involved in the international arena: Memoranda of Understanding that are general statements of collaboration and Memoranda of Agreement that spell out details and actions within an MOU. For both kinds of agreements UM needs to formalize a procedure for vetting possible international exchange partners. Commonly understood procedures have not always worked as they should and making the protocol clear in writing might aid the process.

**Recommendation 13.** The university should establish additional exchange partners in Europe, Australia, and Africa.

The list of University exchange partners for student, faculty and staff exchanges has expanded over the past five years and viable programs are being built. Some attention could be given to expanding the list further in areas such as Eastern Europe and countries that were part of the former Soviet Union.

**Recommendation 14.** Several recommendations for the English Language Institute

Previous problems with the administration of the ELI program that led to several specific recommendations have been addressed. ELI currently is a vibrant and financially sound program serving many students and reporting to one administrator.
International Risk Officer Job Description
Wake Forest University, posted June 2015

Summary:

Coordinates policies, procedures and programs associated with identifying, monitoring, and mitigating international risks for student, faculty, and staff travelers. Provides guidance to faculty, staff, and administrators on decisions that have export control impact.

Essential Functions:

International Risk, Health & Safety (75%)

Develops, implements, and revises policies and protocols designed to assess and mitigate risk to students, faculty and staff on WFU global programs across all academic units on the Reynolda campus (with support to the Bowman Gray campus as requested).

Conducts pre-departure training, in both individual and group format, for faculty, students, and staff travelling internationally.

Manages web-based registration software for international travel conducted on university funds.

Serves as contact for overseas crisis support involving WFU students, faculty, and staff; enables appropriate emergency response.

Monitors world events and keeps current of global health/safety issues and legal and regulatory developments that affect WFU global programs; updates Director accordingly.

Liaises with campus units (e.g. University Police, University Risk Services, etc.) and external entities (e.g. HTH Insurance) regarding practices and policies related to international risk, health and safety.

Export Control (25%)

Assists in the development and implementation of (a) institutional policy requirements regarding U.S. export control laws and regulations and (b) effective export control education and training programs.

Provides guidance, education, and training to faculty, staff and students on export control policies, procedures and federal regulations, including but not limited to: advising faculty and staff on foreign travel; assisting PIs and other individuals involved in the conduct and research in obtaining an understanding of the compliance issues associated with the transfer of materials, restrictions of foreign nationals in labs, publication restrictions, etc.; providing guidance with implementing technology control plans; purchasing controlled technology and securing of technical data; and financial procedures for foreign payments.

Uses web-based system as part of the University’s compliance efforts for commodity classifications, license applications, and other export control compliance obligation.

Prepares, submits, and monitors licensing authorizations and institutional registrations.

Other Functions:

Serves as member of Overseas Crisis Management Team.

Maintains and updates relevant content on University’s global and export control websites.

Gathers and provides data related to international risk and export control.
Reviews contracts/agreements and advises on export related issues arising in connection with these documents as needed; manages relationships with relevant vendors.

Acts as liaison and coordinator for export-related matters between the various research and regulatory offices within the University.

Required Education, Knowledge, Skills, Abilities:

Bachelor’s degree plus 3-5 years of progressively responsible experience in international education/risk-related field, or an equivalent combination or education and experience.

Familiarity with issues related to international travel and education abroad.

Ability to use good judgment and discretion in potentially stressful environment.

Ability to prioritize and work in fast-paced office environment.

Ability to collaborate and coordinate with key stakeholders across the university.

Excellent written, verbal, and interpersonal communication skills, with effective presentation and training skills.

Proficiency on Microsoft Office suite and standard computing operations.

Ability to interpret and ensure compliance with federal regulations.

Ability to travel, as required.

US citizen or permanent resident.

Preferred Education, Knowledge, Skills, Abilities:

Experience working, studying, or living in a foreign country.

Knowledge of relevant federal export control regulations, including those pursuant to EAR, ITAR, and OFAC, and the Patriot Act.

Familiarity with Terra Dotta/StudioAbroad and Visual Compliance software.

Experience in a research university environment.

Proficiency in a foreign language.

Accountabilities:

Responsible for own work only.

Note: This position profile identifies the key responsibilities and expectations for performance. It cannot encompass all specific job tasks that an employee may be required to perform. Employees are required to follow any other job-related instructions and perform job-related duties as may be reasonably assigned by his/her supervisor.

In order to provide a safe and productive learning and living community, Wake Forest University conducts background investigations and drug screens for all final staff candidates being considered for employment.

Wake Forest seeks to recruit and retain a diverse workforce, and encourages qualified candidates across all group demographics to apply.

Position Type
Full-Time/Regular
**ALSS Question 1: Where does primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mansfield Center</strong></th>
<th>• Responsibility for internationalization lies with whoever makes the decisions on requiring foreign language courses for all UM students. ASCRC? Faculty Senate? ASUM? • It seems our system is built to maintain the status quo - not support change. • Fractured structure means if one body vetoes an initiative, it doesn’t go further.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of International Programs</strong></td>
<td>• AA and SA/OIP, GLI, OSS, Admissions, Mansfield Ctr, schools/colleges, FSSS (group agreed upon) • UM’s structure is analogous and arrangements are not as effective as they could be. Most “FSSS” functions are under the umbrella of “OIP”s at other universities. • The separation of FSSS from OIP is strange. Leads to duplication and challenges. • The use of the word “foreign” instead of “international” is a negative. • Also, having international admissions functioning in Enrollment Services, outside of OIP, creates challenges. OIP should handle all admissions related to ELI, international undergraduate and graduate applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15</strong></td>
<td>• Faculty initiative – for items like collaborative research. • GLI. • International Programs did an inventory of international education at the university which was helpful. • GLI took some of the “energy and clarity” away from internationalization – it’s foggy where the authority / structure lies. • Sustainability fellows at college of forestry has been incredibly effective. • The authority (for internationalization) should be in oip rather than in different colleges. • An individual should be responsible to keep track of study abroad support and disseminate it to the campus community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15</strong></td>
<td>• Responsibility lies with the Provost who is the boss of the OIP director. However, initiatives for internationalization come through the faculty that need the endorsement of the leadership • The International Committee (IC) is responsible for reviewing and recommending MOUs with potential partner institutions but more coordination is needed between IC and OIP in following up on those agreements • Several faculty shared experiences working with former OIP directors which they characterized as informal and ineffective. Sometimes also showing gender bias and giving preferential treatment to visiting delegations from particular countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Provost</strong></td>
<td>The Office of International Programs – OIP has many cooperative arrangements (e.g. FSSS, admissions, etc.). There are many parts to OIP’s operation – travel registration, risk management, recruitment, etc. The admissions office is responsible to evaluate and admit international students. Other programs are scattered across campus – Central and Southwest Asian Studies Center, Mansfield Center, etc. The University’s commitment to international education is expressed, at least in part, by having an Office of International Programs. Effectiveness of international education is ultimately determined by how the various units that perform international education functions collaborate and cooperate. Things fall between the cracks and certainly don’t work perfectly but stream-lining has occurred and things (communication) is getting better. Metrics can be used to gauge to determine internationalization effectiveness (e.g.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enrollment of international students). Qualitative metrics can be used to gauge effectiveness as well.

| Office for Academic Enrichment | • Structurally needs to be housed in one location (eg. OIP) o How does IE3, Academic Enrichment, Peace Corps recruiting, etc. fit? ♠ Many of these should be housed under Provosts Office, so that they get more traction ♦ Clearer link to academics • But, definitely needs also to be responsibility of each campus unit department/college) o Which would require stronger ties and greater coordination o Advisors / faculty in every school ♠ Responsible for communicating upstream/downstream ♠ Members of an International Council ♠ Could help train other faculty ♠ Allows for greater efforts for avoiding duplication (eg. how many programs do we need to any particular Latin American country? Seems like we have too many exchange programs going there, as well as faculty-led programs) • Need to advise students better (no-one is controlling central information) ♠ Little guidance as what is legitimate (particularly with external exchange partners, ISEP, etc.), what’s safe, and what credits will transfer back to UM ♠ This is obviously not a problem with faculty-led programs. |
| Human Resource Services |  |
| Enrollment Services | • OIP is the driving force • It must be from the top down, from the President. ♦ Everyone has a stake in this – faculty, departments, etc. ♦ International Programs is the driving force – academic departments and offices don’t necessarily have familiarity with challenges that international students face (e.g. student credits, foreign educational systems, etc.). |
| Global Leadership Initiative | • Within the administration, ultimate implementation responsibility lies with the Associate Provost & the Deans. Internationalization can’t be achieved without academics being front and center. Internationalization can’t be a vacuum from centralized offices, but instead needs to be front and center in the Colleges and Schools. • The centralized offices (OIP, FSSS, GLI) should all report to the Associate Provost, including budgetary responsibility. ♦ These offices are not academic units, and this proves challenging when interdisciplinary programs are being pursued. |
| Graduate School |  |
| School of Extended & Lifelong Learning |  |
| Student Affairs Officers | • Collaborative model makes it a positive for the institution. ♦ If one location, you wouldn’t get input, collaboration and commitment that is currently the case. ♦ Partnerships across campus more valuable than one-stop location. ♦ President’s Cabinet – leaders of all University sectors. ♦ Institutional articulation of commitment to internationalization. Must be articulated as a clear value (and budgeted for) if it’s to truly become a priority. ♦ More should lie within Student Affairs : housing, dining, recreation, disability, health – intl students served at the 11th hour. There is a definite need to keep academic needs of intl students one place and the co-curricular student life needs of intl students in student affairs. Students only spend 30% of their time doing academic related things. Student affairs can ♦ If we meet students’ basic needs
they can be more successful. Advocacy for student affairs being more involved in services to international students. • Importance of responsibility across the administration for internationalization • Make argument that this is important at the State level and for Montanans. All MUS institutions should be required to focus on internationalization. Need support of legislature and BOR... Lobby for State support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SOBA has named Nader S. as the focal point for internationalization in that college. That has made a big difference for SOBA and international activity has increased as a result. SOBA’s accrediting body was favorably impressed that UM was participating in the ACE iLAB process. • A central point to coordinate safety, travel, security is desirable. Dispersed coordination of travel is complicated. • Travel policy has started this processs. • Faculty led programs – deans can’t drive them. Units should have a global picture of what’s going on. Let it happen where it makes sense. • As university, we can’t be everywhere – this is changing, we need to refocus our partnerships and areas of focus – we should bring it down to about 25 places where we can build meaningful relationships • Travel registry a big improvement. There still needs to be more awareness / information sharing so that everyone knows what’s going on and celebrate that (or not) • There needs to be a more attention paid to what and how these things are funded. What students are paying for... we only tend to deal with things when something goes wrong. We could be on the front end of some issues. Lots of diversity in international activity how it is organized and funded – that is OK but it could come back to bite UM. It’s out there and it’s a potentially dangerous thing. • Through lens of support for students: FSSS, OIP, Admissions, others tend to compete with academic advising when international students arrive (often late because of visa issues) – this is not the best transition for students – need for coordination. • For students studying abroad, how to plan the experience without sacrificing on-time graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Advising Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Currently, primary responsibility seems to lie with OIP. But, there is a problem with not having a more unified/collectivized system with all units in one location. That is, student services, recruiting, marketing, etc. could all benefit from being under one umbrella (fusion of ideas and energy). Each is not as sophisticated as the others, and not always aware of the policies of the others. Silos have been created, perhaps reflecting funding lines. • The current structure creates confusion for students, not knowing where they are supposed to go and sometimes having to go to two or three different offices to get the answers/support they need. • Space is always an issue, and being in one location would be better. Symbolism is important and a one-stop-shop would be seen as prioritizing and raising the profile of international activities. • Erasmus (European Credit Transfer System) / Bologna Process provides an important model: o A credit is a credit is a credit o Staff on each campus have similar credentials o Tuition is less of a hindrance to international learning o Big business for tourism (eg. youth hostels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Primary responsibility lies with Academic Affairs (Admissions, OSS, OIP, Mansfield Center, GLI, individual colleges and schools) and Student Affairs (FSSS). • The main challenge with the current model is coordination. Lack of coordination is an obstacle, and creates inefficiencies. • In the past, foreign student support was always strong – OIP started out smaller but has caught up. It is weird that now FSSS and OIP coexist. • If FSSS and OIP merged, that would create more synergy and effectiveness for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the role of an international officer be created within each college and school? This would strengthen coordination and communication lines to ensure community wide awareness, synergy, and mutual support (addressed in the next question). At other institutions, associate deans/other administrators play this role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIP should be the centralized organizer of all international initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure there is primary responsibility, although some would say Paulo. Should be cross-campus, show be coordinated and publicized that it is central o Confusion at the moment as to where students go (eg. incoming international students don’t go to OIP for financial problems, outgoing exchange students might not get assistance through financial aid, etc.) o New Student scholarships offered to international students: who made this decision?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts are donor driven so ultimately the foundation doesn’t have much of a say in how narrow or broad the terms of a gift/scholarships can be. Fundraising is unit-specific, unit-driven. Development directors create opportunities that the UMF supports. If internationalization made priority across campus this would enhance UMF’s ability to raise money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UM Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Claudine started out by naming OIP, Mansfield Ctr, FSSS, OSS, and Admissions, plus the schools/colleges and asked people to add their perspectives.) Responsibility lies with the UM President. He sets the strategic directions for our campus. Also, the Graduate School. Within Student Affairs, FSSS is not the only unit that is responsible for internationalization - Residence Life, UM Dining, the UC, Curry Health Center, SAIT, and Campus Recreation all play proactive roles in the internationalization of campus. (ex. by hiring international students, serving halal meat, etc.) Foreign Student and Scholar Services, as part of the Division of Student Affairs, has been effective in meeting the needs of international students and moving towards the goal of internationalizing the University of Montana campus. Student Affairs has a great deal of experience in working with special student populations (i.e. Native Americans, veterans, and students with disabilities) and that expertise is seamlessly available to Foreign Student and Scholar Services. For students in their non-academic life, the Division of Student Affairs is a critical sector as it embraces important services (e.g., housing, dining, counseling, health care, recreation, etc.) and develops informed approaches to problem solving. Additionally, FSSS work with other campus units and sound working relationships with colleagues across campus has insured a coordinated effort in successfully meeting the needs of foreign students and scholars and integrating them into the campus community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Student and Scholar Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of OPBA is the university’s ‘official’ for data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ALSS Question 2: What are the communication or coordination lines to ensure community wide awareness, synergy and mutual support?**

<p>| Mansfield Center | • Internationalization is a 2-way process - UM reps going abroad and then hosting visitors in Missoula. • Mansfield Center does a lot of community outreach, throughout the State actually via community organizations, economic development groups, retired military groups, legislators, etc. • How could on-campus communication about Mansfield Ctr activities be coordinated? How can we get a list of people who are visiting campus from abroad at any given moment? Conversely, can we create a system to identify UM-related people in any given country abroad? This would prove immensely valuable and create very valuable synergy. |
| Office of International Programs | • People have worked hard to communicate and coordinate given the current structure. This is time intensive and many things could be automated/made more efficient if streamlined. • Coordination has improved of late. • Frequency of communication does not mean more effective communication. • There is lots of confusion amongst students about what office does what. |
| Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15 | |
| Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15 | |
| Office of the Provost | • Global Gateway, and with other members in the community (e.g. Mansfield Center). • Synergy and coordinate occurs because the University is such a dominant and visible member of the community. • Channels or ‘open’ and communication occurs and a number of activities occur each year. • New relationships constantly pop-up • MOLLI courses have been particularly effective, its content has included a lot of international focus. • OIP is the hub (of communication) – there are other actors / participants across campus • Would be interesting to see information about how familiar new students are with international-related services |
| Office for Academic Enrichment | We need to provide Central One-Stop Shop for students • They won’t generally go out of their way to attend information sessions • Tie study abroad into degree, make it relevant • UM currently has too much programming of international activities, overprogrammed • Too much is top-down/administrator-driven, and not grass-roots organized • Questionable relevancy or connection to students &amp; their studies • Not well coordinated, not well prioritized • Little link to UM strategic plan • Not well communicated to students (why else would we bother, if students don’t attend?) • Too many emails, students may not see OIP as relevant |
| Human Resource Services | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Services</th>
<th>Global Leadership Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There has been more communication / coordination in recent times among OIP, FSSS, International Recruiting, but it is still problematic having them in different administrative units. • There needs to be a clearly identified university committee to oversee and co-ordinate international activities. It is currently not clear this is the International Committee’s role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Extended &amp; Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health center example – coordination could be improved so all parts of campus can better prepare to welcome international students (the example given was that of Saudi students arriving at Curry Health Center for their student health requirements and Curry staff being unprepared to address some cultural issues that arose.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• MOLLI program has been successful. There are 16 MOLLI students going to Vienna this summer. Great on several levels. We offer 6 wk program for students, but 2 wk sessions for anyone. Program has grown. MOLLI folks become another group of chaperones – interaction between MOLLI students and younger students is very valuable. Imparting different information to younger students. Added value to younger students. Development of relationships is very enriching for all. Fundraising opportunities for CVPA from MOLLI students who become committed to supporting undergraduate student experiences. • Sometimes intl groups come on campus. Are we able to take advantage of them? Humphrey Fellows are an example. Could they visit classes, etc? Library invites them to talk to Library staff about their countries of origin, work and experience. • Do we collect data from students on their experience at UM? We can speculate on what their needs are but we could ask them what they think. Does FSSS do this? It would be helpful to look at that data. • When we bring international students to campus, do we bring in the Native American story? There are parallels between formal nations that live within the state who have integration issues – parallel to as part of orientation, should we include part of the US native American story?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate Advising Center • Orientation is an example of good co-operation (OIP, FSSS, OSS all working together) • Advising is an example of lesser co-operation (Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Admissions all doing something different) • There would be value in developing a campus-wide international directory, similar to that which the Vets Office has developed. There could also be Regional guides (eg. if a student is from Southeast Asia), focusing particularly on their needs • Departments and programs need people who can advise incoming international students, particularly for departments and programs that teach international students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• They are fractured. • Communication and coordination are two different things. Communication between OIP and FSSS has improved recently. Coordination has not followed to the same degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-led Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is no synergy or mutual support. • Total lack of communication, although that seems to be improving. • Sort of tradition in MCLL to conduct faculty led study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors 5.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Student and Scholar Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
festival is well-established in the campus and community and yearly attracts over 3,500 attendees, making it one of the largest non-sporting public events at UM and in Missoula. The Festival generates a lot of awareness and good-will on campus and in the community for international students. The UM International Month places a month-long focus during the month of March on UM’s many international activities with lectures, presentations. Many units on campus collaborate to offer relevant activities and programs. Coordination of these events is carried out by OIP. amongst offices and units that have functions related to internationalization.

**ALSS Question 3: What are the staffing arrangements and reporting lines? How well are they working?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansfield Center</th>
<th>● Different offices reporting to different VPs follow different practices and direction from above. Inefficient.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of International Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Academic Enrichment</td>
<td>● Too much emphasis on OIP initiatives (eg. exchange programs) and not enough on other university opportunities. Unclear why that is the case, and why exchange programs reflect UM priorities. Unclear how those exchanges reflect college/degree priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>● The lines lie with Paulo and his role as the Assoc. Provost for Global Education. ● All positions report to Paulo. “I’m it” (Lou Laakso) in regard to international admissions except for some functions performed by Marja (and her admission of int’l students from partner universities and ISEP). ● International student admissions should go over to International Programs, especially since international student recruitment is now there. ● The admissions and evaluation function should stay together, but maybe more than 1 person should be able to perform both of those duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>● There are questions of inefficiencies with some personnel overlapping in duties. For other administrators and for students and faculty, this can be confusing. While UM has need of specialized knowledge bases, there is potentially duplication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>The graduate school has a lot of supervision if the IIP program and the Peace Corps (Global Youth Development) grad program. ● Collaboration with FSSS, and their DSO services. ● Incoming international students with foreign (academic) credentials, such</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as a foreign transcript, can have it evaluated/translated by an outside agency (WES) and submit it with their application. They (the student) are responsible for that cost.

- For students who don’t use WES the evaluation can sometimes be done in-house (at UM).
- The language of instruction at the foreign institution determines if the student must take a GRE or not. If the student needs must take a TOEFL then they can submit that score in lieu of a GRE.
- How well is it working? It all depends on the respective graduate program and how responsive they are. How well their systems are developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Extended &amp; Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Don’t even know what the staff reporting lines are. • What is the University’s plan for internationalization? • Decision-making is slow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Affairs Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Advising Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For students, who does what is very confusing. They don’t care about the administrative structure. An example is the onerous and confusing study abroad application process, that discourages students from completing and submitting study abroad applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.4.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • In terms of faculty, MCLL doesn’t have enough faculty to be offering FLSAP on a regular basis AND teach courses at UM on a regular basis. MCLL is not filling faculty lines fast enough to ensure study abroad program frequency and quality. Currently, faculty ask themselves, “Who will teach UM courses if I go away for a semester?”
• Some FLSAP offerings have disappeared others have been scaled down to shorter periods of time. (e.g. semester to Wintersession, or summer course. Uncertainty about Wintersession schedule adds more instability to FLSAP planning for the future.
• Shorter periods abroad give students exposure to another country/culture but don’t necessarily help them acquire fluency in another language
• When UM students go abroad for a semester, whether on FLSAP or via ISEP or at a partner university, numbers decline in MCLL classrooms. This is detrimental to the department. Is there a way to enroll students spending time abroad in mountain campus classes to account for them as language majors?
• General decline in study abroad programs correlates with a decline in language majors. Spending time abroad is decisive in a student’s choice of language as a major. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Faculty leaders do everything. Host families, students, money, etc. Kept detailed expense records and submitted all to BS and they seem to think some money is left in account when there is none. People in BS don’t understand complexities of going abroad/exchange rates, etc.
• DHC works through EF tours (DHC staff wasn’t going to handle anything) for logistics.
• Does Business Services (BS) tell faculty what they’re supposed to do when leading programs?
• BS very difficult to work with. Things have improved lately. Serious issues w/BS: refusal to pay bills to sponsoring organizations (70K!) delays in payment – deans have had to get involved, to get BS moving. Study abroad on campus very entrepreneurial – compared to BS which moves much more |
slowly. Hurts relationships with partners, recruitment of students, etc. • Contracted
services agreements need to be very clear, but even when very clear there tend to
be service breakdowns. • SOBA does one trip that uses a contractor for logistics. Other
trips faculty-led to try to keep the costs low so students can participate. Kathy White
helps out. Concern about new requirements from BS about providing receipts for all
meals. • Naming of indexes used to pay for these trips – there are various
funding/contracting/payment models on campus. • Switch from per diem to receipt-
based expense reporting will put faculty at a disadvantage when they are not paid for
doing this. Same for graduate students. Small incentive. UM one of the few
universities that doesn’t give per diem • A number of different models, where faculty
do everything, to people outsource logistics, make contracted agreements, etc. but the
costs go up for the students. • DHC programs advised not to compete with other UM
programs… created Ireland course and coordinated with another faculty member’s
Italy course to offer every other year (complementary). Now there are a gazillion
Ireland trips.

Financial Aid
• Why does FSSS have so many staff? Are they duplicating duties in other
departments (eg. human resources, residential life, student clubs, etc.?)

Business Services

UM Foundation

Foreign Student and Scholar Services
FSSS reports to the Division of Student Affairs. As stated above, this situation is
particularly beneficial to our students because all non-academic services are easily
accessible within the same division.

ALSS Question 4: What governance structures support internationalization? How well
are they working?

Mansfield Center

Office of International Programs
• Intl committee; intl student coordinating committee; Academic Officers; President’s
Cabinet are groups that meet and can make recommendations about matters related
to internationalization (Cabinet ultimately approves University Policies) • Faculty
Senate wields a lot of power concerning internationalization. ASCRC, General
Education Committee, Writing Committee, Grad Council - all have the power to
approve or reject plans that would directly support or hinder internationalization
(English language proficiency requirements; writing requirements; course and program
development, etc.) • ASUM also wields strong influence as evidenced by its rejection
of the notion that students should have a second language requirement (when did this
happen?)

Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15

Campus-wide faculty
<p>| Office for Academic Enrichment | • Staffing needs to follow priorities if internationalization is truly a UM / College priority then more staff &amp; faculty. Part-time, temporary students who work with international activities don’t understand or respect faculty, and this is hurting forward progress. • Each college ‘owns’ and manages academic programs and courses. • The International Committee needs greater emphasis on academic leadership and strategic oversight and less on ‘busy work’. |
| Human Resource Services | |
| Enrollment Services | |
| Global Leadership Initiative | • The Associate Provost has presence at the Academic Officer’s meetings, so his voice is there, but is he active on other university committees (e.g., ASCRC, Grad. Council, Research &amp; Creative Scholarship)? • In particular, oversight of academic programs (International Development Studies, International Conservation and Development, International Business Program, Global Public Health, Global Youth Development) needs to be separated from OIP and have more campus-wide, academic coordination. • The International Committee could have bigger input and impact from Deans &amp; Faculty, as it is currently dominated by OIP. |
| Graduate School | |
| School of Extended &amp; Lifelong Learning | • Everything we do is ‘reactive’, not proactive planning. • What sort of commitment or support to an effort is leadership putting in place? Is it consistent? • The internationalization of online education and the chance for that (online education) to help internationalize the University. • Understanding how to negotiate the online space is a key to internationalization, which is how students communicate today. Online is contemporary. • What’s working well? • Bringing structure to international education at the university. What sort of support do you have to implement and enforce certain requirements? • The more strongly something is worded, the better. When the units read those messages it’s clear. It’s not an academic freedom issue. |
| Student Affairs Officers | • Diversity Advisory Council’s role? (featuring students/performers at meetings? T. Branch) |
| Academic Officers | |
| Undergraduate Advising Center | • Don’t know much about the International Committee. Indicative of silos and a lack of staff representation. |
| International Committee | • No formal governance structure of UM (faculty senate, staff senate, ASUM) directly supports internationalization. • The International Committee has an advisory role but no real power. • GLI committees are new and support internationalization. • The OIP-FSSS-OSS coordination committee supports internationalization |
| Faculty-led | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Directors 5.4.15</th>
<th>• ASCRC does not support internationalization. • Trying to get appropriate number of credits for a course, getting permanent course numbers, getting cross-listing, showing certain numbers of contact hours, etc. Permanent course numbers being eliminated and replaced by bag numbers “this will kill study abroad”. Students can only take a certain number of bag courses. This will look bad on their transcript if they want to apply to grad school. • Some guidance on credits would be useful. • Flexibility within schools and colleges. SOBA teach 3+3. Dean won’t pay more for more work. If there was a set policy where faculty were paid a prorated amount,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15</td>
<td>• Not clear what they are. o Does Faculty Senate have a committee focused on internationalization? o Does Staff Senate have a committee focused on internationalization? o Does ASUM have a committee focused on internationalization? o Should there be a campus-wide governance committee for internationalization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>• Decentralized structure for faculty-led study abroad programs. UM sorely needs to centralize and structure processes for developing and conducting these programs. This does not mean that faculty will lose any freedom in creating their programs but it will allow UM to standardize practices related to these programs and reduce liability faculty may unknowingly create for the institution through these programs. Currently, people are “going rogue” “under the radar” and this is not an ideal situation! Anecdotally, people have asked “what’s the story with this program, should I send my child on it” when no one should have to seek out the back story on a UM-sponsored program - all information should be thorough and transparent through OIP. • UM does not provide the type of support that other universities provide to visiting scholars and students in the form of HOUSING and MEALS. We cannot invite people to UM because we can’t provide free, comfortable housing to them. We cannot ensure that they will have a meal plan in the summer months. Therefore, we can’t bring as many people to campus as we potentially could, and we can’t reciprocate with other universities that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Student and Scholar Services</td>
<td>With many units on campus, both academic and non-academic, that play a critical role in achieving the goals of campus internationalization, to centralize or not are not viable options. Instead, the matrix management organization structure would be of best fit as it would recognize UM’s context of collective engagement and responsibility, making the academic, support and service units effectively engaged in the process of internationalization. Under this model, the essential elements would be communication and coordination with direct collaborative crosswalks among contributors. OIP would be the unit to oversee implementation of this model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALSS Question 5: What policies or practices (related to this subcommittee) hinder internationalization efforts at this institution?**

| Mansfield Center | • Decentralized structure for faculty-led study abroad programs. UM sorely needs to centralize and structure processes for developing and conducting these programs. This does not mean that faculty will lose any freedom in creating their programs but it will allow UM to standardize practices related to these programs and reduce liability faculty may unknowingly create for the institution through these programs. Currently, people are “going rogue” “under the radar” and this is not an ideal situation! Anecdotally, people have asked “what’s the story with this program, should I send my child on it” when no one should have to seek out the back story on a UM-sponsored program - all information should be thorough and transparent through OIP. • UM does not provide the type of support that other universities provide to visiting scholars and students in the form of HOUSING and MEALS. We cannot invite people to UM because we can’t provide free, comfortable housing to them. We cannot ensure that they will have a meal plan in the summer months. Therefore, we can’t bring as many people to campus as we potentially could, and we can’t reciprocate with other universities that |
| Office of International Programs |
roll out the red carpet when our faculty and students go visit them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15</th>
<th>• Many do not understand what it means to internationalize the campus. Internationalization is perceived as idiosyncratic, usually with one faculty member pushing for a particular program. When that faculty member leaves so does the program -- it is a moving target.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15</td>
<td>• Financial requirements at the state and federal levels can dissuade participation in internationalization efforts. • Many activities are ‘informal’ • Silo-ed administrative structure does not help. Certain units don’t recognize international content as supportive / essential. • We don’t have the necessary levels of financial support to internationalize. UM has the lowest per student level of any flagship institution in the country. • If we had greater financial resources we could apply them to: • Student retention and recruitment • Support for UM students to study abroad • Support for faculty international experiences • The Yamaguchi gift the School of Business Administration helps to support international efforts. • The University is ‘open to travel’ – the Department of State is the only restriction. • Internationalization is prominent in our strategic plan and brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>• Financial requirements at the state and federal levels can dissuade participation in internationalization efforts. • Many activities are ‘informal’ • Silo-ed administrative structure does not help. Certain units don’t recognize international content as supportive / essential. • We don’t have the necessary levels of financial support to internationalize. UM has the lowest per student level of any flagship institution in the country. • If we had greater financial resources we could apply them to: • Student retention and recruitment • Support for UM students to study abroad • Support for faculty international experiences • The Yamaguchi gift the School of Business Administration helps to support international efforts. • The University is ‘open to travel’ – the Department of State is the only restriction. • Internationalization is prominent in our strategic plan and brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Academic Enrichment</td>
<td>• Top-down initiatives from senior administration impedes/squashes enthusiasm and creativity by academic programs, particularly if a one-size-fits-all approach is implemented • Senior administration need to emphasize greater communication with campus leadership, such as Dean’s offices and faculty o There may be a sense that OIP makes decisions and imposes them on campus, which isn’t helpful or encouraging. • Don’t endorse/adopt user-pays systems (whereby the students or programs end up paying for centralized services) o Students are turned-off, can’t afford these systems, and many are excluded by higher costs to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Services</td>
<td>• The President has his vision but not exactly clear what the actual plan is. • Need to make sure everyone has bought into it (the vision). • The university’s commitment and vision in regard to internationalization is to be welcoming to students and ‘make it easy’ (their experience here, not referring to academics). • The University would benefit from more cultural sensitivity training – a series of interrelated workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>• The President has his vision but not exactly clear what the actual plan is. • Need to make sure everyone has bought into it (the vision). • The university’s commitment and vision in regard to internationalization is to be welcoming to students and ‘make it easy’ (their experience here, not referring to academics). • The University would benefit from more cultural sensitivity training – a series of interrelated workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>• It’s difficult for graduate students to go abroad because they’re tied to research, which doesn’t necessary lend to the ability to study abroad. • Some programs do have research sites overseas (e.g. Forestry). • A ‘leave of absence’ form is required to maintain enrollment, which some students forget about and are dropped. • The graduate school is understaffed for any duties other than admission and graduation. • If more resources were made available (to the graduate school) they’d be used for purposes such as to enhance collaboration for international student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recruitment. • Some programs are more efficient than others in regard to making admissions decisions. • Laurie Drake (in the Honors College) has a list of scholarships that accept international students. • There is a “low acceptance rate” of international students – data shows there are a lot of applications from international students. From application to admission, however, there is a challenge (especially in regard to finances). This is not a discriminatory practice against international student applicants, however, it’s just about the limited number of assistantships that are available. • Federal funding for research, which in the past supported many international students, has decreased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Extended &amp; Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For students coming from abroad, (Brazilian science mobility program) – they spend time in ELI then move on to regular science courses. Difficulty in the fact that TOEFL scores don’t translate to ability to do well in coursework. Scientific terms – steep learning curve. Variable experiences for students. Which courses are at appropriate level for these students? Translate their academic experience into ours, placement in courses where they can succeed. Better standardization / analysis where we can better place these students, so they have a good experience, go back, more come. • Non-science side – SOJ experience of students who pass TOEFL but can’t do writing courses. Debating whether to establish a certain standard – in-house support? Program relies heavily on self-expression and ability to step outside of cultural boxes – • With Math there has been a renaissance of taking background while taking basic math, for foreign students could we make a one credit experience to supplement vocab and expressive arts at the same time that they take these challenging courses. Could ELI provide this? • Writing center (Gretchen) might serve as a bridge and develop some sort of seminar that could work. • Are we selecting the wrong students? Does our screening process need to change to select engagement, language skills, etc. • Pharmacy does a selection – not sure that’s the only solution. • The one or zero credit seminar (required) to facilitate transition seems like a good idea. • LAW: ABA requires that students have 4 year degree. They do admit some students but this causes difficulties in the classroom (18 yr olds in class with older more experienced students). • Bridge program discussed with Sandy Ross and Joe Hickman and Peter Baker for Iraqi student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Advising Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incoming and outgoing programs aren’t unified. Could be unified under banner of internationalized learning. • Little informing and/or education on internationalization to domestic students, could be particularly impactful on first year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No policies or practices either hinder or encourage internationalization. Resource limitations are the key issue. • Is the organic/grassroots development of international initiatives that is typical of UM a hindrance in itself? • Policies and practices are not very even across the schools and colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We need BANNER to facilitate/support accounting for students abroad vs. students on campus. • Bureaucracy – changes in Business Services policies (mandated by federal and state laws, BOR) – workload associated with reporting travel expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
abroad programs because it is a good advertising to potential students. Students might qualify for financial aid for SAP even if don’t typically qualify… Luanne responsible to give an accounting to student IF student asks. • In regard to inviting international faculty: Tough because don’t get paperwork ahead of time – don’t know what treaties, agreements, etc. available. Need info for payment: visa, passport, w8ben,; have to look at visa type to see if they are eligible to receive payment. Changing situations with countries – so is often different. To what extent and how does their presence contribute to institutional internationalization? Sometimes state policy for travel is more stringent than federal policies… [reimbursement for anyone at UM]. Need receipts for everything – even for the $36 that is allowed ahead of time. GREAT, but hard to handle – logistics get tricky at times!! • Study Abroad for UM: need more stream-lined practices. How about international students at UM? Hardest part is communication to the student that he/she needs to hit the button to register. Even third-party payment – students still need to pay fees… • Struggle with UM students going abroad – because it’s handled by the department. Get requests for 1098T for tax purposes. Only find out if students have financial aid. Communication is totally lacking between BS and the SAPs. Reporting issues with tuition and fees. Always in the dark. So many different programs – hard to have a policy that is applicable to all campus programs?? How well are they working? • Need to give Business Services access to info about study abroad programs or send them periodic reports about those programs. Information that business services needs about study abroad programs includes: the name of the program, dates of program, credits, cost, detailed budget, participant list. • Business services needs information about study abroad programs because it impacts student bills and student financial aid packages. • If there is an emergency that might impact a study abroad program let business services know – that information might be necessary to modify a student’s financial aid package and refunds. • Business needs to know how faculty are supported to administer the program – how program fees and/or tuition are redirected to pay for faculty administration of the program • Business services needs to receive detailed information about study abroad programs – detailed budgets with all the budget lines (tuition, fees, etc.). Budget services needs this information because they have a fiduciary responsibility to provide students with detailed information about how their payments are being applied at the University. • There does not seem to be any coordination between what students are paying for in regard to study abroad programs and registration. • There doesn’t seem to be any standardization of how study abroad is administered – it seems to be very reactionary/rushed. • Students sometimes come to business services to pay their bills but there is little context about the specific bill that they’re paying for. • There needs to be some sort of standardized mechanism to provide business services with detailed information about study abroad programs on a regular basis and not immediately before a program is scheduled to start. • Business services should not receive information about study abroad programs immediately before the program starts when a student comes in to pay their bill – they need to have that information far in advance. • There are significant tax implications for students in regard to their participation in study abroad programs – paid tuition can be counted towards a tax credit. This information is reflected in the 1098T form. • The study abroad office or faculty leading study abroad trips should tell students to contact business services prior to their trip – not immediately before but weeks
This is important to make sure their bills are paid and their financial aid packages are updated. • There seems to be a lack of clarity of direction about the ability for students participating in study abroad to receive financial aid support and/or modify their financial aid package. • Another reason why business services needs detailed information about study abroad in general and faculty led study abroad specifically is because they need to know when and how to distribute funds. They don’t want students, staff or faculty to get into a situation in which they don’t have access to funds needed to participate in a program.

UM Foundation

• Motor pool policy that doesn’t allow children in UM vehicles - excludes foreign scholars and students with family members from participating in FSSS field trips. It should be noted that FSSS is required by J-1 regulations to expose its exchange visitors to opportunities where they can learn and appreciate American culture and society. Many who are here with family members wish to include them in educational fieldtrips; yet, the lack of easy access to larger vehicles that can include family members (children) makes this requirement cost prohibitive, as hiring a bus for the day costs a minimum of $700 and there is no budget for this. This is an example of how a rule based on saving money for potential tort claims against the University has had an undue negative impact on one population we serve. • Residence Life and Dining Services schedules at the beginning and end of each semester need to better accommodate foreign students in their transition to the University and at departure times. For example, for Spring Semester the new international students arrive seven to ten days before the start of the semester in order to attend new foreign student orientation, but there are very limited dining options, especially in the evening. At the end of spring semester, many international students, especially exchange students, are stressed trying to depart the day after finals since they must vacate their dorm rooms. • Limited financial aid and lack of an on-campus work-study program for foreign students. Such financial constraints hinder us in the recruitment and retention of high caliber foreign students. • All UM international students and J-1 scholars are required to carry health insurance. However, the cost of UM’s Blue Cross-Blue Shield student health insurance of $1,508 per semester is prohibitive.

Office of Planning, Budgeting and Analysis

Coming up with official definitions – data analysis and collection relies on official, established definitions to ensure integrity. A number might be published but it might not match with how offices define and report students #s • Efforts to standardize reporting and provide training (about reporting) are underway by the Office – 4committees have been established, each with specific areas of focus. Similar to the ‘mod’ squad, which is a committee for ‘functional uses’ of banner • A data governance policy will help colleagues follow the same policies • Processes in regard to the collection of data about study abroad have not been determined – the data collection and analysis model being launched for international students will be a helpful model for study abroad students • Processes in regard to the collection of data about international faculty have not been determined – the data collection and analysis model being launched for international students will be a helpful model for international faculty • ‘international’ is the 1st official (student) designation being tested...it will include information about ‘country of origin’, ‘visa’, and ‘country of citizenship’ – this is getting finalized for AY 15/16 • There are significant differences
between what OPBA publishes and what others (e.g. FSSS) publish. Need to determine processes to capture students in special programs, such as summer program students.

**ALSS Question 6: Does the institution gather information on the attitudes of staff (all non-faculty employees) toward international learning? If so, how is this information used?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Center</td>
<td>• Not until today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of International Programs</td>
<td>• No, but it should. If it did, we could use this information to create a strategic plan for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Academic Enrichment</td>
<td>• High priority for Academic Enrichment (and OIP, GLI, FSSS), but not necessarily for other units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who have other specialized missions, priorities and funding end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Endless data collection, imposing burden on other units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rarely communicated how it helps students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>• Not really. There are lots of (opt-in) databases on campus and it is unclear how successful these efforts are. Few of us now have time for yet another memo, yet another email asking us to provide our data – we just don’t have time we need to be attending to our current duties and compile our input for others’ efforts. • Big question of who has the staff time (and expense) to manage and keep it up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Extended &amp; Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>• No – that type of information is not collected. • Staff and faculty can participate but sometimes that’s the committees “of the interested” – the usual suspects always participate. • If internationalization is a priority those concepts need to be built into different departmental policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Officers</td>
<td>• No. • Survey – read like it was for faculty. Poor design of survey. • Stephanie Anderson (MCLL) surveyed staff a few years ago to determine staff’s interest in international activity. Short term staff funding is discontinued now...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Undergraduate Advising Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Committee</td>
<td>• No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.4.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>• Prior to iLab, had never been asked • Probably typical of universities elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Student and Scholar Services</td>
<td>Currently the institution does not gather such information from staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALSS Question 7: To what extent does staff (all non-faculty employees) perceive international learning as an important element of the educational process at the institution? What is the evidence?**

| Mansfield Center | • Mansfield Ctr staff all value international learning because it is so integral to MC mission/programs. There is a disconnect when reaching out to the rest of campus - this is not shared all over campus. • In particular, UM’s support offices (business services, HRS, travel) do not seem to understand or value international learning/travel. o International travel procedures and related paperwork very onerous, discouraging. Designed by people who are not international travelers and don’t understand how hard bureaucracy related to intl travel is (per diems, receipts, etc.) o Conversely, bringing people to UM from abroad (and paying for it) is very costly - more costly than it should be because of time and effort involved due to bureaucracy. o Example of one grant program in which MC is preferring to have non UM-faculty participate because there is less work involved than if a UM faculty member participated. (Receipts requested by Business Services) |
| Office of International Programs | • In general, UM overlooks its staff when staff are the face of UM and the people international students interact with the most frequently. • Before it was eliminated, the short-term staff exchange program received very few applications. (P. Baker please provide numbers on short-term staff exchange since the program’s inception) • iTTEAM is an effort to retain international students by creating a group of informed staff people to support international students. The idea to create iTTEAM came from international student feedback abut general ignorance among staff and faculty about |
customer service for intl students ● Conversely, not enough assistance is given to UM students who want to study abroad on the following levels: o Advising, credit transfer, how to study abroad without falling behind and still being able to graduate as planned o Financial aid - will scholarships transfer, what are the implications of study abroad for an individual student’s financial aid? o Each student should get an “Individual Study Abroad Plan” - a comprehensive plan that is specific to each individual’s degree path and financial aid situation, with a single point of contact who continues to support the student over email when they are abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Academic Enrichment</td>
<td>● Need to prioritize so that student think they can do it, creates a spark of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>● It’s ‘hit and miss’ – some view it as important some don’t. ● Departments that have direct contact with international students might view it as more important. ● Unless there is contact with international students departments don’t necessarily view it as important. ● Some departments don’t want to deal with them “international students”, maybe because they don’t’ know enough about their educational background. ● Students are sometimes not clear why academic departments make the decisions they do, in regard to items such as the transferability of credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>● International learning is strongly supported by many units and offices on campus. Staff are responsive when the needs are brought to their attention. ● Outgoing students (study abroad programs, exchange programs, etc.) are often quite difficult for staff – there are so many pieces that students need to attend to and they could benefit from more help. Each College and School should have a person dedicated to this support, but with a good level of training and expertise (as wrong information / guidance is potentially devastating for students).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>● International learning exposes learners to different ways which helps to “break the mold.” ● Funding for students to go abroad to conferences is helpful. ● Conferences and research are a core part of the graduate education experience ● Dual and joint degrees are good ways to enhance collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Extended &amp; Lifelong Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>● Critical. ● Health Center – challenge: training staff to have cultural competencies to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>address needs of international students (Saudis, Brazilians...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Officers</td>
<td>• About half and half. Many don’t have training, cultural sensitivity (eg. very low linguistic abilities), nor much experience working with international students. As a result, incoming students don’t feel as though their concerns are being heard or addressed. Too many wrong answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Advising Center</td>
<td>• No/don’t know. Staff in Admissions, OSS, OIP, Mansfield Center, GLI, individual colleges and schools and FSSS are obviously interested and invested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Committee</td>
<td>• Staff need to be brought more into the picture of comprehensive internationalization. Those goals and programs should be a required part of new employee training. It should also be integrally incorporated into such ongoing staff professional development programs such as the Staff Ambassador Program. The current curriculum for that program devotes entire days to certain topics, such as Athletics (including a huge focus on the student athlete), but barely touches on the big picture of UM's internationalization. Individual units, such as FSSS and OIP are briefly mentioned, but there is no sense of this being a leading university priority or commitment. • A joint committee comprised of FSSS, OIP, and Enrollment Service Staff have developed a new training program for UM Staff and Faculty called UM iTEAM, which stands for Teaching, Empowering, Advising, and Mentoring international students. The program is modeled after the UM Allies program. Its mission is to provide training to allow faculty and staff to better support international students at UM and includes such topics as foreign student enrollment trends at UM in the context of global student mobility, cross-cultural communication and skills, financial impact, issues facing the students, and an overview of UM resources and offices serving international students. The program was launched in Spring 2015 with two well-received training seminars, and the goal is to offer a minimum of one training...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
session per semester. Human Resources has collaborated with the iTEAM to promote the workshop to faculty and staff. Future challenges anticipated include how to effective reach staff and faculty that are not self-motivated to sign up for this class.

| Office of Planning, Budgeting and Analysis | OPBA tries to stay objective and responds to demands of leadership. If leadership designates international education as a priority it will respond accordingly. |

**ALSS Other points recorded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansfield Center</th>
<th>UM is not structured to support internationalization; it is structured by function. Navigating silos costs time and money; it is hard to work across the lines; therefore broad initiatives like internationalization are difficult to implement: culture shift.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of International Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.24.15</td>
<td>Many do not understand what it means to internationalize the campus. Internationalization is perceived as idiosyncratic, usually with one faculty member pushing for a particular program. When that faculty member leaves so does the program -- it is a moving target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide faculty meeting 4.29.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Academic Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Services</td>
<td>Shelley Hiniker represented HRS at the meeting conducted by Liz Ametsbichler. Shelley explained that every UM employee, including visiting scholars and international student employees, need to submit paperwork to HRS in order to establish their eligibility for employment. HRS collects visa and passport information, and reviews tax treaties to determine the level of compensation. HRS also collects pertinent information from those applying for an H-1B work visa who are subsequently referred to an immigration lawyer. The lines of communication and coordination between HRS and FSSS are very effective. Since FSSS is the only unit on campus that deals with immigration related issues, a good working relationship between HRS and FSSS is essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>• How do we get more people on campus involved – to buy into this process? Maybe a crisis – like having so many international students that people are looking for help about how to work with them. And personal interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>• Money trail shows true University commitment. Self-funding programs are seen as less important, and can currently exist only with strong faculty commitment/leadership. The lack of state funds and/or permanent funding is very telling. • It is hard to know where the international content is in some courses. This is similar to service learning courses, where students are confused as to what they are getting even</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
when there is a service learning designation.  • Unclear how AAIP (and other similar campus-wide strategic planning activities) are focusing on international learning.  • Is there a difference between “Global” and “International” – they’re different terms and have different pedagogical imperatives.

| Graduate School | • International education is essential.  • Effective internationalization is a leadership issue.  • The fact that the most recent correspondences about internationalization have been a series of surveys implies that there isn’t a plan. It’s in its formative stage.  • A lot of things are being asked by leadership without any committed resources. More and more commitments without additional resources.  • If additional activities (related to internationalization) are constantly asked for it doesn’t help to clarify what the priorities are.  • How are activities supported?  • There have been Evaluation process after evaluation process – these have happened in the past, but what will come of these? Priorities are identified (for online or internationalization efforts) but they don’t go anywhere...  • There are no “institutional statements” made.  • Barriers are put in place for things not to happen.  • “Flavor of the day” – constantly creating models.  • Fund travel abroad for faculty. If you want to internationalize your campus you can’t pull the plug on those activities.  • Needs to have long-term commitment. Because financial resources can’t be committed we’re looped in an endless evaluation process.  • We need to update policies – they hold us back.  • 940.2 has to do with tuition levels for out of state students. A minimum of 200% tuition has to be charged – finally that was changed to 125% for online education. This is an example of the type of changes that need to happen.  • There doesn’t seem to be a way for policies at OCHE to be reviewed in a timely manner – what’s the process used to update those policies.  • How influence is exerted on a strategic perspective.  • GLI is a title that’s confusing. How much global learning is actually happening? After the 1st year the drop out rate was significant. Does the reality of the program meet the expectations of how it was advertised.  • Whenever opportunities to participate in international activities were made availability to SELL staff they did respond accordingly.  • There is no systematic process to getting information and opportunities out. |
| School of Extended & Lifelong Learning | |
| Student Affairs Officers | • Short term language immersion opportunities would greatly benefit disabled students (more than semester-long beginning language courses) |
| Academic Officers | |
| Undergraduate Advising Center | |
| International Committee | • Could OSS and then college/faculty advisors plant the seeds for study abroad in students and ensure that they grow? Many freshmen express interest in studying abroad but don’t end up doing it because of wanting to graduate in 4 years, etc. |
| Faculty-led Program Directors 5.4.15 | • Historically, FLSAPs developed separately from OIP programs (ISEP, partner universities). Today, OIP asks for information that in the past, faculty leading FLSAPs didn’t have to provide.  • Now, OIP requests that faculty leading FLSAPs have oversight about all logistical aspects related to their trips is very onerous for the faculty leading the trips. Examples include student and faculty insurance, risk management,
disability/accessibility matters, etc. • The University’s target for study abroad (75% by 2020) is very unrealistic. [this is not exactly what is stated in the strategic plans, but it’s interesting to note that this is the perception]. o General US average is 25% of undergrads studying abroad. o Even 25% would be very high for UM. There are not enough language majors, so MCLL couldn’t “pull it off”. o Other departments need to recognize the importance of study abroad (for majors beyond languages). o Advising could be improved, so students know their options o Some departments dissuade their students from taking language courses in their first year, saying they’ll need to focus on hard science courses, for example. This leads students away from studying languages/thinking study abroad is possible for them. o UM faculty are unaware that you can study abroad AND take courses in English.

• Accommodating disability abroad
  o Student on FLSAP in wheelchair dependent on the group’s willingness to help
  o Meeting with DSS prior to departure didn’t prepare faculty member for all that disabled student faced while abroad

| Faculty-led Program Directors 5.6.15 | • Significant bias against short-term study abroad experiences vs. semester-long study abroad. • Funding via GLI has been very helpful to support students going abroad. • Right now, travel contributes to UM’s carbon footprint. Our flights make up the bulk of our carbon footprint. Sustainability a UM value. Right now there is no requirement for faculty/students to account for their emissions when they travel abroad. Think about ways to offset those footprints (Vietnam course). Students should be aware of impact of travel and we should work out as a university how we are accountable for that. How can UM offset that? Part of the education of travel abroad. • Experience doesn’t have to require a flight across the ocean. There are ways to get an international experience without leaving the US. • Alcohol consumption during study abroad experiences? A policy is needed for this so that there is consistency across the board. • Training for faculty taking groups of students abroad? • STF – unclear deadlines, no one believes it’s a lottery, the thing changes every time you look at the website. • Difficult for students to find information about funding resources online. Laure has a list of resources across the country she can share. • Financial aid increasingly restrictive for study abroad. FinAid “doesn’t understand” “is not willing to do this”… Presidential Loans used to exist to help students pay their study abroad fees on time – this doesn’t exist anymore… • IF UM had a healthy faculty-directed study abroad program here it would be a great recruiting tool. What is Academic Enrichment was tasked with this? |
| Financial Aid | • Not clear if the real and full costs of Study Abroad are being disclosed to students (more a problem with exchanges than faculty-led programs) • Not clear if international students should be eligible for scholarships o Has the President’s Cabinet made a recent decision? Will it become policy? |
| Business Services | • within the last year, Business Services learned that they had not been processing travel requests and reimbursements according to Montana State policy. The procedures have recently changed, which brings UM in compliance and we are now doing things the same way as the other state institutions. These reporting requirements for the state are more stringent than for federal. The only way these procedures can change is through the Montana State Legislature • The State of Montana sometimes has more stringent regulations than the U.S. Dept. of State. An example of this includes the new travel policy – that the State requires travelers to keep all of their receipts. • Business Services basic request is “just let us know what is
going on” – send them detailed updates. • Business services has the ability to wire funds at a much lower rate than through a bank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UM Foundation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Student and Scholar Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>