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Overview

From December, 2013, through the end of April, 2014, a priority of the Office of International Studies in Education has been to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the college’s study and learning abroad program offerings at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This report summarizes faculty discussions on study abroad (SA), presents an analysis of SA data, enrollment trends and their implications for the college, and offers recommendations to improve overall programming coherence, increase student participation and enhance program quality for the academic year 2014-2015. ¹

Methods

The analysis and recommendations in this report are based on data collected through the following means:

- Data and information collected through interviews and discussions led by Dr. Reitu Mabokela and Dr. Todd Drummond with interested stakeholders (primarily college study and learning abroad leaders)
- Interviews with Dr. Jack Schwille, former Assistant Dean for International Studies
- Data and information collected through the participation of Dr. Todd Drummond in the International Studies and Programs (ISP) Study Abroad working group (monthly)
- Data and information collected through the participation of Dr. David Wong in the Study Abroad Director’s Advisory Group (monthly)
- A review of websites and other materials about the college’s ongoing programming (undergraduate for credit programs as well as non-credit and for credit graduate programs)
- An analysis of data and reports issued by MSU’s Office of Study Abroad (OSA)

Key Meetings

Presentation of Brett Berquist, Director of MSU Study Abroad (SA) & Discussion of College Issues

Thursday, February 6, 2014

¹ Appendix 1 contains an overview of all current college offerings.
In attendance: Brett Berquist, Reitu Mabokela, Todd Drummond, David Wong, John Dirkx, Lynn Fendler, Laura Apol, Margo Glew, Ginny Thielsen, Lynn Paine, John Metzler, and John Bell

Summary: The OISE invited interested parties for a presentation by the Office of Study Abroad (OSA) Director, Brett Berquist. Participants included program designers and leaders of credit bearing SA programs, undergraduate short term travel experiences, and the doctoral level Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding. Brett facilitated an interactive discussion in which he introduced participants to current OSA strategies, issues, and new campus-wide priorities for study abroad, MSU-wide. He noted how study abroad programming links to the Bolder by Design strategy. The main points covered included:

- OSA priorities, which included targeted recruitment to increase the number of under-represented students in the SA experience and a discussion of possible ways to get more support for students with the desire but not the means to participate. [In response to this meeting, Dean Heller offered some specific means (scholarships) to provide targeted support to students in need who would like to participate in SA. OISE has agreed to explore the possibility of setting up a scholarship program starting in the fall of 2014].

- Based on discussion following Brett’s presentation, there was a desire for more conversation on the college’s SA programming. The Office of International Studies in Education (OISE) offered to host a follow-up meeting (February 24) with the following discussion items:
  1) SA recruiting and filling our existing programs; opportunities and challenges
  2) Strategies for increasing participation numbers of less-represented student groups in study abroad (MSU campus-wide priority)
  3) Other issues as requested by faculty

- In the week following this meeting, the OISE shared by email study abroad design materials produced by the Office of Undergraduate Education, primarily focusing on the freshmen study abroad. These materials were most relevant for designing an undergraduate experience, but also provided interesting nuggets relevant for the planning and leading of programs at other levels.

Discussion about the College’s SA Strategy for Developing and Supporting Programs, Enhancing Program Quality

Thursday, February 13th, 2014

In attendance: Reitu Mabokela (OISE), Assistant Dean for International Studies in Education; Todd Drummond (OISE), representative from ISP Working Group on Study Abroad; David Wong, Advisory Council member to the MSU Director of Study Abroad.

Discussion Points

- Stakeholders were in agreement that increasing student participation in SA is an ambition shared by all in the college. We would like to foster a culture in the college where SA is “the norm” for all students. All options need to be considered to both increase participation numbers and increase the quality of programs. OISE offered to lead the conversations going
forward as well as conduct more research on “the state of affairs” in the area of ongoing college programming (more below).

- It was noted that several faculty members are currently pursuing new SA programs (Joni Star, Ghana; John Metzler, Uganda; David Wong, Japan), and that, in general, this is to be applauded.

- However, discussion also centered on the concern raised by some faculty that “the market” for students in the college is not infinite; that is, the question about “capping” the number of program options in a given year might need to be considered in order to minimize the number of program closures due to undersubscribed programs and/or “poaching” (real or perceived) that some believe occurs due to the competition between faculty members to attract students.

- Before making recommendations on how to handle the above issue, OISE resolved to probe deeper by raising the several questions at the next SA-leader meeting:

1) **OISE needs more data about each SA program.** Before any recommendations can be made, more information about each of the ongoing programs is needed. Any high stakes recommendations need to be made with complete knowledge of the current state of affairs of each program. For example, what are the goals of each program? What is the curriculum? What is the profile of the typical student? The OISE has begun to meet with each of the college’s study/learning abroad leaders in order to learn more.

2) **If the recommendation is to cap the total number of college program offerings, what are the criteria upon which such a recommendation will be made?** Will recommendations be made based on number of programs per department? Are we thinking about possibly capping the total number of programs per region of the world? I.e. are we saying we want to have X number of European experiences, Y number of African experiences, Z number of Latin American experiences, based on Bolder by Design priorities, but not more?

3) **What assumptions about the SA “student market” are we making about the student decision making calculus when they choose to SA or not to SA?** Do students make choices based on country destination or other factors such as program content, quality of faculty leadership, the “fun” factor, etc. Is each department its “own market”? If we think we have answers to these questions, what is the evidence for our inferences?

4) **What about “same country” programs?** (e.g. 2 programs offered in the Netherlands, 2014). One idea is to implement an “every other year/rotational” system for multiple college programs within the same country. This is the approach recommended by OSA. Do we want to consider alternating years for programs designed for the same country only? Or, perhaps by region as well? On the surface, this might make sense. However, it likely also depends on what the content/aims of the programs are. Each program is unique not only in terms of location but by content, learning goals and leadership.

5) **Capping by content/thematic area?** Related to the above, perhaps it makes more sense to only “cap” programs that offer similar content, activities, regardless of region? I.e. there may be two
programs in a single country (not competing for the same students) if students are getting a completely different experience. We need to do more data collection in order to know the extent of variability between program content and goals across programs.

6) **Should there be a “case by case” selection of programs by department or a laissez faire approach – “if you can get students, your program is a go.”** Or, in order to provide some “flexible regulation” to address these issues, should there be an independent advisory committee to review study abroad applications convened by the college (beyond the department level)? I.e. how do we ensure faculty feel that decisions are made equitably? Should there be a process for program approval like there is for FEGU? Does the benefit of doing this outweigh the cost? Do the ongoing challenges we have now merit the time investment of a program application/review process? Will over-regulating the process create more tension than it resolves?

7) **Continue “market approach” (with minor limitations)?** The FEGU program has an interesting way to deal with competition. It requires that leaders apply to lead a program 2 times in a 3 year period. Leaders know that they won’t travel every year. What would be the effect of doing this for undergraduate programs? Might it provide a way to regulate and reduce competition without the time burden and politics of administering a selection process? Down side would be that some faculty would indeed prefer to go every year. Perhaps most would be willing to go 2 in 3 years for the added payoff of more stable numbers (if we assume that this kind of mechanism would resolve the numbers problem)?

8) **Pure market approach (with enhanced recruiting/student incentives to apply)?** Another option is to not interfere with the current system of planning and submitting SA program proposals but instead simply to invest more aggressively in increasing student numbers across the board. Could, for example, the OISE in tandem with program leaders increase SA numbers by being more active in the recruiting process? Are there other incentives that could be provided for students that might be a game changer to get a 10-15% increase in participation numbers in the next few years?

**Note:** As can be seen from the above questions, it might be challenging to create a system for clearly determining the appropriate number of programs in a particular world region (or country, or department) because deeper analysis of the ongoing programming is revealing that we do not seem to have an “apple to apple” comparison of programs. For example, Ginny’s program for studying disabilities in Ireland is a specialized program with a nuanced constituency. The new Tanzanian development experiences may also look very different from an “arts and culture” experience in Western Europe; and thus, the student markets may not be the same. These are questions to think about carefully. Any attempt to “regulate” the current process by which faculty design and seek approval for program development (which is ultimately approved by the department chairs and legitimized through the OSA process), must take into account the above questions. OISE recommends that if the capping conversations go forward, all department chairs be involved in these discussions.
**Recommended:** The above questions need more discussion with faculty at the next SA-leaders meeting (below).

---

**Study Abroad Leaders Planning Meeting**

**February 24, EH 133 F, 3:00-4:30**

**In attendance:** Reitu Mabokela, Todd Drummond, John Metzler, John Dirkx, John Bell, David Wong, and Joni Star

**Summary:** After introductions, each participant briefly described their work in leading study abroad. The issues raised in the previous meeting (above) were discussed in this meeting. Many opinions were shared and questions raised in regard to the above discussion points. David Wong and John Metzler advocated for moving the entire college culture towards one in which SA was expected of all students. Reitu Mabokela noted that while that sounded good in theory, there may not be enough support for this initiative and we need to focus on filling the ongoing programs we have now.

**Agreed:**

- For 2014 programming, the college will move forward with all ongoing OSA-approved programming; a few programs may be cancelled by OSA due to low enrollment numbers (*note* Israel was the only program that did in fact get cancelled in 2014 due to low enrollment numbers; OSA agreed to find support to cover a small budgetary gap for the new Japanese program in 2014).

- In the fall of 2014, the study/learning abroad group will convene again to discuss fundamental questions about what makes a study abroad program “a quality program.” This session will lead to some program design ideas for leaders.

- OISE stewardship *may be* necessary in the future to create an efficient and sustainable SA regime that results in a reduction of shortfalls in numbers, reduces “poaching” (actual or perceived) of students, enhances programming options, coordinates recruiting, etc. However, we recognize that this is a coordinating role; departments still call the shots on final program approval.

- OISE will continue to provide resources, reference materials, planning tools, information to study abroad leaders, notes from the ISP Dean’s SA team meetings, and publicity for their programs when possible (for pre-travel, recruiting, post-travel events).

- A long term, collaborative planning approach (caps) in terms of college offerings is possibly an optimal solution to meeting challenges; how much actual “governance” is needed remains an open question and we will not rush into capping decisions without further information.

- For 2014-2015, more proactive recruiting support from OISE for study abroad programming will be initiated (website blurbs about program options, success stories, more creative use of “student voices”, recruiting presentations, targeting under-represented groups, etc.).
• OISE may co-organize and co-support (with SA leaders) a college-wide Study Abroad Fair to promote programs; graduate and international students could be tapped into for planning and organizational support (using “community service” hours from FEGU, for example); another possibility is a “post-trip debrief” in the college, similar to FEGU events used to promote participation.

Interview with Dr. Jack Schwille, former Assistant Dean for International Studies

April, 2014

In conversations with Jack Schwille, the OISE has learned that the data in the OSA Study Abroad Report Study Abroad Enrollment and Trends at MSU (2011-2012) (from which considerable data is drawn for this report, below) is not fully inclusive of all the students in our college. In particular, as undergraduates who major in secondary education are not categorized primarily as “education majors,” Jack believes that these students’ participation rates are not reflected in the report.

At present, the OISE is attempting to learn more about how the data in the report is broken down and coded. However, if we assume that Jack is correct, the data story presented here would be far from complete. The total number of students who study abroad from the college may be two to three times the number presented. Further, Jack believes (through anecdotal evidence and experience) that the secondary education students are more likely than other students in the college to actually enroll in study abroad (e.g. foreign language teachers in secondary education, typically study abroad in large numbers). Nonetheless, we move forward with our analysis based on the data we do have below, with this important qualification noted.

Independent OISE Research on Undergraduate Programs:

December 2013 – March 31st, 2014

While ongoing discussions with college SA leaders has provided insight into current issues and challenges, the OISE also conducted its own independent research into the study abroad trends over the last three years. The results of this investigation and implications for decision making are presented below.

Interestingly, despite the popularly expressed notion that “the numbers are down … the number of programs needs to be capped,” the data reveal a trend in the opposite direction; both in terms of the number of programs offered and the number of students participating. Consider that the total number of participants for 2014 will be 127, considerably more than 79 students in 2012- and up from 94 in 2013 (see chart below). The number of programs offered went from 4, to 6, to 7 in 2012, 2013, and 2014, respectively. The biggest change in absolute numbers can be attributed to increased participation in the “Down Under Sports Program (Australia)” offered by KIN, where enrollment went from 25 last year to 45 in 2014.

Other programs are holding steady with the approximate same number of students from year to year or with slight increases in enrollment. “Learning Technology, Culture in Europe (CEPSE),” went from 14 participants in the last two years to 19 in 2014. The Ireland and South Africa programs have also seen
stable numbers over the last three years and this year the Ireland program had to turn away one applicant due to over-subscription. The Global Educators Cohort Exchange (China) has had 12 students for the last two years. A second-year program, “Sustainable Community Development in Tanzania,” managed to get 6 participants this year even though the program poses significant challenges for students as they live in isolated, rural conditions. Even a brand new program, “A Day in the Life of Japan: Education, Popular Culture, Society (CEPSE),” managed to be just one student shy of the needed student number to break even. OSA has agreed to support this program in 2014 and will cover the small budget loss this year (as according to OSA, it is normal to be undersubscribed in year 1 as the program has no alumni, no proven “record of success” from which to draw on).

The only undergraduate program that was cancelled in 2014 was a new program to Israel. This promising new program is designed to promote considerable cross-cultural engagement between Christians, Muslims, and Jews, as well as engagement with Israeli immigrant communities. Perhaps not surprisingly, this program is difficult to recruit for due to the popular perception of Israel being less secure than other regions (fair or unfair). The chart below presents the complete data on student participation and program numbers.

**Three Year Student Participation Trends for the College’s Undergraduate SA Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Technology, Culture in Europe (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Day in the Life of Japan: Education, Popular Culture, Society (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Technology and Culture in the Land in Between (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>canc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability in a Diverse Society (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learning Across the Curriculum (TE)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Teaching Abroad (TE)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Society and Learning in South Africa (TE)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Development in Tanzania (TE)</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Sports Program Down Under (KIN)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Educators Cohort Exchange with Beijing Normal University (TE)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding, Interpreting and Teaching Africa in the World through the Humanities and Social Studies: Case Study of Tanzania for Pre-Service Interns and Mentor Teachers (TE)</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>n/o</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Undergraduate Totals | total students | 79 | 94 | 127 |
|                       | total programs | 4  | 6  | 7   |

Thus, on the surface, a casual glance of the three year trend is not so gloomy. According to the OSA, there was an overall decline in SA numbers after 2008-2009 across MSU, so perhaps this recent uptick is indicative of some kind of “SA recovery” in terms student interest, back to pre-2008 levels. In general, however, a large proportion of the upward trend in 2014 can be attributed to the one KIN program, which almost doubled in size in 2014. This raises questions “what did KIN do differently this year” in recruiting for the 2014 class? Perhaps there are lessons to be learned there for other departments. Clearly, having more programs offered also accounts for greater numbers in 2014, though this would not necessarily always be the case. For a fuller understanding of SA trends across colleges (a bit dated), see *Study Abroad Enrollment and Trends at MSU: 2011-12*, by Brett Berquist and Cheryl Benner.

---

2 n/o = not offered in that year, canc. = cancelled.
Despite the apparent good news for SA in the college, there are SA issues we need to understand better. First of all, according to the most recent systematic data collection (above reference, 2012), only 17% of the college’s total students participated in study abroad in 2011-12: This was the lowest rate on campus (avg. rate was 23%; highest was James Madison at 76%).\(^3\) Interestingly, according to the OSA Data, the college had the highest rate of students selecting study abroad program options outside their own college. On page 16 of Berquist and Benner’s report, it notes that of the students from the college studied who abroad during the 2011-2012 academic year, only 13 of them (or 16.3%) “participated in their own college’s primary program,” while 67 students (83.8%) participated in another college’s program.

Margo Glew notes that this should not be surprising as a considerable portion of coursework for many undergraduate majors takes place outside the college. There could also be some mistakes in the data or labeling and classification of students can be misleading and can skew data interpretation (in addition to the issue of secondary education majors). In any event, it could be interesting to learn on which MSU (or non-MSU) programs were the rest of these students going? Further, if only 13 students participated in our college’s programs, who were the rest of the students who filled the ranks of our own programs? More conversations with our study abroad leaders and OSA leaders could answer some of these questions.

Even if the 83% figure is inflated or misleading, it nonetheless seems plausible that the college is in fact losing students to study abroad programs offered by other colleges. The MSU average for students studying abroad in programs from their own college was only 55.8% (2011-12) which indicates that the phenomena of mobility across colleges in terms of program choice is quite common. It seems quite plausible that “the student decision calculus” could be based on a host of factors (not related to academics) such as program reputation, where friends and peers are going, desired country, language study opportunities, etc. For example, many students might desire to spend a full semester abroad while all of our programs are summer duration or shorter.

### Data on SA compiled by the Office of Study Abroad, for 2011-12 (10 COE programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>% of MSU Ugrad OSA Participation by College</th>
<th>% in own College Program</th>
<th>% in other College’s Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16.9% (2(^{nd}) lowest on campus)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU average</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**OISE Analysis and Recommendations for Undergraduate Programming**

Based on the discussions and the analysis of the data under study, the OISE proposes the following:

- As the numbers seem to be stable over the last three years, with only 1 program cancellation in 2014, it does not seem prudent to suggest capping the number of programs offered at this point in time.

---

\(^3\) Keep in mind that according to Jack Schwille, these numbers do not include students in the college who are considered “secondary education majors” as they are coded as students in other colleges, not ours.
Instead, we recommend focusing attention on:

(1) Enhancing student recruitment for existing programming
(2) Improving the quality of existing programming

1. **Enhancing Student Recruitment:** There are three dimensions to enhancing recruiting: *Visibility* of programs, *accessibility* to information about programs, and *high level support* for programs. One way to increase visibility is a more ambitious SA recruiting fair in the college as well as a series of targeted recruitment initiatives beyond the usual classroom visits by individual SA leaders. A “SA Week” of activities could be designed to generate interest. In terms of accessibility, the OISE could serve as a more permanent “host” of knowledge about each program. OISE can include blurbs and PR pieces on its website, focus on getting student voice heard (use students as recruiters), as well as *devote significant GA time* to collect and analyze SA data and use it for more targeted recruiting. Information through student list serves and social media could also be employed.

Ph.D. - level FEGU alumni are now required to offer 20 hours of volunteer service towards internationalizing the college. They could spend some of this time supporting the activities of a college SA fair as well as spend time assisting with recruiting through presentations about the value of study abroad, classroom visits, and web stories.

In terms of high level support, the OISE should follow-up on the Dean’s offer of scholarship support for students based on need. A competitive process should be developed that provides such students the opportunity to compete for this funding. We also can involve the highest levels in the college at events and fairs (Dean’s blog, speeches, vocal support for SA, Assistant Deans actively involved to support recruitment campaigns and raise attention throughout the college).

2. **Improving the quality of existing programming.**

One area to focus on entails more structured conversations with SA leaders about how to get the most learning from the SA experience. Discussions can center on sharing experiences on topics such as program design, how to get deeper immersion, the value of home stays, as well as planning and preparation tools, to name just a few. All current and former leaders have experience and knowledge to share on what makes a program a “high quality” one. It was agreed that in the fall of 2014 the faculty group would return the question of “quality programming” and try to co-develop some common understanding of the kinds of planning, resources, and learning activities that can be employed in order to improve the overall quality of program design and implementation.
There are other ways to approach improving the quality of existing programming. First, OISE can foster a more rigorous approach to student preferences and needs. This can be accomplished through a more thorough evaluation of existing program evaluations and possibly collecting some additional student data. Feedback loops need to be systematized and suggestions and recommendations heard and incorporated. This, in turn, might incentivize faculty to make program improvements which in turn would generate more student interest. An OISE GA could spend more time analyzing undergraduate perspectives about their desires and needs regarding study abroad. We need a clearer idea of why or why not students are going on the available trips and/or what other kinds of trips they would be interested in.

Also, we need to know the demand for things like whether students would be interested in longer programs (semester), through the college. We could survey undergrads and conduct focus groups to learn more about this. There may be potential for research related to these questions. Aside from seeing what college undergraduates would like to see in study abroad programs, the questions of how students in the college make their program choices could be useful. We could survey, focus group, or interview students who have gone on study abroad. This might help us to understand what constitute "the markets" for this kind of study abroad and the decision making calculus. With that kind of data, plus something like an advisory committee, it could become much clearer as to how to cycle the program offerings as well - as what needs to be eliminated and what needs to be developed.

### Graduate Programs in the College of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master of Arts in Educational Technology (CEPSE)</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HALE Comparative and International Approaches to Higher Education (MA or Ph.D.)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>n/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>n/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total students</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total programs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master of Arts in Educational Technology (CEPSE)

CEPSE sponsors a 30 credit Master of Arts in Educational Technology Overseas degree program. This is not a “traditional study abroad program” but a degree that is completed entirely overseas. The target audience for this program is K12 teachers in international school contexts. Historically, students have attended the program for 3 consecutive summers, with one online course experience to complete the degree. To remain competitive, students are allowed to combine a mix of online courses and overseas summers to complete their degree program. The student population is comprised of teachers from around the globe with US, UK, Australian, European, African and Indian citizenship. The MAET Overseas program is the largest department sponsored overseas program in the University. The program has been held in Plymouth, UK, Rouen, France, Dublin and Galway, Ireland. The future goals of the program are to have 3 stable external University hosts so students attending the program for all 3 years can experience different communities and contexts. More information can be found by visiting: edutech.msu.edu/overseas

HALE Travel Opportunities

The Department of Educational Administration sponsors a series of short term graduate study abroad experiences during the summer session. A program led by Professor Brendan Cantwell is going to Mexico in the summer of 2014. Destinations in the past have included the U.K. (John Dirx), South Africa (Ann Austin), Finland (Jim Fairweather). Each trip has a slightly different focus and purpose but the overall aims are to provide students with “knowledge of comparative approaches to the study of higher education and gain professional experience in the international context.”

Fellowship for Enhancing Global Understanding (FEGU)

The Fellowship for Enhancing Global Understanding is managed by the OISE and has been running since 2010. The program is designed to provide graduate students pursuing doctoral study an opportunity to learn about the educational systems and cultures of other countries. Every year since 2010, faculty have proposes international fellowship experiences through a faculty review process. In 2011, MSU formally expanded the Fellowship to include Fellowships to China, Botswana, and Vietnam. In 2012, another Fellowship—Cyprus—was added bringing the Fellowship program total for 2012 to four. In 2013, faculty led Fellowship trips to Botswana, China, and Indonesia. In 2014, faculty will be leading trips to China, Vietnam, and Mexico.

FEGU Programming: Data Collection Methods

The analysis in this portion of the report is based on data collected through the following means:

- A student debriefing session with Dr. Kristin Janka Millar following the 2013 trips.
- Information collected through casual conversation with returning Fellows across the years of the program.
- Data and information collected through discussions with interested stakeholders (including faculty leaders, Dr. Mabokela, Brianna Becker—the FEGU GA, Fellows, and program GAs) in the College.
- A review the past years of FEGU including but not limited to application numbers, who participates, and the logistics of the program.

4 for more information about FEGU, see: http://education.msu.edu/international/fellowship/about.asp
Recommendations

Through the formal debriefing session of the 2013 Fellows with Dr. Kristin Janka Millar as well as informal conversations with faculty leaders and Fellows, the OISE has found that while overall the Fellowship has been very successful, educational, and personally and professionally rewarding, there are areas where changes are needed to continue to improve the FEGU programs for future years. These adjustments fall into three major categories:

1. **Management of which programs are going, when, and in what combination.**
   - For 2015, we recommend running only two FEGU programs (China and Indonesia). Over the last few years there has been a small drop off in applications. We have enough applications to fill three or more programs but not enough for the program to be competitive. A more competitive program is likely to both get stronger participants and create more buzz around FEGU as a whole.
   - We recommend a review of application numbers and results following the 2015 Fellowship year in which there will be only two programs, down from three or four in previous years. This review would include looking at how many applicants there were in relation to available FEGU spots, what departments the applicants and accepted Fellows were from, who was turned down and why, and how those numbers compare to previous years in order to determine whether a smaller number of programs is beneficial— and if so, how.
   - Encouraging programs that cover a range of regions of the world and are in locations where the Fellowship budget will be manageable (i.e. not countries where the currency is stronger than the US dollar), also, more closely aligning destinations with MSU regional priorities (Africa, Asia, and Latin America).

2. **Preparation of both faculty leaders and Fellows.**
   - Require faculty leaders to attend a workshop with the OISE about planning, designing, leading, and other expectations.
     - Specific additional training for faculty leaders on group leadership, processing, and debriefing; this was requested by Fellows across all three 2013 Fellowships.
   - Provide a handbook for faculty leaders based on both the experiences of the OISE staff and the feedback and needs assessment of the faculty leaders. Included in this handbook should be sections about handling challenging cross-cultural issues such as tolerance and understanding of LGBT issues, and what the implications of such issues are when traveling in countries that not necessarily safe for non-traditional students.
• More preparation for understanding cultural differences and norms for Fellows to help them acclimate better and be more respectful of the local culture where they were studying; this comes directly from feedback from the Fellows.

3. **Continued improvements to the programs.**

• Collect more data from students that can be used for quality control, program improvement overall, and assessment of individual Fellowship trips.
  ○ This should include a review of whether the experiences on the ground match the expectations set before departure.
• Collect more data from faculty about their experiences proposing, preparing for, and leading the FEGU trips.
• Use this data to make ongoing improvements to enhance the experiences of both students and faculty.
• Encourage and support faculty leaders in creating more opportunities to engage with people from the host country which past Fellows have reported enhanced their Fellowship experience and deepened their learning.
• Work to solicit and create Fellowships that meet the educational needs of Fellows from across all of the College’s departments.

4. **Service Opportunities upon Return to East Lansing**

An important part of the Fellowship experience is the opportunity to continue to make a contribution to global understanding through “person to person diplomacy” here in mid-Michigan. The college offers countless opportunities for continued learning about other cultures and education systems and FEGU program goals are further enhanced by students’ commitment to undertake 20-25 hours of service upon return from travel. The hours can be spread out over the first semester back after travel.

Possible service activities include:

• Graduate students assisting with the design and facilitation of an *international student orientation* to be conducted in the fall for incoming international students.
• Graduate students participating in study abroad recruitment activities here in the college in order to help keep study abroad programs vibrant.
• U.S. graduate students mentoring an international undergraduate student here in the college in order to help them adjust to American life and learn about our education system.
• International graduate students in the college may “adopt” a U.S. undergraduate in order to promote the learning of U.S. students about education systems and cultures in other countries. *(The Global Educators Cohort Program provides opportunities for this type of mentoring arrangement as each U.S. student is required to participate in an international experience).*
• Mentoring international students outside the college of education who are currently enrolled at MSU as “provisional students” at the English Language Center. Mentoring a new provisional
international student enhances their chances to be accepted at MSU while providing mentors the opportunity to continue to learn about what it means to be “an international student.”

No major costs would be incurred as the focus of this activity would be spending quality time engaging in discussion, conversation, and participation in cultural activities in mid-Michigan. International students gain from this experience as they learn to better integrate into the fabric of the community and to take advantage of the opportunities afforded at MSU. U.S. graduate students also continue to learn as they engage with students from other countries.
## Appendix 1. Undergraduate and Graduate Programs in the College of Education 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Regularity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Learning, Technology, Culture in Europe (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alison Freed</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A Day in the Life of Japan: Education, Popular Culture, Society (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>David Wong</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Learning, Technology and Culture in the Land in Between (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Bell</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Disability in a Diverse Society (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V. Thielsen</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 English Language Learning Across the Curriculum (TE)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jeff Bale</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cross-Cultural Teaching Abroad (TE)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Corvell Cranfield</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Education, Society and Learning in South Africa (TE)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Metzler</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sustainable Community Development in Tanzania (TE)</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Betty Okwako</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Summer Sports Program Down Under (KIN)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diane Ulibarri</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Global Educators Cohort Exchange with Beijing Normal University (TE)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lynn Paine</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Understanding, Interpreting and Teaching Africa in the World through the Humanities and Social Studies: Case Study of Tanzania for Pre-Service Interns and Mentor Teachers (TE)</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1, 2, or 3</td>
<td>J. Metzler, L. Apol</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters or Ph.D. Level</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Contact(s)</th>
<th>Regularity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Master of Arts in Educational Technology (CEPSE)</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Leigh Wolf</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HALE International Experience in Higher Education (MA or Ph.D.)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>1, 2, or 3</td>
<td>Matthew Wawrzynski</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(locations have included South Africa, Mexico, Finland and the U.K.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ph.D. (students from all departments welcome)</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Regularity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dan Schultz</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>John Dirks</td>
<td>2 in 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Teresa Tatko</td>
<td>2 in 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D. Feltz</td>
<td>2 in 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Laura Apol</td>
<td>2 in 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fellowship to Enhance Global Understanding (OISE)</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lynn Fendler</td>
<td>2 in 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>