

## **A Guide for Faculty Seeking to Direct or Create an Augustana International or Off-Campus Program**

Directing an off-campus study program, whether domestic or international, is a challenging endeavor, one which requires a multiple year obligation and a substantial commitment of time and energy. This document aims to provide faculty who are interested in program development the basic information which will allow them understand the expectations of the college and successfully propose programs to IOSC. We have chosen an FAQ format so that you might quickly find answers to the specific questions you may have regarding requirements and procedures for application.

### **How would an interested faculty member get started?**

Typically it begins with a conversation with the IOP Director or Associate Director. The IOP staff can help guide faculty towards others who might be considering a similar program or location, and those who can speak from experience about the program type or location of interest. You might have an idea for a program in a location already on our regular rotation, in which case perhaps joining that program is preferable to starting a new one. You may find out that there are other faculty who want to go where you wish to go, in which case a team proposal might be beneficial. All of this can start with a conversation with IOP staff. Periodically throughout the year IOP will sponsor events to bring interested faculty together to discuss ideas and find colleagues who might be thinking along the same lines as you are. These can be a great place to start, as can be a visit to the IOP offices.

### **What defines a “study abroad” or “off-campus” program?**

This is not as simple as one might imagine. Obviously any course or program which takes students to another country should be vetted through the IOP, but what distinguishes a study abroad program, one which must be approved by the International & Off-Campus Study Committee, from a field trip or site visit? Here are a few guidelines to consider:

1. Does the program require that all participants earn academic credits? If so, it is an academic program and likely must pass IOSC approval.
2. Does the program require students to be off campus for 5 consecutive days or longer?  
This can include domestic trips as well as international programs.

Programs such as music ensemble tours, athletic team tours or field trips should register with IOP (primarily to complete safety & risk management documents) as should any program which takes students outside of the United States, but these do not require IOSC approval.

Only programs which grant academic credit qualify as “study abroad” or “off-campus study”, and require IOSC approval 2 years before departure. For example, when the Choir tours Europe, some students may be earning their standard choir/ensemble credits, but no student on the program is required to do so. The same is true when the women’s soccer team tours Brazil. Some students may be earning PE credits for that term on the team, but it is not a requirement for them to earn credit in order to go to Brazil. Neither of these would qualify as study abroad, and neither requires IOSC approval. Both, however do require registration with IOP. Likewise a Geography or Art History course which takes a 3 day trip to Chicago does not have to visit with IOSC. These are considered field trips within the normal context of an on-campus course. However, if Geology wanted students to spend 10 days in Arkansas, whether these are during the term or during one of the breaks, and all students are earning Geology credits as part of the program, whether as a stand-alone course, or as part of a course otherwise taught on campus, that qualifies as an off-campus program and should be vetted by IOSC. If you are not sure whether you need to propose to IOSC, the obvious first step is to speak with IOP staff.

**Can I or my department start a program on our own?**

No. Any program which will take students off campus to study (beyond a simple field trip) must get approval from the International & Off-Campus Study Committee (IOSC), which means that you must make a proposal to IOSC for approval in order for your program to become part of the curriculum of your department. This is required in order to maintain a high standard of programming and to protect the faculty who participate, by having them fully informed of their responsibilities and the resources available to them as they lead students off campus.

**What if I want to teach on an existing program?**

This is, of course, a significantly different proposal than one in which you create a new program. If you are interested in one of the programs which has run recently or which is scheduled to run in the next few years, you should try to speak with the current director of that program. No program is guaranteed to run after its current iteration, but the tendency has been that programs do repeat on a regular basis. We have seen this with some of our oldest programs such as East Asia Term, but we have also seen this with relatively new programs such as Ireland Term or the Rome 20/20 program. The best way for you to find out about available slots for faculty on a repeating program is to speak with the director of that program. Most programs are developed by teams, and it may be possible for you to become a team member when they reapply for approval.

This is a key idea. Even programs that have been running since the 1970’s must apply each time they wish to run. The only exception to this has been programs which run every year, which must go through a reapplication process on a regular basis, but not with each iteration.

Most programs, if they repeat, do so on either a 3-year cycle or a 2-year cycle. By speaking with the current, or most recent, director, you can let them know about your interest in their program and perhaps work with them to develop a course which they would include in their next re-application.

**I am interested in starting a new program:**

The first step in constructing a program is to imagine it. Where would you like the program to be located? When do you want it to occur? For how long do you see it running? What manner of coursework might be taught there? Thinking about this is a bit like getting the planets to align. You need to think about your personal life, your professional commitments, and your departmental obligations. Once you have given consideration to these issues, the following steps are recommended:

1. Meet with Director of IOP
2. Coordinate with other faculty or with IOP to strategize about key issues.
  - a. program calendar slot
  - b. program size
  - c. course offerings
  - d. use of a third party provider
  - e. creation of a faculty team
  - f. creation of a model budget
  - g. gauge student interest
  - h. degree of cultural engagement
  - i. familiarization with health & safety concerns
3. Create proposal for approval by International & Off-Campus Study Committee.

Step One: Meeting with the Director of IOP. The IOP Director can discuss with you potential schedule conflicts (e.g. a program in Morocco probably shouldn't operate at the same time as one in Tunisia and the College does not want a situation where 8 programs are scheduled for one academic year and only 1 for the following year), possible faculty partners, and travel advisories/warnings/alerts. IOP can also help craft a preliminary budget and think about the optimal size for the program. During this stage it is important to think about the market for your program. If you build it, will they come? Program cost will be a factor, but in all probability, destination and timing will be critical as well. For example, the robust numbers for Augustana's Sydney internship program can perhaps in part be explained by its being offered in January and February when the southern hemisphere is experiencing its warmest weather.

Step Two: Coordination of program components: This is the stage where the abstract begins to become concrete. You need to think about the number of courses to be taught and identify potential faculty partners. Certainly one factor in this consideration is structuring a sufficient variety of courses offered on the program. Remember: It is the faculty member's responsibility to make sure her or his course carries the appropriate perspective and suffix.

Another factor is personal chemistry. An Augustana study abroad term program will most likely carry a Learning Community (LC) designation, so the director needs to be fairly confident that the faculty team will work well together. IOP can be helpful to the process by sharing information it may have accumulated on faculty interests in a region or by sponsoring a regional interest session for faculty.

Determining the appropriate number of student participants for a program is also very important. There are clear trade-offs in this. A large number of students will be less expensive on a per student basis and can also yield more resources to spend on field trips, housing, theatre tickets, etc... But a smaller number may allow for easier cultural immersion (think of 80 students descending on a rural cooperative in Kenya – 20 is a much better figure). The preliminary budget can help determine the range of optimal participation. As a general rule, if you are thinking about a full-term program (9-11 weeks) in a region that has high travel costs and a high cost of living, you will need to have either an expensive program or one with a large number of students.

Another task to share with IOP is in making some rough judgment about the level of student interest in the kind of program you are envisioning. Some of this is subjective, but there should be a rough consensus between and among the program team and IOP. There is no point in crafting a program without a strong indication that students will be interested. Sometimes a general interest session can be held to “test the waters”, but if this avenue is employed, it should be clearly understood that it is only an interest session. No active, official recruiting is to take place until a program has been approved by the International Study Committee, EPC and the Faculty Senate.

Two final sets of considerations are the level of cultural immersion and the issues of health and safety. Cultural immersion is one of the more obvious goals of any sound study abroad program. It is what distinguishes the study abroad experience from tourism. Intuitively, a longer program is better able to accomplish this than a short-term program. However, there are variables that can be incorporated that can enhance cultural immersion and knowledge regardless of program length. Some of these are family home-stays, avoidance of western hotels and food, planned lectures given by native scholars, and interactions with peers from the host country.

Familiarity with health and safety concerns are extremely important in planning and implementing a study abroad program. The best sources for educating yourself on health issues are websites for the Centers for Disease Control, and the World Health Organization. For safety and health regulations, the U.S. State Department website is a very good tool, as are its counterparts for Canada and the United Kingdom. The Department of State will issue a variety of communications indicating various levels of concern for U.S. citizens. These will range from a Public Announcement to a Travel Alert, to a Travel Warning to an outright ban on travel to a particular destination. These are updated on an erratic schedule and should be consulted regularly.

Websites with useful information on countries:

- U.S. Department of State – <http://travel.state.gov>
- British Foreign & Commonwealth Office - <http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/>
- Foreign Affairs (Canada) – <http://www.voyage.gc.ca/index-eng.asp>
- Center for Disease Control & Prevention – <http://www.cdc.gov>
- World Health Organization – <http://www.who.int/en>

When thinking about these questions and issues, one may wish to consider the possibility of creating a partnership with an independent agent, commonly known in the field as a “third party provider”. They vary in location, range of service, cost, and quality. The best of them can help with residential arrangements, cultural orientation for the students, field trips, and teaching. It cannot be over-emphasized that finding the right third-party provider to fit your program needs is critical to the success of a program. To whatever extent possible, third-party providers should be vetted for service and reliability. Here again, IOP can help.

#### **How many Augustana representatives or faculty are required for a program to run?**

The easy answer is no fewer than two. A program must have two Augustana representatives, typically faculty, on site at all times to ensure that the group can be managed should something require the program director to separate from the group. However, if a contract is arranged with a reputable 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider who is responsible for the logistical components of the program and is charged with emergency care for students, it is possible that a program would be approved with only 1 Augustana representative on staff. This is less common than the faculty team model, but with several good 3<sup>rd</sup> party providers available, it is not unthinkable for a single faculty member to propose a program.

#### **What models, structures or program types are typically considered by IOSC?**

At present we can divide the current offerings by Augustana faculty into five basic program types: Term Abroad, Partial Term Abroad, Course(s) with a Travel Component, Short-Term Travel Programs and Summer Programs. Below I will outline each of these models. They each have different expectations and different design requirements.

##### **I. TERM ABROAD**

The most traditional type of program at Augie, this model entails a group leaving campus for an entire trimester. It may be a relocation to a new single site (London, Vienna, etc.) or a traveling multicity program (East Asia, Brazil, etc.) Because it is a full trimester off campus, these programs must provide students with at least 3 different courses, and often include 4-6 course options. This can mean a larger number of Augustana faculty must apply together or that plans are in place to contract for local faculty through a 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider. In either case, these programs tend to take larger groups of students (30+) in order to disperse the cost of the multiple faculty who are associated with it. The Term Abroad program is typically a Fall or Spring Term program and must include plans for a 1-credit seminar (required of all students) as part of its course offerings. This seminar

includes pre-departure orientation meetings as well as on-site class meetings and assignments. It is given an ISS rubric (International Study Seminar) and is officially led by the program's director. In the area of budgeting, this program requires that each student pay 100% of tuition plus any added program costs. 50% of tuition is returned to the program for use to cover travel, lodging, etc. The other 50% as well as faculty salary, stipends and course release costs must come from the total program budget. So, a typical program, costing \$15,000 will include perhaps \$6,000-8,000 of funds which the college retains to pay for faculty and as tuition and fees. The remaining \$7,000-9,000 is used to pay any hotels, airlines, tour companies, on-site staff, third-party providers or academic costs.

## II. PARTIAL TERM ABROAD

This is commonly a Winter Term program, with students living on campus during December and then traveling during the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of Winter Term in January and February. It is possible that this model could be used in other terms, but to date it has not. Again, since students will be off campus during a considerable portion of a term, it is required that these programs provide enough courses to cover full-time enrollment. They typically offer 3-5 courses. As with full-term programs, since these terms require multiple courses, they often require a large student pool, though it is possible to target these programs to a smaller group due to the reduced travel costs (5 weeks of lodging vs. 10 weeks.) It is anticipated that a faculty team would propose this program as well. Tuition is charged to these programs as it is with term programs, with 50% returning to the program budget for use on program components. Faculty salaries, releases or stipends must also come from program funds. Those students who live on campus are also expected to pay for their room/board on campus in the weeks prior to departure (typically December), though these costs are not included in the program fee. They are charged separately by the college, but students must be made aware of this as part of the real costs of the term, just as we tell them about food budgets, spending money and other incidentals. Budgeting and staffing issues on Partial Term programs are identical to Full Term programs even though faculty will teach on campus for half of the term.

## III. COURSES WITH TRAVEL COMPONENTS

This model, in which most coursework is completed on campus as part of a standard trimester, but which includes a travel component, usually during a term break, has become quite popular of late. An example of this would be the Rome program in which students study Religion on campus in Spring Term before a 2 week stay in Rome in the first weeks of summer. Other programs use winter or spring break to extend their program and allow students a travel component as part of their course. In all cases the coursework is done on-campus and students are able to enroll in several courses in addition to the program's required course(s). This allows students who might not be able to leave Augustana for a full term the opportunity to take 1 course, or perhaps an LC, and still have a travel experience. These programs typically have 1-2 faculty involved (making use of 3<sup>rd</sup> party providers for logistical assistance.) and travel for 1-3 weeks. It is recommended that anyone considering this type of program look at Winter Break (January), Spring Break

(February) or early summer (May-early June) as their target travel dates, making a Winter Term or Spring Term course the expectation. Fall Break is simply not long enough to allow for a strong travel component. The advantage of this model is that it not only broadens the student pool, but it also would allow a single department to tailor a program to their needs (such as we have seen with Psychology in Guatemala or Religion in Rome) and limit faculty participation to faculty in that department, rather than offering a broad range of courses which a full term abroad essentially demands. These programs do not include tuition charges, however the college requires an administrative fee of \$100 be included in the charges to students to cover the added labor required to monitor these programs in several departments, including Financial Aid, the Business Office and the IOP. Any faculty stipends must also be included in program fees.

#### IV. SHORT TERM PROGRAMS

These programs are defined by their exclusive use of calendar breaks or summer to contain the entire program. Unlike the model cited above which combines on-campus courses (typically 3+ credits) the short-term program is a travel program confined to the time of the break and regularly offering fewer credits of academic work. A good example of this program type is the Nicaragua Medical Service Learning program which offers students 1-credit in Biology Service Learning for their work during a 2-week immersion program during either spring break or early summer. These programs also do not charge tuition, though students must make certain not to realize overload status if credits are awarded since these programs are conducted during the academic year, when the 33 credit cap is still active. Programs in this category, as with the prior model must contain a \$100 per student administration fee.

#### V. SUMMER PROGRAMS

Summer programs are in some ways very similar to terms abroad, but in others are more like Short Term Programs. They can vary from a single course (3 credits) to a multiple course program (9-10 credits) and in length from 4-10 weeks. Tuition is charged, but, unlike academic year programs, only 20% of the tuition fund is retained by the college, with 80% available to include in the program costs. Traditionally the summer programs have been largely limited to language immersion programs such as Spanish in the Andes or French in Dijon. However, there is no restriction which prohibits other interested parties from designing summer programs, In fact, domestic summer programs such as Geology in the Rocky Mountains have existed for years. Unlike academic year programs, faculty must be paid using stipends for summer programs. One key factor to consider when deciding between a summer option and one of the other models is program cost. While a Fall program, for example, might cost \$14,000 and a summer program \$7,000, students are eligible for every variety of financial aid during the academic year, but are not eligible for financial aid during the summer. The \$7,000 summer program may prove far more expensive for a family than a \$14,000 fall program for which financial aid is applied. This is a major deterrent to summer programming for students.

These five models have been the predominant examples of study abroad at Augustana. However, if you believe you have a different model which might work with your proposal, this should be shared with IOP staff. There is no prohibition on innovative program models, so long as they can be coordinated within the college's expectations for tuition or other funding models and are appropriate academically.

#### ***CAVEAT: LIMITS TO PROGRAMMING***

Two considerations which may impact the success of a given proposal lie beyond the ability of the program proposers to control. The first of these impacts Term and Partial Term programs only. This is a limit on the number of students who may be permitted to participate in Term/Partial Term programs in a given academic year. The college cannot sanction unlimited access to these programs as they represent a loss of revenue from both tuition and room/board charges for each student who is off-campus during any of the three standard terms. For this reason a cap on the number of programs, or on the number of students participating in Term/Partial Term programs may require that proposed term programs be bumped from a particular academic year due to the potential for oversubscription. For this reason all applications for term/partial term programs are due at the same time. This enables IOSC to consider the pool of program applications and verify if the student cohort remains within the approved levels.

The second factor which may affect a particular proposal is the potential for competing programs in a given year. Diversity of program type and program location is a vital factor in maintaining robust study abroad offerings. It is unlikely that multiple programs in the same location or similar locations would be accepted in the same year unless good evidence can demonstrate that the competing programs will pull students from separate pools. For example, in a year when a strong Spain Fall Term proposal and a strong Portugal Spring Proposal are submitted, IOSC may decide that both programs, with similar course offerings and locations are not viable, and will select one over the other, with a recommendation that the second program reapply for a year in which the first program is not offered. However, were two programs in China proposed, one limited to Asian Study students and the other to Geology majors, an argument might be made that the programs have minimal competition for students due to the restrictions on academic area. If both programs can provide evidence that they have an eager student pool sufficient to fill their pool, both China programs might be approved for the same academic year.

#### **What is the timeline for applying to direct a pre-existing program or to develop a new one?**

Each Fall the call will go out for program proposals (new and repeating), with a deadline for submission by the **first day of classes in January**, after Winter Break. This is done so that all programs can be considered simultaneously and a full year's slate of programs can be considered as a package, with components which do not unnecessarily compete with each other for students or resources.



Proposals will be considered, and proposing teams will be asked to visit with IOSC during their January and February meetings. Once all programs have been vetted, the decisions of the committee will be made known to each program director. Once this process is complete, and only once it is complete, should an announcement be made to students about the program. A general announcement will be issued from the IOP office in late Spring and a more formal announcement in the early Fall of the next academic year.

Following approval from IOSC, a program should seek to complete all other necessary steps with faculty governance to ensure that all proposed courses are approved for the catalog and that any desired Gen Ed categories also be approved (This includes LC, LP's and G/D classification.) These approvals must be in place by the end of the Fall Trimester of the year prior to the program's departure, so that students can be made aware of each program's offerings and Gen Ed qualifications.

### **What requirements do program proposals have?**

As with a course proposal within a department, a proposal for a new study abroad program must pass through various stages and include all the relevant data to provide the appropriate committees evidence that this program is academically sound, and in the case of off-campus programs, that it also meet standards for program integrity, use of the location, safety and budgetary viability. For these reasons each proposal for a new program must contain several core components. These are:

1. Description of program: What are its goals? How do the courses relate to the location? What special activities will be included (ex. Service Learning, Internship, Excursions)? What is the overarching theme or emphasis? Who are the target students? What is the ideal program size? What courses will be offered and how do they work together and with the sites? What will make the program attractive to a large enough population of students to ensure you meet your enrollment target?
2. Description of personnel and their qualifications: Who will be the director and who will teach on the program? Provide evidence that these faculty have academic expertise for the courses, and to what degree do they have experiential expertise in the program locales. What evidence can be provided that the faculty involved have good rapport with students, the ability to work with students beyond the classroom and the skills needed to succeed with the heightened responsibilities which an off-campus program inherently demands?

A program must contain adequate evidence not only of faculty academic preparation but experiential/local expertise as well. If faculty members do not demonstrate a strong prior experience on site, a site visit cannot be considered adequate preparation. The proposing team can supplement their own experiential knowledge through the use of an approved third party provider, preferably one which maintains a permanent office and runs regular programs in the target nation(s) and city/cities.

3. Tentative Itinerary: When will you travel? Are there logistical or academic reasons for this time frame? Where will you go? How do you plan to move between program sites or use excursions? What type of housing do you anticipate?
4. Discussion of program providers: To what degree will you be utilizing travel providers, academic services, foreign or other U.S. universities, third party study abroad specialists, etc.
5. Tentative Budget: You will need to work with IOP to get some of the college-mandated items for a budget, and for many other items you may need to request bids from multiple providers. Numbers at this point should be realistic but can be estimates based on research and inquiry with respected providers. You will need to include not only student travel costs, but the costs for all faculty needs (salaries, course releases, stipends, food budgets, travel expenses, etc.).
6. Tentative syllabi and course descriptions for all courses to be taught by Augustana faculty: If non-Augustana faculty will also be hired (through an approved 3<sup>rd</sup> party provider) course types/expectations should be developed and presented. For Augustana courses, the course description should explain the connection between the course and the locations of the program, the rationale for offering the course on-site rather than on-campus, and the connection between the course and campus offerings (Does it count towards the major in that field? Will it offer any Gen Ed categories or suffixes? Is it a new course or a section of a course already on the books?) New courses should describe if they will be permanent additions to the departmental curriculum or limited only to use on the proposed program. Courses already on the catalog should provide information as to how the course will be modified to make use of the program sites.
7. Statement of approval from departments for faculty participants: Departments should not be surprised to learn that one of their faculty are going on a program. All faculty should seek departmental approval based on the term and year of their proposed participation. Proof of this approval should be included in the IOSC proposal.

### **What does the IOSC look at in a program proposal?**

This can be complex, but there are certainly several key questions which are asked of each program proposal. Here are 4 key questions in each major area of a program proposal.

1. Big Picture:
  - a. Does the location make sense for the proposed goals of the program?
  - b. Do the goals match the courses, faculty and excursions listed?
  - c. Is this program supported by other opportunities on campus?
  - d. What will students be able to do beyond this program to relate this to their studies?

## 2. Faculty/Directors

- a. Is there good evidence of academic qualifications for the courses/location chosen?
- b. Is there adequate experience on site for faculty/directors to be considered experts?
- c. Is this group, perhaps with 3<sup>rd</sup> party assistance, capable of handling logistical needs or emergency situations?
- d. Are all faculty cleared by their departments?

## 3. Courses

- a. Do these courses make good use of the program locations?
- b. Do these courses represent a good mix of Gen Ed areas or disciplines?
- c. Are the courses viable in the time frame of the program?
- d. Are their natural points of contact between the courses?

## 4. Itinerary

- a. Does the itinerary provide ample classroom contact time?
- b. Are transportation patterns viable and sound from a safety standpoint?
- c. Are housing options defined adequately?
- d. Are there safety issues with any of the locations within the proposal?

## 5. Budget

- a. Does the budget provide for all the necessary Augustana charges?
- b. Is the group size sufficient to cover the program costs as laid out?
- c. Is there sufficient contingency planning within the budget?
- d. Is there adequate funding for a scouting trip prior to departure?

### **What typically happens during an IOSC program proposal process?**

Once a proposal comes to IOSC, the standard procedure is to call in the proposing director, and in many cases the accompanying faculty, to present the program and engage the IOSC members' questions. This can take anywhere from 30 minutes to 2 hours. The IOSC will then discuss the program and may call back one or more of the proposing faculty to clarify any outstanding questions. When multiple programs are under consideration for the same year or term, as is often the case, the IOSC may choose to wait until all applications have been vetted before contacting applicants with a decision on the program. This is done to ensure that all applicants have an equal opportunity to present their program in cases when it is not possible for all program proposals to be accepted due to limits on the number of programs which may run in a given academic year.

When a decision is reached, one of these outcomes is offered:

1. Program Accepted: The program is approved and the director must now work with other college committees to seek approval of individual courses, LP's or other Gen Ed requirements.

2. Program Accepted with Qualifications: The program is given a tentative green light to proceed, but must return to IOSC with alterations based on the recommendations of the committee. Typically it is expected that the resubmission of the program, with the recommended changes will be completed by the end of the academic year.
3. Program Asked to Resubmit: This can reflect that a program cannot be offered in a given year and faculty are encouraged to resubmit for the following academic year. This may occur due to conflicts (region/mission) with another program offered the same year or because the program was not selected from the pool of proposals and the cap for programs or number of students enrolled in programs is at its maximum. This response from IOSC may also reflect a program which has merit but which requires more extensive development or revision based on suggestions of the committee before it can be accepted. If it is believed that the alterations or elaboration required would entail more work than can be expected in the remainder of the school year, this designation would be used and it would be recommended that a program reapply for a later year.
4. Program Denied: Typically this designation would be reserved for programs which propose travel to a location which poses a security risk. IOSC, using reports from the U.S. Dept. of State as well as equivalent agencies from the governments of Great Britain, Australia and Canada, may decide that the location proposed for the program is not capable of providing adequate services or poses a safety or health risk. Programs may be denied indefinitely in these locations until evidence is available that the concerns are no longer valid.

This designation may also be used if major components of the proposal are inadequate, incomplete or unacceptable. In most cases this type of proposal might be asked to resubmit, but it is possible that the proposal would have to undergo radical change in order to be accepted, at which point it would need to be considered a new proposal rather than a resubmission.

Once IOSC approves a program, key documents regarding personnel are forwarded to the office of the Dean of the College. The Dean of the College is tasked with final approval of the faculty to be involved in any program and may deem that any given faculty member may or may not participate in a program. This may include a recommendation that the designated chair of the program not be eligible for this position but remain eligible to teach on the program. Only the Dean, with full access to faculty personnel files, may decide that a faculty member is approved or not approved for participation. While IOSC may deem that proposing faculty lack adequate academic expertise or that a program staff does not show evidence of adequate on-site experience, the Dean of the College may Any recommendation from the Dean of the College to deny participation or leadership to the proposing faculty of a program changes the status of the program from “approved” to “approved with conditions”. No program can move forward if the faculty involved do not receive permission from the Dean of the College.

**What factors might make approval more difficult?**

While there is no simple answer to this question, there are certainly factors which would contribute to a program proposal being denied or requiring resubmission. Principal among these would be an incomplete proposal, for example one which did not include a reasonably thorough budget, a plan for student housing or a full cohort of faculty to meet student needs.

Other red flags to look for include:

1. Have we justified the academic rigor and use of the proposed location?  
(Academic rigor of courses is primarily for EPC to vet, however IOSC will look at both the appropriateness of the courses proposed to the site and the mix of courses proposed.)
2. Have we demonstrated both academic and experiential preparation among the faculty?
3. Have we adequately explored any potential health or safety risks?
4. Have we presented a target group size which correlates well with the objectives, offerings and budgetary realities of the program?
5. Is there a connection between subjects and themes explored on the program and other offerings available at Augustana? In other words, will program participants be able to continue their study of the region or of the focal issues of the program upon their return to Augustana? (A program that appears disconnected from the Augustana curriculum or which cannot find links between its offerings and further study at Augustana has an uphill fight for approval.)
6. Are there conflicts with other programs on issues of targeted student pool, program location or mission. Two programs going to the same destination or targeting the same students would be difficult to justify in the same academic year. This may not disqualify a program, but could lead to a relocation of a program to a different academic year or other accommodations.

**What is the committee looking for in a program director?**

The wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job and the work ethic of Edison. But, since that is a little vague, let's try to lock it down a little. For the director position on an international program, in addition to providing a current C.V., the applicant is asked to address a set of questions:

1. What administrative experience do you have that might indicate an ability to direct an Augustana study program, including planning, budget, on-site advising and counseling, and on-campus follow-up activities?
2. If you have led or taught in a program previously, please summarize your evaluations. What are the strengths in your program administration? What weaknesses were noted and how do you propose to address them?

3. What prior experience and expertise in the region do you have?
4. Has your participation in the program been discussed in the department? What impact would you being away for a term have on your department?
5. What would you consider your leadership style? How would you describe your rapport with students and colleagues?

**How is the role of director different from that of faculty?**

The primary differences between directing a program and teaching on a program are those of organization and responsibility. While all faculty on a program are expected to engage with students in and beyond the classroom, maintain a professional decorum at all times and assist with program activities or group “shepherding” tasks, it is the primary responsibility of the director to manage the program from its inception to re-entry programming. Most faculty participants will have little contact with logistical development and delivery, budgetary management or structural adjustments when a program is in the planning stages or on the ground. The program director must be responsible to the program as a whole, have an eye on the needs of the college and the program with issues of safety, finances and integrity of the program.

In cases of student misconduct faculty may participate in conversations about courses of action, but it is the director who must make the final call on disciplinary measures. While faculty may also be called on to assist with emergency situations (be they individual or program-wide) the director must consider themselves on-call for the entire duration of the program, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This may require the director to refrain from normal activities such as consumption of alcohol or separation from the group for non-programmatic activities (attending a conference, field research, etc.). While it is not atypical for the director to depart from the group during the course of a day to handle upcoming events, they are expected to be available to students and faculty to deal with issues ranging from homesickness to hurricanes.

The director of any program is essentially the Academic Affairs Office, Dean of Students Office, Counseling Office, Business Office and Office of Public Safety all in one. Directors are encouraged to engage program faculty with all decision-making, but must recognize that the program is under their watch and that they must take responsibility for ensuring its success. As should be evident, this is a daunting, but also very rewarding position, one with a level of responsibility that is not often felt on campus. For this reason, the decision to apply to direct a program must be made carefully and only after full consideration of the challenges the position poses.

**What needs to be done once a program is approved by IOSC?**

This document does not cover all the responsibilities that a director will face when their proposal turns into an accepted program, but there are a few steps which must be followed once a program is approved by IOSC in order for that program to be considered “Approved” in full.

All new courses must be approved by the college using standard faculty governance structures, typically: Department-> Division-> EPC-> Senate.

Any courses seeking a Learning Perspective, Gen Ed Suffix (I, Q, G, D, etc.) must also be approved by the General Education Committee, typically after division approval and prior to EPC approval.

Any courses seeking to offer Internship or Service Learning Credit must meet the college guidelines for these educational models. It is recommended that faculty seeking to create either Service Learning- or Internship-based programs should consult with the Director of Service Learning or the Director of Internships (both within the CEC) prior to seeking IOSC approval.

Other tasks related to program development, recruitment, coordination with IOP and pre-departure programming will be discussed in a separate document. It is recommended that faculty wishing to develop a new program meet regularly with the IOP Director to discuss these issues throughout the approval process as well as the post-approval planning.

**What faculty or director compensation may be anticipated for an off-campus program budget?**

The first fact to consider regarding compensation with international or domestic off-campus programs is that all compensation for faculty must come from each individual program’s budget. This includes payment for all courses taught, as well as any course releases or stipends earned. There is a great deal of variation in this area, depending on the program type, however certain standards do exist. For clarity these will be broken down based on the program type.

1. Faculty compensation for teaching on a term or partial-term program.

There are three types of compensation typical of a term-length program: salary, course releases or stipends, and travel expense advances. We will separate these out in this first category, though some are relevant to all programs.

- a. Salary & Benefits. When a faculty member participates in a term-away program, the program must pick up the cost of both salary and benefits for that portion of the faculty member’s load, typically calculated as 1/7<sup>th</sup> of a full load for each course. We understand that the typical faculty member teaches 7 courses for the college each year. If one of those seven is taught on a program, the program must pay that 7<sup>th</sup> of salary and benefits. So, a program offering 4 courses must budget

for 4/7ths of faculty salary and benefits. To avoid asking HR or the Business Office to reveal the salaries of each faculty member, and so that programs do not unfairly favor junior faculty over senior faculty, the amount of compensation is based on a college-wide average, rather than basing it on the actual salary and benefits of the faculty member participating. The Director of IOP will provide a program director with the cost per course for each Augustana faculty-taught course. For example, a program running in 2011-2012 had a per-seventh cost of \$10,791. So, a program with 3 courses taught by Augustana faculty must budget for 3x\$10,791. This total is then divided among the number of student participants in a program. It is for this reason that programs with higher numbers of Augustana faculty-led courses tend to also have larger student cohorts, to offset the increased cost of faculty salaries.

- b. Stipends & Course Releases: The second form of compensation for faculty who teach on a term or partial-term program during the standard academic year are payments or course releases provided to faculty as compensation for their time away from campus. Any program which asks faculty to leave campus during the school year is expected to provide funds to cover these stipends and releases according to the following scale:
  1. Faculty who are off-campus from 1-21 days are paid a stipend equivalent to a 1-credit overload (in 2011-2012 this was \$1,420). Faculty in this category do not receive a course release and must teach 6 courses during their time on campus during the academic year (assuming a standard load of 7 courses.)
  2. Faculty who are off campus from 22-42 days are paid a stipend equivalent to a 2-credit overload (\$2,840 in 2011-2012). Faculty in this category do not receive a course release either and also must teach 6 courses during their time on campus during the academic year (assuming a standard load of 7 courses.)
  3. Faculty who are off campus more than 42 days within a given term are not offered a stipend, but are granted a course release for that academic year. This course release is paid to the college by the program. The program must charge to the student participants the equivalent of a 3-credit overload (\$4,260 in 2011-2012). This money is collected by the program but remains with the college.
- c. Travel Expense Advances: A program may also choose to include in its budget a travel expense fund for its faculty participants. This fund allows faculty to receive a designated expense fund in advance. This fund can be used for travel costs such as purchase of a visa or new passport, transportation to and from the group flights (if applicable), meal money for the time spent off-campus, inoculations (if not



covered by insurance), laundry charges, photocopying of course materials (exams, handouts, etc. while abroad) or other incidentals while traveling. It should not be used for the purchase of class materials, books, souvenirs or other items unrelated to the travel component of the program. Faculty who receive this advance must keep a log of all expenses which use college funds and must turn this in along with receipts for purchases upon their return. Any funds not accounted for must be returned to the college.

Let us offer an example of program to model the different types of compensation and the budgetary impact. Our hypothetical program has 3 faculty on a full-term program overseas. Each faculty member teaches 1 course but will be off-campus the entire term. The program director has also budgeted for each faculty to receive \$1,000 for travel expenses. So, in this program, using 2011-2012 numbers the director must budget as follows:

Cost	Description
\$3,000	The \$1,000 travel allowance for 3 faculty.
\$12,780	A 3-credit (\$4,260) course release for 3 faculty.
\$32,373	Three 7ths of salary & benefits average to cover the three courses being offered on the program.

For this program, the total compensation for faculty would be the total of these three items, in this case just over \$48,000. If there were 30 participants in the program. If this program has 40 participants, each student would pay just over \$1,200 of the total program cost to support this compensation plan. If the program had only 20 students, the cost per student would be over \$2,400 each. This is one reason why smaller programs tend to have fewer faculty, since the cost per faculty member can be high, even before the program pays for faculty flights or housing during the program itself.

## 2. Faculty compensation on a summer or short-term program.

Summer and short-term programs are often quite different in their financing from term programs. Stipends are the most common form of compensation on these programs.

For summer programs, faculty teaching a course should receive standard summer pay for the course, essentially the same as overload pay (\$4,260 in 2011-2012).

For short programs held over break, and often including coursework completed on campus rather than off-campus, stipends vary greatly. Since the course is being taught on campus, the stipend does not represent payment for teaching, but rather compensation for the additional effort required to participate in an off-campus programs. There is no set amount for these stipends, and it is recommended that the program director speak with the Director of IOP to develop a reasonable stipend based on length of time off-campus, size of the student cohort and role of the faculty

member during the travel portion of the program. In no situation should the stipend for faculty on a short-term program exceed the equivalent of a 3-credit overload program, and in most cases it is significantly less (\$500-1,000 is more typical.)

Short-term and summer programs may also opt to include a travel expense advance, with the same expectations for receipts and expense logs upon their return (as describe on pages 16-17.)

3. Director compensation.

Director compensation is a complex matter. One must take into account the length of the program, the size of the student cohort, the possibility of co-directors and the option for directors to also teach on a program. At present there is no college policy on Director stipends and practices have varied greatly over the years. Some directors minimize their own compensation in an effort to keep smaller programs at the lowest possible price, while very often larger programs include larger stipends for their directors since the responsibilities and oversight are greater on these programs, especially if they include multiple destinations or independently arranged lodging and transportation. So, IOP cannot offer you a standard policy on director compensation. That said, we have tried to develop a possible future model for compensation which takes into account the two primary driver of director workload, group size and duration of a program. While the scale included below is only a model, not a requirement, IOP feels that it might offer you a model to use as your starting point as you work up a progrma budget. This scale includes both course release possibilities (Not true of summer programs) and stipends.

**Director Compensation**

<b>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</b>	<b>Up to 21 days</b>	<b>22 to 42 days</b>	<b>43 days &amp; up</b>
1 to 10	500	750	1000
11 to 19	750	1000	1 credit stipend
20 to 29	1 credit stipend	1 credit stipend	2 credit stipend
30 to 49	1 credit stipend	2 credit stipend	3 credit stipend
50 and Over	2 credit stipend	3 credit stipend	3 credit stipend

In this chart, the light grey area represents a 1-course release in addition to the stipend cited. The dark grey area to the bottom right represents a two credit course release in addition to the stipend cited. Each course release must be budgeted as it is with faculty (\$4,350 for 2013-2014)

Faculty on short-term programs or summer programs are not eligible for course releases. In cases where a course release is called for, a reasonable substitute is to double the stipend compensation (e.g. from a 1 credit stipend to a 2 credit stipend).

If a director is also teaching on the program, the salary & benefit plan for courses taught cited above (but not the stipend or release plan) must also be taken into account.

Let us look at two hypothetical examples to clarify how the chart works:

- a. Dr. Tina Traveler is the director of a 20 student group studying Economics on campus, then traveling to Dubai for 3 weeks (20 days). She will be working with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party on site, so there is no other faculty member involved. Since her course is taught on campus before the trip, there are no faculty salary or stipend costs, only director stipends apply.

Dr. Traveler is paid a 1-credit stipend (\$1,460 in 2011-2012) but receives no course releases. For this program, the budget would need to include only the cost of the stipend.

- b. Dr. Jacques Voyageur is the director of a 40-student program in Brussels for the full term. He will also be teaching a course on Belgian literature.

As director, Dr. Voyageur is eligible for a 1 course release, and a stipend equivalent to a 3-credit course (\$4,260 in 2011-2012).

Since he is also teaching on the program, he will teach five courses upon return, rather than six (having taught 1 on the program and received a 1-course release). In this case study, the program would need to charge students for the course taught by the director (\$10,791), the course release (\$4,260) and the stipend (\$4,260).

Just a reminder that the scale and these examples are simply suggestions, and that it is current policy that each director's compensation must be approved by the Dean of the College, particularly in those cases where directors are requesting multiple course releases.

A program with two co-directors, assuming equal responsibility for each, should be treated as a program with 1 director, each for ½ of the program. For example, a 30 student, 10-week program with co-directors would be compensated as if each co-director were leading a 30-student 5 week program. Each would receive a course release (paid by the program) and the stipend equivalent to a 5-week commitment (a 2-credit stipend). This is regardless of the actual time spent off-campus. Uneven divisions of responsibility (Director and Associate Director) should be arranged with the Director of IOP and the Dean of the College.

International & Off-Campus Programs invites you to visit us as you begin to consider directing or participating in any program. We welcome questions and interest from all faculty and are here to offer our services as you consider taking advantage of the opportunities Augustana can provide for faculty to work with students across the United States or around the world.