

Models for Faculty-led Programming Abroad

There are several issues with regard to faculty-led programming and the Study Abroad portfolio, and they are unmistakable:

- faculty-led programs account for nearly 60% of LU students studying abroad
- the upward trend in short term study abroad nationally and at Lehigh is indisputable, mostly attributable to lower costs and an increase in non-traditional study abroad students, such as those with disabilities and those NOT in the humanities
- LU students and their parents are very comfortable with faculty-led programming because of the direct involvement of faculty and the ease of credit transfer
- freshman and students with GPAs below 3.0 are eligible, unlike semester programs
- these programs at LU currently are exclusive to the summer and intersession, with the exception of the CBE-SMU pilot
- sustainability remains a serious question in terms of recruiting new faculty leaders
- unlike other “international experiences” such as EWB, Chorus, and others, faculty-led study abroad is credit-bearing and, therefore, counts when organizations like IIE compile data

In the absence of department-specific curricular modifications that would allow more LU students to study abroad during the academic year, faculty-led programming, which may include faculty-directed internships and other experiences that bear credit, is the most likely avenue for getting more students abroad sooner. Affordability and sustainability are crucial to any new programming that we develop, and to help us better understand the most commonly used and easiest to implement models of faculty-led programming, I have outlined below six models for faculty-led programming that, in part, address those two crucial questions.

Model	Faculty Incentive	Student Benefit	Sustainability	Expense to student
A) Student Fee Driven/Off-load Teaching with Hybrid Mgt* (Prague, Shanghai, etc.)	high-avg-low	high	low	high
B) Student Fee Driven with Third-Party Mgt** (no LU examples)	high	high	high	high
C) On-load teaching for Summer/Winter; No Salary (no LU examples)	high	high	avg	avg-low
D) On-load teaching for Summer/Winter; Director's fee (GC Ghana 08-09)	high	high	avg	avg-low
E) Academic Semester/Year Rotational (EES Proposal)	high	high	high	low***
F) On-load Spring Break or May Abroad (CBE-SMU)	high	high	high	low***
G) Subsidized/Outside/One-Time Funding (Martindale; CBE-SMU)	high-avg-low	high	high-low	low****

* Faculty Director, Study Abroad Office, Third-Party Provider

** Study Abroad Office, Third-Party Provider; Minimal Faculty Management

*** Since tuition is tied to the semester and faculty are on-load, the program is not driven by student fees

**** Expense to Lehigh (or other) is HIGH

Notes to Models

Model A: Student Fee Driven/Off-load Teaching (Prague, Shanghai, etc.)

Model A is our current model and the one that I describe as “charisma” or “personality” driven. For the most part these programs have been around for some time and have very motivated and senior faculty running them. They have spent years as Study Abroad faculty leaders, and have streamlined much of the programming. The major drawback to this model is that these courses are taught off-line in the summer, taking away from faculty research and personal opportunities at that time. In addition, program coordination must be carried out during the academic year with no course release. It is true, however, that the additional salary from such a course could also be an incentive to faculty, but this does not seem to be an effective selling point to faculty who have busy enough schedules. Although it is conceivable that this programming could be sustainable, this model is not attractive to junior faculty and faculty that already have heavy teaching and research schedules. Importantly, this model drives up the cost of study abroad because faculty salaries and benefits are paid from student fees; in addition, students are not eligible for financial aid in this model. Currently, there are no faculty lined up to take over these programs, which account for nearly 60% of our study abroad student numbers. We have already lost two highly popular programs in Paris and Rome-Florence because of departing faculty, and CAS has no immediate plans to renew those programs.

Model B: Student Fee Driven with Third-Party Mgt (no LU examples)

Model B is the most faculty-friendly model, in that it relieves the professor—if a professor is needed at all—of any coordination or management responsibilities leading up to the trip, and imposes minimal advising and other responsibilities abroad. This model fully employs a third-party provider to take care of every logistical/operational need including accommodation, travel, airport pick and drop off, classroom and IT reservations, field trips, 24-7 access and availability to students and staff, and, if needed, course design and delivery and/or internship coordination and set up, among a number of other services. Depending on the number of credits attached, amount of faculty involvement, and the location, these programs range from average pricing to expensive; in addition, students are not eligible for financial aid in this model because of the summer programming. Importantly, these programs are flexible and can be tailored, and could include anything from 20 internships in London to 10 students doing a service learning project in sub-Saharan Africa.

Model C: On-load Teaching for Summer/Winter; No Director’s fee (no LU examples)

Model D: On-load Teaching for Summer/Winter; With Director’s fee (GC Ghana 08-09)

Models C and D are not used at Lehigh and, to my knowledge, never have been with the exception of the one-time course release that Tina Richardson received from COE (via GC budget?) to develop the practicum (1 credit) and GC trip to Ghana last winter. These

models are common in the Study Abroad field, and I believe that the universities/colleges that have the most success in sending students abroad employ variations of these models. These models have three exceptional benefits: (1) they give faculty relief from teaching loads and the opportunity to plan programs during the academic year; (2) faculty may do research during the academic year that they would otherwise do in the summer; and (3) they make the programming less expensive for students because faculty salaries are not paid from student fees, but rather from the salaries that they already receive from employment contracts. Model D would include a modest director's fee for program development and implementation, and may employ a third-party provider.

Model E: Academic Semester/Year Rotational (EES Proposal)

Model F: On-load Spring Break or May Abroad (CBE-SMU)

Models E and F are used regularly by institutions that send the most students abroad, usually liberal arts-focused colleges and institutions that have tied internationalization to the curriculum and have developed a rewards system (tenure & promotion) for faculty who engage in this programming. The benefits of this model are similar to those of C and D: (1) with both Models E and F the programming is less expensive because (a) student fees are not paying faculty salaries and benefits and (b) tuition is tied to the regular semester; (2) with Model E faculty are rotated in and out of the international site, leaving them without the commitment of three months abroad (family and personal issues); (3) with Model E faculty teach an intensive course, leaving other time during the semester for research and scholarly activity; (4) with Model G the course is integrated into a semester course, yielding less time commitment from faculty in terms of both academics and time abroad. A fifth benefit of these models is the potential for bringing in larger numbers of faculty and students, and, as a result, making this model more sustainable. Importantly, although the EES proposal and CBE model are department focused, there is no reason why such a program could not be college or university wide, bringing more coherence and sustainability to university-wide global education.

Model G: Subsidized/Outside/One-Time Funding (Martindale, CBE-SMU)

Model F is both new (SMU) and long-established (Martindale) at Lehigh and has two very important features: (1) it allows for greater financial flexibility in the development of programming, and (2) it runs subsidized and, therefore, above and beyond a "normal" and sustainable budget for faculty-led study abroad. However, the drawbacks to this model are clear, especially where there is no endowment or permanent budget commitment: (1) a sustainability plan should be developed for a subsequent program or these become one-off efforts; (2) there is no guarantee that funding can be secured for future programming; and (3) there is probably more "administrative" work associated with this programming, such as the need to commit human resources to fund-raising for future efforts. Importantly, this model may provide insights into ways of funding study abroad other than the more common programming models in the Study Abroad field.