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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force offers an extended and detailed set of recommendations for strengthening, enhancing, and revolutionizing Colby’s global profile, reach, engagements, and partnerships.

The report opens with aspirational statements to define Global Colby, a Colby Global Guarantee, and a globalized curriculum that might include a new global literacy requirement and global labs.

Following a review of international research currently undertaken by faculty, the report suggests a more robust funding structure for supporting international research by faculty and students, as well as institutional mechanisms to better track and showcase such research. Following a comparative review of off-campus study programs, the report offers a number of recommendations to better integrate off-campus study into Colby’s curricular and co-curricular programming, including a new mission statement defining the goals of off-campus study, a thorough review of our palette of study abroad programs, ideas about how to better integrate faculty into off-campus study programs, and an enhanced role for the Off Campus Study Committee.

The report prioritizes recommendations for expanding global Jan Plan courses through investing in support for faculty to develop such programs and ensuring equitable financial access to all Colby students. The report suggests the development of external partnerships to support faculty-faculty and faculty-student research collaborations, student internships, visiting scholars, and international students. The report also highlights funding needs to build the programs suggested in the recommendations.

The report concludes with a major recommendation to build and staff a Center for Global Engagement at Colby to administer and support global partnerships, seek grants and financial support, develop faculty and student research abroad, plan and oversee curricular and co-curricular innovations, manage visiting scholar initiatives, support international students, develop and manage several new recommended signature Colby initiatives, and build and manage a web profile of Colby’s global engagements.
MANDATE

President Greene posed six questions to the task force to guide our work. The task force is charged with offering recommendations, with the understanding that further research might be required to determine how to operationalize the recommendations. The questions are:

1. Should we create an expectation that all students will have one or more meaningful global experiences (study, work, research) while at Colby? The task force revised this question to: What is an appropriate Colby expectation regarding global experiences (study, work, research, summer term) for students while at Colby?

2. How might we better support faculty and student research projects that have an international component?

3. a. Should we be considering a different model of study abroad to support our educational goals?
   b. Does Jan Plan offer special opportunities that we should pursue?

4. a. Are there partnerships that would help facilitate our goals in this area?
   b. Are there special areas of interest at Colby that we could focus on for fostering global connections?

5. a. How should we be thinking about the international composition of our faculty and student body in the years ahead?
   b. Are there visiting models or other innovative approaches we should be considering?

6. Are there areas of the world that deserve special attention by Colby when it comes to global programs or recruitment?

The task force met for the first time on December 14, and during the subsequent five months gathered information to address these questions through interviews with faculty, staff, and students, a faculty survey, and comparative research on peer institutions and funding possibilities.

The report addresses the mandated questions in turn, offering an overview of research results as well as general recommendations that can be implemented swiftly (in bold italics) and radical recommendations that require administrative prioritization and additional resources (in boxes). The report concludes with a recommendation for an institutional and administrative structure for Global Colby, a communications strategy for Global Colby, a list of potential signature Colby initiatives, and a list of funding priorities. The task force wishes to be clear that these recommendations are preliminary and suggestive, intended to open opportunities for fuller campus discussion and consideration. They are not intended to close down alternative options or to be taken as conclusive. In some cases the recommendations would require additional research by a working group to develop a plan for operationalization.

Appendices of detailed or more extensive research results accompany some sections.

The members of the task force wish to thank President David Greene for initiating this opportunity to envision Global Colby. We also wish to thank the large number of faculty, staff, and students who agreed to interviews, provided written comments, participated in focus groups, and completed the Qualtrics Survey.
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1. WHAT IS AN APPROPRIATE COLBY EXPECTATION REGARDING GLOBAL EXPERIENCES (STUDY, WORK, RESEARCH, SUMMER TERM) FOR STUDENTS WHILE AT COLBY?
(APPENDICES A AND B)

We responded to this question by engaging broadly with faculty, staff, and students across campus to develop a Guiding Statement and two aspirational statements to define Global Colby. The first statement offers a collective understanding of how to envision Colby as an institution of global learning. The second statement proposes a Colby Global Guarantee that specifies what Colby should promise to incoming students regarding opportunities for global learning. The task force also conducted preliminary research on Colby’s curriculum to assess its global reach and to compare our curriculum to that of peer institutions. From this research we developed a third aspirational statement about a curriculum for global learning at Colby.

GUIDING STATEMENT ON GLOBAL COLBY

What do we mean by global Colby?
How do the global and the local relate to one another at Colby?
What does it mean for Colby faculty, staff, and students to pursue global citizenship?

Global Colby is a vision and an institutional structure that embraces an exploration of the complex connections between the local and the global through the liberal arts, civic engagement, and scholarly research. A commitment to Global Colby means a curriculum engaged with global issues, concerns, and developments as integral to a Colby education, an educational process that allows students to develop a sense of self connected to the global commons, and resources to ensure that faculty and staff are institutionally supported to carry out this vision.

As a liberal arts institution, Colby should aim to decenter the dominant conceptions of community held by its students and faculty. Instead of seeing the global as exclusively out there, it is important that people at Colby also see it right here—in the United States, in Waterville, on Mayflower Hill, and in each of us. Every member of the Colby community has an identity with a global dimension. Each of us must learn to look at our immediate circles, and within ourselves, and recognize the differences and commonalities that define the college as a global community.

Today global at Colby often means:

- Seeking experiences elsewhere, not here
- Expecting students to leave Colby to enrich their lives, see “the world,” and gain cultural literacy or cross-cultural experience
- Seeing study abroad as taking a break from academic work
- Researching and traveling internationally for faculty and staff
- Thinking about diversity in the US and abroad through college requirements
- Doing altruistic or humanitarian work abroad
Education about the *global* will help ensure this concept does not take on troubling implications at Colby, such as:

- Promoting internationalism for its own sake
- Observing cultures from an ethnocentric or presumptively neutral or innocent position
- Edutourism
- Understanding diversity only as an abstract idea relevant to a small group of people

**In the near future, Global Colby should mean:**

- Embracing many things, not a single, narrow, or fixed definition
- Exploring the complex connections between the local and the global through classroom engagement and scholarship
- Critically thinking about social identity to challenge assumptions about difference
- Seeing everyone at Colby as connected to the world, as having an identity that cuts across multiple communities
- Fostering intercultural competence on and off campus
- Cultivating a community at Colby in which each member exercises a civic responsibility that exceeds the boundaries of the Colby campus
- Understanding diversity as a lived experience relevant to everyone
- Understanding that making Colby global is a process and not an end goal

Appendix A offers examples of initiatives at Colby that demonstrate this vision. Appendix B provides a comparative review of Colby’s current global curriculum.
ASPIRATIONAL STATEMENT: THE COLBY GLOBAL GUARANTEE

Colby College guarantees opportunities for global learning. Colby is committed to supporting appropriate global engagements for the scholarly growth of faculty and students and the pedagogical enhancement of the academic program. In addition to semester or year-long study abroad programs, Colby ensures equal access to other opportunities for global engagement through Colby’s distinctive Jan Plan program as well as summer research. Our commitment includes administrative support, financial aid, relevant counseling and medical preparation, internships, rigorous and engaging off campus study opportunities, and dynamic curricular and co-curricular programs.
ASPIRATIONAL STATEMENT: A GLOBALIZED CURRICULUM AT COLBY

A curriculum dedicated to global learning entails an intellectual exploration of global-local connections, global developments, and global issues. An orientation to global awareness infuses the entire curriculum, apparent most conspicuously in the prevalence of Global Studies majors, interdisciplinary area studies programs, a global literacy requirement, high standards for language proficiency, and students' high participation in study abroad programs. A globalized curriculum ensures that students effectively contextualize their experiences to engage in research, internships, and study abroad programs in relation to Colby's academic and ethical goals.

Background

Colby’s global learning curriculum is inherent in courses that center on geographic regions around the world, addressing natural, cultural, political and economic issues and developments as well as intellectual traditions of those regions. Colby's global learning curriculum also ensures attention to the intersectionality and inseparability of the global and the local. A globalized curriculum encourages research and civic engagement on scales that span the local and the global. This engaged curriculum, in turn, demands that faculty can access the necessary resources to realize their own global engagements.

The analysis of Colby’s curriculum and the comparative research presented in Appendix B on curricular offerings at peer institutions suggest that further attention could be directed to some gaps in Colby’s course offerings: Arabic/Middle Eastern Studies; African Studies/Africana studies as a free-standing major; South and/or Southeastern Asian Studies; expanding Latin American Studies by adding Portuguese and/or Border Studies. Adding a new foreign language might well broaden and deepen our global coverage, but allowing students to meet the language requirement or complete a major in the language or related area studies program given Colby’s current curricular structure requires a minimum of 1.8 FTE.

Curricular Innovations

**Global literacy requirement.** While Colby offers a comparatively strong global curriculum with the exception of the areas noted above, we may wish to replace the current international diversity requirement with a global literacy requirement. We refer this question to the Task Force to Review the All College Distributional Requirements. One route would be to investigate the Global Learning Rubric designed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities available in *Essential Global Learning*, edited by Dawn Michele Whitehead and published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2016 (available at Miller Library). This rubric calls for radical interdisciplinarity in the form of scaffolded courses offered across all four years of study, including such interlinked possibilities as freshman seminars, internships, international research collaborations, civic engagement courses, and capstone courses. This report defines global learning as:

A critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and
legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people’s lives and the earth’s sustainability. Through global learning, students should (1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences; (2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities; and (3) address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably.

**Global Labs.** Another curricular innovation explored and endorsed by the task force is the creation of Global Labs. Global Labs would be a new format and designation for courses that, in alignment with the Global Colby statement, “embrace an exploration of the complex connections between the local and the global through the liberal arts, civic engagement, and scholarly research.” Such courses would combine academic and experiential dimensions of learning through connecting classroom work with research and/or civic engagement in another context. Global Labs would be inherently collaborative (engaging a relevant combination of faculty, research collaborators, students, and/or external collaborators and partners). For example, an ISP cluster or a language course could culminate in a faculty-led off-campus Jan Plan or summer research program. A Jan Plan course on its own could constitute a global lab. Alternatively, a global lab course could prepare students in an on-campus course to conduct independent research at an off-campus center with which Colby has established a partnership, where a faculty member has established research connections, or in a pre-approved off-campus study program. A global lab course could take place entirely in Maine, engaging students and faculty in collaborative research on issues such as immigration, migrant labor, language, trade, tourism, commodity flows, and more.

Global labs would: enable faculty to meaningfully engage students on important global issues through various pedagogical approaches that combine academic and experiential learning; enable Colby to utilize specific partnerships where Colby faculty already have long-term scholarly connections to expand opportunities for students to conduct directed research; enable Colby faculty and students to cohere on-campus courses with off-campus study programs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COLBY EXPECTATIONS REGARDING GLOBAL EXPERIENCES**

*Recommendation:* We suggest that these aspirational statements, after review by relevant campus community members and updated to reflect the adoption of recommendations from this report, should be available on Colby’s website and adopted as guiding aspiration by the campus community.

*Radical Recommendation:* We suggest that the Task Force to Review the All College Distributional Requirements consider a Colby version of the Global Learning Rubric and that the proposed Dean of Global Engagement be tasked to work with faculty and relevant offices at Colby to develop Global Lab courses.
2. HOW MIGHT WE BETTER SUPPORT FACULTY AND STUDENT RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT HAVE AN INTERNATIONAL COMPONENT?

(APPENDICES C AND D)

This section summarizes findings surrounding strengths and weaknesses of current Colby College support for international faculty and student research, and the potential for additional funding and support services to catalyze additional international research activities. The report is divided into four sections, two of which have appendices of supporting data.

Section 1 summarizes the publicly available data on faculty-led international research at Colby, based on data drawn from departmental and program websites, faculty websites, and a review of the (limited) available data on faculty use of Provost’s Office funds for international research and international conference attendance.

Section 2 describes the results of a Qualtrics survey distributed to 85 permanent Colby College faculty identified by the task force as currently or previously engaged in international research. Of the 53 completed responses (62% response rate), 39 faculty indicated that they are currently engaged in one or more international research projects. These international research faculty hail from a wide array of departments and programs, and many are engaged in research in more than one country or region. Faculty report lack of funding (especially for international travel for research and conference attendance) and lack of administrative support (including applying for and managing grants, managing student travel logistics and safety, etc.) as key barriers to expanded international research activity. Survey results also suggest a relatively low familiarity with available on-campus and off-campus financial support for faculty research.

Section 3 summarizes current efforts to more systematically compile and share data on international research being undertaken by Colby faculty and students, via a central repository of international research activities and an associated website under development through the Colby College Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs (GSP). Also this spring the GSP will be adding a grant management system to make grant submissions more efficient, plus a comprehensive searchable grants database to make the research and discovery of grants easier.

Section 4 offers some novel ideas for developing new initiatives at Colby to support faculty and student scholarship and to promote Colby’s reputation as a leader in international scholarship and signature global programming.

SECTION 1. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AT COLBY COLLEGE

To date there has been no comprehensive review of international research being undertaken by faculty or students at Colby College, and no central database of international research activities or opportunities is currently maintained. We therefore began with a review of all Colby faculty web profiles and research descriptions to identify faculty with current international research projects or interests, followed by a review of the limited body of existing data maintained by the College to track faculty and student international research activity. The complete report from which this section is excerpted is included in Appendix C.
Summary of Faculty International Research Activity at Colby College

Figure 1 summarizes the current numbers of faculty engaged in some form of international research across the various divisions and departments. Figure 2 shows the geographic range of international research faculty. These classifications are based solely upon faculty self-reported research interests as posted on their Colby College web profiles and personal/lab research websites where available.

The largest numbers of internationally oriented faculty are in the Arts & Humanities Division, most prominently in the foreign languages departments and programs. English also has several faculty with research interests classified as “international”; in many cases these faculty focus on continental European literature. Other departments and programs in the Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies Divisions, as well as Biology in the Sciences Division, have large numbers of international research faculty. Not unexpectedly laboratory-based (e.g., Psychology) and STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) have relatively low levels of participation in international faculty research, with some noteworthy exceptions. With the exception of the Sciences Division, all divisions have broad geographical representation in terms of faculty research interests.

Figure 1. Colby College faculty engaged in international research.

Figure 2 summarizes the geographical distribution of current faculty research activities and interests as reported by departmental and program websites. With the exception of the Sciences Division, all divisions have broad geographical representation in terms of faculty research interests.

A few faculty have “international” research without a specific defined research geography, including Dr. Rodman’s work on U.N. governance (Government), or the cross-country and cross-region work in Australia, Brazil, Denmark, Ghana, Jordan, and Taiwan by Dr. Howard
Ultimately the results of this review of available web materials on international research at Colby College suggest a broad level of interest and capacity to engage in international research across divisions and across many departments and programs. But this process has also revealed the paucity of standardized or centralized data on international faculty research results and interests; indeed, many faculty online profiles are severely outdated, and it is likely that additional international research interests are present at Colby but not captured by this review.

**Overview of Available Sources of International Research Funding and Support at Colby College**

Mirroring the lack of centralized data collection on faculty international research interests and activities, there is virtually no currently available data on international research funding. Scattered sources of international research funding include:

- **The Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs (GSP)**, which has begun to organize data on externally-sourced grants, is implementing this spring/summer a web-based discovery and workflow tool, called Pivot, that combines a comprehensive source of global funding opportunities with the largest collection of scholar profiles into one intuitive solution. GSP and faculty will be able to easily explore new avenues for funding, view funding opportunities uniquely matched to their scholar profile, collaborate with colleagues and manage the results of the process to build a partnership strategies.

- **The Provost’s Office**, which maintains data on the use of startup funds, endowed funds, Dean/Provost funds, and travel grants, although with the exception of travel grants the location of the research (domestic versus international) is not monitored in a standardized way.

- **The Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs & Civic Engagement** and the **Oak Institute**, which maintain databases of grants for faculty and faculty-student collaborative research as well as limited data on past funding for international travel for visiting research collaborators.

- **Individual Departments/Programs**, which also maintain some data on international
research activities that is not monitored by either the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs or the Provost’s office. These include flexible endowed funds, and many student research opportunities that may not be recorded as such in other administrative offices.

- **The Career Center** maintains a detailed list of internship opportunities, and Colby student participation in Colby-approved and registered internships. These internships are tracked by country, and include data on the location, academic credit received, and funding for 483 student internships in 83 countries since 2004 (prominently Costa Rica (49), China (40), India (36), Japan (22), and France (19), with Sub Saharan African countries less common but including South Africa (10) and Malawi (7)). However “research” versus “other internship” has not been clearly differentiated in these data to date.

As with faculty research, international research opportunities and activities for students are difficult to trace at the College level – for example students may participate in international research with individual professors using startup funds, endowed chair funds, Division funds, Provost Office funds (Student Special Projects grants, CUSSR Summer Research Assistantships), Presidential Scholar funds, designated/competitive thesis funds, or internship funds, among others. The use of these funds for international versus non-international research is not systematically monitored; identifying instances of student (or faculty-student) international research will therefore require manual classification of research activities based on Provost or Departmental records.

**SECTION 2. QUALTRICS SURVEY OF FACULTY INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH INTERESTS, ACTIVITIES, AND PERCEIVED BARRIERS**

In response to the dearth of organized data on faculty or student international research at Colby, a task force working group developed a Qualtrics survey to collect data on past, present, and proposed faculty research on international topics and/or in international settings. This section provides a brief summary of important survey results and task force recommendations; detailed information about the structure and results of the survey are contained in Appendix D.

**Survey Results**

The most common type of international research reported by respondents was independent faculty research, followed by faculty collaborative research with non-Colby faculty, faculty-student collaborative research, and faculty supervision of international independent student research. Faculty conduct research in all of the regions included in the survey (totaling 57 countries), with the highest level of faculty research underway in Western Europe, followed by Sub-Saharan Africa, the US and Canada, and Southeast Asia. Many faculty have multi-country research agendas, and a majority of faculty respondents in the survey have multi-region research agendas.

The majority of respondents report internal funding (especially Division Grants) as a primary source of support for current international research. Among non-Colby funding sources, sources of funding for international research currently include non-US Universities (13 out of 39), non-US government agencies (11) and NGOs (10), followed by US government agencies and other domestic institutions.
Use of major government sources of funding for international research is very limited, and at the time of the survey (March-April 2016) less than one third of respondents (12 out of 39) reported that they were actively pursuing additional funding opportunities for international research. Many respondents were unfamiliar with several sources internal and external funding for international faculty research, especially on-campus sources of student research support, on-campus Provost Office support, and off-campus sources of private sector support. Large numbers of respondents reported familiarity with multiple funding sources but no past efforts at applying. This, combined with the very small number of responses for “Applied but did not receive funding”, suggests that additional support for faculty applications to various funding sources might yield meaningful dividends.

**Opportunities for Student Engagement in International Research**

Respondents listed research assistantships during the academic year as the primary opportunity available to engage their students in international research, followed by, in order of significance, summer student research assistantships, honors student research and advanced independent study opportunities, and finally international internships. Ten percent of respondents had offered an international Jan Plan. Just over a third of respondents reported that they targeted low income and underrepresented groups for international research opportunities.

**Opportunities for Collaborative and/or Interdisciplinary International Research**

Almost three-fourths of respondents indicated involvement in collaborative or interdisciplinary international research, although results do not suggest that faculty perceive that Colby is particularly supportive of these efforts, even though many faculty do indicate that they receive support for such research from their departments or programs. Unsurprisingly, the highest numbers of responses of faculty who report involvement in interdepartmental collaborative research are in interdisciplinary program.

**Summary of Comments by Respondents**

The Qualtrics survey invited faculty commentary on the global scope of faculty research and faculty perspectives on institutional support for faculty and student research abroad. As a whole, faculty comments highlight gaps in available funding, administrative support, clear College-level standards and protocols for conducting international research, and institutional flexibility for establishing new research projects and partnerships as critical barriers and roadblocks both to individual faculty member’s global research and to incorporating students in overseas research efforts.

**Summary of Identified Needs to Support Faculty and Student Research**

While the specific needs of the different divisions, departments, programs, and individual faculty vary in many ways, there were nevertheless several key themes that emerged from the Qualtrics survey as College-level opportunities for investments and institutional reforms that might enable faculty and students to continue and expand their global research agendas.
Available Funding for Faculty. Faculty repeatedly emphasized a need for expanded and more flexible funding categories - specifically for travel - to support international research projects. The inadequacy of available funding (whether college-based or through external grants) to support sustained international research is nearly uniform across responses. However, the kinds of problems identified varied. Some faculty noted that current funding levels for division grants, conference funding, and other common funding sources are insufficient to cover current costs of international research travel – leading faculty to focus their efforts on non-global research where the same amount of funding can yield greater research outputs. Others emphasized a need for “family-friendly” funding that could be made available (by application) to enable faculty to pursue globally oriented projects at less cost to family life and personal finances.

Survey responses suggest that many Colby faculty are unfamiliar with available funding sources for international research, including both on-campus resources (e.g., Oak Institute funding) and off-campus resources (e.g., NSF grant opportunities). Some faculty observed that improved institutional support combined with a topping off policy, could serve to incentivize faculty to seek out international research funding in support of international research projects.

- Inequities arise when faculty, whose research/data collection requires expensive travel, apply for the same College grants as faculty whose data collection is more domestically accessible or requires no travel at all. This raises concerns that faculty with domestically oriented research projects may be seen as more productive and so will fare better in tenure and promotion assessments.

- The absence of support for childcare costs or travel for family members who must accompany the researcher affect the ability of faculty to dedicate significant periods of time to research involving travel and/or can undermine the financial feasibility of such travel even when the faculty members are themselves fully funded.

- The college’s longstanding per diem rate ($25/day and unchanged for the past 25 years) can lead to significant out of pocket travel expenses.

- Some faculty find the timing of Division grant competitions restrictive; the late spring timing can make it difficult to apply for January funding (too far in the future) or to plan effectively for summer months (not enough lead time).

Available Funding for Students. Faculty responses to questions surrounding barriers to engaging students in global research included a need for enhanced funding for student research opportunities with faculty and more supportive and flexible risk management approaches. Some noted that the College needs a more flexible set of criteria than the State Department travel warnings in its support of faculty teaching/research opportunities that involve student travel. Others observed that in order to support expanded cutting-edge student research at the global level the College must also offer appropriate liability coverage to faculty who work or seek to work with students off-campus.

- Summer support for students does not allow for (and is insufficient to cover) students’
travel to international research sites. Not all faculty feel that students can be helpful to their research but those who do wish to involve students need greater support in finding grants which budget for student RAs in order to cover these costs (especially if students are low-income and/or on financial aid).

- Faculty expressed strong concerns around the difficulties posed by current risk assessments and liability practices that preclude students from accompanying faculty (to some places) abroad and limit faculty willingness to involve students in their work.

- Other roadblocks include institutional inflexibility over administrative rules: for example, being unable to hire students as RAs when they are already abroad to study (because they are “off-campus” they cannot be employed as an RA during the semester).

**Administrative Support.** The task force recognizes and appreciates the major reforms that have begun under the guidance of Bill Layton, director of the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs (GSP), including working with global funding agencies and foundations. However we also recognize that the College has only begun to build an enabling institutional environment for faculty to develop ambitious research programs, seek external grants and other funding, and implement global research projects with international partners and student researchers. Greater administrative support (more staff and more effective institutional knowledge) was repeatedly cited in faculty surveys as a key need to assist faculty to apply for and to manage external grants (GSP Grant Survey 9/15, Global Task Force Survey 4/16).

Similar administrative support was identified as a need for developing and sustaining institutional partnerships. Faculty have neither the time nor resources to effectively manage institutional partnerships (nor are they likely to pursue them) without significant logistical support and institutional commitment.

- Faculty seeking external grants and institutional partnerships uniformly cite a lack of adequate administrative and logistical support for their efforts. Faculty feel they must manage grant applications on their own which is time-consuming, complex, and sets them up for failure. (The Office of Grants and Supported Programs reports that full support for grant applications submissions has gone from roughly 40 in FY15 to more than 100 in FY 16.) No full-time staffing is currently provided to manage ongoing institutional partnerships (e.g., budgeting and reporting, MOI/MOU negotiations, and related tasks that many schools have full-time offices to support). GSP reports that some of this work takes place in the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs often in partnership with academic departments, programs, Administrative Financial Services, and the Provost’s office.

- In some cases, faculty who want to apply for outside funding need assistance finding viable sources, grants, etc.; in other cases, faculty feel they do not have the time or expertise to apply for such funds. This sentiment was expressed most forcefully by faculty in the Humanities SS and IDS.

- There are no readily available sources for “topping off” funding for faculty who secure fellowships with stipends below their Colby salaries, meaning that faculty must take a
salary cut or cut short the time available for the project. For Amherst College’s topping off policy, see https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/funding/outsidefunding

**College Level Standards and Protocols for International Research.** Survey respondents also noted a lack of clarity surrounding College-level expectations for international research, and around the opportunities for support. Faculty reported perceiving little incentive to engage in the costly and time-consuming development of international research or Jan Plan programming versus less costly domestic research efforts. Others sought improved clarity surrounding the conditions under which expanded financial and institutional support (e.g., administrative support, topping off, course buyouts) might become available. Clear-cut, equitable, and transparent policies surrounding compensation, institutional and professional recognition, and access to institutional resources could support expanded faculty engagement in international research.

- Faculty emphasized uncertainty surrounding College policies and commitments to sustaining international collaborations (e.g., terms and implications of MOUs) as a barrier to establishing new partnerships, including faculty research opportunities as well as research and internship opportunities for students.

- Others noted apparent inconsistencies in expectations across departments and divisions or a lack of support for collaboration across programs and departments. Scholars in the languages help prepare students to conduct international fieldwork in other disciplines, but to date such on-campus partnerships remain rare.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AT COLBY**

*Recommendation: Colby’s Director of Risk Management (in consultation with the proposed new Dean of Global Engagement) should support faculty and students in evaluating the risks associated with international travel for Jan Plans and faculty-student collaborative research.*

**Radical Recommendations:** The college should: create a different grant structure that better reflects differential travel costs of international travel; create a topping off policy; explore family-friendly policies to support international research; raise the per diem rate; and move the timing for Division grants to earlier in the spring term. The college should also offer increased funding to support students who are invited to conduct summer research as RAs with faculty in international locations. Finally, Colby needs to dramatically enhance the support offered to faculty to pursue, accept, and administer grants. Our recommendations in Section 7 address this major gap.

**SECTION 3. DATA COLLECTION ON GLOBAL FACULTY AND STUDENT RESEARCH**

A working group of the task force developed a new web portal to organize and showcase international research at Colby using an interactive online map. Presently, this tool maps
research activity with a global component, categorized by: Student Projects; Faculty Projects; Jan Plan and Summer Courses; Internships; as well as Study Abroad.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DATA COLLECTION ON INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AT COLBY

Recommendation: We strongly urge the college to develop a mechanism for comprehensive tracking of international research and annual updating of these maps. We also strongly urge the college to create a Global Colby web profile, managed with dedicated staffing, that offers viewers clearly accessible links to find information about Colby’s global programs, curriculum, and opportunities, as well as a central location for collecting and archiving data on relevant faculty research.

SECTION 4: SOME NOVEL IDEAS

Here we offer two suggestions for innovations at Colby that would enhance Colby’s global engagements and reputation as a center of international scholarship.

• The proposed Center for Global Engagement could work with faculty to plan and host an annual Global Colby Conference on a key theme of global importance with invited keynote speakers, leading scholars, and scholars from other schools in Maine. Past examples include the Photography and Migration conference organized by Tanya Sheehan in 2015, the Migrations to Maine conference organized by David Friedenreich in 2015, and The Consequences of War: the Iraqi Refugee Conference organized by Jason Opal and Catherine Besteman in 2008.

• Drawing on Colby’s existing strengths in supporting student applications for Watson Fellowships, we propose a new signature Global Colby Student Fellowship. To encourage our students to think, act, and imagine globally beyond Colby, this fellowship would fund student-designed projects requiring international travel and inner growth. This fellowship would embrace a wide range of projects, selecting grantees through the existing Watson application process; awardees would begin their journey immediately after graduation. At the present, four other colleges (Williams, Hamilton, Rice, and Hendrix) have adopted similar “Watstonesque” fellowships with great success both in terms of outcomes and dedicated funding.
3A. SHOULD WE BE CONSIDERING A DIFFERENT MODEL OF STUDY ABROAD TO SUPPORT OUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS?

More than two-thirds of Colby students participate in off-campus study. Here we characterize aspects of Colby’s off-campus study program and propose initiatives that could enhance our mission of creating a globally aware and engaged campus. In preparing this report, a task force working group consulted with Nancy Downey and Juliette Monet of Off-Campus Study. The working group solicited input from program and department OCS liaisons and received feedback from liaisons representing Art, Economics, French & Italian, German, Government, History, Jewish Studies, Latin American Studies, Music, Philosophy, Psychology, Religious Studies, Russian, Sociology, and Spanish. The working group also reached out to Jonathan Weiss, resident director of the Colby in Dijon program, and Julia Piera Abad, resident director of Colby in Salamanca.

The research compared study abroad programs at Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Bates, Beloit, Bowdoin, Carleton, Colgate, Gettysburg, Hamilton, Middlebury, Mt. Holyoke, Oberlin, Tufts, the Vassar-Wesleyan collaboration, and examined materials on the website of NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFF-CAMPUS STUDY MODEL
1. Financial aid and enrollment management
2. Balance of Colby-led versus outside providers
3. Breadth of options for students
4. Language requirement for study abroad
5. Incorporation of study abroad experiences into life at Colby
6. Opportunities for faculty participation
7. Internship and research experiences
8. Expectation of participation

FINANCIAL AID AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

Colby students engaged in off-campus study do not pay Colby tuition, and their financial aid is adjusted to reflect costs of the off-campus study program in which they are enrolled. A working group of the task force reviewed the relative merits of changing our policy regarding tuition payment for off campus study programs. A review of the pros and cons of converting to a home school tuition model is below.

Pros of a home school tuition model
- Study abroad is not an isolated experience but is fully integrated into Colby’s liberal arts education. Home school tuition allows our students to expect that they will receive all the services and support of a Colby education: enrolling at Colby, earning Colby credit, paying Colby tuition, receiving Colby support services and graduating with a Colby degree. (The Provost of Emory University, in an interview in the Atlanta-Journal Constitution (10/5/07), well summarizes the advantages of the home-school tuition model.)
Study abroad decisions should be made on the basis of academics, not finances. Home school tuition equalizes the costs over all majors/programs. This is consistent with Colby’s mission of offering a quality comprehensive education. Being an English major costs less than being a chemistry major with labs, equipment etc., but we don't charge higher tuition for chemistry majors.

The institution can use the extra funds for other purposes such as addressing the inequity of access to Jan Plans abroad because of financial constraints.

Home school tuition may relieve pressure for Colby to have an administrative cap on the number of full year away students. Currently only language studies, area studies and Dartmouth and Bigelow students are currently guaranteed a full year away; all others must petition.

Study abroad grades could be included in Colby GPA assessments. However, Colby’s policy (created by a faculty vote) to not count grades from study abroad courses would have to be overturned.

**The cons of home school tuition**

- Colby’s current model is more cost-friendly to families. Some programs are only around $16-18,000 per semester, plus the $1,000 fee they pay to Colby; this is a financial break for the semester when the student is away.

- The additional income generated by charging full paying families home school fees for one semester may not be worth the ill will it generates among families who resent paying Colby fees for a study abroad program that may cost far less.

- There is potential risk of reputational harm from unhappy students and parents. According to Colby’s Director of Risk Management, Will Saxe, a parent of a graduate of Wheaton College in Massachusetts, filed a lawsuit in 2008 alleging that by charging home tuition for a student when the hosting program was several thousand dollars less, Wheaton breached its contract with the parent, breached its obligation to act in good faith/fair dealing, committed misrepresentation, and violated the Massachusetts unfair and deceptive practices statute. It appears that the suit was settled, but Wheaton did change its practice to have students pay the hosting fee directly. If Colby adopts a home school tuition model, we would have to be very clear in our messaging about the model and the policy.

- The savings from homeschool tuition are unclear. One cannot assume students will choose the same study abroad programs under a different tuition cost structure. To avoid parental complaints, the college itself will likely promote more expensive “full service providers” offering more complete services.

- We also anticipate a need for increased staff in the Off Campus Study Office to manage payments, determine what is and is not included (such as technology fees, facility fees, recreation fees, etc.), and field complaints.
• There is a potential increase in liability, as some might argue that charging home school fees increases the institutional connection to the outside program and thus exposure to legal action resulting from problems with the program. While there is no apparent legal prohibition from charging home tuition in Maine, there is nothing to prevent an unsatisfied parent from filing a complaint against Colby similar to the Wheaton case. Based on the specific claims in the Wheaton case, Colby could reduce its risk of a similar complaint by taking the following steps:

  o Ensuring that there is adequate disclosure of the tuition fee to students and parents, and that Colby publications like the Student Handbook, Course Catalogue, and other communications are consistent.
  o Providing an adequate notice period to students/parents before they are impacted by the change. At the least, Colby will want to ensure that students/parents are aware of the change before applying and committing to study abroad.
  o Providing adequate support and services to students while they are participating in non-Colby programs as this will help justify the home tuition charge. Support can include non-financial support such as academic counseling or financial support such as airfare.
  o Waiving the administrative fee for non-Colby programs (currently $1,000), as there is little or no justification for charging that fee when home tuition is charged.

Alternatives to a Home School Tuition Model
• Colby could increase our off-campus study fee to raise the funds to provide aid for Jan Plan and summer internships: 5% of our comprehensive fee (for one semester) would bring the fee to about $1,500. Bates charges 7% of its comprehensive semester charge. Assigning a percent as opposed to a flat fee would allow the returns to accompany inflationary changes.

• If we assume that 300 students study abroad, the fee will raise $450,000, $150,000 more than the current fee. Leaving the revenues already received under the $1000 charge as dedicated to other ends, raising the fee would add support for 50 Jan plan or summer internship fees of 3K per year. This number would be adjusted downward if we waive the OCS study abroad fee for financial aid students.

Balance of Colby-led versus Outside Providers

Schools differ in the extent to which students attend programs run by the home institution, by other colleges, by a small consortium including the home institution such as Associated Colleges of the Midwest, or by outside providers such as IFSA-Butler, CIEE, IES, OTS, SFS, or SIT. Colby students primarily participate in programs organized by other institutions or by outside providers, with Colby-administered programs limited to Bigelow, Salamanca, Dijon, and Jan Plan courses. Potential advantages of home-institution programs include more curricular oversight, more opportunities for faculty participation, and development of programs for which no alternatives exist. Disadvantages include increased administrative burdens and the potential for the "Colby bubble" to be transported overseas. Colby’s programs in Salamanca and Dijon have a relatively low profile, both for incoming students and for juniors; greater visibility would be welcome. A welcome recent change was the name change to Global Entry program (from First-Year Away).
Notable leaders in study abroad include the Vassar-Wesleyan collaboration (similar in some ways to the defunct CBB, see also Claremont consortium), Hamilton (known for its language pledge, also in South Asia via New York state consortium), Carleton (ten programs, mostly led by their own faculty, facilitated by quarter system), and Middlebury (huge institutional investment in languages learning, multiple sites in some countries, and coverage of Israel, Jordan and Morocco). Schools that excel in running their own study abroad programs and offering an exceptional number of faculty–led programs are often distinguished by an institutional identity defined in part by the study of foreign languages and/or a quarter system. Colby could explore starting or joining a consortium or partnering with a university with SLAC characteristics that has its own global campuses. Finally, Colby could consider introducing one or two annual faculty-led multi-sited study abroad programs in which a faculty member travels with a group of students to three different locations in order to study a global issue or topic. (For example, the University of Pittsburgh’s Institute for Global Studies utilizes this model, contracting with agencies in each location to manage local travel, lodging, and other logistics. The expense per student for recent programs that visited Paris, Meknes, and Shanghai and London, Hyderabad, and Shanghai was $16,000).

**BREADTH OF OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS**

Colby has a nearly unlimited palette of options for students who wish to pursue off-campus study, with pre-approval or petitions encouraged for more than 200 programs. Students can petition to earn credit from off-list programs, and such petitions are often approved. New programs can be added to the list if two or more students successfully complete them, but there is no current mechanism for removing programs from the list. The large number of options can be beneficial in finding the perfect match for a given student, but can also be overwhelming and add to administrative challenges for the registrar and financial aid office. The breadth can also make it difficult for faculty departmental liaisons and OCS staff to determine academic rigor and quality of student support services. Most of our peer institutions have comparably broad palettes (e.g., Bates, Oberlin), although some are more restrictive. For example, Colgate University currently lists 116 approved programs. As a whole, the number, size, and locations of our programs generally compares well, but nothing distinguishes Colby either. Geographically, our study abroad programs are found (in order of occurrence) in Western Europe, Latin America, and East Asia, mirroring our peers’ priorities. While European and East Asian programs tend to be more language-focused, Latin American programs often have an anthropological or more general cultural component as well as a linguistic one. College/university-sponsored study abroad opportunities elsewhere, for instance in the Middle East/North Africa and South/Southeast Asian, are much rarer.

**LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY ABROAD**

Colby's study abroad language policy states:

With the exception of students in Colby’s language acquisition programs in Salamanca and Dijon, students who wish to study in a country whose language is taught at Colby must have taken the equivalent of at least three semesters of the language before departure (some programs and majors require more advanced
preparation).... For study in countries where the language is not taught at Colby, students are required to take at least one course in the host country’s language for the duration of their program.

Colby's language policy is a strength of our model, because it enhances student engagement in the host country. However, an unanticipated consequence can be that students are steered towards English-language programs because they have not yet attained requisite proficiency.

**INCORPORATION OF STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCES INTO LIFE AT COLBY**

For the study abroad program to most effectively contribute to globalizing Colby, students must have opportunities to integrate their personal or academic experiences abroad into their lives on campus. We divide this incorporation into two distinct categories: re-entry and curricular integration.

Re-entry focuses on psychological and emotional aspects of the study abroad experience. Students often experience reverse culture shock and struggle with ways to incorporate their new perspectives into familiar surroundings and social settings. Re-entry challenges are currently addressed several ways:

- Students complete program evaluations, which require at least a minimal amount of reflection upon their experience. The OCS office is currently updating this form.
- The OCS office offers welcome-back dinners, photo competitions, career workshops, and other events that provide opportunities for students to share and reflect on their experiences.
- Returning students can apply to be Global Ambassadors who help organize events and serve as peer mentors.
- Some departments or programs host events where returning students present to sophomores who are considering off-campus study.
- Dijon alums have created a committee that promotes adjustment for Dijon Feb frosh. We commend the office of OCS for its efforts at easing re-entry.

Curricular integration provides opportunities for students to incorporate academic experiences from off-campus study into their lives at the home institution. In contrast to re-entry, where centralized OCS offices can play a key role, all successful curricular integration programs are developed and sustained primarily by academic departments and programs. One-size-fits-all strategies will not be effective given the wide diversity of abroad programs pursued by Colby students. Colby already demonstrates a baseline level of curricular integration because academic departments and programs recommend particular programs and determine course equivalencies. Possible approaches to enhance curricular integration include:

- An OCS mission statement that is aligned with the mission of the College and explicitly connected to our intellectual and ethical imperatives. A preliminary draft suggestion is:

  > An understanding of cultures that differ from one’s own is an essential component of global learning at Colby. The opportunity to study off campus fosters a shared experience between Colby students and members of their host communities, which in
turn provides deep and enriching connections in their personal, academic, and professional lives.

- Enhanced departmental oversight of applications for study abroad, requiring students to articulate their academic and personal goals
- Senior seminar courses capitalizing on study-abroad experiences
- Extension of off-campus study experiences into independent study or honors projects
- Upper-level rhetoric courses focusing on travel abroad
- Fall semester courses, most especially ISP and language courses, tied to Jan Plan courses
- Abroad at-home experiences led by Colby faculty that develop awareness of our own society in a global context
- Courses team-taught between home and international faculty (Global Liberal Arts Alliance)
- One or two annual signature Colby faculty-led single or multi-sited semester long study abroad programs
- Global Literacy requirement. The newly formed Diversity Requirements Task Force may consider a distribution requirement calling on students to demonstrate various components of global proficiency including curricular integration of study abroad experiences.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR FACULTY PARTICIPATION

A powerful strategy to promote integration of study abroad into the fabric of the academic institution is to promote faculty exposure to students' study-abroad experience. Institutions such as Middlebury, who administer their own study-abroad programs, or those that belong to the Associated Colleges of the Midwest provide many such opportunities for their faculty. Possible avenues include:

- Site visits for faculty to popular study abroad programs for their majors
- Guest lectures for faculty at Salamanca or Dijon
- Colby scholars-in-residence at DIS or IES programs
- Signature Colby study abroad programs led by Colby faculty
- Signature Colby summer study abroad programs, such as recent programs to China funded by Asia Network
- Support for faculty to develop research rotations with IES or Euroscholars
- Joining the Organization for Tropical Studies consortium, which grants faculty access
- Joining existing consortia or entering partnerships with institutions with facilities abroad that can be used by Colby
- Development of exchange programs with international universities where our faculty have personal connections
- Funding through the UISFL, Fulbright-Hays group projects abroad program, or other sources to support international curriculum development (See USA Study Abroad website - programs for US Institutions)

Thinking more radically, Colby might consider developing a signature Colby multi-sited (or single sited) study abroad program organized and supported by the proposed Center for Global Engagement, to be run by Colby faculty on a particular topic or theme. The Center would
contract with study abroad contracting agencies in the locations selected by the Center and the teaching faculty to provide logistical, travel, lodging, some pedagogical, and other on the ground assistance. The faculty would be responsible for developing course content. (For an example of this format, see the PittMap program, offered by University of Pittsburgh: http://www.abroad.pitt.edu/pittmap.)

INTERNATIONAL INTERNSHIP AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCES

Colby students would benefit from action abroad, in the form of research experiences and internships, as well as study abroad. We do not include standard voluntourism in this category although volunteer and humanitarian experiences can contribute to students' development as world citizens. We also distinguish between research experiences as integral parts of most site-based programs (e.g., OTS, SIT) and mentor-sponsored research. Currently, we have little institutional memory about action-abroad experiences; the OCS office facilitates the EuroScholars program and BU internship programs; individual students and faculty have discovered other opportunities independently.

EXPECTATION OF PARTICIPATION

Global engagement as referenced in our aspirational “Global Guarantee” does not translate into an expectation that every student will study or conduct research abroad. Study abroad is psychologically demanding, and medical or counseling support is often not as readily available as at home. Furthermore, we are concerned that a promise of an entitlement to study abroad for students may enable a lackluster exploration of academic and personal goals for the experience. If departments and programs are to screen applications more rigorously, the threat of no participation must be an option.

EMERGENT ISSUES

Conversations with OCS liaisons revealed tensions that don’t fit into any of the components described above. We place these into three major categories.

Department and program objectives
Because the college does not have a clear mission statement for study abroad, there is no consensus on what our goals for students should be. Some departments have well-defined objectives for their students; in particular, language departments prioritize language and cultural immersion. Other departments and programs have a more laissez-faire attitude, leaving liaisons with more specific goals to feel concerned about the quality of our study-abroad program overall.

Double majors
Students who are double majors frequently find that their two majors have conflicting goals and attitudes towards OCS. This problem is especially severe for programs with very specific goals for study abroad (i.e., language immersion or field experience) and for programs with tight vertically structured curricula (i.e., chemistry, economics). This is a serious issue. We
heard stories of departments pressured to accept unacceptable course equivalents, departments who refused to consider potentially acceptable course equivalents, and students pressured to drop majors. More coordination is required.

Role of the OCS Committee
The OCS Committee has played a fairly passive role, limited primarily to voting on petitions. Study abroad is a central academic program and requires much more active coordination from the faculty. Throughout this report, we have indicated possible action items for the OCS Committee to pursue.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OFF-CAMPUS STUDY

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that Colby assess a higher fee for students who study abroad, perhaps 5-7% of our comprehensive fee for one semester, to raise funds to support Jan Plan equity and other priorities for Global Colby.

Recommendation: The Global Entry program should be pitched more effectively to prospective students and made available by application instead of by invitation.

Recommendation: The Colby Dijon and Salamanca programs should be more broadly promoted and supported.

Recommendation: We recommend that the proposed Dean of Global Engagement work with OCS staff and Colby’s Off Campus Study Committee to explore and greatly enhance opportunities for direct faculty engagement with the student study-abroad experience, including the possibility of developing more study abroad courses led by Colby faculty during a semester or summer. The Dean could also determine the feasibility and advisability of instituting signature Colby faculty-led single or multi-sited study abroad semesters.

Recommendation: We recommend that resources be dedicated to tracking action abroad experiences, perhaps by the new Coordinator of Global/Off Campus Opportunities suggested in Section 7, who also assists with international Jan Plans.

Recommendation: We recommend that the Provost's office, OCS staff, and Colby’s Off Campus Study Committee work with departments and programs to promote opportunities for enhanced curricular integration.

Recommendation: We recommend that the OCS Committee meet at least monthly, setting long-range goals at the outset of each academic year relevant to oversight of our study-abroad program. Items to consider include revising our mission statement, guidelines for common double majors, a review of our palette, a review of the policy for year-long study abroad, and a consideration of academic justification for waivers of the language policy.
3B. WHAT OPPORTUNITIES DOES JAN PLAN OFFER THAT WE SHOULD PURSUE FOR STUDY ABROAD?

A task force working group interviewed 14 faculty members about their experiences with global Jan Plans taught in the past ten years, including department chairs of programs with a non-Colby (or retired Colby) on-site professor, faculty members who organize and attend Jan Plan sessions with their students, faculty members who have run independent studies abroad, faculty members who no longer conduct Jan Plans, and a non-Colby professor who organized a Jan Plan course.

Conducting a Jan Plan is a taxing process on the organizing professor, who must run information sessions for students, collect health forms, liaise with the host institution or country, create and carry out an established itinerary, and secure lodging and safe conditions for students and themselves, in addition to creating course content, amongst many other things. It is clear from our research that faculty feel completely unsupported by the college in this process. While some faculty benefit from established programs that run continually year after year (in French, Italian, Biology and Environmental Studies, for example), the organizational and administrative work is substantial. Organizing a new Jan Plan places a professor (often, interestingly, an Assistant Professor) into the difficult task of navigating Colby systems without the benefit of years of knowledge of those systems.

Some participants mentioned the hands-off nature of OCS during Jan Plan as both an advantage and disadvantage; only one participant had any substantial interaction with OCS, who s/he found to be very helpful. While acknowledging the importance of Jan Plan’s exploratory nature and the freedom it affords faculty to “choose their own adventure”, our research clearly reveals the efficiency costs of Colby’s current ad hoc approach to global Jan Plans.

Furthermore, faculty rightly recognize the economically-biased nature of off-campus Jan Plans, which mostly require full financial contributions from students (in order to cover professor costs as well as program costs). Student participation is thus limited to those who can afford it, as financial aid covers little to none of their costs. A better and more equitable system must be established if Colby hopes to develop its global offerings. Jan Plan is a distinctive Colby program and no Colby student should be denied the opportunity to participate in an off campus Jan Plan because his or her financial aid package does not include aid for Jan Plan program expenses. See Topic 9 of this report for an analysis of funds required to provide equitable access for Off-Campus Jan Plan experiences.

The majority of our global Jan Plans have been located either in Europe or the Caribbean. Given proximity, it is interesting that none so far have ventured into Canada; along those lines, there is a substantial global/local arena that might be enhanced (for example, the Jan Plan 2016 course on Resettling Refugees and Immigrants in Portland, Maine). There have been only two (unrepeated) programs in Africa, none in Arabic-speaking countries, and three in Asia (one in China and two in India).

The following map indicates locations of Colby-sponsored global Jan Plans during 2006-2016:
Given Colby’s programs in Salamanca and Dijon and its global connections with other campuses and institutions abroad, a potential partnership model to consider may be Columbia University’s global centers. These campuses (in sites such as Paris, Rio, Istanbul, Mumbai, and more) allow for more localized connections with the host country while maintaining an organized institutional presence for the College/University (see [http://globalcenters.columbia.edu/content/about-1](http://globalcenters.columbia.edu/content/about-1)).

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JAN-PLAN STUDY ABROAD AT COLBY**

The task force recognizes that as a signature feature of a Colby education, Jan Plan offers unique opportunities to enhance Colby’s opportunities for global learning. Therefore we PRIORITIZE the following recommendations:

**Recommendation:** In keeping with the idea of a globalized curriculum, Colby could better integrate fall language and culture courses as well as ISP courses into off campus Jan Plans. Additionally, the Jan Plan program offers a terrific and Colby-specific opportunity for developing Global Labs at Colby.

**Radical Recommendation:** As recommended in Section 7, we strongly urge the college to create an administrative structure to manage and oversee the administrative tasks associated with developing and running off-campus Jan Plans, such as managing travel, collecting student health forms, fielding simple student questions, and so forth. An additional suggestion is to consider all the work of organizing and administering Jan Plan as an additional course during the prior Fall; faculty who plan an international Jan Plan could be incentivized and compensated by the choice of remuneration or a course release. The
Flexibility of this system might allow faculty in small departments (where course releases are difficult to administer given student and major demand) to also participate in Jan Plans.

**Radical Recommendation**: The task force strongly urges the college to commit to adopting an equitable guarantee of student access to off-campus Jan Plans, such that students who receive financial aid can receive financial aid sufficient to enable their participation on the same financial terms as their peers. The current pay to play model is inequitable and contradictory to Colby’s values.

**Radical Recommendation**: Colby might consider allowing students from other colleges and universities to apply to participate in off campus Jan Plan programs as full fee-paying students. Applications would be managed by the proposed new Coordinator of Off Campus Opportunities for Students (Section 7).
4A. ARE THERE OTHER PARTNERSHIPS THAT WOULD HELP FACILITATE OUR GOALS OF GLOBALIZING COLBY?

EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS

Building structural global partnerships that benefit both students and faculty is a way in which Colby College can become more global. Structural partnerships can enable opportunities for global research and engagement for faculty and students that are directly tied to pedagogical and scholarly goals in the Colby classroom. This has benefits on various levels, such as an easier transfer of credits, programs that connect well with education and scholarship at Colby, focus on themes that are important to the College and its departments, guaranteed quality of the partner abroad, and even chances for building stronger relations with alumni. In addition, reciprocal partnerships can also bring international students and faculty to Colby, creating further global experiences on campus.

We identify five options for engaging in global partnerships.

1. Colby College could join existing networks, such as the Global Liberal Arts Alliance (GLAA), which consists of a transnational partnership between 29 American style liberal arts institutions in 17 nations, although the task force notes the geographic and institutional limitations of the GLAA network. The majority of these institutions are located in the United States (13) and Europe (6). While the GLAA does have partnerships in Asia (4), Africa (3), and the Middle East (3), it does not cover certain geographical regions, foremost the Caribbean, Latin America, Southeast Asia, and Oceania.

2. Colby could inquire about the possibility to participate in the global networks of major American research universities. For instance, creating a network like Columbia University’s Global Centers or New York University’s Global Academic Centers is a near impossibility for a small college like Colby, but perhaps cooperation with these centers is an option.

3. Colby can follow in the footsteps of other liberal arts institutions by engaging in bilateral partnerships with other global institutions. An interesting trend in this regard is the emergence of University Colleges outside of the United States. Essentially, these provide the closest thing to liberal arts education in some countries abroad. For instance, in the Netherlands several of the premier universities have created University Colleges that offer both generic Liberal Arts Degrees as well as more thematic ones, such as one focused on human rights. It is uncertain if this trend will continue globally, but at the moment it might offer new opportunities for international cooperation and partnership.

4. Partnerships can also help fill gaps in language training at Colby. We can consider how Rice teaches Arabic. Rice offers beginner/intermediate Arabic on campus (two semesters minimum before study abroad), then for advanced instruction Rice students attend Qasid Arabic Institute (qasid.com) of Jordan for a semester or summer. Rice students who complete a semester at Qasid receive a minor in Arabic. Qasid offers both Classical and Modern Standard Arabic. The Qasid institute currently accepts individual enrollment as well, and has
affiliation with many schools, including Harvard and Oxford, as well as the US State Department and the United Nations. We only looked at 32 peer schools; there might be others outside our sample that have partnerships for Arabic or Farsi.

5. As mentioned in topic 5B of this report, Colby could take advantage of opportunities to bring Artists in Residence and Scholars in Residence through funded programs such as the Scholars at Risk program, and could also find ways to bring international collaborators for short period of engagement with faculty and students, such as during Jan Plan for a few weeks during a semester. The Goldfarb Center in the past has offered funding for such collaborative visits, which were quite successful.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUPPORTING EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS AT COLBY**

*Radical Recommendation: The proposed Dean of Global Engagement evaluates and develops external partnerships aligned with Colby’s research and pedagogical priorities.*
4B. SPECIAL AREAS OF INTEREST AT COLBY THAT WE COULD FOCUS ON FOR FOSTERING GLOBAL CONNECTIONS

The preceding sections on Colby’s curriculum, Off Campus Study program, Jan Plan program and potential partnerships review several special areas of interest that Colby could maximize for fostering global connections. Another task force working group consulted existing centers and institutes on campus to learn about their current efforts to foster global connections at Colby and ascertain what would make additional efforts possible in the future. The working group spoke with representatives at the Colby College Museum of Art, Center for the Arts and Humanities, Colby Libraries, Goldfarb Center, Pugh Center, and Oak Institute. The task force notes that additional opportunities could be explored for enhancing global connections and opportunities with Colby’s athletic teams, musical groups, student clubs, Outdoors Club, and more.

COLBY COLLEGE MUSEUM OF ART

Current efforts:

- Lending artworks/exhibitions to and borrowing them from international venues
- Building global contemporary and Latin American collections
- Participating in the international Whistler Consortium, which includes student internships in the US and abroad
- Applying for support from the Terra Foundation, which places American art in transnational and global contexts (e.g., Terra funded the Whistler symposium)
- Hosting international artists in residence (e.g., Israeli artist Shirel Horowitz)
- Launching the Museum Diversity and Inclusion working group

Future possibilities:

- Establishing an Institute for American Art with a global perspective
- Creating targeted collection and/or student and faculty exchanges with international partner institutions, especially aimed at globalizing American art
- Supporting visiting international scholars in residence and coordinating more effectively with departments/programs on campus to bring international artists in residence to Colby
- Expanding Colby’s collaboration with Skowhegan School of Art, which brings international artists to central Maine every year
- Inviting students studying abroad to make connections between Colby’s collections and what they see outside the US (e.g., asking them to contribute reflections to the museum’s social media)

CENTER FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Current efforts:
• Offering student research grants, most for traveling abroad (officially $8k/year in funding is currently available but the student need is much larger)
• Sponsoring year-long arts and humanities themes with a global focus that attract international participants and promote global curricula and student research

Future possibilities:
• Establishing international partnerships with institutions and centers (e.g., Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities)
• Supporting arts and humanities lab courses abroad (e.g., Jan Plan, Colby on Tour) or Global Labs on campus
• Attracting and supporting international artists in residence

COLBY LIBRARIES

Current efforts:
• Studying international library models, attending the IFLA conference, fostering international networks
• Participating in the Center for Research Libraries, which provides access to collections (print and digital) with global strengths
• Trying to support new faculty with global and interdisciplinary perspectives

Future possibilities:
• Using international contacts to develop library internships for students abroad
• Participating in the ALA Sister Libraries project, which can include staff exchanges or library loans
• Addressing budgetary demands associated with acquiring global collections for new faculty
• Working closely with Off-Campus Study so students are aware of major libraries abroad, acquiring research library access for students, inviting students to report back on their international library experiences
• Hiring library staff to take a big picture look at the global scope of the collections
• Establishing a TOP faculty fellow position to diversify the library staff and its expertise

GOLDFARB CENTER

Current efforts:
• Hosting lectures/panels by international speakers and hosting lectures/panels on global topics
• Fostering an interdepartmental and inclusive approach to public policy issues (leading to collaboration between social sciences and the humanities, for example), although the Center’s focus has recently narrowed more to the US
• Supporting the Department of Russian’s International exchange program with the Lomonosov Moscow State University (MSU) in Russia
• Introducing criteria of financial need to decision-making on research and internship grants

Future possibilities:
• Funding for student-faculty research, including research outside the United States
• Funding to host international guests
• Pursuing a new staffing plan that would invite faculty members to serve as research fellows for a year or perhaps two, which might involve some administrative work
• Supporting Oak proposal to create a new FTE for Oak and “Worldwide Colby,” converting the current part time Assistant Director position into a full-time Goldfarb Assistant Director

**PUGH CENTER AND DIVERSITY/INCLUSION/EQUITY PROGRAMMING**

Current efforts:
• Programming at Pugh is by definition global, as articulated in Appendix A
• Hiring new assistant director to coordinate student diversity, inclusion and equity programs
• Introducing new Community Views program to bring a Maine-based social justice activist to campus, which might include people with global connections such as an immigration reform advocate

Future possibilities:
• Joining conversations about financial equity for student access to off-campus study, global research opportunities and global internships
• Securing funding to engage students on global questions
• Facilitating global and domestic civic engagement projects of student groups
• Consulting on the hiring of new people, such as post-docs, into issue or program clusters organized by existing faculty and staff

**OAK INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS**

Current efforts:
• Bringing a human rights activist from outside the U.S. to Colby every fall
• Hosting events, from lectures to films to musical concerts, that illuminate particular human rights issues with a focus in the fall on issues of specific concern to the Oak Fellow but with an additional interest in highlighting the U.S. role in human rights violations
• Supervising student research on human rights problems around the world
• Financing summer internships at human rights organizations around the world

Future possibilities:
• Moving to stabilize operations with a full-time assistant director
• Expanding to become a social justice and human rights center with domestic and global connections and faculty involvement (would require renegotiation of the current agreement with Oak Foundation)

**SUMMARY OF INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AT COLBY**

Across these centers and institutes, there is strong interest in:
• Enabling opportunities for discussion and conversation about global connections and
issues

- Developing sustained programs to host visiting artists in residence, scholars, and fellows
- Growing targeted partnerships with institutions abroad to enable faculty and student research, visiting scholar/artist exchanges, and Jan Plans
- Providing funding for collaborative faculty-faculty and faculty-student research abroad as well as student opportunities abroad for research, internships, civic engagement
- Hiring additional staff to support goals

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUPPORTING GLOBAL CONNECTIONS AT COLBY

Recommendations emerging from this research are included in Sections 7 and 8. The proposed Dean of Global Engagement would take a leading role in working with each of these Centers and Institutes to develop their global visions, programs, and networks.
5A. HOW SHOULD WE BE THINKING ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL COMPOSITION OF OUR FACULTY AND STUDENT BODY IN THE YEARS AHEAD?

This question engages the issue of how we define “international faculty” in relation to Colby’s larger educational and intellectual mission. It seems productive to think not just about personal origins or citizenship status when defining how Colby’s faculty is or could be “international” or “global”. A great many Colby faculty members conduct research on and teach subjects which are transnational or global in scope. A progressive strategy for globalizing Colby could mean taking a more intentional and focused approach to support the ways in which Colby faculty of all backgrounds might expand the global reach and significance of their scholarship and teaching. Such efforts could encourage new and existing modes of exchange with scholars and institutions outside Colby, whether in the US or abroad, and could seek out opportunities to build partnerships in those parts of the world currently underrepresented in Colby’s curriculum.

COLBY’S CURRENT PROFILE AND PRACTICE REGARDING THE HIRING OF NON-US ORIGIN FACULTY

With a few exceptions (foreign language assistants, the Fulbright supported instructor in Arabic, and the Oak Fellow – and of these only the Oak Fellow has faculty status) Colby does not make specific or systematic efforts to recruit non-national (non-US citizen) faculty. Programs such as the annual exchanges of faculty between Colby and the University of Cork, Ireland, or Caen University, France ended more than a decade ago when Colby closed down its study abroad programs at those institutions.

When non-national (non-resident) faculty are hired (either temporarily or on tenure-track lines), the college provides financial and logistical support for processing their H1 visa applications as well as applications for permanent residency. This funding is provided through the Provost’s office. (In contrast, comparable staff hires do not receive similar institutionally-backed funding assistance and visa costs must be paid by the hiring program office.)

Colby reports its annual number of foreign non-resident faculty hires as part of its institutional statistical profile. Comparative data from comparable liberal arts institutions across the country (IPEDS data) show that Colby’s record in recent years is similar to peer institutions, with quite low numbers of non-resident foreign national hires (typically on H1 visas); for example, Colby reported hiring 6, 3, and 4 such faculty in 2012, 2013, and 2014 respectively. (Bowdoin hired 4, 5, and 10 such faculty and Bates hired 2, 3, and 4 such faculty in the same years.)

IPEDS data do not capture specific countries of origin nor do they record faculty hired who already have permanent residency status or naturalized citizenship. A survey of the faculty listings in the Colby catalogue shows that in 2015 approximately 40 Colby faculty completed their undergraduate degrees outside of the US. Consultation of similar faculty listings in the catalogues of Amherst, Bowdoin, Bates, Dickenson and Swarthmore (all colleges of roughly similar size) reveal very similar patterns. Approximately 17-22% of faculty members hold undergraduate degrees from outside the US. The largest number of these are in areas of language instruction but the rest are scattered across all divisions. In each case, faculty with
Canadian and European degrees form a large proportion of this group with lower levels of representation from other regions of the world: Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean.

In sum, Colby has roughly the same profile of international-origin faculty as many other similar small colleges. We are neither “behind” nor “ahead” in our faculty composition. Whether this reflects a tendency specific to small elite colleges or to the US professoriate more generally is not clear.

**COLBY’S CURRENT PROFILE AND PRACTICE REGARDING NON-US ORIGIN STUDENTS**

There is significant variability in the percentage of international students included in the total student population at small liberal arts colleges ranked in the top 10 of US News and World Report.

![US News and World Report Top Ten Small Liberal Arts Colleges Percentage of International Students](chart)

The variability is less significant at major research institutions, which predominantly have at least 10% of the total student population identified as international students.
These data indicate that Colby has a similar percentage of international students within its total student population as aspirational institutions. It also appears that a larger percentage of international students does not directly correlate with *US News and World Report* ranking indicators.

**International Students at Colby**

There are approximately 225 international students enrolled at Colby representing more than 70 countries. More than half of the international student population are Chinese, Canadian, Indian or Japanese citizens. More than 41% of the international student population is Chinese citizens. Institutions that support international students at US universities and colleges with whom Colby could partner include Bridge to Rwanda, Grew Bancroft Foundation, KenSAP, MasterCard Foundation, Sutton Trust Foundation, Thai Scholars, and many others.

**International Admissions at Colby**

Colby is in a new position regarding its international student applicant pool. Since 2014 Colby has achieved an increase of 90% in the total number of applications from international students. These increases have occurred in traditional markets, including Canada, China, India, Nepal, and Pakistan, as well as emerging markets, such as Brazil, Ethiopia, Ghana, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, South Korea, Singapore, Vietnam, and Zimbabwe.

**Financial Aid for International Students at Colby**

Colby has allocated a substantial portion of its financial aid budget to international students. The allocation is most apparent when comparing to some peer institutions that often distribute fewer grant dollars to international student populations. Through partnerships with organizations such as the Oak Foundation and Davis UWC Scholars, the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid
has further leveraged financial aid grants to make a significant positive impact on the Colby community.

Colby should research ways to leverage scholarship opportunities to attract talented students from all backgrounds while providing students with global experiences during the summer. For example, the Hesburgh-Yusko Foundation at the University of Notre Dame ensures its scholars participate in a global inquiry experience in which scholars develop a research project with an international dimension during their sophomore year. The Morehead-Cain Scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill supports its scholars across the world as they dig into an area of professional or academic interest. While Colby does not currently offer merit-based scholarships, these types of programs can support multiple institutional priorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Recommendation: We recommend that the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid continues to grow its partnerships across the globe, including but not limited to the opportunities listed in this report. Staff may work with members of the Office of Alumni and Student Advancement to identify and expand global partners for the College.

Recommendation: Colby should continue to recruit applicants who hold undocumented or refugee status.
5B. WHAT VISITING MODELS OR OTHER INNOVATIVE APPROACHES SHOULD WE BE CONSIDERING?

There are many existing programs and fellowships that provide support to colleges to bring visiting scholars to the US for short periods of research and teaching. Some examples include:

- The Fulbright program that Colby has worked with to bring a teacher of Arabic. At the moment, this program supports only ungraded language instruction and the instructor is not considered a member of the Colby faculty. Colby could work to identify other areas of curricular or research interest that would be attractive to international Fulbright scholars and do more to actively recruit such individuals as visiting faculty.

- The Scholar Rescue Fund, with which Colby has worked once to bring a scholar to the Anthropology Department. This fund aids academics whose work has placed them at risk of persecution and who have fled their home countries. Colby could position itself as a regular host for the Rescue Fund, perhaps in coordination with the Oak program, as a way to broaden and extend the College’s commitment to the freedom of scholarly inquiry on a global scale.

- Institutional sources of funding such as the Ford Foundation, Mellon Foundation, and others could enable Colby to become a regular host of visiting scholars/post-docs on a topic or topics of global significance. The college might host a small group of such visitors each year (who themselves might or might not be of non-US origin) – enabling these scholars to work together on matters of mutual interest while also engaging with the wider Colby community.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VISITING MODELS AT COLBY

Recommendation: The Grants and Sponsored Programs and Provost Offices should pursue funding opportunities through existing programs and other institutional sources of funding to bring visiting scholars to campus.

Radical recommendation: The Dean for Global Engagement (recommended in Section 7) could identify and work with Colby faculty who are already engaged in collaborative research with international partners to find ways to build on and support these partnerships institutionally and to promote regular or targeted exchanges of faculty and students (for a year or semester). The Dean could also identify areas of scholarship and teaching (thematic, disciplinary, interdisciplinary) and seek out universities or programs outside the US with which to develop new institutional partnerships. Such partnerships could foster collaborative work or teaching exchanges – bringing student and faculty visitors to Colby and enabling regular exchanges in return by Colby faculty and students.
6. ARE THERE SPECIAL AREAS OF THE WORLD THAT DESERVE SPECIAL ATTENTION BY COLBY WHEN IT COMES TO GLOBAL PROGRAMS OR RECRUITMENT?

The task force recommends that the proposed Dean of Global Engagement described in Section 7 should be charged with making determinations regarding special areas of the world that Colby should target. Identifying special areas of the world for engagement by Colby will involve a consideration of faculty connections and areas of expertise, potential sources of funding, faculty interest in collaboration, potential partnerships, and resources on campus (such as language preparation) and with off-campus Colby networks (such as alumni) to support such engagements.

We do note, however, that there is a particular gap at Colby in relation to Africana Studies as well as Middle East Studies and Arabic language offerings. Although we are not unique in regard to the latter in relation to peer institutions, contemporary events in the Middle East suggest that Colby may wish to enhance its expertise and programmatic attention to Arabic and Middle East Studies.
7. STRUCTURAL RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Radical Recommendation: The task force recommends that Colby create a Center for Global Engagement to provide an institutional support structure for Global Colby.

The Center for Global Engagement will provide both leadership and a support structure for coordinating a diverse array of activities (both existing and new) integral to the task force’s vision of Global Colby. The mission of such a Center and the scope of its work require the creation of the four new positions described in more detail below: a Dean for Global Engagement; a Coordinator for Student Off-Campus Opportunities; a Coordinator for Faculty Global Opportunities; and a Coordinator of Global Student Life. These positions would work together to coordinate Colby’s global engagements across many domains, including curricular planning, pedagogical support, faculty and student research support, administrative oversight and staffing support, internships abroad, Jan Plan abroad, publicity and outreach, and more. We envision that the proposed positions would be in constant communication while also working directly with the Offices of the Provost, Off Campus Study, and Career Services. They would also cultivate active ties with Development, Admissions, Campus Life, Athletics, Communications, and any other relevant office as needed. While this recommendation is obviously not staffing neutral, we believe there are opportunities for restructuring and expanding current positions to address and manage this array of responsibilities.

This recommendation draws on comparative research included in Appendix F on institutional approaches to global programming at other colleges and universities. The Center itself might or might not have a designated location on campus, although a physical presence would be ideal in many ways. Nevertheless, what is most crucial to this concept is a deliberate and coordinated focus on envisioning and enabling global engagement for both faculty and students (including opportunities for research and scholarship, curricular development, and co-curricular programming) with particular attention to providing the logistical support needed to fulfill the aspirational goals of Global Colby for all members of the college community. Importantly, the Center would function as a nexus leveraging internal and external partnerships. The Center staff would be responsible for maintaining a robust web presence that would provide a virtual home and offer an information clearing house to facilitate communication with both students and faculty.

Our comparative research covered many models for coordinating global initiatives at other SLACs and represents our suggestions, based on this research, for what will work well at Colby in order to promote and coordinate what is already happening on our campus as well as what we need to be doing to develop the College’s global engagements, reach, and profile.

The goals of the Center are to:
• provide visionary leadership
• enhance institutional visibility of global engagements
• coordinate, supervise, and support already existing opportunities and practices (including off campus study, competitive fellowships, internships, career opportunities, Jan plans)
• envision new opportunities, partnerships, and engagements (both for teaching and for scholarship) and provide the support to make them happen
• enhance administrative support for faculty scholarship and for co-curricular programming
• enable students to find and make the best use of existing resources on and off campus
• support international students, to facilitate their integration and to improve their academic and co-curricular experience

The proposed positions to staff the Center include:

1. **Dean for Global Engagement** - a leadership position within the Center that is also appointed to the Provost’s office. It would be filled by a member of Colby’s teaching faculty (with rotating terms, possibly with a continuing but substantially reduced teaching load of 1-2 courses). The Dean would be responsible for providing leadership, visibility, and institutional coordination of global opportunities across campus. The task force emphasizes the importance of appointing someone from within Colby’s faculty, who has established deep linkages with and capacious knowledge about the research and teaching strengths of Colby’s teaching faculty as well as strong links with Colby’s signature institutions (Oak Institute, the Colby Museum of Art, the Colby libraries, the Goldfarb Center, the Center for the Arts and Humanities, etc.) and programs (the Integrated Studies Program, the Pugh Center). The Dean would require support from an administrative assistant.

Duties would include:
- working to publicize and make visible Global Colby in ways that are informed by the aspirations of this report, to enrich our conceptualizations of the global as already integral to the daily life of the College, and to leverage institutional resources in the service of developing and enriching these understandings;
- working to identify and build on already existing global engagements involving Colby faculty, students, and (potentially) alumni in the form of MOUs, partnerships, internship possibilities, and more;
- working with faculty to grow these opportunities and seek out others, such as cultivating institutional affiliations/exchanges with international and off-campus partners (e.g., universities, NGOs and other institutions; developing new off-campus Jan Plans; strategizing for dynamic co-curricular programming; and more);
- providing ongoing leadership to coordinate resources, sustain collaboration, facilitate conversations and leverage resources between offices that now tend to work in isolation, such as Development, Off-Campus Study, Career Services, Communications, Advancement, Alumni Relations, academic departments and programs, and much more;
- working with faculty, institutional partners, and external partners to develop Global Labs, described on page 11.
- working with faculty to develop, support, and oversee a suite of Global Colby Jan Plans, as well as novel connections between fall courses and Jan Plans;
• working to reinvigorate the Off Campus Study Committee to attend to new initiatives, policies, and visions for strengthening Colby’s management of Off Campus Study programs and integrating Off Campus Study into the life of the campus;
• Developing a comprehensive strategy for Global Colby across Colby’s various Institutes and Centers (Oak Institute, the Colby Museum of Art, the Colby libraries, the Goldfarb Center, the Center for the Arts and Humanities, Pugh Center, Integrated Studies Program, Center for Teaching and Learning).

2. Coordinator of (Student) Global/Off-Campus Opportunities - a position (possibly with a physical location in Off-Campus Study to promote accessibility to students) responsible for coordinating off-campus opportunities for students other than study abroad semesters. Locating this position in OCS will allow students who go there to learn about study abroad to also have access to information about a host of other off-campus opportunities. This would allow them to think about integrating study abroad with other academic and career goals.

Duties would include:
• coordinating publicity and support for competitive student fellowships and funded internships (e.g., Fulbright, Watson, Marshall, Rhodes, Elfrida Frank, Goldfarb, Humanities, Oak, Davis Projects for Peace, among many others) making this a one-stop office that would have all the information about different opportunities in one place;
• coordinating publicity, helping with recruitment, providing information about fellowship applications, allowing faculty selection committees to focus on the work of selection and mentoring applicants rather than the logistical administration of these numerous programs;
• liaising with Career Center, Alumni Relations, Admissions, Center for Teaching and Learning, and Dean of the College offices (among others) to help identify and promote internships and funding for global experiences;
• supporting faculty who are planning/running off-campus Jan Plans (e.g., liaising with partner institutions, travel and visa support, etc.) and working with administrative staff in OCS to manage student applications and collect student forms for off-campus Jan Plans.

3. Coordinator for (Faculty) Global Opportunities – a professional with experience in international programs and the funding partnerships to support them, as well as experience working directly with government agencies/ministries, international foundations, and multilateral agencies, focused on developing resources and building institutional linkages that will support faculty scholarship. This position could be located in the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs (GSP) to expand GSP’s existing capacity to discover and develop global funding resources and partnerships, especially with government agencies, foundations, and non-government organizations, and to help the Center for Global Engagement build and maintain the institutional relationships to promote and support faculty scholarship, including collaborative research projects abroad and global partnerships. The mission of the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs is to ensure that the College and its faculty are well positioned to develop partnerships and submit funding proposals to government entities, foundations, and other sponsors in a global context. In addition to developing institutional relationships, GSP monitors proposals and grants, reviews partnership agreements, and meets reporting requirements to protect Colby institutional interests. For example, GSP is working with the European Commission in Brussels on a funding agreement for faculty research, and manages partnerships
with foundations abroad, such as the Foundation Zao Wou-Ki, the Oak Foundation, the Li Ka Shing Foundation, and the Asia Network for faculty and student research abroad. GSP also manages the relationship and ongoing affairs of the Davis United World Scholars College partnership with Colby, including the Projects for Peace component. It is envisioned that GSP would support and closely work with the Dean for Global Engagement through the addition of the Coordinator for Faculty Global Opportunities position.

Duties would include:

- fostering new (or solidifying and regularizing existing) off-campus/global partnerships between Colby faculty, departments/programs and outside institutions;
- working with the associate director in the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs to coordinate and provide logistical support for new and ongoing institutional partnerships (e.g. by managing MOU arrangements);
- identifying and working with appropriate funding sources and facilitating faculty applications to outside grants, fellowships, foundations, as part of the existing Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs partnership team;
- working with the associate director in the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs to assist with co-curricular elements of the global programming (such as facilitating invitations and coordinating logistics for visiting scholars as well as non-resident guest speakers who require special visa paperwork).

4. Coordinator of global/international students – a full-time staff position charged with overseeing and monitoring support services for international students (who currently number 225 students). Currently the college has only one Advising Dean whose responsibilities focus on international students (and this represents only a part of that individual’s full-time duties), a situation that is inadequate to support the needs of international students. A new coordinating position with full-time responsibility would not replace the current role of advising deans but would support and build on the latters’ day-to-day work with students.

Duties would include:

- developing and maintaining avenues for collaboration and consultation between offices that now deal separately with international students (e.g., Admissions, Dean of Students, Off-Campus Study, Financial Services, Career Services, Athletics, Center for Teaching and Learning, etc.);
- fostering regular, inter-office conversations about the needs and experiences of international students and how best to coordinate support across campus and throughout their time at Colby;
- providing logistical support for J1 visas;
- developing new and coordinating existing programming and logistical support for international studies in all aspects of their Colby experience including: transition to life at Colby, transition to life after Colby, challenges to participation in the full range off-campus study, internships, and summer employment opportunities, co-curricular support, and more.
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE OAK INSTITUTE AND A GLOBAL COLBY WEB PRESENCE

Oak Institute

In addition, and outside our interest in a new center, the task force considered the pressing need for additional staffing at the Oak Institute for the Study of International Human Rights, which currently shares an assistant director with the Goldfarb Center. Oak has expanded its mission dramatically in the past few years and is now a major program on campus providing research, internship and leadership opportunities for Colby students concerned about human rights around the world. Prospective students increasingly mention the Oak Institute in their applications to the College. This task force urges the College to address the critical staffing needs of the Oak Institute. Such support will be even more necessary if the Institute is to pursue an enhanced mission in line with the recommendations of this task force.

Global Colby Web Presence

Finally, the Center staff would be charged with maintaining a dynamic web presence signaling and detailing global connections and opportunities, with links to necessary medical, visa, funding, and other forms, an element that is standard at many other colleges, although not yet at Colby. The website would be accessible through a menu heading for Global Colby on the home page, which would direct readers to webpages with information on a wide range of global activities sponsored and supported by Colby, including links to the following:

- annually updated information about relevant faculty research
- annually updated information about locations where students have conducted internships or independent research
- annually updated information about Jan Plans and summer programs for students run by Colby faculty abroad
- monthly updates about events and programs at Colby that engage with the global
- information on Colby’s curriculum for global learning
- information for students about available grants and funding sources for research abroad
- information for faculty about available grants and funding sources for research abroad
- information on study abroad programs
- information about how to find internships abroad
- information about medical resources in preparation for travel abroad
- information and forms for international students
- information and forms useful for faculty who are planning Jan Plans abroad

A task force working group has already been meeting with the Communications Department to discuss this new web addition, and is expanding upon the initial work of the GSP office to create several interactive maps that will feature information in pop-up boxes about faculty research abroad, student internships and research abroad, Jan Plans abroad taught by Colby faculty, and study abroad programs attended by Colby students. Building and maintaining a comprehensive global Colby web profile will require dedicated staffing and could be a responsibility of the administrative assistant to the Dean of Global Engagement.
8. SIGNATURE COLBY INITIATIVES

This section catalogues some specific recommendations offered throughout the report that present opportunities for programs and practices unique to Colby. The first list compiles initiatives that already exist at Colby; the second list is aspirational, reflecting the visions and ambitions developed throughout this report for a dramatically enhanced global presence at Colby and Colby presence globally. In addition to the critically important building blocks listed below that currently exist as signature Colby initiatives, Colby already has the scholarly reach, faculty and student profile, and ambition to make global connections and opportunities a major component of Colby’s reputation. The modest additional staffing we proposed would revolutionize Colby in this regard.

SIGNATURE COLBY INITIATIVES

- Language proficiency requirement
- Oak Institute for Human Rights
- Colby in Dijon
- Colby in Salamanca
- Off campus Jan Plans
- Strong Global Studies and Latin American Studies majors
- High participation in study abroad

RECOMMENDED SIGNATURE COLBY INITIATIVES

- The Colby Global Guarantee (p. 9)
- An annual suite of Global Jan Plans and summer off campus study programs led by Colby faculty, with guaranteed equal access to students and administrative support and incentives for faculty (pp. 30-31)
- Global Labs (p. 11)
- An enhanced Oak Institute for Human Rights (p. 36)
- Unique partnerships with institutes abroad (pp. 32-33)
- Unique visiting global scholar and artist-in-residence positions (p. 42)
- A signature Colby Global Fellowship (p. 20)
- An annual Global Colby conference (p. 20)
- Institute of American Art (p. 34)
- A signature annual Colby faculty-led multi-sited study abroad program (p. 26)
9. RESOURCES AND STRATEGIES TO HONOR THE COLBY GLOBAL GUARANTEE AND OTHER INITIATIVES

Honoring the Colby Global Guarantee will require internal and external partnerships to ensure financial support.

GLOBAL RESEARCH, INTERNSHIP, AND JAN PLAN SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS

_Institutionalizing Colby’s Global Network for Internships._ Developing robust research and internship opportunities for students requires a network of alums, parents and friends of the college. To date, opportunities have popped up in an ad hoc fashion, usually through a personal relationship between a faculty member and an alumnus. This mechanism is less effective for students from less affluent backgrounds who may not have family networks supporting work in the global arena. Scaling up international opportunities for all students requires growing and institutionalizing a global Colby network.

The launch of Campus Tap presents an exciting possibility to reach alumni and parents who can identify opportunities for global work and study. Deepening the pool in Campus Tap will require that faculty assist career services, the alumni office and the PEC (Parents Executive Committee) to connect former students to contacts on campus. Maintaining a dynamic contact base will take considerable dedication from the Dean of Global Engagement and the staff in this proposed office, with a role facilitating the flow of information between the faculty, Career Services, and the Office of Advancement.

_Funding the Colby Global Guarantee._ Building out opportunities for student research and study abroad during January and the summer will require substantial financial resources. In addition to supporting the administrative functions through the proposed Center of Global Engagement, actualizing the Colby guarantee requires endowed support.

If we assume that each trip (internship, research, or participation in Jan Plan or summer course) costs $3,000 and that we will need financing to support one trip over four years for the roughly 40% of Colby students who receive financial aid, and that enrollment holds steady at 2000 students, the annual cost will be approximately $600,000. Since not all students will wish to take advantage of this possibility, this figure is an upper bound. This also assumes that partially aided students receive the full $3000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award amount</th>
<th>% of Colby students covered</th>
<th>Estimated # per year</th>
<th>Annual need</th>
<th>Endowment required (assume 5% payout)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, when adjusting for fellowships already available on campus through sources such as the Goldfarb Center, the Latin American Studies Walker Funds, Provost Funds, and other fellowships, the potential support through increasing the study abroad fee, as
well as the fact that not all students would choose a summer or January international travel experience, we offer a lower estimate of an annual need for endowed funds of $300,000.

**Extending the Colby Global Guarantee:** The above discussion concerns access to a global opportunity in addition to a regular junior year abroad program for Colby students who receive financial aid, the guarantee could also ensure one financially supported global opportunity for those Colby students who do not receive financial aid. Offering every single Colby student $3000 to cover one global opportunity in addition to junior year abroad would cost $1.5 million per year, assuming every single student takes advantage of this opportunity and not taking into account the already existing sources of funding noted above. Providing $1.5 million per year, a very high estimate, would require an endowment of $30 million.

**SUPPORT FOR OTHER RECOMMENDED INITIATIVES**

**Center for Global Engagement.** Our report suggests the creation of a Dean of Global Engagement and associated staff. This person could be housed out of the Provost’s office or might, as with the initial launch of the Goldfarb Center, be a virtual office run from existing offices. A bolder and more transformational step would be to create a physical space for a Center for Global Engagement. In the most imaginative conception of this scenario, a new building could bring together several of our existing global majors (perhaps Global Studies, East Asian, Latin American Studies, and Languages), releasing classroom and office space in existing buildings and locating these programs in the physical heart of a Global Colby. This, of course, would require a substantial commitment by an interested donor to revolutionize the global positioning of Colby.

**Global Colby Faculty Fellowships.** In addition to raising endowed funds for January and summer research for students, we look to the office of advancement for enhanced support for Colby faculty research. We propose funding to augment the current research funding for international research grants up to $5000. These grants would be awarded competitively by recommendation of the Steering Committee. These grants could be naming opportunities: DONORNAME Global Faculty Fellowship. An award of 10 such fellowships each year at a cost of 50K would require endowed funds of $1 million.

**Global Labs.** Just as Humanities Lab courses receive financial support for innovative pedagogical and civic engagement components, Global Labs would also require dedicated support. Following the practices already established for promoting and supporting Humanities Lab courses, the Center for Global Engagement could make funds available on an annual basis through a competitive application process. Center staff would work closely with prospective faculty applicants to develop exciting new pedagogies that connect the global and the local, that connect fall courses to Jan Plans abroad, that enable faculty to create Jan Plans abroad in collaboration with partners or institutes abroad, and so forth. Compensation for faculty who propose and develop Global Labs could include a combination of course releases and stipends, and Global Labs abroad could be supported through additional funds raised to honor the Colby Global Guarantee.
Global Colby Conference. An annual (or bi-annual) conference might cost $10,000-$20,000, and could be funded through a named endowment.

Colby Global Fellowship. The Watson Fellowship provides $30,000 for an unmarried graduate. The Colby Global Fellowship might aspire to a similar level of support and offer a naming opportunity to a prospective donor.
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APPENDIX A: EXAMPLES OF COLBY INITIATIVES THAT CHALLENGE THE FALSE
DICHOTOMY BETWEEN THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

• The decision by the former International Studies program to rename itself Global Studies. This was a deliberate effort to de-center nation-states as the central building blocks of the world, and also bring the United States (and its various sub-national communities) into Colby’s thinking about what constitutes this world.

• The Oak Institute’s increasingly diverse programming, which strives to highlight the fact that human rights violations happen in the US as well as abroad.

• Tanya Sheehan and Natasha Zelensky’s work on “Migrations,” the Center for the Arts and Humanities’ theme for 2014-15. The many classes and events that bubbled out of this theme, including the ongoing Photography and Migration Project, helped focus Colby’s attention on problems of dislocation and belonging—locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.

• The Pugh Center’s embryonic Community Views program, which will allow Maine-based social justice activists to spend time on campus and interact with members of our community.

• Catherine Besteman and Maple Razsa’s new ISP on “Global Maine,” through which Colby students collaborate with immigrant-run community organizations in Lewiston.
APPENDIX B: COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON COLBY’S GLOBAL CURRICULUM

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES OFFERINGS
We compared Colby to 31 other small liberal arts colleges and a few universities resembling SLACs. Our sample was national but the northeast was overrepresented. We relied on open source on-line information, which allowed us to carry out a very broad comparison of global coverage in terms of majors, global/international and area studies programs, language offerings, and study abroad programs. We could not, however, address faculty-student research or faculty- faculty collaboration in our limited time, especially considering the organization of our peers’ websites, and we were unable to include environmental sciences or the natural sciences.

Academics

Foreign Language Majors: Colby is typical in offering French and Spanish (only 2, both consortia members, do not), German (29 do), Russian (22), Chinese (19), slightly unusual in offering Japanese (15) and Italian (11), and like the vast majority offered neither Portuguese (2 do) Hindi (2), Urdu (1) Korean (1), Hebrew (0), Farsi (1), nor Sanskrit (1).

Arabic/Middle Eastern Studies: programs exist at approximately half of our sample of schools, but only Middlebury and Williams have Arabic majors. Just six colleges offer minors in Arabic, and eighteen offer Arabic classes, most only through intermediate level (4-6 class track). Often Arabic was offered as part of Middle Eastern Studies program. Rice’s model for intensive Arabic is notable: special affiliation with Qasid Arabic Institute.

African/Africana Studies: Colby is an outlier in not having a free-standing program covering Africa. Most peers do so via an Africana Studies program that includes Diasporic communities.

South Asian Studies: By far the most common area studies program in Asia is East Asia Studies. Even programs designated as “Asian Studies” are largely EAS. South Asia Studies is the next most common area studies program in Asia, although few schools offer South Asian languages (English aside).

Interdisciplinarity: A Global Advantage at Colby: Our East Asian, Environmental, Global and Latin American Studies programs compare very favorably to our peers and contribute to Colby’s strength in interdisciplinarity, although these programs could be accurately described as under-resourced and facing high coordination costs.

Filling the Gaps in Colby’s Global Offerings

Several options merit additional study: Arabic/Middle Eastern Studies, restoring African Studies/Africana studies as a free-standing major, South and/or Southeastern Asian Studies, expanding Latin American Studies by adding Portuguese and/or Border Studies. Adding a new foreign language might well broaden and deepen our global coverage, but allowing students to meet the language requirement or complete a major in the language or related area studies program requires a minimum of 1.8 FTEs.
COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON PROGRAMS AND DEPARTMENTS ASIDE FROM LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES

To complement the comparative research outlined above on language and area studies programs, we compared Colby's course offerings in other departments with those at Amherst, Bowdoin, Middlebury, and Swarthmore. We note that there are many aspects of a global curriculum that are not captured here; for example, the popularity of the Global Studies major, the presences of an international diversity or global literacy requirement, and participation in study abroad as well as curricular integration of study abroad experiences.

Methods
For the five colleges listed above, we read course catalog titles, and descriptions as necessary, for the departments of Art, Economics, English, Environmental Studies, Government, History, Music, and Philosophy. We categorized courses according to their geographic focus:

- The United States, including indigenous and immigrant populations, and including regional studies
- Europe, including the British Isles, Russia, and ancient Greece
- Africa, Asia, or Latin America
- A global or comparative focus.

Courses concerning "Western" thought were not counted, unless they were exclusively devoted to European influences. Classification was often difficult. For example, courses on diasporas could be categorized according to the home region, the immigrant regions, or as global/comparative courses; categorization was sometimes subjective, based on the emphasis in the course description. Colby courses were counted if they appeared in the 15-16 catalog, whether they were taught this year or not. Amherst and Bowdoin courses were counted only if they were taught in 15-16. Middlebury courses were counted only if they will be taught in 16-17. Swarthmore courses were counted if they appeared in the 14-15 catalog (the most recent available when we did our search) whether they were taught in that year or not.

Results (See graphs on next page)
Counts of courses at Colby and Swarthmore were higher than the other two because they included off-year courses. Patterns across colleges were fairly similar, with an emphasis on Eurocentric courses - this pattern can be best visualized by looking at median numbers of courses across departments (Figure B1). Colby looks relatively strong with respect to courses focused on Africa, Asia, or Latin America; we were the only college where each surveyed department offered at least two courses in that area (Figure B1). We were fairly typical for other areas. The geographic curricular focus varies more among disciplines than among schools (Figure B2). English, Government, and History have large numbers of courses focused on particular regions of the world. Colby may be distinctive with regards to our Philosophy department; the other schools had even a stronger European focus.

We would be reluctant to make any other generalizations from these data. The data could be improved if we looked at only a single year's curriculum, but difficulties in categorizing courses would remain.
Figure B1. Number of courses with particular geographic emphasis across eight departments at five leading liberal arts colleges. A = Amherst, B = Bowdoin, C = Colby, M = Middlebury, S = Swarthmore. Counts for Colby and Swarthmore are elevated because they include courses not taught in a particular year.

Figure B2. O = Asia, Africa, or Latin America; E = Europe; G = global/international; U = United States
Box plots include Amherst, Bowdoin, Colby, Middlebury, and Swarthmore. Stars show Colby.
APPENDIX C: OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AT COLBY COLLEGE – SUMMARY OF EXISTING DATA

To date there has been no comprehensive review of international research being undertaken by faculty or students at Colby College, and no central database of international research activities or opportunities is currently maintained. We therefore began with a review of all Colby faculty web profiles and research descriptions to identify faculty with current international research projects or interests, followed by a review of the limited body of existing data maintained by the College to track faculty and student international research activity.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITY AT COLBY COLLEGE

Figure 1 summarizes the current numbers of faculty engaged in some form of international research across the various divisions and departments. These classifications are based solely upon faculty self-reported research interests as posted on their Colby College web profiles and personal/lab research websites where available.

The largest numbers of internationally-oriented faculty are in the Arts & Humanities Division, most prominently in the foreign languages departments and programs. English also has several faculty with research interests classified as “international”, although in many cases these faculty focus on continental European literature.

Other departments and programs with large numbers of international research faculty include History (7), Government (6), Anthropology (5) and Economics (4) in the Social Sciences Division, Environmental Studies (5) and Global Studies (4) in the Interdisciplinary Studies Division, and Biology (3) in the Sciences Division. Not unexpectedly laboratory-based (e.g., Psychology) and STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) have relatively low levels of participation in international faculty research, with some noteworthy exceptions including Biology (Dr. Bevier, Dr. Collins, and Dr. Stone’s research in Latin America) and Geology (Dr. Gastaldo’s research in South Africa).

**Figure C1.** Colby College faculty engaged in international research.
**Figure C2.** Examples of geographic concentration or distribution by department or program.

Figure C2 summarizes the geographical distribution of current faculty research activities and interests as reported by departmental and program websites. With the exception of the Sciences Division, all divisions have broad geographical representation in terms of faculty research interests.

A few faculty have “international” research without a specific defined research geography, including Dr. Rodman’s work on U.N. governance (Government), or the cross-country and cross-region work in Australia, Brazil, Denmark, Ghana, Jordan, and Taiwan by Dr. Howard (Education).

**Figure C3.** Geographic extent of Colby College faculty international research.

At the department or program level there are noteworthy differences in levels of regional specialization by faculty (Figure C3). In Arts & Humanities faculty within a department/program are generally more focused on a key geography - English faculty focus largely on Europe, for example, and Spanish faculty on Europe and Latin America. In Interdisciplinary Studies and the Social Sciences international research faculty are fewer in number but more evenly distributed across regions of research (though this is largely driven by Environmental Studies and History).
Ultimately the results of this review of available web materials on international research at Colby College suggests a broad level of interest and capacity to engage in international research across Divisions and across many departments and programs. But this process has also revealed the paucity of standardized or centralized data on international faculty research results and interests – indeed, many faculty online profiles are severely outdated, and it is very possible additional international research interests are present at Colby but not captured by this review.

OVERVIEW OF AVAILABLE SOURCES OF INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH FUNDING AND SUPPORT AT COLBY COLLEGE

Mirroring the lack of centralized data collection on faculty international research interests and activities, there is virtually no currently available data on international research funding. Scattered sources of international research funding include:

- **The Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs (GSP)** which has begun to organize data on externally-sourced grants, is implementing this spring/summer a web-based discovery and workflow tool, called Pivot, that combines a comprehensive source of global funding opportunities with the largest collection of scholar profiles into one intuitive solution. GSP and faculty will be able to easily explore new avenues for funding, view funding opportunities uniquely matched to their scholar profile, collaborate with colleagues and manage the results of the process to build a partnership strategies. **Contact:** Seven Grenier.

- **The Provost’s Office** maintains data on the use of startup funds, endowed funds, Dean/Provost funds, and travel grants. However with the exception of travel grants the location of the research (domestic versus international) is not monitored in a standardized way. Travel grant data (number and size of grants by department/program) is currently available, but the Provost’s Office estimates a concerted 2-week work effort would be necessary to compile and classify startup, endowed fund, and other funding uses for analysis by country/region of activity. **Contact:** Bev Boose.

- **The Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs & Civic Engagement** and the **Oak Institute** maintain databases of grants for faculty and faculty-student collaborative research. They also maintain some limited data on past funding for international travel for visiting research collaborators to come to Colby for research and results-sharing. **Contact:** Alice Eliot.

- **Individual Departments/Programs** also maintain some data on international research activities that is not monitored by either the SPO or the Provost’s office. These include flexible endowed funds, and many student research opportunities that may not be recorded as such in other administrative offices (for example undergraduate thesis work with an international focus or international fieldwork component). **Contact:** Scott Smith and individual departments/programs.

- **The Career Center** maintains a detailed list of internship opportunities, and Colby student participation in Colby-approved and registered internships. These internships are tracked by country, and include data on the location, academic credit received, and funding for 483 student internships in 83 countries since 2004 (prominently Costa Rica (49), China (40), India (36), Japan (22), and France (19), with Sub Saharan African countries less common but
including South Africa (10) and Malawi (7)). However “research” versus “other internship” has not been clearly differentiated in these data to date. Contact: Jordan Bell.

Like for faculty research, international research opportunities and activities for students are difficult to trace at the College level – for example students may participate in international research with individual professors using startup funds, endowed chair funds, Division funds, Provost Office funds (Student Special Projects grants, CUSSR Summer Research Assistantships), Presidential Scholar funds, designated/competitive thesis funds, or internship funds, among others. The use of these funds for international versus non-international research is not systematically monitored; identifying instances of student (or faculty-student) international research will therefore require manual classification of research activities based on Provost or Departmental records.
APPENDIX D: QUALTRICS SURVEY OF FACULTY INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH INTERESTS, ACTIVITIES, AND PERCEIVED BARRIERS

In response to the dearth of organized data on faculty or student international research at Colby, our working group developed a Qualtrics survey to collect data on past, present, and proposed faculty research on international topics and/or in international settings.

SURVEY DESIGN AND SAMPLING
The survey questionnaire developed by the Global Colby Task Force consisted of 32 questions asking about current and proposed international research activities, sources of funding, opportunities for student engagement in international research, key sources of on-campus support for international research, needs for additional support to enable international research, and other questions seeking more qualitative feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of current support for international research at Colby.

Respondents
Characteristics of the survey respondents are summarized in Figure D1. Survey responses were obtained from a broad array of departments and programs.

The most common type of international research reported by respondents was independent faculty research (34 out of 39 respondents), followed by faculty collaborative research with non-Colby faculty. Sixteen faculty reported engaging in faculty-student collaborative research, and 12 reported supervising international independent student research (multiple responses were possible). Figure D2 shows the distribution of research types across faculty respondents.

Figure D1. Survey respondents by department / program (n=39, multiple responses possible).

Figure D2. Survey respondents by type of international research undertaken (n=39, multiple responses possible).
CURRENT INTERNATIONAL FACULTY RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Figures D3-D5 show the distribution of international research activities across regions. Colby College has at least some international faculty research underway in all of the regions included in the survey. Western Europe has the highest level of international faculty research underway, followed by Sub-Saharan Africa, the US and Canada, and Southeast Asia. As shown in Table D1 and Figure D6 international research is currently underway in 57 countries. Many faculty have multi-country research agendas, and as summarized in Figure D4 a majority of faculty respondents in the survey – 21 out of 39 – have multi-region research agendas.

**Figure D3.** Current international faculty research by region (N=39, multiple responses possible).

**Figure D4.** Most international research faculty (21 out of 39) have multi-region research agendas.

**Figure D5.** Distribution of multi-region international faculty research (N=21).

Table D1 summarizes the international research projects currently underway as reported by survey respondents.
Figure D6. Current international faculty research by country (N=39, multiple entries possible).

Table D1. International research projects at Colby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Research / Archival Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vél d'Hiv roundup in French television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Defense Mechanisms of Frogs Against Microbial Pathogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avignon at the time of the Plague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building participatory institutions in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic movement among Indian Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Delbo's Cinematic Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of Essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Minerals – DR Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically Close: Performance and Queerness in Contemporary Cub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enteric Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union heritage policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline Cultural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates Foundation Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globally Elite: Elite Adolescents' Self-Understandings in a Global Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Fear Book Project-Inquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Fear Book Project-Natural Disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Fear Book Project-Plague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House and Home in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Elephant Conflict in Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights abuses &amp; statebuilding in DR Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Forests &amp; Food in East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Cook Stove Adoption in Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice and Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Landscape Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Protected Areas and Coral Reef Protection in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsters and the challenge of the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montaigne and political conciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Histories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF REU: Church Forests in Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Deforestation in Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Deforestation in Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority rights and women's rights in postcolonial India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putumayo After Coca: Extractive Industries and the Legacies of Counternarcotics Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research at Freie Universität Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research for Article(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Monograph 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Maribor Uprisings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger/rhino/elephant conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of Yiddish Holocaust Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Library (VILLY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Art: Spectatorship in Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zao Wou-Ki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNDING SOURCES FOR INTERNATIONAL FACULTY RESEARCH

Funding sources currently supporting Colby faculty as they engage in international research are summarized in Figures D7 – D8. More than half of respondents – 23 out of 39 – reported on-campus funding (especially Division Grants) as a primary source of support for current international research.

Figure D7. Sources of funding for current faculty international research.

Among non-Colby funding sources, sources of funding for international research currently include non-US Universities (13 out of 39), non-US government agencies (11) and NGOs (10), followed by US government agencies and other domestic institutions (Figure D8).

Figure D8. Sources of non-Colby funding for current faculty research.

As shown in Figure D9, use of major government sources of funding for international research is very limited (all funding agencies listed in Figure D9 were asked about specifically on the survey as yes/no questions).
Figure D9. Sources of U.S. Government funding for current international faculty research.

At the time of the survey (March-April 2016) less than one third of respondents (12 out of 39) reported that they were actively pursuing additional funding opportunities for international research (Figure D10).

Figure D10. Faculty pursuit of additional funding for international research.

As summarized in Figure D11, many respondents were unfamiliar with several sources of on-campus and off-campus funding for international faculty research, especially on-campus sources of student research support, on-campus Provost Office support, and off-campus sources of private sector support. Large numbers of respondents reported familiarity with multiple funding sources but no past efforts at applying. This, combined with the very small number of responses for “Applied but did not receive funding”, suggests that additional support for faculty applications to various funding sources might yield meaningful dividends.
**Figure D11.** Faculty familiarity with various sources of on-campus and off-campus funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Unfamiliar</th>
<th>Heard of but not applied</th>
<th>Applied but not received</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus foundation funding for faculty research in my field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus private sector funding for faculty research in...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus government funding for faculty research in...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program / Departmental Student Internship Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center Student Internship Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program / Departmental Student Research Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Provost Office Funding for Student Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Student Research Funding (including CUSSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam’s Presidential Scholars Program (CARA Student RAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Special Projects Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS / Library Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Institute for International Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Provost Office Funding for Faculty Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Travel Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Faculty Startup Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH**

As summarized in Figure D12, many respondents were broadly supportive of engaging students in faculty research, although in qualitative comments many reported concerns or unfamiliarity with logistics and safety implications of working overseas with students. Use of Jan-Plans to support research was rare (Figure D13) and most respondents also had no options available for supporting low income or underrepresented groups in research (Figure D14).

**Figure D12.** Survey respondents’ research by type of student engagement.

**Figure D13.** International Jan Plan instruction relating to research was rarely reported.

**Figure D14.** Faculty-student research targeting low income and underrepresented student groups was limited.
OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATIVE AND INTERDISCIPLINARY INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

Figure D15. Faculty engagement in interdisciplinary research.

Figure D16. Perceived support for collaborative research.

Figure D17. Interdepartmental collaboration in international research.
**Figure D18.** Colby services most valuable for international research (scale of 0 to 10).

**Figure D19.** Potential expanded services most needed for research (scale of 0 to 10).
APPENDIX E: LIST OF FURTHER RESOURCES ON TUITION FOR OFF CAMPUS STUDY PROGRAMS


2. http://www.nafsa.org/Find_Resources/Supporting_Study_Abroad/Network_Resources/Education_Abroad/Financial_Strategies_for_Expanding_Study_Abroad_Models_Mission_Management_and_Means_for_Growth/

3. nafsa.org has additional listings.


APPENDIX F: COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON GLOBAL CENTERS AT OTHER COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A working group of the task force researched the global profile of other universities and colleges to compare their web profiles and centers for global programming.

UNIVERSITIES


Different Models

- Center oversees a wide range of on- and off-campus programming, including study abroad, student research and internships abroad, funding for faculty research, support for faculty to lead study abroad programs during semesters and summer, faculty exchanges and visiting scholars, international studies, civic engagement, and partnerships with institutions abroad (Duke, Columbus State).
- Center oversees a suite of centers located in other countries where faculty do projects and students can study, do research, or intern and offers funding to faculty and students for work abroad. Separate center oversees student study abroad. (Columbia, Chicago)
- Center is a hub for globally-oriented curricular and scholarly activity on campus. Runs academic programs, research institutes, offers and facilitates study and faculty grants, facilitates colloquia and faculty working groups. Separate Learning Abroad Center. (Minnesota)
- No center per se but a variety of programming, perhaps supervised by a VP. Examples: George Mason offers faculty-led study abroad programs over winter break, spring break, and summer, and through Academic Internships Council offers internships in nine locations. The Ohio State University attracts international students through recruitment in China, offers a month long abroad program in May, has offices in Shanghai and Mumbai to recruit students and facilitate faculty research, and has partnerships with other institutions around the world for research on specific topics. North Carolina State has Study Abroad, International Services (visa, travel), Global Training Initiative (student exchanges, business partnerships, short term professional training abroad), four sponsored collaborative research projects abroad, dual degree programs with international partners, and strategic global partnerships. (George Mason, Ohio State, Rutgers, North Carolina State).

Overarching Patterns

- centralized focus on global engagements with clear web presence
- dedicated staff, with faculty co-directors and/or steering committees
- focus on supporting collaborative interdisciplinary research for faculty
• focus on supporting student opportunities (study, research, internships) abroad, involving institution-owned centers, partner institutions, alumni networks

**Interesting Highlights**

• programs supported by a mix of institution, donor and grant funds
• programs clearly articulated, linked, and explained on website
• centralized source of information and support for faculty to lead study abroad programs
• consolidation of curricular and co-curricular programs in one place
• in some places, separation of student study abroad from Center’s activities (with the latter focused on programming, visiting faculty, student research and internships, and faculty research abroad)
• institution-run centers abroad to coordinate student and faculty research and collaborations, student internships, partnerships, alumni relations abroad
• Chicago takes students to different locations in the world for 1-3 day “treks” so they can learn about other work environments
• extensive use of partnerships through bilateral agreements or consortia for student internships, dual degree programs, short term study abroad, and collaborative faculty research

**COLLEGES**


**Different Models**

• A “hub” model: the center (virtual or physical—hard to distinguish) links offices such as Civic Engagement, Study Abroad, and Internships/career center (e.g. Macalester College)
• A “comprehensive” model is similar to the “hub” but also links numerous academic programs and activities (Mt. Holyoke; NAU)
• A “dispersed” model: several relevant offices and activities on campus, but not explicitly linked by a named Center—only a website (e.g. Bowdoin, Wesleyan, Hobart and William Smith, Barnard)
• A “branch” model: campuses in international locations (e.g. Bard College)
• International Programs/Study abroad office with some curricular links or campus activities associated
• Academic center of study for Global Studies majors as on-campus focus

**Overarching Patterns**

• Large, diverse programs have Dean of International Studies (or similar title) and/or a Director
• Most centers were student-focused: study abroad, internships, international students, etc.
• When available, resources for faculty typically focused on pedagogy, curriculum, or
logistics
• Resources for faculty scholarship rare or located on Dean of Faculty page, typically not linked to student global experiences

Interesting Highlights
• ESL programs to integrate and prepare international students (College of St. Benedict/St. John’s University, Juniata)
• Articulated learning goals associated with study abroad to facilitate integration into campus curricula before and after semester abroad (NAU)
• Faculty development opportunities e.g. visiting study abroad sites, explore possibilities for teaching and research collaborations (Beloit)
• Scholar in Residence/ Visiting Scholar (Mt. Holyoke, Beloit)
• Global internship network (Mt. Holyoke)
• Global Research Support Program – funded student research (many)
• Workshops for faculty taking students overseas (Juniata College)
• Summer Magellan Projects for students to explore international study (Washington and Jefferson College)
• Web links to highlight faculty and faculty/student collaborative scholarship based internationally (e.g. Bowdoin)
• Graduate opportunities that may extend directly from undergraduate work (Middlebury, Bard)
• Special programs (International artist series, etc.; e.g. Barnard)
• Taking advantage of location to become experts (University of Arizona—Latin American specialty)
• Global Village themed living (Juniata)