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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The EPPC Task Force on Global Education in the Arts and Sciences was created in January 2015 at the behest of the Executive Committee (EC) of the Arts and Sciences. Its charge was to “take up a range of issues around the global strategy of the University with specific reference to teaching abroad and study abroad programs.” It was further asked to determine “over-arching goals” and the “resources and structures” needed to accomplish those goals, while also considering “sustainability questions” as the basis for “sound economic models for our global activities.”

1.a. General Principles

Global education is to be pursued for the intrinsic goods that it offers: forms of understanding and learning that will enhance our teaching and equip our students to enter a rapidly changing world with necessary critical skills and knowledge. However, educational standards must be rigorously protected, and the reduction of study abroad to tourism must be avoided. We support and encourage immersive learning off-campus, including but not limited to that conducted in other languages, and we believe that an overall benefit to the university community has accrued from the many excellent programs that are currently operated by Columbia. However, to the extent that global education is realized through learning and teaching abroad, activities that are particularly resource- and time-intensive, it should not be pursued at all costs. We advocate the adoption of the following principles to guide decision-making about future activity associated with off-campus global education.

1) It should be undertaken in a manner that maintains or enhances the academic standards of the University.
2) It should not be pursued if doing so intensifies existing inequalities in our educational system or introduces new ones.
3) The maintenance of the scope and quality of the Morningside Campus’s curricula and overall mission should constitute an absolute priority in all decision-making about teaching and programming abroad. Sufficient supplementary funding and substantial teaching personnel should be a prerequisite for sustained absence of regular faculty from Morningside Campus.

1.b. Columbia Global Education Status Review

To enable the implementation of these principles, we believe that better quality control and faculty governance should be established, along with more integrated policy and operational practices, and that regular, comprehensive self-review be built into all levels of activity. There is considerable diversity both between and within divisions, at all levels: undergraduate pursuit of education off-campus, graduate student research abroad, and faculty research and collaborative engagement with
international scholars. Policies and procedures must be responsive to these differences, rather than aimed at eliminating them.

Our own review permits us to make the following observations:

- Education abroad takes place in numerous locations and involves many, but not all of our departments. It is enabled by research networks and the expertise of a faculty that is itself increasingly multinational and engaged in broad, often multinational professional networks. And it is addressed to an increasingly diverse student population. Nonetheless, there are significant discrepancies between goals and existing opportunities. Columbia University undergraduates appear to desire more, and more diverse, opportunities than are currently available. Finally, despite a lack of full data, they seem not to study abroad either at rates that are comparable to the student populations of many of our peers, or at the rates at which our own graduate students did so when they were at college.

- Columbia has invested significant monetary and other resources in the furtherance of global education, and pursued at least two major grant-based strategies for promoting teaching abroad, in addition to its ongoing investment in the Columbia Global Centers. This has succeeded in expanding our teaching off-campus, and thereby enhancing opportunities for our students to engage specific topics with Columbia faculty in a multiplicity of sites. However, at an aggregate level, there has not been a significant increase in the rates of undergraduate study abroad over the past three years.

- Teaching abroad, partly enabled by Mellon and PGIF funding over the past three years, has led to the development of several innovative courses off-campus but has led to a net loss of total courses, and a relative loss of courses on Morningside Campus.

1.c. Undergraduate Education

Factors that inhibit our undergraduate students’ access to desired education abroad relate to three main issues: financial constraints, curricular constraints and problems of quality linked to the transferability of credits from study abroad. To mitigate these limitations, we propose the following:

- Financial resources need to be enhanced to permit need-blind access to education abroad. This means enlarged funds to enable summer-time study abroad for Columbia College (CC) students and further, portable funding for General Studies (GS) students. Considerations of aid should include the contingent expenses of studying in a foreign context and the need to buy students out of work obligations associated with their tuition
obligations. It should not be limited to US citizens or resident aliens, as per the terms of federally sponsored aid. These funds should not be taken from those devoted to existing programs at Morningside Campus.

- We encourage departments to **review their policies for granting credit for courses taken off-campus**, and to think creatively about how to enable students in course-intensive majors and concentrations to access such activities, including through more flexible sequencing of courses, where appropriate.

- We advocate the **development of research opportunities for students in the STEM fields as well as other course-intensive majors**, including programs aimed at pairing students with PIs on research projects abroad, visits to field sites, and other short-term activities.

- Faculty and especially Directors of Undergraduate Study need to be assured of the quality of the study for which they are granting credit toward degrees. To enable this, a **more robust quality control system and regular academic review of Columbia-operated and recognized programs should be instituted**.

- The offices that oversee and operate programs for our students, notably the Office of Global Programs (OGP), should be subject to review similar to that undertaken for other curricular units, including regional institutes.

### 1.d. Graduate Education

Factors that inhibit our **graduate students’ access to global learning opportunities** are largely financial and logistical. They are differentially distributed by division and are influenced by citizenship limitations on access to funding. We encourage:

- The **establishment of a Graduate Office of Global Education and Research**, analogous to OGP that services undergraduates, but addressed to the specific research needs of graduate students, which tends to entail solitary research and is not undertaken for credit.

- The **enhancement of mobility funding for doctoral students**, to include more adequate support for pre-field site visits, conference and pre-professional travel to international destinations, including travel for the purpose of consultations with relevant specialists or visits to archives, libraries, laboratories and other field sites, as well as access to international presenting organizations and festivals (as for the School of the Arts).
Because so many of our graduate students undertake sustained research abroad, and because that entails negotiation of unfamiliar or incommensurable institutions, in multiple languages, that is often very time-consuming, we advocate:

- **More flexibility on time-to-degree**, with additional time permitted for doctoral students who conduct a year or more of fieldwork abroad.

- **Flexibility with regard to temporality of Teaching Assistant** assignments for doctoral students, with the possibility of gap years.

1.e. **Faculty Teaching Abroad**

Over the past three years, there has been a substantial increase in the number of our own faculty teaching abroad, mainly during summer semester, but also during the regular year. The total number of FTEs abroad for this purpose is low compared to the faculty absent from Morningside Campus due to research leaves and other teaching reductions. Nonetheless, we believe that scaling up teaching abroad would put a significant strain on the Arts and Sciences. Given finite resources, we recommend that the adjudication of costs and benefits, as well as requests for teaching abroad, be undertaken annually based on the following principles:

- **Teaching abroad should not be a primary means of promoting study abroad, and should be pursued in limited degree.**

- In addition to academic considerations and the substantive merits of proposed courses, the **calculation of costs associated with teaching abroad to the Morningside curriculum and to the operations of the home campus** should be based not only on the number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) that teach abroad but on an assessment of courses lost on the Morningside Campus in relation to those gained elsewhere, as well as the number of students served.

- **Substitutional teaching for faculty members absent due to teaching abroad (via visitorships or local adjunct hiring) should aspire to 1-1 replacements**, bearing rank, expertise and other variables in mind.

- **Teaching of the Core Curriculum abroad should be limited to Music and Art Humanities.** Core courses (including Music and Art Humanities) should not be taught during the summer unless and until funds are generated that can ensure equality of access to that course.

- **Greater transparency in budgeting and fiscal practice of OGP is needed.** Faculty involved in both old and new courses and programs should fully understand the rationale for costing of classes and supplementary activities, and participate in decision-making when fiscal exigencies lead to changes in planned course activities.
1.f. Communications, Information and Logistics

Across the board, informational dispersion and institutional fragmentation lead to lack of coherence and problems of access; redundancy in function; and, in some cases, confusion about existing opportunities. To remedy these problems we propose:

- **Data and tracking of activities associated with global activity should be based on uniform categories and standard definitions, and systematized across all units** that undertake or administer such activity. These should be communicated more efficiently and made the basis of reporting to the Institute for International Education.

- For classes taught abroad by our faculty, **information systems should be revised to make collaborative classes abroad more viable and functional**.

- **Place-holder names for instructors used for registration in courses within our own systems should be eliminated** by the time courses are completed. Registration and tracking of non-Columbia student participation in Columbia-operated courses should be standardized.

- **The academic support systems and information technology needed for teaching abroad should be enhanced** to make shared access to library resources, files and interactive communication more functional for both Columbia students and non-Columbia students in Columbia-operated classes.

- **Student evaluations should be standardized across all courses**—with the same parameters used on the Morningside Campus, but with relevant additions to account for the context of instruction—and distributed from the first iteration of every class. This should occur no matter where the courses are taught, or through which office they are administered.

- **Information on funding that is administered by Columbia for undergraduate study abroad and graduate research should be updated regularly and communicated in a timely manner, with improved coordination between OGP and departments and institutes on this issue, and better academic advising on application procedures and protocols**.

- **There should be an integrated one-stop website from which to access all relevant offices and services associated with teaching, study and scholarly activity abroad**. We recommend the further development and enhancement of the ‘Beta.Global.Columbia.edu’ site, as well as upgraded
websites for the International Students and Scholars Office (ISSO) and OGP, with cross-referenced indexing among them and, at a minimum, a unified visual interface.

- We advocate a Provostial initiative to secure **enhanced international health insurance coverage** that does not cost instructional personnel additional money to teach abroad and that makes emergency resources available beyond SOS.

- There is need for **better housing assistance** in situ and a consideration of policies to support families, in keeping with directions recently embraced under the auspices of Columbia’s “work-life” programming. Housing for visitors is an additional, important determinant of global exchange, and needs to be improved if any scaling up of such activity is to be undertaken.

**1.g. Languages at Columbia and Abroad**

Language education at Columbia and abroad should receive continued investment. It constitutes an indispensable dimension of all global education, whether abroad or on the Morningside Campus.

- In addition to our languages and literatures departments, and the interdisciplinary programs that partner with them, the **Language Resource Center merits enhancement** and a more visible role in graduate education in particular, as well as ongoing technological updating. Making use of international partnerships for language instruction (beyond the existing tri-state regional consortia), via existing or new inter-institutional agreements should also be explored.

- **Translation should be inscribed into the budgets and the planning of the Columbia Global Centers’ (CGC) activities.**

**1.h. Policy and Governance**

As with all educational activities, the adjudication of academic quality necessary to the maintenance of Columbia’s standards and principles depends on faculty governance. This principle should extend to global education in all its dimensions.

- **We propose the creation of a standing Joint Committee of the EPPC and PPC on Global Education in the Arts and Sciences** to replace the previous ‘EPPC Subcommittee on Global Curriculum.’ The core of this joint committee should be drawn from the faculty. It would advise the Executive Committee and the Divisional Deans on global educational policy and ensure the maintenance of academic standards in Arts and Sciences programs operated through OGP, the CGCs and other entities. It would help the EC generate policy to guide decision-making and to
prioritize requests for resource allocation in terms of a long-term strategy for global education and the overall health of the Morningside Curriculum. It should also be empowered to call for and oversee reviews of global programs so as to ensure the quality of education abroad, and to advise on the establishment of an appropriately equipped Graduate Office of Global Education and Research. As such, it would advise on communication strategies linked to global activities, and would help articulate interests of the Arts and Sciences in relation to the other Schools of the University.
2. PREAMBLE

The EPPC Task Force on Global Education in the Arts and Sciences was created in January 2015 at the behest of the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences, including Executive Vice President and Dean of the Faculty, David Madigan; Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Carlos Alonso; and Dean of the College and Vice President for Undergraduate Education, James Valentini. The charge given to the committee is expressed in the letter of January 25, 2015, which asked the EPPC to:

…take up a range of issues around the global strategy of the University with specific reference to teaching abroad and study abroad programs. What are we trying to accomplish for our students—undergraduate and graduate alike? For faculty, in work we do here on campus and work we do elsewhere in the world that falls under the category of ‘global,’ what are our over-arching goals? What resources and structures do we need to do to accomplish those goals? We also need to consider sustainability questions and also develop sound economic models for our global activities.

This specific mandate, with its emphasis on sustainability and its request for the articulation of “over-arching goals,” differed somewhat from those informing other previous and contemporaneous efforts to assess the status of Columbia University’s global initiatives. Unlike the University Senate’s 2013 report and recommendations, Global Initiatives at Columbia University, the 2015-16 self-study associated with the Middle States re-accreditation process, and the report generated by the Faculty Forum on Global Columbia, the Task Force was exclusively concerned with the issues confronting the Arts and Sciences, independently of the professional schools.

Focused in this manner, the Task Force was able to consider models of pedagogy linked to research and questions of fiscal viability that are particular to the Arts and Sciences and that may differ from those relevant to the professional schools. We assume that any principled calculation of costs and benefits must accommodate these differences and this report reflects that ambition.

Nonetheless, there are many points of convergence between this report and those university-wide studies mentioned above, particularly with regard to the need for more coherent policy and more integrated support systems. In the recommendations section of this report (Section 10), we address these issues and offer several concrete proposals for strengthening the most productive and promising aspects of Columbia’s current global educational activities. We also propose remedial interventions where these appear necessary. The recommendations are organized around three major sets of issues: information, communication and data; logistics and organizational priorities; and policy and governance. The report itself is organized in relation to the principles of Arts and Sciences’ functional organization: undergraduate education; graduate education; and faculty teaching.
3. DEFINITIONS

Global Education, as understood by the Task Force on the basis of the Executive Committee’s charge to the EPPC, comprises all sustained activities carried out abroad (outside of the United States) that contribute to the pedagogical activities of the university and specifically its globalizing initiatives. These include, but are not limited to:

- formal study abroad programs managed by Columbia’s own Office of Global Programs or its recognized partners;
- student participation in research projects abroad, whether supervised by Columbia faculty and their collaborators or other scholars and intellectuals;
- study undertaken in the context of dual-degree programs;
- courses taught abroad by Columbia faculty or under Columbia supervision, in both the regular and summer semesters;
- individual learning outside of the US that forms part of doctoral and master’s level training;
- a wide variety of informal learning experiences, including internships, work experience, volunteer activity and other, short-term site-specific engagements.

Some of these activities are carried out in conjunction with the Columbia Global Centers, but most are not.

Global Education is both education intended to prepare students for the changing circumstances of globality, and education that takes place under these circumstances but that, in many other ways, resembles activities that were previously undertaken under different rubrics, such as ‘international education’ or, simply, ‘study abroad.’ While immersive education about the cultures, histories and natural environments elsewhere comprises a significant strand of such activity, the Task Force defines global education in a manner that also encompasses teaching and learning which, though situated elsewhere, is not necessarily about that location. Thus, education that involves work in laboratories or observatories outside of the US, or that includes American Studies conducted elsewhere, or that engages foreign scholars in their respective formulations of questions about global phenomena, is encompassed in the category of global education in addition to more conventional forms of immersive study abroad. This report reflects the Task Force’s interest in both the differences and the continuities between more conventional forms of study abroad and those that are specifically inflected by or oriented toward the new conditions of globality.
The literature on globalization and globality is vast and a full discussion of the debates surrounding the terms is beyond the scope of this report. For our purposes, globality refers to a historically particular conjuncture characterized by the increasing integration of social, financial and technological systems around the world, accelerated and multidimensional structures of cause and consequence, and, associated with these phenomena, rapid change and increased volatility in both natural and social environments.

We assume that the intellectual habits, analytical skills and knowledge acquired through immersive education abroad—for both students and faculty, learners and teachers—is substantively marked by the location of learning and that it also affects the classroom experience and the research agendas on Morningside Campus. When students and faculty members return to Morningside Campus, they bring new questions and changed perspectives to bear upon the curriculum as well as the classroom discourse on the home campus. We also recognize that for many of our students, whether from the US or elsewhere, study at Columbia may already be, de facto, ‘study abroad.’ None of this means, however, that our US or foreign students are automatically thinking about ‘globality’ in new ways. It will be the task of a changed Columbia to ensure that studying abroad—by US students going elsewhere, by those who stay on campus, and by students from other countries coming here—does indeed foster new habits of thought and practice adequate to the changing nature of the global.

The diverse and changing nature of the student and faculty populations at Columbia is, in our estimation, an unequivocal good. The university is further enhanced when faculty members and students can bring the understandings gained in different contexts to bear on discussions at the home campus, whatever the topic. Nonetheless, as per the charge adumbrated by the Executive Committee, we have not addressed curricular issues and initiatives on the Morningside Campus such as changes to the Global Core, new courses on ostensibly global topics, or transformations in syllabi of long-standing courses. Our purview has been limited to the intellectual opportunities and material consequences of education abroad, including their impact on curricular and staffing capacities on the Morningside Campus.

4. PRINCIPLES, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

As a world-renowned institution located in New York City, Columbia University is especially well-placed to pursue global education. The Arts and Sciences, which constitute the intellectual core of the university, is the only site at which undergraduate education is offered other than the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (not included in the Task Force mandate), and Barnard College. Accordingly, it is here that

---

1 The Task Force’s purview did not extend to Barnard College, although we met with the Provost and discussed issues of possibly mutual concern. We understand that a timely review of the inter-institutional agreement between Barnard and Columbia is under way,
the task of preparing students and ourselves for changing global circumstances mainly takes place. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, many of its departments ranked among the 10 best in the country, extends this educational function into the domain of primary research. According to GSAS, almost half (45%) of its population comes from outside the US. That number rises above 50% for students enrolled in stand-alone MA degree programs. Our faculty similarly comprises scholars from around the world, making the university itself a significant node in a nested and overlapping networks. These networks are the basis of regional and trans-regional communities of learning and scholarship, institutional collaboration, and practical engagement. They are the intellectual infrastructure for global education at Columbia.

4.a. Reinforcing the Aims and Goods of Global Education

By necessity, given recent and ongoing changes in the University’s portfolio of offices and activities, and its efforts to respond to emergent forces and opportunities on the global stage, the policies guiding global education have until now been opportunistic and poorly integrated. This fact has been repeatedly observed, and was explicitly identified as a problem to be overcome in the Senate report of 2013, and again in the report of the Faculty Forum on Global Columbia (2015). Faculty participation in the generation of policies and in their implementation has been insufficient, to date.

We believe that there is intrinsic virtue in learning that takes place in more than one location, and that ‘studying abroad’ can constitute an important means for doing so. Such learning demands that students think comparatively about knowledge formation, and that they consider the impact and effect of local histories and circumstances on the questions and understandings generated in different contexts. Even exposure to ostensibly comparable institutions in different locations (such as laboratories or observatories) can be revelatory for students. It also permits them to grasp how globality—with its attendant problems and opportunities—is conceived elsewhere.

We believe, further, that cross-cultural encounters and immersive learning, particularly when these entail learning through other languages, contribute to the social and intellectual preparedness for the future, and enable a better understanding of both the past and the present. Immersive experiences are nonetheless difficult to achieve, given increased digital connectivity between formerly remote sites and the tendency of mixed classes (those with Columbia and non-Columbia students enrolled) to be conducted in the English language. Strategies to prevent study abroad from becoming the mere reproduction of US-styled experience in other places (bubble classes) should be assiduously cultivated.

In this context, the Task Force believes that language education, both prior to and in the context of study abroad should be strongly encouraged and robustly
supported—and indeed that it should be encouraged even in the absence of study abroad. Recent changes in language policy generated by OGP and the EPPC Subcommittee on Global Curriculum (now suspended, see Section 6.f) have substituted uniform standards with more program-specific requirements that aim to remove obstacles to studying abroad, and are discussed in Section 6.f of this report.

We recognize that our student population is diverse in interest and background and that not everyone can or wishes to partake of the same opportunities. Curricular differences, goals and predispositions between departments and divisions are profound. Moreover, for many, coming to Columbia is already the endpoint of long and complex movements—physical, social, psychical and intellectual. This diversity of experience must be recognized and should be made the most of in classroom contexts on Morningside Campus. But place of origin in itself is not an index of diversity in thought, or preparedness to think and live in the changing circumstances of our world. To the extent possible, and in accordance with individual needs and aspirations, no students should be denied opportunities for enhanced learning off-campus, regardless of where they come from.

Global education is nonetheless not reducible to the question of rates of participation in study and teaching or research abroad. The substantive content of the learning must be changed in relation to its relocation, affected by conversations with other scholars, elsewhere, and made the basis of agile, responsive and creative critical thought. To this end, global education and study abroad should be rethought as vigorously as the other aspects of education at Columbia’s Morningside Campus have been. For example, through reflections on the Core Curricula and the creation of Global Core requirements have led to the development of a new technologically supported language learning for less commonly taught languages at the Language Resource Center and the establishment of a Center for Teaching and Learning to explore innovative pedagogical methods.

However crucial we may feel that global education is within the overall curriculum and training of our students, our evidence suggests that it is, and is likely to remain, a resource-heavy enterprise. This is true at all levels, whether we are speaking of the costs of programs that we operate ourselves, or the costs to students who travel elsewhere for immersive experiences in programs operated by others. Programs in which our own faculty members teach bring additional costs into play when factoring in the impact on the Morningside Campus (see Section 4.c).

With respect to our own operations, it is clear that some programs have achieved economies and efficiencies that allow them to thrive over time, although even the most robust program is vulnerable to contingent events (such as epidemics, natural disasters, or political crises) that can lead to dropped enrollments and lost financial viability. However, financial viability is not sufficient to guarantee educational quality, and a highly developed quality-control system, linked to the assessment of both financial viability and intellectual merit, overseen by faculty, is imperative.
Finally, we believe that faculty research—itself a mode of learning—constitutes the basis for teaching, and hence, enabling faculty mobility and networks of collaboration, supporting its research, and investing in pedagogical innovation, is the *sine qua non* of enhanced global education.

### 4.b. Ameliorating Inequalities and Preventing New Inequities

Equally important, and related to its resource-intensive nature, global education can introduce or intensify inequalities at several levels. The costs of participation in learning elsewhere are significant, and, currently, much financial aid is limited by citizenship determinants of eligibility for work-study. For graduate students, there are similar citizenship limits on many grants. Financial aid is not available to Columbia College students for summer study abroad, negatively affecting students of limited means.

Students in STEM disciplines may be discouraged from participating in study abroad because of curricular sequencing and other issues that make absence from campus during the regular semesters undesirable from the perspective of departments. This makes them especially vulnerable to the limitations on financial aid that affect study during the summer.

Teaching Core courses abroad has been explored, and is discussed below, but here too inequalities may be inadvertently exacerbated if Core courses are taught elsewhere in a manner that significantly transforms them, thereby undermining the principles of a single, shared learning experience via the Core Curriculum. A number of possible solutions to these risks are discussed in the recommendations section of this report, but in principle we believe that, in all cases, global education and especially study abroad should be pursued with an eye to ameliorating inequalities in opportunity for our student population. It cannot become the exclusive prerogative of the elite.

### 4.c. Learning or Teaching Abroad: Costs and Benefits to the Morningside Campus

Finally, we need to differentiate between the principles informing study abroad and those informing teaching abroad. The two do not necessarily entail each other. Nor does research abroad necessarily generate teaching abroad.

The educational activities of the Arts and Sciences are and should remain anchored on the Morningside Campus. The maintenance of excellent research and teaching capacities here, and the sustenance of the curriculum operated on the Morningside Campus, are sacrosanct principles for the EPPC Task Force. Teaching abroad by regular, full-time (FT) instructional faculty during the Fall and Spring semesters should be promoted only if and when such teaching can take advantage of conditions, or respond to events and circumstances, that make such teaching uniquely dependent upon the off-campus site and timeliness of instruction. While the expertise of particular faculty members, and that available through their networks of collaborators and interlocutors elsewhere, is central to any such pedagogical initiative,
the development of courses that would mean the recurrent absence of particular FT faculty from the Morningside Campus should be avoided. This avoidance might be achieved by a variety of means, including: focusing such teaching in the summer semester, not in lieu of the regular semester but as a supplement, with appropriate additional remuneration; providing full 1-to-1 substitutions for absent faculty members with visitors; creating courses that can be taught in a ‘blended’ fashion (using long-distance, virtual technologies as well as face-to-face interaction); or rotating cohort of faculty members (see recommendations). We note here that **a uniform policy is needed to determine if and when, or under what circumstances, summer teaching would count toward faculty member’s annual teaching obligations**. This will be especially true if the activity is scaled up. At present, summer teaching is largely remunerated through additional compensation, and does not count toward regular responsibilities. This seems appropriate, but issues of rates of compensation and additional costs to faculty members have yet to be fully addressed (see below).

Because faculty members also bring new resources and deepened thinking to Morningside Campus by virtue of their activities and collaborations elsewhere, the assessment of the costs and benefits of instructional faculty abroad cannot be limited to the presence or absence on the Morningside Campus alone. Teaching abroad, we presume, also changes teaching here, and global education at Columbia—on Morningside Heights—far exceeds the Global Core, although it should nourish and by nourished by the latter project.

### 5. TASK FORCE INFORMATION-GATHERING PROCESS

This report is the outcome of a sustained information-gathering process, which included both a review of previous reports, and several surveys written and implemented by the Task Force, as well as face-to-face meetings with individuals from across the Arts and Sciences and beyond.

#### 5.a. Task Force Activities

The following list provides an indication of the range and depth of information- and data-gathering activities undertaken over the last year. (See Appendix A for a summary of the surveys as well as the full survey instruments.)

- Survey of faculty and other full-time Instructors who have taught abroad during the past 3 years
- Survey of Departments
- Survey of interdisciplinary Institutes, Centers and Programs with significant curricular activities
- Survey of students in doctoral programs in the Arts and Sciences
- Survey of students in stand-alone MA degree programs in the Arts and Sciences
• Discussions with:
  o Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, by division (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences), and together
  o Graduate Students, both MA and PhD
  o Departmental Directors of Academic Administration and Finance
  o Arts and Science Faculty (in faculty meetings)

• Consultations with:
  o Educational Policy and Planning Committee
  o Planning and Policy Committee
  o Executive Committee (EVP, Dean of GSAS, Dean of CC)
  o Divisional Deans
  o Dean of General Studies
  o Dean of the School of the Arts
  o Vice President, Columbia Global Centers
  o Dean, Office of Global Programs
  o Leadership of the School of Professional Studies
  o Chairs of the subcommittees of the Middle States Reaccreditation Committee
  o Individual faculty members
  o Special Advisors to President Lee C. Bollinger
  o Provost, Barnard College
  o Leadership of the Language Resource Center

• Review of reports and documentation previously devoted to global education at Columbia

• Review of national level statistics and policy documents produced by the Institute for International Education (IIE)

• Review of Mellon and President’s Global Innovation Fund (PGIF) grants for the past 3 years, including courses generated and faculty appointments made

• Review and mapping of all websites operated by Columbia concerning global education and the support services that are associated with it

In addition, we have received data, reports and analysis from numerous offices across campus, including Office of Global Programs, Office of the Dean of Columbia College, School of General Studies, School of the Arts, School of Professional Studies, Arts and Sciences Planning and Analysis, Columbia Global Centers, Columbia
University Senate, International Students and Scholars Office, as well as voluntarily submitted reports from individual faculty members about their experiences mounting and teaching courses abroad.

5.b. Data and Information Tracking: Caveats

Activities associated with global education are dispersed across a wide array of institutional sites and under a diverse set of authorities. There are no standardized data-tracking categories, nor a single locus, either physical or virtual, from which to access information about such activity.

At the undergraduate level, credit-based programs are mainly overseen and in some cases administered by OGP. However, internships, grant-based study abroad and other professionally-oriented learning experiences are also operated through the Center for Career Education (CCE) and the School of Professional Studies (SPS), as well as in other locations such as the Office of the University Chaplain, interdisciplinary programs, and in conjunction with individual faculty research. Others are run through departments but are not registered with either CCE or SPS.

Information about students in Columbia-administered study abroad programs is distributed across multiple information systems, making it difficult to correlate rates of participation in study abroad in terms of demographic, financial aid, and other variables. This has impaired the Task Force’s capacity to assess the university’s activities and its student experiences in comparison with national trends or our peer institutions, whose own data-gathering principles are also often opaque.

At the graduate level, there is no single office responsible for facilitating or tracking education and research abroad, with the result being that student activity abroad remains largely unaccounted and, as discussed below, unevenly supported. Significant variability in reporting exists within and between departments, so that the location and nature of graduate student research and learning abroad is belatedly reported and poorly understood in terms of its impact on issues such as time to degree. Moreover, because time to degree is also linked to other issues, such as eligibility for fellowships, housing and health insurance, this single issue ramifies throughout graduate education.

At both graduate and undergraduate levels, the processes of registering and updating information for students enrolled in courses abroad has made it difficult to assess with certainty the nature of the student population in such classes, and consequently the nature of the pedagogical task for the instructors. In the case of courses jointly offered with other institutions, the fact of different information infrastructures, formats, and time frames for registration, as well as grading and accreditation practices, affects both the data on class membership and the operation of the courses themselves (see below). But even within Columbia, the use of placeholder names to set up courses (because they are taught by locally recruited adjunct faculty who are neither in the Student Information System, nor, in some cases, known at the time that the course is listed for advance registration) has created significant challenges for
analysis. In one case, namely Reid Hall, a single name was used as a placeholder for an average of almost 100 courses per year over a 3-year period, and no records in the Columbia Student Information System existed to permit the identification of the actual instructors. Nor was this unique. The Berlin Consortium also listed a large number of courses under a placeholder name.

A similar lack of coherence characterizes information about visitors to Columbia, which occurs at a very high rate and which constitutes a crucial dimension of the university’s global undertaking. Departments do not, for example, maintain records of ‘visiting scholars’ that are consistent with those of the International Students and Scholars Office.

To evaluate global education in the Arts and Sciences, it is imperative to establish a robust and accurate system of information and data gathering that will make analysis and pertinent reporting possible with ease. Without them, analysis is difficult and policies and procedures for governance risk becoming detached from actualities of teaching and learning. Proposals for better data management and integrated information systems appear in the recommendations section of this report. However, the data referenced herein have been generated using the best possible practices, given the constraints described above. To create a list and to survey instructional faculty teaching abroad, for example, we cross-referenced the lists available from the Student Information System and verified this with the Departmental DAAFs before seeking confirmation from the individual faculty members themselves. In all cases, the sources of the data referenced in individual sections of this report are described, and limitations to those data are made explicit. Despite modest margins of error and the impediments already mentioned, we are confident that the data presented here are sufficiently robust to justify the conclusions made on their basis. We are strengthened in that conviction by the very high rates of response to our surveys: 26 of 27, or 96% of departments and 10 of 11 (or 91%) of Institutes and Centers responded (See Appendix A for details about the survey).

6. UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND STUDY ABROAD (COLLEGE AND GENERAL STUDIES)

According to data maintained by OGP, the overall rates of student participation in study abroad in the College and GS combined did not change significantly over the years 2013-2015. Those rates were 22%, 22% and 21% respectively by graduating class for Columbia College. For General Studies, the comparable annual rates were 13%, 11% and 12%. In other words, GS students study abroad at roughly half the rate that College students do, although they also participate in other programs, such as the Dual-Degree programs, which provide a substantial international education in one of two sites (France or Hong Kong, at present; these latter initiatives are discussed below). The relative

stability in the rates of study abroad make clear that the increase in Columbia faculty teaching abroad has not been associated with significant increases in rates of study abroad. These dimensions of our global education initiative can therefore be treated independently, although we consider the specific case of recent efforts to teach the Core abroad in the following discussion.

The Institute for International Education (IIE) produces a list of research universities rank ordered by the percent of participation in study abroad. The list extends only to those universities with participation rates in the top 40, with the lowest participation rate of 32%. Participation rates at Columbia therefore seem to be lower than those for our peers (including Harvard University, Princeton University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Chicago, and Stanford University).

The question of what counts as study abroad varies significantly among institutions. Some schools include work experience, organized travel and brief internships along with full for-credit courses in the same category. Others, including Columbia, observe a much stricter definition when reporting to the IIE. Nonetheless, based on a review of the Senate report, IIE data and a comparison of advertised off-site offices and satellite campuses by our peers, it is clear that there is no correlation between the number or range of institutional sites operated by a university, on one hand, and the levels of study abroad by the undergraduate population, on the other. If, as the Senate Report noted, Columbia is unique among its peer institutions in having a material presence on four continents (via the Columbia Global Centers), this seems to have no observable effect on the rates of its students’ study abroad. Most of our peers appear to have higher rates of participation in pursuit of study in non-US locations (even when accounting for the incommensurability of data points and definitions), and fewer offices and facilities elsewhere.

In addition, in a 2013 EPPC survey of our undergraduate students, an overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they thought “having an international experience” as part of their Columbia education was either “very important” (60%) or “important” (19%). Another 14% thought it somewhat important. For students who valued an international experience, 82% expressed a desire for formal study abroad. More than 71% expressed a desire for an internship experience and a comparable number (71%) indicated their aspiration to learn another language as part of their “international experience.” Students were not asked to choose among options but to list all of those that were relevant to them. In addition to study, 54% of respondents said they wanted an international research opportunity and 50% said they would like to undertake field research abroad.

While it is difficult to extrapolate on the basis of the EPPC Global Curriculum and Study Abroad Survey (2013), given its response rate of only 9%, it gives us some evidence of an undergraduate population with strong interest in learning experiences beyond the United States. (See Appendix B2 - Charts from Global Curriculum Survey). Given this level of interest, the fact that only about 19% of any graduating class (combined CC and GS) actually undertakes study abroad during their time at Columbia suggests the need for additional opportunities and an examination of inhibiting factors. It is interesting and somewhat perplexing to note, in this context, that according to the formal faculty response to the Departmental Survey, faculty members generally believe that there are sufficient opportunities for undergraduate study abroad.

There are four main sets of conditions that affect undergraduate student access to study abroad and informal or non-credited educational experience abroad. These can be summarized as follows:

a) structural conditions associated with the demands of the curriculum in the College and in General Studies, with the Core playing a significant role in setting overall limits on both likelihood and timing of study abroad activity for CC students;

b) cost, and differential access to financial aid, linked to the differences between CC and GS;

c) curricular requirements associated with disciplinary and departmental majors and concentrations, with students in most of the Natural Sciences and some language departments subject to particular demands and expectations that hinder study abroad;

d) sociological and/or demographic variables, some linked to the CC/GS distinction, as well as national and experiential backgrounds of the students.

Because we have so little data on informal and non-credited education abroad, the bulk of the Task Force’s data analysis concerning undergraduate education focused on formal study abroad, and depended on data provided by the Office of Global Programs via the Office of the Dean of the College, and from the Dean of General Studies.

6.a. Curricular Structures

There is enormous variability in the rates of student participation in study abroad by division. This is to be expected, given the historical predominance of language and culture study in CC students’ traditional study abroad experiences. A significantly higher percentage of students in the Humanities pursue formal education abroad than is the case for students in either the Social Sciences or the Natural Sciences, although the rates for students in Interdisciplinary Programs and the Arts are also closer to those of the Humanities.

These broad contours are, however, insufficiently specific. Differences within divisions are significant in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and, with the exception
of Earth and Environmental Science, and Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, there is a uniformly low rate of participation in the Natural Sciences. Chart 1a shows the study abroad participation by divisions while Chart 1b shows the proportion of students, by program, who have gone abroad relative to the total number of programs declared in each division. Further breakdowns by CC and GS can be found in Appendix C1-C5.

**Chart 1a: Programs Completed by Columbia College and General Studies Students Who Studied Abroad Within Division, Classes of 2013, 2014, 2015**

**Chart 1b: Programs Completed by Columbia College and General Studies Students by Division as Percent of Total, Class of 2015**
To understand these differences requires a consideration of the limitations imposed by the Core Curriculum, which absorbs much of students’ time in the first two years of their education at Columbia, and which leaves relatively little time for the accomplishment of program requirements in the latter two years. In addition, departmentally-determined curricular demands for majors and concentrations vary widely in terms of total courses required, and in relation to the mandatory (or not) sequencing of those courses. Financial aid enters as a variable as well, but its relation to program choice is not self-evident. It is possible that factors affecting program choice, including national background, demographics, and public perception of the practical usefulness of degrees in the Natural and Social Sciences affects the rate of study abroad participation, but we choose not to speculate on causal links among these factors on the basis of the limited data we have.

Summer programs appear to be a possible solution to the conundrum facing students in degree programs that do not encourage regular-semester study abroad. However, the limitations on financial aid, which is not available in the summer to Columbia College students, and the demand for students to work as part of their tuition contribution, inhibits this possibility and excludes students of few means. Grant programs that provide undergraduates with opportunities for study abroad are few, and inadequately publicized in general.

6.b. The Natural Sciences

Our discussions with faulty in the Natural Sciences makes clear that faculty opinion is varied about the degree to which study abroad can or should be encouraged for students in the Natural Sciences, and about the degree to which scientific knowledge is (or is not) already global, its questions and answers universally valid. It is not the place of this Task Force to adjudicate this issue. We do, however, recognize the predominant sentiment among faculty members and especially DUs in the Natural Sciences with whom we met, namely that learning experiences in non-US and especially non-English speaking contexts is desirable if it does not compete with completion of core required courses, the acquisition of research skills or research itself. The significance of research abroad for graduate education and for faculty, as well as the centrality of multinational collaborations (discussed elsewhere in this report) also leads us to believe that undergraduates could be better prepared for professional life in the Natural Sciences if they had more opportunities for international experience.

However, the course-intensive nature of many degree programs in the Natural Sciences (like course-intensive majors in the Social Sciences and Humanities), coupled with the belated entry into those programs thanks to the Core, means the traditional Junior year study abroad experience is a potentially compromising pursuit for students in the Natural Sciences. DUs and representatives of the Natural Sciences also reported to the Task Force that there is very high variability in science curricula around the world, even at relatively commensurable universities (such as in the UK), making the transfer of credit and the timely acquisition of relevant knowledge difficult. We found that these assessments are somewhat hard to reconcile with a countervailing view that scientific
discourse and knowledge may already be global. In this context, while we recognize departmental control over majors as a sacrosanct principle, we would encourage departments to review their policy on the accreditation of natural science courses taught off-campus, and to consider whether more flexibility is possible or warranted for students who can and wish to pursue some of their science requirements at other institutions. In the past, different sequences of science courses at Barnard have enabled some students in Natural Science departments to satisfy requirements there, off the Columbia semester sequence; this may provide a precedent that can be used with non-US institutions as well.

Without a major revision in the Natural Sciences curricula, or a change in the academic year’s structure (such as to a quarter system, which is much more flexible), the most significant opportunity for enhancing Science students’ access to study abroad and global education may lie with the development of programs that support shorter-term research internships and fund undergraduate participation in research projects that are led by Columbia faculty or their collaborators and recognized colleagues. We advocate the creation of substantial endowed funds for this purpose, and the careful and regular survey of possible sites for such research-oriented learning opportunities. To do so will require broad and deep familiarity with faculty members’ changing research projects, and an enhanced advisory process for undergraduate Science students that would make such opportunities visible at an early stage. Students should be enabled to plan for such activity and apply for admission to relevant research projects in a timely manner. We also advocate a stronger advisory engagement of Science students about the virtues and opportunities of summer study abroad that would be supplementary to their Science study, without necessarily being directly tied to their majors or concentrations.

One last consideration for undergraduates and graduate students who want to pursue research opportunities abroad during the summer is that the existing small grants for such purposes are often offered by regionally-oriented interdisciplinary Institutes, and are not likely to be known by students in the Natural Sciences. We suggest that a conversation between the Science departments and these regional institutes and programs establish the eligibility for Science-oriented study and collaborative research abroad, as well as the pursuit of supplementary funding for this purpose via the Divisional Deans. office.

6.c. The Core Curriculum

The rationale for increased teaching abroad appears to have several dimensions and to have evolved over time. Central among these has been the desire to ensure that the maintenance of the Core Curriculum does not hinder the acquisition of a global education. (The issue of “globalizing” the Core from within was beyond the purview of the Task Force’s mandate, and has been addressed by other committees, most notably the Committee on Global Core).

Because the Core Curriculum puts limits on the timing of study abroad and constrains its possibility for those in course-intensive majors, Columbia has begun
experimenting with making some parts of the Core available to students in international sites where other courses can also be accessed, both through local institutions and in classes taught by our own faculty. At Reid Hall, thanks to support from the Mellon grant, this has been explored with the offering of Music and Art Humanities in 2015-16, with syllabi reconceived and revised to take advantage of the rich cultural (museum and performance) resources of Paris. By all indications these courses were enormously successful for students and the faculty involved, although the revision of the syllabi was onerous and particularly time-consuming for the course’s first iteration. The labor-intensiveness of these first offerings is not unique, of course; it is inevitable for all new courses, although it may be intensified if faculty members are unfamiliar with the milieu of the new site and/or if they have to establish new networks to enable field visits or supplementary, extra-curricular activities for their students. Such activity was a crucial dimension of the revamped Paris-based courses.

To date, there have been two distinct approaches to teaching the Core abroad—both of which have taken place at Reid Hall. The first entails teaching it during the regular semester, so that students already pursuing study in Paris can satisfy their Music and Art Humanities requirements in their junior year (the most typical year for study abroad). In this case, students take only one of either Music or Art Humanities course per semester, and pursue their other classes, including those in French medium, alongside the Core. The second has been offered in the summer as an intensive, combined 6-unit course, taken exclusive of other classes.

The two approaches raise two further questions: 1) equality of access; and 2) the commensurability of the courses that are recognized as part of the Core. These are analytically distinct issues but they may overlap in some contexts.

Federally-linked financial aid is not available to CC students in summer (for students in GS, financial aid is more portable). Hence, Core courses that are offered in summer threaten to become available only to those with significant financial resources. Not only are there tuition fees, travel and accommodation costs, but out-of-pocket expenses tend to be high. And, of course, there are factors (such as care-giving responsibilities or other limitations to travel) that make it impossible for some students to go abroad. Given the self-evident centrality of the Core to our undergraduate curriculum and the commitment to a need-blind education, the summer Core risks becoming a source of new inequality if additional monies cannot be made available. Until sufficient financial aid can be generated to ensure that the Core courses abroad are not limited to students of means, we believe that the purpose of the Core is undermined by siting it abroad. Either such courses should be taught only during the regular year (as they are also now taught), when fewer financial obstacles would be introduced, or their being offering during the summer should be contingent on the generation of an endowment or other stop-gap funding that would ensure the possibility of a need-blind selection process.

A secondary issue emerges in this context, however, insofar as faculty who are abroad to teach the Core during the Fall and Spring are not only not teaching it on the
Morningside Campus, but are also not teaching other courses at the same time (this is not specific to the Core, of course). So, as discussed in Section 8, either their regular Morningside classes must be covered at additional expense to the Arts and Sciences budget, or they are lost, putting greater pressure on offerings and class-size at home.

The question of incommensurability is somewhat different. It arises when we consider that Core courses taught in Paris may be substantially different than those taught in New York. The intensiveness of the course, the retooling of syllabi to make use of local museum and cultural resources, and the relatively high number of supplementary activities are all dimensions of difference. Even Core courses taught at Columbia vary by instructor and iteration. Absolute uniformity is not possible and is probably not desirable. Nonetheless the Committee on the Core may wish to revisit syllabi and consider this issue in general based on the accumulating experience in Paris.

We do not advocate an elimination of Core courses because they are changed and made responsive to local circumstances. However, if we are willing to open up the category of Core courses to this level of variation, Columbia may wish to go even further, and consider at least Art and Music Humanities as modular courses, rather than as a single entity. In this case, one might consider versions of Music and Art Humanities that are taught in other, non-European contexts, such as Istanbul, Mumbai, or Beijing. This would perhaps lead to transformations in the way the Core is conceived, globalizing it internally. Such questions lie beyond the mandate of the Task Force, but we encourage their further discussion.

Having said as much, we concur with the undergraduate survey results (EPPC Survey of 2013), which indicate that the more primary courses in the Core sequence, namely Literature Humanities and Contemporary Civilization, should not be taught abroad. The opportunities of developing specialized versions of the Core should always be weighed against the risk of creating internal inequalities that contradict the fundamental goal of giving our students a shared and comparable intellectual foundation.

6.d. Demographic Factors

Currently, the OGP makes use of data that track student participation in study abroad according to multiple variables, including declared and completed programs (majors and concentrations), gender, ethnicity, financial status (but not differentiated according to level), college-attending generational status (first in family), athlete status, location of study, and language of study. However, it does not, as a matter of course, cross-tabulate these categories for analytic purposes. The Task Force requested that such multiple-variable data be generated, but was given the basis to undertake an analysis of only two variables at a time (e.g., gender and ethnicity, generational status and financial aid) (See Charts 2a, 2b). According to the Office of the College Dean, a finer-grained analysis would compromise the privacy of individuals by permitting identification of students on the basis of their study abroad choices and backgrounds. We believe that, while the publication of such data is not necessary and potentially harmful to privacy, it is an essential instrument for understanding the factors that affect student choice, the social
obstacles that confront them, and the issues that should shape appropriate advising. At the end of this section of the report, we consider areas in which improved tracking and data management, as well as integrated oversight of non-credited activities, should be improved.

Chart 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>All Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>All Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Financial Aid Recipient</td>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not First Generation</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Recipient</td>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not First Generation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The available data reveal that, as in the past, and as is the case nationally, women are more likely to study abroad than men—and that this is true even within those disciplines where they are a minority. The ratio of participation rates females to males in study abroad appears, on the basis of the data provided by OGP, to be highest among Black and Native American students and lowest among White students. However, without a more substantial and qualitatively supplemented data set, we cannot assess these rates in context, nor understand their relationship to other issues, such as financial aid status, generational status, and so forth. Perhaps the most surprising discovery in our review of demographic data, was that students who are the first of their family to attend college but who are not on financial aid are more likely to study abroad than those who are on financial aid and those who are not the first in their generation. Again, we do not know if this population encompasses foreign students whose parents have different educational backgrounds and if those ‘first generation’ students differ from students in historically disadvantaged groups in the US. Understanding such issues would be important for enhanced advising and for the identification of possible needs for support services before and after study abroad.
The Task Force’s review of the evaluations generated by students who had studied abroad (published by OGP on its website) provides some reason to believe that personal identity and demographic variables are significant determinants of the study abroad experience and should be more vigorously tracked and analyzed. Racial, economic, and sexual identities may affect home-stays in particular, and in some cases, their concatenation produces multiple challenges as well as legal vulnerabilities. While OGP offers workshops and discussion groups about such issues, and while it is clearly cognizant of the importance that student biography plays in study abroad experiences, it does not appear to link this general advisory practice to a systematic effort at formal study, tracking, or data analysis. We believe that linking these practices—data gathering and analysis, on one hand, and advising on the other—would enable more effective program planning, the development of more adequate advising, and the capacity to remedy or intervene more readily and in a more timely manner in situations or programs that could negatively affect student learning.

6.e. Joint Programs and Dual Degrees (General Studies)

By definition GS students are unlike those in the College. Of diverse backgrounds, many with professional experience, and including a large population of veterans, the GS students often have substantial international experience and a worldly understanding of the US’s place in global context. The relative lack of financial aid available to them limits participation in costly Summer study abroad activities, but the portability of the aid that they do have (which is not semester specific) also means that they are not confined to Fall or Spring semester study abroad. The result, as Chart 3 indicates, is that most GS students who do participate in education abroad do so during the summer months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Fall Only</th>
<th>Spring Only</th>
<th>Fall &amp; Spring</th>
<th>Total AV</th>
<th>Summer Credit</th>
<th>Total for Credit</th>
<th>% Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Academic year includes preceding summer. If a student participated in separate programs in two different years, the student will be counted once in each of those years.

The School of General Studies has also been notably thoughtful and ambitious in providing its students with substantial global educational opportunities. GS students may transfer up to 60 units of credits (with approval), which fact is has enabled the development of joint and dual degree programs. These highly selective programs are
among the most significant contributions of GS to the overall project of Global Education at Columbia and are consequently described here in some detail.

Students in the joint and dual degree programs apply coursework from partner universities to their Columbia undergraduate degree requirements, but are still expected to meet all Columbia requirements. Their programs of study are conceived, from the start, to enable matriculation from two separate universities over the course of four years, and students divide their time and studies between two continents and two distinct academic communities. The first two years are undertaken at the non-US university and the latter are completed at Columbia, but advising by Columbia staff occurs throughout. Many students in the dual degree programs also participate in Summer study abroad programs in other locations. Typically multilingual and oriented toward multinational career paths, they are often strong advocates of immersive learning.

Currently, Columbia operates dual degree programs with Sciences Po, the Institut d’études politiques de Paris, which is built upon an already-established partnership managed by the Alliance Program, with support from the Office of Global Programs. That program encompasses partnerships across several schools and several levels, including: Dual MIA and MPA Programs between SIPA and Sciences Po; JD/Master’s Program in Global Business Law; PhD Partnership in Political Science; Dual Master’s Program in Journalism; Global Master’s Degree in Development Practice.

As of 2012, Columbia also operates a dual degree program with the City University of Hong Kong. Students are recruited for the program once they are enrolled at CityU in a pre-approved major. While pre-selection is done by CityU, there has been faculty consultation in program development since its inception and active engagement in the assessment of course equivalency.

Faculty efforts to ensure equivalency and commensurability at either institution are not merely a matter of accreditation but have led to substantive changes in curricula. In one case, this led to an alteration of the curriculum at Sciences Po and courses recognizable as Calculus I and II were introduced.

At present, Columbia is investigating several other possible partnerships to extend this model. These include a Global Health Scholars Program, with a BA-MD partnership between the University of Nairobi, GS, and the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons (P&S). Under this program, highly qualified students studying medicine in an African university will be admitted into a joint BA-MD program. After successfully completing the BA degree at GS and earning the required GPA, students in this new Global Health Scholars program will begin study at P&S with the ultimate goal of returning to their home countries to practice medicine.

Finally, discussion is under way with the National University of Singapore, and Trinity College (Dublin). Explorations with possible partners in Brazil and elsewhere are being explored with facilitation by the Office of the Columbia Global Centers.
From the Task Force’s point of view, the dual degree programs are enormously successful examples of well-planned and broadly conceived global education. The student populations are diverse, and there has been substantial effort to move the programs beyond a concept of institutional commensurability that is, effectively, a form of institutional ethnocentrism. The 65 students in the Fall 2015 entering class in the joint program with Sciences Po represent 25 different countries and will join their peers in Le Havre, Menton, and Reims to study the Social Sciences of Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and North America before coming to GS and declaring a major here. The 99 Dual BA students at Columbia currently are registered in 25 distinct majors.\(^4\)

There are, nonetheless, some obstacles to be addressed if this model is to be developed further, and these are partly a function of the very global circumstances that such education is intended to address. Currency differentials and differential tuition rates, the latter often linked to the traditions of state rather than private education, has meant that the semesters away from the Morningside Campus are relatively inexpensive and those here relatively more so. For US students going elsewhere, the differentials can be advantageous. For students coming here, they are onerous. In at least one case (Boğaziçi University), these differences proved insurmountable and a possible dual degree program was tabled due to high costs on the US end. While it is not possible to provide a resolution to the impasse generated by the unevenness and inequalities of the global economy, it is possible that Columbia could consider an expansion of its concept of financial aid that includes non-citizens. This proposal is a thought experiment more than a recommendation, but the structures that it responds to cannot be ignored in our broader, long-term reconceptualization of the global university.

6.f. Global Destinations and Language Issues

In relation to these broader issues, and the dual degree programs’ exemplary ambitions, it is also important to reflect on where our students and faculty go when they do study and teach abroad. In other words, what, in actuality, are the geographical, cultural and linguistic assumptions and tendencies that characterize “global education” at Columbia today? As Charts 4a and 4b show us, the vast majority of our students undertake study abroad in Europe.

\(^4\) Source: Dean of the School of General Studies, “School of General Studies: International Programs” January 12, 2016.
Specifically, Britain, France and Spain account for almost half of our CC study abroad activity. This is despite the fact that we have high rates of participation in study abroad among CC students majoring in non-European languages and cultures programs, and especially in East Asian Languages and Cultures, and in Middle Eastern, South Asian and African Studies. However, we should note, in this context, that students in GS pursue study abroad in a far more diverse array of locations. The different backgrounds of GS students, some of whom are US Vets and some of whom are professionals returning to school for skills relevant to new global circumstances, may explain some of this difference. In addition, CC students pursuing majors in non-European languages may study them elsewhere but not necessarily pursue formal study abroad in that medium. This is especially true for students who are studying languages that they did not encounter prior to the collegiate level. So, while residual Eurocentric biases may linger within the patterns of Columbia College study abroad, the differences between CC and GS are not explained by them, and the issue is highly complex. (The Maps in Appendix D1-D4 provide a visualization of the locations in which our undergraduate students are studying, as well as the sites of the Columbia Global Centers).

In addition, the fact of Reid Hall accounts for much of this preponderance of Europe in our CC student’s study abroad; its long history, robust institutional resources
and strong partnerships with local universities makes it an obvious choice for many students. But there are other cultural factors at play. The Global Center at Amman is another site with strong institutional resources for language-based teaching but it has not become a node for formal study abroad during the regular semesters so much as for summer language instruction. A deeper comparison between the two than was possible for the Task Force might permit a better understanding of the ways in which language instruction and global education are grasped at present, and of the status granted to both knowledge production and teaching in European and non-European contexts.

Even in the absence of such a study, it appears that global education and study abroad is still shaped by its long-standing, US-based and centered traditions. The Columbia curriculum’s historical privileging of the concept of ‘major civilizations,’ although now reformed, has its echo in the distribution of knowledge and in the degree to which reciprocity is granted to other institutions and traditions of knowledge production. More practically speaking, the likelihood of acquiring sufficient linguistic capacity to take university-level courses in languages other than English is limited by the nature of language instruction at all levels of education in the US. Like other aspects of Columbia’s education, language instruction is characterized by much unevenness—between languages that are commonly taught in the US (mainly European languages and some Asian languages) and others; between that aimed at heritage speakers and that aimed at new learners; and so forth. The relatively low rates at which students participate in study abroad programs in languages other than English is demonstrative of this unevenness as well as the much higher frequency of European languages, relative to other regions (see chart 5 for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language in Study Abroad Program</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croat</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columbia College: n=274. General Studies: n=63
Note: One reference to "Nigerian" is excluded here.
Over the last few years, the language requirements for study abroad have been altered so that, rather than following a one-size-fits-all model, they are now determined by the faculty members who oversee particular programs and/or departments that grant credit toward majors for classes taken elsewhere. This new policy was developed by OGP and the EPPC Subcommittee on Global Curriculum in response to a number of developments that made the previous uniform standard of intermediate-level language competency impractical: (i) students regularly desired to pursue study abroad in countries or regions whose languages were not taught at Columbia. (ii) in the case of students learning new languages, the intermediate-level requirement often delayed study abroad, thereby introducing conflicts between the pursuit of other major requirements (already delayed because of the Core) and study abroad. In many cases (and for most non-European languages), second or third language acquisition commences only in college, whereas study of European languages often begins in high school. It was determined that differences in competency between those languages studied before college and those learned later should not become the basis for excluding students from going abroad. And (iii) faculty had expressed a wish to design study abroad programs in which the pursuit of foreign language study was not a primary goal and for which language skills were not deemed necessary.

The Task Force continues to believe that language requirements should not be determined by individual faculty members, but in conjunction with COI and other relevant review procedures. It also believes that support for languages should be robustly pursued as part of global education, and that all students should be encouraged to pursue the study of other languages, both as the basis for study abroad and independently. It also commend the new OGP language policy insofar as it requires in situ language study from students who have not previously studied the language of their host country before studying abroad.

Finally, we encourage further investment in and enhancement of the Language Resource Center, which provides a crucial venue for the instruction of lesser-taught languages. In 2012, a 1.2 million-dollar grant from Mellon helped create a consortium between Columbia, Cornell and Yale, using videoconferencing and joint classes (for no more than twelve students) to provide instruction in less commonly taught languages. Sixteen languages are currently taught in this manner, contributing to the total of fifty-three languages taught at Columbia. But there is greater need than can be sustained at present, and supplementary funding is necessary to take up where Mellon leaves off. (See Appendix E, for languages offered at Columbia University.)

This kind of language instruction is especially important for our graduate students and faculty conducting primary research in areas and languages for which Columbia does not have standing department-based instructional resources. Additional funding for the

---

5 Source: Language Resources Center, “Shared Course Initiative.” (See http://www.lrc.columbia.edu/sci/).
graduate-level study of less commonly taught languages, including support at (foreign) institutions with relevant expertise and programming would be a significant improvement given that even the Mellon-supported program leaves many languages untaught. Finally, translational resources should be enhanced at all levels, including at the Columbia Global Centers, with appropriate line-item budgets built into operating costs for international conferences and public events.

7. GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ABROAD

Without doubt, graduate education and its relationship to learning and research abroad is the least tracked and least well supported dimension of the university’s global educational project, at least at a logistical level. Our doctoral students undertake research abroad at extraordinarily high rates, and outstrip both our faculty and our undergraduate students in the levels of this activity. Some of them pursue language and other study abroad in courses and programs operated through our Office of Global Programs and/or the Columbia Global Centers. A few make use of the Partnership Ph.D. Mobility Program that permits Columbia students to conduct research at the LSE, the National University of Singapore or Sciences Po. But most doctoral research activity is undertaken in independent fashion or in conjunction with research projects operated by faculty PIs which are also independent of large-scale pedagogical programs. Partly for this reason, there is no structure comparable to the OGP for graduate students, and nor would OGP be an appropriate entity to absorb the functions and services that are needed to better support graduate research and education (but see Section 10 about organizational distribution of those functions, such as logistics and communications, which might be efficiently shared).

Map one provides a visualization of the geographic distribution of research by our graduate students. (We note here that this research occurs in a far wider range of sites and implies a less Euro-centric orientation than is the case for our undergraduate students studying abroad.)

---

6 See [http://gsas.columbia.edu/content/partnership-phd-mobility-program](http://gsas.columbia.edu/content/partnership-phd-mobility-program).
To determine what our graduate students do and what their needs are, we undertook a survey of doctoral students in the Arts and Sciences, and a separate survey of Masters students. The response rate on the doctoral survey was 26% (507 of 1963), with a higher response rate for women (30%) than for men (22%). There are some limits to the representativeness of the survey, due to an unusually high response rate among Social Science students and especially those in Anthropology. (For a fuller account of the representativeness of the doctoral survey see Appendix A2.)

The Masters’ survey proved an inadequate instrument for analytic purposes and generalization is impossible because such a large percentage of the students surveyed came from a single department (Statistics). Our focus in this report is therefore driven by the relative reliability of our information on doctoral students, and on our sense that this area is both inadequately supported and extremely significant for the university as a whole. MA students receive lesser attention here both because of data problems and because the short duration and course-intensiveness of the Master’s degrees makes research outside of the US extremely difficult. We do note, however, that many students who did respond to the MA survey indicated that they would pursue more research abroad if their degree programs permitted it and the time constraints were not so severe. Moreover, there are a few excellent MA programs, including the MA in International and World History operated in conjunction with LSE that is structured as a two-year degree.

---

Students in stand-alone MA degrees in Statistics, and those in the Math and Statistics program comprise fully 40% of all MA students, and 36% of the respondents. This makes the Statistics MA population 10 times bigger than the next largest program in the A&S.
and in which international movement between institutions and access to foreign scholars enhances the opportunities for vigorous globally oriented research. This model, by virtue of both its duration and the institutionalized partnerships that facilitate it, overcomes the most significant factor limiting research abroad, namely time to degree. Additionally, the French department has introduced an MA in History and Literature (HiLi) that is housed at the Columbia Global Center for Europe in Paris. Students in that program are taught by Columbia faculty at Reid Hall and also choose from courses at France’s two top-tier graduate schools in the humanities and the social sciences: the École normale supérieure and the École des hautes études en sciences sociales.

7.a. Doctoral Student Profiles: Origins and Ambitions

Knowing that identity is more complex than is typically captured by census categories, our survey asked students to identify themselves in terms of linguistic background and country of origin. We encouraged students to include multiple identifications if this described their own sense of self. Thus, the survey asked students not only what their citizenship is but what they believe to be their home country, if they had lived in another country for extended periods of time, and if they claimed more than one home country. The results indicate an enormously diverse student population. Only 50% claimed English as a native language, although 11% indicated as their mother tongue English and one other language. Results showed 43% were born in the United States, 3% are naturalized citizens or permanent residents, and 8% identified two home countries, including the US. Of the respondents to our survey, 40% indicated that they are from elsewhere and do not consider the US to be their home. This corresponds roughly (though the survey rates are slightly lower) to official statistics maintained by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and gives us confidence in the generalizability of the demographic data generated through the survey.

Of all the students who did not claim to be non-US citizens (that is, those who are either born in the US, naturalized citizens, permanent residents, or who claim dual nationality), 32% had attended college outside of the US. The language of instruction for those students was largely English (50%) or English and another language (13%). Almost half (48%) had previously engaged in a formal study abroad program, and the majority of these in semester-long programs (56%) with another significant percentage (17%) in year-long programs. A very substantial number (33%) had also undertaken intensive language-education through study abroad. Many others (24%) had pursued intensive in situ language training outside a study abroad program. Of particular interest is the degree to which those students who had previously pursued study abroad stated that they had been influenced by that experience to pursue additional “global experiences.” Fully 72% claimed this to have been the case.

Of the students who claimed to be non-US citizens, 32% indicated that they had participated in a formal study abroad program prior to coming to Columbia, in either a formal semester-long (43%) or year-long (38%) program. Of these survey respondents,
65% indicated that this experience had led them to pursue additional global experiences, among which, we assume study at Columbia would be counted.

We conclude from this that **study abroad is a significant influence on future academic and professional decisions, and that we, at Columbia, select for such experience.** Not all undergraduates can or should pursue graduate study, of course, but insofar as Columbia’s graduate admissions process seems to privilege applicants with prior study abroad experience, we can infer that it contributes recognizable skills, experience and analytical capacities that are valuable in themselves and for further intellectual pursuit.

Much of our survey asked students to think prospectively about what they believe is necessary and desirable for their doctoral training. Chart 6 shows doctoral student response to questions about whether they deem research abroad to be necessary, desirable and feasible for their degree, on a divisional basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of Column</th>
<th>% of Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not necessary or desirable as part of my doctoral degree</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a necessary part of my doctoral degree</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not necessary, but desirable as part of my doctoral degree;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however, my degree requirements are too heavy to accommodate it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not necessary, but desirable as part of my doctoral degree;</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to enhance my capacity to obtain employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not necessary, but desirable as part of my doctoral degree;</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer Provided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Respondents** 507

The responses to this question revealed both profound divisional differences, as to be expected, but also a very significant differential between the relative significance afforded to research abroad when this is not deemed necessary for the degree or for future employability. In the Natural Sciences, where only 10% of students deem research abroad necessary to their degree, 42% see it as desirable. And, in the Humanities and Social Sciences, where more than half of all respondents said research abroad is necessary for their doctoral training, almost all others stated that they deem it desirable even when it does not appear necessary. This aspirational expression gives us a sense of the current ethos in which research abroad is conceived: as an intrinsic good and an anticipated dimension of professional attractiveness, even when not necessary to the immediate research agenda. (See Appendix F1 for detailed information on student response to questions about desirability of research abroad.)

What research abroad means, how long it takes and in what contexts it occurs is, of course, enormously variable. We found that there was a broad spread on the question of duration (from fewer than 6 months to 24 months), with doctoral students in the Social
Sciences and Humanities tending toward longer periods of research abroad. The faculty responses to the Departmental Survey indicate concern that extended research abroad affects time to degree. This is not always the case; the most time-intensive research tends to involve language-based field research and the negotiation of unfamiliar contexts (compared, for example, to the use of library or archival resources that are structured in ways analogous to those here). For cases where more time is clearly needed, faculty expressed a desire for more flexibility in the allocation and timing of teaching assistant responsibilities, which, in some cases (especially in the Humanities), make travel or sustained research abroad difficult. Currently, there is considerable variation between departments in the assignment of TA responsibilities, but in disciplines where outside funding is not typically available for field research, it is presumed that students will TA in consecutive years. This inhibits absence from campus, even for research. We would therefore urge GSAS to develop a more flexible policy regarding both the temporal distribution of teaching assistantships, and the 7 and 9 year rules (which determine doctoral student eligibility for much funding, teaching positions, housing and health insurance). Our policy and practice should enable students to undertake the kinds of substantive research abroad necessary for good scholarship in some fields, consistent with our institutional values.

As variable as duration, we found that the reasons for such research varied widely, and included work with scholarly experts elsewhere, consultations of materials in archives, libraries and other repositories, work in laboratories or field sites. Again, the rationale for research abroad was differently inflected by division—although internal differences in the division are perhaps as great as those between them.

Our doctoral students both come from and pursue research in an astonishingly diverse set of locations, although here, as with our undergraduates, a relatively high percentage work in Europe. (See Map 1, above, regarding location of graduate research) Given that so many of our students come from elsewhere, we were interested to know how many of the students involved in “globalized” research are actually pursuing investigations tied to their own origins and ancestral connections. We wanted to understand, in other words, to what extent the globalization of education might be enabling and also perhaps hiding a form of renewed attachment to locality. We do not have baseline data to generate a historical picture, but the prevalence of such factors is significant. Of the respondents who intend to do research abroad, 39% said they would be returning to a place with which they had ancestral connections. The percentages were highest in the Social Sciences (49%), and the Humanities (42%) and relatively low in the Natural Sciences (17%).

We also wanted to understand what personal factors affected student choices about the location of their research in addition to country of origin. We asked whether gender, sexual orientation, racial identity, political affiliation or previous activity, religious belief, socioeconomic status or other factors played a role, and all did to varying degrees. The most common of these variables identified as a determinant of research were socioeconomic status and gender. Chart 7 shows the rates at which doctoral students rated these factors in the calculation of research site and project.
7.b. Advising

Students require both advance supervision and advising during their research abroad, and just as faculty absence from campus affects advising, so too does student absence from campus affect access to supervisory support. Students bear responsibility for being in touch with their departments and their dissertation committees, but not all maintain regular contact with their supervisors or with their departmental administrators. Recent requirements for reporting of Columbia-related travel will permit the University to identify the location of students but it does not yet address the substantive needs for continuous intellectual engagement and research oversight.

Currently, very few departments have any policy regarding the advising of doctoral students when faculty are absent. (All Natural Sciences departments said they either lacked a policy or that the issue was not applicable to them while 86% of the Humanities departments and 100% of Social Science departments indicated that they had no policy whatsoever). Nonetheless, all departments indicated that their faculty members advised students during their own absence using Skype or other teleconferencing technology. That is to say, lack of policy does not mean lack of advising—although the range and regularity of such advising is clearly variable, and not always sufficient. There is some indication from the doctoral students (based on survey responses) that they perceive worrisome gaps in access to supervisors when they are on leave, and in some cases an unsatisfactory level of support. We cannot judge the nature of this lack of dissatisfaction without deeper, qualitative study. At the very least, given the stringent timelines for completion of doctoral degrees, GSAS should provide policy guidelines to ensure that students are not without advising and adequate research supervision at any point during their tenure at Columbia. Skype and other video conferencing currently facilitate much of the advising need, but it is sometimes necessary for supervisors who are teaching or researching abroad to come to campus for the purpose of dissertation defenses and other examinations. We do not believe that all advising can or should be performed long-distance; face-to-face interactions still constitute a crucial dimension of mentoring. The Task Force believes a line item should be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin or nationality</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial identity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliations or past political activity</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious belief/identity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status/Class</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
included in departmental budgets and a reasonable set of resources allocated to permit faculty travel for this advising. Monies for graduate supervision should not, in any case, come out of individual faculty research budgets. To the extent that Skype and such technologies are required for examination and defense purposes, there should be more and better resources available in departments; we heard of several cases in which dissertation defenses were undermined due to poor connectivity, low bandwidth, or other inadequate technical support—including, on occasion, a simple lack of cameras. The LRC has shown that good technology can mitigate many of the pitfalls with distance interaction and provides an exemplary model for departments and the university in general to emulate.

7.c. Funding and Support

The nature and duration of a graduate student’s proposed research abroad is shaped in part by availability of funding and other institutional support as well as its impact on time to degree. Sixty-two percent of students obtain funding from external grants, but approximately half of all students also anticipate using GSAS stipends and summer research monies to assist in covering the costs of their research abroad. A significant percentage also indicated that they had or would seek funding from a regional institute. Eleven percent said they would obtain monies from grants associated with their faculty sponsor’s research projects, and another nineteen percent said they had or would use personal funds to augment those described above. See Appendix F3 for a chart showing the sources for financing research activity, broken down by division.

Preparing for research abroad is a complex process, and demands access to a multiplicity of informational sources, from those concerning visas, travel and health issues (including local conditions, disease prevention, and insurance) to informal networks of personal familiarity with a given location. In the absence of a single informational site and a dedicated advisory office in GSAS, our students seem to rely heavily on informal personal networks for information, as well as their own faculty advisors (though not necessarily to the exclusion of other sources). These are obviously important, but they are also uneven and neither vetted nor updated on regular basis. (See Appendix F4 for details.)

Many students responded in the comments section of the survey, requesting more and better information, substantial advising and pre-travel preparation, as well as standard formats for letters of introduction and other devices that can enable travel and research. Preparatory workshops covering some of these issues are currently offered by the Columbia Global Centers, in conjunction with the PGIF grants, and might provide a generalizable model. But students also expressed a desire for a robust and actively updated database of Columbia alumni, and other means for putting them in touch with personal networks in the places where they conduct their research. We consider questions of communication and a revised web-based information system in the Recommendations Section of this report.
In Section 10 of this report, we suggest some institutional and organizational possibilities for answering these requests and needs, and we are mindful that such resources must serve a student population of diverse nationalities, with differential access to visas, permissions and other resources—both monetary and practical. Distances traveled and costs associated with them should also be factored into the amount of monies made available to doctoral students. At present funds available for pre-professional activities are quite limited. This is especially true of the funding available for travel to conferences. At $650 per year, including both GSAS and departmental contributions ($550 in years beyond the first request), conference travel funding is woefully inadequate for conferences that take place outside of the US, and these are often important for professional development.

Similarly, support for doctoral students in the Natural Sciences to travel to laboratories and the sites of their advisors’ research (or projects on which CU faculty function as PIs) would be a significant aid to the globalization of Science doctoral education, and is as important as enabling travel to conferences.

We would add here that support for students in the School of the Arts, albeit limited because of the fee-paying structure of the MFAs, which account for so many of its students, should aim to enable access to international festivals, performance venues, installation sites and collaborative workshops around the globe. Our conversations with the Dean of the School of the Arts indicated that the international origins of the student population and the sense of New York’s centrality to the art world limit demand for outward movement, but some faculty members also shared with us aspirations for their students to be more known by international communities of presenters. The CGCs might play an important role in facilitating such activities, with supplementary funding from consular, foundation or the University’s presidential funds.

At present, a very significant proportion of funding available to doctoral students for primary research abroad is limited by citizenship. Given that nearly half of our doctoral students come from abroad, this is a profoundly consequential limitation. Columbia’s own grant programs, such as the Traveling Fellowship, are not similarly limited and provide an important alternative and supplement to federal and other grants limited by citizenship. **Recent efforts by the GSAS to make monies available to our non-US students for summer research and study (including language study) have been a welcome addition to the existing resource pool. Prompted by student requests, these new grants are already having a positive effect. This should become a permanent dimension of GSAS budgeting, and enlarged to the maximal extent possible. At present, there is some uncertainty about the grants on the students’ part, and planning for summer activity this year was delayed as a result of the late announcement and consequent uncertainty about the program’s renewal.**
8. FACULTY RESEARCH AND TEACHING ABROAD

Depending on division, Arts and Sciences faculty members are very actively involved in research abroad, and often on issues and phenomena linked to globality. Our faculty’s substantive engagements, as well as their personal and intellectual networks around the world form the invisible infrastructure for much of what we do by way of global education. For this reason, global education depends on the sustenance of faculty research.

8.a. Research and Teaching: Expertise and Professional Networks

In some cases, faculty members actively teach students off-campus, in situ. This may entail using the field research site as a pedagogical site. But, teaching may itself extend the research of the faculty members. And, even when faculty members are not personally present in a teaching site away from Morningside Campus, they can facilitate student experience and opportunities by making available their own substantive knowledge and networks of individuals and institutions. This is especially relevant in the case of graduate student education, and, as stated in the recommendations section below, this dimension of our faculty’s expertise and interest should be better integrated and utilized by the advisory process at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

Chart 8 a and b, based on the survey of departments, show rates at which faculty members are currently engaged in research abroad and in collaborations with other scholars around the world.
The rates vary significantly between and within divisions. However, these rates are both higher than our undergraduate students’ rate of study abroad and lower than that of our doctoral students. We were not able to access information that would permit us to determine whether factors such as age and gender affect these rates, but it appears that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th># of Faculty Conducting Research While Abroad</th>
<th>% of Total FTE</th>
<th># of Departments Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th># of Faculty Involved in Collaborative Work with Scholars Abroad</th>
<th>% of Total FTE</th>
<th># of Departments Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
status in the tenure process unevenly affects the likelihood of faculty members teaching abroad, although not having tenure does seem to correlate with lower rates of research abroad. Thus, for example, in the Humanities, of the instructors who taught abroad over the past three years, nineteen were tenured, three were non-tenured-but-on-track, and twelve were other full-time instructional faculty. In the Social Sciences, all but one instructor was tenured. In the Natural Sciences, the numbers, though low in absolute terms and therefore non-generalizable, were evenly balanced, with one person in each of the categories.

8.b. Negotiating Faculty Aspirations To Teach Abroad

The expertise and networks of our scholarly professionals make possible graduate research abroad, but also contribute to the networks that sustain the Columbia Global Centers, and that enable a multiplicity of inter-institutional collaborations. So, robust support for faculty research abroad is essential. Teaching abroad, however, has particular costs that need to be accounted for and covered more adequately than is presently the case.

Over the last several years, there has been an increasing push, facilitated and enabled by grants from the Mellon Foundation and the President’s Global Innovation Fund (see below), for Columbia faculty to teach abroad, thereby supplementing and indeed changing the historical model for study abroad, which had hitherto mainly entailed students being enrolled in programs taught by locally recruited instructors (even in programs operated by Columbia or consortia in which it is a partner, many of the instructors are not full-time Columbia employees). There are both opportunities and problems associated with this new emphasis on teaching abroad by our own faculty, including burdens to the regular curriculum on Morningside Campus and diminished capacities for the performance of advising and administrative work necessary to the Arts and Sciences.

Chart 9a shows the rates of teaching aboard over the last three years. Chart 9b.i, ii, iii shows the changes in these rates according to whether the courses taught abroad were offered in the regular or the summer semester.
Mellon Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidential Global Initiative Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring ’14:</td>
<td>1 Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring ’15:</td>
<td>4 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer ’15:</td>
<td>3 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring ’15: 1 Award for set of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer ’15: 1 Award for 2 Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 9a: Ladder Rank Faculty Teaching Abroad, 2012/13-2014/15 including Subsequent Summer Term
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Chart 9b.i: Ladder Rank Faculty Teaching Abroad, Fall Terms
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We note that the increase in Columbia Faculty teaching abroad is almost entirely explicable, in numerical though not necessarily causal terms, through reference to the Mellon grants. That is to say, courses created through the Mellon Program account for the increase in teaching abroad during this 3-year period.

The issue of timing—regular or summer semester—is at the heart of almost every issue having to do with teaching and study abroad. Regarding teaching, the timing of courses has profound consequences for curricular resources on the Morningside Campus. Courses abroad that are taught in the regular semester and/or those that are counted towards faculty member’s annual teaching obligations necessitate a loss on the home campus—not just of teaching in their departments
and, sometimes, in the Core Curriculum, but of other service capacities as well (committee duties, advisory responsibilities, and so forth). Depending on the division, a single FTE’s absence (either one faculty away for an entire year or two faculty members absent for one semester each) may mean a loss of up to four courses. In some small departments, the reduction of course offerings risks undermining the capacity to mount required courses except through adjunct hiring.

Equally important, the distribution of teaching abroad by CU faculty varies significantly by department and division. Most of the teaching abroad is undertaken by faculty members in the languages and literatures departments, with small numbers coming from two of the Natural Sciences, and a few from the Social Sciences. The burden is thus localized, though spread across tenured, non-tenure-but-on-track, and off-tenure track faculty. Chart 10 shows the relative burden of teaching abroad as a percentage of departmental FTEs.

![Chart 10: FTE Teaching Abroad as % of Total Department FTE, 2014/15 (Excluding Summer)](image)

8.b.i. Institutional Incentives: The Mellon Grant and PGIF

It is widely perceived among faculty that Columbia has made a strategic decision to embrace the “global” as a domain of opportunity, an object of study, and a brand value. The preamble to this report describes globality and the task of globalizing the curriculum as the Task Force understands it. Here we wish to consider the ways in which faculty have been recruited into teaching abroad and the consequences of that recruitment. We also consider other funded opportunities that make faculty research and study abroad possible.
Two major initiatives bear discussion here: the Mellon grant, entitled *Global Liberal Arts Initiative*, and the President’s Global Innovation Fund. The former is specifically intended to “internationalize” the undergraduate curriculum through “faculty renewal and coordinated use of the University’s Global Centers.” Funds were initially directed toward the hiring of assistant professors, and entailed a “commitment from Columbia to offer at minimum 15 courses abroad in Humanities and humanistic Social Sciences” during the period 2013 - 2016. In fact, Columbia offered 17 courses during the grant period.

In 2015, Columbia submitted a proposal to renew its Mellon grant in modified form. The costs of developing new courses and the burden on OGP had proven greater than anticipated, and accordingly, the now-approved Mellon Phase 2 will lead to fewer courses and promises the hiring of four more Assistant Professors (whereas 8 had been hired during Phase 1). In both cases, the grant provided for visiting faculty. However the funding for visitors was not directly correlated with the number of faculty abroad. Nor was it distributed as compensation for absent instructional personnel; during the three years of grant, funds were made available for 1, 2, and 1 visitors, respectively. In the renewed grant, the same principle will apply. During 2015, the Mellon saw three courses taught in Summer, two in the Spring and three in the Fall. As all of the faculty teaching abroad during the regular year taught only one course while abroad, i.e. less than the two they would have taught at home (most faculty in the Humanities teach a 2/2 load), the Morningside Campus lost twice as many courses as it gained abroad during this period. However, it gained 8 courses from the visitors hired through the same grant. In 2016, CU faculty taught three courses in Spring, three in the Summer and two in the Fall. For 2017, the numbers are: three in Spring, two in Summer and two in Fall. We note with some concern that departments that received Mellon grants had to compete for visitorships and that there was significant confusion about this requirement and, in some cases, an erroneous assumption that visitorships would be automatically granted to departments that sent faculty abroad under the Mellon Grant. Such confusion was unnecessary and a more transparent communication of Mellon’s terms and especially those associated with the visiting positions would have easily prevented it.

As we will see in Section 9, the ratio of students to faculty in these courses tends to be far lower than that on the Morningside Campus, making CU-taught study abroad, which is already a resource-intensive undertaking, even more costly (although such low ratios are a pedagogical virtue). If we calculate faculty absences in terms of courses lost rather than persons lost from the Morningside Campus (typically two courses per semester per FTE in the Humanities and many Social Sciences, and one course for faculty in the Natural Sciences), and we add to this the recognition that courses taught abroad generally have lower enrollments, the costs and benefits of the Mellon grants will shift, and the costs will be harder to sustain. The virtue of the smaller classes is obvious—intensive, one-on-one education and immersive education is a goal in seminar-style teaching. The benefit to faculty, who bring back to Morningside Campus the enlarged understanding and experience of the mixed classroom abroad, is also significant. But the trade-offs in terms of the reduced numbers of classes and, as a likely
corollary, the larger classes at home, as well as the limited access to faculty members for advising and service when they are away, mitigates these benefits at an institutional level.

Beyond the quantitative gain or loss of courses, the Mellon program raises questions about how individual faculty members and departments are mobilized for the project of teaching abroad. Our sense, based on the Department Survey and consultations with individual faculty members, is that there is widespread discontent about the linkage of teaching abroad to the IBS process, and about the determination to make some hiring within departments contingent on participation in the Mellon, and in teaching abroad more generally. The fundamental reason for hiring should be the maintenance of the excellence of the teaching faculty at Morningside Campus. Given the diversity of interest and capacity, that excellence and the possibilities for both incremental growth and reproduction of the faculty at a departmental level should not be tied to teaching abroad.

While some departments greeted the Mellon grant as a long-sought opportunity to create new programs that serve both faculty and student interests, others expressed a concern about having to invent initiatives which they would not otherwise have pursued, that they cannot commit to in the long-term, and that will tax their capacities to fulfill their curricular obligations on the Morningside Campus. The possibility that the Mellon, if not augmented by considerable endowment or other grant monies, will constitute only a very short-term transformation of teaching must be therefore considered.

The sustainability of teaching abroad has thus far been considered in terms of immediate costs but we also need to consider which costs are reduced over time. For example, the outlays entailed in the creation of new courses, which were experienced most directly as a budgetary burden for OGP during Phase 1 of the Mellon grant, diminish over time as the logistics are settled and the institutional networks are established, reducing the necessity of site-visits and other first-time expenses, including the labor of syllabus development. But more importantly, repeat courses that can be taught by several different faculty persons also enable the distribution of teaching responsibilities between our home campus and the foreign site in a manner that permits rotation of courses and tasks. This lessens the need for substitutional hiring. The Mellon grants, conceived in terms of a relatively short time horizon (as is common for soft-funding), do not appear to take account of this temporal dimension in the calculation of costs over time. Better planning and more effective budgeting would result if these issues were considered. Changing circumstances and new opportunities should be taken advantage of but the most efficient way to develop new courses—to the extent that this activity continues in the future—is to build on existing partnerships, including but not limited to those linked to Columbia Global Centers. Using existing partnerships reduces start-up costs and deepens the relationships within which intellectual exchange can take place.

Discontent was also expressed about the communications around the process of applying to host a visiting faculty person under the grant, and about the incommensurability between outgoing faculty and replacement visitors (see also Section 9.g), despite the fact that permanent hires are also a part of the Mellon. It is too soon to
tell what role the newly hired Assistant Professors will play in both fulfilling the terms of the Mellon and in changing the curriculum on the Morningside Campus. However, as Phase 2 moves forward, the demand for a fuller and more consultative process with the faculty should be borne in mind.

It should be noted here that the Mellon initiative also directed teaching toward the Columbia Global Centers, and indeed made the enhancement of CGC’s academic programming as part of the rationale. We discuss the role of the CGCs in Section 9.f of this report, but it has been repeatedly asserted by our faculty that the uneven distribution of the centers, and the limited range of their networks, which are inevitably focused in the urban location of the center, inhibited the possibility or at least the perception of the viability of proposals for the Mellon. As it turns out, several of the courses selected for the Mellon are not being taught at a CGC; Mexico City, Ramallah, Seoul, London, and Venice are among the destinations, some of which entail long-standing partnerships with other universities and others of which required the development of entirely new relations built on the personal networks of the faculty members leading the courses.

The PGIF was inaugurated in 2013 with the goal of assisting faculty in mounting either research or teaching activities at Columbia’s Global Centers. The grants are awarded annually on a competitive basis, at two levels: non-renewable planning grants (up to $20,000); and renewable (up to three years) project grants (up to $50,000). The stated goal of the program is to promote “an interactive network of partnerships across geographic boundaries and collaborations within and across traditional academic disciplines [that] can help address complex challenges by bringing together scholars, students, public officials, private sector leaders, and innovators from many fields.”

Since its inception, 19 of the 49 PGIF awards have been given to faculty members with at least some portion of their appointment in the Arts and Sciences. These have supported initiatives that include: formal credited study for undergraduates and, in some cases (but far less often) for graduate students; the creation of digital resources to be used in courses and other contexts; conferences; and workshops. The majority of the grants do not underwrite formal study, and in cases where they do, the award winners work with OGP and the CGC to follow the standard protocols for creating and mounting new courses (see below, Section 9).

In general, the proportion of the Arts and Sciences projects funded through PGIF has diminished over the last three years, falling from 9 of 20 projects (45%) in 2013 to 5 of 13 (38%) and 6 of 16 (38%) in 2014 and 2015 respectively. With few exceptions,

---

9 This count includes individuals who are appointed in multiple departments and across different schools. Even if someone has only a 33% FTE in an A&S department (with the other 67% in a professional school) they are included. If we count only those people who are fully and exclusively appointed in A&S, the percentages of PGIF grant recipients drop to 35%, 31% and 25% respectively.
graduate student mobility has not been a significant part of these grants and we concur with those faculty members who have indicated a desire for more resources to be directed to graduate student research opportunities as a part of this and other CGC-oriented funding. They are more able to benefit from the networks of institutions and scholarly expertise that the CGCs can facilitate than can undergraduates, and they are less able to access funding for such purposes otherwise. A graduate award comparable to the Presidential Global Fellowship for undergraduates, a program currently administered through the OGP, would be an excellent addition to the graduate program.

8.b.ii. Institutional Needs

At present, even taking into account the incentives created by the Mellon Grant and PGIF, the absolute number of faculty members teaching abroad is relatively low and accounts for a very small percentage of total losses to the instructional complement in a given semester. Moreover, most teaching abroad occurs in the summer months. However, even modest scaling up of these activities during the regular semester, if not accompanied by a very substantial input of funds, constitutes a real threat to the curriculum on Morningside Campus, especially in the Humanities but also in the Core Curriculum itself. In all areas, such funds should be large enough to enable temporary 1-1 substitution — that is to say, substitution at a level comparable to that of the absent faculty person.

A repeated assertion in the departmental responses to the Task Force Survey, and in meetings with the Chairs, was that the aspirations and desires of faculty members are not always congruent with the needs of departments and sometimes they directly conflict. Moreover, there is currently no single structure within which to adjudicate the total cost relative to the substantive benefit, of teaching abroad, at the Department or School level. An increasing number of the teaching opportunities for faculty actually originate not with departments but with stand-alone and interdisciplinary MA programs (such HiLi at Reid Hall). Solicitations for faculty to teach courses in these contexts tend to emanate from the programs, and go directly to the faculty members, who approach a chair secondarily. The location and force of approvals is unclear and uneven. Does such decision-making sit with the Chair, with the Divisional Dean, or with the EVPAS? Under what circumstances should such requests be adjudicated? The result of this uncertainty is that long-term planning and curricular performance within departments, in interdisciplinary programs, and in the Core, is undermined as a result. We believe that individual and departmental requests for teaching abroad during the regular semester (not necessarily the summer) should be integrated via the annual instructional budgetary statements, and that they be reviewed and adjudicated viz. both departmental and study abroad program needs. In some cases, as in the languages and literatures departments, these needs may be completely congruent. In other cases, they may be contradictory but capable of reconciliation through budgetary means. But in some cases, there will have to be a decision between the satisfaction of the Morningside Campus and the study abroad programs’ needs. In the latter cases, the Task Force believes that the Morningside Campus needs must take absolute priority.
8.c. Enabling Faculty Mobility and Teaching Abroad: Costs, Needs, Logistics

Insofar as faculty will teach abroad, keeping the constraints outlined above in mind, issues of remuneration, costs, housing needs and insurance need to be addressed systematically to ensure a well-functioning process.

8.c.i. Remuneration and Cost Reimbursements

Remuneration to faculty who teach in programs operated by OGP is presently standardized at 1/9 of salary per course, up to a maximum of $10,000 per course. (This is independent of the faculty person’s teaching load: whether they teach 1/1, as is often the case in the Natural Sciences, 2/2 as is typical in the Humanities and many Social Sciences, or 2/1 as is the case in some Social Sciences.) Up to a limit, this reproduces the differentials that already characterize our faculty’s compensation. In addition, courses taught abroad are remunerated differently depending on which office administers them. Regular departmental courses offered in summer on the Morningside Campus, for example, are remunerated on a scaled basis with set rates for professors, associate professors and assistant professors. But other summer courses run through SPS, including those taught internationally by Columbia faculty, are remunerated on the basis of tuition revenues and course-specific calculations. There is no standard.

Some faculty members, including those who have recently co-taught courses sponsored by the Mellon grants, have indicated dissatisfaction with the reproduction of inequalities in remuneration for comparable labor, particularly when courses are co-taught by individuals of different rank. At present, there are no systematic data on these inequalities and the degree to which they are biased by gender, race and other factors, as well as the conventional scales of remunerative inflation based in experience. It is therefore difficult to advocate a change in policy. However, the Task Force would welcome a review of salaries for teaching abroad, and advocates a careful analysis of the possibilities for standardizing salaries on the basis of labor/time/course units taught, given the existing data that suggest inequalities in compensation on demographic bases. In general, however, we believe that comparable pay for comparable work is an appropriate principle, and that pay for teaching should not be dependent on course-specific budgeting. Whatever its basis, the rationale for remuneration should be transparent and the pay for teaching should be fair. Any review of pay should moreover, consider unreimbursed and incidental costs, as well as the opportunity costs of teaching abroad, particularly as these affect young faculty members and those with accompanying dependents.

10 This issue is obviously not specific to teaching abroad. Nonetheless, the scope of our investigation being limited to global education, we restrict our recommendations to this domain.
As reported by faculty members who have taught abroad over the past three years, there appear to be marked unevenness in the coverage of costs and in logistical support—housing, transportation, visas, health insurance, etc.—afforded to different individuals depending on where and in what program they taught. Our faculty receive relatively little by way of support for families accompanying instructional personnel, and the budgeting process varies from program to program, depending on many factors, including whether the course is operated solely by Columbia or by a consortium, and whether it already possesses or has access to housing and so forth.

Faculty members who taught abroad over the past three years were evenly split about whether they received appropriate compensation for their teaching abroad, but most expressed relative contentment with the financial assistance and its processing by OGP, for travel and the in situ costs of course operation. However, depending on the program, supplementary costs for “extra-curricular” activities deemed essential to the course experience, especially museum visits and performances, as well as local and regional travel, were widely thought to have been insufficiently budgeted. In some cases, belated decisions to reduce such activity were thought to adversely affect the student experience and to demand revisions in the syllabus. In those cases where students were expected to cover some of these costs, the differential resources of the students made it difficult for those of lesser means. Financial aid considerations do not typically extend to these supplementary costs, and these should be more fully accounted in the course development process, as well as in advising, and perhaps incorporated into a lab fees structure or folded into tuition fees as a special line-item. We note, in passing, that for some students it is the capacity to cover incidentals, or to demonstrate the capacity for nonessential spending that most marks socio-economic status and that is the source of the most social discomfort. Mitigating such experiences should be a goal of our financing.

8.c.ii. Housing and Accommodations

There is wide variability in the support and kinds of housing assistance offered to faculty. Insufficient funds for reasonable accommodations in expensive cities such as Paris and Shanghai was reported by some faculty members, and discontent was expressed about lack of assistance in locating such housing in the latter. It is clear that programs of longer standing and strong local partnerships are better able to facilitate access to housing, but it is also clear that this is a very significant issue for faculty members teaching abroad, and must be factored into the overall assessment of costs and benefits.

For instructional faculty who have spouses and family, there is relatively little (and often no) support to enable their travel or living expenses, and this was felt to be an area in need of improvement if such activity is to be encouraged or expected. In relation to the investments made by Columbia in “work-life” issues for Morningside Campus faculty, this is a neglected area. Some of our peers provide more assistance for family accompaniment of faculty who teach abroad, and this makes it easier for many younger faculty members to participate in such activity.
8.c.iii. Health Insurance and Medical Costs

There is widespread variability and significant discontent among faculty who teach abroad with both costs and advance information about necessary supplementary health insurance. As Columbia regularly renegotiates its relationship to insurance providers (the recent loss of a general indemnity option and the move from Cigna to United HealthCare has led to substantial changes in coverage), this topic must be fully addressed. The issues of relevance are not limited to cost, and are slightly different depending on whether teaching takes place during the regular or summer semesters and for what duration. Supplementary insurance does not typically cover preventive care, including vaccinations, reproductive health and birth control or regular diagnostics for gynecological health issues and pre-existing conditions—matters that become more pressing when faculty are teaching abroad for extended periods (as when they direct Columbia-run or consortium-led programs for a year). International rates and local practices also vary widely. In some instances, no health care will be provided without upfront payment of fees, and not all faculty members can cover these sometimes substantial cash demands. Hospital bills must also be reimbursed in some contexts prior to the discharge of patients or exit from a country. So, access to emergency funds should be facilitated by Columbia. These needs are also of grave concern for students, and while Columbia’s partnership with SOS helps to ameliorate the risks in very acute situations, there is need for address to more typical emergencies: acute but not life-threatening illness, accidents that require hospitalization but not evacuation and so forth. Many faculty members responding to the Task Force Survey felt that they were inadequately forewarned about costs, needs and limits of transferability of their health insurance before undertaking teaching abroad assignments.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

As indicated at the outset of this report, the many activities associated with global education at Columbia are distributed across a wide array of institutions and programs, with little and often no integration. Nonetheless, the largest and most coherent of these organizational sites is the Office of Global Programs and Fellowships, which operates or administers eight semester and year-long study abroad programs and fourteen summer programs. It also facilitates student access to other programs administered by other academic institutions around the world. (See Appendix G)

With a staff of fourteen, the OGP is responsible for all aspects of the programs that it develops and oversees, including: working with faculty to conceive courses and to link them to existing or newly created programs; assisting faculty in preparing applications to the COI for new courses; determining feasibility of new programs through consultations with faculty; conducting risk and cost assessments, site visits and negotiations with partner institutions and services in situ; reviewing existing programs under Columbia’s auspices and those to which it sends its students for credit; budgeting; advertising and communications about study abroad, including the maintenance of a website and publication of student evaluations of programs; advising students and vetting
applications; managing student access to fellowships for study abroad; liaising with
departments and interdisciplinary programs and assisting them in the administration of
courses offered by their own faculty members; coordinating with the Center for Career
Education and other global education initiatives at Columbia; tracking of student
participation in study abroad and reporting to the Dean of the College; liaising with the
Office of Academic Affairs in the College and GS; data analysis and reporting to the
Institute for International Education; liaising with other study abroad programs in the
United States.

This is an enormous array of responsibilities and is dependent on a diverse set of
skills, for which the complement of full-time staff is very small. According to the Dean
of Global Programs and Assistant Vice President for International Education, the general
organizational principle of OGP is one of regional focus, with staff responsible for both
advising and program management within the regions of their expertise and authority—
i.e., geographical area rather than function determines the assignment of responsibilities
in OGP.

Although OGP serves graduate students who participate in formal summer
programs and some language-study courses, it does not otherwise engage graduate
students about research abroad or facilitate their access to graduate education at foreign
institutions. The concerns of graduate students, particularly in relation to budgetary
matters and accommodations policy, are addressed elsewhere (in Section 8). But
basically, the nature of the activity undertaken abroad and the kinds of advising needed
by our undergraduates and graduate students are so different that we do not recommend
any extension of OGP’s functions into the graduate domain. The issue of how to
accommodate graduate student needs, clearly underserved at this point, is addressed in
Section 10 of this report.

The Task Force did not undertake an in-depth review of the Office of Global
Programs, and had limited access to its staff and working offices. We did have two
substantial meetings with the Dean of Undergraduate Global Programs, but requests for
data were mediated by the Dean of the College. Contact with the Office of Career
Education was similarly limited, and our capacities for deep analysis of their operations
were curtailed as a result. We nonetheless had significant discussions with students and
faculty who have worked with OGP, as well as with members of the EPPC Subcommittee
on Global Curriculum. (The latter was temporarily suspended during the period of the
Task Force’s operation, and we advocate its complete restructuring in the
Recommendations Section of this report—see below.) The surveys conducted of the
departments and instructional faculty who have taught abroad over the past three years
fill out the sources on which we base our analyses. But, in addition, we also reviewed all
of OGP’s publications, its website and all the information made available therein.
9.a. OGP and CU Faculty Abroad

Based on the Task Force’s surveys, the greatest strengths of the OGP appear to lie in student advising, program conception and management and logistical services. The greatest weaknesses, other than those that are a function of sheer understaffing, lie in the maintenance of the quality of academic content, in data tracking and analysis and in information and communication. There is, nonetheless, clearly some unevenness in faculty satisfaction with OGP. Not surprisingly, where OGP has deeper experience and longer-standing connections in a particular area, and where it has substantial familiarity with the academic culture of the host/destination as well as with faculty interests and expertise at Columbia, its capacities are greatest. Nonetheless, there are recurrent problems at the intersection of logistical and academic interests that ought to be remedied.

Some of these problems are a distinct function of our changing conception of global education and the laudable goal of establishing more mixed and collaborative courses which, whether taught by our faculty or in partnerships between our own and other faculty, are nonetheless open to both CU and non-CU students. Such situations require, on a practical level, getting non-CU students enrolled and given access to course materials, from syllabi to readings. Sometimes, this means establishing dual systems of enrollment. It also requires the negotiation of standards and expectations for courses at different levels, including the grading practices in the local context, and the bases for credit there. These negotiations work best when there are faculty members on both sides, and linguistic competence among both the support and teaching staff, that together enable smooth and constant communication.

In long-standing partnerships that individual faculty members bring to OGP’s table, or that have stabilized as part of Columbia’s study abroad tradition, a grasp of local institutional priorities and logics can be more or less taken-for-granted. In the case of new courses taught by faculty members who have not previously worked in a given locale, such as those encouraged by Mellon and PGIF, there have been more misunderstandings. To reduce such misunderstandings, we advocate a series of procedures for new courses and a check-list that could help faculty members anticipate and thereby prevent problems. These should address everything from how to advertise courses and how to assess standards for reading assignments in the local context, and related to the latter, the assessment of linguistic capacities of students; to the arrangement of access to library materials and, clarification of responsibilities and obligations of departmental administrative staff in relation to OGP.

The reality of teaching mixed classes in contexts with different pedagogical standards and traditions, however, is that a compromise is needed between, on the one hand, maintaining the standards that Columbia deems appropriate for its own students and, on the other, finding ways of accommodating students from different backgrounds, while making the co-presence of both a source of learning. We believe a healthy discussion of these challenges, facilitated by OGP as part of regular workshops for faculty teaching abroad, would be very useful, and could become the
basis for a handbook that would be distributed to all such faculty or made available on-line. Face-to-face workshops, such as are offered by the Columbia Global Centers for projects funded by the PGIF, provide one model for addressing some of these issues, but print and electronic sources of information that can be accessed regularly and repeatedly are necessary.

9.b. Review, Evaluation and Quality Control

9.b.i. Courses

If global education and study abroad is to be congruent with the principles and values espoused by the University, and if it is to expand opportunities that do not dilute the academic excellence of our degrees, regular review and quality control are essential. Review of courses, programs and education abroad takes place along two axes: 1) student evaluations; and 2) academic and administrative review by faculty.

Like all courses, those offered abroad by our own faculty must be submitted for review by the Committee on Instruction. The process has undergone some revision over the last year and continues to be in transition. Faculty who have submitted proposals to the COI for review in relation to Mellon- or PGIF-supported initiatives have reported varying degrees of clarity and comfort about the process. It is clear that review and judgment would be assisted by a standardized set of questions about the relation of the course to existing or new programs, and applicants should be able to provide or refer to a simple (on-file) program description that situates the course and thereby makes judgment by the COI easier. Just as COI proposals for courses at Columbia ask for a consideration of their relevance to departmental curriculum, so those for courses abroad should be judged in terms of already approved programs; the program, once approved, should not be a dimension of judgment of the course. Eliminating redundancy of judgment would go a long way to alleviating the frustration of faculty members who have said that, in preparing their COI applications, they were asked to explain or rationalize the program’s non-US based location, or that they did not feel competent or appropriately charged with explaining program-level (more than course-level) issues. However, courses that are taught abroad should, in the Task Force’s estimation, be crucially shaped by and responsive to the specificity of their situation; in other words, the syllabus should demonstrate the necessity and not just the desirability of teaching a course abroad. Depending on the scale of the teaching abroad (see Section 8.b.ii.), it may be useful to dedicate a subcommittee of COI to address study abroad issues and to consider the relationship between courses and programs. In the meantime, a more streamlined and standardized review process would be beneficial, with the COI’s mandate restricted to course-level judgments.

Course review for the purposes of accreditation when this is not administered or overseen by Columbia’s OGPs falls mainly on Directors of Undergraduate Studies within the programs (operated by departments and interdisciplinary institutes). They determine whether the courses that students wish to count toward their majors and concentrations are worthy of credit. This is an
extremely variable and sometimes difficult process and one about which there is considerable concern on the part of the DUSs. It would be helpful if reporting and adjudication guidelines could be established to aid this process. At present, the courses to be credited are judged on the basis of the syllabus and on the reputation of the institution offering the course. This is often insufficient as a basis of judgment, given that syllabi change and that expectations of performance are fairly idiosyncratic, program by program. Students also often come late to the process and are uncertain about how to get advance-approval from their DUSs. For their part, DUSs are often unsure about how to verify that the basis of preliminary approval has been legitimated by what was actually done.

It appears that departmental DUSs are most concerned about crediting courses that will be counted toward the major and concentration. For these purposes, they need to assess comparability of content, pedagogy, and standards for evaluating student performance in the study abroad context. We propose that students be informed by both their college advisors and the departmental DUSs at the time of declaring a major or concentration about the necessity to not only get advance descriptions of the courses that they wish to take abroad, but also about procedures for submitting their work (papers, tests, assignments) upon completion of the course for final approval by DUSs. Strong advance preparation, the timely submission of requests, and the clear indication that advance approval is necessary to guarantee credit transfer is imperative. But students will also often discover new opportunities while abroad, courses may be changed or dropped by the hosting institution, and so forth. Some flexibility is therefore necessary; it is clear that better and more regular communication on this matter to undergraduates, and to DUSs (who, after all, rotate), would help. Insofar as DUSs and, by extension, departments are to be confident in the quality of the courses taken by our undergraduates, OGP needs to assist in this process by insisting on regular reviews of the standards and relevant dimensions of academic life in any given program.

9.b.ii. Student Evaluations

Students who participate in CU-administered study abroad programs are asked to evaluate their experience in terms of several variables, including the academic content of their program, the material resources available to them, accommodation and travel, and financial aid. The process and questions used for evaluation are not uniform from program to program, and the template of questions shared with the Task Force was not that which was used to generate many of the evaluations that are published on OGP’s website. These latter evaluations may be accessed by anyone with a Columbia UNI. Students are asked at the time of filling out their evaluations if they would agree to act as peer advisors or to otherwise share their experiences with prospective applicants to OGP’s programs. If they agree to do so, their names and Columbia email addresses are published along with their evaluations, but it is unclear whether they are aware that this is the case; the Dean of Undergraduate Global Programs was himself unsure if they are informed about it.
At several levels, the evaluation process appears to require revision, and OGP is in fact in the process of moving from a satisfaction-based approach (did students like or dislike their experience?) to a model that would seek to determine what they learned, and how this relates to their intellectual goals and university academic standards. We would advise that OGP work with the newly established Center for Teaching and Learning to refine their evaluations. We also recommend that such evaluations be standardized across all programs. Further, a more robust privacy policy should be enacted, so that the names of willing peer advisors are not published along with their responses, which should be anonymized; this will permit them to determine which elements of their experience they reveal to which people.

Program evaluations are distinct from course evaluations, which are presently administered through the CourseWorks site, as are all Columbia courses. Presently, there is a lag between the establishment of a course and the generation of automatic course evaluations for students, such that not all courses run through OGP and taught by Columbia faculty get evaluated. This seriously inhibits instructional faculty’s capacity to assess their courses and to generate improvements in response to student input. There is also some confusion about whether non-CU students receive the opportunity to evaluate courses. (For instance, if non-CU students are not issued a UNI, and the course evaluation is only available via CourseWorks, then non-CU students are automatically locked out of the evaluation process.) The poor integration of the various information systems used to track and manage student registration in courses and programs is clearly a major obstacle to the ongoing process of review and assessment, and its amelioration should be a priority in the transition to a new system.

9.b.iii. Programs

How should program evaluation be undertaken? What are the standards to be used? When should we withdraw recognition of a study abroad program? At present, OGP has no established set of standards to make such judgments nor a regular procedure for doing so. The primary determinant of a program’s loss of status at Columbia appears to be complaints from students and/or obvious risk factors in the location where the study abroad is located. We recommend a more robust and systematic process, characterized by regular periodic re-evaluation.

The Dean of Undergraduate Global Programs also desires more regular evaluative processes, somewhat modeled on the Academic Review Committee, for all programs. We concur with his assessment and advocate triennial reviews of Columbia-operated programs, and a more systematic and recursive (perhaps every five years) review of those that it recognizes but does not administer. Finally, we believe that the OGP would itself benefit from the kinds of review that are now periodically undertaken of the regional and interdisciplinary institutes. Insofar as it is a significant center of pedagogical activity, and insofar as its programs and operations influence very substantial portions of our students’ undergraduate education (sometimes a semester or year of the collegiate experience), it needs to be able to identify areas of strength and weakness, benefit from the judgment of others.
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who are actively involved in comparable activities at other institutions, and be given structured opportunities to adjust its policies and procedures.

A last dimension of program evaluation, one that is related to planning, concerns budgeting. **We recommend a more transparent budgeting process than is presently the case.** Faculty members shaping courses and programs abroad need to understand and be involved in the determination of costs as these relate to scheduled activities and other dimensions of the pedagogical programs for which they are responsible. They need to be able to assess, in retrospect, whether expenditures were worth it, whether students needed the activities for which costs were associated, and to determine if alternative strategies might benefit both the courses and the students. Individual faculty members report a lack of opportunity to address these issues, and engage budgetary matters primarily in terms of their own monetary outlays and reimbursements. Several have indicated a disjuncture between anticipated and real costs that had significant consequences for the quality of the educational experiences that they were able to offer students.

9.c. Advising and Financial Aid

Advising is the lynchpin of OGP’s operations: the means by which students are informed of opportunities for educational experiences abroad, assisted in determining what programs are best suited to their interests and needs, aided in applying to and enrolling in particular programs, assisted in obtaining access to financial aid and helped to make sense of study abroad experiences in relation to their overall college education. OGP works in tandem with other advisory structures, and maintains an active outreach program to students.

We have already noted the need for substantially enhanced financial resources for our students, particularly for summer study abroad, as well as the fact that there are numerous existing financial aid resources that go unused at any given time. **To better assist our students in accessing what resources do exist, we also recommend a more robust institutional mechanism to ensure that OGP can direct students to relevant funds in departments, interdisciplinary and regional institutes, and non-academic programs (such as those administered by the Office of the Chaplain).** Partly, this is a matter of information gathering and dissemination, including regular review and updating of such information. Annual reviews of grants and funding opportunities, and their coordinated indexing on the OGP website would help here. Enhanced reporting outreach to, and reporting from the DUSs will be essential in this regard, and meetings between DUSs and OGP should be routinized and recurrent, given the degree to which DUSs rotate. The timeliness of information-dissemination to students is absolutely crucial in this regard, given that applications for funding have hard deadlines and undergraduates often have little or no experience with such procedures. But information is not enough. For many competitive grants that go beyond Columbia, students also need strong mentorship on application and interview processes, ideally with faculty input sufficiently in advance of deadlines to help students learn and revise their application strategies.
Overall, the Task Force recommends a stronger relation on OGP’s part to faculty, based in current knowledge of faculty expertise, areas of interest, and membership in specific scholarly and professional networks. These networks are often the most important element in students’ familiarity with and access to opportunities off-campus—as important as the presence of Columbia Global Centers or formal institutional partnerships, which must themselves be activated through personal relations. Conceived as a lateral network of on-the-ground experience and knowledge of both persons and resources, faculty research should be familiar to OGP advisory staff, on regional and topical bases. To maintain the requisite in-depth knowledge for this kind of advising, it may be helpful to divide OGP functions, such that advising becomes the purview of some staff, while program management, including budgeting and logistics, becomes the domain of others. A proposal for such a realignment, which nonetheless presumes tight cooperation among the elements (advisory and program managerial) of OGP, appears in the recommendations section of this report. It is our sense that OGP is at the limit of its capacities given current staffing levels and any scaling up of activity should be accompanied by an increase in personnel, as well as a review and reorganization of administrative functions.

9.d. Academic Oversight and Institutional Procedures

Until the creation of the EPPC Task Force on Global Education, OGP was “advised” by a subcommittee of the EPPC—the EPPC Subcommittee on Global Curriculum. This latter committee was suspended for the duration of the Task Force’s activities because of apparent overlap of functions and because the relation between the Subcommittee and OGP was itself to be assessed by the Task Force. Several meetings with the membership of the Subcommittee, some of whose members are on this Task Force, lead us to conclude that the previous structure was inadequate because both its authority and its mandate were unclear.

While the Task Force recognizes the need for OGP to seek faculty input on specific problems, particularly those related to practical and operational exigencies, it also believes that stronger academic oversight of OGP would be advisable. The significant role played by study abroad in the academic training of our students means that faculty should be centrally involved in the creation and implementation of goals and standards for study abroad and in content evaluation of programs. We do not believe that “any experience abroad” is better than none, but that study abroad ought to form part of a rigorous learning experience that is fully integrated with a transforming curriculum on Morningside Campus. Over the past two years, substantive issues addressed by the now-suspended Subcommittee (discussed above) include the revision of the language requirement for study abroad and a review of the problematic administration of a program. Both of these processes would have been improved by better communications with the faculty, as well as a stronger sense of how faculty judgment is to be made the basis of policy decisions and institutional practice. There remains confusion about the language requirements, for example, among many DUSs and other members of the faculty.
More generally, the determination of what makes programs desirable and viable from a scholarly point of view (and not just potential student interest) should not be limited to conversations between OGP and individual faculty members. Based on interviews with both the Dean of Global Programs and individual faculty members, our understanding is that, when creating new programs or soliciting courses that are not directly sponsored by the CGCs, the SPS or the Mellon and PGIF programs, OGP typically seeks ideas or responds to suggestions from faculty or from partner entities in the “International/Global Education sector.” The Office of Global Programs provides faculty interested in teaching abroad guidelines for doing so on its website (See Appendix H). These focus on logistical issues, timing and the possibility of OGP’s facilitation of institutional connections. There does not appear to be any systematic vetting of these proposals by a representative faculty body on academic grounds prior to the submission of course proposals to the COI. Because the educational value of study abroad programs is strongly affected by a variety of non-curricular factors, this Task Force advocates the creation of an institutional body capable of such oversight.

In particular, we propose the establishment of a Joint Committee on Global Education which would be appointed by the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences, based on recommendations from the existing EPPC and the PPC. This committee, should include representatives from these governance committees, and should be additionally staffed by faculty members who have deep and ongoing involvements in global education, research and study abroad. It should be robustly empowered to access information necessary, undertake program reviews, advise the Divisional Deans and the EC on global educational policy and ensure the maintenance of academic standards in A&S programs operated through OGP, the CGCs and other entities. The Committee should be small enough to work intensively, with timely meetings that enable agile response to emergent situations and active engagement with the OGP and other offices and individuals involved in or relevant to global education. In addition to OGP, these include: ISSO, CCE, COI, GS, the DUSs and DGSs, CGCs, the Office of the Chaplain, among others. The Joint Committee would participate in the conception of policies that can guide decision-making regarding the allocation of resources, the pursuit of outside funding (from Mellon Grants to donor underwriting of fellowships for study abroad), and the adjudication of competing requests from faculty and departments regarding teaching abroad. It should assist in the development of institutional support systems for graduate research, as well as in the review of OGP’s programs, and advise on communication strategies linked to these activities.

With appropriate support and a strong relationship to the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences, a Joint Sub-Committee of the PPC and EPPC on Global Education would enable the integration of the many now-dispersed offices and entities that support global education at Columbia. In addition, and by virtue of its policy-making role, it would help to articulate the interests of the Arts and Sciences in relation to the other Schools of the University, ensuring that they are grasped in their specificity. The unique role that the A&S plays within the sphere of global education, and the scrupulous integration of activities abroad with those of
the Morningside Campus would be well-served by such a committee. In its absence, we believe that role risks being lost, if the current tendencies toward dispersal and ad hoc operation continue.

9.e. Non-Credited Activities and the Center for Career Education

Non-credited activity is not coordinated through OGP, though it works closely with the CCE. The latter serves as the major informational node and facilitator of internships, work experiences, and volunteer work, including those abroad, for students in CC, GS and SEAS. CCE also administers a support program, Columbia University Global Opportunities, to which students who have secured internships or other such engagements, can apply. Accepted students receive advising, interview preparation, alumni mentorship and networking, as well as on-going career support. As with OGP, students who are seeking information about CCE’s activities can access published statement about their experiences abroad. However, these are not program evaluations so much as narrative statements, authored by the program participants in the anticipation of their publication (See http://www.careereducation.columbia.edu/findajob/intlresources). These statements often provide personal insight, but they are less useful for comparative purposes than standardized evaluations, and do not appear to be guided by the goal of assessing the educative dimensions of the experience.

There are numerous non-credited activities carried out under the auspices of entities other than the CCE, with no obligations for reporting or coordination with either CCE or OGP. During the course of its review, the Task Force learned of several of these programs, including one operated by the Office of the Chaplain (a major grant program sponsored by the Kraft Family Fund for Intercultural and Interfaith Awareness), and another by the Institute for Israel and Jewish Studies. Moreover, many of the regional institutes as well as the departments provide funding to undergraduate and graduate students for various summer and, occasionally, Winter Break activities, including research and informal study, thesis research and pre-professional training. Some coordinate this with OGP, fewer with CCE, but the majority does not.

Only those activities run formally through CCE are tabulated in Columbia’s accounting of non-credited educational experience abroad. Chart 11 shows the rate or participation over the past 9 years, based on data maintained by CCE and submitted to the Task Force by the Dean of the College. It shows substantial growth between 2009 and 2012, with a relatively constant rate after that.

Chart 11: Number of Participants in Formal but Non-Credited Internships and Work-Related Experience Abroad, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The nature, destination and duration of the tabulated experiences is not discernable from the data submitted to the Task Force. The CCE website nonetheless makes clear that the majority of international internships are made possible through the Columbia Experience Oversees initiative (or CEO), which places students in industry-related situations for 8-week periods. This program operates in conjunction with the Columbia Global Centers in Amman, Beijing, and Mumbai, as well as in Hong Kong, London, Seoul, Shanghai and Singapore. In addition to their work experience, students receive preparatory guidance, accommodations with other CEO interns, an alumni mentor and, in some cases, financial assistance to cover travel and other costs. (See: http://www.careereducation.columbia.edu/findajob/cce-internship/ceo)

The lack of a formal requirement or a tradition of reporting such activity when it is not run through CCE creates two kinds of problems. The first is one of information. We often do not know, except at a local (program level), what students are doing and where they are, how their experiences relate to their formal study and how, if at all, they will be integrated into study toward the degree. Related to this lack of information and the associated capacity to undertake both planning-oriented analyses of these activities and critical evaluations of their merits, risks and problems, the lack of information makes emergency response in crisis situations difficult. New policies emanating from the Office of the Provost, which require reportage of Columbia-related travel, will help with the latter issue, but they do not address the more substantive dimension of experiential content and quality.

Assuming that such non-credited opportunities for experience abroad are indeed valuable, and that students wish to access them, the lack of integrated administration, tracking and oversight also means that information about such activities is hard to obtain for and by students, that applications are submitted belatedly (resulting in typically late and sometimes unmanageable requests to faculty for urgent recommendations), and that careful planning of the non-credited activity in relation to credited activity, cannot take place. There is not a single comprehensive information source for College and General Studies advisors to consult, and the result may appear to be an unhelpfully ad hoc and partial advisory processes. We heard of several instances in which funds offered by one or another program have gone un-used because students found out about the program and applied too late. We also heard complaints from faculty and DUSs who discovered new programs and/or who were asked to support student applications for them, only a few days before application deadlines closed.

The combination of unused funds and the need to make monies available to those with limited financial means reveals that our current practices are not serving our stated goals. This contradiction needs to be addressed through better communication and more coherence at the interface between policy and institutional practice.

Our current practice also leaves Columbia inadequately prepared to represent its non-credited activity to the outside world in a manner that permits
comparison with our peers, the recruitment of students, and better fund-raising. Many of our peers aggressively promote, track and advertise the opportunities they provide their students for non-credited research and work experience abroad. They represent it as an important dimension of pre-professional training, expanded community service, and preparation for global citizenship. In some cases, this promotion effaces the significant differences between scholarly learning and academic experience on one hand, and vocational or even touristic experience on the other. We do not advocate a loss of differentiation between these profoundly different kinds of activities. However, unless non-credited activities are more broadly accounted for, tracked and analyzed, we cannot either understand our students’ needs and engagements, or enhance the opportunities we give them. Nor can we make a case for our particular approach to a differentiated array of global opportunities. The result will be the simple (if erroneous) appearance of lower levels of activity than our peers.

One area in which such activities might be better developed (beyond the question of administrative integration) would involve the Columbia Global Centers in an expanded partnership with CCE. Short-term internships that bring students to Columbia Global Centers to assist in planning and the operation of seminars and courses, and thereby introduce them to new professional communities while learning how such activities are undertaken elsewhere, could be extremely valuable (see below, Section 9.f). Based on a review of recent programming at CGCs, it is clear that a partnership of this sort would also expand the range of CCE’s internships beyond what is presently a largely business-oriented focus, to include public health, law, social work, and arts management, among other fields.

9.f. Other Structures: Global Centers and the School of Professional Studies

The Columbia Global Centers—in Amman, Beijing, Istanbul, Mumbai, Nairobi, Paris, Rio de Janeiro and Santiago—are diverse in history, form and institutional resources. Anchored in core cities, they are differentially capable of functioning as entry points for research and pedagogy in the broader regions in which they are located. They are typically part of multiple networks with local universities and other institutions, arranged through bi-lateral or multi-lateral memoranda of understanding. The latter are in the process of being collated and indexed so that faculty and others can identify the institutional possibilities for possible collaborations, and this will be a considerable boon for those who are tasked with setting up or activating institutional partnerships. We welcome this development.

Undergraduate and graduate education currently constitute a small part of the activity that occurs at the CGCs. Most education carried out at the CGCs serves local professional constituencies and is taught by faculty in Columbia’s professional schools (the Schools of Public Health, Nursing, Business, and Journalism, as well as SIPA and the Earth Institute), largely through partnership with the School of Professional Studies. There is also considerable activity linking the School of the Arts to the Columbia Global Centers, both for events that bring creative professionals together with Columbia faculty, and for courses or seminars led by the latter, but directed mainly at local
constituencies. Nonetheless, a number of incentivizing programs, including the PGIF, the Mellon grants, and the Columbia Global Scholars program have endeavored to enlarge the place of the Arts and Sciences, and especially undergraduate education in the overall profile of Columbia Global Center activities. But graduate education has been a relatively minor part of this agenda.

Most of the CGCs are not large enough to function as venues for instructional activity on their own. Rather, they forge linkages between Columbia faculty, OGP and local institutions. Inevitably then, their success or failure (as judged by visiting CU faculty) depends on the knowledge, enthusiasm, and depth of contacts of the staff on the ground. These appear to serve well the professional communities in which the CGCs are located. More uneven is their capacity to support academic work. Insofar as the CGCs aim to increase the place of A&S education—both graduate and undergraduate—in their mission and portfolio, the CGCs need to ensure that their staff members also have deep knowledge of the cultures of learning and the forms and expectations of university life in both the host location and at Columbia University. This means effective and regular communication with OGP but also with instructional faculty from both Columbia and partner institutions. It also requires assessments of library and other resources, and/or the creation of mechanisms by which pedagogically necessary resources can be equally accessed by students from Columbia and the local institutions. Seemingly minor technical facts, like registration schedules and traditions of announcing courses or advertising events, should also be accounted for well in advance of any sited teaching activity. This is crucial if the learning situation is to be of mutual benefit in those cases that envision collaborative learning (albeit, not all courses taught abroad are open to non-Columbia students).

In some cases, these procedures and practices are already in place, and the partnerships and mixed classes work well. In other cases, incommensurabilities of expectation and practice, as well as institutional form have made continuing collaboration dubious. Not all institutions of higher education are organized in a manner that mirrors Columbia, with its ‘universal’ range of disciplines, spanning Natural Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences, and it behooves Columbia’s CGCs and its local offices to generate a shared understanding of the academic institutional cultures of both locations. More practically, periodic meetings among faculty members who have and who are going to teach at one or another CGC would help. At present, preparatory workshops hosted by the CGCs endeavor to help faculty with little previous experience in a given location anticipate issues they might encounter. More regular sharing of faculty experience—and discussion of the intellectual challenges of teaching and doing research in a given location, rather than the merely logistical challenges—should be enabled.

At present, there is no standard format for the annual reports of the Columbia Global Centers. We therefore recommend a more coherent and regular reporting structure—to enable assessment of activities and accomplishments in relation to both good baseline data and well-articulated goals—and are pleased to learn that a new position has been created within the CGCs to undertake data analysis and reporting of this sort. We would also like to encourage better evaluative systems for
the individual courses taught through the CGCs. According to the Office of the CGCs, this is mainly left to the discretion of the instructor, and it cedes the review of academic program content and performance to the units responsible for the courses and/or non-credited activity in question.

Of the Columbia Global Centers, only Santiago, Rio de Janeiro and Beijing have line-item budgets for translation, and Santiago conducts almost all of its events in English. The Amman center folds translation into each program budget. We believe substantial additional funding should be granted to the CGCs for translational purposes and that translation itself should be more fully accounted for and advocated in Columbia’s global activities. The current lack of underwriting for multilingual activity of the Columbia Global Centers limits local audiences and gives to the CGCs a more insular quality than it should have, while also containing the reach of discussion at conferences, public lectures and other events. In this respect, enhanced translation support should be considered along with enhanced support for languages at the Morningside Campus. There may also be further opportunities for internships and professional training for Columbia students with specific linguistic skills and ambitions to work in the field of translation, such as was discussed in Section 9.e of this report. The Language Resource Center could provide an invaluable resource in this regard, given its developing expertise in the use of new media and distance-technologies for language purposes.

9.g. Morningside as Global: Hosting Visitors

In addition to our own students and faculty, Columbia’s Arts and Sciences also hosts visiting scholars at all levels: doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial. Non-US visitors, whether they are appointed as short-term instructional or research faculty, postdoctoral fellows or self-funded visiting fellows, are processed and assisted in their pursuit of visas through the International Students and Scholars Office. The ISSO also works closely with departmental and institute administrative staff to process relevant paperwork.

Departments and institutes have variable definitions of who constitutes an international or visiting scholar. The result is that there is some variance between the information maintained by the departments and institutes and that kept by the ISSO, which is generally scrupulous about its record keeping.

The Departmental Surveys also indicate that departments have highly variable procedures and policies for soliciting visitors, vetting requests for visiting status and incorporating them into the department. Most often, visiting scholars, whether doctoral or postdoctoral, request status at Columbia through individual faculty members, who then support (or do not) the application, which is approved by Chairs and then processed by departmental and ISSO staff. The situation is quite different, obviously, for instructional visitors, who come mainly at the invitation of departments or institutes.
While the level of engagement by visitors with student and faculty at Columbia varies, it is clear that, over all, they contribute a great deal to the university. They bring research and conversations from other parts of the world into the discourse at Columbia, and they join in networks that extend outward and that shape our students’ and faculty’s relations with other intellectual communities and fields of inquiry. They also express or reflect the place of Columbia in the world, as it is perceived from abroad (see Appendix I).

For many departments, particularly in the Natural Sciences and some of the Social Sciences, but also the Humanities and in the School of the Arts, the presence of visiting scholars and professors, including those with short-term instructional appointments, is as important as is the movement of Columbia faculty elsewhere. In some cases, such appointments are structured into exchange agreements with other institutions shaped by the reciprocal movement of faculty between Columbia and its partner institutions (examples of this type include LSE and Sciences Po). In some cases ½ time appointments ensure the ongoing, recursive movement of an individual between 2 or more institutional homes, and on this basis, the sustained but personalized linkage between communities on Morningside Campus and elsewhere. Occasionally, short-term (less than 1 semester) visitorships take the form of intensive lecture or seminar series (often with reduced credit). This format typically involves visitors of global renown, which makes them eminently desirable for our students. In still other cases, contract visiting appointments substitute for faculty who are either absent on leave (for reasons of sabbatical or research), or teaching abroad. The preferred principle of the latter, in almost every instance reported to the Task Force, is a direct one-to-one replacement (at a rank or stature level).

Replacing absent faculty at a comparable level is expensive, if Columbia is to pay salaries, although some visitors come to Columbia for their own sabbatical purposes, and are covered on the home institution’s salaries, or are supported by postdoctoral fellowships. Nonetheless, there are serious monetary and logistical obstacles to bringing visitors to Columbia and the Task Force received repeated and consistent expressions of concern about the resources available for this purpose. The issues most frequently discussed in this context were: housing, office space on campus, salary and other financial incentives to visitors and hosting departments, costs of living in New York City and problems with access to good education for children in the case of visitors with child dependents. A variety of suggestions were received to address these needs.

For housing, the possibilities include: 1) a permanent stock of housing, of smaller and larger size, for visiting faculty, to be accessed either competitively or on a rotational basis by departments; 2) long-term rentals with a variety of local real estate providers, again to be accessed competitively or on a rotational basis. Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed about Butler Hall’s facilities for visiting faculty and about the fact that there is no surety about access to its apartments even for recurrent visitors.

With respect to office space on campus, well-documented shortages make the provision of work-spaces to visitors difficult. The establishment on the Manhattanville
Campus of an office center dedicated to visiting international scholars was among the most persuasive suggestions we heard.

Costs of living, and especially education, in New York make visits by scholars with families difficult. While it is not possible for Columbia to fully compensate for this costliness in a direct fashion, a robust support office, allied to or co-extensive with Columbia’s “work-life” office, could assist greatly by making knowledge of existing resources available, either through a constantly updated database or (to be desired) a combination of the database and personal advising.

10. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

As will be clear, an overview of global education in the Arts and Sciences confronts several fundamental features and problems in our current institutional policies and practices.

In brief, with regard to activity abroad and international collaborations—the primary object of our analysis—there is extreme diversity within and between departments and programs, and at the divisional level. Policies and procedures must be responsive to these differences, rather than aimed at eliminating them.

There is also considerable discrepancy in the levels of engagement with such activity between undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty. As Chart 12 a-c shows, doctoral students are engaged at a higher rate in research abroad than are our faculty, and they have also pursued formal study abroad prior to entering our graduate program at higher rates than our undergraduate students do at present.
We also have reason to believe that Columbia’s undergraduate students do not undertake study abroad—in broadly conceived terms—at the same rate as students at our peer institutions, although the data are too incommensurable to permit a final decision on this. Certainly, our funding is currently insufficient to match the expressed interests of our students or our stated ambitions. Nor have our recent investments in Columbia-taught courses resulted in any significant increase in undergraduate participation in study abroad. Given our public commitments to global education at Columbia, and the extensive investments in it (financial, administrative, pedagogical and rhetorical), these discrepancies demand systematic address.
At the graduate level, a different set of problems emanate from the lack of support for what is, already, a very high level of activity. The same may be said for visitors and for faculty.

Across the board, informational dispersion and institutional fragmentation lead to lack of coherence and problems of access; redundancy in function; and, in some cases, confusion about the opportunities that do exist, resources that could have been utilized, or collaborations that might have been facilitated. We note that there are ongoing efforts at self-review and improvement at several levels, and many of our recommendations will overlap or reinforce those emanating from the Senate, the Faculty Forum on Global Columbia, and the committees devoted to the Middle States re-accreditation process, as well as from the institutions, such as OGP or COI, that are fundamentally engaged in global education.

The following summary recommendations, then, are organized under three main rubrics: information, communication and data; logistics and organizational priorities; and policy and governance.

10.a. Information, Communication and Data

The category of study abroad should be more carefully and differentially defined, and non-credited forms of education abroad should be better identified and described. All units that offer non-credited forms of educational activity abroad should maintain data, including program specific information and demographic data on participants, in a manner that enables an assessment of changes over time and enhanced advising. These should be coordinated and overseen by a single entity (see Section 10.c).

Data and tracking of activities associated with global activity should be based on uniform categories and standard definitions, and systematized across all units that undertake or administer such activity (OGP, CCE, SPS, CGC, departments, interdisciplinary institutes and programs). Such data should be made the basis of periodic review and long-term planning. Multi-variable analysis of this data should be possible and practiced as a part of planning. Arts and Sciences should review its reporting to the Institute of International Education in light of our peer institution’s practices. We recommend a policy that both reflects our own standards and permits a better communication of the diversity of our students’ activities to the outside world.

Information systems should be reviewed with an eye to making collaborative classes abroad more viable and functional. Place-holder names used for registration in courses within our own study abroad programs should be eliminated by the time courses are completed. Registration and tracking of non-Columbia student participation in Columbia-operated courses should be standardized.

We recommend the development and enhancement of the existing Beta.Global.Columbia.edu site as the primary portal through which to access information
on global education. At present, this website does not address and is not linked to the websites for student activities and this creates confusion and problems of information access for students both at Columbia and around the world—most of whom presume that the “Global Columbia” link on the university’s home page will lead them to such information. It also needs redesign to facilitate better access, more logical distribution of information, and a substantially enhanced faculty directory. It is nonetheless robust enough, visually attractive and functional, and is the best starting point for the kind of integration we propose.

OGP’s website should be revised so as to interface visually with the Beta.Global.Columbia site, and in a manner that makes programs searchable on thematic, as well as areal/region and name bases. It should also be equipped with lateral indexing internally and in relation to other relevant sites at Columbia (such as ISSO, which site also needs substantial revision and updating). This should extend to departments and institutes whose faculty are involved in teaching abroad, and the CCE as well as other entities that offer educational experiences off-campus. Funding opportunities should be indexed on topical and areal bases, in both the languages in which they operate and in English (such that, for example, it is possible to search for both Deutsch and German). We understand that there are currently significant efforts to upgrade both the Beta.Global.Columbia and the ISSO websites. This fact presents an excellent opportunity for integrated planning and aesthetic unification, and if done well could overcome many of the information access problems noted above. If undertaken independently, such renovation is unfortunately likely to intensify the sense of dispersal and insularization that is currently undermining efforts to pursue and represent a coherent image of Columbia’s global activities.

Student evaluations should be standardized across all courses—within the parameters used on the Morningside Campus, but with relevant additions to account for the context of instruction—and distributed from the first iteration of every class.

The academic support systems and information technology needed for teaching abroad should be enhanced, to make shared access to library resources, files and interactive communication more functional for both Columbia students and non-Columbia students in Columbia-operated classes.

Information on funding that is administered by Columbia for undergraduate study abroad and graduate research should be updated and communicated in a timely manner, with improved coordination between OGP and departments and institutes on this issue. This should be integrated with advising at both the OGP and departmental (DUS & DGS) level.

10.b. Global Education, Logistics and Organizational Priorities

In addition to improved communication and information management, the Task Force recommends improvements in the basic infrastructure necessary for teaching and studying abroad, including: better coordinated and communicated assistance with visas
and international travel; significantly enhanced international health insurance coverage that does not cost instructional personnel additional money to teach abroad and that makes emergency resources available beyond SOS; better housing assistance in situ and a consideration of policies to support families, in keeping with directions recently embraced under the auspices of Columbia’s “work-life” programming.

10.b.i. Undergraduate Study and Teaching Abroad

The resource-intensiveness of study abroad has been repeatedly observed in the above discussions. Given finite resources, we recommend that the adjudication of costs and benefits be based on the following principles:

Study and teaching abroad should never lead to a diminishment of standards and resources available on the Morningside Campus. Teaching abroad should not be a primary means of promoting study abroad, and should be pursued in limited degree.

With regard to teaching, the calculation of costs to the Morningside Curriculum and to the operations of the home campus should be based not only the number of FTEs that teach abroad but on an assessment of courses lost at Morningside in relation to those gained elsewhere, as well as the number of students served.

Leaving aside standard questions of rigor and excellence, courses taught abroad should be selected on the basis of the following considerations, which will vary depending on when the course is taught, including:

- the significance of the course to the overall program abroad, if it is part of a larger initiative;
- the dependency of the course on the specificities of the location or the timeliness of the topic;
- the recursiveness of the course (can it be taught again, to reduce costs associated with start-up?);
- the amenability of the course to being taught by different faculty persons (to prevent the repeated absence of a single person);
- the degree to which the course enhances the majors and concentrations already in place at Columbia;
- the degree to which the course specifically enhances pedagogy oriented toward translocal, regional and global phenomena, and/or comparative thought;
- the collaborations and networks that the course enables with faculty and students elsewhere;
- the departmental and or institute capacity to function in the absence of the faculty person and/or their plans to compensate for it (financial, advisory, etc.).
Teaching of the Core Curriculum abroad should be limited to Music and Art Humanities. Core courses should not be taught during the summer unless and until funds are generated that can ensure equality of access to that course.

10.b.ii. Graduate Education

There are two major sets of recommendations concerning graduate education.

The first entails the establishment of an office analogous to OGP but charged with enabling the individual research abroad of our graduate students, with advising and logistical support aimed at enhancing our students’ access to networks of expertise and information, to research resources (archives, field sites, laboratories and so forth), and to the funding of such activities. Where appropriate, this office should share cross-cutting functions (logistical and informational) with OGP, but its fundamental purpose would be distinct, and it should not be incorporated into OGP.

The second recommendation involves enhanced funding for our foreign students who study outside the US, whose access to support for language study and other necessary research funding is often limited by citizenship. An endowment should be established within GSAS and incorporated into the President’s new capital campaign. We would also advocate the targeted use of some PGIF funds to support graduate mobility for such purposes, as well as for travel to international conferences and other venues where they may present their work.

10.b.iii. Languages at Columbia and Abroad

Strong support for language education at Columbia and abroad should receive continued and substantial investment. The Language Resource Center merits enhancement and a more visible role in graduate education in particular, as well as ongoing technological updating. Making use of international partnerships for language instruction (beyond the existing tristate regional consortia), via existing or new inter-institutional agreements should be explored.

Translation and translation services should be inscribed into the budgets and the planning of CGCs events, and internships with the LRC and the CCE should be considered and, where viable, funded in the manner that the CEO programs are now funded.

10.b.iv. Scholarly Networks and the Global Centers

Recognizing that faculty expertise and professional networks constitute the intellectual infrastructure of all global activity at Columbia, we advocate the more systematic use of our faculty as the basis for advising, both by OGP and by the CGCs. With regard to the teaching and learning at or via CGCs, funding of graduate student mobility for the purposes of accessing the CGCs and, through them, scholarly
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communities in different regions, should be developed, perhaps through the assignment of some PGIF monies to this end. Internships linked to the activities at the CGCS, via partnerships with the CCE, would constitute a valuable opportunity for undergraduates beyond the Presidential Fellowship-related research and study that already takes place.

10.b.v. Non-Credited Educational Activity

Existing educational activity that does not generate credit should be integrated and overseen by one of two offices: the CCE at the undergraduate level and either GSAS or the proposed new Graduate Office of Global Education and Research at the graduate level. Such activities, whether operated through departments, interdisciplinary institutes or programs, or entities such as the Office of the Chaplain, should be subject to rigorous review, using shared principles of evaluation, while recognizing the different purposes that such activity may serve. At all levels, enhanced opportunities that involve the pairing of students with faculty researchers, through participation on projects in laboratories and other field sites abroad, should be developed, with care to ensure scholarly integrity while maximizing immersive experiences. Internships at the CGCs, to support the academic activities there—from conferences and workshops to ongoing research projects funded through PGIF—could also be developed as a significant new dimension of the globally-oriented pre-professional training that we give students. This should include support of scientific activity.

10.c. Policy and Governance

As with all educational activities, the adjudication of academic quality necessary to the maintenance of Columbia’s standards and principles depends on faculty governance. This principle, which underlies the current governing bodies of the Arts and Sciences, including the PPC and the EPPC, and which legitimates the COI, should extend to global education in all its dimensions.

Global education, as defined in Section 3 of this report, is to be pursued for the intrinsic goods that it offers: forms of understanding and learning that will enhance our teaching and equip our students to enter a changing world with important critical skills and knowledge. However, this goal cannot be pursued at all costs. It should not be pursued if doing so intensifies existing inequalities in our educational system or introduces new ones.

Accordingly, any scaling up of Columbia’s study and teaching abroad should be contingent upon substantial new monetary resources (not subtracted from existing functions and budget items) directed at the following needs, with the first item an absolute priority:

- Financial aid for students in the College and GS, particularly for summer study (in the case of CC), and for any Core courses. Considerations of aid should include the contingent expenses of studying in a foreign context and the need to buy students out of work obligations associated with their
tuition obligations. It should not be limited to US citizens or resident aliens, as per the terms of federally sponsored aid.

- Enhanced research opportunities abroad, especially for students in the Natural Sciences, designed to both extend student access to laboratory and other experimental contexts, and to permit exposure to the institutions and intellectual traditions of scholars in non-US contexts.

- Coverage of 1-to-1 substitutions for instructional faculty on the Morningside Campus, so as to prevent low-level adjunctification becoming a corollary of teaching abroad.

- Support for visiting faculty (salaries, housing and office space, as well as logistical support), so that Columbia becomes more thoroughly inserted into a global network as a destination and not merely departure point for global scholarship.

The adjudication of competing interests and claims on university resources, and of the consequences of teaching and study abroad for the Arts and Sciences at Morningside appears, at present, to require a decision-making body that can mediate individual faculty and departmental/institute interests, as well as those of the Core Curriculum, while securing the fiscal stability and curricular coherence of the Arts and Sciences. We propose the creation of a standing Joint Committee of the EPPC and PPC on Global Education to replace the previous ‘EPPC Subcommittee on Global Curriculum.’

The core of this joint committee should be drawn from the faculty, and would ideally include representation from each of the divisions (two each), from at least one interdisciplinary institute that is actively engaged in education abroad, and at least one person from each of the EPPC and the PPC. This Joint Committee would be appointed by the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences on the basis of recommendations from the existing EPPC and PPC. It would advise the Divisional Deans and the EC on global educational policy and ensure the maintenance of academic standards in A&S programs operated through OGP, the CGCs and other entities. It would help the EC generate policy to guide decision-making and to prioritize requests for resource allocation in terms of a long-term strategy for global education and the overall health of the Morningside Curriculum. As described in the previous section of this report, it should be empowered to call for and oversee reviews of global programs so as to ensure the quality of education abroad, and to advise on the establishment of an appropriately equipped Graduate Office of Global Education and Research. It would advise on communication strategies linked to global activities, and would help articulate interests of the Arts and Sciences in relation to the other Schools of the University.

Ultimately, the requirements of serving an expanding and more coherent program of global education, will require organizational transformations, if quality is to be
maintained. To assist our conceptualization of the needs and the institutional functions that are currently involved in global education and that are likely to grow over time, we have produced a diagram (see diagram 1) that shows which functions are shared or that cross-cut the offices that both exist at present and that might be created (such as a Graduate Office of Global Education and Research). Implicitly, it provides a proposal for restructuring, in a manner that allows for the focus of skills and expertise on one hand, and the development of domains of responsibility on the other. It is not intended as a plan for immediate implementation but rather as a sketch of the needs that already exist and the organizational sites that address them, as well as those that are emerging and are without support. It is our belief that the “cross-cutting functions” should be better integrated, regardless of whether they are now distributed across one or several offices. One of the tasks of a Joint Committee on Global Education would be to help relevant offices and programs to realize their potential through organizational form, while ensuring that their functionality always serves to enhance the goal of good scholarship and pedagogy.
Diagram 1

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF GLOBAL EDUCATION IN THE ARTS AND SCIENCES:
FUNCTIONS AND STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</th>
<th>PROPOSED JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE PPC and EPPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMANITIES</td>
<td>GRADUATE EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>FOR-CREDIT UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>NON-CREDIT BEARING EDUCATION &amp; INTERNSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTERS AND INSTITUTES</td>
<td>OFFICE OF GLOBAL PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Student Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH COLLABORATION</td>
<td>Grants and Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATIONS AND DIGITAL</td>
<td>Partnership Ph.D. Mobility Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS, INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>Summer Language Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSTING OF VISITORS</td>
<td>Pre-Professional Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER-INSTITUTIONAL EXCHANGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BE DEVELOPED: SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH EXPERIENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAB AND FIELD-BASED WORK AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION WITH COLUMBIA P-LED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH BOARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RESEARCH APPROVALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS AND SPONSORED PROGRAMS,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTS, COMPLIANCE, EXPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA GLOBAL CENTERS AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER-INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS-CUTTING FUNCTIONS: DATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Information Systems,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Information Systems,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking and Analysis, Internal and External Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS-CUTTING FUNCTIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Design, Digital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface, Courseworks and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Learning Platforms, File-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing, Videoconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS-CUTTING FUNCTIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGISTICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visas, Health Insurance, Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance and Reporting,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations, Security and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment, SOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Experiences currently not run through CCE; e.g. Kraft Global Fellows Program.
11. **NOTES ON CHARTS AND MAPS**

OGP refers to the Office of Global Programs

OPIR refers to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research in the Office of the Provost

**Charts**

1a Programs Completed by Columbia College and General Studies Students who Studied Abroad Within Division, Classes of 2013, 2014, 2015

Data Sources: OGP; OPIR. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. The N-value is the average number of programs for the three graduating classes. Natural Science includes programs completed in Computer Science. Programs include majors, interdepartmental majors (IMAs) and concentrations. IMAs are counted as 0.5 in each department. Special concentrations and special programs are excluded because they are not sufficient for a degree. Study abroad includes students who went abroad and completed the academic program (Numerator). Total programs completed are the degrees conferred in that academic year (Denominator).

1b Programs Completed by Columbia College and General Studies Students by Division as Percent of Total, Class of 2015

Data Sources: OGP; OPIR. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. The N-value is the average number of programs for the three graduating classes. Natural Science includes programs completed in Computer Science. Programs include majors, interdepartmental majors (IMAs) and concentrations. IMAs are counted as 0.5 in each department. Special concentrations and special programs are excluded because they are not sufficient for a degree.

2a Participation in Study Abroad for Columbia College Students (2010-2014) by Ethnicity, Gender, and Field of Study

Data Source: Columbia College Office of the Dean. Reporting: Columbia College Office of the Dean.

2b Participation in Study Abroad for Columbia College Students (2010-2014) by Financial Aid, First Generation, and Field of Study

Data Source: Columbia College Office of the Dean. Reporting: Columbia College Office of the Dean.

3 General Studies Students Study Abroad Participation by Term, Relative to Columbia College Students, 2010/11-2014/15

Data Source: OGP. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. Academic Year includes the preceding summer. If a student participated in separate programs in two different years the student will be counted once in each of those years.

4a Location of Study Abroad by Region, Columbia College Students, Classes of 2013, 2014, and 2015

Data Source: OGP. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis.

4b Location of Study Abroad by Region, General Studies Students, Classes of 2013, 2014, and 2015

Data Source: OGP. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis.
Languages of Study Abroad Programs, Columbia College and General Studies Students, Class of 2015
Data Source: OGP. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis.

PhD Survey Question 11 “Which of the following best describes if doctoral research outside the United States is a necessary part of your doctoral training?”

PhD Survey Question 29 “Please indicate any and all of the following factors that limited your options or influenced your decisions about the location of your studies or research outside the United States”

Faculty Conducting Research While Abroad, 2014/15
Data Source: EPPC Task Force on Global Education Department Survey; Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. Counts are based on survey questions Q3 and Q4; percent of total FTE is based on the departments that provided responses.

Faculty Involved in Collaborative Work with Scholars Abroad, 2014/15
Data Source: EPPC Task Force on Global Education Department Survey; Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. Counts of faculty involved in collaborations aboard are based on survey question Q5; percent of total FTE is based on the departments that provided responses.

Ladder Rank Faculty Teaching Abroad, 2012/13-2014/15 including Subsequent Summer
Data Source: OPIR. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. Includes courses identified as being taught outside the United States based on a combination of Campus Code and Offering Unit. Excludes independent study courses.

Ladder Rank Faculty Teaching Abroad, Fall Terms, Spring Terms, Summer Terms
Data Source: OPIR. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. Includes courses identified as being taught outside the United States based on a combination of Campus Code and Offering Unit. Excludes independent study courses.

FTE Teaching Abroad as % of Total Department FTE, 2014/15
Data Source: OPIR; Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis. Based on year with highest FTE abroad; 2013/14 for one department. Excludes independent study courses.

Number of Participants in Formal but Non-Credited Internships and Work-Related Experience Abroad, 2007-2015
Data Source: Columbia College Office of the Dean. Reporting: Columbia College Office of the Dean.

Faculty (Research and Collaboration Abroad), PhD Students (Research and Study Abroad for the Doctorate, Study Abroad Prior to PhD), and Undergraduate Students (Study Abroad), Social Sciences, Humanities, Natural Sciences
Data Sources: EPPC Task Force on Global Education Department Survey; EPPC Task Force on Global Education Doctoral Student Survey; OGP; OPIR; Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs. Reporting: Academic Planning and Analysis.
Faculty Research and Collaboration Abroad:

Blue Bars: Number of participating faculty (average, based on survey responses for 2012/2013-2014/2015). Diamond: % of faculty participating as proportion of FTE in departments that provided survey responses. Arrowed Lines: Minimum and maximum percent of faculty participating in a department.

The 27 Arts and Sciences departments were surveyed in Fall 2015. Responses were provided by 26 departments. If a department provided no response to a question it was excluded from the denominator. If a department provided partial data it was included only for those years. Two natural sciences departments provided no data for either question. One humanities department provided no data on collaboration. Three humanities departments and one natural sciences department provided partial data regarding research abroad. FTE counts are provided by Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs.

Faculty Research Abroad: Counts of faculty conducting research abroad is based on survey questions Q3 and Q4; average of combined responses for tenured and non-tenured-but-on-track for 2012/2013-2014/2015. The denominator is the average FTE count for Fall 2012-2014 of the departments that provided responses.

Faculty Collaboration Abroad: Counts of faculty involved in collaborations aboard is based on survey question Q5; average of responses, which include tenured and non-tenured-but-on-track, for 2012/2013-2014/2015. The denominator is the average FTE count for Fall 2012-2014 of the departments that provided responses.

PhD Students Abroad:

Blue Bars: Number of participating PhD students (based on survey). Diamond: % of survey respondents participating, by division. Arrowed Lines: Minimum and maximum percent of survey respondents participating in a department.

All doctoral students in Arts and Sciences were surveyed in Fall 2015. Students in Classical Studies and Theater were also surveyed. The response rate was 26%.

PhD Study Abroad For the Doctorate: Counts of PhD students studying abroad as part of their doctoral studies is based on survey question Q10. The denominator is the total number of students who responded to that question (Q10), as well as those who indicated study abroad was not necessary or desirable in the previous question (Q9) and therefore skipped Q10, by division.

PhD Research Abroad For the Doctorate: Counts of PhD students conducting research abroad as part of their doctoral studies is based on survey question Q12. The denominator is the total number of students who responded to that question (Q12), as well as those who indicated research abroad was not necessary or desirable in the previous question (Q11) and therefore skipped Q12, by division.

Study Abroad Prior to the Doctorate: Counts of PhD students studying abroad prior to their doctoral studies are based on survey question Q7. The denominator is the total number of students who responded to that question (Q7) by division.

Undergraduate Students Abroad:

Blue Bars: Number of participating undergraduate students who completed a degree in the division (average, Classes of 2013-2015). Diamond: % of students participating, by division. Arrowed Lines: Minimum and maximum participation rate in a department.

Counts of programs of undergraduate students (Columbia College and General Studies) who studied abroad and completed their degree with a program in that division. Data provided by Office of Global Programs (OGP).
The denominator is the total number of programs undergraduates completed in that division. Programs include majors and concentrations. Interdepartmental majors (IMAs) are counted as 0.5 in each department. Counts are the average of the Classes of 2013-2015. Data from SIS provided by OPIR.

Maps

Map 1  Countries in which PhD Students Have or Plan to Conduct Research