



*Internationalizing the Curriculum and Campus*

**Institutional Case Studies of Curriculum  
Integration Practices Based Upon the  
University of Minnesota Model**

by Christine Parcels  
University of Minnesota

© 2011 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.

Published by the Global Programs and Strategy Alliance at the University of Minnesota.

100 University International Center  
331 - 17th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis MN 55414  
612-624-5580  
global@umn.edu

The University of Minnesota shall provide equal access to and opportunity in its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

This publication/material is available in alternative formats upon request. Direct requests to the Global Programs and Strategy Alliance, 612-624-5580 or global@umn.edu.

The University of Minnesota, founded in the belief that all people are enriched by understanding, is dedicated to the advancement of learning and the search for truth; to the sharing of this knowledge through education for a diverse community; and to the application of this knowledge to benefit the people of the state, the nation and the world. The University's threefold mission of research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service is carried out on multiple campuses and throughout the state.

# Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Surveys</i>	2
<i>Interviews</i>	5
<i>Case Studies</i>	6
<i>North Carolina State University</i>	6
<i>Indiana University</i>	10
<i>Miami University, Ohio</i>	13
<i>Oklahoma State University</i>	17
<i>Boston College</i>	20
<i>Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville</i>	23
<i>Villanova University</i>	26
<i>Conclusion</i>	28

## **Preface**

This publication represents ongoing research by the University of Minnesota into case studies on curriculum integration of education abroad. For further information about this publication and other research on curriculum integration, please contact Gayle Woodruff, director of curriculum and campus internationalization, [gwoodruf@umn.edu](mailto:gwoodruf@umn.edu), 612-625-6065 in the Global Programs and Strategy Alliance at the University of Minnesota.

# Introduction

The current case study project on study abroad Curriculum Integration intends to further expand on van Deusen's (2007) paper<sup>1</sup> on how other institutions have implemented their own Curriculum Integration practices following the April 2004 University of Minnesota "Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum" conference. This conference took place in Minneapolis, Minnesota, bringing together 400 administrators and faculty from 120 higher education institutions in the United States, Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Australia, Denmark, France, and Spain (Anderson, 2005).

The Curriculum Integration initiative began as a collaborative effort between the study abroad units on each of the campuses at the University of Minnesota and individual academic departments "to identify study abroad opportunities that faculty in those departments determined to be appropriate and worthy of awarding credit towards their degree programs" (Balkum, 2005, p. 6). Success of the initiative led to its expansion across the campuses, garnering support from central administration. Curriculum Integration became more than a drive to increase the number of students going abroad, but a more complex process called Assess-Match-Motivate, which means "assessing the curriculum and determining how study abroad can fit with each major's curriculum, [as well as] determining how study abroad can help students achieve their desired learning outcomes" (Shirley & Gladding, 2005, p. 14).

Van Deusen (2007) indicated that at the time of her case studies, with only three years having passed since the conference, little was known "about the outcomes of the implementation of the Minnesota Model at other institutions and, ultimately, the duplicability and transportability of the model itself" (p.7). Thus, this current case study project intends to elaborate upon additional institutions now that more time has passed to implement Curriculum Integration practices. This project included a survey and follow-up interviews with seven institutions utilizing van Deusen's (2007) previous interview questions as described in the sections below.

---

<sup>1</sup> To read this report visit: <http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/documents/B.VanDeusenCicasestudiespaper.pdf>

# Survey

In February 2010, a 24-question survey was sent to 176 participants from 87 institutions who attended the 2004 “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” conference. Thirty-five conference participants responded. The purpose of this follow-up survey was to learn more from the conference participants about the development and current status of the Curriculum Integration practices at their institutions as a result of what they had learned at this conference. The following section presents the summary findings of the survey.

Participants were asked what motivated them to attend the conference and were allowed to choose multiple reasons. The majority of participants (70.3%) came to the conference interested in exploring ways to increase the number of students studying abroad, as well as to learn the “Minnesota model”<sup>2</sup> of Curriculum Integration for use at their institution (see table 1, next page). When asked what their institutions’ response was to Curriculum Integration (see table 2), 43.2% of respondents immediately began developing and implementing aspects of Curriculum Integration after the conference, while 40.5% experienced some delays with implementation, but eventually developed a plan and reported that implementation is currently underway. The remaining 16.2% of institutions’ implementation plans have since stopped or never began at all. Participants were also asked if they set concrete goals for their initiative; 56.3% of respondents indicated they did.

Table 1. Reasons participants attended the 2004 conference

Reason	Percentage
Interested in exploring ways to increase number of students studying abroad	70.3%
Wanted to learn the Minnesota Model for possible use at our institution	70.3%
Interested in meeting colleagues that are interested in the topic	64.9%
Wanted to learn what Curriculum Integration is	45.9%
Other	10.8%

Table 2. Institutions’ response to Curriculum Integration following the conference

Response	Percentage
Immediately began developing and implementing aspects of Curriculum Integration	43.2%
Experienced some delays, but eventually developed a plan and implementation is underway	40.5%
Initially implemented some aspects of Curriculum Integration, but action has since stopped	10.8%
Have not implemented any aspects of Curriculum Integration	5.4%

<sup>2</sup>For more information on the Minnesota Model please visit: [http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/what is CI/index.html](http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/what%20is%20CI/index.html)

The survey asked participants to select all design elements their institutions included in their implementation plan for Curriculum Integration. Table 3 provides the percentages of participants' responses.

Table 3. Design elements of Curriculum Integration

Response	Percentage
Organize Meetings with faculty members/academic advisers	81.3%
Develop major-specific advising materials	75%
Create new ways to publicize study abroad options	71.9%
Develop study abroad advising materials	68.8%
Meet with higher administration, executive level leadership	62.5%
Develop new study abroad options/programs	50%
Conduct needs assessment	43.8%
Develop new faculty/academic adviser training activities/workshops	40.6%
Develop an evaluation plan	28.1%
Organize program site visits for faculty and advisors	21.9%

The majority of these plans did not include a time frame, nor did they receive funding, which respondents indicated as an obstacle to their initiative. Of those that received funding, the central administration and other internal sources were the most common sources. Table 4 displays participants responses to what elements of their plan were implemented as of this current year.

Table 4. Elements of Curriculum Integration implemented to-date

Response	Percentage
Expanded study abroad advising materials/tools	83.3%
Established liaisons from the study abroad office to work with academic units	56.7%
Developed advising tools/materials specific to majors	56.7%
Addressed the development of appropriate study abroad program options	50%
Held workshops for faculty/academic advisers on "internationalizing the curriculum with study abroad"	43.3%
Appointed a lead for the Curriculum Integration project	40%
Conduct needs assessment in order to establish appropriate goals	36.7%
International site visits for faculty/staff to learn about study abroad programs	30%
Conducted an evaluation of our initiative	13.3%

Of those that responded, the majority indicated that faculty members are either interested in participating in the initiative, but have time constraints that may prevent their involvement, or that only some faculty members are interested and willing to participate. With regard to academic advisers, there was a range of responses

from “eager and willing to participate,” “interested but had time constraints,” or only “some were willing and able to participate” (see Table 5).

Table 5. Faculty/academic adviser participation

	Eager and willing to participate	Interested, but had time constraints	Some were willing and able to participate	Many were reluctant to be involved	Responded negatively	No interest
<b>Faculty Members</b>	3.8%	42.3%	46.2%	7.7%	0%	0%
<b>Academic Advisers</b>	30.4%	26.1%	34.8%	4.3%	0%	4.3%

According to respondents the top choices of Curriculum Integration activities that involve faculty members include:

- Individual trainings on how to incorporate study abroad into undergraduate degrees
- Study abroad office meetings
- Site visits to international programs
- Evaluation of credit approval for study abroad

Academic advisers most frequently participated in the following activities:

- Study abroad office meetings
- Individual trainings on how to incorporate study abroad into undergraduate degrees
- On-campus workshops

The academic area that showed the greatest increase in study abroad participation (i.e., respondents who marked ‘a lot’) was Business and Management (11 respondents). For those academic disciplines that showed ‘some’ increase, Humanities (17 respondents), Social Sciences (16 respondents), and Foreign Languages (15 respondents) were selected most frequently. Open Doors categories were used to define academic areas.

Time, interest, staffing needs and funding continue to be obstacles for many institutions, especially due to the recent economic recession. Overall, the most visible outcomes have been the increase in academic advising for study abroad both within the international programs and academic units, and the increased awareness by students and faculty of academic integration of study abroad into degree programs.

# Interviews

Of the thirty-five survey respondents, seven participated in follow-up interviews to gather more in-depth information regarding their institutions' Curriculum Integration practices. This current project utilized and adapted van Deusen's (2007) interview questions, which built upon case studies originally developed by Gayle Woodruff, Curriculum Integration Director (currently the Director of Curriculum and Campus Internationalization). The questions are as follows:

1. How did you/your office first learn about Curriculum Integration?
2. What was the impetus for your office/institution to begin Curriculum Integration?
3. What were the goals of this initiative? How have these changed since you began?
4. What were some of the perceived benefits that the institution would gain from the use of Curriculum Integration?
5. How did your office/institution begin the process? What was the time frame you established?
6. Why did you choose to implement elements of your plan you noted in the survey?
7. What aspects of your plan have been working well? Which ones have not?
8. How has your office adapted the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration to meet the specific needs of your institution?
9. Has your institution/office developed its own model of Curriculum Integration? If so, please describe it and discuss how it has been implemented at your institution and/or other institutions.
10. What advice would you give to other study abroad offices/institutions interested in using Curriculum Integration?

For this series of case studies<sup>3</sup>, administrators from the following institutions participated in interviews: North Carolina State University, Indiana University, Miami University Ohio, Oklahoma State University, Boston College, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, and Villanova University. The following section provides the reports of each institution in the order in which the interviews were conducted. A brief discussion and summary of the institutions' responses will conclude this multiple-case study project report.

---

<sup>3</sup> Original case studies by Woodruff & VanDeusen: UW-Eau Claire, Michigan State University, Skidmore College, and Oregon State University.

# Case Study #1:

## North Carolina State University

Brooke Ashley, an assistant director at the Study Abroad Office at North Carolina State University (NC State), is the current lead for their Curriculum Integration initiative and participated in the interview along with her graduate intern, Liz Yaros.

### **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota Model**

In 2004 the director of the Study Abroad Office, along with a team of faculty and the vice provost of international affairs, came to the University of Minnesota “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” conference to learn about the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration. Subsequently, in 2007, when the NAFSA annual conference was held in Minneapolis, the director and associate director of the Study Abroad Office met with the University of Minnesota Curriculum Integration team to gain further knowledge about Curriculum Integration.

### **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

For NC State, Curriculum Integration has been a goal as a means to better integrate study abroad into the institution. The large size of the institution, particularly with regard to the large size of the engineering college, created a challenge for the Study Abroad Office to attend to the whole student population. Ashley acknowledged that NC State has “faced parallel challenges that the University of Minnesota initially faced. Seeing the tremendous success that the Minnesota had with this specific framework was particularly inspiring.” The Study Abroad Office saw that Minnesota had “similar campus cultures and curricular structures,” which made the Minnesota model seem more feasible adapt to NC State.

To determine the goals of their initiative, NC State first identified stakeholders and strategies to get these stakeholders, including the Study Abroad Office and upper-level administrators, to see the project as a long-term investment. The pillars of NC State’s model serve as the key goals of the Curriculum Integration initiative:

1. Utilize faculty, staff, and adviser collaboration and partnership
2. Develop college-specific brochures
3. Encourage faculty and adviser ownership
4. Foster intentionality among students in study abroad program decision making
5. Ease student anxiety about the study abroad process

6. Create a structure that adjusts and evolves to the university's academic curricula and internationalization efforts

The Study Abroad office established a framework at the start of the initiative, but the goals change based on the needs and interpretations of various departments. For example, within the College of Engineering, Yaros acknowledged:

*Coordinators of advising are very important within their structure. To be successful, you have to work with them, get them engaged and get their buy-in. With regard to aligning study abroad into the curriculum, course mapping is very important to coordinators. They want to see how these courses align with our curriculum back here at home.*

By contrast, the College of Education found that they needed to look at their own curriculum and how to incorporate more study abroad options. Initially, the college thought that the Study Abroad Office was not offering enough programs, but after examination, the College of Education realized that their curriculum was too restrictive with approving study abroad courses due to the rigor of on-campus course sequencing.

### **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

The Study Abroad Office sees the benefits of Curriculum Integration to coordinate efforts between the Study Abroad Office and academic departments to increase study abroad, as do the higher administrators within academic departments. Ashley indicated that Curriculum Integration provides “a common language and context for discussion” with academic administrators. As a result, deans and department heads make an effort to include Ashley and/or Yaros, her graduate intern, in their meetings. These relationships, Yaros pointed out, have snowballed into further successes as administrators see the work of other units and consequently take ownership of their role in Curriculum Integration efforts.

### **4. Beginning the process**

As discussed above, the interest to start Curriculum Integration began in 2004 when the director of the study abroad office and her team came to the University of Minnesota for the “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” conference. The initiative “sat dormant” for many years, however, due to lack of time and resources. In 2008, Ashley assumed the lead of the project as part of her responsibilities and this year, 2010, was the second year of implementation. For the last two years, Curriculum Integration has been 25% of the assistant director's responsibilities and the project has also had a 20 hour/week graduate intern each year. Ashley envisions the project assuming closer to 40-50% of her responsibilities next year, including more “relationship building

and strategizing, as well as doing more assessing and course mapping.” Yaros, who has had significant ownership, will take more of a supporting role—doing brochure updates and attending meetings as a historian, as well as continuing program research for colleges within NC State. These adjustments were developed to ensure a consistent face for the Curriculum Integration initiative within the Study Abroad Office and to facilitate relationships with outside units.

The initiative started with the College of Engineering, the College of Natural Resources, the College of Management, and the College of Textiles. As Yaros stated, success from these colleges “has spilled over into other colleges. Last year, there was difficulty with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the College of Education getting on board. This year we were able to get into a meeting and break down [the college] into manageable chunks to create brochures.” Ashley added that “there has not been success with math and physical sciences, but they are in the pipeline for next year.”

### **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

NC State has had both success and challenges with their goal of obtaining faculty and adviser collaboration through the Curriculum Integration initiative. The project requires a long term time investment, in addition to knowledge of study abroad program options and curriculum. Resistance occurs, Ashley noted, “when we haven’t identified the right person to work with.” The team has discovered that their “champion” within a department or college does not need to be a faculty member, but it can be a coordinator of advising or academic adviser. These positions can help build momentum to develop materials to share with upper-level administrators, who are more likely to be receptive with tangible materials to demonstrate how the initiative will be carried out. Additionally, the economic crisis and resulting budget restrictions have created challenges for some colleges; for example, Yaros stated that “last year the College of Natural Resources was really on board and this year it is harder.”

Nonetheless, Yaros indicated that other colleges “are taking off like a rocket and we are just strapped on.” Overall, getting upper-level support for Curriculum Integration has been successful. The initiative has just established a web presence and is increasing campus-wide visibility and support. Furthermore, the study abroad office is able to deliver a cohesive message with advisers and upper-level administrators about study abroad and how the experience can truly fit into a student’s degree program. Ashley acknowledged that:

*We do more listening than talking and more learning than teaching in this process...I think another success or reward is that it has caused us to think more critically about other processes in the office—the way we approve courses or approach new partnerships in general. Now, Curriculum Integration is forefront in the conversation—is it a good match with our curriculum?*

## 6. Adapting the Minnesota Model

NC State has tried to adhere to the framework of the Minnesota Model “without reinventing the wheel.” Specifically, they have tried to align the naming of their materials (e.g., college-specific brochures) and the overall objectives of the initiative. They have made adjustments based on the interpretations of the various colleges as discussed above. Their adviser training sessions also have not been fully implemented yet. Thus far, Ashley indicated that their sessions have been “initial goal sharing and brainstorming to get a sense of how Curriculum Integration would be beneficial for them.” They expect to carry out training workshops at a future date. Additionally, due to staff size within the NC State Study Abroad Office, the project is carried out primarily by the two positions—the assistant director and the graduate intern—whereas the University of Minnesota assigns liaisons to each department and/or major.

As a result of their own efforts, NC State has begun to assist other North Carolina institutions in adapting the Minnesota model to smaller offices and a limited amount of resources. Ashley stated:

*We hosted colleagues from another university in the UNC system for a Curriculum Integration site visit/working session... We will also be hosting our system-wide consortium office (UNC-EP) for a similar visit, and we have heard of one more UNC system institution that has asked for graduate intern funding to apply our Curriculum Integration application of the U of M model. We have begun sharing our institutional research and brochure templates with interested surrounding NC colleges and universities to give them a head start on the CI process.*

## 7. Advice to other institutions

Ashley acknowledged that starting an initiative on the scale of Curriculum Integration can sound intimidating and that it needs much time, money, and staff attention.

*A lot of people don't participate in a strategic way because they don't think they have time and money to do it. It's not an “either/or.” You can find a way to take the Minnesota Model, which is large and comprehensive with a staff of 30 people [working towards its implementation], but using the foundational principals, you can scale it down to a fraction of that time and make sweeping success.*

As Ashley stated, “We’re a good case study that it doesn’t take all of this to begin applying the U of M Curriculum Integration model. You can carve out a little bit of time in a full-time position and hire a graduate student—though it needs to be an exceptional grad student.” NC State recommends being flexible and recognizing that one size does not fit all when approaching a college or school with a plan for Curriculum Integration.

## Case Study #2: Indiana University

This interview was conducted with the Associate Vice President for Overseas Studies, Kathleen Sideli, from Indiana University (IU).

### **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota model**

Sideli has followed the Curriculum Integration project at the University of Minnesota since 1999 and has been a strong supporter of Minnesota's efforts, including giving the keynote address at the 2004 conference while serving as the president of the Forum on Education Abroad.

### **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

Curriculum Integration has always been an integral objective “with regards to program development, program approval, program evaluation, academic requirements, curricular expectations, financial aid access and course equivalency policies and procedures” at IU, but there was no formal defining or visible separation of the initiative. Approximately 15-18 years ago, as part of a study abroad program catalogue project, the Office of Overseas Studies made a conscious effort to include programs for every department. Additionally, “going back well over a decade we had increased outreach efforts to students and faculty in underrepresented disciplines as well as various ethnic groups.”

Continuing upper-level support has been an important goal of IU's Curriculum Integration efforts. In 2008, a new president at IU developed an international strategic plan, which got the attention of many departments and encouraged them to get on board with the effort. Additionally, continuing to increase non-traditional departmental participation has been critical.

### **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

One of the key benefits of Curriculum Integration has been for “students and faculty [to be] more aware of the complexities of education abroad (program choices, etc.).” The initiative has also increased relationships with departments through the development of faculty-led programs and exchanges. The processes for these relationships are centralized and departments must go through the Office of Overseas Studies to create programs or relationships with overseas institutions.

The increased visibility of Curriculum Integration has also led to stronger encouragement of study abroad from departments and their faculty to students. Additionally, departments have offered students financial support for study abroad through scholarships. Utilizing the relationships with departments to connect with

students is important, as this generation of students wants more information on a micro-level when they are planning something with regard to their academic programs.

#### **4. Beginning the process**

As stated above, Curriculum Integration was already embedded within structures at IU. The language associated with Curriculum Integration has resulted in increased visibility of the initiative. As Sideli stated, the Office of Overseas Studies:

*simply folded in a few new approaches to our already strong relationships with individual schools and departments. We don't use a set definition, but use the terminology when making the case that at IU. Education abroad is first and foremost considered an integral part of a student's degree program.*

#### **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

Due to the organic nature of Curriculum Integration on their campus, IU has experienced success with the integration of study abroad into IU students' academic programs. One example of existing integration is the availability of courses that contain embedded study abroad components. For instance, in a course titled *Emerging Economies in Business* students take the course in the spring and then participate in a spring break trip in one of four countries. In general, the School of Business has been a "champion" for study abroad, sending 40% of students abroad. Since the 1980s, this school has also had an international focus requirement that can be fulfilled with a study abroad experience.

Sideli acknowledged that staff limitations are the primary obstacle to increasing efforts across campus, stating, "We haven't encountered specific barriers but, due to our limited staffing, we are unable to go beyond certain efforts generated by our office."

#### **6. Adapting the Minnesota model**

Sideli indicated that the Curriculum Integration initiative at IU is more "ad-hoc than Minnesota because of resources. We insert Curriculum Integration into the planning process without having a separate and special initiative." Nonetheless, in recent years common vocabulary has become more intentional to increase visibility of the efforts. Additionally, training and workshops are more purposeful. In 2002, IU "launched an annual workshop for advisors (including faculty advisors). [They] alternate between a 101 workshop and a 201 workshop (giving advisors an introduction to study abroad at the first and more advanced information at the second)." IU also utilizes major-specific handouts for students, though these are more simplified than the University of Minnesota's *Study Abroad Major Advising Sheets*. They also undertook a project with "the College of Arts and Sciences to get departments to create guidelines for study abroad course articulation so that the

rules wouldn't change with staff/faculty turnover." Finally, instead of structured international site visits, such as those in the Minnesota model, IU is able to devote \$30,000 a year toward sending faculty abroad to destinations where they intend to lead study abroad programs. These funds, allocated by the university president to the Office for Overseas Studies, annually support ten program development grants.

#### **7. Advice to other institutions**

Sideli advised that it is important to have staff buy-in with an initiative such as Curriculum Integration. Staff, whether upper-level administrators or advisers, need to see the importance of study abroad in a student's academic program.

# Case Study #3:

## Miami University, Ohio

This interview was conducted with David Keitges, director of International Education at Miami University, Ohio.

### **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota Model**

In 2004, a group of four from Miami University-Ohio (MUOhio), including Keitges, came to the University of Minnesota to participate in the “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” conference after learning about the conference and initiative through professional connections.

### **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

The primary motivation for taking an intentional approach to integrating study abroad into the curriculum at MUOhio was the belief that study abroad needs to be tailored to a student’s academic program and that credit approval should be accomplished more easily whenever students go abroad. MUOhio has had success for many years with regard to the number of students studying abroad. In 2004, 28% of students studied abroad by the time of their graduation date. Currently, 43% of students who graduate have studied abroad, but there is an institutional goal to have 50% of students studying abroad by time of graduation. Nonetheless, the concern with the ways in which students study abroad stemmed from the quality and nature of programs available. Traditionally, most students participated in faculty-led summer programs. These programs are developed and carried out within academic departments. Furthermore, faculty can take students abroad without consultation or administration from the Office of International Education because the budgets for the programs are maintained within departments. Additionally, coordination of the faculty-directed study abroad programs comes through the former Center of Continuing Education (currently Life Long Learning). To ensure the quality and seriousness of study abroad programs, Keitges saw the need to put restrictions on these programs through more closely monitored credit approval.

### **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

As a result of the above-mentioned goals, quality control management is seen as a critical benefit of Curriculum Integration. By ensuring the quality of study abroad programs and guaranteed credit approval for all programs, the university can better ensure timely graduation, which Keitges indicated as an important consideration for students and their parents. (Currently, the average time to gradua-

tion at MUOhio is 3.72 years.) Furthermore, the Curriculum Integration initiative accentuates the institutional commitment MUOhio has made to study abroad. For instance, in addition to guaranteed credit approval for all programs—including co-sponsored programs (non-MUOhio developed)—students can transfer all financial aid and scholarship money to their program. Additionally, the university has seen an increase in exchange programs, and selection of destinations outside of Western Europe.

#### **4. Beginning the process**

Starting the Curriculum Integration initiative at MUOhio has been rather informal. OIE staff contacted departments, letting them know “we’re thinking of you” and then sat down to work on identifying compatible programs for their department requirements and credit approvals. Within their design plan, the OIE included meetings with higher-level administrators, as well as with faculty and advisers. Major-specific study abroad materials were placed on the Office of International Education’s website. The OIE also established annual meetings with faculty members and advisers to explain their duties and to encourage them to be proactive when advising students on study abroad options.

The structure of study abroad administration is decentralized at MUOhio, which has affected the way Curriculum Integration is shaped with regard to staff responsibilities. There are two study abroad advisers within the OIE who interact with departments, but there are also separate offices and staff for the Luxembourg program (one of the oldest programs at MUOhio), the Life Long Learning office, and the Business School. As a result, the OIE staff do not interact with all students and faculty regarding study abroad options.

#### **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

Keitges indicated that their study abroad participation numbers have not been affected by the current financial crisis. As a result, the visibility of the importance of study abroad continues to increase across the MUOhio campus. The number of departments that previously did not have any students participating in study abroad has decreased, with only five or six departments still lacking in participation. The increases in study abroad participation vary across departments and some have had more difficulty increasing numbers than others. Engineering, for instance, has had minimal increases in study abroad participation, but there have been efforts to boost awareness of study abroad. In their first year engineering students partake in a general, professional overview course; in one of these class sessions, study abroad advisers come to talk to students about options for engineering students and how such an experience might be incorporated into their careers.

In particular, one of the most important successes at MUOhio has been the upper-level administrative support and the inclusion of study abroad as a “top-five academic goal” in the institution-wide strategic plan. In 2005, Keitges noted, one

provost in particular, took an active approach toward integrating study abroad into degree programs. Although this provost is in the process of leaving his position, he has pushed heavily for the requirement of study abroad within academic programs. In fact, many majors have already established this requirement, such as International Studies, which currently sends 85% of its students abroad. The Spanish and French education programs, as well as the China Business certificate program, also have the study abroad requirement.

The annual meetings with advisers and faculty have been additional successful opportunities for OIE staff to talk with stakeholders regarding program options they feel are appropriate matches for their students, as well as identify new possibilities for students. These meetings also allow the OIE staff to discuss important study abroad-related topics, such as risk management. Working with advisers and faculty to identify study abroad options will become even more important as the core curriculum requirements at MUOhio adjust in the fall of 2010 to include a more global focus. Currently, the core curriculum is known as the Miami Plan and includes a course requirement on domestic diversity, as well as a course with an international focus. The new plan will be known as the Global Miami Plan, which will include even more globally focused coursework. Keitges stated that this requirement entails nine credits of globally-focused coursework on campus, or the option for students to participate in a study abroad program. In the latter case, students will only need to enroll in six credits to complete the curriculum requirement. The Global Miami Plan was a cooperative effort between the Liberal Education Council and Keitges in his role as director of the OIE.

## **6. Adapting the Minnesota Model**

Curriculum Integration at MUOhio is more of an informal process compared to the structured model at the University of Minnesota. The OIE has held meetings with advisers and faculty, has developed online, major-specific materials, and has worked with faculty to ensure course approvals. As discussed above, the office capacity and study abroad administration is quite different from the University of Minnesota, necessitating an adaptation of OIE staff responsibilities.

## **7. Advice to other institutions**

Keitges offered several points of advice for other institutions to consider when starting a Curriculum Integration initiative. He first suggested “hiring someone that knows what Curriculum Integration means. It’s a conceptual issue. People are eager to send someone abroad but don’t always know why.” Second, he advised that everyone in the international office should be a member of the Forum on Education Abroad, which serves as an important guide for establishing practices. As aligned with the underlying principles of Curriculum Integration, Keitges further emphasized the need to see study abroad as an integral academic component, and voiced the opinion that study abroad advisers should be seen as academic advisers. Addi-

tionally, he believed a study abroad office should report to an academic provost, as opposed to being housed under Student Affairs. Last, to ensure academic support, he said that staff should aim to gain access to deans and department chairs.

# Case Study #4:

## Oklahoma State University

This interview was conducted with Gerry Auel, Study Abroad Coordinator at Oklahoma State University (OK State).

### **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota model**

Auel first learned of Curriculum Integration through the SECUSS listserv, a professional network for international educators. She participated in the “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” conference in 2004 at the University of Minnesota. Auel noted that “going to the conference was inspirational and it caused me to be a little more determined. It certainly presented goals to strive for.”

### **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

The main goal for OK State to begin a Curriculum Integration initiative “was to increase participation in study abroad.” One distinguishing characteristic of study abroad at OK State is the fact that the office is relatively new, opening only in 1996. As a conservative state, Auel suggested that the notion of study abroad is growing in popularity in Oklahoma, but that such an experience has not been as sought after by students as much as it has in other states. Additionally, there have been certain barriers to study abroad that the Study Abroad Office wanted to address. One of these barriers for students was “that they could not find courses abroad that would fit into their degree programs.” To address the goal of increasing study broad participation, the coordinator aims to “work with faculty and departments to identify courses students could take abroad...by targeting some reciprocal exchanges in specific disciplines.”

### **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

The overarching goal of increasing student participation in study abroad also serves as a benefit of Curriculum Integration. Additional benefits include contributing to the internationalization for the campus, as well as increasing faculty awareness of study abroad programs and fit into degree structures for students.

### **4. Beginning the process**

At the time of the 2004 conference, Auel was “a one person office with an administrative assistant.” She began the process by talking to department heads and faculty members “with the idea of trying to target universities with which we had reciprocal agreements to refine or reduce the number of choices to a few that we

would really develop course equivalencies.” There was little result from these initial efforts, however. Although departments seemed interested, many people were already overburdened with other time commitments. Auel stated: “For example, I met with the head of advising in the engineering college—they were interested. We looked at courses together. That director is so busy and over-burdened with his own student caseload that it just fizzled.” Consequently, many of the initial attempts to work with departments, aside from developing some course equivalencies, have led the initiative to stall.

### **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

OK State has had several challenges gaining momentum with their Curriculum Integration initiative. Limited staffing devoted to the project, in addition to lack of support from upper-level administration, have been the primary obstacles. It appears that upper-level administrators, while interested in study abroad, are more concerned with numbers and do not necessarily understand how the process of Curriculum Integration could be a catalyst to increase study abroad numbers or the other benefits of such an initiative. Funding is also a concern in working with higher-level administration.

One aspect of their initiative, finding courses equivalencies, has been working fairly well. Auel indicated that her office established relationships between the study abroad office staff and advising offices within departments early on, creating a guidebook “to help them understand the study abroad process and help them advise students in study abroad.” Advisers are thus very aware of what course equivalencies have been identified, which is important when students sign learning agreements with their advisers to receive credit for study abroad programs.

Peer advisers within the study abroad office are also knowledgeable about course equivalencies. Both these peer advisers and academic advisers are able to access a database that houses the course equivalencies. Nonetheless, one of the greatest challenges at OK State is finding courses abroad that can count towards students’ majors. OK State interprets guidelines for federal aid restrictively, meaning that students can only use their federal financial aid for courses that count towards their major, not their minor. Consequently, this limits the courses students can take abroad.

### **6. Adapting the Minnesota Model**

Auel views OK State’s Curriculum Integration initiative as more informal due to its evolving nature and not being a concrete plan. This is primarily due to the setbacks they have experienced due to administrative buy-in, as well as funding issues and time commitments. Their process has included establishing relationships with advising units within colleges and working with these units to determine course

equivalencies. Overall, however, their efforts to partner with other stakeholders besides advisers, such as faculty, have been somewhat limited.

### **7. Advice to other institutions**

Auel acknowledged that the type of university they are—a land grant institution from a less wealthy and very conservative state—causes some limitations in their ability to move forward with Curriculum Integration. Based on their efforts and lack of success, she recognizes that it is crucial to gain faculty involvement and commitment. Additionally, she acknowledged that it is important to set achievable and realistic goals. For instance, the study abroad coordinator explained that “OK State’s faculty council announced that ‘100% of graduates need to study abroad.’ [Auel] was able to modify this statement to say: ‘have a significant international experience,’ because 100% of students won’t be able to study abroad.” She advises being patient and civil, and to start small, concentrating on one department at a time.

# Case Study #5:

## Boston College

This interview was conducted with Elizabeth Goizueta, Assistant Director for Curriculum Integration in the Office of International Programs (OIP) and lecturer in the Department of Romance Languages and Literature.

### **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota Model**

The Curriculum Integration project at Boston College was started around 2003 by a former director of the Office of International Programs. In 2004, an associate director for academic operations attended the “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” Conference at the University of Minnesota. The current lead for Curriculum Integration, Goizueta, began her role in 2009, though she did not learn specifically about the Minnesota Model when beginning her efforts.

### **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

The motivation behind Curriculum Integration was to emphasize the academic seriousness of a study abroad experience. Furthermore, OIP wanted to increase faculty’s awareness of study abroad opportunities for students, and for faculty to take study abroad more seriously. Previously, it was difficult for students to receive credit for their international experiences. Thus, the goals for the Curriculum Integration initiative are to identify and maintain course equivalencies abroad that departments find consistent with students’ coursework at BC and for departments to become more familiar with courses abroad to satisfy general elective credit.

### **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

The above-mentioned goals also serve as the benefits of Curriculum Integration. Curriculum Integration has served as a mechanism for discussion with faculty members and department chairs to enhance the perception of study abroad as a serious academic component of students’ degree programs. In addition to the benefit of identifying course options for students to take abroad, the Curriculum Integration project has allowed faculty to be more engaged in the study abroad process.

### **4. Beginning the process**

Since Curriculum Integration was initiated in 2003, the project has passed through two administrators within the OIP before being assigned to the current lead for the project, who participated in this interview. Additionally, a graduate as-

sistant works on the project; however, having a short-term graduate assistant makes it difficult to develop consistency.

When first talking to departments, staff in the OIP discussed Curriculum Integration in terms of process, specifically in terms of systematizing course approvals for students. Initially, the OIP intended to gain a consensus among departments to decide if they wanted to pre-approve courses, maintain a list of prior approved courses, or do it on a case-by-case basis. OIP found, however, that they could not build unanimity among departments and that it was best to let each department decide how to maintain course approvals independently. The OIP placed departmentally approved courses onto the OIP website under advising information, which the section below discusses.

### **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

Goizueta stated, “[Curriculum Integration] is an ongoing pursuit and we have hit roadblocks.” The most visible outcome of their initiative has been the process of systematizing course approvals. Since March 2010, the website has provided students with access to lists of these approved courses by department and by country. If the department has not approved any courses, students schedule an appointment with the appropriate departmental contact directly. These approved study abroad courses, however, are for Boston College programs, not approved external programs. If students want to participate in external programs, students need to go through the process of getting courses approved through departments. While the current format is not ideal (PDFs of tables broken down by country), OIP has received positive feedback from students that they appreciate being able to see specific courses they know will earn credit. OIP shows students how to use this tool in study abroad orientations the office conducts. While the departments have helped identify the courses, they have not seen the finished product. Next semester, OIP plans to bring department chairs and faculty to a lunch to show them how they can use the tool with their students. Initially, OIP faced some resistance from departments when determining course pre-approvals, but departments receive the initiative more positively now that departments are autonomous in their decision to determine course approvals for study abroad programs.

### **6. Adapting the Minnesota Model**

Although staff of the OIP at Boston College did attend the 2004 conference at University of Minnesota, Goizueta was not aware of the Minnesota Model until after beginning the project. As a result, Boston College is in the process of developing their own model, starting by building relationships with department chairs and other faculty members to engage them in the study abroad process through OIP’s system for approved course selection.

## **7. Advice to other institutions**

The process for getting the Curriculum Integration initiative going has been a long and arduous process and the OIP is just now beginning to see the “fruits of their labor”. Goizueta would like to have, as well as advise others to have if it is possible, a consistent, part-time staff member devoted to Curriculum Integration, which would benefit the development of the project. Additionally, she suggested being aware of departmental autonomy when establishing relationships with various units across campus. She indicated that it is important to try something, acknowledging that an initial effort won’t always work.

# Case Study # 6:

## Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville

This interview was conducted with Dr. Ronald Schaefer, Director of International Programs at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville (SILU). As a faculty member, Schaefer was involved in starting the Office of International Programs at SILU.

### **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota Model**

A few years before the 2004 “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” conference, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville was trying to get broader acceptance for study abroad campus-wide, including creating a central office. Schaefer attended the conference and considered that the information presented at the conference would “be one way to proceed, going department-by-department to begin to develop or advance particular sites that would be useful to semester-long study abroad.”

### **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

Thus, the goals and motivation behind starting a Curriculum Integration initiative was essentially parallel with organizing a study abroad movement on the SILU-Edwardsville campus. The goal was to work with some initial departments, including English and History, to build momentum. After having to halt work on the initiative, as discussed below, SILU is currently working on restarting Curriculum Integration efforts and is focusing on the foreign language department. Their present goal is to organize and coordinate information students receive in terms of study abroad program options and how study abroad fits into their curriculum.

### **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

Curriculum Integration has allowed SILU to increase study abroad awareness and efforts in an organized fashion. In addition to delivering similar messages to students about what options they have for study abroad, one of the perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration is to further promote destinations outside of Europe. Indeed, SILU recognizes growth in destinations such as Africa, China and the Middle East. Additionally, SILU views Curriculum Integration efforts as a way to build on faculty expertise and knowledge by identifying which faculty are either foreign-born and/or who conducts research abroad.

### **4. Beginning the process**

As stated above, SILU did experience some initial setbacks. Delays occurred because central administration charged Schaefer with the task of establishing a central

office for international programs, which included study abroad, international student services, and other internationally-related curricular activities. Schaefer stated:

*The integration program was very useful to try and get started, but all of the other stuff—developing the central unit—overwhelmed us. It created a great interest, but this is being done with limited personnel. It had to be put on the back burner, but we’re starting to bring it back.*

Another difficulty Schaefer faced was the knowledge that students heard conflicting messages about which programs in which to participate. Faculty promoted sites they thought were best, while the study abroad staff suggested other programs. In general, the initiative did not have upper-level support, especially in the hard sciences, such as chemistry, physics and biology. For instance, the director tried to develop short-term, faculty-led programs with nursing. As Schaefer stated, “Everything was set, just needed a dean’s signature and at the last minute the dean said ‘No’, so the program was cancelled.”

##### **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

After experiencing the above-mentioned challenges with starting the Curriculum Integration process, SILU is beginning to see some success. Specifically, the initiative is experiencing more upper-level support. As Schaefer described, “this past year, the chancellor initiated a task force on internationalizing the campus... If you don’t have top-down input—you can do a lot bottom-up—but it’ll stop and only resonate in a few places. That’s the biggest thing we’ve learned.” As a result, more departments are coming to the Office of International Programs and saying “we’d like to do something, but we don’t know what.” The College of Arts and Sciences has a new dean who has included study abroad and experiential learning in his strategic plan. Thus far, however, departments are having difficulty acting on this plan. The most notable outcomes are coming from departments that have international faculty. Schaefer emphasized that these efforts with Curriculum Integration will only continue to succeed if they are faculty-driven. Building off faculty’s interest and international knowledge helps push these efforts.

The Curriculum Integration initiative still faces some resistance. Nursing and the hard sciences, for instance, still have difficulties seeing how they can integrate study abroad. Additionally, although there is more interest from the education department, there are difficulties identifying suitable programs because of state requirements with teacher education. There has also been pushback when trying to encourage the incorporation of more international elements into the general education requirements.

## **6. Adapting the Minnesota Model**

Schaefer stated that SILU's Curriculum Integration initiative "is more informal and intuitive at this point." Departments express a great deal of ownership over the curriculum and it has been difficult to infiltrate these processes. Nonetheless, some of the guiding principles from the Minnesota Model underlie the Office of International Programs' efforts, particularly in coordinating efforts with departments and faculty and working within existing structures to build off of faculty's established knowledge and expertise. Schaefer foresees the need for more individual departmental strategic plans to include international elements, in addition to a revision of the university's vision and mission statements to incorporate internationalization, which the new task force has called for as well.

## **7. Advice to other institutions**

Schaefer advises that administrators need to be persistent with their efforts. He acknowledged that "there are so many conflicting factors on campus, but one just needs to stay focused and not become frustrated because you haven't been able to achieve the specific goals that you thought were not too complicated, but in retrospect [they were]."

# Case Study #7: Villanova University

The interview for Villanova University was conducted with Lance Kenney, Director of International Studies.

## **1. Learning about Curriculum Integration and the Minnesota model**

The Curriculum Integration project at Villanova University (VU) began around 2004 when Kenney attended the “Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum” Conference at the University of Minnesota. The information learned at the conference allowed VU to communicate a shared vocabulary regarding Curriculum Integration of study abroad with faculty and departments.

## **2. Impetus and goals for Curriculum Integration**

The motivation behind Curriculum Integration was to increase the number of students studying abroad. One component of this goal was to make study abroad program and course options—that departments find consistent with students’ coursework at VU—more identifiable to faculty and students. To do so, Kenney decided to create a course database to provide students with previously approved courses and programs in which students participated.

## **3. Initial perceived benefits of Curriculum Integration**

By creating the database, Kenney viewed the benefit of Curriculum Integration as a way to “streamline the application process in terms of academic approvals for overseas coursework.” As mentioned above, Curriculum Integration has also allowed for a shared vocabulary to develop between the Office of International Studies and academic departments. As a result, faculty and departments have a better understanding of how study abroad can fit into students’ degree programs.

## **4. Beginning the process**

Creating the database of previously approved courses and programs for students was seen as the most important task in order to establish a single, consistent location for students and faculty to go to for study abroad options that would fit into degree programs. Getting the database implemented required much effort on the part of the International Studies Office to coordinate with the departments, as well as identify the programs in which students had previously participated.

## **5. Success and challenges of implemented aspects**

While the database is the most visible outcome of the Curriculum Integration project, it is difficult to maintain the content and technology aspect of it. Addition-

ally, some departments refuse to use it; though, this resistance is typically due to the department preferring to meet with each individual student who wants to study abroad.

## **6. Adapting the Minnesota Model**

Attending the 2004 conference allowed VU to adapt the language of Curriculum Integration and include faculty in the process of study abroad course approvals. Another component of the Minnesota Model VU has utilized is taking faculty on international program site visits. Typically, teams of faculty will visit a program to assist in a site evaluation. These visits are beneficial for helping faculty to get out of their department silos—as multiple departments are represented—and foster a more interdisciplinary perspective of study abroad programs. In addition, Kenney has held planning sessions with faculty and academic advisers, as well as established liaisons from their office with academic departments.

## Conclusion

These interviews provide insight to seven institutions' implementation of Curriculum Integration since their attendance at the 2004 conference. These institutions have all taken a different approach to developing Curriculum Integration and have experienced a range of successes and challenges. Similar to the survey findings, the primary obstacles to implementing Curriculum Integration that institutions discussed were due to lack of staffing and funding resources. Nonetheless, each institution has been able to focus on at least one element of Curriculum Integration, whether it is a component of the Minnesota Model or not. Echoing the salient themes of van Deusen's (2007) findings, the following elements can be re-asserted as findings from these current case studies:

- The role of institutional culture in the interpretation and implementation of CI
- The benefit of cooperative partnerships with faculty
- The need for efficient utilization of existing resources and structures (p. 43)

One of the critical components of these institutions' initiatives appeared to be identifying how to cooperate with academic departments and faculty, adapting to each as needed. As van Deusen (2007) stated, "institutions seeking to adopt the Minnesota Model should consider conducting environmental scans and/or faculty focus groups to assess potential institutional traditions, procedures, and misconceptions that could present future challenges for the implementation of the CI initiative" (p. 43). For example, Boston College attempted to create systematized course approval process across academic departments, but could not achieve unanimity. Each department had a particular way it wanted to maintain lists of course approvals—or approve on a case-by-case basis—thus it was important to allow departments to maintain individual preferences.

As stated in van Deusen (2007),

*learning to set the tone for a close, cooperative relationship with faculty emerged as another primary factor for successful implementation of the Minnesota Model. As this framework is highly dependent upon departmental participation and support, international education professionals must develop the skills and strategies necessary to build trust and credibility among the faculty (p.44).*

Institutions that participated in this series of interviews supported this notion, each taking different approaches to reaching out to faculty. John Schaefer, director of International Programs at Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, for instance, asserted that building off faculty's international interest, knowledge, and experience,

as opposed to adding on tasks and responsibilities, helped to further Curriculum Integration efforts. Gerry Auel, the study abroad coordinator at Oklahoma State University, created a guidebook to help faculty and academic advisers understand study abroad processes to advise students better.

Three other components can be added as visible salient aspects of Curriculum Integration now that more time has elapsed:

- Strong internal staff support
- Using Curriculum Integration as a common language to engage academic departments—department chairs, faculty, and advisers—in a discussion on study abroad.
- The importance of garnering and maintaining the support of the upper-level administration to sustain Curriculum Integration

As NC State and Boston College recognized, it is important to have continuity and consistency when working with faculty. This presents a challenge when offices are only able to hire graduate student interns to work on the Curriculum Integration initiatives. Secondly, as Kathleen Sidelli at Indiana University indicated, the language associated with Curriculum Integration has increased the visibility of the initiative, even though their efforts were already in process before CI in an ad-hoc fashion.

In 2007, van Deusen stated: “As more institutions begin to utilize the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration to transition toward discipline-focused study abroad administration and advising, institutional case studies and practitioner interviews will become an increasingly important method of gathering information about the transportability and sustainability of the model” (p. 45). Based on these current interviews, it is evident that these institutions have not been able to implement the Minnesota Model in its entirety due to a number of reasons, such as lack of staffing and funding, or other obstacles, such as institutional culture and buy-in. However, the principles and motivations behind Curriculum Integration, in addition to advising tools, are seen as highly valuable and can be implemented in a more informal, or possibly adhoc, manner, and allowed institutions to set goals and plan according to their institutional needs and abilities.

# References

- Balkcum, A. (2005). Background and context: An emerging interest in study abroad. In Anderson, L. (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (5-7). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Shirley, S. & Gladding, S. (2005). Background and context: An emerging interest in study abroad. In Anderson, L. (Ed.), *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum* (14-20). Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.
- Van Deusen, B. (2007). *Moving Beyond Marketing Study Abroad: Comparative Case Studies of the Implementation of the Minnesota Model of Curriculum Integration*. Unpublished Master's thesis from the University of Minnesota. Retrieved June 17, 2010 from <http://umabroad.umn.edu/ci/documents/B.VanDeusenCIcasestudiespaper.pdf>