

**Task Force on Global Education**  
**Faculty Subcommittee**  
**April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2008**

*Present:* David Schlosberg, Karen Plager, Tom DeStefano, Pete Fulé, Harvey Charles, Sara Sullivan

**Minutes:**

Prior to the meeting, the group compiled a draft list of recommendations to bring to the full Task Force. The purpose of the meeting was to finalize these recommendations.

Karen began by stating that Harvey had made some last minute comments and these comments were included in the handout. From the suggestions made, the group crafted sixteen recommendations. Tom asked if the group should prioritize these recommendations and it was decided that the full task force will give both the final edits and the prioritization. Karen then asked if there were any other comments on the recommendations.

David suggested that under the first bullet, *“faculty need experience in international research, teaching, and/or service activities in order to be better equipped to infuse a global perspective into teaching/learning activities for students”* there should be one point emphasizing supporting international research and another point emphasizing supporting travel to international conferences. In addition, the support should include any research endeavors, not just travel.

Karen then asked Pete what sort of support he received during his Fulbright experience in Spain. Pete explained that most of the support came from the Spanish university that he worked with, not from NAU. He did receive some indirect funds from grants.

Karen asked Harvey whether the group should limit the number of recommendations they submit, and Harvey said that they should not. The group should also not worry about prioritizing the recommendations. Some recommendations from the different subcommittees may overlap, so the full task force will work toward prioritization. Also the timeline for submission from the subcommittees to the full task force will be different; therefore the general task force will work on incorporating everything in the end.

David added that on point number three, *“international visiting scholars enrich the academic milieu and augment opportunities for students to have encounters with global perspectives on the campus”*, there should be direct mention of the Fulbright program. Currently there are not any resources for faculty participating in the program. Karen asked if NAU does any advertising for Fulbrights, and Harvey said the NAU does not. This responsibility usually lies with the hosting faculty member. David also suggested that with point number two, *“faculty need to develop more in and out of classroom academic experiences with a global focus for students”*, we should add in domestic

faculty led programs. These programs could be field experience for international students. Pete mentioned that the former Executive Director of the School of Forestry, Dick Patton, had tried to get the School of Forestry into the School of Field Studies, but it didn't work financially.

Tom mentioned that the fourth point, *“a reward structure at NAU will encourage and support faculty to engage in international research, teaching, and service as well as incorporate global perspectives into courses”*, is important but wonders if some ground work needs to be done beforehand. David said that the Deans have determined that faculty are allowed to devote 10% of their time towards interdisciplinary endeavors. This international work could be considered interdisciplinary work. Therefore, the groundwork is already done. 10% of a faculty members time could be one internationally themed class, hosting or mentoring a visiting scholar, or research abroad.

The group then discussed if international work is mentioned in each colleges strategic goals. Karen said international work is in the goals of the Nursing department, and David said that it is definitely in the goals of the Political Science department, but that he is not aware if it is in the goals of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. Pete added that international work is mentioned in the School of Forestry's goals. International work is looked upon more highly than domestic work.

David mentioned that the reward structure point was at one time in the COFS document, but was taken out because it was considered “unrealistic.” We should work towards getting this statement back in the COFS document. Harvey said that the commitment is there from the Provost. This conversation should also happen with the Faculty Senate, Deans, and Department Chairs. If it survives those groups, then it will be adopted.

Karen then said that she will clean up the recommendations and then send them out for final approval. Harvey thanked the group for its work. David said that if these recommendations are adopted, then it would radically change the atmosphere of NAU. Harvey added that he has had dozens of conversations with faculty members and he thinks that these recommendations will resonate with faculty.

Finally the group decided to change the formatting from a bullet format to an outline format. The final version of the recommendations will be presented at the next general task force meeting.