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SUMMARY

The subcommittee on Policy, Procedure and Infrastructure set forth to describe the administrative infrastructure currently in place to support international activities and identify existing policies and procedures for establishing and implementing international activities (including legal, financial, risk management, research compliance, curricular and university governance) and to review these policies and procedures with regard to the support or potential obstacles they present to international activity.

While reviewing the administrative support and infrastructure for international programs and the inventory of policy and procedures (Appendix A), the subcommittee found the following:

- Policy and procedural infrastructure for operation international activities is relatively robust; however, procedures for implementation of programs are more developed than for the initiation of new programs.
- The responsibility for these policies and procedures is distributed broadly throughout various operational units in the university resulting in occasional redundancies, miscommunication and/or contradictory practices.
- The distribution of tasks across operational units is neither well communicated nor understood by campus stakeholders and the Office of Global Engagement is frequently misidentified as the solely responsible unit.
- OGE’s physical location on campus, as well as its placement in the administrative structure of Academic Affairs, limits its reach and recognition on campus.
- Many, but not all, CU policy and procedures for global operations are what might be called “compliance” or “regulatory” procedures, wherein the University is required to comply with state, national, or international laws and regulations. Often the room for revision of such “compliance” policies is limited to narrow areas of university interpretation. Others have been established through University governance procedures and have more room for reconsideration than those of the “compliance” category.
- Colleges, faculty, and students express an interest in/need for service/support in the areas of advice about risk management, visa, insurance, and travel logistics.
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METHODOLOGY/PROCESS

The subcommittee included representatives from the Office of Global Engagement, Office of the Comptroller, Office of Sponsored Programs, Faculty and Faculty Senate. An inventory of policies and procedures for global operations was compiled and reviewed with regard to the activities governed/guided by the policy, the responsible office, and impacted stakeholders and whether they are compliance/regulatory procedures or established internally. In addition, feedback from stakeholders was sought and data from the faculty and staff surveys reviewed for commentary on administrative practices.

CURRENT STATE OF PRACTICE

Administrative Support And Infrastructure

Organization Of Office Of Global Engagement

Between 2009 and 2012, the then Office of International Affairs (OIA) underwent a period of stasis with its leadership in the hands of a series of interim vice provosts. During this time, much of the impetus for new initiatives both emerged from and was managed within academic colleges and units, and administrative procedures developed in isolated administrative units with little centralization or communication. In August 2012, a “non-interim” vice provost was appointed and given the mandate of reviewing, reviving and expanding the OIA.

Since then, the office has changed its name to the “Office of Global Engagement”, seen a considerable turnover of staff, filled vacant positions and has added a new office of Global Partnerships and Initiatives. As of November 2014, the OGE has 11 full-time staff, 2 time-limited positions, 2 graduate assistants and several undergraduate interns and/or hourly student workers. These are divided into the Vice Provost’s office (2 FTEs), Global Partnership Office (1 FTE, 1 GA), International Services (3 FTE, 1 vacancy, 2 time limited temps) and Study Abroad (6 FTEs, 1 GA).

Organizational Challenges within OGE. A review of the structure, staffing, organization and spatial functioning of the Office of Global Engagement indicates that the OGE could be organized or staffed more effectively.

The four most pressing issues according to our review are:

1. Understaffing that limits the provision of services and ability to expand international activities. This is particularly true of the immigration services to students and faculty/staff where the advisor to student ratio has reached
1:1000 (see International Services report for more details) and Study Abroad where fiscal operations of 60+ faculty led programs are handled by one program manager and a fiscal analyst shared with the other units.

2. A bottom heavy structure that negatively impacts strategy and decision-making—decisions are often taken by those without the authority or experience to do so, with the few in discretionary positions overwhelmed by the volume of decisions brought to them by their staff.

3. Bifurcation of the office into paths of mobility—Study Abroad and International Services. This over simplified structure presents considerable challenges. While it provides relatively adequate support for basic student mobility, it leaves many of the other responsibilities, goals and possibilities of Global Engagement unsupported. One far reaching implication of this bifurcated structure is that campus understanding of Internationalization/Global Engagement encompasses little but student mobility. OGE’s organizational structure and staff abilities must support a broader range of international activities including:

- Supporting Global Engagement opportunities that do not fall into the neat boxes of “study abroad” such as multilateral exchanges, research, and internships.
- Developing international partnerships that further the reputation and reach of CU internationally.
- Internationalizing the curriculum (general education and within the disciplines).
- Contributing to a campus climate that values international diversity.
- Providing opportunities for faculty to engage with colleagues/in research abroad.
- Providing an administrative and operational infrastructure to support international activities.

Note: The new Global Partnership Office added in September 2014 is designed to begin to address the first and second bullet points above.

4. Physical Location on Main Campus and lack of presence at other Campuses. The Office of Global Engagement is located on the third-floor of an academic building on the main campus. This location is neither central nor easily located by campus stakeholders. Students needing the services of the office, in particular, have difficulty locating the office or find it out of the way. In addition, despite large numbers of international students and community partners engaged in our Greenville and Charleston campuses, the OGE has no satellite office from which to interact with these stakeholders.
Cross-Campus/Cross-Unit Organization of International Activities

While the OGE is the only administrative office focused solely on the administrative support of international activities, many other units and offices on campus provide various specialized services and/or support to the programs that they specifically sponsor. For example, the office of research conducts the export control reviews, Human Resources reviews work eligibility of non-US citizens/residents, and the enterprise campuses within Economic Development have staff specifically or tangentially supporting the universities relationships with foreign industry. In addition, a number of committees, formal and informal, are charged with aspects of decision making/review of international activities. These include:

University-Wide Committees. The university has two formal, standing committees. These are the International Programs Coordinating Committee (IPCC) and International Services Coordinating Committee (ISCC). Both include elected faculty representatives from each of the academic colleges and schools and are chaired by the Vice Provost for Global Engagement. After at least three years of inactivity, the IPCC and ISCC were reconvened in 2012-2013. They meet 4-6 times per year and their charges are as follows.

International Programs Coordination Committee (IPCC)
The International Programs Coordination Committee: (1) coordinates information and recommends to the Vice Provost for International Affairs policies and plans for: study abroad; international research opportunities; international internship, co-op, and service learning opportunities; international agreements, and other activities and opportunities related to the internationalization of the campus, and (2) develops and reviews proposals for international studies courses, and submits them to either the University’s Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee (as appropriate) for approval. The committee shall comprise the Vice Provost for International Affairs (non-voting Chair) and eleven voting members including an elected faculty representative from each of the five academic colleges, two student representatives elected by the Study Abroad Ambassadors from among its membership, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Vice President for Agriculture, Public Service and Economic Development, and the Director of Study Abroad. Elected faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms; all other members shall serve one-year terms, which may be renewed by election or appointment.

International Services Coordination Committee (ISCC)
The International Services Coordination Committee coordinates information and reviews and recommends policies and plans for international student recruitment, admission and retention, financial aid, and academic support as well as international student affairs, immigration services, and tax and employment information for international students, scholars, faculty and staff.
The committee shall comprise the Vice Provost for International Affairs (non-voting Chair), and twelve voting members including an elected faculty representative from each of the five academic colleges, two representatives elected by the International Student Association from among its membership, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, a staff member appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Director of International Student Services, and the Director of International Employment and Taxation. Elected faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms; all other members shall serve one-year terms, which may be renewed by election or appointment.

While relatively effective in reviewing proposals and recommending policy, the committees could be more effective if specific criteria were established for nomination to the committee (some members have limited/no international experience); and, if the committee’s relationship to colleges was better defined.

College International Committees. In Fall 2014, each of the collegiate Deans agreed to form a College International Committee to serve as a point of communication and collaboration between their college or school and the Office of Global Engagement. The Vice Provost has been in communication with the chairs of those committees that have been formed, and continues to encourage the other colleges to convene their committees. Formation of the committees in several colleges has been stalled by leadership transitions within the colleges themselves. It is hoped that these committees will eventually work to coordinate internationalization strategy for each college that could be used to inform a university level conversation about comprehensive internationalization.

Other Committees. The Vice Provost, Directors, or professional staff within the Office of Global Engagement serve on the following committees/task forces:

- Academic Council
- Crisis Management Team
- Campus Climate Task Force
- Diversity Administrators
- Living Learning Housing Committee
- Student Engagement Sub Committee of QEP
- Educational Sub-Committee of Upstate International

Challenges to Working Across Campus—Administrative and Operational Units. The reconvening of IPCC and ISCC and the formation of college internationalization committees provide some solid possibility for increasing collaboration between the OGE and the colleges. What remains a challenge is collaboration with administrative units, especially those that are not within Academic Affairs. In an attempt to bridge the gaps between OGE and Financial and Legal offices, Human Internationalization Task Force--Policy, Procedure, Admin Subcommittee Report

Last update November 21, 2014
Resources, Research and other units a decision was taken to seek the assistance of a consultant with experience of internationalization of administrative and operational functions within institutions of Higher Education. The Vice Provost and the Director of Procurement wrote the RFP in May 2013. Unfortunately, it resulted in a “No Award” and has not been revisited.

Current State of Practice: Policy and Procedure

The primary policies and procedure that impact international activities cluster in the activity areas of international research (import and export control and intellectual property), overseas travel, procurement of goods and services abroad, visa and immigration services for international students and scholars, and risk management for study and research abroad. The offices responsible for the implementation of these procedures are spread rather widely across functional areas of the university including Office of Research, Human Resources, Student Affairs, Comptroller, Procurement, Risk Management and Global Engagement. See appendix A for the full list of policies and procedures compiled by the subcommittee.

HIGHLIGHTS OF SURVEY RESPONSES

A general survey on internationalization was administered to Clemson faculty in the spring of 2014. The data below are drawn from that survey. Fuller results of the survey are available in the general appendices of the Internationalization Task Force Report; and, raw data may be requested from the Office of Global Engagement.

There were 255 responses to the general section of the faculty survey out of 1329 instructional, public service, and research faculty, which is approximately 20% response rate. The faculty respondents comprised 31% Full Professor, 31% Associate Professors, 22% Assistant Professor, 8% Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, and 8% Non-Tenure track teaching/research position and other faculty. The response rate for the faculty survey by college is as follows: 22% - AAH, 19% - BBS, 27% - CAFLS, 14% - E&S, 24% - HEHD.

The survey was designed in four sections: general climate/attitude, research, teaching and service. Questions and responses addressing administrative support, policy and procedure are found across all four sections.

In general, faculty respondents indicate that they do not perceived adequate administrative support or leadership for international activities.

Respondents indicated a very neutral attitude toward the following statements that Clemson University’s international initiatives reflect:

- A strong emphasis on the institution’s mission
• Good communication between management and academics
• Inclusive decision making processes
• A cumbersome administrative process
• A supportive attitude of university leadership toward international activities
• Administrative units and politics supportive toward international activities

Respondents disagree with the following statements:
• I am adequately informed about university procedures and policies for conducting international research.

Administrative Obstacles: In the free response sections throughout the survey, faculty respondents report the following areas as obstacles to engaging in international activities:

• Lack of clarity or access information about policy and procedures for international activities. Comments in this regard, most frequently mentioned challenged with immigration services, research procedures (IRB, export control) and the establishment of agreements.
• Cumbersome, confusing and arduous procedures. Comments in this regard, most frequently mention financial policies (access to funds for travel, reimbursement/procurement restrictions, and pay-lag for graduate/research assistants) and immigration services for new-hires, visiting faculty and students.
• Understaffing and high turnover of staff in international services office. Respondents cited the high turnover of staff and the general understaffing in the office of international services as an obstacle to recruiting and hosting international faculty, scholars and students.

Suggestions for Improvement: In the free response sections throughout the survey, respondents listed the following suggestions for improvement, reflecting the challenges summarized above):

• Streamlined and dependable process for processing visa paperwork
• Address SC restrictions on international travel from incentive money or internal funds, it is getting difficult to secure international travel from grants, particularly for undergrad and grad students to send to a conference
• Reduce paperwork and restriction on international travel; get rid of foreign travel authorization form
• Change the reimbursement procedures
• There is serious issue about hiring international postdoc starting from visa to arriving on campus and a huge delay in payment hire non US postdoc is a hassle.
• Need some more targeted information about opportunities for funding, assistance in applying for international funding, staff support who understands the importance and logistics of international funding and then support the process;
• Create an office to facilitate the labor, tax, and procurement issues working with foreign countries, export control issues;
• Workshops related to working with international partners
• Staff at VP of Research Office to identify international research opportunities – OSP, cultivate team members that can write the proposals and do the research, facilitate the grant writing proposals
• Reimbursement of travel for international visitors is really difficult at Clemson compared to other institutions;
• Money transfer for international conferences, money order etc. which faculty has to do it on their own then file for reimbursement;
• Reorganize Office of Global Studies (Engagement) to function more efficiently.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

If Clemson University is to increase the number and quality of its international activities moving toward a more comprehensive internationalization aligned with University mission and values, the current administrative support and policy structure for such activities will need to be thoroughly reviewed and revised to effectively support continuing internationalization. Overall, the review reveals that the administrative support for international activities is still relatively thin in many areas, inadequately coordinated amongst campus units and poorly communicated to stakeholders. However poorly coordinated or communicated, structures and services exist that provide a foundation from which to build a coordinated infrastructure;

Assets: The following assets were found to exist with regard to the administrative support of international activities.

• Considerable points of knowledge and expertise for internationalization exist on campus. Office of Global Engagement houses staff with expertise in immigration, curricular internationalization, international risk management, and operations/logistics. Export Control expertise is available in the Office of Research Compliance. And, individuals within the comptroller’s, procurement and legal offices also have considerable experience/access to resources for international operations.

• Area of international activity and operations covered by established policy and procedure is relatively robust, particularly for activities governed by state, national or international regulations (i.e. import and export control, US Customs and Immigration Services, Homeland Security).
Risk management policy, procedures and practices for Study Abroad, while not regulatory in nature, are well developed on campus. Study Abroad participants are covered by international health insurance purchased through the university group policy with CISI; all faculty-led programs are registered with the Smart Traveler Enrollment Program of the Bureau of Consular Affairs, faculty workshops on risk management including substance abuse, sexual harassment and emergency response are being developed, and the university has a policy to review requests for student travel to countries subject to Department of State travel warnings.

Challenges:
- Minimal coordination of policies and procedures distributed among a wide range of university units. The coordination and communication of the policy and procedures can be cumbersome, confusing and even contradictory at times.
- Poor communication of policies and procedures for international activities to campus stakeholders.
- Dispersed expertise with minimal communication amongst experts housed in distinct administrative units.
- Lack of coherent policy/guidelines in some key areas, such as the establishment of new international initiatives/activities and guidance for risk management, visa regulations and travel for individuals travelling on university related business including research.
- Uneven knowledge/expertise within responsible units with regard to international activities and the policies/procedures in support of them.
- Insufficient/outdated committee structures for shared governance/faculty input regarding international activities. Two existing university-wide standing committees are operating with possibly outdated and overly ambitious charges. Majority of colleges and departments have no organized group/committee for input on internationalization.

Promising Practices from other Institutions

Strategies for Coordination and Communication of Policy and Procedures for International Activities at other institutions
• External review and/or retainer relationship for Global Operations support from organization with specialized expertise in international operations for higher education institutions (e.g. High Street Partners).
• Centralized Website or on-line “Tool Kit”
• Appointment of an office/person to serve a central role in coordination of policies and procedures for international activities. Some universities have a designated Director or Coordinator of Global Operations, usually reporting to the President or Chief Financial Officer. Another model is to establish a committee for international operations that includes representatives from the primary stakeholder units.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Goals/Objectives

The goal is to provide the administrative infrastructure and operational efficiencies to support and nurture the comprehensive internationalization of the university while ensuring the safety of students, staff and faculty and minimizing risk to the institution and maintaining compliance with relevant state, national and international regulations.

Ideally, this administrative infrastructure would be:
  • Flexible and responsive to the unique circumstances of overseas/international activities;
  • Streamlined and well-coordinated among stake holding offices avoiding redundancies and bureaucratic bottlenecks;
  • Transparent and clearly communicated allowing easy navigation of processes by faculty, staff and students.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

• **Appoint an office/person to serve a central role in coordination of policies and procedures for international activities.** Many universities have a designated Director or Coordinator of Global Operations, usually reporting to the President or Chief Financial Officer. Another model is to establish a committee for international operations that includes representatives from the primary stakeholder units.

• **Establish a mechanism for effective and regular communication among units with operational responsibility for international activities.** This might take the form of monthly meeting of appropriate representatives from Internationalization Task Force--Policy, Procedure, Admin Subcommittee Report
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Research, economic development, OGE, OGC, comptroller, media relations, etc.

- **Contract external review and/or retainer relationship for Global Operations** support from organization with specialized expertise in international operations for higher education institutions. This review would ideally lead to the establishment of internal infrastructure or retainer agreement with external service provider for assistance with aspects of international operations (tax, property, legal/physical presence, hiring, risk management, etc.)

- **Develop Effective mechanisms for the communication of policy/procedure to all stakeholders.** This would include outreach to colleges and units, as well as upgrade of centralized website or “tool kit” for international operations that will consolidate information from all relevant offices into a central location.

- **Expand and improve professional staff resources for international operations.** Review current staffing structure in OGE and other responsible offices in light of university goals for internationalization. Provide resources to support additional staff support where needed and professional development for existing staff across the university.

- **Develop a strategy for the organization of the International Operations that would effectively support an expanded understanding of Internationalization at CU.** This may involve reorganization or additions to the OGE, as well as, incentives (mandates?) for internationalization among other campus units such as the colleges, departments, administrative units and student affairs.

**INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The following are some specific actions that the subcommittee recommends as immediate/interim interventions.

- **Relocate Office of Global Engagement** to a location that affords it more visibility and highlights the importance of internationalization and global engagement to the University and the Community.

- **Provide the Office of Global Engagement office space in the Greenville One building** to facilitate its collaboration with both Clemson colleagues and community partners in the Greenville area. This will raise the visibility of Clemson’s Global Activities.

- **Review the charge and structure of IPCC and ISCC** to determine if these committees are sufficient and responsibilities appropriately distributed between them.

- **Formalize the structure and charge of the College International Committees** to facilitate collaboration among colleges and administrative units.
• Consider establishing Global Engagement/International Programs staff within specific colleges.
• Work the Office of Research to ensure more effective communication and information sharing (no external input not needed here, just time!) both with regard to grant opportunities and post-award processing for international research.
• Establish Regional/Topic Focus Initiative Groups
  • Bringing together faculty with interests in a particular region (Africa, East Asia, Latin America, etc.) into conversation with one another for sharing information and resources about the restrictions/regulations for conducting activities in particular regions/countries.
• Provide web resources/links for faculty to find information and advice on travel, housing, visas and insurance when traveling for research or other university related travel. Currently, such individual travel is the responsibility of the traveler and no support or guidance is available on campus.

Appendix A: Spreadsheet with Inventory of existing Policies
Appendix B: Flow chart of processes required for the establishment of new international agreements
# Appendix A
## Existing Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Operational Need</th>
<th>Coordinating Office/Officer</th>
<th>Related Policies</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Sponsored by Foreign Entity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Conducted with Foreign Collaborators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Conducted on International Research Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Data across Intl Borders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Property; Import-Export</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Field Research for Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRB; HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement of Materials across Intl Borders (Equipment, Specimens, etc.)</td>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>Import-Export</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for Services Rendered Abroad (Research Assistants, Consultants, CU Faculty/Staff/Students)</td>
<td>Procurement; HR</td>
<td>HR, Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Services/Goods Abroad</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Student Travel (Academic)</td>
<td>Sponsoring Unit; Study Abroad;</td>
<td>Student Travel to Countries Subject to Travel Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Student Travel (Academic)</td>
<td>Sponsoring Unit</td>
<td>Student Travel to Countries Subject to Travel Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Student Travel (Service; Student Org)</td>
<td>Sponsoring Unit; Student Affairs</td>
<td>Student Travel to Countries Subject to Travel Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Student Travel (Service; Student Org)</td>
<td>Sponsoring Unit; Student Affairs</td>
<td>Student Travel to Countries Subject to Travel Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Travel (Athletic)</td>
<td>Athletic Department</td>
<td>Student Travel to Countries Subject to Travel Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa Procurement and Information Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Operational Need</td>
<td>Coordinating Office/Officer</td>
<td>Related Policies</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Procurement of Services/Goods Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Support Staff/Faculty Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensating CU Staff/Faculty for Time Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetting and Contracting Third Party Vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa Procurement and Information Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA challenges with Education Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (personal safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Planning (group emergencies, cancellations, relocations, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Policies (applying aid; waivers, in-state rates; differential tuition; lab fees; etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Policies &amp; Quality Control (course review; articulation and transfer of credit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Immigration Requirements</td>
<td>Intl Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs &amp; Immigration/Homeland Security Certification</td>
<td>Intl Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Labor Verification</td>
<td>Intl Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security and Taxation of Foreign Nationals</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Intl Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>Recruiting Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI-B Faculty &amp; Staff non-Immigrant Visa Processing</td>
<td>International Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERM and Green Card Processing</td>
<td>Individual Staff-Faculty Member works with Approved Immigration Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and Programming for International Students</td>
<td>OIS; Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance requirements</td>
<td>OIS; Red Fern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response/Crisis Management</td>
<td>Student Affairs (CMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>VP of Global Engagement w/ sponsoring unit; Review by General Counsel; signed by Provost; D. Jackson processes Notification to State CHE and approval from BOT.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No current strategy or policy for selecting partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Establishment of new international agreements

Initiating an International Partnership Agreement

So, you have an idea for an international collaboration or partnership. How do you move it forward? You’ll need to pitch the idea to sponsoring units and the OGE, develop a plan for establishing the partnership, and work through the process of internal review and approvals.

- Discuss the idea with your department/unit to determine whether/how it meets strategic goals/objectives of the unit, college, and/or university and to ascertain the level of interest.

- Discuss the idea and strategic objectives with the OGE to assess viability, learn about the necessary processes, and determine whether the idea duplicates existing initiatives. The OGE will also explain the various types of agreements and program models generally used for international partnerships.

Once consent to proceed is obtained from the department, college and OGE (and in some cases the Provost), you should work with the Vice Provost or Director of International Partnerships to develop a plan for establishing the relationship. The conversation should determine:

- Type of Agreement Required. Does the intended activity require MOU and Activity Agreement or only one of these? If Activity Agreement is required, what type?
- Departmental/College Liaison. Who from the initiating unit will be championing and shepherding the process, having conversations with the partner, and collaborating with OGE during the review and approvals?

- OGE Liaison. Which member of OGE will be working with the department/college on this agreement? This will depend on the type of activity planned.

- Delegation of responsibilities among the liaisons.

- Establish realistic timeline for the collection of necessary information, negotiation with partners and review process.

- Discuss Travel schedules. If travel is required for the negotiation/planning of the initiative, timelines, budgets and personnel designated to travel should be discussed early.

The establishment of an international agreement can be as simple as obtaining approval and signatures on our general MOU template or as complicated as developing an articulation agreement for a feeder institution or 2+2 program, or negotiating terms of balance on an exchange. While the process can be slow, rarely does it require considerable time from any one person. The pace is determined by the number of steps for review and approval at EACH institution and the challenges of working with different academic calendars, work weeks and time zones. Despite the pace, the process rarely breaks down. We repeatedly see both patience and flexibility reap reward. So, please plan the launch date at least 12-18 months out.

The process may include:

- Establishing a general Memorandum of Understanding with the partner. Complete the approval form and email it along with the MOU as an attachment to the OGE liaison for this project. OGE will obtain signatures from the Provost.

Note: *If the partner requests changes to the MOU language, additional review and approval will be required at CU prior to obtaining Provost’s signature.*
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➢ Determining the type of activity agreement needed. Some of the more common activity agreements include Student Exchanges, Hosting Internships, Faculty Exchange, Articulation Agreements (2+2 and feeder institutions) and agreement to host study abroad programs.

➢ Negotiating details of activity agreement with partner institution.

➢ Navigating the review process. General MOUs and student exchanges are relatively straightforward, however, more complex activities may require review by other offices such as, import/export control, General Counsel, Graduate School, Curricular units, Risk Management, procurement, Student Financial Services and Board of Trustees. OGE liaison will ascertain appropriate level of approvals required.

➢ Obtaining signatures. OGE will obtain Provost’s signature and coordinate partner signatures with the Department Liaison.

➢ Recording and Reporting completed agreement. OGE will add agreement to database and alert Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for SACS and CHE notification.