New Products Team: Summary of Key Discussions and Decisions – Jesse (Facilitator), Ann, Cesar, Fatimah, Mark

This team had a goal of being very realistic in terms of what CGE would be able to accomplish in terms of new products and site expansion. We felt strongly that our lack of staff time and inability to reinvest our own resources in program and product development means that much of what we might want to do is out of reach due to lack of funds and time. We tried to balance what the Commission on Academic Affairs (CAO) outlined as our priorities with our own internal priorities.

We propose two product areas and two location expansion recommendations. Below is an outline of those products and locations along with rationale, broad timelines, and potential staff assignments. Our full notes suggest specific action steps and lists of tasks associated with these products and locations.

**Product Development**

1. Online video library
* Develop a youtube channel with academic content: interviews with resource people, mini-lectures from our own faculty and staff, etc.
* The content would have some ‘off the shelf’ pieces that we would develop based on our expertise; other content would be directed by faculty (i.e. faculty telling us what they want/need)
* These videos could be used in classrooms to supplement course topics and should be piloted with AugSem.
* Rationale: Augsburg should be more broadly using our depth of resources at sites. We want Augsburg to see our value. Additionally, videos will expose freshman students to CGE. Research shows that this is the best time to capture interest. Plus, many of these students are undecided majors – where our curriculum will fit well (utilize our classes to meet general education requirements and electives)
* **Decision-Making: Final decision is marketing’s, but should be referenced with APA**
1. Online Re-Entry Programming
* Develop an online module with videos, chat, journaling that helps students re-enter the US. This is not intended to be “re-entry 101” (reverse culture shock, etc) – this would be CGE-style, with a social justice/activist spin.
* Students would receive a certificate of achievement/co-curricular certificate upon completion for resume building. Some schools might require it as well.
* In the future, we could charge a small fee for the certificate. We could consider merging it into a full online course (KeyStone Topics in Global Interdependence) that students could pay full-fare for credit
* While the staff time involved would be intensive at first, we could simply update and re-offer each semester. Staff could rotate as facilitator of the module (Minneapolis and site-based) since we’re not offering credit, credentials wouldn’t matter, although experience/comfort with the topic would matter
* Rationale: Study abroad advisors would be keen on the idea since they are always asking for more formal re-entry programming; it would really position CGE further as an INTEGRATIVE/HOLISTIC study abroad provider. It is also true to our mission (cycle). Finally, it could be a value-added that might help students choose our programs.
* **Decision-Making: LC makes final decision, but should be referenced with marketing and APA**

**Site/Location Expansion**

1. This team recommends that we pursue a relationship with Kevin Connors, former CGE and SIT staff member based in Europe. Kevin has pitched one program to us (Netherlands/Spain) and has concrete ideas for a second (Spain, Morocco). We recommend responding positively to his initial program proposals, i.e. tell him we would like to pursue these programs. Additionally, this team recommends that we pursue Kevin as a “Europe Consultant” for short-term programs, i.e. have him work with us on a regular basis in a variety of locations in the region.
* Rationale for making this location a priority: we don’t want to miss an opportunity with Kevin Connors, who this team believes to be the highest-quality partner we could ask for. If we don’t execute with him, he may find other partner prospects. Further, from what he has sent along, programs would be ready to go – any delay would only be recruitment-wise. Therefore, we could move very, very quickly into a location that both CGE and the CAO have mentioned as worthwhile.
* Decision-Making: LC makes final decision with input from marketing. KEY action step for LC in deciding: what staff member(s) would be responsible for leadership on this region? Even if ITS assumes logistical/coordination, there should be someone before that (in the development stage with Kevin) who might be ITS or might not be.
1. This team recommends that the Central America staff determine whether Costa Rica could become a more widely advertised and utilized location. Currently, we do offer short-term programs there on an as-requested basis. But it is not advertised, nor are there ITS-Minneapolis processes in place for responding to inquiries (program planning checklists, a Minneapolis ITS coordinator, etc.) Therfore, while it is a not a new location, it is currently an underused location.
* Rationale for making this location a priority: We have had inquiries lately, perhaps because people are hearing that we are in Costa Rica for the semester program. Cesar will also be there quite a bit this year to research/develop contacts. Since we’re already familiar with the location, the program development process would not be as intensive as a brand new location, allowing us to diversify our offerings in the region quickly, which is crucial in light of loss of travel seminars to El Salvador and lower enrollments overall.
* Decision-Making: Since it is the Central America region, it would be that team’s decision. Reference with marketing.

**Further Locations to Consider**

Our final meeting, which was set aside to discuss further locations, did not go as planned as two member were not able to be there. However, in summary, we feel the above two locations (Europe and Costa Rica) should be the immediate priority, but that other locations might be worth considering in the medium- to long-term. In other words, Europe and Costa Rica could be executable within the year, whereas the **below would be under consideration** **for offering in 3-5 years**.

* India: Ann, who would have to be a lead person due to curricular issues and her historical relationship with this country as a potential CGE location. However, she is tied up with the new Cuba semester program and is experiencing staff shortages in Mexico. Therefore, the earliest she could begin to pick up work on it again is Spring 2014. Which means that any potential program launch would be in Fall 2015.
* Laos/Thailand: Could be interesting for immigrant communities in the US, especially MN. We have staff members with connections in the locations. However, if it were to be an academic program, it would have to wait until after India since developing another APA location anytime soon is not possible because of staff shortages (2015). Therefore, we could consider it for an ITS location. ITS will discuss this sometime this year.
* Other emerging markets are listed in our report. At this time, we don’t feel CGE has the resources to pursue since most would take heavy staff and monetary investment. Ultimately, we recommend more staff and more re-investment of our own funds so that we can expand, but this is out of our control at this time. If that ever happens in the near future, the list in our notes should be referenced and includes:
	+ Brazil, South Korea, Palestine, Eastern Europe (Croatia and Slovenia particularly), China (although we aren’t sure this is “emerging” anymore). We discussed that the Middle East may not be secure enough – many travel warnings in the region – but that we might be able to work in countries near the M.E. with a M.E. influence particularly Turkey and Morocco.