

MINUTES (DRAFT)
International Education Committee Meeting
October 26, 2012
8am, Wyatt 206

Members present: Phillip Brenfleck (student), Matthew Ingalls, Haile Canton (student), Lisa Ferrari, Donn Marshall, Diane Kelley, Tanya Stambuk, Peter Wimberger, John McCuiston, Roy Robinson, Matt Warning.

Also present: Stephanie Noss and Sally Sprenger

Kelley called the meeting to order.

1. The committee approval of the minutes from the October 12, 2012 meeting.
- 2.
3. 2. Review of current Study Abroad programs.

Kelley suggested and members approved a calendar for program reviews: Australia, New Zealand, Samoa, South Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam at our next meeting; China, Japan and India at our final meeting of this semester. Robinson discussed briefly the programmatic information and evaluation criteria that would be available to reviewers.

3. Discussion of criteria for student selection for study abroad .

Robinson presented a rank-ordered list of criteria to be used in selecting students for study abroad participation.

1. Good academic and judicial standing (not on probation)
2. Highest Priority: Students going on Puget Sound sponsored programs (e.g. Dijon, Oaxaca) and students in language immersion programs
3. Faculty Recommendation
4. Academic and Intellectual Fit of the program (from student essay)
5. Country and cultural understanding (from student essay)
6. Students may be limited to a single program (semester or year) taken on a case by case basis
7. Preference to seniors who have not previously studied abroad
8. GPA will be a factor, but not a dominant factor

Wimberger suggested that Puget Sound programs be given preference in selection. Wimberger suggested that emphasis be given to maximizing the number of students participating in study abroad. Kelley countered that it would be better to let a student with compelling academic justification reasons for two programs might be given preference over a student who had a weak justification for 1

Robinson proposed and the committee agreed that, in the interest of transparency, the Office of International Programs should share these selection criteria with students and faculty.

4. Discussion of procedures for the review of new Study Abroad program proposals.

Ferrari suggested that, before allowing liberal additions of new programs, we contact accounting and budget services to determine the cost of evaluating programs. She further stated that we should be careful not to add programs for which there will be little student interest.

Robinson questioned whether we should add a program to our list of offerings every do we need to add a program to our list every time a student wants to participate in a program? If this is just a one-off kind of thing. Kelly - It might be good to just consider this as just a trial run – vetting the program

Roy – wants to make more opportunities who identify a program very well suited to their needs to participate in the program without adding it to our overall list

Wimberger reminded us that there is an official rule that if a student hasn't gone on a program for three years, it is removed from the list

Ferrari – thinks just applies for new programs – gets reevaluated after three years and if no students, that is one of the criteria that can be used to evaluate it

McQuiston – suggested we just see how many programs come in before we decide on how to deal with it if the problem arises

Warning asked why a long list is bad . roy said budget is the issue. Ferrari said that it is hard to predict budgetary needs with more programs, but quality control is the more important issue. Extra work for acct and budget services and for Kathleen Campbell.

Wimberger suggested that we might want to be looser with summer programs-others disagreed.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Warning