

MINUTES –MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE –MARCH 29, 2013

Present: Matt Ingalls, Lisa Ferrari, Diane Kelley, Donn Marshall, Stephanie Noss, Tanya Stambuk, Matt Warning; Peter Wimberger, Haile Canton (student)

Absent: Michael Johnson, John McCuiston, Roy Robinson

Minutes from IEC meeting of March 8, 2013 were approved.

Announcements: Noss announced that the International Education Week would take place the third week in April with a showing of the movie “Girl Rising.” She said more details would be forthcoming.

Wimberger opened up the meeting with a discussion concerning minute writing. He stated that there seemed to be no consistent protocol across university committees regarding the taking of the minutes. Ferrari stated that there was a time when one member was elected to take minutes for the full year but as less and less people were able to make that commitment more committees adopted rotating the writing of the minutes. Wimberger questioned the practice of only using faculty members to write minutes versus using both faculty and staff. Ferrari responded that the Senate took up this concern and concluded that the preferred method was for faculty to take minutes at meetings. Ingalls stated when faculty members are given the task of taking minutes, it becomes difficult to fully participate in the discussion. Peter concluded that he would talk to the Senate regarding this issue.

Wimberger continued with the next agenda concerning the approval of the China/Taiwan program. Marshall stated that the subcommittee reviewed the current program and didn't have any adjustments to suggest. Marshall concluded that Lotus Perry's preferences would add two programs to the current list. Diane Kelley questioned how many students actually attend these programs. Noss stated that she sent out pre-departure applications and only two students have applied. Noss concluded that this is low compared to other years. Noss also stated that approximately eight students are going on the summer Taiwan program. Marshall stated that the two programs Lotus Perry suggested are semester long programs. Kelley questioned the reasoning behind adding programs when the committee is trying to cut programs from the current list. Noss suggested that adding these programs would add diversity to location and program choices. Wimberger clarified that there is a process for adding programs and that this protocol should be followed. He stated that he didn't believe we could add programs at this meeting. Kelley stated that the committee ask Perry to write a formal proposal for the two programs and the committee agreed. Wimberger thought the committee should examine the list of existing programs to determine which ones fulfill the needs of students. He also said that we should have the list of programs that Perry thinks we should keep. Noss volunteered to provide us with the cost and the number of students who have attended these programs. Ferrari stated that the subcommittee had questions about the CIEE programs and SIT programs. She stated that many programs were good for Chinese literature, environmental studies, history, globalization, and international business. She questioned whether or not several of these studies could be accomplished through one or two programs. Ferrari stated that it is more costly to keep programs on the list and many of these programs have not been visited in years. Ingalls proposed we should approve everything with the exception of the two programs Perry wanted to add. Wimberger reiterated that the proposal was to accept the revised list that the subcommittee detailed. He continued that this meant the committee would be taking out the two CIEE and SIT programs and not adding any new programs. The committee unanimously voted in favor of the proposal.

Wimberger stated that next year's charge should include examining existing programs and determining which ones fulfill the needs of our students. Warning stated that China should be treated differently. Ferrari agreed and said that students may be able to gain a more diverse study abroad experience in various locations of China.

Wimberger continued with the report from the subcommittees work on the application process. The subcommittee met twice and included Gareth Barkin, Lisa Ferrari, Martin Jackson, Priti Joshi, Jan Leuchtenberger, Stephanie Noss, Michel Rocchi, Roy Robinson, and Peter Wimberger. Wimberger

informed us that the subcommittee discussed the problems with the application process and the essay requirement at the first of two meetings. They discussed whether or not the essay should be required from every applicant. The subcommittee considered the following models:

1. Existing model
2. Students in majors that required study abroad would not have to write the essay as long as they met the requirements. Students outside of majors that required study abroad would need to complete the essay requirement.

Wimberger said in the end they decided to make GPA an important consideration in the application process. He stated that the committee thought all students below a certain GPA would be required to write the essay. He stated at the second meeting, the subcommittee reached consensus that all students should be required to write at least one essay or an answer to one question. Wimbergerer said that most institutions require essays as part of the pre-application process. The subcommittee recommended the following:

1. If a student is in a major that requires study abroad and has a 3.0 GPA or above, the student would be required to answer one question regarding the importance of the program to their major.
2. If a student is in a major that required study abroad and had below a 3.0 GPA, the student would be required to answer two questions dealing with the importance of the program and explaining their lower GPA.
3. If a student is in a major that doesn't require study abroad, the student would be required to answer two questions concerning the importance of the program and its location. If this student had below a 3.0, they would be required to explain their lower GPA and their success in the program.

Wimberger also pointed out that Kelley, Marshall, Noss, and Ferrari agreed that there should be a change in the faculty recommendations. Wimberger pointed out that the committee wanted to know from faculty whether there was any concern regarding students attending a study abroad program. He suggested that there could be one question on the pre-application process for the faculty member asking if they had any concerns with the student attending a study abroad program. Wimberger stated that criteria used in the past would still be applicable:

1. Students in good academic and judicial standing,
2. Students meet the program requirements
3. Highest priority given to students going on UPS sponsored programs
4. Students in majors that require study abroad
5. No faculty concerns
6. Essays
7. If necessary limit the number of students wanting to go on two semester programs
8. Students who are rising seniors who have not previously studied abroad, then rising juniors, rising sophomores

Wimberger stated that Robinson, Joshi, and Michel will be meeting to work on the questions and bring these back to the committee for discussion at the end of the semester.

Wimberger stated that Robinson wanted to discuss and provide a list of programs that the committee should think about cutting. Wimberger continued that Robinson also wanted to discuss summer programs and revising the application process for these programs. Since many students find summer programs that are not on our list, Robinson would like to have these programs approved without going through the more lengthy review process. Kelley said she was concerned about this approach because she wanted to make sure that credits would still transfer and that students would be safe. Wimberger wondered if we could streamline the process so that it moves more quickly. Kelley suggested that Kathleen and one faculty member look over the program. If a concern arises, then the committee would help in the review process. Noss suggested using providers that we already use for semester long programs. Ferrari stated that she was uncomfortable with the idea that summer courses don't require the same sort of review process as semester long programs. She stated that university transfer credit can't be granted unless the student receives permission before they leave. Wimberger said that Robinson probably thought of treating this application process more like the study away summer classes where students go through Kathleen. Warning stated that he felt somewhat uncomfortable about having a single faculty member oversee a program approval. He stated that there could be liability issues if something happens. Kelley suggested that a single faculty

member could review programs associated with an established provider. If it is an unfamiliar program or provider, the committee can oversee the review process. Wimberger suggested that the next step would be for Robinson to come up with a proposal for the committee to consider a specific procedure for summer program reviews.

Kelly stated that at the next meeting her subcommittee will give a report on the fall event.

Meeting adjourned at 1:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Tanya Stambuk