

International Education Committee Minutes
October 30, 2009 8 a.m.

Committee members present: Gareth Barkin, Jessy Arends, Becca Davidson, Lisa Ferrari, Mark Harpring, Diane Kelley, John Lear, Janet Marcavage, Donn Marshall, Jan Moore, Jannie Meisberger, Mei Rose.

Donn's minutes from October 16, 2009 were accepted with minor changes.

Student IEC members Becca Davidson and Jessy Arends were introduced and welcomed.

Bread: All committee members were appreciative of the sweet bread baked by Mark's partner Daniel.

Senate Charges: Mark explained that the senate had only recently taken up the charges that the IEC proposed last year and handed out the related minutes from their Oct. 5 meeting. The senate had questions on several of the 10 charges, but ultimately moved to delete charges #1 (review program) and #3 (assist International Programs) because these were already contained in the bylaws, and #7, on the moratorium, because it had already been lifted. Wording on the final charge (now 7 total) was amended to read "Discuss and recommend budget requests for Study Abroad to the Academic Dean's office." There was also discussion about the charge to "Communicate on a regular basis with the Student Life Committee," which has included questions for students returning from abroad in their surveys. Since the information gathered in those surveys proved inadequate, it is not clear whether future surveys will take place through the Retention Force, International Programs or elsewhere. For now, communication with the SLF remains an IEC charge, and Mark will try to get results from the last SLC survey and clarification on where future surveys might occur. I include immediately below the revised Senate seven charges as inserted from the Senate minutes.

1. Evaluate offerings from a global and disciplinary perspective with an eye to providing coverage in geographic and disciplinary areas that are currently not represented or are underrepresented. Consult with departments to find out if there are programs that they think we should have, or have additional insights about programs we have that they don't think we should keep.
2. Communicate on a regular basis with the Student Life Committee.
3. Recommend criteria for allocating study abroad funds within the constraints of the study abroad budget.
4. Work with faculty to encourage the integration of study abroad experiences into on-campus classes and work with the SLC and Dean of Students to encourage integration of study abroad experiences into co-curricular activities.

5. Organize faculty discussions on study abroad to consider how recent changes in study abroad affect academic programs and how better to integrate study abroad into on-campus learning.
6. Discuss Summer Programs including how to better publicize opportunities as well as consider policies pertaining to summer programs such as residency credit (students pay program costs but still receive residency credit)
7. Discuss and recommend budget requests for Study Abroad to the Academic Dean's office.

Moratorium. At the last meeting, the moratorium was lifted in principle. Today we discussed criteria for approval. Our working model is that student proposals that are approved will receive a probationary status of three years, and then be made permanent or eliminated, depending on whether and how many additional students go over that period and what their experiences are. We agreed that the review process would involve an ongoing review by which the IEC could consider all such programs each year, but would make a deliberate decision within four years. The IEC would need to be aware of departmental concerns, and could also extend probation or make a program permanent if it was considered promising or important, even if few students had enrolled. After some discussion, it was agreed that: probationary programs would instead be called “provisionally accepted programs”; that they would be listed among our other programs so that students were aware of them; but they would be marked accordingly so that students would be prepared if these programs were eliminated before they could apply. Jannie suggested that, given the work involved in adding a program, students be urged on their proposal and again on their post-semester abroad evaluation to give careful feedback on provisional programs.

Agreed upon wording for the process to be included (somewhere): “Provisionally accepted programs will be reviewed as needed to become permanent, but not more than four years after acceptance. “

In response to Becca's question, we agreed that if a student wanted to go on a program that had been a provisional program and been cut, she would still have to go through the approval process again, since the program might have changed since provisionally approved or since cut.

Students with Disabilities: Donn brought up his concerns about how students with disabilities were approved for some study abroad programs and excluded from others. He expressed particular concern for the legal implications of excluding students from our own programs, like PacRim. Jannie gave examples of how students had been accommodated, and programs where such accommodation was much more difficult. It was agreed that this was an issue we need to address down the road, but that it was not directly relevant to the current discussion of the process for proposing programs.

Pac Rim Eval: The deadline for the subcommittee's PacRim eval is the end of this semester.

Application procedures: We agreed to cut the word “often” from the heading “Criteria often considered by IEC in assessing new programs include:” There was some discussion as to how open the procedure should be, and we agreed that we didn’t want to impose a minimum GPA beyond that of the program being proposed, or allow proposals only from “star” students. Rather, we should require students to make a convincing case for the program in their application. Diane suggested adding wording to indicate that the application procedure is not to be taken lightly by students or faculty.

So that students don’t seek out the least challenging programs, we agreed to add the following fourth criterion:

“4) Is there evidence in your program review of acceptable academic rigor in this program?”

In addition, the final line of the form should require the appropriate faculty member to endorse not only the program, but also the student. Proposed wording:

“Please attach a rationale for your endorsement for the program and the student.”

Other suggested changes to the bulleted steps on the first page:

Third bullet: Change from “case” to “proposal”

Fifth bullet: Second sentence should begin, “ If the IEC approves the proposal for comprehensive review, the Director of International Programs will request.....”

Mark agreed to incorporate these changes into our working document.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:02, and everyone finally tore into Daniel’s sweet bread.

Respectfully submitted,

John Lear