Minutes of the International Education Committee November 12, 2010

Members present: Lisa Ferrari, Diane Kelley, Janet Marcavage, Donn Marshall, Jan Moore, Kelly Wyman, Lisa Griswold, Michael Johnson, Peter Wimberger, Don Share, Tanya Stambuk

Meeting convened by Peter at 3pm. Minutes from October 29th meeting, as amended, were approved.

Prior to the meeting, Peter sent the job announcement for Director of International Programs to the IEC committee. Peter invited the members of the committee to contact Lisa F., Michael or Peter with suggestions and/or revisions to the job description. Lisa F. said that the present document was the original job description used in the last search.

Jan announced that many students are investigating summer study abroad opportunities through IES and AIFS. Currently, AIFS is a partner but Jan stated that she wasn't allowed to tell students that they could apply and not receive credit. Jan thought that this was a throwback to when students were charged tuition for such programs. Jan stated that we should allow students to apply for summer programs. Currently, students are required to sign a form by such programs as IES that asserts the program is an academic one and that the student will participate in all aspects of the program without the home university issuing credit for the program. Lisa F. thought that this was not an issue. She went on to say if a student is participating in a summer program without credit, the university has no right to control how the student spends their time in the summer. Lisa F. also stated that the university couldn't promote these programs because of liability obligations. Peter concurred with Lisa. Jan was wondering if there had been any rules related to this issue. Lisa F. said she didn't think so but that she would check.

Members Lisa F., and Diane met as a subcommittee to discuss study abroad program proposals and forms. At this time, they didn't have a document to show to the IEC but they did have some questions for the IEC concerning applications for new programs. Diane asked, "What role is the faculty expected to have in a proposal that is initiated by a student and how would that role be different if a faculty member initiated it by themselves?" Lisa F. stated that they ran into some difficulties because they were trying to create two forms, one for a faculty-initiated process and one for a student- initiated process. Lisa F. elaborated that the concern was if a student simply writes a proposal stating the suitability of the program for his or her needs and the faculty member merely composes a letter endorsing it as an acceptable program or does the student bring ample material to the faculty member who then decides if the program is a worthy one for the university. Lisa F. also questioned if the process and student involvement change when faculty initiate the program. She inquired if the process should be equally onerous for the faculty member a student or a faculty member brought the proposal forward. Diane and Peter both agreed that it should be equally onerous.

Lisa F. stated that the student should do the legwork for the proposal but that the proposal brought to the IEC should come from the faculty member. Diane said that if a student initiates the proposal, that student should work with a faculty member and make a case for why that program would be suitable for them. She said that she would trust the faculty member's input as to whether or not the program was good for the university and that the proposal should come through the faculty member. Diane suggested if the faculty member chose to initiate a proposal for a program, the faculty member should gather all the material and have it presented to the IEC. Lisa F. clarified that in both cases it would be the faculty member presenting the proposal. Diane stated that the IEC should still have the opportunity to see the student's proposal in addition to the faculty member's presentation. Diane continued by saying that there would still be two processes.

Peter stated that most proposals have started with students but there had been a certain amount of unevenness in the faculty contribution to those proposals. He said that the forms should clearly state that faculty members should thoroughly investigate the program so that a strong case can be made for the proposal. Janet suggested having a place on the form for a signature from the advisor or faculty relevant to the area of study. Kelly brought up that it wasn't clear if students should be making a case for themselves or the university. Lisa F. stated that the burden is on the student to make a strong case for why the program works for them.

Peter announced that the next meeting would take place on December 3rd.

Peter provided the committee with a second draft of the Pacific Rim memo, which will be presented to Kris. He asked for comments on this draft.

In the memo, Peter stated that the courses are designed and taught by UPS faculty. Diane stated that not all courses were taught by UPS faculty. Jan asked what types of contracts were offered to the faculty who were teaching in the Pacific Rim program. Lisa F. stated that they were all adjunct. Jan commented then that they were all considered UPS faculty.

Don S. added that the Pacific Rim program has actually been returning money to the university.

Peter suggested sending any additional comments regarding the memo to him.

Don S. brought up a discussion concerning study abroad students who are encouraged to register for classes on campus and then consequently drop these courses to go study abroad. He commented that this issue is a concern because new sections are likely to be added to courses and many students are being wait-listed. He said that two or three students dropping a course could make a difference between adding or not adding a new section to a course.

Jan stated that students are told specifically at the pre-departure meeting that if they paid their deposit, they should not register for classes.

Peter stated that in the past students were told to register in order to safeguard their places at the university in case something happened to the program. Lisa F. added that one year there was a potential for programs to be disrupted and students were encouraged to register for classes.

Jan suggested that a solution would be to have the registrar's office make record of all students attending a study abroad program. Once these students are in the system they would be unable to register for classes on campus.

Peter suggested that the registrar should notify and drop those students from classes who will be attending a study abroad program. Jan said that she will look into how many study abroad students are registered for classes and then the committee can see if this is or isn't a broader issue. Jan also said that she could send a list of students who are going to study abroad to department heads. Donn Marshall stated that usually all cancellations to study abroad programs are due to personal reasons and those students can be dealt with on an individual basis.

Donn M. brought up a discussion of conduct probation and the single application deadline for study abroad applicants. He stated that the current rule is if a student is on conduct probation on the deadline date of the application, that student may not apply or appeal the decision. He continued that if a student is on a level one conduct probation, that student may appeal for a waiver to participate in such activities as swimming, theater, orchestra among others. In other words, the student is able to represent the university by appealing to the person who gave the sanction. He said that we make no such provision for level one students who wish to apply to a study abroad program. Donn M. asked if we would like to reconsider whether or not a level one probation student can petition for consideration into a study abroad program. Peter wanted to know if this decision is our responsibility. Donn M. suggested continuing this discussion at a meeting in the near future.

Peter adjourned the meeting at 4pm.

Submitted by Tanya Stambuk