International Education Committee September 27, 2013

Present: Gareth Barkin, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Rachel DeMotts, Lisa Ferrari, Diane Kelley, Michael Johnson, Pepa Lago, Allyson Lindsley, Donn Marshall, Roy Robinson, Matt Warning, Peter Wimberger

Came to order 9:03

Minutes: Warning asked whether there was a policy about revising meeting minutes? How major should the edits be? Do we change the minutes to reflect what we want to say or what was said? The committee agreed that we should only revise mistakes, not create new material.

M/S/P to accept minutes from 9/13/13.

The committee has not received charges from the Senate, so we were unable to review them.

For the next meeting we need to examine the programs that have been petitioned for addition to the approved offerings. Robinson reviewed the petition process for adding new programs and the process by which the committee considers the proposed programs. He added that that we often eliminate a program when we add a program. Kathleen Campbell has reviewed the Balkans program, but still needs to review CIEE Thailand and IES Istanbul programs. Robinson has received 3 additional petitions to add programs. He will give these to Kathleen Campbell to review. One is a summer program. Another is with one of our providers.

We proceeded to form subcommittees for different tasks:

1) Short term study abroad guide. Rachel, Gareth, Peter, Roy

- 2) Review CIEE Thailand; SIT Balkans; IES Istanbul: Matt, Kena, Stephanie
- 3) Review the new petitions CIEE China Environmental, Cultural and Economic Sustainability; SIT:

Traditional Medicine and Healthcare Practices (Summer): Donn, Pepa, Roy

4) Review the China program petitions: Lisa, Allyson, Diane

Next meeting Groups 2, 3 and 4 will report back.

We considered a student request to extend a Chinese study abroad program to a full year. This request was for a continuation of the same language program. Robinson felt that he needed to bring it back to committee because we now have a policy that restricts students applying to two semesters of study abroad. This policy generally applies to students applying to two different study abroad programs. Kelley says we should make sure we are transparent about our process so that if other students want to petition the policy, there is a process in place. Because it was: 1) the continuation of the same program, 2) supported by the student's advisor, 3) a language program, and 4) there were funds available, we approved the student's request.

We asked whether Robinson needs to bring these requests (continuation of a program) to the committee every time. We agreed (M/S/P) that if it was for a continuation of the same program and the

process seems seamless, then it is fine for Robinson to make the decision. The requests are rare. If the request is for a different program, then the petition needs to be brought to the committee.

We then considered a student petition to waive the rule about being on campus during the semester they apply to study abroad. Robinson explained that the rule is in place because there have been students who go on medical leaves for either medical or mental health issues and who also want to study abroad. By having the students on-campus during the semester that they apply to study abroad it is easier to assess risk. DeMotts suggested that since the petitioning student will return to Tacoma during spring semester, she check in on her return to Tacoma. There was a concern raised about whether granting an exemption would set a precedent. Barkin suggested that granting the exemption wasn't precedent setting, since the student was following the petition process that is in place. Various members suggested that the rationale for being on leave was good (invitation to join a river expedition in Peru). There was some concern raised that having the student check in when she returned would involve liability and that Robinson would be left making judgment. Marshall asked whether students needed to be here only the semester they were applying, or in the case of students studying abroad in spring, whether they also needed to be on campus Fall semester. Robinson said that the policy now covers both the semester applying and the semester before leaving. The committee M/S/P the student petition to allow the student to apply for study abroad while she was on leave.

We proceeded to discuss the study abroad budget and program costs. Robinson asked how do we cut some of the costs? Some of the programs in Australia and the UK are very expensive. He wondered if we would consider moving to some direct enroll programs in Australia which are much less expensive and provide students a very similar experience to what the students now get through the program providers. He said that many students who are going on provider programs don't even realize it. Some of the Australian universities would like to do this. It would save Puget Sound about \$7-8,000 per student.

We asked what services do providers actually provide? Robinson said they provide a list of courses, orientations, arrange visas, have someone who checks on the students, and they guarantee housing. Housing can be a problem in Australia. Both of the universities that Robinson is meeting with, Queensland and Melbourne, are willing to guarantee housing in residence halls. New Zealand universities are more hesitant about moving to direct enroll because they felt like they were breaking a contract with providers. Students would have to apply to the universities for the direct enroll programs. With direct-enroll programs, more of the responsibility would fall to the student and OIP. The universities all do an international student orientation. There was a question about where we would guide students who might need more support. Robinson answered that it was not the direct enroll programs. What is chance that students wouldn't get the classes they want because they don't enroll until they get there? This is also the case for the provider programs. There is support for international students during enrollment – they have to go to International Office for help. There was a question about the process for approving courses. We have direct enroll programs already, so that wouldn't be new for the Kathleen Campbell and the Registrar's office. All direct enroll programs already have to do that. Robinson likes idea of reinstating Melbourne because it is popular with students and is one of the best universities in Australia. Direct enrolling students there would save ~\$8,000/ student. Queensland

has a music conservatory so it might appeal to music students. Robinson and OIP looked at other Australian university possibilities such as Tasmania, but Tasmania is restructuring the university. How about Sydney? Students aren't choosing Sydney. Wimberger asked about James Cook University. Robinson compared James Cook and Queensland. He thought Queensland provided more opportunities. Would direct enroll be a greater burden on OIP? Robinson thought yes, but he thinks that it would start a relationship with the universities and develop useful connections. Robinson said that using ISA would be even more taxing because the options are so broad, there are so many programs that would be new and take more work. He thinks that we should consider direct enrollment in other places like the UK. St. Andrews in Scotland has contacted us about doing an exchange. Barkin said that he didn't think it would be bad to add responsibility to students going to Australia, which isn't a difficult country in which to travel. Warning expressed concern that students might not get courses, trips, other experiences. Lindsley said that even students in program-provider programs are low on the pecking order for class choice. Housing in the program-provider programs is often with the international students and students find that isolating, so the housing for students direct-enrolling might provide students more contact with native students.

M/S/P Encourage OIP to pursue direct-enroll options in Australia and to suggest programs to drop.

Meeting adjourned at 9:47 AM

Submitted,

Peter Wimberger