

International Education Committee Meeting
30 January 2014
Misner Room, Collins Library

Members in attendance: Gareth Barkin, Rachel DeMotts, Lisa Ferrari, Matt Ingalls, Donn Marshall, Roy Robinson, Matt Warning (chair)

Meeting came to order at 9:04

The meeting began with agreement that the committee will meet every other Thursday at 9am this semester.

The rest of the meeting focused on revisiting the Senate charges to determine the current status of each one while making a plan to address those not already completed.

Charge 1:

With respect to the issue of sexual violence particularly, determine a process for assessing, as part of the approval processes for Puget Sound study abroad programs:

- 1. the student support resources and response protocols for student safety;*
- 2. the number of reported instances of sexual violence at the international program;*
- 3. the efficacy of Puget Sound's safety information for students before they study abroad; and*
- 4. the efficacy of Puget Sound reporting and response processes should a sexual violence incident occur.*

The background here is that there have been some incidents in the past and Lisa indicated that this issue is particular interest to the Faculty Senate at the moment. Other committees have raised this issue as well. Roy indicated that Stephanie has started collecting this information from providers but because she has been out for a few weeks, it's not entirely clear where that stands at the moment. Matt W. asked if we were intending to develop a protocol of some sort, and whether it is not already expected as part of approving programs that they have some mechanism in place when an incident occurs. Roy indicated that OIP makes sure that there is an emergency procedure but nothing specific to sexual assault, and Don suggested that it would make sense to include a 'check' in looking at programs to make sure that they have something in place.

The question was then raised as to whether this should be preventive or reactive requirement. Roy stated that he was not sure if programs have statistics but that they likely would have to give us such information if they do. Reporting requirements under the Clery Act are only if we own a property abroad – so we may not be responsible in circumstances when we don't own the property. Don pointed out that we should get ahead of a concern like that regardless, by making sure that we add preventive work no matter where it is. Roy and Stephanie are working on parts 1 and 2 of charge 1.

Matt I. indicated that in some programs with homestays there's an informal assumption that women students would not stay in a family with young men – is that the case with any or most of ours? Roy said not necessarily; Matt W. indicated that older men might even be more of a concern at times. Gareth stated that it will probably be hard to get any of this info from providers, as they aren't going to tell us if they have problems.

The question was raised as to whether this review only applies to new programs, or to reviews. Matt I. suggested that we add a question to the debriefing questionnaire for returning students, and Don added that we should focus on the intent of the charge and try to collect the information that we can. Lisa observed that part 3 of the charge seems more like making sure students have good information but part 4 is more about having a protocol in place if something happens. Rachel added that it's reasonable to say that we should have a few steps or checklist of things that happen when we find out there is a problem.

Don raised the issue of reporting requirements and said that we generally go beyond what is required about reporting assaults to community – all in summary, but this year for example there was a jump in the number of cases but it's because we changed what we report. He did not think including students abroad had ever been considered but commented that we should.

Matt W. noted that this issue is part of the broader discourse now, eg with Obama's task force, so we should take this on and get ahead. The question is whether this is all OIP's responsibility to collect, and Roy indicated he's fine with gathering the information. Lisa asked how we currently assess safety in programs; Roy indicated that in general they look at plans for what happens, work with some providers over time and get a sense from that relationship, and that OIP also gets email communications from them about current issues or programs. Lisa asked what would lead to our awareness of existing problems and whether we have a process to deal with approving safety issues. Roy replied that this has been looked at in a general way and through OIP bringing information to the IEC. Rachel asked about when the University makes exceptions to the travel warning policy.

Lisa indicated that the student petitions, that goes to Kris, and she sends it to Roy, and there is a small group/risk review committee (Lisa, Don, Roy, Jeff Tepper) that reviews it, and it goes back to Kris who may consult legal and Ron and then decides. This does not come up very often. Oaxaca is an exception to this because travel warnings are state by state and because it is one of our own programs.

Matt W. observed that overall, parts 1 and 2 of the charge are really about the program approval process but 3 and 4 refer more to what we do here on campus, and that it seemed like Don was suggesting there might be something to add here; for example 3 would come up from debriefing students. Don asked about personal safety information in the pre-departure program and Roy indicated that they could look at this together.

Charge 2: *“Review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g., language, discipline, or geography).”* The committee agreed to create a subcommittee to review the UK programs, which is one of our spots with many redundant programs, and also includes a lot of expensive programs. Matt I. will chair a subcommittee evaluating which programs to recommend for elimination. Matt W. and Roy will be subcommittee members.

There is also a possibility of creating some direct programs with universities there. The SIT India program has been added but not sure where the Contemporary Beijing program approval is (committee ok'd but waiting to hear from Kathleen). Don asked if we should also be asking about the safety information of these two new programs and Roy indicated that can still be done.

There is also a subcommittee reviewing applications for study abroad (Gareth, Pepa and Roy) but Roy indicated that there are currently 85 fewer applicants right now than last year. The deadline is tomorrow so that means this subcommittee might be unnecessary. There is a science-major-heavy class coming up to be juniors so that might also have something to do with it, and also it is just a smaller class.

Charge 3: *“Once the financial model is resolved, revise the short-term study abroad guide for faculty and develop a clear template for proposing, organizing and leading short-term study abroad programs.”*

“Once a financial model is resolved” seems to mean whether or not students will pay tuition for summer short term study abroad programs and the answer seems to be yes. Lisa replied that this is not entirely clear yet and Roy raised the issue of other costs. Lisa indicated that her reading of this charge is that regardless of the financial questions there is a lot that can be done even without that happening. Roy added that there is already a document that outlines ways to put together a program and things to consider, it just needs to be updated (Rachel said that she and Roy and Mike Johnson put it together a few years ago). Don suggested that it would be good to include some consideration of safety as well.

Roy asked about the possibility of using extra funds from fewer study abroad students; for example, could there be a second application date for people who missed? The rationale for the early application date is to avoid redoing financial aid over the summer. Gareth suggested that it would be great to use that money for a fund for short term study abroad if that would be approved.

Matt I. moved to adjourn at 9:54, Gareth seconded.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel DeMotts