

International Education Committee meeting minutes  
Monday, 11/10/14.

Members Attending: Gareth Barkin, Alva Butcher, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Diane Kelley, Pepa Lago, John Lear, Allyson Lindsley, Eric Orlin, Roy Robinson, Daniel Sherman, Peter Wimberger, Grace Witherell

- 1) Minutes from 10/27/14 meeting were approved as circulated, after a typo correction.
- 2) There were no announcements.
- 3) Update from faculty-led study abroad funds sub-committee.  
The group met and prepared a handout with instructions for applying to faculty development grants.
  - a) Butcher asked how is level of funds determined. Since funds available to send students abroad are a fixed amount, the money available will depend on how much of the funds will be used (depending on how many students are going). The maximum amount available per year is \$50,000. Right now there is only \$19,000 because some money was already allocated.
  - b) While the maximum amount is normally not reached, if programs go up in cost we could reach it. The recent big decline on students going abroad has caused for funds to accumulate, and right now there are \$800,000. Unused funds go back to the general budget pool at the end of the year.
  - c) Lear was concerned about funding for short-term study abroad programs being undermined if merit aid comes back and suggested to use more of these funds to support more short-term programs. As a more of a long-term issue, this could be looked at in the next couple of years.
  - d) A March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline will address more substantial proposals and a second deadline on Oct 1<sup>st</sup> will be for remaining funds. Having specific deadlines will make managing and classifying grant requests easier than a rolling deadline, and will allow for competing grants to be evaluated for funding simultaneously. Orlin suggested adding the line “the committee will consider

- proposals after the Oct 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.” Both deadlines use funds from the same fiscal year. Potentially there could be funds left over from previous year.
- e) The proposal brought to the committee for consideration is for existing programs only. Next work is for a set of guidelines for new programs that will be much more detailed in terms of budget. A suggestion to improve the document was to remove the section “New programs” since these guidelines only address existing programs. Butcher suggested avoiding repetition of terms such as “sustainability.”
  - f) The guidelines document must be very clear about what these funds are for, and how they will be spent. A suggestion was to include a list of examples list of examples and ideas for the use of the grant. Lear suggested that money could support faculty travel to visit some programs, to encourage larger faculty participation, which can increase sustainability of programs, since it can be difficult for the same faculty member to do it year after year.
  - g) Elise Richman is one of the faculty members waiting for these guidelines to get going so the Rome program can be confirmed. She is hoping to get funds to bring the cost down for students. For the 8-10 students currently signed up, the cost is \$3700 per student without meals or airfare.
- 4) University of Essex visit update.
- a) Several departments met with the representative during his visit to our campus. Essex seems to be a good option for students, but there’s no clear specific reason for us to send students, and it’s not clear whether this option will be attractive to students. It’s located one hour outside London, too far for students to take advantage of the cultural opportunities of the city (such as theater productions for example). Butcher explained that her department was not particularly enthusiastic about this exchange, and wanted to know if there is a possible exchange with London instead. We have close to 10 programs in the London area (not exchange). Some are redundant, and we need

- to start paring down some of those.
- b) The idea of creating exchange programs is very attractive and a more sustainable model. The key to success is to get departments to take ownership of particular programs, such as theater (Sara Freeman is interested in UK programs, for example). Essex could be willing to create a faculty exchange, Passau-type, and this could open up other opportunities for collaboration and exchange. Follow up is needed to firm up their position on this issue. If it was made a Puget Sound program, students could use their merit aid and that could make a big difference. Lear suggested a faculty exchange for a semester, but realistically, approval would be hard and salaries would have to be comparable in order for it to work.
  - c) There was agreement not to pursue exchange programs unless there's clear faculty investment in it. Regarding the Essex program, at this point that condition is not met.
  - d) In general, we need to funnel students to some preferred programs. For this, we need to communicate with departments to see what programs are better fits for our students, and focus on those. Kelley requested a list of London programs the committee can examine, to look at duplication and redundancy, and try to pare down and cut programs that are not being used, or don't fit us well.
- 5) Proposal to allow for the approval of programs outside of the October 1 deadline.

Robinson would like to be able to review programs on an ongoing basis, to be able to alter portfolio when needed, such as if a new program comes into view.

- a) Some questions from the committee: If IEC can approve or cut programs at any time it makes it difficult to advise students about study abroad. Also, Kathleen needs to review programs, but she can only look at them at the end of the semester.
- b) A motion was made to keep the Oct 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for all students' petitions and allow the Director of IP and the IEC to make adjustments to the study abroad program portfolio as they see

fit. The motion passed.

6) The meeting was adjourned at 2:51.

Respectfully submitted,

Pepa Lago