

## IEC Minutes for Nov. 17, 2016

Alva W Butcher, Debbie C Chee, Carmen J Eyssautier, Lea Fortmann, Eowyn L Greeno, Diane D Kelley, Kriszta Kotsis, Sunil Kukreja, John Lear, Roy Robinson, Nicholai J Sekino,

The meeting began at 3:45 with approval of minutes from the previous meeting. Arrangements were made for the final meeting of the semester to be held Thursday, Dec. 8 from 12-1, with an acknowledgement that student members should feel no need to attend, given reading period.

First, we discussed and re-considered our proposed revisions to IEC standing charges in light of concerns about procedure (the need for any changes to bylaws to go before the faculty and the board) and wording expressed by senate liaison Peter Wimberger. The proposed changes and plan for presentation to the faculty are included in the attached document.

Second, we reviewed the proposal of Holly Roberts of OT/PT for a Faculty-led Program to Guatemala for this spring. Roy Robinson explained the program, the various measures taken by Holly and her organizing sponsor to assure security, and the security review and endorsement by a subcommittee. The IEC approved the program.

Finally, members of the subcommittee on selection criteria (John Lear, Sunil Kukreja--Gareth Barkin was travelling) presented a draft of program evaluation criteria that might better guide us in our proposed charge to "Establish and review criteria and assessment procedures for evaluating international education programs" and maintain a "sustainable" number of those programs. They noted it was derived largely from discussions within the current SAWG, including review of stated objectives at other colleges and the literature measuring learning outcomes. They emphasized the tentative nature of the draft, and proposed ongoing revisions as we applied it the task of cutting existing programs and approving new ones.

Several members asked for clarifications of the meaning of some criteria (interventions, faculty mentoring). Others noted tensions between some of the criteria (favoring long-term vs. favoring faculty-led short term or summer; favoring "less culturally similar" destinations vs. traditional European sites that students study and professors teach; the need to assure quality programs without limiting the opportunity for the greatest number of students to experience study abroad, regardless of the nature or location of the program).

The general agreement seemed to be that these criteria were concrete points of discussion and therefore a good starting point that we didn't have before; that no single criteria was a "must have" that could make or break a program, given the diverse interests and needs of our different programs and students; that an initial explanation could clarify the tentative nature of the criteria; and that a "rubric" format might make

application of the criteria to specific programs easier. The subcommittee will try to address these issues and create a rubric.

The meeting was adjourned around 4:40.

Respectfully submitted,

John Lear

## **Proposed Revisions to the standing charges of the IEC**

The current standing charges are as follows:

1. Establish criteria and assessment procedures for international education programs.
2. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty.

We propose:

1. Changing the language of the first charge to:

Establish **and review** criteria and assessment procedures for **evaluating** international education programs.

2. Change the language of the second standing charge to:

Maintain an institutionally sustainable number of international education programs that are consistent with, and that promote the goals and objectives of international education at Puget Sound, through the review of new and existing programs.

3. Switch the order of the above charges, so Charge 1 would be "Maintain an institutionally sustainable..." and Charge 2 would be "Establish and review..."

### **Motivation for changes**

1) The IEC anticipates that by the end of the year the Study Abroad Working Group, with input from the IEC, will have an updated set of criteria that will be used as the standard for reviewing and evaluating study abroad programs. The IEC plans to use these criteria to evaluate the current list of programs as well as newly proposed programs. Once these criteria has been established, we believe moving forward, the main role of the IEC will be to continually *review* the criteria and make sure it continues to align with the goals and objectives of study abroad at Puget Sound and update the criteria as needed.

Note to Peter – We decided to take out the word “periodically” from the charge altogether and leave it open. We see the criteria as more of a living document that will evolve over time and part of the charge to the IEC will be to continually review and update it as needed.

2) We revised the second charge to include language that incorporates the additional job of cutting redundant or underutilized programs by "maintaining a sustainable number" of programs from year to year. We believe that this should be a standard part of the work of the IEC but the current language in the standing charges does not specifically acknowledge this. As a result, recurring charges to the IEC dating back to its creation as a standing committee in 2008 have been to “review and eliminate programs that do not provide something distinctive...” or

“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.”

Furthermore, the standing charges for the IEC were initially created along with the committee in 2008, and have not been revised since. Reflecting on the evolving role of the IEC over these past eight years, we feel that updating the standing charges in this manner is a better reflection of the work the committee has been doing and will continue to do.

We recognize that changes to the Bylaws requires two readings and a 75% vote in favor of the changes by the faculty. If approved by the Senate, the IEC will make plans to introduce the new standing charges at a faculty meeting early in the spring semester to ensure that there is enough time to allow for discussion and a second reading before the vote takes place.

Note: I still need to check with Peter and see if this is something that we introduce at the faculty meeting or the Senate does, but I think that the IEC would introduce it. It seems that the curriculum committee is currently responsible for introducing the proposed changes to bylaws for the curriculum review times.