IEC Minutes for February 17, 2017
Wyatt 226

Present: Gareth Barkin, Alva Butcher, Lea Fortmann, Eowyn Greeno, Diane Kelley (presiding officer), Kriszta Kotsis, Sunil Kukreja, John Lear, Roy Robinson, Nicholai Sekino

The meeting was called to order at 11:00am

The minutes of the February 3, 2017 meeting were approved.

Kelley brought up the issue of the different nomenclature used when referring to study abroad programs and called for clarification on distinguishing between study abroad providers, sites, programs, and tracks. For example a *provider*, such as IES Abroad, has a study abroad *site* in Paris. Within the *IES Paris program,* there are different *tracks* such as "Business and International Affairs" and "French Studies".

Kelley inquired about which level study abroad petitions are approved at - the program or track level. Robinson explained that sometimes whole programs are approved if it is in the same location by an approved provider based on the assumption that the quality of the tracks within the program are sufficiently high. But other times certain tracks within programs may or may not be approved if, for example, they are run by different directors. Robinson further pointed out that it is not completely straightforward since IES programs are more integrated and comingled – where students in one track can take classes in other tracks, compared to SIT programs, which are more distinct.

Kelley emphasized the need to clarify between programs (IES Paris) and tracks within a program (Business or French studies) and at what level they are approved since in one case, a student went to IES Paris for the Business track but did not take classes in French. Kelley commented that had this been known ahead of time, they wouldn't have recommended the student study abroad under that specific program track given that is was not in French.

Additional need for distinguishing the difference between programs and tracks is to fully understand the charge to the IEC to cut down the number of "programs". The committee discussed the need to clarify this charge to determine if the goal is to cut down the total number of programs (e.g. IES Paris) or total number of tracks within each program, which is a much larger number.

Lear helped clarify the impetus for this charge explaining that at the last SAWG meeting Peter Wimberger asked about the logic of cutting programs and the financial people talked about the labor intensive aspect of managing multiple programs. Follow-up questions inquired if the financial office has to pay by program provider or by individual track.

Robinson further explained that the costs for each track within a program are also different. Typically, Robinson receives a bill from IES for each track within a program and accounts for different costs for each tracks, but then re-aggregates them under the umbrella of say, IES Dublin. He said that it would make it administratively easier to have fewer tracks, but doesn't want to eliminate tracks for this sole purpose.

Kukreja commented that perhaps the best approach for determining the number of programs and tracks would be to refer to the criteria as a basis for evaluating programs and thus cutting programs based on whether or not they meet the study abroad objectives rather than targeting a specific number of programs to be cut. Then the IEC can make arguments about why it believes it should maintain a certain number of programs and tracks based on the criteria they fulfill.

Barkin expressed the idea of using total number of tracks as the main unit of analysis for the IEC, but using the total number of programs for discussion and reporting outside the committee, where individual program tracks were less important. The IEC could keep track of both numbers and invoke either as appropriate.

Ultimately the committee agreed that the IEC will keep track of study abroad "programs" at the track-level and will approve future study abroad petitions at this level rather than the broader program level. The IEC plans on explaining this in their report to the Senate including their rational for counting tracks, which allows them to identify specific tracks within a broader program that best meet the stated criteria and goals of study abroad.

Next, the committee looked over the table of current programs and tracks and decided to take off programs for which no students had gone in the past five years. For some programs that have been dormant for a long time, but recently a student has applied to go, the committee decided to evaluate these programs based on the study abroad criteria. Lear expressed concerned about cutting programs just because students have not gone recently if they are culturally important, e.g. programs in Africa or Latin America, and suggested that we could promote these programs more within the university to attract students if they fulfill the study abroad goals.

Tracks that were cut due to no students or suspension:

- Stirling, Scotland
- Dharamsala, India (suspended)
- Dublin, Ireland - Dublin City University
- Galway, Ireland
- Buenos Aires, Argentina
- Durban, South Africa
- Stone Town, Zanzibar, Tanzania

It was also noted that the IEC should consider geographic representation when considering which tracks to cut.

For the next meeting, the committee asked to get three updated spreadsheets, one with all the programs, one with all the tracks, and one by country.

Final business

It was proposed to add a line to the study abroad criteria rubric to include institutional concerns regarding sexual violence. Given this addition, all voted in favor of adopting the criteria as it stands and putting it on the International Programs website, though it should be noted that the criteria rubric is considered a "living document" and will be subject to change as goals and needs evolve over time.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50am.

Respectfully submitted by Lea Fortmann