

IEC Minutes for March 3, 2017
Wyatt 226

Present: Gareth Barkin, Debbie Chee, Lea Fortmann (presiding officer), Carmen Eyssautier, Eowyn Greeno, Kriszta Kotsis, Sunil Kukreja, John Lear, Roy Robinson, Nicholai Sekino, Mike Spivey

The meeting was called to order at 11:03 a.m.

The minutes of the February 17, 2017 meeting were approved.

Announcements:

Kotsis announced that there are new exhibitions at Kittredge Gallery: one is a student curated show, while the other is an exhibition of the work of an international artist.

Eyssautier mentioned that PLU's current magazine focuses exclusively on the topic of study abroad.

Agenda Items:

Review and approval of the proposal of Professors Tubert and Lanctot for a short term study abroad program in Argentina to be offered in Spring 2018:

Robinson explained that Tubert, who is from Argentina, visited Buenos Aires last year and met with representatives of several organizations before selecting the Universidad de San Andres as the host for the program. Lanctot will be visiting Buenos Aires during Spring 2017 to carry out more preparatory work before the program is offered next spring. The short term study abroad program in Argentina is similar to the Cuba program led by Lear and Share in the past that was linked to LAS/PG399; it includes a semester long course and a three-week long trip after the conclusion of the semester. Lear pointed out that Tubert and Lanctot will offer the semester-long course in the Connections core area (LAS/CONN 399), which he believes to be a good idea. There was discussion about the cost of the program, which is about \$5000, including fairly expensive air fare (\$1500-1800), but it was noted that OIP might be able to offer subsidy for the trip. It was also mentioned that Lanctot and Tubert are considering cutting the trip to Mendoza and Puerto Iguazu to keep costs down. Lear asked about the timing of the program in the middle of the summer (proposed dates are June 27-July 20), however, nobody knew why these dates have been selected. Barkin noted that he sees too many tourism inspired activities on the schedule and wondered whether it would be important to encourage the program leaders to create greater connections with students and professor of the host university in order to enhance the intercultural competence of the participating students through interactions with local students and faculty. Robinson noted that the location of the university outside of the city may have an impact on the level of interaction that will be possible with local students and faculty because the program participants will be using the downtown facilities of the university. Lear noted that most scheduled activities appear to be culturally significant, and Kotsis observed that visits to museums and other institutions no doubt will be presented to the students as part of a discourse about visual culture, an area in which Lanctot has expertise.

The proposal was approved with the caveat that the IEC would like to ask two follow up questions from the organizers: 1) Why did they select this date for the trip? 2) Would it be possible to foster greater engagement with local students and/or faculty?

Discussion of the possibility of inviting Maggie Mittuch from Financial Services to answer questions from the IEC:

Two reasons would justify inviting Mittuch to an IEC meeting:

- 1) Fortman and Spivey's sub-committee, which is working on a charge to explore the participation of students of color and first generation students in study abroad programs, thought that Financial Services might provide some insight into their charge; and
- 2) it could be beneficial to find out whether Financial Services are processing payments at the program or the track level. (The differences between programs and tracks are defined in the February 17, 2017 meeting minutes of IEC.)

In response to the second reason, Robinson suggested that after SAWG's discussions with Financial Services staff it might be sufficient just to e-mail questions to Mittuch if we have any. Robinson, Kukreja, Barkin, and Lear explained what they learned about how Financial Services processes payments for study abroad programs: they do it at the program

not at the track level. Although different tracks within a single program may have different costs, it is OIP's responsibility to sort this out and submit disbursement forms for the various amounts to Financial Services; Financial Services has all tracks of a program under a single budget number. Even though Financial Services processes payments at the program level, the number of programs we do have still presents a significant administrative burden because these payments are processed manually, thus the cost of processing is high. Therefore, if IEC is to comply with the charge to eliminate programs, this should be done at the program not the track level. It was also noted that it would definitely be useful to cut programs that have not been attended by students for several years in order to facilitate a less cumbersome administrative process. However, it was also noted that certain programs should not be cut even if students have not participated in them recently, because some programs are valuable for certain departments and some programs help to create a balanced geographical spread across the globe.

With regard to the first reason, Fortman noted that the sub-committee assumed that students of color and first generation students participate in study abroad programs in fewer numbers because of financial issues, and they wished to follow up on this with Financial Services. Lear and Chee suggested that it would be helpful to reach out to Ellen Peters for information about students of color and first generation students; it would be important to ask them directly about their attitudes toward study abroad because the more general surveys don't seem to yield sufficient information about why students of color and first gen. students are less likely to study abroad. Fortmann noted that the subcommittee talked to Joseph Colon of the Access to College Program, and he identified many of the constraints these students face and likely barriers that may prevent them from studying abroad, which will be included in the subcommittee's report to the IEC. Fortmann also noted that she learned that students are able to apply both merit and need aid to study abroad up to their documented full financial need, a helpful piece of information.

After this discussion it was agreed that it is not necessary to invite Mittuch to an IEC meeting.

Kaelie Coleman petition to participate in Round River Conservation Studies Summer Program in Mongolia:

Robinson provided background on the petition. Coleman came to OIP on the day when the applications were due to talk to him about the Mongolia program. The problem is that she will not be able to earn academic credit on this program because the Mongolia program is not on our approved program list. (Coleman plans on participating in the program given that her family has already submitted a non-refundable down-payment on it). Coleman (and her parents who sent a letter that was shared with the committee) argued that this should be an approved program because the Round River Program in Patagonia is a program that IEC approved and students have and are attending. Coleman argued that she and her family assumed that she will be able to earn credit just like students on the Patagonia program. Robinson told the student and parents that he would bring their request to the IEC.

Questions about credits earned on study abroad programs vs. transfer credits were discussed. Kukreja asked about the nature of the program. Robinson noted that Coleman would like to earn biology credits while attending this 6-week long program. The understanding is that the Round River Programs are very hands-on, providing many experiential learning opportunities for students, research opportunities, as well as field work. However, we do not know the details of the Mongolia program. Kukreja noted that looking at the syllabi would be helpful, and Kotsis remarked that asking the Biology Department about the program and whether they would accept credit from it would be useful. Robinson suggested that we tell Coleman that we are willing to look at her petition to participate in this program and earn academic credit for it if she provides information about the program and finds a faculty in the Biology Department who is willing to support her petition. She will need to submit an application to add this program to our list with all the necessary documentation, which will help IEC in evaluating the merits of the program.

The principle of allowing a student to petition to add a program and participate in it so much after the deadline, without following our procedures and discussing it before the deadline with OIP was also considered. The opinions varied on whether such flexibility on our part is good or counterproductive.

The committee decided in favor of allowing Coleman to submit a petition for the Round River Program in Mongolia; the decision, however, was not unanimous: 8 were in favor and 3 were against it.

Kukreja noted that it would be important for the committee to talk about whether or not the petitioning process will be allowed to add programs to our list of approved programs now that the IEC is adopting the program evaluation criteria for reviewing programs. Should the IEC still allow the petition process to put programs on the books, or should we eliminate

the petition process altogether? Barkin noted that if we retain the petition process, the petition should address the criteria outlined in our program evaluation document. He also wondered whether it would be possible to approve the Mongolia program (if indeed we approve it) only on a one-time basis.

Program Evaluation Criteria Rubric (Appendix I):

Is it necessary to make changes to the Program Evaluation Criteria Rubric to reflect our definition of program vs. track? Barkin added a definition as a footnote to the document. Barkin noted that Financial Services are only focused on programs not tracks in terms of administration; the administrative burden is on OIP to provide disbursement requests to Financial Services based on the different tracks within a program. Although Financial Services deals with study abroad at the program level, IEC will approve programs at the track level as we discussed last time.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:52.

Respectfully submitted by Kriszta Kotsis

**Appendix I: International Education Committee
Program Evaluation Criteria (DRAFT)**

New and existing international programs¹ will be evaluated on the basis of Puget Sound's objectives for study abroad experiences:

Objective 1: To foster intercultural competence, cross-cultural communication skills, and personal development.

- Knowledge: to develop a richer understanding of another culture, and a broad competence that is applicable across a variety of intercultural contexts.
- Communication: to develop skills and ability to engage in effective cross-cultural communication and understanding.
- Self-Awareness and reflexivity: to develop the ability to contextualize and understand alternative perspectives based on different cultural systems.

Objective 2: To foster global citizenship and appreciation of international diversity and interdependencies.

- To develop a deeper understanding of global interconnectedness and diversity.
- To develop a stronger sense of social responsibility, social justice, and international power relationships.
- To foster civic engagement at home and abroad.

Priority will be given to programs that substantively incorporate the following policies and practices, which have proven to most effectively achieve the objectives outlined above, as assessed through the rubric below.

The rubric below is intended to assess program impact through the following thematic criteria:

- 1. Integration into the Broader Curriculum**
- 2. High Impact Program Design**
- 3. Practices Associated with Intercultural Development**
- 4. Institutional and Breadth Concerns**

¹ The term "programs" in this document refers to specific tracks within multi-track programs as well as single-track programs.

International Education Committee Program Evaluation Rubric

As noted in the Program Evaluation Criteria document, priority will be given to programs that substantively incorporate the following policies and practices, which have proven to most effectively achieve Puget Sound's objectives for study abroad experiences.

The IEC should consider the four questions below, **scoring programs on a scale of 1-5** based on a *qualitative evaluation of program structure, content, and its relationship to institutional concerns and curricula (rather than simply adding the bulleted items fulfilled)*. These scores can then be used to compare and evaluate programs.

Individual programs are unlikely to score highly in every category, and some criteria are mutually exclusive from others, but preference should be given to programs with high scores (4-5) in two or more categories.

<p>How well is the program integrated into the broader Puget Sound curriculum?</p> <p>Examples of curricular integration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Substantive, synthetic links between campus learning and study abroad.○ Globalizing and internationalizing the on-campus curriculum.○ Abroad programs that draw on faculty expertise, including direct program design and leadership. <p>SCORE: _____</p>	<p>Is the program structured in a way likely to yield a high-impact experience?</p> <p>Examples of high-impact program design elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Long-term (semester or year).○ Perceived "less culturally similar" destinations.○ Integration of foreign language courses (before or during).○ Leveraging partnerships with international universities and non-profits. <p>SCORE: _____</p>
<p>Does the program incorporate practices that increase intercultural competence?</p> <p>Examples of practices associated with increased intercultural competence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Homestays or related practices that lead to students spending significant portions of their time abroad with locals.○ Faculty mentoring beyond the classroom during program.○ Completing a research experience.○ Completion of a service learning experience or internship.○ Strong site utilization through interdisciplinary or discipline-based fieldwork or experiential engagement. <p>SCORE: _____</p>	<p>Does the program comport with institutional concerns and priorities?</p> <p>Examples of relevant institutional concerns/priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Programs that provide qualitatively different or unique experiences, as compared with those already offered, and which address the University's objectives for international education.○ Programs that allow students in a particular major/field/department opportunities to study abroad that contribute to their field of study.○ Programs that draw student populations that are historically underrepresented in international education.○ Programs with reasonable costs.○ Programs with clear and effective procedures to ensure student well-being and safety (including response to instances of sexual violence). <p>SCORE: _____</p>