International Education Committee Minutes
March 28, 2012 9:00 a.m.

Committee members present: Michael Johnson, Matt Warning, Mark Harpring, Matt Ingalls, Roy Robinson, Sally Sprenger, Bob Boyles, Donn Marshall, John McCuistion, Tanya Stambuk, Rachel DeMotts and Sam Gregory (student)

1. Approve Minutes of the March 7th meeting
   The following amendments to the notes were proposed:
   a. Would like to see an academic argument for why a program would be shorter than 6 weeks.
   b. A vote by the committee will take place on April 2nd
      The minutes were approved as amended
2. Approval to Apply Form Revisions
   Roy circulated a set of guidelines for approving students applying for study abroad proposed by the Selection Subcommittee.(Roy Robinson, Donn Marshall, Matt Ingalls and Rachel DeMotts with Stephanie Noss and Sally Sprenger)
   Discussion followed given that we want to adopt a consistent policy for reviewing applications by the Office of International Programs (OIP) and reduce the number of applications that need to be reviewed by the SA Selection Committee
   - Should there be a separate GPA requirement for .summer programs?
   - What are the consequences of allowing students with sub 2.5 GPA to participate?
   - Most program providers have a minimum GPA of 2.5, with the exception being some Archeology programs that are open to members of the community.

Roy pointed out that we don't want to submit applications that are significantly below the PS profile because of the potential negative impact on future relationships with providers.
Bob suggested that we adopt whatever GPA the program providers suggest year round.
Matt W: if the student is in good academic standing maintaining a 2.0 GPA they could have access to study abroad through summer programs
Mark and John gave examples of where student feedback on the questionnaires provide useful information about programs using examples of students who went to Argentina, the students said in their evaluations the instructors weren't successful.
John: Attended session with the students in Passau about why they were unhappy with the program so evaluations have some merit. Problems are not necessarily with students with a low GPA but could be with a student who has high expectations.
Mark: The committee has been reluctant to make a decision to only allow a student to select a program based on GPA requirements. GPA isn't always a reliable indicator that a student will be successful.

Recommendations for GPA requirements:

- Program requirement with 2.5 as the default.
- Summer: if the program doesn't have a minimum we'll go with 2.5.
- If they are not able to meet the minimum GPA for programs, students have the option of taking the program for no credit transfer. "This student understands that the credit will not transfer to Puget Sound."
- Faculty led programs: the procedure can state that they have to have a minimum GPA.
  This is an issue that will have to be discussed in the criteria for faculty led programs.
  Roy pointed out that because the professor is the one who is dealing with the students, they could decide a minimum GPA if they are comfortable dealing with the exceptions
- Suggested language for faculty led programs: "Student needs to be in good academic standing" and at faculty discretion. Faculty will set criteria for programs they are leading.

Recommendations for conduct standards:
Donn provided the following overview of levels of conduct violations

- Conduct reprimand (might be caught with a beer)
- Level 1: A student can't represent the University (debate, play in a sport) unless faculty sponsor agrees to present a waiver and the hearing officer can decide if they want to waive for that activity. Level I waiver is activity specific.
- Level 2: Can't represent the University (repeat offenders, sexual misconduct, sexual harassment issues)

In the past IP would not accept an application for a student with a conduct violation. Donn felt Mike would be supportive of a student requesting a waiver for Level I conduct violations. (letter could come from Roy or a faculty member)
Historically the number of students who are prevented from studying abroad is very small

- A student should be able to apply if they are on probation or expected to be off probation by the time of their departure.
- Students should be sent notice that they must be off probation before participating in study abroad. We need to verify the SA policy states they can't go if they are on probation when they are scheduled to be abroad.

3. Program review criteria:

The IEC is charged with reviewing programs that have been on probation (most were reviewed in 2008-09

- Discussion about putting programs on a 3 year cycle. i.e.2011-12 Australia and New Zealand)
- Next meeting: Establish criteria for program review: Does the IEC want to make any revisions to the policy that Mike distributed, “Criteria for review of proposed study abroad programs”

4. Policy for limiting students able to study abroad in order to maximize the number students going abroad within the university’s financial constraints.
   It is critical to assure the policy has been well established and communicated before students plan to apply

- Discussion about criteria for limiting students.
- Roy noted the suggestions for identifying students who should have priority for study abroad (foreign language majors, majors like IPE where foreign study could be an important component of the major, if they are a senior, if they are participating in more than one program/year) haven’t really limited many students from participating
- .Subcommittee members Roy, Donn and Matt Warning might include Darcie Sak who has been involved in the discussion from SFS.
- Roy suggested we need give students responsibility for making the case to determine why they should be able to go.

Meeting adjourned 10:00 am
Sally Sprenger