

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
April 26, 2013

Present: Lisa Ferrari, Matthew Ingalls, Diane Kelley, Allyson Lindsley, Stephanie Noss, Roy Robinson, Matt Warning, Peter Wimberger

Absent: Haile Canton, Donn Marshall, Michael Johnson, John McCuiston, Tanya Stambuk

Minutes from April 12, 2013 were approved with some small changes.

Robinson had asked about approval of three new program proposals the committee has not yet addressed:

SIT Balkans - http://www.sit.edu/studyabroad/ssa_hrr.cfm

IES Turkey - <http://www.iesabroad.org/study-abroad/turkey>

CIEE Thailand - <http://www.ciee.org/study-abroad/thailand/khon-kaen/development-globalization/>

Kathleen Campbell will review these programs over the summer and we will get to this first thing in the fall.

Wimberger asked Robinson if we are getting rid of any expensive programs. Robinson said Butler cancelled the Tasmania program, so this is off the books. Noss reported that we have 38 students going just through Butler in direct-enroll programs in Australia and the UK. Robinson reported that we will easily be within budget.

Wimberger asked about proposing a rollover of funds in the study abroad budget. Dean Bartanen had reiterated that funds remaining when study abroad is under budget are not likely to rollover. A proposal will need to be put together that might have different options, such as having a percentage of the funds roll over or leaving a percentage of funds in the OIP budget to fund the creation of new faculty-led programs, etc. Warning suggested that if a surplus rolls over, so might a deficit. Ferrari asked if the hard ceiling on the budget would prevent there from being a deficit anyway. Warning said that makes sense, assuming the ceiling is a hard ceiling.

PacRim and Alcala programs both have budget rollover. Robinson elaborated that Alcala has an administrative fee that will be kept to pay for other expenses and this is what might roll over. Ferrari said that PacRim cost savings go to Study Abroad Emergency Fund. What rolls over into PacRim budget are the funds that BTF budgets for 7-8 PacRim students per year.

Report from Short-term Study Abroad Committee: Ingalls distributed handouts for the committee's consideration: "Short Term Faculty Led Study Abroad Program Guide" and "Faculty-led Program Creation Issues to Resolve" [both of these documents are appended

below]. He reported that the question of establishing a clear outline of what faculty need to do in order to create a new faculty-led study abroad program will require several more conversations with the Dean, particularly with regard to cost. Ingalls indicated that new program courses would have to go through the Curriculum Committee. Robinson said a question has come up about dividing the unit associated with a course that would have a study abroad component so that .5 units would apply to the semester, and then .5 during the summer. Wimberger asked what the difference was between this and doing one unit during the semester and then going abroad. Robinson asked how the units would be put on the books. Ferrari asked about faculty load and how this would be worked out, as well as financial aid for students, since it would be better to have the full unit in the spring for financial aid purposes. Warning also said that this might have an effect on course offerings in a department. After discussion, it did not seem that there is any benefit to having a course with .5 units in the spring and .5 in the summer. The recommendation would be that 1 unit be taken in the spring, but the add-on trip take place in the summer. Profs. Gareth Barkin and Nick Kontogeorgopolous had asked Robinson if a course could be 1 unit in the spring and an additional .5 units in the summer. Robinson suggested his office work on this over the summer. The committee encouraged him to do this. The biggest question about this charge right now is how to settle finances. The subcommittee has a draft of a timeline and steps to create a new faculty-led study abroad program. The committee suggests that a charge for next year be the following: Revise the short-term study abroad guide for faculty and develop appropriate clear guidelines or a handbook for establishing a short-term study abroad program. Jannie Meisberger had some materials, but they need to be vetted.

Report from Study Abroad Evaluation Subcommittee: Warning and Noss reported that self-reported input may be the best we can do right now because we have no good control group: students who study abroad and those who don't are very different *ex ante* in terms of majors, backgrounds and ethnic identities. Students' self-reporting of the impact that study abroad had on them may be the only assessment we can undertake. Ingalls asked if there are any questions about reflections about their experiences that require more than 5 minutes, as this kind of reflection would be appropriate. Noss said it would be fruitful to have a pre- and post-reflections. Wimberger asked, "What do we want to know?" We should identify this question and work with Office of Institutional Research to make this happen. The committee suggests that this be one of our charges next year.

Report from the Fall Event Subcommittee: Following up on the discussion from the previous meeting, Kelley indicated that in informal conversations with seniors who have studied abroad students would welcome a "welcome-back" reception but find that September is too early to ask returning students to participate in recruitment of new students for study abroad as they are too nostalgic. While the committee did not think this was a good excuse, Ingalls suggested that for this year's event we not pursue the idea of asking returning study abroad students to present their research concurrently with the Study Abroad Fair as it may be like herding cats. Robinson thought that perhaps the following year a presentation can be enforced as a requirement for

students going on programs for which research is a an important component (ie SIT). Noss reported that approximately 30 students per year participate in such programs. Robinson liked the idea of a poster session for these students to display their work. Regarding the fall welcome-back reception, the committee encourages inviting faculty of returning students. This event can also be a good forum for briefings or invitations to events such as brown-bag lunches about how to highlight study abroad experiences on a resume, adjustment back to college life, etc. It was concluded that the Office of International Programs will work on a Welcome Back event for study abroad students and their faculty, and that there will be no concurrent event this year with the Study Abroad Fair.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Kelley

APPENDED DOCUMENTS:

Short Term Faculty Led Study Abroad Program Guide

Timeline for summer 2013 Program

1. February 2012 – Attend a Program Creation Workshop – Offered by the International Programs Office – Discuss plans with Department Chair and International Programs Office
2. Spring 2012 - Seek Funding for summer 2012 site visit – Burlington Northern deadline for funds - April 1; seek departmental funds
3. Spring 2012 - Meet with International Programs Office –discuss possible site visit; site visit questions, budget needs for the program etc.
4. Summer 2012 – conduct site visit
5. September 2012 – Work with International Programs Office to setup logistics and budget for program
6. September – receive departmental approval and IEC Approval for a new study abroad program
7. September/October – receive course approval through the Curriculum committee
8. Fall 2012 – Finalize the Budget and begin marketing the program
9. February 2013 Finalize students for the program
10. April 2013 – Attend Faculty Health and Safety Workshop

Faculty-led Program Creation Issues to Resolve

The following financial and administrative issues need to be resolved in order to create a packet for faculty to follow in order to create a faculty-led program

1. Will students pay Puget Sound tuition and fees on Puget Sound faculty-led programs?
 - a. Currently when students go abroad in the summer on a non-faculty-led program they do not pay Puget Sound Tuition and Fees
2. If students on summer faculty-led programs are charged Puget Sound tuition and fees would these funds be given back go the program to be used to reduce the overall cost of the program?
 - a. Example

Summer 2013: 1 unit = \$3,790; 2 units = \$7,580

For a 1 unit program with in-country costs of \$5,000. Could the \$3,790 (tuition and fees) be used to reduce the total in-country costs to \$5,000 - \$3,790 = \$1,210

- When I created faculty-led programs at the University of Missouri the university returned 80% of the tuition to support the program
 - Some schools return 100% of the tuition in order to support these types of international activities or do not charge any tuition for faculty-led programs
3. Would the cost of the faculty salary on a faculty-led summer program be paid out of the amount of funds received by Puget Sound for the tuition and fees?

Academic Issues that still need to be resolved

1. What is the process for new program approval and course approval?
2. Is it possible for a faculty member to teach a .5 unit course (half) in the spring and then teach a .5 unit course (the 2nd half) in the summer?

Sample Budget Difference

IES Melbourne 6 weeks

June 16 - July 28

43 days

Puget Sound

10 students

Tuition = to 1.5 UPS units	\$4,320
Housing	\$1,610
Meals	not included
Health Insurance	\$120
UPS Admin Fee	\$500
Total	\$6,550

Tuition (1.5 UPS units)	\$5,685.00
Housing	\$1,610
Meals	not included
Health Insurance	\$0
Faculty Salary (\$5000 Asst Prof/10 students = \$500)	\$500
UPS Admin Fee	\$500
Total	\$8,295.00

If we take a current approved summer program and show an equivalent UPS budget our current system would make our program \$1,745 more expensive given the same housing and meal costs

We need to make our own faculty-led programs more attractive than other opportunities through program providers.

We need to make a strong argument detailing the academic importance of faculty-led programs as well as the need to make these programs financially competitive.