

January 27, 2009 International Education Committee meeting minutes

Committee members present: Tristan Burger, Lynnette Claire, Lisa Ferrari, Diane Kelley, John Lear, Donn Marshall, Jannie Meisberger, Jan Moore, Heidi Orloff, Jonathan Stockdale, Peter Wimberger. Members absent: Mei Rose.

Peter Wimberger convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Minutes

Peter noted that the correct procedure for taking minutes involves sending out a draft to the entire committee, receiving back comments and corrections, then revising and sending out again prior to the next meeting for approval at that meeting. After it has been approved by the committee it is sent to facultycoms.

The committee approved one set of outstanding minutes from last semester; one more set remains to be approved.

John asked if we could attach (“read into the minutes”) Kris Bartanen’s memo to the committee, which informed our discussion at a previous meeting last semester. Lisa said that she would ask Kris if that would be ok.

Selection Committee:

Jannie noted that the deadline for study abroad applications this spring is February 15, and since some of the students applying are below the required GPAs of their desired program, the selection committee will need to be ready for action (especially because many programs are on rolling admissions, so that the sooner applications can be submitted the better.)

The selection committee for the spring semester will consist of: Lynnette Claire, Diane Kelley, John Lear, Donn Marshall, Jannie Meisberger, and Jonathan Stockdale.

Kyoto Summer Program Approval

Discussion turned to the proposal from Mikiko Ludden, Japanese language instructor, for adding a new summer Japanese language and culture program in Kyoto (to replace the IES Tokyo program cut by the IEC last year).

- Diane wondered why it would give students one unit of credit yet not count toward fulfilling the core language requirement, and the reply was that this is actually a non-issue.
- Given that the Kyoto program issues its own transcript, Donn wondered whether the fee for that was exorbitant. (Jannie said it wasn’t).
- Donn also wondered in what sense the program was designed for students who are “unable” to do other programs, as the proposal states. Jannie replied that simply means that the program fits, for example, the requirement to study abroad for a short time for certain majors (e.g. international business; Japanese language program.)
- Lisa asked that since previously summer study abroad was understood to require a minimum of six weeks of study [“university “approved” or “affiliated” summer study

abroad programs should be at least six weeks in length”], would we be approving this program only as a kind of anomaly (rather than setting a precedent for shorter term study abroad)?

- Peter mentioned that in the past we’ve had four-week programs as long as the number of hours was similar to a six-week program.

- Lisa wished the minutes to record that we’re not so making a new precedent, but rather that by approving this four-week Kyoto summer program we’re stating that it is one of the exceptions noted as a possibility in earlier decisions made by the curriculum committee [which state: “in evaluating programs fewer than 6 weeks in length, the Curriculum Committee will also give due consideration to the challenges of assimilating course material in a shorter time.” – Curriculum Committee 10/20/2004]

The proposed KICL Kyoto summer study abroad program was voted on and unanimously approved.

Committee Agenda for Spring Semester

In reviewing some of the committee’s activities from last semester, Peter noted that program approval was a major task of the committee last semester, and that toward the end of the semester Kris Bartanen met with the committee to check in on how the IEC was dealing with the recommendations proposed by the Study Abroad Working Group (SAWG).

Lisa mentioned that at a recent cabinet meeting, it looks like the cabinet is moving toward embracing a “one financial model system” for all study abroad programs (i.e., eliminating the distinctions between partner and approved programs). Lisa noted that George Mills has expressed a desire to know what model that would be prior to sending out student aid letters in the spring, which means that a possible deadline for that decision could come as early as the middle of March. Lisa noted that moving to a “one financial model system” for study abroad would mean either that all programs have the status of “approved,” meaning that program tuition fees, etc. would be paid directly to that study abroad provider by the student, or that all programs would be moved to the status of “partner,” meaning that students would pay their ordinary tuition to UPS, and that UPS would then pay the tuition fees, etc. to the provider.

Lynnette asked whether the cabinet desires our input; Lisa said “yes.” However, Lisa mentioned that the direction that cabinet was going looked like it was trending toward moving all programs to “partner” status, partly in consideration of the UPS tuition revenue that would be lost if we switched to all “approved.”

Lynnette asked, assuming that we have 300 students going abroad each year, what the real cost difference would be between the two models, at which point Diane mentioned that if the cabinet would like our input, we can’t really give it in any intelligent way without having access to the necessary data. John mentioned that earlier the Study Abroad Working Group had been moving toward a different model, and with this seeming

reversal—in the context of an impending deadline for such a decision—it’s both frustrating and difficult to know what to advise, especially without the necessary financial data.

Jannie mentioned that March 6 is the date around which the program review of International Programs will happen, which she noted might yield dramatic suggestions for changes that need to take place. She also mentioned that some of the actors involved in the decision-making (including the cabinet and financial services) continue to use outdated language regarding study abroad (e.g. the older terminology of “affiliated” programs) and Don’t always seem as up-to-date on the situation as they might be, so that she hoped that the re-accreditation review might yield some useful clarity for those outside International Programs.

Jan noted that SAWG’s recommendations were proposed 1.5 years ago, and much has changed since then, not least of which is the economic climate. Heidi mentioned that a move to a one-model system might lead to greater clarity regarding study abroad programs, and noted that the UK programs approval would be completed in two weeks.

Looking Ahead

In future meetings, Peter proposed that we will need to turn our attention also to the IEC mission statement, the issue of GPA requirements, and the pricing model mentioned in Kris’ memo.

John wondered whether we should turn our attention, once all of the above is completed, back to the completed reviews of all programs and see if we have any adjustments to make? Lynnette responded that first we should clearly map out what students are studying abroad where and which majors are being served.

Heidi mentioned that the overall program review process has resulted in adding nearly as many programs as we removed, so that the net reduction is slight at best [though most of the additions have been summer programs, it was noted]. She asked Jannie and Jan whether the process was serving the International Program’s needs? Jan replied that it’s certainly removed some of the clutter and the stuff that gets in the way, but that perhaps the biggest single service the IEC could give to IP would be to set a May deadline for studying abroad the following spring. That way students could get their applications in before leaving for the summer and then could turn their attention to pre-departure issues during the fall.

Peter directed the minutes to note the addition of a new agenda item: application deadlines. He also asked whether the curriculum committee is the one that sets such deadlines, and concluded by saying that if we can’t make the new deadline, at least we could propose it to the proper authorities.

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jonathan Stockdale