

Minutes

International Education Committee

October 2, 2009

8am

Committee members present: Gareth Barkin, Lisa Ferrari, Mark Harpring, Diane Kelley, John Lear, Janet Marcavage, Donn Marshall, Jan Moore, Jannie Meisberger, Mei Rose, Don Share, Peter Wimberger.

Minutes from September 18 – M/S/P with changes added

Mark began a discussion regarding the charges that have been prioritized.

Senate Charge A: Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by university faculty. Reevaluate programs placed on probation.

Pac Rim Program

We now have a report for the Pac Rim program, which is the only program not yet evaluated. Jan reported that students will turn in their completed materials for this program by next Friday. The materials will be available for review after fall break. Gareth, Mei and Diane volunteered to serve on the subcommittee, which will review this program.

Study Abroad Course Evaluation form

A discussion regarding the Study Abroad Course Evaluation form, which no longer requires an advisor's signature continued. Previously Kathleen Campbell received a hard copy of this form to process, which took up a great deal of her time. The Registrar has recently put all of their forms online. The new form does not require an advisor signature. Jannie pointed out that students still have a form that they sign indicating the date when they have met with their advisor to **discuss their study abroad courses and plans.**

Questions raised by Mark:

Are we fine with this new system?

Are students abusing this?

Jannie pointed out that the change to the online form was made due to sustainability and limited staff resources. The decision to do this came out of the registrar's office. Don pointed out that it is the responsibility of students to meet with their advisor. Tightening up too much can be counterproductive. Donn pointed out that if this system is abused, it could be an academic dishonesty concern. Gareth suggested the possibility of an online form on Cascade. Several members of the committee were in agreement that if it was not too much work for the registrar's office, this could be a good solution.

Jannie mentioned that after Kathleen evaluates course, the student and Kathleen signs the form.

Diane asked if paper is better, or an email to prove that students have met with their advisor and the courses were approved. Gareth mentioned that the current system has freed up Kathleen's time, without having to process each form by hand. Peter pointed out that some of the faculty in the Foreign Languages Department has some concern with the new system.

Don mentioned that he gives suggestions to students to have more courses evaluated than what they bring to him for study abroad. Diane pointed out that if a student "messes up", they could need to do an independent study in order to get their requirements met.

Lisa asked if this could be solved at the departmental level? Can something be built in? Gareth had some students that thought that they were getting study abroad credit that did not. He said that the form could help.

The committee was in agreement that we should ask the registrar about the online form in Cascade, where an advisor could click to okay that they have met with the student.

Donn stated that the form is presently emailed and printed out. Lisa mentioned that this could be emailed to the advisor.

An add code was brought up, which would be another way to help out the responsibility on the student.

John Lear said that one of his students did not get credit from course abroad, and ended up switching his major due to this. The student corresponded via email during the summer, but there was not a physical meeting. The committee felt that is example further reified requesting something on Cascade.

Senate Charge B:

Evaluate offerings from a global and disciplinary perspective with an eye to providing coverage in geographic and disciplinary areas that are currently not represented or are underrepresented. Consult with departments to find out if there are programs that they think we should have, or have additional insights about programs we have that they don't think we should keep.

Mark brought up consulting departments to see where they have gaps in their study abroad coverage. Mark brought along a copy from the website with a listing of all of the departments.

How do we want to proceed? Mark raised the idea of forming a subcommittee that could formulate questions to be sent to departments. Then, members of the full committee could divvy up the departments and contact them with the questions. A few people on the subcommittee would work on the questions that would go out.

Donn asked if we are seeking to know there were adequate options in areas worldwide?

Gareth stated that there are primarily discipline-based needs.

Peter mentioned that a strong study abroad program in Buenos Aires was ~~added~~ which will benefit Spanish and Theatre double majors.' The program will not begin until fall 2010. There is a combination of geographic and discipline needs. Double majors will raise different questions that we can find out from questions directed at individual departments.

Lisa asked, Does it make sense to say what experiences are important for your students to have in study abroad? For example, some departments may prefer history or technical workshops. Also, another question to consider is, what opportunities are good?

Peter stated additional questions: Is there something that is missing that would benefit students? (This will probably be the big question) What don't we need? What is your wish list? Diane brought up, Are we the unable to add programs? A wish list may be problematic. Don proposed another question, Are there needs that are not getting met?

Peter stated that in the sciences, some "wish" programs do not exist. Diane thought that it would be nice if departments could suggest specific programs. Peter and Mark volunteered to be on a subcommittee to work on a set of questions to present to the committee.

Senate Charge G. Decide whether to maintain or end the moratorium on adding new semester programs.

Mark stated that the moratorium has been in place for two full years now. The program reviews are nearly done, so now is a good time to look at the moratorium. We don't want to have to re-do this work. Peter posed a question to consider, "What are student needs and interests?" We should take into consideration travel warnings. We can talk about what we want but are limited by the moratorium. The avalanche of programs moved from partner to approved was part of the initial reason for the moratorium.

Lisa stated that we don't know what the future holds for programs. There is a very real possibility that the number of programs will need to be pared back. Donn mentioned how we are the quality-control gatekeepers and asked how can we have quality control without limiting programs?

Jannie posed, Should programs only be proposed by faculty? We don't want the SA office to be inundated. It takes at least 4 months to approve programs. Peter noted that with the current process, students have to have faculty support.

Jannie said that currently students are expected to meet with the advisor and faculty with expertise in the relevant area. A proposal comes from faculty approval, then goes to the IEC and Kathleen. Diane stated that we might ask the departments, what is important to you? Also, What the programs does this complement?

Jan brought up how a department will have a more overall view than a student in proposing programs. New programs can emerge from faculty. Mark stated that proposals coming from departments would help the IEC know if we need special programs. Jannie has questions for the current process that will be emailed out to everyone on the committee.

John Lear gave a word of caution: Ten years ago many students were upset that they couldn't add programs. Although reducing programs created much work, we want to try to find a balance with introducing new programs. We want to make sure that innovative programs are introduced and that we support our best students. We do not have current figures on certain programs being used. We want to accommodate students a bit outside of the box.

Jannie offered Kathleen Campbell's suggestion of having a 3-year probationary period to gather feedback from those who went on the program. Mark added that outstanding students have some valid reasons for going to programs not listed. Peter said that students are like scout ants, then faculty can approve.

Jan has some data from enrolled programs. Jannie stated that we have how many majors in certain disciplines went to certain programs. Jan said that the list by first major is bit skewed, when considering minors and double-majors. She has a spreadsheet from the past five years and has offered to pull this together for the committee.

Don suggested that we hold off on a moratorium vote. Lisa said that some programs will need to be pared back due to not knowing what finances will look like for the next few years, in addition to the effects of a large class coming in. It will take time to assess this. Jannie said that in February 2010 we will have a better sense of **finances for the following year (2010 -2011)**.

Lisa mentioned that gradually students will be in the new study abroad system and this also contributes to how budget concerns pan out. Mark said that last year we revisited all programs. Do we add one and take one away? In Australia, we had many programs, but now only 5 or 6.

Diane stated that the data from departments would help us to better manage study abroad additions and subtractions. Mark mentioned putting in a provision for exceptional students. Jannie suggested that we run a parallel list for the exceptional students. It doesn't need to be publicized but could be available in the study abroad office or in particular departments.

The meeting was adjourned 9:00

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Marcavage