

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 6, 2003

Senators Present: Paul Loeb, Karen Porter, David Tinsley, Kris Bartanen, Sue Hannaford, Bill Haltom, Terry Cooney, Darrell Frost, Alyce DeMarais, Julian Edgoose, Robin Foster, Sarah Parker, Barry Anton, Keith Maxwell, Bill Beardsley.

Visitors Present: Associate Dean Bill Barry, Peter Wimberger.

Senate Chair Bill Beardsley called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

On behalf of Senator Orlin (who was absent in observance of Yom Kippur), Senate Secretary Tinsley asked for approval of the minutes for the September 22 meeting. The minutes were approved without amendment.

The Chair noted that President Ron Thomas will visit the Senate on December 1.

The Chair also noted that the next Senate meeting would be held on November 3.

The Chair introduced Senator Darrell Frost, President of ASUPS, who announced that the ASUPS Centennial Banquet would be held next Tuesday evening. All faculty and staff are invited, and can email Senator Frost at asupspres@ups.edu.

Special Orders:

Senator Tinsley invited everyone to attend tomorrow's 5 pm lecture on Ian McEwan by Günther Jarfe, our current Passau Exchange Scholar. He also invited applicants for the Passau Exchange program (noting that one did not have to be a German speaker).

Old Business:

The Chair turned the Senate's attention toward the final report by the Study Abroad Task Force (SATF). He noted that Senator Orlin, who could not be present today, is especially interested in this issue, so no substantial vote or action would be taken on it until the Senate's next meeting.

The Chair then turned the floor over to the SATF Chair Peter Wimberger, who directed the Senate's attention to their final report (see attached file).

Peter Wimberger noted that the SATF had gathered information in the Fall and deliberated on recommendations in the Spring. He also noted that their most substantial recommendation, one that addresses all the others, is their last one (p. 12, #9): to revise the Student Selection Process if the Interim Study Abroad Committee (ISAC) is formed (see Appendix E, pp. 20-21). Senator Tinsley asked if this recommendation would mean disbanding the current Student Selection Committee and replacing it with the ISAC. Peter Wimberger replied that it would.

Senator Porter asked who was in charge of the current review process, and Bill Barry replied that it was the Curriculum Committee (CC), Academic Standards Committee (ASC), and the SATF. He noted that the CC could take over once it is finished with its discussion of the core, but that the SATF felt that there was enough work to merit an independent committee.

The Chair asked whether time was the only reason the CC could not do this, or was it because the CC should not select students. Peter Wimberger replied that it was a time issue, but that there could be a subcommittee of the CC appointed for this.

The Chair asked if the problem with the CC selecting students is that an action of a standing committee could be overruled by the Senate. Senator Edgoose noted that this was already the case for the University Enrichment Committee and the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Senator Edgoose asked who is on the Selection Committee now, and Senator Tinsley replied that four faculty, the Study Abroad Director, and the Associate Dean of Students are now on it. Peter Wimberger listed the SATF recommendation for the new ISAC (see Appendix E, p. 20, # 1).

Senator Anton asked what percentage of applicants is denied, and Peter Wimberger replied that it depends on the program. Dean Cooney added that some study abroad programs are not ours.

Senator Porter asked why there was a transparency requirement, and Peter Wimberger replied that it was about accountability. Bill Barry added that students might lobby selection members. Also, he said, all other committees are not confidential, so why should this one be?

Senator Tinsley said that the Study Abroad Program had expanded greatly in the last 20 years, and many of the programs are no longer tied to language and culture. Twenty years ago, he said, the programs were administered by individual faculty members. He added that the SATF recommendation is a move to administer the programs more broadly within the university, and that this is a judicious change.

Senator Foster asked whether the proposed ISAC would eventually be a CC subcommittee or a separate standing committee. Peter Wimberger replied that they had left this to the Faculty Senate to decide. He added that a standing committee might be too hasty and require a changing of the by-laws, so the SATF recommended an adaptive committee for now that could be disbanded later. Senator Edgoose noted that the transfer of power would also involve the ASC, and Peter Wimberger added, the Dean's office too.

Senator Tinsley asked whether the proposed ISAC Committee needed all this structure, or whether it might be smaller and more efficient, and Peter Wimberger explained why each component of the committee was indeed needed: 4-6 faculty to represent FLIA and other disciplines (with some on leave), 2 students as a reasonable number, the Dean and Dean of Students both need to be involved, and of course the Director of International Studies. Bill Barry added that the six members might break up into two subcommittees of three so as to lighten the load. He added that the committee's decisions would have a lot of implications for the CC, so that the committee would have a much bigger responsibility.

Peter Wimberger returned to his review of the SATF summary of recommendations (Appendix E, p. 12). He focused in particular on recommendation #6, and our current distinction between "approved" and "affiliated" programs. The former involves direct program costs, no UPS tuition, no eligibility for UPS financial aid, no residency credit, and eligibility for state and federal aid. The latter involves UPS tuition and financial aid, as well as state and federal aid, and residency credit. He noted that there was currently some tension around this distinction among students and parents, especially because some students go with affiliated programs that requires small program costs but large UPS tuition costs. The two-tier system was set up several years ago by the administration so as to maximize the opportunities for students to study abroad: either pay UPS tuition and get UPS aid, or don't pay UPS tuition and don't get UPS aid. Peter Wimberger reported that the SATF was undecided about this system, and that it seems to work pretty well with the university breaking even financially. But student surveys record complaints about financial reasons for not going on study abroad. He wondered whether we should have a scholarship funds pool.

Senator Foster noted that the two financial options are linked to particular programs, so that there is often no option at all if one wants one program.

Dean Cooney noted that there are some "approved" programs where the cost is very high, sometimes even more than UPS tuition. So the two-tier system was an effort in the early 90's to

have a common fee (=UPS tuition) that would exclude disparities with respect to geographical settings.

Dean Cooney added that, although UPS breaks even, the increase in study abroad shows up as added cost because of overhead and students not paying tuition. He estimated \$100,000 a year is lost. Senator Anton remarked that study abroad reduces class size, to which Dean Cooney replied that study abroad almost always happens at the upper-level, and so it doesn't make much difference to class size.

Senator Anton remarked that for those students requiring no financial aid who enroll in programs that cost less, this is a financial benefit to UPS. Bill Barry replied that it is and that parents seem to understand this once it is explained to them, e.g. ILACA London has no financial aid and students pay UPS tuition. The financial benefits of this practice accrue to study abroad as a whole.

Peter Wimberger remarked that, ideally, students should have a choice about financial aid. The other issue, he said, is budgeting, if projected study abroad goes into budget planning. It is unfortunate, he added, that study abroad is a cost to the university.

Dean Cooney replied that study abroad is not a cost, but a deliberate choice on spending (just like departments are chosen for their contributions to our overall educational mission).

Peter Wimberger then pointed out the current requirement that residency credit is granted for "affiliated" programs only, and not "approved" programs. This requirement restricts seniors to affiliated programs, who then petition and usually get residency credit. The SATF therefore recommends granting residency credit to both sorts of programs (p. 12, #6).

Senator Foster asked whether we should rephrase this motion with Jack Roundy's approval. The Chair added, or to the ISAC? Dean Cooney replied that we can't go to the ISAC, but have to go to a standing committee if we want to enact and not just review. Senator Tinsley remarked that for some programs, affiliated is in direct competition with approved, and that if issue becomes one of cost, there will be a big impact on affiliated programs (some will die). He added that this may be good, but what if we know that some of these programs are academically superior? Peter Wimberger asked if he was referring to internally affiliated programs.

Bill Barry asked a question about loosening up residence credit to include both approved and affiliated programs: since it will be easier to go abroad and away from UPS, does this loosen up on senior major requirements (curriculum, etc)? Dean Cooney replied that the 16 units of residency includes the final 8, and that this goes back to the expectation of a senior year on campus. Peter Wimberger added that medical school applicants might benefit from a senior year abroad since their first three years involve pre-requisites.

Senator DeMarais noted that the SATF recommendation for a six-week minimum for summer study abroad programs (p. 12, #8) is already being discussed by the ASC, so perhaps the Senate should give this to them.

Peter Wimberger concluded his report by noting that Stuart Smithers should have been included on the cover letter as a member of the SATF.

Invoking Aristotle's doctrine of the four causes, the Chair then proposed that the Senate should consider four questions: 1) Existence: Should the ISAC exist? 2) Form: Should the ISAC be standing or a CC subcommittee? 3) Matter: Who should constitute the ISAC? 4) Telos: What should be the purpose and duties of the ISAC? Senator Loeb endorsed these questions and noted the extraordinary clarity that philosophy can bring to these kinds of discussions. The Chair suggested that we link the first three questions and consider motions to institute the committee, its constitution, etc.

Discussion ensued: Senator Edgoose wondered whether we could have one committee serve two standing subcommittees, and Dean Cooney replied that there are joint committees on certain topics, but not joint ongoing committees. He then asked the drafters of the report whether the Senate should approve certain points, or was the goal to send these to the Curriculum Committee? Bill Barry replied that #1 and #4 on the p. 12 summary were deemed by the SATF good work and complete, but that the rest raised good questions and were left for others to decide. The Chair inquired whether two of the recommendations were therefore separate, and Bill Barry replied that the mission and the criteria do sit outside. Dean Cooney commented that the CC needs to give formal approval, so this makes sense. Commenting on # 9 on the p. 12 summary, Bill Barry remarked that the current revision is in operation (see Appendix E), and that this could also need Senate action outside the committee. The Chair noted that #1, #4 and Appendix E are therefore part of the revision of the constitution.

There was no further discussion on this issue, so the Chair asked the Senators to come to the next meeting (November 3) with written motions.

The Chair then introduced the next issue for discussion, namely, possible topics for discussion with President Ron Thomas on December 1. He said that OT/PT will likely come up as a topic, and the Senate may want to use that meeting to consult officially on this issue. There was a brief discussion as to whether the Senate should discuss this issue now, and it was agreed to wait.

Senator Edgoose proposed as a topic for discussion the system for evaluating the Dean. Senator Anton wondered if there were any updates from the Fall Faculty Conversation President Thomas might want to discuss with us. Dean Cooney added that there are questions regarding the profile of the university (such as admission) and its relationship to the community that the President might want to discuss with the Senate. Senator Loeb proposed the topics of open and closed files, as well as the topic of the President's approach to faculty evaluation. Senator Haltom proposed the topic of corporate culture at the university and its potential to squeeze out academic and intellectual culture. Finally, Senator Loeb proposed the topic of the President's future administrative organization.

New Business:

Senator Frost announced the ASUPS idea of "Senate swapping," designed to improve connections among different campus constituencies, wherein representatives from each senate (students, faculty, staff) get to vote on each of the other senates. He noted that this was not yet a formal proposal, since there was still a lot to do.

The Chair commented that the idea would require reciprocal changes in the faculty and staff by-laws. Senator Haltom wondered what conditions would be needed to achieve meetings like this, especially since staff don't have that much flexibility in their schedules. Dean Cooney replied that a fair portion of the staff don't work in the afternoon and need a supervisor's permission to go (especially if an office would close if only one person is there). Senator Bartanen commented that the question has already arisen on the Diversity Committee, and Dean Cooney wondered if we might not be creating too many faculty governance demands. The Chair noted that these points mostly concerned issues of mechanics and wondered (as Aristotle often did) whether there were any philosophical objections. Senator Maxwell asked whether the votes would include all issues, to which Senator Haltom replied that there could be recusals and abstaining on certain issues. The Chair asked whether the Faculty Senate would insist on having a representative on the Staff Senate, to which Senator Haltom replied no. The Chair concluded this discussion by suggesting that a senator formulate a specific by-law amendment.

Senator Foster reported on a couple of proposals being discussed by the Salary Committee: (a) adding a step at the top of the pay scale for those faculty who have completed all their steps and still have 10-15 years to go. (b) including a fixed minimum cost of living increase during times of economic difficulty.

There being no further business, Senator Haltom **M/S/P** a motion to adjourn at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Loeb

Date: April 18, 2003
To: Faculty Senate
From: Study Abroad Task Force
Subject: Final Report

At its March 25, 2002 meeting, the Faculty Senate established a task force to examine the study abroad program at the University of Puget Sound. The Senate appointed to serve on this task force Peter Wimberger (Chair), Stuart Smithers, Tom Rowland, Michel Rocchi, Walter Lowrie, John Lear, Karl Fields, and Bill Barry. The Senate charged the Study Abroad Task Force (SATF) to confer with various interested parties, to review current study abroad policies, and to submit findings and recommendations to the Senate by April 2003. (For the specific charges to the SATF, please see the attached, Appendix A.) Herewith is the final report of the SATF.

Sincerely,

Study Abroad Task Force
(Bill Barry, Karl Fields, John Lear, Walter Lowrie, Michel Rocchi, Tom Rowland,
Peter Wimberger, chair)

The SATF Process: The SATF dedicated its meetings last year and at the beginning of this year to reviewing current policies and to devising a student survey on study abroad (see attached, Appendix B). Towards the end of last semester and in the first part of this semester, the SATF then met with various interested faculty and staff, including current and former directors of UPS or UPS-affiliated study abroad programs, members of the Study Abroad Selection Committee, and the Director of International Programs. The SATF also held an open meeting on study abroad for all interested faculty. On behalf of the SATF, the Associate Dean met individually with the Registrar, the Associate Vice President for Finance, and the Dean and Associate Dean of Students to discuss specific issues around student selection and financing study abroad.

By the end of February, the SATF had completed the data-gathering phase and began to develop recommendations. The SATF has already recommended a few minor changes in study abroad processes and these changes have been instituted by the appropriate bodies (discussed below). If the Senate believes that the SATF was premature in advocating immediate changes to policies and procedures, the changes themselves can be reversed.

Below is a specific discussion of the SATF's findings and recommendations. By far the most significant of these recommendations is the creation of an Interim Study Abroad Committee to review and modify further study abroad policies and to provide oversight of specific program approval and student selection. The SATF anticipates further consideration and implementation of many of its recommendations to occur—initially, at least—in the context of this new Interim Committee. At the end of a three-year trial run, we request the Faculty Senate to consider whether to create a permanent standing committee on study abroad. The rationale for the establishment of this committee and its structure, charges, and authority are discussed in Point I below.

Findings and Recommendations:

- A) **Mission Statement:** The current mission statement for Puget Sound study abroad programs dates to 1986 and represents a slight modification of the mission statement adopted by the Senate in 1978 (see attached, Appendix C). Both the 1978 and 1986 mission statements assert “the value of study abroad lies chiefly in the exposure of students to cultural patterns and values different from their own.” The SATF believes that “culture” should be interpreted broadly to include political, economic, artistic and other facets of cultural diversity. Based on conversations with faculty, and given the wide array of excellent study abroad programs, the SATF believes that sole emphasis on the cultural experience for students studying abroad may unduly limit the addition of study abroad programs to the Puget Sound list. In

particular, some concern was raised that such an emphasis may make it more difficult to add science study abroad programs where the primary academic emphasis is the study not of culture but of nature. The emphasis on the encounter with another culture may also provide grounds for denying approval of a program should it not have, for example, a homestay residential experience or should the host country limit student freedom of movement and thus limit direct contact with the host culture. To avoid such potential obstructions to program approval and in the firm belief that extended stay in a foreign culture will *ipso facto* involve significant contact with that foreign culture, the SATF recommends modifying the mission statement to be more inclusive, in particular by balancing the emphasis on cultural experience with an emphasis on enrichment of academic study. The relevant new language would read: “The value of a study abroad program lies in the exposure of our students to cultural patterns and values different from their own and in opportunities to enrich and enhance academic study.” (For the full text of past mission statements and the proposed revised mission statement, see Appendix C.)

- B) Range of Program Opportunities:** The University of Puget Sound offers 35 “affiliated” programs, 97 “approved” programs for a total of 132 programs (for a discussion of the terms “affiliated” and “approved,” see below, Point D). Students can study at 90 different sites in 50 different countries. Not surprisingly, in the survey question asking why students chose not to participate in study abroad, few indicated a lack of choices or opportunities. Many mentioned, however, that they chose not to study abroad because of the “constraints of their major” and some students and faculty have commented that certain regions of the world are underrepresented (Africa and Latin America). These comments suggest that the University still needs to explore the addition of programs that serve underrepresented majors (perhaps especially in math and the sciences, as some students commented) and that contribute to the sociocultural/geographical diversity of opportunities. We recommend that the new Interim Study Abroad Committee treat these two concerns as a high priority for further consideration.

In general, the SATF found that the range of study abroad programs offered by the University of Puget Sound to be impressive and the SATF commends the Office of International Programs for supporting so many study abroad opportunities for Puget Sound students.

- C) Criteria for the selection of study abroad programs:** The criteria for the selection of study abroad programs have been modified several times over the last twenty-five years. The criteria address issues of host faculty expertise, cost, immersion in the host culture, and academic rigor of the study abroad

program. The SATF recommends modifications of the criteria in accord with the revision of the mission statement discussed above and to encourage the addition of programs to study in areas and disciplines under-represented. (For past and current criteria and recommended modifications, please see Appendix D.) In particular, the SATF recommends limitation of the “non-competitive” clause such that it apply only to UPS “sponsored” programs and exchange programs, which UPS has an obligation to promote. In the spirit of the revised mission statement and based on concerns raised above about the range of programs, we also have deleted the requirement that a study abroad program “must clearly use the locale to enhance instruction.” Such a requirement could be used as grounds for denying approval of programs that might make it easier for students in particular majors to study abroad (e.g., attendance at a foreign university with strong Biology courses that do not necessarily take advantage of the “locale”). Finally, the SATF requests the Curriculum Committee or Interim Study Abroad Committee to reconsider the six-week minimum for summer programs and to explore the possibility of granting one-time only approval for programs. Academically intense shorter courses may warrant granting University credit.

- D) **Financial Structure and Classification of Programs:** Puget Sound study abroad programs are currently organized into two separate groups: “affiliated” and “approved.” The primary distinction between these two groups is financial/budgetary. Students participating in “affiliated” programs pay UPS tuition and are eligible for federal, state, and UPS financial aid. To mark the closer affiliation between UPS and these study abroad programs, students also receive residency credit. Typically, the University tends to have a closer relationship with and a voice in curriculum development of “affiliated” programs. Such involvement is not always the case. Indeed, the group of “affiliated” programs includes Pac Rim, ILACA, and Dijon, all formally sponsored by Puget Sound; IES programs, which are sponsored by a separate entity, but in which Puget Sound plays an increasingly important role in curriculum development; and the Universities of Durham and Lancaster, over which Puget Sound has little, if any, influence in directly shaping the study abroad experience for our students. Puget Sound pays the program costs for students on “affiliated” programs. All “affiliated” programs are ultimately reviewed and approved directly by the Curriculum Committee.

Students attending “approved” programs pay direct program costs to the sponsoring organization (i.e., they pay nothing to the University) and are eligible only for federal and state financial aid (i.e., they do not receive Puget Sound financial aid). Students do not receive residency credit on “approved” programs unless they petition to receive it (such petitions occur typically for the senior year; see below, Point E). The University has no direct influence

on the shape of these programs. The Associate Dean reviews and approves these programs on behalf of the Curriculum Committee.

The distinction between “affiliated” and “approved” has, to date, largely been maintained to provide two distinctly different payment options for the students (i.e. UPS tuition/UPS financial aid vs. direct program costs/no UPS aid). In an effort to maximize those opportunities, the number of “affiliated” programs was significantly increased in the early nineties (in particular, IES programs were designated as “affiliated” programs).

According to Sherry Mondou, the Associate Vice President for Finance, the University effectively breaks even in this budget arrangement. Although the University receives full tuition from students participating on affiliated programs, on average about 75% of that tuition goes directly to program costs and about 25% goes to financial aid for these students. Obviously, the University receives no tuition from students studying on approved programs.

The challenge to the University comes in ensuring that its budget plan reflects an accurate number of students studying abroad. Students studying abroad have, in fact, increased significantly over the last decade to a total of 267 students this year. These on-going students do not bring revenue to home campus operations for a semester or year of their career at Puget Sound (i.e. on “affiliated” programs, students pay 100% of tuition, but then about 100% of that tuition is paid out in program costs and financial aid; on “approved” programs, students interrupt tuition payments by, in effect, taking a leave of absence to attend a study abroad program). To better plan the institutional budget, the University needs to try to anticipate as realistically as possible the number of students who will study abroad. For budgetary reasons, some institutions have imposed some variation of a cap on the number of students who study abroad (e.g. actually limiting the number of students who may study abroad or permitting students to study abroad for only a semester). The SATF is pleased to note that the University has not had to follow this path: no limit on students studying abroad has been established, new programs that might attract more students to study abroad have been approved, and the BTF has recommended and the Trustees have approved substantial increases to the academic budget to support the increasing numbers of students studying abroad.

The SATF endorses the “affiliated/approved” financial structure for study abroad programs, while at the same time recognizing that embedded in the system are various tensions. In particular, a student may pay \$12,000 in UPS tuition to participate on an “affiliated” program for which the direct cost to the University is only \$7000. Students (and parents) will occasionally note

with varying degrees of politeness during or after participation in the program that UPS is “profiting” from such differential pricing and that the scheme the University has devised is unfair. In addition, despite the two different payment options, some students noted on the survey that they chose not to study abroad because of the costs involved. Most probably these student comments refer to the extra costs of airfare and of acquiring appropriate visas.

In the best of all possible worlds, the University of Puget Sound would charge all its study abroad students only direct program costs, would be able to provide Puget Sound financial aid to all study abroad students with financial need, and would cover extra costs such as airfare and acquiring visas. Some institutions with billion-dollar endowments and less dependent than UPS on tuition for financial aid are in fact able to come very close to this ideal. Under the current budgetary circumstances of the University of Puget Sound, however, such an arrangement doesn’t seem feasible.

The SATF is largely untroubled by the “fairness” question. The financial distinction between the two types of programs is well-advertised in the OIP and in the *Logger*, thus giving students an opportunity to make an informed choice. It is true that money from a student on one study abroad program may in some sense subsidize a student participating on another study abroad program—much as the tuition dollars of English majors (relatively cheap students) subsidize the education of Biology or Chemistry majors (relatively expensive students). As noted above, the study abroad program as a whole does not make money for the University. At the risk of opening another can of worms, when operating costs of the Office of International Programs itself are taken into consideration, it is probably the case that on-campus students as a whole subsidize study abroad students as a whole.

The SATF is more troubled by student concerns about the costs of studying abroad. Although recognizing that the University’s options may be limited, the SATF recommends that the Interim Study Abroad Committee explore the creation of a pool of scholarship funds to help students meet the extra costs of studying abroad.

Finally, in the context of budgeting for study abroad, the SATF offers two other suggestions. It might be useful for responding to parents and students unhappy about the “pricing” arrangement to illustrate the budgetary implications of charging only direct costs if students were able to choose whether to pay UPS tuition and receive UPS financial aid, or pay only the program costs while forgoing UPS financial aid when attending affiliated programs. The SATF respectfully requests Financial Services to consider the

budgetary implications of allowing students to choose an “affiliated” or “approved” option for any given program. Finally, the SATF encourages the Director of OIP and the Associate Dean to continue working to clarify for students the differences between “affiliated” and “approved” programs and our reasons for having such a structure in place.

- E) **Residency Credit:** As noted above, one of the distinctions between “affiliated” programs and “approved” programs is the granting of residency credit to the former and not the latter except by petition. The SATF believes that the distinction is largely artificial. Some “affiliated” programs are as immune to Puget Sound input on curriculum and program as any of the “approved” programs, so residency credit in this context does not necessarily reflect the existence of a closer academic relationship between the University and the study abroad program in question. In addition, under the current rules, to receive residency credit for an “approved” program, a student must have earned 16 units in residence at Puget Sound and must demonstrate that the selected study abroad program is “an extension of the student’s undergraduate studies, involving courses in, or closely related to, areas of demonstrated curricular interest.” Most students are able to meet both of these standards and most petitions are granted; the current threshold for meeting the standard is low. Finally, though the student earns residency credit for “affiliated” programs, the courses from most “affiliated” programs are not treated as UPS courses: they do not, for example, appear on the UPS transcript and the GPA from these courses is not calculated into the student’s UPS GPA (the exceptions are those programs directly sponsored by UPS: PacRim, ILACA, Dijon). The primary benefit of the designation of residency credit is to permit seniors to study abroad without concern for the graduation requirement that their last 8 units be in residence.

The SATF recommends that the Interim Committee seriously consider granting residency credit to all “approved” and “affiliated” study abroad programs. Doing so would erase an artificial distinction and ensure that students focus on the key financial distinction between “affiliated” and “approved.” Elimination of this distinction might also make it marginally easier for some students to study abroad, especially seniors. Granting residency credit to all study abroad programs also signals to students the University’s endorsement of study abroad as an enriching experience. In the case of seniors wishing to study abroad, the SATF recommends retaining the requirement that they show 16 units in residence.

We make this only a recommendation-to-consider since converting to an “all-residency credit” system is not wholly unproblematic. Will such a system increase the number of students participating on “approved” as opposed to

“affiliated” programs and thus adversely affect the budget? Will such a system subvert senior major requirements? Does granting residency credit to current approved programs require closer scrutiny of those programs (see below under the new committee structure)? The SATF recommends the conversion of all programs to residency status, but also recognizes that such may come with some costs. One option for implementing this recommendation would be to initiate a two or three year trial period during which all programs receive residency credit. The impact of this change on the number of students studying abroad could then be assessed and a final decision made.

- F) **Student Selection Committee Composition and Practice:** One of the outstanding issues as the SATF began its deliberations concerned the Selection Committee charged with reviewing and approving student applicants for Puget Sound “affiliated” programs. (For “affiliated” program, students apply through the University of Puget Sound. For “approved” programs, students apply directly to the study abroad program.) The core issue concerned the role of the directors on the committee and whether (a) they should be able to vote on the committee and (b) whether they should be present during a vote of the committee. The SATF discussed revisions to the current practice with members of the current Selection Committee (a member of the SATF is on the current Selection Committee), with current and former directors of UPS programs, and with the Director of the Office of International Programs. Consensus emerged quickly around a proposal that the directors remain in the room when a vote is taken so as to continue to participate in the consultative process, but that they not vote in the final selection process. Given the clear consensus around this proposal, the guidelines for the Selection Committee practice were revised accordingly and were implemented immediately. The SATF endorses the current revised guidelines (the revised guidelines are attached as Appendix E.); however, we recognize that if the Interim Study Abroad Committee is formed and our other recommendations are accepted the guidelines will have to be changed to reflect the new structure.

A separate issue that arose from discussions earlier this year about lightening the administrative burden for faculty, the Selection Committee itself proposed to the SATF a streamlining of the selection procedure such that the Director of OIP would review and recommend for fast-track selection those students whose applications for study abroad meet all objective criteria. This revision replaces the prior practice of having all members of the Committee review and discuss every application. The SATF supported this change.

Finally, although membership of the Selection Committee has been kept confidential in the past to protect faculty from students lobbying for admission to a study abroad program, the SATF believes that, as with other faculty committees, membership of the Selection Committee should be treated as public information.

- G) **Approval Process for Programs to the Puget Sound List:** One important reason for the expansion of study abroad opportunities over the last decade has been the existence of a student-driven process for adding new programs to the UPS “affiliated” and “approved” list. Although the SATF is sensitive to student complaints in the survey that the process for adding a program is unusually cumbersome, the SATF also recognizes that by approving new programs, the University is adding curriculum. It is appropriate that the process of program review and approval be careful and thorough.

In this context, the SATF supported and the Academic Standards Committee subsequently approved a proposal brought forward to require faculty endorsement of any student proposal to add a program prior to submission of that proposal to the OIP. In keeping with the desirability of faculty vigilance over the addition of new study abroad curricula, the SATF recommends that the addition of future programs to the Puget Sound “affiliated” and “approved” list should fall within the scope of responsibilities of the new Interim Study Abroad Committee proposed in this document. The SATF recommends that the Interim Study Abroad Committee also work with the Director of OIP to continue to find ways to encourage student initiative and to streamline the program approval process for students without compromising academic or program standards.

Finally, some specific concerns were raised about the obstacles to UPS faculty attempting to create study abroad programs. Some members of SATF felt that the process of creating “home-grown” programs could be streamlined for Puget Sound faculty, while others felt that the process was appropriate given the complicated nature of creating study abroad programs. The SATF agreed that this issue should be explored further and that a clear set of guidelines for creating study abroad programs by Puget Sound faculty should be established.

- H) **The Office of International Programs:** At the beginning of the process that led to the creation of the SATF, some concerns were raised about the operation of the OIP and the service that it provided. Some students through the survey expressed concerns about bureaucratic hurdles they faced either in applying for participation on a study abroad program or in attempting to add a program to the UPS list. The SATF consulted with Jannie Meisberger, the Director of the OIP, and welcomes

the OIP's attempts to begin to address such concerns by providing students opportunities to give confidential feedback regarding service in the Office. The SATF is also pleased that the OIP has been relocated from its cramped space in Warner Gym to Howarth 215 and is hopeful that the more spacious environment will help to make both the student and staff experience in the Office more positive and pleasant. The plan in the Howarth 215 remodel to create offices within which confidential conversation can occur is also welcome. Finally, the SATF is hopeful that the creation of a new faculty committee on study abroad will provide a more appropriate forum for addressing student complaints about study abroad policies. The SATF encourages the OIP to continue to look for ways to respond to student concerns.

- I) **Interim Study Abroad Committee:** Governance of study abroad policies and processes and approval of programs currently falls to the Curriculum Committee and, in some few cases, to the Academic Standards Committee. Both of these standing committees already have significant responsibilities, especially in the last three years with the mobilization and implementation of the new core curriculum. At the same time, the Puget Sound study abroad program is a large and complicated undertaking and requires ongoing attention, at the very least review and evaluation of specific programs and review of the effectiveness of policies and practices.

Accordingly, we recommend the formation of an Interim Study Abroad Committee. We recommend that this Committee exist for three years. At the end of three years, issues currently facing study abroad may have been adequately addressed and the Curriculum Committee's workload may have mercifully lightened so that it can resume its oversight of study abroad. Alternatively, at the end of three years, the Faculty Senate may wish to initiate a By-Laws change that creates a new faculty standing committee for study abroad.

The SATF recognizes that this proposed committee will exist within the framework of authority defined by the Faculty By-Laws and administrative responsibility. Accordingly, we recommend that the Committee function either as a sub-committee of the Curriculum Committee or that it submit, as appropriate, its recommendations concerning policy changes and program additions to the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Standards Committee. The SATF also recognizes that the Office of the Academic Vice President will continue to provide administrative approval of additional study abroad programs since such additions may have broader budgetary and liability implications for the institution as a whole. With approval from the Academic Vice President, this Committee would also subsume the powers of the current Student Selection Committee. In short, SATF wishes to create a

committee that reviews study abroad policies and programs without in anyway compromising established prerogatives of approval. Finally, we respectfully request that the Senate Executive Committee and the academic deans appoint the faculty members of this Committee.

Responsibilities of the Study Abroad Committee:

1. Review and evaluate study abroad policies to ensure:
 - (a) that the policies continue to reflect Puget Sound's educational goals and standards;
 - (b) that the policies maintain for our students broad accessibility to study abroad programs (in terms of cost, geography and academic interests).

- 2a) Review and evaluate “affiliated” and “approved” programs to ensure that they suitably reflect Puget Sound’s educational goals and standards and meet the University’s expectations for health and safety. The Committee will also recommend removal from the list programs that do not meet these standards and expectations.
- 2b) Recommend additions and removals of programs from affiliated/approved listings. Work with faculty and students to streamline this process.

- 3a). Approve, or where appropriate, establish Puget Sound criteria for student eligibility for affiliated/approved study abroad programs.
- 3b) Act as Study Abroad Student Selection Committee.

4. Review fiscal and registration issues.

- 5) Consider other issues brought to it by students, faculty and staff.

Committee membership:

As a faculty standing committee, membership shall be selected in accordance with procedure for other standing committees.

To ensure effective continuity, *six members of the faculty* shall serve three-year terms (one-third rotating off annually). At least one of the six shall be from the department of Foreign Languages and, preferably, one other shall have experience as leader or coordinator of a study abroad program. The remaining faculty should be chosen to guarantee participation from a wide variety of disciplines.

Ex-officio: Dean of the University, or a member of his/her staff

The Dean of the University representative will be a fully participating member of the Interim Study Abroad Committee, but will not participate in student selection.

Director of International Programs

Ex officio: Dean of Students, or a member of her/his staff

The DOS representative will be a fully participating member of the Interim Study Abroad Committee, but will serve only as a consultant to the Student Selection subcommittee. The DOS representative will review all student applicants and consult with the Student Selection subcommittee in specific cases where issues of behavior and conduct are relevant to the selection process.

Two students selected in accordance with usual ASUPS procedures. Student members will not participate in student selection.

Summary of Recommendations: The SATF recommends that

- 1) the Curriculum Committee and Senate approve the new mission statement and criteria for selecting study abroad programs;
- 2) the creation of an Interim Study Abroad Committee with the scope of responsibilities outlined below;
- 3) the Interim Committee explore the addition of programs to the Puget Sound list (a) that serve majors for whom departmental requirements make it especially difficult to study abroad and (b) that contribute to the sociocultural/geographical diversity of study abroad opportunities;
- 4) Curriculum Committee and Senate approve the proposed revisions to the criteria for adding study abroad programs to the UPS list;
- 5) the Interim Study Abroad Committee explore the creation of a pool of scholarship funds to help students meet the extra costs of studying abroad;
- 6) the Interim Committee consider extending the grant of residency credit to all study abroad programs, both “approved” and “affiliated;”
- 7) the Interim Committee establish a clear set of guidelines for creating study abroad programs by Puget Sound faculty;
- 8) the Curriculum Committee or Interim Study Abroad Committee consider revision of the six-week minimum for summer study abroad programs.
- 9) Revision of the Student Selection Process document if the Interim Study Abroad Committee is formed

Appendix A

Senate Charge:

- A. Review comprehensively the study-abroad program in the context of the current mission of the University of Puget Sound and its academic programs. More specifically, the Task Force is . . .
- to gather information* from and consider views of *all* constituencies involved with the program (students, faculty, administration, and especially staff), making a particular effort to confer with and seek ideas from the Director of International Programs, the Academic Vice President, the Financial Vice President, the Dean of Students, the Associate Deans, the Director of Academic and Career Advising, the Registrar, *and/or their designees*
 - to confer, as needed, with current & former chairs and members of the Academic Standards Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Study-Abroad Committee
 - to review the study-abroad document approved by the Faculty Senate in 1978 to suggest revisions (if any would be advisable and substantial) to the Faculty Senate
 - to identify the strengths of the program as well as areas that may need improvement
 - to consider external factors with which the program must contend as well as its internal operation; federal financial-aid regulations is but one example of an external factor

*Information may include data about how much the program has grown in recent years; financial implications and issues; how selection processes work; questions about transfer-credit; evaluation procedures; data from surveys of students and/or faculty; and so on.

- B. The Task Force shall prepare a report for the Faculty Senate that presents findings and recommendations aimed at articulating existing strengths and benefits of the Study Abroad program and at making the program better. The Task Force shall report back to the Senate in October 2002, at which time this report may be delivered. If the Task Force decides it needs more time, it may provide the Senate with an interim progress-report. The Task Force shall present a final report to the Faculty Senate no later than April 10, 2003.

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Please refer to hard copy or the second attachment, Study Abroad Survey.main.

Appendix C: Mission Statements

1978 Philosophy:

As part of its commitment to a liberal undergraduate education of excellence, the University of Puget Sound believes that a sound program of study abroad should be made available to interested students. The opportunities afforded by such a program should be sufficiently varied to meet the academic interests of diverse portions of the student population. Underlying such variety, however, shall be the expectation that each program will be compatible with the education goals of the University and will meet standards of rigor demanded of other parts of the academic program.

The value of a study abroad program lies chiefly in the exposure of our students to cultural patterns and values different from their own. The University believes that preparation of students for a varied and productive lifetime includes preparation for understanding a world of complexity and diversity. A sound study abroad program clearly can contribute to the attainment of that objective.

1986 Philosophy:

The University of Puget Sound believes that, as part of its commitment to a liberal undergraduate education, it should make available to its students a sound program for study abroad. The opportunities afforded by such a program should be sufficiently varied to meet the academic interests of diverse portions of the student population. Underlying such variety, however, shall be the expectation that each program will be compatible with the education goals of the University and will meet standards of rigor demanded of other parts of the academic program.

The value of a study abroad program lies chiefly in the exposure of our students to cultural patterns and values different from their own. The University believes that preparation of students for a varied and productive lifetime includes preparation for understanding a world of complexity and diversity. A sound study abroad program clearly can contribute to the attainment of that objective.

As a projection of the university's curriculum, the study abroad program both bears a responsibility for enriching that curriculum and a responsibility for supplementing it with an experience which is different from the customary campus classroom.

2003 Philosophy (proposed revision):

The University of Puget Sound believes that, as part of its commitment to a liberal undergraduate education, it should make available to its students a sound program for study abroad. The opportunities afforded by such a program should be sufficiently varied to meet the academic interests of diverse portions of the student population. Underlying such variety, however, shall be the expectation that each

program will be compatible with the University's education goals and will meet its academic standards.

The value of a study abroad program lies in the exposure of our students to cultural patterns and values different from their own and in opportunities to enrich academic study. Students participating in a study abroad program will develop their understanding of the complexity and diversity of the world and will enhance their knowledge in selected academic fields.

Appendix D: Criteria for selection of study abroad programs

The criteria for selection of study abroad programs have evolved over time and have taken different forms, from the original statement of “Criteria” in the 1978 document adopted by the Senate to a restatement of general “Principles” adopted by the Curriculum Committee to minor modification of *Logger* language approved by the Academic Standards Committee. These iterations of criteria are presented below. Point 4 proposes a composite statement of criteria.

1. 1978 Criteria for Selection of Study Abroad Programs

The selection of individual study abroad programs should be done with great care, to ensure that they meet the University’s educational expectations and conform to the standards set for the institutions academic program. Proposed programs which fail to measure up to these standards should not be approved. In the selection process, those responsible for selection should employ the following considerations:

- (1) The program must offer educational opportunities significantly different from those offered on the University campus. A course of study which essentially duplicates that offered on the home campus does not qualify for overseas study.
- (2) The program must clearly use the locale to enhance the instruction. The relationship between the locale and the program must be clearly defined and central to the course of study.
- (3) The person identified as the director of a proposed program must possess clearly the personal and professional qualification necessary to ensure a successful academic experience.
- (4) Persons identified as instructors in the program must possess the requisite expertise to ensure an academic experience of high quality. Moreover, these persons should be nationals of the country in which the program will reside.
- (5) Facilities for the program, including housing, classrooms, and library, must be adequate to permit a successful academic experience.
- (6) The program should be of such a nature that there is a high likelihood it will attract sufficient student participation. Matters such as the instructional program the director and instructors, locale, and cost are important in assessing the probable attractiveness of a program.

2. 1986 Principles:

The following general principles govern the selection and designing of the study abroad program:

- (1) Each part of the program shall build upon a base in the university's curriculum, so that students may prepare adequately for study abroad and supplement their study abroad experience with further study upon their return to campus.
- (2) Each part of the program shall build upon the special opportunities for learning which the location provides, including formalized instruction in the language of a host country, if an adequate mastery of that language has not been obtained prior to arrival.
- (3) Each part of the program shall, insofar as it is possible, include the use of qualified faculty members from the host country, in order to enrich the students' exposure to that culture.
- (4) Each part of the program shall be designed in such a way as to keep costs as close to on-campus costs as possible, in order to ensure that no student will be barred for financial reasons.

3. Current Criteria as listed in the *Logger* (p. 76, B):

- (1) The program is of strong academic merit and offers at least six weeks of instruction.
- (2) The program is non-competitive with Puget Sound affiliated programs.
- (3) The program is located in an area in which the University wants to foster study.
- (4) The program offers a specialty fitting a particular student academic program that is not available through the Puget Sound affiliated program.
- (5) The course list for the program is consistent with the liberal arts mission of Puget Sound.

4. Criteria including proposed revisions for program approval:

- (1) The program is of strong academic merit and consistent with the liberal arts mission of Puget Sound.
- (2) Summer programs must offer at least six weeks of instruction.
- (3) The program is non-competitive with Puget Sound exchange programs and ILACA London and Granada, Dijon, Pac Rim, and Archaeology Abroad programs.
- (4) Facilities for the program, including housing, classrooms, and on-site or local libraries, must be adequate to permit a successful academic experience and to ensure the health and safety of the students.

In evaluating a proposed study abroad program, the Interim Study Abroad Committee will consider wherever possible qualifications of instructors and the director of the program, course syllabi and other curriculum documents, the accrediting institution, facilities, opportunities for interaction with the host culture, and health and safety issues.

Appendix E: Selection Committee Process

Note: If the Interim Study Abroad Committee is formed, this document will need revision to fit the new structure.

- 1) **The Selection Committee:** The Selection Committee will be composed of the Director of International Programs, a representative from the Dean of Students Office, and 4 faculty members serving terms of 3 years each. At least one of the faculty members of the Selection Committee will be from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature. Terms of service on the committee will be staggered to ensure continuity from year to year. One of the 4 faculty members will also serve as chair of the Selection Committee. He or she will work with the Director of OIP to set the agenda for meetings, will run the meetings, and will serve as the primary liaison between the Selection Committee and Directors regarding decisions by the Committee.

Faculty members of the Selection Committee, including the chair, will themselves be selected by the Associate Dean in consultation with the Director of the Office of International Programs.

- 2) **The Selection Process:** The Selection Committee will establish its own methods for preliminary review of student applications. Program Directors may wish at the beginning of the application season to send a brief statement to the Committee describing the character of the Program and what sorts of students do well in the Program. Program Directors will also have an opportunity to review all applications.

When the Committee has completed a preliminary review of applications, it will meet with Program Directors individually. Directors will provide further information about the Program in question. Committee members and Directors will also discuss at that time any general or specific concerns they have with the applicant pool in an effort to clarify further criteria and standards of the selection process. At the conclusion of the discussion, Committee members will select students for the study abroad program under consideration. Program Directors may wish to remain during the actual selection process should any further questions about applicants arise. (In some instances, a Program Director and the Selection Committee may agree that it is not necessary to meet and so choose not to do so.)

- 3) **Follow-up:** If requested to do so by a Director, the chair of the Selection Committee, one of its members, or the Committee as a whole, paying due respect to the confidential aspects of the applications, will attempt to clarify for the Director why an applicant was accepted or rejected by the Selection Committee.