

November 9, 2015
Meeting Minutes, IEC

Present: Kriszta Kotsis, Lisa Ferrari, Mike Spivey, John Lear, Ian Craighead, Sarah Comstock, Lea Fortmann, Gareth Barking, Eric Orlin, Roy Robinson, Carmen Eyssautier (Guests), Alva Butcher

Called to order at 10:01

MSA: Minutes of last meeting were approved with minor addition and correction.

Announcements: Lear announced the Oaxaca interest meeting: Thursday, Nov. 12, 5:00 pm in Wyatt Hall.

Rainforest Studies Program petition – the question was raised last time how the faculty in the summer program compare to the faculty of the standard academic year. We did not take up discussion of this because the actual petition by the student has not been presented yet, although it is in the works.

Round River Program – petition was received with a letter of support. Roy noted that he talked to Colby College about this program who view it as a strong study abroad opportunity. Wimberger is supportive of it. Roy inquired about who is teaching in the program but has not received an answer yet. Roy also asked about their sexual violence prevention program. They do not have a policy in place but have an emergency response program which they believe to be strong. It was noted that when we develop our sexual policy guidelines we could send them ours and ask their compliance.

MSA – petition was approved

Roy has also reached out to other programs that we use in order to find out about their sexual violence prevention programs/policies

Discussion of Senate Charges:

Charges 1, 2, 3 were discussed in the last meeting.

Charge 1: With respect to the issue of sexual violence:

- a. **Work with the Office of International Programs (OIP) and the Dean of Students office to determine a course of action regarding study abroad programs that have reported that they do not have a sexual violence response protocol, and those that have not responded to requests for information.**
- b. **Assess the efficacy of safety information provided to students before they study abroad, including sexual violence support and reporting procedures and;**
- c. **The efficacy of Puget Sound Reporting and response processes should an incident of sexual violence occur. This will also be in partnership with OIP and the Dean of Students office.**

Subcommittee: Kriszta Kotsis and Sarah Comstock

Butcher noted that she contacted the senate representative to find out more about what expectations the senate has regarding charge 1b but not yet heard back; several members of the IEC feel that this charge has been covered by the work IEC carried out last year.

We need develop a protocol to deal with schools that do not have a policy on sexual violence response and prevention or who have not provided this information to us. OIP and IEC together will work on this. OIP can gather the information from the various programs but they will need assistance in evaluating the responses to see whether the particular program's policy and response is sufficient and in line with our

policies. Butcher noted that the IEC could look at sexual violence prevention and response protocols of other schools. In terms of dealing with the various study abroad programs: we notify them about the need for such a protocol and let them know that if they do not have this in place by the end of the year we will no longer use their program.

Charge 4: Make recommendations for improving the rate of participation in study abroad based on survey data collected in 2014-2015.

Subcommittee: Mike Spivey and Eric Orlin. Peter Wimberger will be consulted as an interested and experienced party on this.

Pac Rim merit aid issues should be discussed in relation to this. It is possible that financial aid has much to do with the decreasing rate of participation by our students in study abroad programs. Pac Rim was brought up as an example where participating students did not receive their full aid packages when they attended the program. This issue has been taken to the administration but so far no change has been made.

Orlin wondered whether this topic should be taken to the senate or the full faculty in order to affect a change in policy. It would be useful to know whether it would be possible to change this policy. Butcher noted that an IEC subcommittee could work on this topic and bring it to the attention of the senate. Barkin suggested that perhaps it should be taken to the full faculty.

Charges 3 and 5 will be treated together:

Charge 3: Work with faculty to develop exchange programs with colleges and universities abroad.

Charge 5: Work with faculty to develop in-house study abroad programs.

Subcommittee: Eric Orlin, John Lear, Lea Fortmann, Gareth Barkin.

The subcommittee working on these should consult with the subcommittee working on Charge 4.

Regarding charge 3 (exchanges) it was noted that it requires a champion on campus (e.g., an interested faculty member) to work well.

Barkin noted that many faculty members are interested in developing programs, but the word should be spread to even more faculty letting them know about the possible funding opportunities for new initiatives in this realm of programs. Fortmann wondered whether cooperation with other schools (e.g., Lewis & Clark which has a robust study abroad program) would be part of the work of this committee, and the general consensus was that yes, this should be the case. It was also noted that we also need the support of the administration to provide release units for faculty members who undertake in-house study abroad programs.

Robinson explained that it is not easy to find the right places for exchange programs, but his office could help with the logistics once programs have been identified. The best way to find such programs is by finding faculty interested in developing them. The question was asked: what is easier to do, exchange programs or faculty-led in-house programs? Exchange programs typically are developed between faculty members across institutions who know each other. In-house programs are going to be likely small (not a large number of students attending) but the money will stay at our institution. Robinson also noted that exchange programs are important because we need foreign students on our campus. Orlin mentioned that we should proceed with both exchange programs and in-house programs and see which gains more traction since we don't really have a robust program in either of these areas.

It was noted that it would be informative for the subcommittee working on Charges 3 and 5 to learn about how the university funds the Pac Rim program.

Barkin noted that short term programs are more variable and new research shows that they have less of an impact than originally believed.

Robinson will send current study abroad student questionnaire to the committee.

Fortmann noted that it would be useful to survey students who wanted to go but decided not to.

Roy explained that two main themes have emerged amongst students who did not attend study abroad programs: concern about whether or not credits would transfer, and concern about financial aid. He said that some information was gathered about this last year.

Barkin noted that sometimes institutional expectations can inspire students to study abroad (i.e., just the fact that the school conveys the message “that we expect you to study abroad” might be a significant factor). He also observed that to get a fuller picture, we should also look at students who did not intend to study abroad at all.

Lear asked whether the subcommittee created last year to review short-term study abroad program proposals is still in existence. Yes, it is.

There are faculty development grants available for such programs (deadline in March). It was discussed how to get the word out to faculty that this is funding is available: Facultycoms; chairs meeting; Wednesday at Four were suggested. It was noted that disseminating the information in multiple venues would be most effective. The funding does not cover honorarium, but it can be used for other expenses (e.g., travel). There is a \$50,000 budget (which can be added to after some amount is used, but no more than \$25,000 can be added back in a given year).

Butcher asked whether there have been any applications for this funding. Yes, four applications have been funded last year (to Greece, Jamaica, two to Cuba) in order to explore the possibility of potential programs. It was also noted that some funds are available to subsidize students participating in these programs.

Charge 6: Work with OIP to revise the returning questionnaire for study abroad students, particularly those questions that deal with the benefits of the experience.

Subcommittee: Gareth Barkin, Alva Butcher

Barkin noted that last year IEC requested guidance from the Senate on how far to take this charge. Institutional research has data on why students decided not to study abroad. Barkin wondered whether the senior survey was amended with questions about study abroad programs. No, it was not. Butcher noted that Institutional Research did not want to bombard students with more surveys.

It was noted that the Intercultural Development Inventory, which surveys what is important about studying abroad could be a useful tool in generating quantitative data. It costs \$12 per student. Orlin wondered whether we should use this instead of our own survey or whether we should administer it at the same time as our own survey. It was noted, that our surveys and the IDI serve different purposes. Lear noted that he used the IDI survey for the Oaxaca Program and that the outcome was quite predictable. He noted that it would be perhaps more useful to modify our own already existing survey. He also mentioned that it may be helpful to hire an outside consultant to review our study abroad programs in

order to evaluate programs and help us understand the drop in student attendance in study abroad programs. He believes that this might provide a more holistic view of the situation.

Robinson noted that his office has talked about the possibility of using outside consultants and he could also provide the committee with a figure regarding how much this might cost. His office would be in favor of this. Funding could possibly come from the Study Abroad instructional budget. He also mentioned that it would be useful to explore the correlation between study abroad and retention (similarly to athletes and retention).

Robinson noted that we have a questionnaire in place, but not for Pac Rim. Barkin mentioned that there have been course evals for Pac Rim and wondered whether those could be used. A more tailored form was desired for Pac Rim but that has not been produced yet and thus it needs to be developed. Orlin suggested that the standard study abroad questionnaire should be sent to Pac Rim students in addition that is tailored to this particular program. This way the data gathered could be folded into the study abroad data more easily.

Charge 2: Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate expensive programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g. language, discipline, or geography)
Subcommittee: Alva Butcher and Ian Craighead.

We need to get programs down to about 70.

Adjourned at 10:47.