

Minutes of the February 24, 2016 IEC Meeting

Present: Alva Butcher, Sarah Comstock, Lisa Ferrari, Lea Fortmann, Kriszta Kotsis, John Lear (co-chair), Eric Orlin (co-chair), Roy Robinson, Mike Spivey, Kazu Suzuki,

The meeting was called to order at 11:03.

The **minutes of the January 28 meeting were approved**, and it was agreed that documents about the fee structure for a consultant and a graph showing the number of the study abroad applications will be added as appendix.

The **minutes of the February 10 meeting were approved**, with minor amendment.

After co-chair Lear summarized the agenda of the meeting, the sub-committees began their reports.

Returning Questionnaire (Charge 6)

Butcher reported that her subcommittee is reviewing the returning questionnaire for study abroad students. The subcommittee is focusing on the academic impact of study abroad and it is in the process of devising less open-ended, more specific questions to collect information about the academic benefits of study abroad experiences.

Exchange Programs and Faculty-led Programs (Charges 3 and 5)

Robinson and Lear reported regarding charges for exchange programs and faculty-led programs. Workshops were held on 2/19 and 2/22 for faculty interested in these programs. Both had about 5 or 6 interested faculty in attendance in addition to the organizers and OIP staff. There was greater interest in faculty-led programs. There were good questions regarding models that have worked and inquiries about how to move forward. Faculty members from graduate programs (OT and PT) were also present, which indicates that graduate programs might be interested in participating. It was noted that it might be more difficult to develop programs for graduate programs, yet our graduate programs have taken students on faculty-led trips to Japan and Mazatlan (the latter visit was initiated by a UPS alumna).

Butcher wondered about the current status of funding for these programs. Is it likely that we will have funding for faculty-led programs in the future?

Robinson responded that currently we have ca. \$35,000-40,000 for this purpose in next year's budget. This money can be used for site visits and getting a program started. He also noted that it is not likely that a new faculty-led program will be added for next year. Still, it is unclear how much money will be available next year, given that things change very quickly around study abroad applications (which has an impact on the available funds). Although this year's initial number of applications indicated that there will be a serious deficit in the OIP budget if all students who applied will indeed study abroad, if we take into account the likely "melt" from the numbers of applications, then OIP might be under budget for study abroad programs. Therefore, there is likely going to be some funding for new faculty led programs.

The question was raised: how much funding has been given out in the past for new faculty-led programs? Probably ca. \$20,000 has been used thus far in support of new programs (some retroactively).

Lear noted larger concerns in relation to the uncertainty of funding for short term faculty-led programs. While it is important to have support for establishing programs and initial trips, it is a problem that there is no funding in place for sustaining such programs in the long run. He wondered how we can get faculty members interested in developing such programs if they get no compensation beyond trip expenses, given that developing and conducting such a program requires a significant amount of work and time commitment (which comes on top of a full time teaching load). It is also problematic that currently we plan these programs without knowing whether or not in fact they will receive funding; this is a particularly significant problem that needs to be addressed. He also suggested that there might be some workarounds, namely that financial aid could be used for students who participate in these programs and that perhaps faculty members could receive a release unit. While there are possible other funds to draw from (such as the Luce Fund for East Asian Study, and also possibly Experiential Learning), we need to find a way to make short term faculty-led study abroad programs more financially sustainable.

Butcher noted that she attended the Student Symposium on Experiential Learning on 2/23 and talked to Harry Velez-Quinones about his experiences with leading the Madrid Summer program. This program is only 3 years old; in the first year about five students attended, but in the last year it was up to twenty students. Harry noted that he gets no compensation for supervising this program and echoed that this is not sustainable in the long run. This program is particularly popular amongst our science majors, who due to major requirements, are often not able to study abroad for a semester, but are eager to do so during the summer.

Robinson also noted that it can be particularly problematic for junior faculty to develop study abroad programs because of the time commitment. Junior faculty need to focus on research and publications before tenure and may not have the time required to develop study abroad programs. He wondered whether it would be a disadvantage for a junior faculty member to develop a study abroad program.

Orlin noted that we should evaluate carefully what models work for faculty-led programs and we should find a funding model that works.

Lear suggested that perhaps semester long programs shared with other NW5 colleges (like the one Orlin is developing with Lewis & Clark) might offer a financially sustainable model that will also not be overly burdensome for our faculty since leading the program will be shared by the partner colleges. He also wondered whether developing our own semester long study abroad program from scratch might be the way to go.

Sexual Violence Response Protocols and Efficacy of Information (Charge 1)

Kotsis reported about Charge 1, which is focused on reviewing sexual violence response protocols and the efficacy of information provided to students before they leave for study abroad. The subcommittee has collected information from some of our larger program providers (IES, SIT, DIS, IFSA Butler, Dijon) which represent perhaps 75% of the programs our students use. The subcommittee's priority is to address the largest programs first given that they impact the largest number of students. While most

programs have a clear harassment policy and provide information to students before they leave on the program and also at the beginning of the program, few of the programs have clearly delineated step-by-step emergency protocols for dealing with sexual violence. The committee is still in the process of collecting and reviewing materials. DIS has a clear emergency protocol that could be used as a model. The committee will have a phone call with IFSA Butler soon to collect more information. The committee would like to see a more formalized, clearly defined emergency response protocol developed for the Dijon program.

Comstock raised the important question: how do we train our own faculty who lead study abroad (or off campus) programs in responding to sexual violence when it occurs? She suggested that developing a clear protocol and training for example for the Dijon program, which is our own, would be a good place to start.

Butcher wondered – who would conduct this training? Would it be associated with OIP?

Robinson noted that it would indeed be useful to have formal training in this since no formal training in emergency protocol and sexual violence response exists, rather, it is done quite informally.

Orlin noted that this training for faculty-led programs should apply to all programs, whether they are abroad or in the US (as for example the Southwest Semester). He underscored that currently there is no formal training for faculty members who take students off campus on a study away program in emergency and sexual violence response protocol.

Comstock suggested that OIP could coordinate such training, however, other parties should be involved actively in this, namely the office of the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, since Michael Benitez is the Title IX officer on campus.

Robinson also echoed that a formal training process should be in place.

The discussion then turned to how can we formalize this training process and how should faculty be informed about it. The question was raised as to who would have the authority to approve and require such a formal training for faculty? It was agreed that most likely the Academic Dean and the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion would have the authority over this. It was also noted that the IEC can initiate this process and inform the Senate about it, after all, this relates to a charge the Senate has given to the IEC this year and the year before.

It was suggested that the formal training requirement should be built into the faculty-led program approval process. Lear also noted that the training should consider how cultural and legal definitions of harassment differ across the globe. Ferrari noted that in the process of assessing risk for a study abroad program, there is already a procedure that asks the faculty member in charge of the program to prepare an emergency plan. Therefore, it is not unreasonable that the response to sexual violence should be part of this emergency plan. Lear suggested that IEC should come up with a recommendation about need for training faculty members in handling emergency situations, including response to sexual violence. Spivey and Ferrari agreed that this training should be part of the approval process for new programs. Orlin suggested that the approval process could be a three step process: first a faculty member proposes a program; then the faculty member receives training in emergency response (including response to sexual violence); and then the faculty member submits an emergency plan before final approval of the program. Orlin suggested that requiring the training before the

emergency plan is submitted would be helpful because it would alert the faculty member about the specific information and response steps that should be included in the emergency and sexual violence response protocol. Robinson noted that the emergency protocol submitted as part of the approval process then should be taken on the program and should also be distributed amongst students. Comstock mentioned the example of how this is done for the Global Brigades program, where all participating students receive a card with all essential information about potential emergencies.

Lear suggested that Robinson and the deans should come up with a policy that institutes a requirement regarding training of faculty members before they take students on an off campus program. The subcommittee will prepare a proposal about this.

Improving Rate of Participation in Study Abroad Programs (Charge 4)

Orlin mentioned that this subcommittee is planning on giving a presentation at the next faculty meeting on March 8 about current study abroad numbers. The presentation will also introduce a resolution (see text below) to make an argument for allowing students on the Pac Rim program to take their full financial aid package with them during their year away. The subcommittee has reached out to the Asian Studies Program who are supportive of the idea. It was noted that having Robinson attended this faculty meeting would be beneficial.

Text of Resolution: "The Faculty Recommend to the Cabinet and the Board of Trustees that Puget Sound students participating in the Pacific Rim program be allowed to take their full financial aid package with them during their year studying in Asia."

Meeting adjourned at 11:53.

Respectfully submitted by K. Kotsis