

International Education Committee Meeting Minutes, March 30, 2016

Committee Members Present: Alva Butcher, Sarah Comstock, Lisa Ferrari, Lea Fortmann, Pepa Lago-Grana, Kriszta Kotsis, John Lear (co-chair), Allyson Lindsley (guest), Eric Olin (co-chair), Roy Robinson, Mike Spivey, Kazu Suzuki (student representative).

The meeting was convened at 11:00am by Chair Olin.

Meeting minutes from 3/9/2016 were approved.

There were no announcements

Discussion on Study Abroad Working Group II and Responses to Kris Bartanen's email

Chair Olin addressed the first item on the agenda, which was discussing the possible Study Abroad Working Group-II and responses to Kris Bartanen's email regarding questions she posed for the IEC and the potential working group to address.

Orlin suggested that many of the questions may eventually be turned into charges for the committee and/or working group next fall, and current discussion could help shape those charges. He also brought up that there may be an opportunity to fold the Quality Assurance Program (QUIP) consultancy into the working group to do a full departmental review of international programs before the working group gets going to have a better understanding of strengths and weaknesses of the study abroad department before the working group convenes.

Orlin suggested that a broader question to address might be looking at the role of study abroad at Puget Sound and what an appropriate target may be for the number of students that study abroad. Ferrari noted that this is a difficult question to answer, unless the answer is 100% or 0%, and will likely depend on a number of factors, including the interest of students, how study abroad is classified, mix of majors, etc. She stated that it is a worthwhile topic, but is not sure how to answer the question in a meaningful way that would provide direct guidance to the working group or IEC.

Orlin responded that he thinks the underlying question is about addressing the value of study abroad and considering the tradeoffs, e.g. are we okay if some students are prohibited from studying abroad due to their major or coursework requirements? If not, and study abroad is deemed more valuable, then should we restrict the number of majors students are allowed to pursue?

Lear brought up that another important question to answer is determining what is driving the decline in study abroad at UPS and our relative position to our peer groups. Is it market demand or is it the way the market is structured that is leading the decline?

Ferrari noted that this might be more of a question for students. If students are okay with not being able to study abroad due to their major and curriculum requirements, then it may not be a problem. We should consider what students want compared to what faculty want. Lindsley commented that the student study abroad withdrawal survey may be a starting point to understanding what the students want.

Next, Lear brought up the question of how to accommodate students in sciences that want to study abroad and how to get a better understand of what the limitations are, such as major requirements, financial constraints, etc.

Kotsis then asked if it is mostly science students in STEM fields that are most likely to not study abroad due to course requirements. Lear commented that this is the fastest growing study abroad group is in sciences and Lindsley responded that many Biology students study abroad and there have been increases in students going on summer programs such as the Madrid program.

Orlin asked for further questions or comments regarding Bartanen's email.

Butcher acknowledged the second question:

What would be a viable, standard approach to fully account for the costs of faculty-led study abroad/away programs? Do we need to place them in a scheduled rotation in order to achieve sustainability? Are these programs feasible in the absence of the "subsidies" that have supported start-up pilot projects?

reporting that one professor has commented that he couldn't see a non-tenured professor doing study abroad given its time consuming nature, which raises the question of having more tenured professors do study abroad or rethinking how the evaluate service and time spent on study abroad in promotion evaluations.

Other issues that were brought up for consideration in the discussion include costs for faculty teaching abroad. One model could be the South West semester led by Barry Goldstein, where the total number of students taught abroad could be weighed against the number of students that would have been taught on campus. How departments are able to replace missing faculty members and the reduction in courses and electives are still issues to consider though.

Orlin commented that he would like some members of IEC to be on the study abroad working group when it is convened to maintain regular communication between the two groups.

Lear suggested generating a document that could serve as a conversation starter for putting the group together that would include proposing some faculty members to serve on the working group. Two names were mentioned: Peter Wimberger, who has served on the IEC in the past, was on the previous study abroad working group, and comes from a science department, so he may have a better perspective on limitations for these students studying broad; and Gareth Barkin, who has also served on the IEC and has been doing research into faculty-led study abroad models.

Orlin the asked how long the QUIP consultancy process takes and if it would be possible to do it over the summer before the working group starts. Robinson responded that he doesn't know if they work over the summer – the process may take a couple months, and noted a potential problem with summer if people are not around to meet with the consultants, or if they want to meet with students. Comstock commented that it is typical for these groups to meet with

students when conducting reviews. Robinson said he could check with Willamette University to see how long process took for them.

Butcher asked if we have the budget for hiring the QUIP consultants, Robinson responded that he didn't know. Other ideas could include a concurrent process with both the consultancy and working group together.

The committee discussed creating a document that could frame questions and set an agenda in preparation for the working group that could also include requests for data that would be helpful. Other items could include information on financial models of other universities for their study abroad programs, such as Lewis and Clark.

Lindsley commented that some research on that topic was done a few years ago and Robinson added that places are generally willing to share financial models and there seems to be a lot of variation. Lear contributed that information on financial models could also come from looking at the universities' websites.

Butcher summarized a list of recommendations to make for a response to Bartanen's email:

- Recommend departmental review of international programs in fall
- Generate info on other financial aid models from other universities
- Request overlap between the working group and the IEC members

There was some discussions of informal meetings before summer to start prepping info and data that might potentially include Robinson and Wimberger.

Other discussion included a question from Lear about the term study away (third bullet point in email). Ferrari clarified that study away are domestic study away initiatives off campus, such as Washington D.C. or Olympia, WA, and include the South West Semester.

Robinson brought up a potential interest in looking into the Woods Hole Semester in Environmental Science, which is more focused on research (as opposed to Semester at Sea).

Orlin noted that study away programs are outside domain of IEC, and Ferrari commented that the working group will need to recognize the study away programs and how they will work along with study abroad – right now it is a grey area and they have no home, but will need to live somewhere in the future. Any decision made about one type of program will potentially have implications for other programs.

Other Business: Report from the Subcommittee on Response to Sexual Assault Abroad

Kotsis updated the IEC on the sub committee for addressing sexual assault abroad. She presented a draft document on the emergency response for students that are sexually assaulted. The subcommittee recommends that something similar to the draft be used in study abroad programs so students have a list of steps to follow in the case of an attack. The highlighted text on the document are items that require action.

While reviewing the document, some of the issues brought up by the IEC committee were concerns with step 3 under the emergency response, which involves contacting the police. Lindsley cautioned that in some countries if you call the police you are required to file a report and explained that previously they have let that decision vary by country since decisions to call the police may depend on level of trust with local police. Discussion followed with options for moving that down on the list, making it optional, or adding a line about calling the police “after consultation with program director”.

Other comments on the draft document included:

- changing the language from “safe house” to “safe housing” on section 4 under the emergency response;
- changing the language from *emergency* response to *crisis* response; and
- removing “Sexual Misconduct” in the second half of the document to just “Emergency Response” (or crisis response).

Other discussion centered around softening the language for telling students to directly take action and follow the response procedures to saying “you may want to follow these steps”. Ferrari expressed concern about softening the language too much, where students may be hurt and afraid and not want to do anything, so if the language is not strong enough, they may be inclined to not follow the procedures. Discussion followed on other ways the language could be softened, making other parts optional such as going to a hospital or doctor, and changing the language on *preservation of evidence*, which as Orlin pointed out, may turn students off.

Lago-Grana asked about the phrase *Sexual Misconduct*, preceding the emergency response heading, which could come across as putting the blame on the victim of the assault. Comstock responded that sexual misconduct is the broader category used on campus when dealing with these situations, so they wanted to use the same language so it would mirror the university’s own policies and carry over into current programs and processes. Discussion concluded with removing “sexual misconduct” and just having “emergency response” as the heading.

Finally, Ferrari expressed more support for changing “emergency” to “crisis” response and commented that students may question if they actually were assaulted – and that using the word assault may set too high of a threshold for students deciding if they fall into that category or not. One proposed alternative was changing the language to “if you *feel* you've been sexually assaulted.

The meeting convened at 11:53am by Chair Orlin.

Respectfully submitted

Lea Fortmann