

Minutes of the February 24, 2008 Meeting of the International Education Committee

Committee Members Present: Tristan Burger, Lynnette Claire, Diane Kelley, John Lear, Donn Marshall, Jannie Meisberger, Jan Moore, Mei Rose, Jonathan Stockdale, Peter Wimberger

Chair Peter Wimberger convened the meeting shortly after 2pm.

Minutes from the February 10 committee meeting were approved with the understanding that the worksheet on Study Abroad Net Revenues Analysis that Dean Bartanen presented at that meeting would be appended.

Lynnette apologized for missing the last meeting due to illness. Regarding our discussion with Dean Bartanen that day, Lynnette wondered if model G would work if the money saved could be used for study abroad scholarships. The committee remembered that model G might limit the number of students who could go abroad, but acknowledged that Lynnette's idea sounded feasible. Lynnette will pursue the question.

The committee then began discussion of the subcommittee report on study abroad programs in the United Kingdom (appended here).

Donn indicated that the list of study abroad programs in the UK was excessively long. After review by area (London/Ireland/Scotland), the subcommittee recommends some cuts. Their recommendations were based on non-enrollment and student and faculty evaluations.

In London, there are a great number of programs that cover the diversity that London brings in terms of culture and academics. They recommend keeping six programs: IES London, AHA London (formerly ILACA), UCL, Queen Mary, SOAS and Arcadia (see report for details).

John asked how many students go abroad to the UK, and Jannie and Jan estimated that about one-sixth of UPS study abroad students go abroad to the UK.

Discussion ensued regarding charges by some universities in the UK, Lancaster, Edinburgh and Aberdeen, which are direct-enrollment programs.

John asked if there were any holes to fill regarding coverage. Donn affirmed that given the large number of programs, that was not a question they asked while reviewing, but it can be asked in a future round of reviews.

Donn affirmed that only one program's student evaluations raised the question of safety – the Queen Mary (Butler) program in London. Jannie assured that this was not in fact a problem and that this program is located in a gentrified area of London.

John asked about the lack of programs in Northern Ireland, and Jannie indicated that no students have gone to any of the Northern Ireland programs on our list in approximately fifteen years. John also expressed disappointment that now that AHA has taken over the ILACA London program no UPS faculty can go with our students there, and hopes that perhaps this will change in the future.

Several members of the committee discussed the six programs offered in London, given that that still seems like a high number for one city. However each has specific strengths that warrant their inclusion on our list. Donn pointed out that the subcommittee was successful in limiting their recommendation to six from the current list of thirteen programs available in London.

Jonathan moved to close discussion on the UK programs in favor of determining what the committee would be doing next.

John then raised the question about how faculty will be informed about the programs that have been cut. Jannie indicated that this information will be available on the International Programs' website. The committee recommends that the updated list be sent out not only to offices involved in billing and advising as it currently is, but also to faculty and students. This could potentially be done by advising department chairs and in the email about study abroad financing sent to students [IS THIS ACCURATE?].

Jannie questioned whether it was a good idea to change the Lancaster direct-enrollment program to one administered by Butler and also to drop two direct-enrollment programs in Scotland, Aberdeen and Edinburgh, replacing Edinburgh with the Arcadia program. Her concern was that as the Cabinet may be imminently deciding to move to one study abroad model which could potentially make all programs sponsored programs, thereby eliminating the need for this replacement.

Peter amended Jonathan's motion to approve all changes recommended by the UK subcommittee except for the replacement of the Lancaster and Edinburgh programs, pending the Cabinet's decision.

Motion passed.

Discussion ensued as to what the committee should do next given the SAWG report and our mandate from the Senate to make academic recommendations on study abroad. The committee came up with a list of questions to address:

- Required GPA for students going abroad
- The number of semesters a student can study abroad
- The number of abroad programs a student can participate in
- Application deadlines
- Residency credit
- The number of programs we would recommend cutting
- Credit transfer

- Finding scholarships for study abroad
- Short-term study abroad options
- Opportunities for intercultural experiences near campus

We prioritized our top subjects for discussion as follows:

1. Deadlines for study abroad applications
2. GPA requirements
3. The number of semesters a student can be abroad and the number of programs a student can participate in
4. The number of programs to keep

The committee affirms that our job is to look at the academic impact of the above items regardless of financial impact, which is outside of the purview of this committee's work and because we are not privy to all the financial information that would be needed to make overarching recommendations. It seems to us that financial impact of some of these changes is negligible, and we will move forward with our recommendations with that in mind and also with the general understanding that it is against our educational ideology to fundamentally limit the number of students who can go abroad.

In our next meeting, we will discuss the first item on the above list as well as hear a brief report from the five committee members who recently went to the Forum on Education Abroad conference in Portland.

Because we couldn't help ourselves and because GPA has already been discussed numerous times in this committee, we confirmed that we have already determined that a 3.0 GPA limit would not significantly change the number of students going abroad and that GPA is petitionable anyway. Some UPS programs such as Pac Rim and Dijon prefer to have a lower GPA limit so as to be able to have greater control on the students who go on these programs. Peter will glean information from past committee discussions on GPA and provide it to us so that we can hopefully make a recommendation on this item soon.

The meeting adjourned at 2:56

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Kelley