

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

International Programs Committee (Inactive)

Campus Governance

3-8-2017

International Programs minutes 03/08/2017

International Programs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/intl_prog

Recommended Citation

International Programs Committee, "International Programs minutes 03/08/2017" (2017). *International Programs Committee (Inactive)*. 26.

https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/intl_prog/26

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Programs Committee (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

International Programs Committee

March 8, 2017, Prairie Lounge, 8:10am-9:10am

In attendance: Fiona Wu, Joe Alia, Sheri Breen, Viktor Berberi, Leslie Gubash-Lindberg, Ray Legasse, Michael Peters, Karyssa Scheck

Propose Agenda:

IPC Agenda, March 8, 2017

I. Approve minutes from 2-22-17

II. Continue discussion of policy on study-abroad rotation

Other items, time allowing:

III. UMM's non-affiliated programs process

IV. Curriculum Committee's review of Global Village gen eds.

I. IPC approved minutes from previous meeting Feb 22, 2017

II. Sheri B updated the IPC on her review of the study abroad proposal process for Dean Finzel so far:

Capacity:

1. ACE Office

Discussion amongst the committee agreed that 5-6 programs is sustainable in terms of staffing for ACE

2. Student Enrollment

Viktor B commented that most of the work (~85% and up to 1 ½ years of work) is done by the point the program needs to be cancelled due to low enrollment. Sheri B indicated that there are sufficient efforts made by ACE on student recruitment; however, we (faculty and other staff) can do things to increase overall student capacity for study abroad [SA] programs. Ray L made the point that student capacity is a moving target as desire for SA ebbs and flows over time as political environments change from year to year. Sheri indicated that we as a campus program provider need to be ready to adapt/jump to another country if political climates change. Having a significant enough portfolio would allow us to adapt more quickly, which is not something we have been doing so far.

Ray made the point that money is also a barrier for students. How can we restructure our costs and/or scholarships to get those students who are currently unable to afford programs? Sheri indicated that we can break up the review process for SA programs to address scholarships and financial access. IPC could also approach External Relations in an effort to find exterior funding for students. The IPC scholarship could be changed to give out fewer, larger scholarships if the current \$750 is not significant enough to attract students who are in need. Joe A asked if we could focus more on exchanges with larger scholarships to create opportunities that would be more equal to or even less than a semester in Morris. Ray asked about the opportunity to create more exchanges that fit the mission of UMM. He

indicated that Meredith McQuade at GPS Alliance could work with us to promote more applicable SA exchanges. Joe A agreed that the GPS are very helpful during exchange agreements. Ray discussed the dance between institutional politics of the GPS Alliance and the LAC and our different relationships with both offices.

3. Learning Abroad Center

Viktor asked whether having 1-2 programs run through the LAC is in line with our agreement with the LAC. (Committee agreed that it was with input from ACE staff) Joe A indicated that the LAC is moving in a direction that has not been working as well for us and our model as they have in the past. The LAC currently takes a program based approach to short term SA whereas Morris takes a professor based approach to SA programs.

Ray asked how the insurance process works through us [Morris] as opposed to using the LAC. Sheri responded that we were (~10 years past) negligent of this issue, but are now working with the GPS and are able to ensure this process is able to occur thanks mostly to Stephanie in her capacity in ACE. Having a full-time director of ACE would ensure continuity for this process. Ray also indicated that ensuring that Morris programs work with a program provider will help give us a safety net where we do not have solid contacts in country.

Proposal and Review Process:

This process has changed over the years from going through an ad-hoc committee to working through the full IPC.

1. Distribution of programs

Sheri shared the preliminary results from her program leader survey. She indicated that fledgling programs need to be encouraged (having students around for recruitment who have gone before helps out a great deal). The IPC needs to be clear about why programs are chosen to ensure fairness.

Leslie G.L. asked how we can find the right number according to student capacity. Michael indicated that he wanted to see what happens this year and next as we have not had adequate data from previous years. Sheri reminded IPC that cancelled programs are not failed programs as many can be cancelled in one year due to low enrollment, but will go find the next year as has happened in the past.

Sheri shared with IPC that Dean Finzel has been particularly keen on pushing for programs to non-English speaking countries (not necessarily FL programs, simply countries that do not have English as their primary language). We as a committee also want to offer a range of costs of programs (ensure we do not have 5-6 \$6000 programs), as well as offering programs that cover different times throughout the academic year like winter and spring break. Some students and disciplines (student athletes, science majors doing research, etc.) simply are unable to attend summer programs.

Karyssa S believes that IPC can and should be more transparent about programs that are “On the horizon”. This will help students plan farther out if they want to complete certain Gen Ed requirements or major electives through SA. She indicated that putting SA programs on reoccurring schedules, past programs, and possible future programs on the ACE website could get people’s attention and attract interest. Michael strongly agreed that we should put more information about past and possible future SA programs on the website.

3. Preselection advisory reports

Sheri indicated that for purpose of clarity and fairness, some of these issues that the IPC is running into (multiple programs from the same discipline or division in the same year) need to be dealt with on the disciplinary and division/program level. Issues surrounding work load, tenure and promotion, and scheduling should prompt the IPC to solicit information from division chairs. Viktor made a point that disciplines should not be asked to narrow down the field, but should be asked for information. Program leaders should be free to propose programs and not have this process run through the disciplines. Sheri agreed that leaders shouldn’t have to submit proposals to disciplines. Ray asked if we have a clear rubric for proposals. Michael announced that ACE can and will be updating the rubric for SA over the summer to be approved by IPC in the fall.

Sheri will continue to work on collecting program leader input for our review process and that she will send out updates as she receives them.