

4-23-2019

## International Program minutes 04/23/2019

International Programs Committee

## International Program Committee Minutes, April 23, 2019

Present: Joe Alia (IPC chair and minute taker), Barbara Burke, Ray Lagasse, Emily Bruce, Sheri Breen, Devon Johnson, Stephanie Ferrian (arrived at 12:25 PM)

Absent: Diwan Umam (student rep), Melissa Voss (student rep)

### Announcements:

Sheri in Stephanie's absence: All UMM faculty-lead programs for this summer and fall are going  
Ray – The renewed/updated agreement with Kansai Gaidai U in Japan has been signed by their president. Ray will be working on updating/renewing the agreement with Shainghai U.

Minutes from March 12, 2019 approved

Discussion of proposal to eliminate the IPC based on revised rationale (See email from Tammy Berberic.

Emily – Do we have a contract with LAC, Sheri/Joe – No

Emily – Is it normal to have long standing *ad hoc* committees? Barbara, they exist but are not really supposed to.

Ray/Sheri – It seems that there will be more work in putting together *ad hoc* committees. This will likely fall on ACE and fall through the cracks if there is a work overload which is also likely.

Emily – Does Matt know about this? Sheri met with Matt and Janet early this year to think about the relationship of ACE, the dean, and IPC.

Sheri – We will be losing expertise by depending on *ad hoc* committees. The review of programs in the past was done by *ad hoc* committees and it did not work as well. Having tenured faculty on committees can help to back up ACE staff who have more to lose by voicing strong opinions.

Barbara – the assumption of extra work being taken on by *ad hoc* committees does not seem like a good one.

Ray – How will this change the campus environment around internationalization? How would faculty be empowered on campus to for goals of internationalization?

Joe – IPC's charge is vague and not up to date

Sheri sees three possibilities 1) eliminate IPC, 2) update the charge of the IPC, 3) (Emily) more careful farming IPC work.

Sheri - IPC work does not fit the charge of other committees. Why should we hand off work to *ad hoc* committees very likely experienced in the needed areas of expertise.

Emily: The goal of reducing service load is well taken but the plan from Steering will not be effective in accomplishing this goal.

Barbara: Will the IPC chair make a statement at assembly of the IPC's consensus views?

Positions of consensus

*Ad hoc* committees are a bad idea; tasks now done by IPC will still need to be done and do not fit into the charge of other committees. Example: Study abroad questions come up before the curriculum is approved so is not appropriate for the curriculum. Sheri and Stephanie and perhaps Ray would all need to be on Curriculum.

We no longer have a relationship with the LAC. They do not even advertise our programs.

The current IPC is willing to come up with a clearer statement of the IPC's work.

Work done by the IPC is closely aligned with UMM's mission of global citizenship.

Ray – Internationalization has a special place at UMM. Students, faculty, and staff are all invited to participate and IPC has a unique role in facilitating this.

Devon – We don't have a lot of support for international students but IPC is a place where international students are supported.

Ray – international students have perspectives that challenge our assumptions and need to be supported. IPC can help to shape and direct possible contributions made by international students.

Devon – Responsibilities of IPC may be administrative but we do not have people in these roles on our campus. No fulltime support person in EDI for example.

Sheri – If we are thinking possible constitutional changes, add Matt.

Joe – What constitutional revision would the IPC support?

Stephanie: People who are very much effected cannot vote on this.

Sheri – We should send out a statement after assembly next week. We can give some feedback to Tammy right away.

Joe will make minutes available and start a Google doc with a statement we will send to Tammy.

Dear Joe,

As you likely know, Steering Committee is bringing back 'Group 4 Amendments' to Campus Assembly yet this spring. The agenda packet that will be published on April 24th includes materials related to these amendments. The original workgroup that developed Group 4 recommendations suggests that the work of the international programming committee might be accomplished in other ways, particularly since the ACE Office and its advisory group have evolved since its charge was renewed.

**I am excerpting the IPC charge here, and offering preliminary and tentative (updated) ideas about how its work might be accomplished in other ways. I have spoken with Joe and I appreciate your willingness to consider these updated ideas and to propose alternatives that would work for you. Please feel free to call (x6093), email, or propose a meeting or email with feedback, suggestions, more conversation.**

International Programs Committee

"The International Programs Committee helps develop international policy for the campus and oversees international programs and activities. It serves as liaison between this campus and the Office of International Programs on the Twin Cities campus."

Suggestions for redistribution of responsibilities:

Staff in International Student Programs could work with the ACE office and its advisory group to accomplish work that has been done in committee; *ad hoc* groups could be convened to consider scholarship applications and other high-volume tasks. As appropriate, VCAA/Dean already works with the Learning Abroad Center. Issues related to curriculum are taken to the Curriculum Committee. Issues related to academic credit are taken to the Scholastic Committee. Any policy-level issues that do not align with a core committee charge can be taken to the Steering Committee for consideration and routing.

A BIT OF BACKGROUND:

The work of imagining these amendments was begun in 2016 by Chancellor Johnson, who convened a small workgroup. You may recall that Campus Assembly ratified groups 5 and 6. After being tabled in favor of timelier projects, Group 4 is being revisited. It is not assumed that all of the committees that were identified by the workgroup will be eliminated: members of Campus Assembly will have the opportunity to vote in favor or against the elimination of each committee. Group 4 will be discussed at the April 30 and May 7 Campus Assembly meetings; electronic voting on the status of each committee will open immediately following the May 7 CA meeting.

Thanks for your consideration,

Tammy