

10-9-2014

International Programs minutes 10/09/2014

International Programs Committee

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

Recommended Citation

International Programs Committee, "International Programs minutes 10/09/2014" (2014). *International Programs Committee*. 14. http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/intl_prog/14

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 by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

International Programs Committee [approved November 13, 2014]

October 9, 2014, 8:00am, Moccasin Flower Room

In Attendance: Sarah Ashkar, Viktor Berberi, Ed Brands, Sheri Breen, Pilar Eble, Stephanie Ferrian, Leslie Gubash-Lindberg, Yuka Nagasaki, Monica Rin, Marynel Ryan Van Zee, Amber Whittemore

Absent: Tinu Bello

The meeting was called to order at 8am.

1. Approval of Minutes

The first order of business was approval of the minutes from the September 2, 2014 meeting, which was unanimous.

2. Next Meeting Date

Our next meeting was set for November 13, 2014, 8am [location TBA]. Marynel Ryan Van Zee will send out a Google Calendar invitation.

3. Budget for FY15

Marynel Ryan Van Zee reported that we have \$10,917 in the budget currently. Adele Lawler recommends that we retain \$2000 of that amount as a reserve (in case of scooping, or to meet new demands that might arise during the year).

After a review of last year's spending, we discussed and approved the following provisional allocations to our various priorities for FY 15:

\$3000-4000 for International Curricular Development (ICD) off-campus grants, with an additional \$1000 for on-campus grants

\$1500-2000 for Extracurricular International Programming (ECIP)

We can shift around within and between categories as necessary. A question to consider for the year would be whether we should give money to other priorities or re-think our priorities for the next budget year.

4. UMM's relationship/contractual agreement with the Learning Abroad Center

Sheri Breen provided updates about our relationship with the Learning Abroad Center, and requested input from the IPC to inform contract negotiations.

We are in the second year of a three-year contract. The Board of Regents has instituted some new policies, is why LAC wants to renew contracts early. Sarah Tschida is the LAC person responsible for communication; Sheri plans to give her feedback on 10/10/14. One new policy requires that all programs promoted to U of MN students be handled through a learning abroad center on one of the campuses. It is also now required that each program have two program leaders. One must be a faculty or staff member; the second does not need to be an employee, but they must be able to take over completely in the event of an emergency. It can be a trusted program provider/contracted affiliate, if

they agree, and can assume complete responsibility. Fees have not changed; the rates will not change for the new contract.

The new agreement with LAC will be 2 years and not 3 years. 3 years is too long, and updates need to be made more often. This gives us a chance to clean up language in the agreement.

Timeline: The ACE coordinator has seen a preliminary draft; Sheri Breen as faculty representative and Marynel Ryan Van Zee as IPC chair have also seen the draft. Ryan Van Zee emailed copies of the draft to IPC members for their information/review. The assumption is that the process will involve IPC review and review by the dean before approval. The new agreement must be in effect in time to apply to programs that will be approved in the coming Spring Semester [preference is for a final draft by February 2015].

The agreement states it needs to be approved by the ACE Coordinator, the dean, and the faculty rep. One change is that IPC may have a more formal role in the vetting process of the agreements. The last agreement renewal was short turn around; we will make an effort to ensure that sufficient time is available to provide feedback. Sarah Ashkar noted that before the last renewal Viktor Berberi, Sarah Ashkar, and Sarah Buchanan interviewed faculty and the overall review went well; most were happy with the LAC as a provider. Viktor noted that the agreement among faculty/staff was due partly due to the fact that the LAC was the only option we have for study abroad.

The significant change is a cap of 5 programs. The LAC wants to cap to avoid cancel programs, because they feel that the cancellation of planned programs causes significant harm to students, faculty leaders and wastes ACE, UMM, and LAC staff work time. The LAC is also concerned about the reputation of UMM and the LAC.

The authority for approval is at UMM, then we recommend to LAC and they approve the final programs.

Their philosophy of the LAC stated by Sarah Tschida is that programs should not be consecutive, should at most be offered every other year; and that programs should not repeat indefinitely – they should be rotated out for fresh ideas. Their concern is that because of these long standing programs, other ideas and faculty could get locked out of the process.

Sarah Ashkar noted that three programs fill early each time they are offered [Italy, Paris and London], and that the LAC philosophy may not align with UMM practices. Marynel Ryan Van Zee noted that the on-campus process could manage competition on our end before the programs are submitted to the LAC.

Sarah Ashkar supports the cap. She noted that the role of UMM study abroad is to get students on UMM programs, and it is difficult to fill all the programs. We then spend time attempting to recruit from outside to fill our programs. Stacey Tsantir has indicated that liability can really be a problem if we are recruiting students from non- U of M of schools. Sarah Ashkar said it also changes the dynamics of the program to have students from different Universities. Viktor Berberi noted that he has taken students from other institutions on study abroad trips and there has not been any significant problems or challenges from this practice.

Marynel Ryan Van Zee stated 5 was a reasonable number of programs to send forward each year. It was noted by several members of the committee that cancel programs is very problematic and the issue

should be addressed. Viktor Berberi added that we should use LAC to the extent we need them- UMM should be deciding which programs should be forwarded to LAC. Breen noted this language about recurring programs versus new programs is not in the contract; it is just a philosophy.

Breen wants proposals in January. She would like one ex-officio staff person from the LAC to provide feedback on applications before we send them forward in February. This will allow us to see any potential problems or setbacks early and proposals can be modified before LAC approval process.

Eble asked how many programs were proposed last year. Sarah Ashkar said we had 8 proposals last year, and 2 programs did not go but were extremely close, only needed 1 or 2 more students. Clarification: we had 8 programs offered last year; this is distinct from the number of programs proposed for 2015.

Pilar Eble and Viktor Berberi stated it would show commitment on the part of UMM to study abroad if we had funds available to give to programs so close to the minimum number of students needed for a program to run. Eble noted that educational missions are not always cost-neutral and sometimes require investment. Prior to our agreement with the LAC, UMM did invest money in programs that did not fill the required quota. While it was not financially sound practice, it did allow for more students to study abroad and was an investment in campus-wide internationalization.

Sheri Breen identified an issue with the contract language. It covers faculty compensation, but not professional staff. She is suggesting the language be changed to program leader or faculty/staff. She noted that in her conversations with LAC they do not foresee any problems with this change.

There is also a concern about compensation. UMM program leaders are paid by the credit hour; UMTC are paid by the number of weeks. UMM programs are usually 4 credits, but this year some of the programs are more than 4 credits. For example, Nepal is 6 credits.

Under the new policy with 2 program leaders, how compensation is awarded is not mandated by the agreement; it would continue to be a flat rate. UMM past practice has been to divide the amount between the two program leaders as if they were team teaching unless the leaders make a different arrangement.

Monica Rin mentioned that when she went to Paris it was a lot of work; more than 4 credits. Credit hours were compared to the model used for on-campus courses. Time spent on study abroad cannot all be counted, because the time the faculty spend is not all instructional hours. Marynel Ryan Van Zee noted in response to Monica's comment that the credit hour allotment is more a question of pay than of student workload.

The LAC has best practices for credit hours assigned to study abroad; they recommend one credit per week. This is not how things have been calculated here; for example, Cotter's class is 4 credits is for 18 days. Sarah Ashkar noted that there is some precedent for 1 credit per week in Global Student Teaching.

The potential problem with compensation in relation to the new policy does not need to be spelled out in the agreement but needs to be discussed as an issue of equity. When solo leaders use program providers as their second program leader they can potentially receive the entire amount of pay, which is not equitable compared to the programs that run with two leaders. Viktor Berberi said compensation

should be decided by UMM and not the LAC; Breen pointed out that the agreement allows for this and that the pay was set by UMM.

Stephanie Ferrian mentioned the dean is working on a related issue with one of the programs going this year, so UMM may have a precedent on how to deal with the issue.

The last issue for discussion was that the LAC wants to know if we want a flat rate for travel to the cities by program leaders (for departure), or should the amount offered be determined on a case-by-case basis. It could be mileage or the cost of the shuttle.

Viktor Berberi noted that UMM staff and faculty are very cost-conscious and this should be decided on a case-by-case basis. Sarah Ashkar and Stephanie Ferrian were in favor a flat rate, and the faculty then decide how to get to the cities. Costs can add up quickly especially considering parking costs if a faculty member is gone for several weeks. Pilar Eble noted that it should be more than the cost of the EE shuttle in case faculty/staff decide to travel another way. Marynel Ryan Van Zee noted that the flat cost should be the most economical way to travel to the cities, which would be the EE shuttle.

Sheri Breen will provide an update to the IPC either before or at our next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9am.

Minutes submitted by Pilar Eble.