

## **Advisory Committee on International Study Meeting notes from October 17, 2005**

In attendance: Marie alice Arnold, Michael Arnush, Sue Bender, Cori Filson, Jim Kennelly, Kate Leavitt, Monica Raveret-Richter, Paty Rubio

### Action Items:

1. Full committee: review ACIS Petition guidelines to students and make suggestions for wording or word order that will make committee's criteria clearer to students.
2. Sue Bender, Kate Leavitt, and Marie alice Arnold: develop rating sheet for ACIS petitions.
3. Cori Filson: develop budget for faculty assessment training workshops.
4. Full committee: review faculty assessment budget for feedback.
5. Full committee: review assessment documents for feedback.

### Agenda Items:

1. Short-term program
  - Michael Arnush began the meeting announcing the formation of a subcommittee of ACIS. This subcommittee will review existing guidelines on short term programming and explore the development of new guidelines regarding limiting the number of opportunities per year. Discussions will include:
    - i. To what institutional criteria the proposals will be subject to;
    - ii. Who (what body) will make the final decision;
    - iii. And what are the roles of the various committees that have some purview over aspects of these short term programs such as ACIS viz, OIP, CEPP, CC, and DoF.
  - If we are limiting student and faculty opportunities the process must be transparent.
  - The finalization of these guidelines will be the basis of conversations with the Dean of Special Programs on the relationship with OIP in regard to summer programs. It was recognized that the role of ACIS in these discussions would be purely an advisory role. The Dean of Special Programs has approached OIP regarding standardizing some of the practices around summer programs since some of the OIP short term programs happen in the summer. OIP would like to have the short term academic piece clear and firmly established before those talks begin.
  - The committee will be made up of members from the various committees that have a stake in the guidelines:
    - Michael Arnush for ACIS;
    - Cori Filson for OIP;
    - Michael Ennis-McMillan for Curriculum Committee;
    - Ruth Andrea Levinson for CEPP; and
    - Sarah Goodwin for the Dean of Faculty.
  - The decisions of the committee will be presented to CEPP.

## 2. Petition Process Review

- The committee then went on to review the Non-approved programs petition process. Committee members have been struggling with some of the petitions. The petitions the committee finds most difficult center on location as reason. The question for the committee is where and how does location affect the academic reasons a student has for attending a particular program. In many of those cases it is hard to see the difference between what the student wants and what they need. A related question to be discussed at another point is the development of the departmental approved lists. Now that most departments have finalized their lists how does ACIS and OIP approach holes in offerings to ensure a range of options without diluting the goals of the lists? What is the role of ACIS in regard to reviewing the lists with that strategic eye?
- The committee originally had said that location alone wasn't a good enough reason to deny a petition. However, students have not been articulate about good academic reasons that relate to location. The committee feels torn between giving the student the benefit of the doubt too much and too often or the possibility of denying a student only because they can not articulate that connection.
- Sue Bender pointed out that the reason for limiting location was to limit students from going to hot properties. To limit them from choosing location meaning "just a place", like just a warm place in the sun. There are different locational differences that are legitimate like the student who doesn't want a major urban environment. How do we encapsulate that thinking into the guidelines to students in a clear manner?
- The conversation then focused on how to change the guidelines to better inform students on what the committee would entertain in a petition. The current guidelines do state what the committee will look for in the petition and stresses the need for "clear and compelling academic reasons". Patricia Rubio recommended a change in the order of what a program should have to be successful. Cori asked if committee members could review the guidelines and make suggestions for wording or word order that might help make it clearer.
- This conversation also made it clear that the committee itself might benefit from a rating sheet that could be used to identify the pieces and weight that the committee would place on those different pieces. For example a program might earn more possible points for more integration or compatibility with major than language study in the host language. The rating sheet, recommended by Sue Bender, would create a clear set of standards. That would help OIP do a better job of advising and would make the decision making less subjective.
- Sue will work with Kate Leavitt and Marie Alice Arnold on the development of the rating sheet.

## 3. Program Assessment

- Another question brought up through the petition process is assessment of programs. OIP does not want students using the subjective quality of approved

programs as a reason for going on a non-approved program. This brings us to the guidelines and procedures for evaluation and assessment of programs. OIP needs to formalize the implementation of an assessment program to complete the move to the Approved Programs Model. The model is not legitimate until that piece is put in place. Departments will not have confidence in the programs until the review process is complete.

- Cori has worked on a budget for the faculty piece of evaluation and assessment. When asked “where will the money be coming from ?” OIP will be able to point to the increased revenue that the approved programs model is bringing in to the college. Cori will work with the committee on finalizing aspects of the budget. The budget will include a stipend line for workshops to train faculty on how to do a site evaluation. {Cori has sent the budget to the committee for feedback, is OIP missing anything?} The committee considered including department chairs in the workshop but decided that the necessary consultation on program location that needs to happen with the chairs, what that department needs to see in an evaluation, what questions need to be asked, should be done by the faculty as part of the preparation process.
- To be determined is the protocol on how to prioritize which programs to evaluate and who would be involved. ACIS could work with departments to determine a list during the spring of academic year A for visits in academic year “B”. By end of academic year “A” faculty would be tapped. The faculty would attend a workshop at end of summer. The work shop would help set expectations and include information what advanced work needs to be done, what has to be done on site, and what the report has to look like.
- Colleagues participating in the evaluations will have to be empowered to look at non-specialized areas. This is why consultation has to happen with the chairs of all departments that approve the program. Who would go would rotate and might be based on enrollments. Perhaps evaluators could be chosen by percent of majors so large departments do not dominate the evaluation process. Faculty would have to look at the job as a curriculum committee type of job.
- The committee ran out of time here. Cori has sent to the committee copies of the current evaluation questions used by the different groups who evaluate programs.