

Advisory Committee on International Study

Meeting notes from January 23, 2006

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

Action Items:

1. Cori will provide an up-to-date list of approved programs and status of departments who have not yet determined their approved programs at the next meeting.
2. Cori will bring a copy of the travel awards information to the next ACIS meeting.
3. Marie Alice will put the rubric into table format.
4. Michael and Cori will meet to review agenda for next semester before next ACIS meeting.

Agenda Items:

1. ACIS Report for CEPP
 - Michael Arnush asked the committee to review the draft report of work done to date by the committee. Please send any comments to Michael. The report recommends the continuation of the committee as a permanent subcommittee of CEPP. There are still many questions regarding study abroad at Skidmore that need to be addressed. Some of these questions are included in the report. There also has not been sufficient time since the implementation of the approved programs model to adequately assess the impact on enrollment patterns.
2. Numbers Update
 - Cori reported on her conversation with the numbers optimization group. Until this group determines the final class number OIP will not know how close we currently are to the college goal of 60% of the graduating class having an experience abroad. OIP is currently working on final numbers by class as we currently use student semesters to count participation.
3. Extending Approved Non-Approved Programs
 - OIP asked for comments on what process should be implemented for students who had gone through the non-approved program petition process and then request to extend their stay abroad. The committee determined that since ACIS had approved the program the student should not have to petition the committee again.
4. Short-Term Programs
 - The Short Term programs committee is working through a proposed set of guidelines for determining the selection process for short term programs. This process is currently complicated by the two areas that are currently operating short term study abroad options. The committee considered if there needed to be another committee to vet proposals and review affect on resources. The committee felt that the idea of restructuring college governance was to reduce the number of committees. There was also concern regarding the validity of a subcommittee of a subcommittee making these determinations. There are current committees within the governance structure that could have purview over determining short term programs. Curriculum Committee might be the appropriate place as these programs should be integral parts of the college's academic programming. Appropriate representatives of the areas affected by the offerings are members of the committee.
 - Cori confirmed that conversations are happening at all levels to create a system that would function smoothly and maintain appropriate academic integrity.
5. Travel Award Program
 - Cori gave an update on the travel award program. There were 13 applications, 5 eligible. Since there were five awards each eligible applicant received an award. The average award was \$1500; top \$2000, low \$1000. The next round will be advertised more broadly through the application process. There were some complaints from faculty regarding the need to write recommendations. There were some complaints

from parents on students having to apply. If there was money left over why not just distribute is evenly to all students?

6. Site Evaluation Proposal

- The site evaluation proposal is still awaiting approval from the Dean of Faculty. Muriel knows it needs to happen. She is just having difficulty getting to it. As soon as we get the go ahead, ACIS will need to determine what programs need to be evaluated next year. In the meantime OIP is putting together a spreadsheet of all approved programs, when they were last evaluated and by whom.

7. Rubric for Evaluating Student Petitions

- Sue Bender shared the rubric for evaluating student petitions. Each attribute is assigned a numeric value: 0 for missing information, one if the program is deficient, two if it is okay, and three if it meets all criteria. The committee still needs to determine how it will use the rubric. Should some areas be weighted more heavily, such as the areas of academic rigor and cultural immersion? The committee will be working on this through this round of petitions.