

## **Advisory Committee on International Study Meeting notes from March 6, 2006**

In attendance: Marie alice Arnold, Michael Arnush, Cori Filson, Deb Hall, Jim Kennelly, Kate Leavitt, Monica Reverett-Richter

### Updates/Announcements:

Michael has asked for the website from Deanne and has given her a suggested location. As soon as the website has been set up OIP will be informed. OIP will then upload all ACIS documents. No change in the status on the website.

Middle States visit will be Monday March 20. The ACIS meeting may have to be shifted or cancelled for that day.

### Action Items

- Cori and Jim will look over short-term programs documents and submit them to CEPP before spring break.
- Cori will make Dean Poston's revisions to approved programs evaluation process document.
- OIP will look to group programs in geographic regions to assist in determining which programs should be evaluated first.

### Agenda Items:

#### 1. Petitions:

- ACIS reviewed six petitions. All petitions were approved. Marie alice will consult with SIT regarding facilities to students in the SIT: Africa Diaspora Studies program.

#### 2. Short term Programs Sub Committee

- All materials created by the sub-committee will go to CEPP.
- No need for ACIS to vet them but committee members should make themselves aware of the documents.
- Please do not circulate the documents. These are drafts.
- Some items are being left intentionally for CEPP to determine. The committee felt these were items that CEPP would want to consider. These are the development of a protocol that lays out for all reviewing bodies the appropriate procedures at every stage of a proposal, what constitutes a direct connection by a short-term program to the curriculum, and should the College continue to sponsor non-credit-bearing trips and, if so, under what auspices and to what purpose.
- The committee considered if there would be instances when the time line for the process would need to be shortened or overlooked. The committee could not think of a credit bearing opportunity when that would be the case. The office of international programs does not have the flexibility to be able to support a program on a short time line. Additionally some indicated that they could submit proposals on a longer time-line. Should those proposals be vetted and approved earlier? The committee felt that would be unfair to others given that such approval would further limit the number of open slots. Approval of those would close opportunities.
- CEPP will be tackling domestic exchange opportunities.
- CEPP will also eventually have to sit down and determine if all credit bearing international opportunities should all be housed in the same area.

#### 3. Future of ACIS

- From conversations and lists of items to be considered it is pretty clear that ACIS, in some iteration, will continue.
- The current committee should have some input into the shape of the committee to come. The committee determined that the CEPP representative should serve as chair, given the committee is a sub-committee of CEPP. Once the original charges have been completed, there will still be a need for OIP to have a place to bounce ideas off faculty, there will always be the evaluation of programs to be managed, and petitions to be reviewed and approved, and CEPP will always have a lot on their plate. It makes sense that there be somewhere for these concerns to be brought.
- CEPP will have to write a new charge for the sub-committee.
- The committee should remain a faculty committee. While a few members of the committee want to resist the creation of a new committee, they felt it an important bridge between CEPP and OIP.

- The committee sought to reduce membership. It was determined that since the committee is to serve as a sounding board the membership will need to be representative of varied disciplines.
- Original members should rotate off given the committee was to sunset.
- CEPP would need to create guidelines on how to select the next series of members. The committee felt that members should be tenured faculty who has worked with students who have gone abroad. The members should not have a high learning curve. The committee can provide basic support. The committee also thought the number of members should not change, there are a nice number of voices, if someone cannot make meeting there is still a quorum. The types of questions that will come to committee will probably relate to issues of disciplines and study abroad, enrollments, managed growth of study abroad, etc.

4. The committee decided to table pre-departure/re-entry committee until the fall 2006 semester.

5. Approved Program Evaluation Process

- Dean Posten has reviewed the document and has a number of suggestions. These will be incorporated into the report.
- The proposal will be shared with CEPP first, then with Academic staff.
- Departments will nominate members to perform evaluations; chair will sign off on nomination. Process allows departments to determine their internal process for nominations.

The committee adjourned.