

Advisory Committee on International Study

Meeting notes from December 2, 2005

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. OIP will continue to gather data on percentage of class abroad and in what majors.
2. OIP will provide a good sample of the kind of report desired of evaluators including depth, length, and types of back up documentation. This will be included in the pre-evaluation training OIP will be organizing. The guidelines, with budget implications, have already been discussed with Dean of Faculty. Cori will finalize and submit to Muriel.
3. If this does become a standing committee there will have to be a conversation about membership and configuration. Cori and Michael will draw up a proposal by the end of January and bring it to the appropriate committees.
4. Kim will work on spring semester schedule. The committee was asked to let Kim know their availability.

Agenda Items:

1. Enrollment Numbers
 - The first item the committee discussed was numbers. OIP is stressing a policy of managed growth in the number of students going abroad. There are a number of implications to increasing the percent of class size going abroad to be considered. An important item is how curriculum at the 300 level will be affected if all growth comes out of the junior class. Some of the committee thought maybe if we knew students interests earlier, it would help planning. In some majors higher numbers abroad is seen positively as it opens up course development. It allows faculty to integrate the experience in courses. Other departments are looking to have more students away to provide enrollment relief at the 300 level. The ending of LS2 combined with fewer juniors for 300 level courses contributes to some departments' chairs difficulty in managing course loads. Although number of courses may not change, the distribution of those courses is different. The work of balancing the semesters could improve some of these on campus enrollment difficulties too. Currently not enough time has passed for us to see trends. This should continue to be on ACIS agenda to review for red flags.
2. Meeting Times
 - Michael Arnush queried the committee regarding meeting times in the new semester. There are still a number of important questions on the agenda. He would like to increase the frequency of the meetings and hold the first meeting during the first week of classes.
3. Site Review/Evaluation Guidelines
 - The site reports will end up in OIP. Distribution will be limited to chairs of relevant departments. A copy will be available in OIP for anyone to review. The committee recommends that after the report is done the chairs of the relevant departments get together with the evaluator to discuss and get feedback. An ACIS member would also be included in this meeting. If the committee still exists, the report should end up in the normal committee documentation. The group approved the guidelines. They advised that OIP provide a good sample of the kind of report desired of evaluators including depth, length, and types of back up documentation. This will be included in the pre-evaluation training OIP will be organizing. The guidelines, with budget implications, have already been discussed with Dean of Faculty. Cori will finalize and submit to Muriel.
4. Future of ACIS
 - The committee then began to discuss future of the committee. From the conversations the committee has been having OIP recommends that the committee not sunset at the end of this year. There are continual policy discussions where the

committee could provide beneficial advice and guidance. The committee would also be the most appropriate place for the evaluation reports to be vetted. There was some discussion as to where the committee should sit. Was this a curriculum committee issue? Some items might fall under CEPP. Should it be a joint sub-committee? Original parameters of the committee were to set policy around approved programs, and to look at overarching items and concerns with study abroad. The committee was to be an advisory body. The committee has looked at both types of questions. If this does become a standing committee there will have to be a conversation about membership and configuration. Cori and Michael will draw up a proposal by the end of January and bring it to the appropriate committees.

5. Short-term programs update

- Jim Chansky was asked to formally join the committee as a permanent member. Conversation is focusing on coordination of Special Programs and OIP in the area of short-term study abroad. Currently offices are not operating under the same rules for program development. Skidmore does not want to create a structure where faculty must go and sell their program to each office. It is unclear if programs operate under the same policies for development and curricular requirements. In future there needs to be one process for all and clear guidelines on where programs sit. The committee is working on all these issues.