

## CSULB INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE (IEC)

**Minutes for Tuesday, November 8, 2016**

**Noon – 2:00 PM (FO2 101A)**

**In attendance:** Tim Keirn, Terrence Graham, Jeet Joshee, Charles Slater, Sherry Su, Elaine Haglund, Christy Nellis, Em Williams, Sharon Olson, Leakhena Nou, Ehsan Barjasteh, Heather Parker, Frcine Visilomanolakis, Leslie Reese, Kim Glick, Nilufer Medora, Richard Marcus, Aparna Nayak, Flora Banuett, Ashutosh Pandy, Darshan Patel, Eugenia Kim, Mohammed Mozumdar

1. Introductions
  - a. Approval of October Minutes
  - b. Approval of Agenda
2. Reports
  - a. AVP Joshee Report
    - i. Sunday marks one year anniversary of the loss of Nohemi Gonzalez in the Paris attack. There was nice New York Times by article in tribute of Nohemi and in support of Study Abroad last Sunday. On Sunday, the Design department will have a tree planting in honor of her at 12:30pm.
    - ii. 3 year degree was approved by the counsel of Deans. Graduate programs will be advised as to how to review the applications. Most of the administrative work/screening will be done by the International Admissions office. Students will be accepted that have achieved first division or higher.
    - iii. Campus Plan: The university is engaged in a 10 year plan. Jeet has asked that International Education be included in enrollment planning, campus infrastructure and resources.
  - b. International Education Week (Eugenia Kim)-Begins Monday, November 14. Events by East Asia Subcommittee, Africana Studies Department, and the American Language Institute will present poster sessions. (Tim will send out pdf of flyers)
  - c. CIE Report (Terrence)
    - i. ASI-CSULB scholarships update.

The committee met last Friday to finalize scores. Some scores were missing and had to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> reader for one, but the process should be finished in the next couple of days. The committee used a new format for the evaluation process and reported that the changes made norming easier and more efficient . Leslie suggested leaving a little more time between when scores are due and when the final meeting is. Sharon said that it is always a tight turn around. In the past the deadline was in February for the summer and fall applications, which allowed more time

for evaluation, but faculty leading study abroad programs didn't have enough time to recruit. Flora: Can the deadline for application for scholarship be moved up? Sharon: Problem is that winter session faculty don't have all their people recruited. Terrance: We are exploring using Terra Dotta database for study abroad scholarship processing. Tim: What about the university wide scholarship system? He asked if we could use their system modified for IED. This is being explored.  
ii. A search for Director of ALI is well underway. The search committee has identified a short list and are moving forward with interviews.

d. Study Abroad Report (Sharon)

Update on study abroad numbers: In Spring 2017, there will be 186 students abroad, including semester exchange students, London semester, students going independently, students who are staying for a second semester. In Spring 2016, there were 116. The number for Winter Session is up to 178. It was 98 last year. They actually had to turn people away for Winter Session. (There is a group of 7 students going to Kathmandu to rebuild a library with Birgit P.(Computer Science)under the organization, Conscious Impact. Also, A group of 9 nursing students are going to Antigua, Guatemala to volunteer in health clinics in smaller villages)

3. Old Business

a. Program Review Process.

A new charge for the IEC (Tim) : To be more involved in program review of affiliations abroad that we already have by reviewing how the programs work for the purposes of doing a better job of advising students at the department level and to be able to determine which affiliations are worth renewing. A discussion of this was opened:

- Terrence: There needs to be an official process of ending a relationship with an exchange partner. Coming up with this process is crucial for the curricular aspects of our exchange partners because IEC would have to look at what courses students are taking and could potentially take. We will probably want to revitalize programs that might provide essential courses. Sharon: It takes faculty to look at curriculums to see if courses are REALLY a good fit for our curricular requirements. The IEC Committee members need to be informed about these partners because we will then be more apt to talk to students.
- Richard: IP has done this kind of evaluation for quite a while. An example of the process: China program was a problem. \$5000 scholarships were available, but no one was taking them. What was the problem? The IP review committee found that it was completely a

curricular matching issue. A change was made this year. Curricular offerings were changed, and now it's much more robust. Academic/advising/ curriculum needs to be analyzed from both sides: our requirements and what the partner is offering. It shouldn't be IEC's job to decide which partners should/shouldn't be cut (that's CIE/Jeets job) but rather to feed information into the process to point out advising/academic/curricular issues are and to give recommendations or highlight issues.

- Jeet: Not sure if the IEC should evaluate existing programs.
- Em: Faculty need to know what's offered by partners that matches up with the curriculum of which majors. For example: someone from History needs to be in contact with someone in History at the partner institution. Sherry: Faculty needs to be educated by CIE about curriculum so that faculty can help student "match" requirements to classes abroad
- Sharon: Asked Richard if the IP committee has a review instrument. Richard: It has evolved quite a bit to look at academic and administrative functions and is again being changed to focus on what curricular aspects are fitting and if our training here is appropriate to match training there. An example of what the committee is doing: In South Africa GPAs were going down when students were going to Nelson Mandella. Lots of evaluating and interviews were done and it was discovered that there were no program issues, but that the good surfing in SA attracts certain kinds of students.
- Em: It's important to know where the students are going and figuring out which CSULB professors are interested in making connections and perhaps incentivize these connections. (Instead of PAW, World Professors Around the campus.) Jeet: In many ways we do this now, but it certainly can be done more.
- Tim: Idea for what would come from IEC would be a curricular review. It would be useful to have a cyclical review, and now seem like the right time to look more deeply at our partners for more curricular matches (ie. Mary Immaculate)
- Sharon: It would be valuable for IEC to look at existing partnerships with fresh eyes. Finding new curricular matches within "old" partnerships could really reinvigorate programs. For example Korea: There is a much larger group at Hyong Yeak for further art besides just ceramics because of a faculty member doing the research to find that other art classes there were matches for CSULB curriculum.
- Richard: 1) Couldn't we borrow the PARK instrument, so that Sharon/ Atlas advisors could use the information to help students be matched with abroad programs. Tim: Semester modules should be made by this committee and then give them to Atlas.

- Em: Real life relationships with faculty in partner universities are necessary to keep up constant changes. If it weren't for these relationships, the programs wouldn't work. We can come up with a perfect system, but we have no control of what the partners do.
- Terrence: A recommendation on the curricular aspects of the exchanges and affiliations in written form from IEC would be very valuable.
- Tim: We need to create a working group with Terrence to talk about process, create a template, and think about how we communicate the findings of the review. (How do we keep in touch with the departments?)
- Sharon: Will it be a subcommittee of IEC like the Education Abroad Subcommittee? Tim: Or it could run like the scholarship evaluation group. We have experts in IEC in many fields to comprise the group.
- A motion was made that working group be formed. Seconded. Passed unanimously. Ehsan, Em, Terrence, Sharon, and Richard will be in the group. They will report on the process and template in March 2017.

a. Education Abroad Subcommittee Membership (Norbert Schurer, Chair of the Academic Senate)

- Tim: Last time the IEC met, we came up with 3 scenarios of what to do with the Education Abroad Subcommittee: get rid of it, keep current slate that was created this year and revisit next year, or keep current slate with times of members as assigned.
- Norbert: Couldn't find any documentation of the EA Subcommittee. It would actually be advantageous if it "does not exist" because that would make it an ad hoc committee. We could do with it what we want. (Elaine and Sharon mentioned that it was established about 30 years ago. It began as the Study Abroad Committee, and Elaine pointed out that the IEC was not excited to come under the AS)
- Norbert asked if all of the committees were made up of members of the IEC. The answer is, "no", which, he said, could make the situation more complicated. He said that it is up to us. From Academic Senate perspective, we are free to get rid of it and the other 2 options that we came up would be fine as well are fine.
- Sharon: The AS rules (2.2.1) are silent on how the IEC (or any other committee) should select members for subcommittees Tim: We (IEC) can make our own rules for where the membership of a subcommittee comes from. We need to clarify our (IEC) rules for forming subcommittees.

- Richard: There is a procedural issue. Can our (IEC's) subcommittees be put on the faculty preference survey? Norbert said, "yes". And the subcommittee mission and charge would need to be available.
- Tim: Make agenda item to clarify charge of the Education Abroad Subcommittee and decide terms etc.

b. Revision of IEC Committee Charge.(Norbert Shurer)

- The IEC mission and charge says, "members of this committee shall be recommended by the AS Nominating Committee **in consultation with the Education Committee**". He is proposing that the above bolded language be removed because it is not a practice that is useful and isn't seen to improve the quality of the committee. The idea is to minimize work, and this is just one extra step.
- Richard: Original thinking behind this part (in bold above), which is very important, is that the AS Nominating Committee doesn't have the knowledge of the expertise of the nominees. If the AS nominating committee were provided with information about the nominees and the AS Nominating Committee took on the responsibility of making sure that the IEC had a well-distributed knowledge base. This consultation with the Education Committee makes sure that we (IEC) have a distributed set of knowledge basis for all the areas IEC deals with.
- Norbert: has full confidence in nominating committee. Also, nominations go through the floor of the Academic Senate.
- Flora: As a member of the Nominating Committee, she knows that they request statements of education expertise from the candidates. Doing this is discretionary, but they do it.
- Tim: How can we ensure that this happens?
- Richard: If this challenge comes up for other committees, is there a reason why there isn't a space on the faculty survey form to write a paragraph about personal expertise?
- Norbert: It is hard to get people to volunteer for committees. If we asked everyone for a personal statement, we won't have anyone serving anymore.
- Flora: reiterated that the Nominating Committee does talk to candidates about their expertise.
- Norbert: This change could be put on the consent calendar of the AS, but it could be taken off if even one Senate member objects.
- Flora pointed out that there is some discrepancy in the rules and regulations. They say that the terms for faculty members serving on standing committees are limited to 2 years, that lecturers are limited to one year, and that there is nothing in the charge of the IEC that says that the term for IEC is 3 years. Having a shorter term would give more people the opportunity to serve on the IEC. A

discussion ensued about the fact that 3 years actually seems very short. It is possible to be re-selected. Flora said that it is important to have new blood as well as people who have served for longer periods, and that the nominating committee pays attention to this

#### 4. New Business

##### A. Education abroad Subcommittee

i. London and Florence: Em Williams reported that a call went out for faculty for the London and Florence programs, but we need to recruit faculty for Florence by Dec 5, 2016. Interviews will probably be done Dec 16. It would be good if IEC could approve the candidates virtually.

- A motion was made to approve virtual vote. It was approved.
- Sharon reported that the “pilot” program in Florence is going phenomenally.

ii. CIS Abroad Program- Affiliation Agreement

Em Williams presented a proposal for an independent provider program that has to be approved by IEC. Sharon: application is very complete. They have options that are different from other providers. They offer different locations. Discounts and scholarships are available, and there are internship options. This is a private provider, so the students will still be studying at a reputable foreign university, but the provider does the logistics, the application process of the students, getting housing, enrolling students in courses and providing academic advising, and are available 24-7 in case a student is injured or ill. The provider is an intermediary between CSULB, the student, and the foreign university to facilitate the whole process. They do cost more but try to stay reasonable and provide scholarships. Students often feel safer because the provider is “taking care” of them. These private providers often facilitate students being more successful in the foreign educational systems because they have relationship and ongoing communication with professors and administrators in the foreign universities.

- Sherry: When we send students through private providers, don't we lose the opportunity to have those foreign universities send students to CSULB?
- Terrence: We want students to have different study abroad options: direct exchanges based on reciprocity, faculty led programs, and third party providers.

- Nilufer: has done short-term faculty led programs through private providers since 2005 and is a strong believer in them because hiccups(emergencies, lost passports, etc.) arise, and private providers tremendous help.
- Tim: They are significantly more expensive (up to 40%).
- Sharon: asking independent providers (and getting them to agree)about discounts based on numbers.
- A motion was made to approve the new independent provider. It was approved.
  
- Sharon quickly added that, for those in the Engineering program, there is an discounted program at John Cabot University in Rome just for Engineering students.
  
- Terrence: Nov 15 is the deadline for Professors Around the World applications. Once we know how many applications we have and how many committee members we need, we will identify readers by email.
  
- Elaine reminded everyone that President Conoley will be at the next IEC meeting and asked Tim about the IEC meeting with provost at the International House in the spring. Tim is working on it.
  
- b. RTP and International Efforts (Elaine) Faculty don't get credit for international efforts. About 15 years ago, the College of Ed put into their RTP policy the effort it takes to take students abroad. She would like the President to hear about these RTP policies.
  
- c. A SAW proposal: will be on next agenda

5. Next meeting date- December 13, 2016.