MEETING MINUTES

Meeting was called to order at 9:00AM by Iyonka Strawn-Valcy.

I. Welcome and Introductions

II. Overview of Meeting Agenda

Iyonka provided a brief overview of the packet and welcomed walk-ins for any questions.

III. Discussion of Ex Officio Member Nuru Akinyemi

Iyonka called for a motion for Nuru Akinyemi to be a formal Ex-Officio Committee Member

Motion made by Kami Anderson.

Motion seconded by Johnathan Steppe.

None opposed, motion carried for Nuru Akinyemi to be an official committee member.

- Nuru joined the meeting.
- Introductions of the members that arrived late.

IV. Overview of Committee Charter

- Iyonka introduced the purpose of the EA Faculty Standing Committee and discussed the different sub-committees and their roles.
V. Overview of Annual Report

- Exactly 900 students went abroad in the 2016-2017 Academic Year.
- Majority of students participate in our faculty-led model.
- This information can be brought back to individual colleges to increase communication with Deans.
  - Jun Ji inquired about an electronic copy of meeting packet.
  - Iyonka noted that it had been emailed to committee members.

VI. Discussion of Moving Proposal Submission Deadline to April

- July/August submission deadlines had many flaws that were not being addressed.
- Many faculty are off-contract during this time.
- The later the deadline provides less time for the faculty to promote their programs.
- The current timeline has not allowed the committee to review programs appropriately.
- We have previously piloted an earlier-decision deadline in addition to the August deadline. This early-decision deadline (in April) allowed faculty more time to recruit.
- Earlier deadline is consistent with what other USG institutions are moving towards and provide more time for faculty program promotion.

Comments

Johnathan Stepp discussed the value of an earlier deadline for programs, like his, that travel in the Fall. He also discussed the issues with Survey Monkey which is currently used for the proposal submission process. He is in favor of the earlier deadline.

Kami Anderson is also in favor of the earlier deadline. It would be beneficial for her Spring programs to have more time to recruit students.

Teresa Raczek asked about renewals and a renewal deadline. Iyonka explained that the renewals would no longer be an option. All programs will submit the same proposal format. Renewals gave existing programs an unfair advantage with the new prioritization process.

Nuru Akinyemi mentioned some concerns with eliminating the renewal process and the cumbersome proposal process, specifically related to the platform. Iyonka noted that we are striving to use a simpler platform for proposals and welcomed any suggestions.

Jun Ji expressed his support of the earlier deadline. He noted the benefits of pushing back the payment deadlines in order to reduce costs. Iyonka recommended that programs in need of a distinct set of deadlines/different timeline, seek input from their colleges, and meet with the EA Office to determine a more helpful option. However, the payment timeline has been consistently updated and adjusted over-the-years to best
accommodate students and best practices in education abroad. A concern with an earlier application deadline is that some faculty will struggle to recruit sufficient students, providing the need for a later deadline anyway. The timeline has been a balance in supporting all academic college’s needs in addition to adhering to processing timelines set by EAO campus partners.

➢ Changing payment deadlines was tabled for discussion at the next meeting. Iyonka called for a motion to implement an April proposal submission deadline for 2019 programs.

Teresa Raczek mentioned that some programs would occur after the next year’s proposal was submitted. So, if issues were to arise with the program, they would have to change a lot of details about the program.
Iyonka explained the potential for a revision process with an April deadline.

➢ The process of establishing a revision process was tabled for the next policy meeting.

Nuru Akinyemi mentioned potential disadvantages of earlier deadline.
Iyonka requested that committee members bring these issues to their colleges for feedback.
Motion made by Johnathan Steppe.
Motion seconded by Marietta Monaghan.
None opposed, motion carried for submission deadline to be moved to April.

➢ Exact date in April was tabled for future discussions.

VII. Discussion of Proposal Review Process
Johnathan Steppe inquired about whether or not faculty were notified if their proposal was incomplete.
Iyonka confirmed that the Education Abroad Office was able to inform faculty that submitted their proposals early of the documents that would be required for completeness.

Jun Ji mentioned that he was opposed to a ranking system because the number of proposals was under the 55-program limit.
Iyonka explained that we are recommending some sort of prioritization from the colleges.

Kami asked how you would prioritize a smaller number of programs attached to standing courses? Honors College has two signature programs that they do not want to rank.
Iyonka noted that the decision of how to prioritize programs would be the colleges’ decisions because of the varying college and departmental-priorities. Colleges will establish their own ranking system.
Jonathan Steppe noted the potential drawback of colleges approving all of their programs in an effort to avoid any of their programs being at a disadvantage among the other colleges.

Jun Ji recommended allotting a certain number of programs to each college. Rai suggested that the number be related to the size of the college. Teresa Raczek mentioned that it wouldn’t be as simple for CHSS because they offer so many general education courses.

Nuru asked if the criteria checklists for proposals would be the same across colleges. Iyonka noted that the current Criteria Reference Checklist is the only document we have in place right now.

Johnathan Steppe inquired about the hypothetical situation of a college not using all of its allotted programs and the committee determined that there should be flexibility with allotments and the ability to revisit based on submissions.

Natasha Thornton suggested providing an objective ranking scale to the colleges, outlining the priorities based on significance and impact. Iyonka referred back to a weighted rubric that was used in the past. The rubric received negative feedback because the criteria were too subjective and did not necessarily meet the needs of some of the niche programs or more non-traditional program approaches.

- Committee wants to avoid providing a ranking scale based on what the committee wants.

Teresa Raczek recommended including an academic component to the criteria checklist. Jonathan Steppe was in favor of adding this component.

- The committee discussed the verbiage for an academic component to be included on the criteria checklist. It was decided to add the category “Curricular Significance.”

Iyonka called for a motion to circulate the addition of this component. Teresa requested the motion be changed to discuss this addition with individual colleges first and have feedback by 09/01/2017.

Motion made by Diana McClintock.
Motion seconded by Kami Anderson and Natasha Thornton.
None opposed, motion carried to discuss the addition of “Curricular Significance” with individual colleges with feedback requested by 9/1
➢ Iyonka sending out exact verbiage by the end of the day.
   ▪ The Committee discussed the different ways to approach a program allotment for each college.

Jun Ji recommended using historical data to determine how many programs each college gets. Johnathan Steppe noted that doing it this way would give the existing programs an advantage. Nadine suggested that the committee goes back to their individual colleges and discover how many programs they think they should have; as it is critical for the committee members to support the role as informed representatives of their colleges. The committee would then decide on college allotments based on college feedback.

Iyonka called for a motion to bring this question back to the individual colleges for feedback to help inform committee votes and stressed the importance of college feedback in these processes.

Motion made by Kami Anderson.
Motion seconded by Marietta Monaghan.
Teresa clarified that this motion does not decide the colleges’ allotments nor does it confirm the existence of an allotment system.
None opposed, motion carried to ask individual colleges how many programs they think they should be allotted before the committee decides on their official number.

➢ Decision on official allotment for each college was tabled for another meeting based on college feedback.

VIII. Discuss Graduate Cohort Models
   ▪ Carmen Skaggs of CHSS has requested that two particular programs from CHSS be exempt because they are required.
   ▪ The aforementioned Curricular Significance criterion would address the importance of these two programs.

Johnathan Steppe noted that the DGA has determined the other exemptions and the committee should not be responsible for determining whether or not these two programs are exempt.

Iyonka called for a motion to make exemptions a DGA decision.
Motion made by Jonathan Steppe.
Motion seconded by Kami Anderson.
None opposed, motion carried for exemptions to be determined exclusively by the DGA.

IX. Important News
Education Abroad was identified as a high impact practice to be included in KSU’s upcoming QEP.
X. Farwell to Teresa Raczek - CHSS

Meeting was adjourned at 11:06AM by Iyonka Strawn-Valcy.
XI. Farwell to Teresa Raczek - CHSS

Meeting was adjourned at 11:06AM by Iyonka Strawn-Valcy.