

Minutes of ISCAPC Meeting -- April 11, 2005

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Present: Brian Blouet, T. J. Cheng, Laurie Koloski, Theresa Johansson, Gail McEachron, Sue Peterson, Ed Pratt, Margaret Theobald, Mary Voigt (Chair), Jen Waina.

2. Laurie Koloski introduced minor changes in the curriculum of the interdisciplinary European Studies program. The European Studies CFAC proposed to remove two courses and add one course to the list of electives for Lines 4 and 5, and add two courses to the list of electives for Lines 6 and 7. The committee approved the revisions unanimously. Note that major changes of the program were passed during the March 14 meeting and approved by the EPC on March 31.

3. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to the "second reading" of the William and Mary study abroad program on-line evaluation form.

---The proposed evaluation form had been significantly recast during the previous meeting and subsequently sent to Reves Center's Global Education Office (GEO) for feedback.

---GEO representatives, Theresa Johansson and Jen Waina, and some ISCAPC members provided more information on various recruitment activities and pre-trip sessions held by resident directors and the GEO. There was also discussion on whether the evaluation form could elicit information on the effectiveness of the program administration by the GEO, RD and even local directors. Following vigorous exchanges on the floor, Part I concerning background information and general comments was fine-tuned, and Part V on Program Orientation and Administration was expanded and recategorized.

---The discussion briefly turned to Part III on housing and meals. Given the diversity of various programs, a "not applicable" box was added to the list of the possible responses to most of the questions in this section.

---Ed Pratt made a number of editorial changes, calling attention to the correct use of academic terminology in the questionnaire.

---Toward the end of the discussion, a few questions regarding the "efficacy" of the evaluation form were raised. Would this form capture specific problems such as availability of courses or possible difficulty in dealing with the Financial Aid Office? Presumably open-ended questions should permit students to catalogue these problems, if students would care to go on line and register them. Compilation of survey results can be very labor intensive, as not all questions are sufficiently numerical to allow

automatic data entry. The GEO should seek assistance from IT office.

--The committee hoped to be able to vote on the adoption of the study abroad program evaluation form soon.

4. The committee then turned to teaching evaluation forms, and agreed to evaluate all courses, regardless of whether they are taught by RD. There seemed to have been a consensus on the need for a generic evaluation form for non-RD courses, and on using the home department's evaluation form to evaluate RD's courses. Course evaluation forms differ from department to department, but there are common features, and even a few common questions. A task force composed of Ed Pratt (chair), Sue Peterson, Bruce Campbell, and Laurie Koloski agreed to study the entire matter of course evaluations and to come up with proposals.

5. The committee briefly examined RD reports, identifying two problems:

---Staffing the Siracusa program (how necessary is it for William and Mary to send a resident director to a program not really under our college's control)?

---Opening a bank account for the management of a program (this turned out to be an excessive burden imposed on RD of our Cambridge program).

The committee found current RD reports extremely useful. In the future, reports may be "standardized" and further enriched (for example, course syllabi may be attached); such enhancements will be taken up again at the next meeting.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 15:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T.J.Cheng