

**Minutes of the ISCAPC Meeting
December 8, 2005**

Attendance: Berhanu Abegaz, Allison Biggs, Brian Blouet, T.J.Cheng, John Eisele, David Feldman, Cosmo Fujiyama, Guru Ghosh, Tom Heacox, Laurie Koloski (chair), Scott Kuhagen, Gail McEacheron, Sue Peterson

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. The minutes of the November 10, 2005 meeting were approved.

II. Discussion of Study Abroad Program Evaluation

---A subcommittee chaired by Tom Heacox presented a broad outline of the Guidelines; this subcommittee will present a working draft, including the standards, mechanics, and the personnel assignment of evaluation early next semester.

---The discussion turned to the program evaluation form currently used by study abroad students.

---The current form evaluates a program, in general, rather than specific courses that study abroad students have taken.

---The form is too lengthy; many questions are repetitive; the Heacox subcommittee will revise this form.

---This form should include questions on academic content rather than on general features of a program.

---Feedback on non-William and Mary faculty courses might not amount to much; feedback on faculty courses taught abroad may be valuable information for a program.

---Low response rate is a concern; however, the validity of the survey results lies more in random selection of respondents rather than in the level of participation in the evaluation process.

III. Presentation and Discussion of the Guidelines for Governance of W/M Study Abroad Programs.

---The Eisele subcommittee presented a draft of the Guidelines.

---Discussion first centered on the concept of a “sponsoring department” of a study abroad program (SAP), yielding the following consensus:

1. A degree program (such as an environmental study program) can also sponsor an SAP.

2. Sponsorship should not become de facto ownership of the program. That no department or program has ownership of any SAP should be made clear up front in the section on program sponsorship.

3. In some cases, an MOU on specific features of an SAP can be signed to ensure that the sponsoring department/program remains a key (but not the only) component of the SAP.

--Discussion then shifted to the jurisdiction that the ISCAPC possesses. The following points were emphatically made:

1. ISCAPC oversees curriculum and makes recommendations with regard to the selection of program directors, but does not have jurisdiction over the budgets of SAPs.

2. For the purpose of assessing specific programs, the committee may consult with Reves regarding the program budget.

3. Reves explains that program budget is quite transparent and is structured after close consultation with program directors.

IV. Reports on Student Evaluations of the Summer Programs

---Student evaluations showed that nearly all programs were in good condition.

---There were a few critical comments about the Siracusa program, especially with respect to on-site administration, extra expenses, and safety matters.

---Problems for other programs are minor.

---The Beijing program was said to be too dense, but the program has been restructured to insert an excursion break.

V. New Program Approval

The committee formally approved the Freshman Experience in Scotland program, its program directors, and its William and Mary course.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T.J. Cheng