

## Graduate Student Advisory Committee

### Meeting Minutes

Connable Board Room, The Bernhard Center

06-09-06

**Representatives Present:** Rosana Alsaud (Finance—sitting Chair), Todd Ide (chair), Kelly Daniels (vice chair), Toni Strutz (Social Work), Jan Miller (Social Work), Doris Dirks (past GSAC chair), Kazuhiro Iwamoto (Biological Sciences), Nate Michon (Comparative Religion), Kinfu Adisu (Teaching, Learning and Leadership), Brad Salisbury (Mech and Aero Engineering), Marcel Brouwers (Former Chair), Nuria Ibanez (Spanish), Jason Nuzzo (Performing Arts Admin), Manik Kapoor (Mechanical Engineering), Joanne Lau (Philosophy)

**Guests:** Kevin Vichcales (Graduate College)

1. Call to order: 4:05
2. Introductions
3. Approval of Minutes (pgs. 2-3): Moved by Marcel, seconded by Jason
4. Report from the Dr. Lewis Pyenson, Graduate College Dean: couldn't make it, but will come next time
5. Report from Dr. Kevin Vichcales: Dr. Pyenson is about to take over as Grad Dean. He's preparing now. Provost has resigned, among others. Appeal process under way. Health Care moving forward. There will be a mailing to sign up. Paper process is better for students at this point, as opposed to an online system. Stipends will look differently this fall—on faculty pay schedule, beginning in August
6. Report from the Chair
  - a. Faculty Senate President Meeting: Todd requests more formalized relationship with Faculty Senate, and this was met with enthusiasm
  - b. Dinner with Bailey: Todd requested a new dinner, and as of today she hasn't replied
  - c. Provost Search Committee: first meeting next week. Stay tuned
7. GSAC Sub-Committees and University Councils
  - a. Web Committee – Kelly Daniels: will be meeting with Doris this week to work on a history page. Otherwise, everything is proceeding well
  - b. Public Relations – Need Replacement
  - c. Graduate Research Symposium and Journal – Chris Jones: final selections are being made Monday for Hilltop Review, publication date September. Symposium coming together
  - d. University Councils**
    - i. Research Policies Council (2) – Chris Jones & Adam Milewski: met yesterday, elected officers. Made recommendations about downtown building: open lab space, externally funded researchers
    - ii. Graduate Studies Council (2) – Rosana Alsaud & Todd Ide: discussion about Grad Program Review; many members and guests weren't in attendance, which changed the agenda. Many faculty members left early to vote on censure. An atypical meeting
    - iii. Campus Planning and Finance Council (1) – Brad Salisbury: President offered a budget, which carries over six million in dept from last year. This is just a model, and no decision has been made. Design of Miller, will meet soon to present the findings of the design focus groups. The Herald published an article critical of the Miller plan. Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup>: celebration of Dwight Waldo's anniversary at East Campus, partly to highlight desire to restore East Campus. Everyone should attend
    - iv. International Education Council (1) – Kazuhiro Iwamoto (pgs. 11-13): No one could attend, but see minutes

- e. GFAC – Kelly Daniels
  - i. Proposals: we allocated \$500 for operational expenses to OUTreach. Moved by Marcel, seconded by Joanne. Motion carries
  - f. MLK Committee – Doris Dirks: committee reports to Provost, so it has some problems. Plus, the chair is having health issues. No further reports as of yet
  - g. CAB representative –
  - h. WSA representative –
- 8. Old and Continuing Business
  - a. Committee Replacements – Public Relations, Assessment Steering Committee
  - b. Chair Transition: Rosana and Todd are working closely together
- 9. New Business
  - a. Future of the Ombuds Office Discussion: Ombuds retiring, administration quickly decided to cut the office, under the radar of the Provost’s exit. Marcel: position crucial, exists in every structure. What should we do? Draft an official GSAC position to present to the President
  - b. Budget for 2006-07 Approval: questions about ComuniverCity and postage. Kelly Davidson explains. Moved by Kinfu, seconded by Daniels. Motion carries
  - c. New Proposals – Housing (pg. 4) and Innovation Fund (pgs. 5-10): suggestions: charge a nominal fee for housing; spread out innovation fund to help maximum number of students
- 10. General Announcements & Briefs
  - a. Union – Keith Russo and Jason Olson: TAU picnic a success. Daniels: join forces with GSAC for a softball team?
  - b. Announcements for the Good of the Order
  - c. Next GFAC meeting(s) – July 14, August 11
  - d. Next GSAC meeting(s) – July 14, August 11
- 11. General Discussion “The State of Graduate Schools”
- 12. Adjourn

## Graduate Student Advisory Committee

### Meeting Minutes

Connable Board Room, The Bernhard Center

05-12-06

**Representatives Present:** Todd Ide (chair), Kelly Daniels (vice chair), Toni Strutz (Social Work), Jan Miller (Social Work), Doris Dirks (past GSAC chair), Kazuhiro Iwamoto (Biological Sciences), Nate Michon (Comparative Religion), Kinfu Adisu (Teaching, Learning and Leadership), Brad Salisbury (Mech and Aero Engineering), Marcel Brouwers (Former Chair), Nuria Ibanez (Spanish), Jason Nuzzo (Performing Arts Admin), Manik Kapoor (Mechanical Engineering)

**Guests:** Kevin Vichcales (Graduate College), Rosana Abu Alsaud (Finance), Eric Gato (Chemistry)

1. Call to order: 4:05
2. Introductions
3. Approval of Minutes: Kazu's name misspelled. Corrections agreed upon. Moved by Marcel, seconded by Brad
4. Report from the Dr. Lewis Pyenson, Graduate College Dean: not present
5. Report from Dr. Kevin Vichcales:
  - Healthcare is moving forward with the Chickering Group, a large step forward, better provider, better package, for nominally more cost. Also, we should have an online enrollment for appointees. Annual exams covered, vision plan, RX coverage, no dental at this stage.
  - Meeting with the President: All appointments will be adhered to through 06/07. Budget will be administered much earlier than before, which will help all facets of university work.
  - Discussion about the Grad Program Review.
6. Report from the Chair: Grad Program Review: see enclosed attachment. Marcel attended the meeting. Says much anger has been expressed. Faculty Senate were not allowed to respond during their own meeting. GSAC, as a member of the Faculty Senate, should oppose the administration, says Marcel. Todd mentions the cuts in programs serving working teachers. Yet they create programs that departments do not want. GSAC should be on board with any protests. Kevin: watch the news, read the editorials, endorses Marcel's position. Doris: the traditional process has been circumvented toward a more corporate model, for better or worse. More discussion later

End of Semester BBQ Report: it was fun. Food left over

Dinner with Bailey: will inquire about rescheduling

Board of Trustees Report: Todd shared complaints, to some cheers

7. GSAC Sub-Committees and University Councils
  - a. Web Committee – Kelly Daniels: website functioning. Aesthetic concerns to be addressed over the summer.
  - b. Public Relations – Toni Strutz: no report
  - c. Graduate Research Symposium and Journal – Chris Jones (not present): Todd: close to completion. We should use GSAC money to offer research grants to grad students.
  - d. University Councils**
    - i. Research Policies Council (2) – Chris Jones & Adam Milewski: not present. RPC did not meet, so that all could attend Faculty Senate

- ii. Graduate Studies Council (2) – Toni Strutz & Todd Ide: Kevin: long report from Ron Davis concerning program review, emerging criteria—not enough faculty, not enough appointments. Council wondered what criteria should emerge as the process moved on.
- iii. Campus Planning and Finance Council (1) – Brad Salisbury: did not meet. May 19<sup>th</sup>, the Council will meet with focus groups concerning Miller Plaza. If any want to participate, ask Brad
- iv. Assessment - Kelly Daniels: did not meet
- v. International Education Council (1) – Kinfu Adisu: presentation by Study Abroad Program. WMU students well rated nationally in this area. Yet international student enrollment is low.
- e. GFAC – Kelly Daniels
  - i. Proposals: no proposals. But Eric Gato attended to discuss last month’s tabled proposal for “A Career Building Workshop for Scientists.” Kevin has question about advertising. Kazu asks about facilities. Brad asks if the consultant will actually help all scientists. Moved by Kelly, seconded by Kazu. Motion carries for \$1,995
    - f. MLK Committee – Doris Dirks: our discrimination policy has recently changed to include gender identity—we are the first four year public school to make such a change
    - g. CAB representative –
    - h. WSA representative –
- 8. Old and Continuing Business
  - a. Chair Search Committee Report and Approval of Recommendation – Doris: Committee met several times. Interviewed six candidates. Recommended Rosana. General discussion. Brad moves, Marcel seconds. Motion carries. Long live Rosana!
- 9. New Business
  - a. Replacements on Councils and Committees (Graduate Studies, Campus Planning, International Education, Public Relations)
- 10. General Announcements & Briefs
  - b. Unionization – Keith Russo and Jason Olson: not present
  - c. Announcements for the Good of the Order: Doris: our Nobel Laureate could not make it because of civil unrest in East Timor. Greek Fest is coming 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup>. Pride Art Hop coming. Race for the Cure (Breast Cancer), on 20<sup>th</sup>, Arcadia Festival. Girls on the Run coming up. Ultimate Frisbee summer league. Contact Doris for any details. Kelly Davidson: Art Department offers color printing with cost center funds.
    - d. Next GFAC meeting(s) – June 9th
    - e. Next GSAC meeting(s) – June 9th
- 11. General Discussion “The State of Graduate Schools”
- 12. Adjourn: 5:40

## **Graduate Housing Proposal**

### **Graduate Student Advisory Committee, June 2006**

It is readily acknowledged by the Faculty and Administration of WMU, that graduate stipends and awards at WMU are not sufficiently competitive with institutions of our size or institutions within the state of Michigan. This fact places WMU at a competitive disadvantage in luring potential graduate students to WMU.

The GSAC recognizes that the University is facing financial difficulty from declining enrollment and insufficient state support. As a result, the GSAC acknowledges that the likelihood of an increase in stipend levels by the University is unlikely in the near future. Therefore, the GSAC would like to recommend that the following proposal be adopted by the University as a way to increase WMU's ability to compete for the best and the brightest graduate students, while keeping costs down.

One of the greatest expenses faced by graduate students is housing. According to the Kalamazoo Chamber of Commerce, the median rental price for an apartment in Kalamazoo County is \$456/month. This cost does not include cable, internet access or utilities, which can add another \$100 or more to a student's monthly costs.

Currently the University has 22 dorms on campus. Two of these buildings are vacant and closed due to low occupancy. The University also has apartments on campus as well. Of this number, XXX are vacant or closed. These buildings cost the university money in terms of maintenance, security, etc. regardless of whether they are opened or closed.

For a small additional expense, the University could offer Graduate Assistants and Fellows the chance to live in a Graduate only dorm or block of apartments. This would be beneficial for both the University and the graduate community. First, it would increase the competitive ability of the University in attracting graduate students. Offering an on campus single occupancy dorm room or apartment rent-free (with the student being required to pay for cable TV and perhaps a modest fee for utilities. If a dorm set-up students may be asked to purchase a meal plan) would be a meaningful addition to the package offered these students. It would also cost the university only slightly more than leaving them sit vacant.

In addition, this would create dynamic graduate communities that would help create a support network for graduate students. Such a support network would also help decrease the rate of graduate student attrition and help stabilize enrollment, a goal of the University. These communities would also foster more creativity and cross-curricular application of knowledge by fostering and creating opportunities for a healthy, and vibrant free exchange of ideas.

## **2006 Graduate Student Innovation Fund FAQs**

### **What are Innovation Funds?**

Innovation funds have been used in higher education as policy tools to help universities improve academic and management quality, introduce innovations aimed at greater academic relevance, and increase university-cost effectiveness. The goal of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee in creating these awards is to provide WMU's graduate community with an opportunity to pursue innovative approaches to teaching, unique learning and/or research opportunities.

### **What is the goal of the Innovation Fund?**

The goal of the 2006 Graduate Student Innovation Fund is to facilitate innovative approaches to teaching, learning, and research. Effective innovation is the key process by which the quality of graduate education at Western Michigan University can be improved.

### **Who is eligible to submit proposals?**

All WMU graduate students, either individually or as part of collaborating units, are eligible to submit applications. There is no limitation on the number of applications a graduate student may submit except that a graduate student may serve as project director or "person of primary responsibility" on only one application. Should the project director leave WMU during the period of the project, notice must be given to the GSAC chair and another project director named.

### **Can faculty submit proposals?**

Faculty may be members of a proposal team, but they cannot however serve as the project director.

### **What are the criteria for the award?**

The GSAC, with the advice of a review panel, will grant monetary awards to projects based on a merit review process using the following weighted criteria:

1. Innovation - 50%. The project proposal exhibits imagination and creativity and employs a new and timely idea or approach to quality improvement.
2. Mission focus - 10%. The idea advances WMU's mission or one of the mission components or goals.
3. Impact—10%. The project improves quality of teaching, research, and/or education and benefits one or more WMU internal and or external constituencies.
4. Feasibility - 10%. The work plan (tasks, time line) and budget are congruent with the scope of the project. Proposed quality improvement initiatives are accompanied by a well-defined implementation plan and benefit/risk assessment.

5. Deliverables - 10%. The intended objectives (outcomes) and their measures are clearly defined and quantifiable. The applicant articulates formative and summative evaluations of the project.

6. Expertise of the person with primary responsibility for the project - 10%. The applicant has demonstrated appropriate and adequate expertise and experience to conduct the project.

### **Can a project application have co-Project Directors?**

Yes. However, each project MUST have a single Project Director who will have fiduciary responsibilities for the award and be responsible for presenting progress reports to the GSAC and its Chair. The names of all other team members should be presented in the application.

### **Can one person be the project director on more than one proposal?**

No, an individual can be listed as a team member on more than one project application, but can serve as the Project Director on only one.

### **Do I need to get a sign-off from team members and/or persons and units affected by my proposal?**

Yes, it is the responsibility of the Project Director to assure that all persons, departments, or units participating in or directly affected by the proposed project have signed off on the project. Such assurance should be documented by providing a sign-off sheet with the names and signatures of all persons participating in or affected by the application. It is not necessary to include a "bucksheet" with the application, although one may be requested before award money is disbursed.

### **Should more than one curriculum vitae or resume be included in the application?**

Only the Project Director needs to submit a CV or resume with the application.

### **Are there guidelines for submitting proposals?**

Applications must address each of the six criteria listed above. Applications are limited to a total of eight pages, divided into three sections: the proposal (five single-spaced pages maximum), a budget and budget narrative (one page maximum), and a two-page (maximum) curriculum vitae or resume of the project director or person with primary responsibility for the project.

The proposal section should contain the following elements:

- a. Clearly defined statement of the problem or need addressed by the proposal with appropriate supporting documentation.
- b. Project goals and objectives (Goals should broadly describe the results expected from the project being proposed. Project objectives should be measurable and time-specific - not a method to be accomplished.)

c. Project description (i.e., project design and implementation plan to accomplish the goals and objectives)

d. Evaluation (qualitative and/or quantitative assessment of the project's success in accomplishing its goals and objectives)

### **What are acceptable formats for project submissions?**

The accepted format for applications is:

- Standard electronic document form (Word, PDF, etc.)
- No more than 8 pages (including any appendices, supplemental information, and references)
- 1 approval sheet for team member and affected parties signatures
- 1 inch margins
- 11 point font or larger
- Single spaced
- Text in serif font
- Charts/graphs in sans serif

### **Will proposals be partially funded?**

Possibly. If the cost of the project exceeds the maximum award of \$4,000. Methods for securing the additional funds will need to be addressed in the application and proof that the additional funds have been secured must be demonstrated before the Innovation Funds will be distributed.

### **Will the Review Panel review more favorably those proposals that include dollars awarded from external funding sources?**

No, this is not one of the award criteria.

### **Where do send my proposal?**

Proposals must be submitted to the Graduate Student Advisory Committee Innovation Fund, c/o The Graduate College, Walwood Hall, Kalamazoo, MI 49008, Mail Stop 5242, by 5 p.m. EST on December 1, 2006. No supplemental materials are permitted. Incomplete and/or late proposals will be returned unread.

### **Can proposals be submitted electronically?**

Electronic copies may be submitted to Rosana Abu Alsaud at [gsac@wmich.edu](mailto:gsac@wmich.edu).

### **What process will be used to grant awards?**

Monetary awards will be granted to projects selected through a competitive, merit-based application process. The Chair of GSAC will convene a panel to review applications. The panel will be chaired by XXX, who will present the committee's final recommendations to the GSAC's approval. After the application deadline, the panel will meet to review the applications.

### **What is the schedule for making decisions on proposals?**

The Review Panel will begin the review process immediately following the deadline for applications. Recommendations will be forwarded to the GSAC who will announce awards on February 9th.

**Who makes the final award decisions?**

The Graduate Student Advisory Committee.

**Could the President elect not to award the full \$2 million designated for the Innovation Fund?**

Yes.

**When will award funds be available?**

Award decisions will be announced February 9, 2007, with the release of funds on March 1, 2007.

**The Innovation Fund guidelines stipulate an anticipated project length of 12 to 18 months. When does the “clock” begin on this time period?**

Disbursement of funds will take place on March 1, 2007. The goal of the Innovation Fund is to turn good ideas into results as soon as possible. Accordingly, the Review Panel will favorably weigh those proposals that indicate that intended results will begin to be realized by September 2008.

**Will teams be expected to give progress updates?**

The Project Director will be required to deliver quarterly progress reports to the Chair of the GSAC starting in July 2007.

**Can you provide more specifics on the budget? What can it be spent on and how quickly? For example, can it be used to pay salaries?**

In development of your project budget, it is appropriate to include time, materials, and labor needed to complete the project; the Review Panel recommends team members consult with their department supervisors on questions relating to workload and labor needs if necessary.

**What if two proposals are similar? If the essential ideas are found meritorious, will the committee suggest funding both, or just pick one?**

**Will project leaders of similar proposals be put in contact with one another?**

Each proposal will be reviewed on its merits. The committee doesn't envision putting Project Directors in contact with one another prior to making award recommendations.

**Research was not directly addressed as a funding goal – so to what extent are research projects acceptable?**

The Innovation Fund should not be viewed as a research grant per se.

**Will a proposal building on an applicant's previous work be ok, or will that not be considered sufficiently `innovative'?**

Applications that present innovative proposals that build on an applicant's prior work will be reviewed on its merits.

## **Western Michigan University 2006 Graduate Student Innovation Fund**

Innovation funds have been used in higher education as policy tools to help universities improve academic and management quality, introduce innovations aimed at greater academic relevance, and increase university-cost effectiveness. The goal of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee in creating these awards is to provide WMU's graduate community with an opportunity to pursue innovative approaches to teaching, unique learning and/or research opportunities.

**Program Goal.** The goal of the 2006 Graduate Student Innovation Fund is to facilitate innovative approaches to teaching, learning, and research. Effective innovation is the key process by which the quality of graduate education at Western Michigan University can be improved.

**Eligibility.** All WMU graduate students, either individually or as part of collaborating units, are eligible to submit applications. There is no limitation on the number of applications a graduate student may submit except that a graduate student may serve as project director or "person of primary responsibility" on only one application. Should the project director leave WMU during the period of the project, notice must be given to the GSAC chair and another project director named.

**Awards.** The maximum award will be \$4,000 of one-time dollars. It is anticipated that projects will typically run 12 to 18 months in duration. The number of awards granted will be based on the quality and merit of applications and the availability of funds.

**Award Criteria.** The GSAC, with the advice of a review panel, will grant monetary awards to projects based on a merit review process using the following weighted criteria:

- 1. Innovation - 50%.** The project proposal exhibits imagination and creativity and employs a new and timely idea or approach to quality improvement.
- 2. Mission focus - 10%.** The idea advances WMU's mission or one of the mission components or goals.
- 3. Impact - 10%.** The project improves quality of teaching, research, and/or education and benefits one or more WMU internal and or external constituencies.
- 4. Feasibility - 10%.** The work plan (tasks, time line) and budget are congruent with the scope of the project. Proposed quality improvement initiatives are accompanied by a well-defined implementation plan and benefit/risk assessment.
- 5. Deliverables - 10%.** The intended objectives (outcomes) and their measures are clearly defined and quantifiable. The applicant articulates formative and summative evaluations of the project.
- 6. Expertise of the person with primary responsibility for the project - 10%.** The applicant has demonstrated appropriate and adequate expertise and experience to conduct the project.

**Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions.** Proposals must be submitted to the Graduate Student Advisory Committee Innovation Fund, c/o The Graduate College, Walwood Hall, Kalamazoo, MI 49008, Mail Stop 5242, by 5 p.m. EST on December 1, 2006. No supplemental materials are permitted. Incomplete and/or late proposals will be returned unread.

Applications must address each of the six criteria listed above. Applications are limited to a total of eight pages, divided into three sections: the proposal (five single-spaced pages maximum), a budget and budget narrative (one page maximum), and a two-page (maximum) curriculum vitae or resume of the project director or person with primary responsibility for the project.

The proposal section should contain the following elements:

- a. Clearly defined statement of the problem or need addressed by the proposal with appropriate supporting documentation.
- b. Project goals and objectives (Goals should broadly describe the results expected from the project being proposed. Project objectives should be measurable and time-specific - not a method to be accomplished.)
- c. Project description (i.e., project design and implementation plan to accomplish the goals and objectives)
- d. Evaluation (qualitative and/or quantitative assessment of the project's success in accomplishing its goals and objectives)

**Proposal Review Information.** The Chair of the GSAC will convene a panel to review applications. The review panel will consist of members of GSAC and two faculty members. The panel will be chaired by XXX, who will present the committee's final recommendations to the GSAC for approval. The GSAC encourages nominations of individuals to serve as reviewers. After the application deadline, the panel will meet to review the applications. Award decisions will be announced February 9, 2007, with the release of funds on March 1, 2007.

**Award Administration.** Project directors will be required to submit to the Chair of the GSAC quarterly reports of progress toward the outcomes or deliverables. Reports to the University community may also be made as a means of dissemination. Once a proposal is funded, all materials prepared related to the project should include the statement: "Funding for this project is provided by the 2006 Graduate Student Innovation Fund."

<sup>1</sup> Paper Presented online based on Chicago Manual of Style: Marquis, Carlos "Innovation Funds for Universities," Discussion paper online for World Bank Competitive Funds for University Innovation, September 2000. <http://www1.worldbank.org/education/tertiary/documents/fomec.htm>, accessed September 9, 2005

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COUNCIL**  
**Minutes of 18 May 2006**

**Members present:** S. AbuBakr, P. Ari-Gur, J. Barry Davis, B. Berquist, M. Bundza, J. Butterfield, E. Cutrim, R. Dlouhy, Mary Lagerwey (for J. Thompson), Judi Rypma (for Paul Pancella), and Maarten Vonhof (for S. Malcolm). **Members absent:** R. Davis, W. Homan, and M. Luqmani. **Guests:** Olasope Oyelaran, interim director, International Studies.

Council Chair Jim Butterfield called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

**Procedural Items**

*Acceptance of the Agenda*

Ari-Gur moved, supported by Cutrim, to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved.

**Approval of the Minutes**

Ari-Gur moved, supported by Barry Davis, to approve the minutes of the April 20 meeting. Motion carried.

*Introduction and Welcome to New Members and Welcome to Guests*

At the May 11 Faculty Senate meeting Jim Butterfield and Willem Homan were re-elected to the International Education Council. Two new members were also elected: Caroline Gore from the School of Art and Jorge Rodriguez from Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering. (They were unable to attend this meeting on such short notice.) Paul Pancella will be the Faculty Senate Executive Board representative.

Butterfield welcomed substitutes Mary Lagerwey for J. Thompson, Judi Rypma for Paul Pancella, Maarten Vonhof for S. Malcolm, and guest Olasope Oyelaran, the interim director of International Studies.

**Discussion/Action/Informational Items**

*Chair's Report – Jim Butterfield*

Butterfield regretted not being present to say farewell and thanks to the former IEC members Mary Lu Light and Charles Stroh for their years of service to the council. He sent letters of gratitude to each for their hard work and insightful contributions to the council.

Butterfield briefly mentioned the Graduate Program Review has a number of issues that might affect the IEC. The new MA programs in Ethnohistory and, in particular, the emphasis on World Languages, could provide discussion items for the IEC agenda next year.

*Policy Committee Report on Study Abroad Credit – Brett Berquist*

Berquist distributed the report from the Policy Subcommittee on study abroad credit. They were charged to “examine issues and propose University-wide policy regarding how academic credit completed abroad is recognized and integrated into degree programs at WMU.” The Policy Committee met with deans and representatives from all seven colleges and is recommending the following:

1. Residency requirements. There is a general approval for coursework completed at WMU-sponsored programs to automatically count toward the WMU residency requirement.
2. The awarding of Credit/No Credit for international coursework. The subcommittee recommends that this issue be decided on a college-by-college basis.

3. Recognition of internships undertaken abroad and possible creation of campus guidelines to expedite their arrangement. The subcommittee recommends that the Faculty Senate generate a statement encouraging department chairs to identify faculty/student interest in credit for international internships and course numbers to be used for international internships.

The first and third points were accepted with little discussion, but the second point was discussed at length. Though ideally this issue could be resolved on a departmental basis, administrative complexity requires it be decided on a college level. As this provides more flexibility than the current University policy, the second point was also accepted. Butterfield requested a vote on the recommendations and they were accepted unanimously.

Butterfield and Berquist will translate these recommendations into Memorandum of Action (MOA) language, after which they will be distributed to IEC members for review. Barring expression of any concern, they will be treated as accepted. Otherwise, the council will return to the issue for resolution in June.

#### *Fulbright Program - Olasape Oyelaran*

Although not on the agenda, Butterfield recognized Oyelaran. Oyelaran passed out information on the Fulbright program and will give the IEC a full presentation at a later date.

#### *Faculty Forum on Internationalization*

Butterfield asked for general observations of the Faculty Forum on Internationalization held during the April 6 Faculty Senate meeting and the impact it would have on the work of IEC. All colleges were represented and faculty seemed engaged in the discussion. Berquist stated the framework for internationalization used for the forum will be very helpful for the work of the Haenicke Institute. The president and provost have both expressed their support of internationalization. When the faculty were asked if there were any who felt internationalization was not relevant to their program, there was silence. Dlouhy and Light took notes on the discussion. Many ideas can be implemented without a large investment of resources, such as organizing workshops or a conference on how to incorporate internationalization into the curriculum. It is important that the IEC continue the conversation started at this forum. This can also be used as a basis for the work of the council next year. The IEC decided to utilize this framework as a working document for further developing strategic initiatives in internationalization.

#### *Election of 2006-07 Officers for IEC*

The following candidates for officers of the IEC were presented:

Chair - Jim Butterfield

Vice Chair - Pnina Ari-Gur and Steve Malcolm

Secretary - Maira Bundza

Closed ballots were requested and used for the vice chair position and Pnina Ari-Gur was elected. Rypma moved, and Cutrim seconded the motion to approve the chairperson and secretary by acclamation. The motion passed.

#### *Review of the International Education Faculty Development Funding Committee (IEFDF) Process and Composition – Elen Cutrim*

Cutrim, as chair, Judi Rypma and Muralidhar Ghantasala have served on the IEFDF and should be commended for an outstanding job of identifying the problems in this grant process. Cutrim presented some of the issues that still need to be worked out.

- The amount available for distribution (in \$500 to \$1000 grants) was not clear. The IEFDF distributed \$25,000 this academic year, but found that more was available.
- Some of the requests had incomplete information.
- The IEC approved moving to four deadlines instead of three for requesting grants. Butterfield will contact the Senate to send out a reminder for the upcoming deadline May 31.
- The grant application for IEFDF is now available online, but a few details need to be worked out concerning confirmations and notifications.

A question arose about matching funds for grant proposals with an international component. These should be discussed with Bill Woods, from International Programs and Services, and not requested from the IEFDF.

Butterfield and Cutrim will work up a list of issues that need to be addressed in light of the first year's experience. In addition, two points were decided:

- The IEFDF Committee has full rights to deny applications that are not complete, and should not be expected to search the web for conference and other information not supplied by the applicant.
- Faculty will be allowed to apply every other year instead of every third year. Preference will generally be given to applicants who have not received support recently.

Rypma will no longer be serving on the IEFDF Committee, and Cutrim will continue being chair, but can serve only one more year. Ghantasala will be contacted if he is still willing to serve next year. Josephine Barry Davis was appointed as the third member for a two-year term, with the understanding that she will serve as chair of the IEFDF Committee in 2007-08. Butterfield thanked Cutrim for responsibly shepherding the IEFDF through its first year.

The council adjourned at 5 p.m.