To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) met eight times over the course of the academic year to carry out its duties (three times in fall quarter, twice in winter, and three times in spring). In spring, a subcommittee on non-national students was formed to study the issue of non-resident tuition for non-national graduate students.
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Final Report of the Senate-Administration Joint Task Force on Education Abroad Program

The Committee on International Education reviewed the Final Report of the Senate-Administration Joint Task Force on Education Abroad Program in fall 2009. It sent a letter to Academic Senate Chair Henry Powell in November, and then provided additional comments to the Divisional Chair in December. CIE endorsed six fundamental principles that it felt should govern the decisions of the Governing Committee until the time the Academic Council makes the final decision on the final report on the Joint Task Force. The Committee felt that any alterations of these principles would fundamentally change the nature of EAP, and that such changes should wait until the Academic Council completed its review of the final report of the Joint Task Force.

1. The composition and the task of the Governing Committee and to what bodies it should report its decisions should be clarified.
2. The principle of accepting reciprocity students should be preserved.
3. The principle of “immersion,” which makes UCEAP unique among education abroad programs, should be maintained.
4. Adequate financial support to campus EAP offices should be provided.
5. UOEAP’s budget should be made in such a way to eliminate its deficit at the end of the five years.
6. New EAP fees should not be set so high as to discourage our students from participating in EAP.

CIE was encouraged by the many positive recommendations made in the Task Force’s Final Report. In particular, CIE applauded its positions that UCEAP is an academic program, and as such that the Academic Senate has a legitimate role to play to maintain its academic integrity.

Serious questions were raised about how the Final Report came to be approved and written. The Committee on International Education also expressed concerns regarding the process in which the report was adopted and the response that the systemwide Academic Council took on it. The Joint Task Force completed its final report on July 17. CIE had tried to obtain a copy of the Final Report for months so that the committee would be able to discuss the document at the committee’s first meeting in October. At the end of August, the chair of CIE asked Joel Michaelsen, Chair of the Santa Barbara Academic Senate and a member of the Task Force, about the Final Report. Professor Michaelsen had no knowledge about it until it was reported to UCIE. The report was presented to UCIE for comment at UCIE’s October 8 meeting, but it was not sent out for systemwide review until October 20.

The Final Report may reflect the consensus of the Task Force, but without having gone through the approval process from its members, its legitimacy was questioned. CIE felt that the lack of a final approval of the Task Force members from the Academic Senate also violated the principle of shared governance. Furthermore, CIE was concerned by the tardiness with which the systemwide Academic Council responded to the Final Report.

CIE was concerned that whatever comments it made on the Task Force’s final report (by January 15, 2010), the Governing Committee or the Office of the President will have preempted the decision to determine the future of UCEAP in such a way as to make it impossible to alter the course that will have been implemented.

One example of UCOP’s preemptive decision to determine the structure of EAP is clearly illustrated by the job description for the EAP Director (see below). CIE was concerned that by making the EAP Director subordinate to the Vice Provost, instead of the Provost, it intends to downgrade UOEAP. By not requiring a PhD and that the appointment be at a faculty level, it ignores the principle that EAP is an academic program.

CIE endorsed the mission statement that the Final Report adopted and concluded: “UCEAP is an academic program of the University of California. Its mission is to provide students with international learning opportunities to enhance their academic experience and to prepare them to be effective and responsible citizens of an increasingly interdependent global society. Education abroad is not a luxury that we can jettison at a time of financial crisis, but a necessity that we have to preserve even in a smaller and more modest scale. We have to meet the financial challenge in such a way that when the financial outlook improves, we will be able to restore the strength that UC has built for the past 47 years.”
Finally, CIE stressed the importance of the role in the Academic Council in preserving the framework of UCEAP. The Committee strongly encouraged the Academic Council to reject “Model C” of the report, which CIE felt would be tantamount to destroying UCEAP, and also reject “Model B,” which would seriously imperil the operations of the program. CIE felt the Office of the President should provide funding to UCEAP that is adequate to meet its needs as a systemwide academic program.

**EAP Director Job Description and Search**

CIE reviewed the job description of the Director of the University Office of Education Abroad Programs and expressed several concerns. In a memo to Academic Senate systemwide chair Henry Powell, CIE noted the uncertainty of the so-called “final version” of the job description as well as the ambiguity of the selection process (whether or not UCOP planned to conduct a nationwide search through head-hunters or to seek an appropriate tenured faculty). It also was not clear to CIE whether the job description would be submitted to the “Governing Committee” for review or approval.

CIE felt that the “final version” was fundamentally a rejection of the recommendations made by the Academic Senate: in Henry Powell’s letter to Pitts (11/24/2009), UCPB’s statement (11/12/2009), Errol Lobo’s letter to Henry Powell (11/23/2009), and UCIE’s revised version of the job description.

Finally, CIE underscored the importance of this issue beyond the specific job description of the director of UCEAP. CIE felt the “final version” of the job description was a clear challenge to the legitimate role that the Academic Senate should play in the academic program of the University of California.

Therefore, CIE requested that several actions be taken to address these concerns, including further consultation and review by the Governing Committee, UCIE, and UCPB, and an Academic Council statement that the UC Education Abroad Program is an academic program and its director ought to be “an academic administrator … one who could qualify for a tenured faculty position on a UC campus.”

**CIE Sub-Committee on Non-resident tuition for Non-national Graduate Students**

A subcommittee was formed which studied the issue of non-resident tuition (NRT) for non-national graduate students (NNS)\(^1\) and issued a report on its findings. Subcommittee Members included: Swati Chattopadhyay (Chair), David Berenstein, Ben Zhao, Mayfair Yang, Shane Jimerson, and Tsuyoshi Hasegawa. The subcommittee report noted that NNS in graduate

---

\(^1\) The term “non-national students” refers to students in F1 and J1 non-immigrant visas, those who do not qualify for resident tuition during their period of study at UC.
programs across the UC system represent a “substantial brain gain” to the state.\(^2\) They bring research innovation and diversity increasing UC’s competitiveness in attracting research funds; as teaching assistants they are key to undergraduate education and subsidize the cost of instruction; after graduation they make essential contributions to the economy of California by working as professionals and entrepreneurs in the state; as alumni they are vital resources for keeping UC linked to the global community of research, industry, and education.

With NRT as the key obstacle in attracting and admitting NNS, the subcommittee studied the problem of NRT and its effects on research and teaching on campus. Because campus data on NNS was not readily available and the available information gave only a partial sense of the problem, the subcommittee sent out a request for further information on departmental policy on attracting and retaining non-national graduate students to departmental graduate advisors. The subcommittee received responses from 29 departments.

In the survey, all departments identified NRT as the main obstacle in recruiting and admitting NNS. The high cost of NRT places different kinds of burdens on departments. The subcommittee reported that unless immediate and concerted efforts are made to handle the problem of non-resident tuition, the declining population of non-national graduate students would cause irreparable damage to the quality of graduate education and research at UCSB.

The subcommittee recommended that the problem of NRT be handled at several levels and in a multi-pronged manner. This would include decreasing NRT to a nominal level or eliminating it altogether, redistributing resources, and raising private funds for non-national graduate student support and creating NNS fellowships named after donors. The report presented a three-phase approach to addressing the problem. Phase I called for an immediate coordination of data collection and regular reporting of NNS enrollments. In addition, the subcommittee recommended exploring the elimination of non-resident tuition for NNS graduate students, such that these students would be treated similarly to domestic out-of-state students who are able to establish residency after one year. A faculty-led, campus-wide committee should be established to study the data and make recommendations based on the actual flow of funds.

For Phase II (2011-12) the subcommittee suggested that the following recommendations be implemented on an interim basis, followed by a more permanent solution based on the recommendation of the campus-wide committee. First, eliminate non-resident tuition after a graduate student’s first year, as is done with domestic non-resident students when they establish residency. Second, eliminate non-resident tuition for RAs and TAs, as is widely practiced by other public universities in the US and ought to be a model for UC. And third, if each campus is allowed to decide the level of NRT in 2010-11, then UCSB should eliminate non-resident tuition for doctoral students and study the possibility of reducing the burden of non-resident tuition on other NNS students. This should be considered the first option, if the decision about non-resident tuition is left to each campus.

---

\(^2\) Final Report and Recommendations of the Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee.
Phase III (2012-2014) is contingent upon the campus’s ability to decide on the level of non-resident tuition by 2012; if so, then UCSB should move to bring this issue to the system-wide Academic Council.

**International Agreements**

The Committee on International Education received five requests to review international agreements:

1. Australian Council for the Arts
2. Camoes Institute (Instituto Camões) in Portugal
3. Cheng Kung University in Taiwan
4. University of Naples (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”) in Italy
5. University of Science & Technology of China (USTC)

CIE endorsed the proposed international agreements with the Australian Council for the Arts, the National Cheng Kung University, and the University of Naples “L’Orientale”. The agreement between the Camoes Institute and the Department of Spanish & Portuguese was withdrawn.

The Committee expressed several concerns about the draft agreement with the University of Science & Technology of China (USTC). CIE saw clear advantages to partnering with USTC as it is one of the premier institutions in China. At the same time, the Committee believed that it was not logical to evaluate the UCLA agreement (as it was asked to do) and CIE preferred to see one that was specifically written for UCSB. Of major concern to the committee was the lack of clarity about funding issues and the status of students who would come to UCSB from USTC. CIE was also concerned about the nature of the students’ status: would they be exchange students, visiting students, visiting research assistants, or something else? It was unclear how many students might be sent from USTC and what their status would be once they were on our campus. Finally, CIE also found that the issue of intellectual property ought to be more clearly defined.