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).

Purpose

As per the Academic Senate by-laws, the committee’s purpose is “To provide advice and consent on all matters of international education and exchange, including practice that impacts exchange students and scholars.”

Membership of the Committee on International Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Berenstein, Chair &amp; UCIE rep</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjorn Birnir</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Cook-Gumperz</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Gans</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei-Te Lien</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Matthys</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Ogbechie</td>
<td>History of Art and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd M. Squires</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Stoll</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mian Wang</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Weber</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Campo (Consultant)</td>
<td>EAP Campus Director, Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudine Michel (Consultant)</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Bankston (Consultant)</td>
<td>Associate Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Barthelemy</td>
<td>Graduate Students Association representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of Undergraduate International Students

The committee decided to repeat its survey of undergraduate international students, which was first administered in 2011. CIE sought funding from the Executive Vice Chancellor to conduct the survey, and $5,000 was offered to have the Social Science Survey Center (SSSC) administer the survey, analyze the data, and write a report. CIE worked with staff from the SSSC to revise questions from the previous survey. The committee considered steps to take to avoid “survey fatigue” on the part of the students. First, it was agreed that it would be best to administer the survey on a biennial basis, and that it would be preferable to conduct it on odd years (2011, 2013, 2015, etc.) since the UC Office of the President conducts a very ambitious survey of all undergraduates every two years, on even years. Also, Paolo Gardinalli, Associate Director of SSSC, suggested that the survey be open for a 4-week window in spring quarter, which would not conflict with other surveys targeting students.

Four hundred and sixty eight undergraduate international students were invited to participate. Potential respondents were e-mailed four times during the month of May 2013, and directed to an online questionnaire hosted by the UCSB Social Science Survey Center. One hundred and eighteen respondents submitted a complete questionnaire, for a final response rate of 25% (calculated excluding bouncing addresses and other unreachable students), which according to the Social Science Survey Center is typical of UCSB undergraduate surveys fielded in Spring Quarter.

The Survey Center’s draft report will be available in the summer (2013), with the final draft ready for approval by CIE in fall 2013.

Future considerations and recommendations: After conducting the survey twice (in 2011 and 2013), the committee had hoped that subsequent surveys would be coordinated and administered by the campus administration. However, after proposing this to the Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS), CIE was informed that this would not be possible, due to the limited resources of that office. This brings up a broader concern that OISS is underfunded and is unable to fully meet the needs of our international students. These students pay for out-of-state tuition, and they should expect to receive appropriate support and services. CIE recommends that the Executive Vice Chancellor consider allocating more resources to OISS so that they can sufficiently serve the needs of the large number of international students that the University is enrolling.

In addition, the committee recommends that a focus group be run in advance of the next survey. This would help insure the effectiveness of the survey instrument and that appropriate questions are being asked.

Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 430: Visiting Scholars

In December the Committee on International Education reviewed a proposed addition to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 430) which would add a new category of “Visiting Scholars”. CIE acknowledged the need to add this classification, in order to regularize the practice of inviting scholars to visit campus for short periods of time. However, the committee expressed several questions and concerns about the proposed policy.

The committee’s concerns focused on the following issues: failure to specify a minimum length of stay for “visiting scholars” (even though a maximum was noted); the potential to inadvertently create a burdensome bureaucratic framework; the possibility to interfere with
departments’ ability to invite outside speakers; the overly-broad definition of visiting scholar; the authority to appoint visiting scholars; and the lack of clarity regarding the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of a visiting scholar.

In April, CIE was given the opportunity to opine on a revised version of the proposed policy, but the committee had no further comment.

**International Agreements**

This year, the Committee on International Education reviewed seven agreements between UCSB faculty/departments and international institutions. The committee continued to be concerned by the lack of campus procedures or guidelines for the review and approval of new international agreements. It was reported that Academic Senate staff have been working with the EVC’s office to develop a draft set of procedures, and CIE is eager to review them when they are available.

**International Agreement with University of Iceland**

In December CIE reviewed a proposal to renew the international agreement with the University of Iceland for a 10-year period. In general, the committee was supportive of the agreement with this University. The committee endorsed this agreement, with a few qualifications.

CIE expressed concerns with regard to the following: the failure to mention a tuition waiver for UCSB students studying at the University of Iceland; the failure to mention a quota for the number of UCSB graduate students studying in Iceland; lack of clarity regarding the two-week field course in offered to students in Iceland; and the time period specified for the length of the agreement (CIE recommended five years).

**RWTH Aachen University**

CIE reviewed a proposed international agreement with RWTH Aachen University (Germany) in December. The agreement proposed students, postdocs and faculty to be exchanged for research purposes only. CIE noted that the agreement did not include any exchange of students to participate in classes or any direct cost to UCSB. Resources for the program would be obtained from grants or other funding opportunities. The scope of the agreement was limited to faculty, postdocs, and student research exchange and the rights over intellectual property. The committee had no objections to this agreement.

**Innovation Center of Chemistry for Energy Materials (iChEM)**

In January CIE reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UCSB’s Institute for Energy Efficiency (IEE) and the Innovation Center of Chemistry for Energy Materials (iChEM), a collaborative venture involving three universities in China (Xiamen University, Fudan University, and the University of Science & Technology of China). While the committee did not object to the agreement, it did raise some questions.

The agreement appeared to CIE to be somewhat one-sided, at least with regard to the provisions for Chinese graduate students to carry out part of their research at UCSB. These students would apparently be co-supervised by UCSB’s IEE and iChEM faculty, but it was not specified who would have ultimate authority for the acceptability of the graduate students’ work or if the iChEM visiting graduate students would be allowed to enroll in courses offered at UCSB. CIE
also recommended that the agreement specify that medical coverage for the participants would be covered by appropriate channels.

VIA University College in Denmark

CIE reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UCSB’s Teacher Education Program (TEP) and VIA University College (Denmark) in May. With this agreement, the respective host institutions would coordinate fieldwork (practicums) for the exchange students, who would be responsible for all of their expenses (accommodations, travel, health insurance, etc.) with a cap of four students per year.

The committee was very supportive of the collaboration, but the committee expressed concerns regarding ambiguity about the selection, training, and teaching of cooperating teachers. CIE endorsed the proposal with the assumption that these questions would be resolved.

Korean Advanced Institute of Science & Technology

In June CIE reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UCSB’s Department of Chemical Engineering and the Korean Advanced Institute of Science & Technology (KAIST) in South Korea. The MOU would reestablish a formal relationship that expired in 2008, and in CIE’s estimate, this was a rather favorable agreement with a top chemical engineering program.

The committee sought clarification regarding the extent to which the parties involved were committed to developing web-based education as well as the financial arrangements of the agreement. CIE offered its endorsement of the agreement pending the consideration of these concerns.

Institute of Taiwan History, Academia Sinica

In June CIE reviewed a proposed agreement of cooperation between UCSB’s Center for Taiwan Studies and the Institute of Taiwan History, Academia Sinica in Taiwan. In CIE’s estimate, this was a rather straightforward agreement with a world class institution. The committee’s only feedback about the agreement was with regard to its renewal after the 5-year period expires. CIE recommended that the renewal should not be automatic, as the agreement states; rather, the renewal should be contingent upon a satisfactory review. With this change, CIE supported the agreement.

Sichuan University of People’s Republic of China

In June CIE reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UCSB’s Extension Program and Sichuan University in China. CIE had no objection to an affiliation with this University as described in the documents. Nonetheless, the committee noted that there were activities listed in the cover letter that were neither mentioned nor described in the MOU. CIE recommended that the MOU more explicitly detail the scope of the agreement.

Open Access Policy

In December CIE reviewed a proposed policy on open access (OA) put forth by the University Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). The committee brought forth a number of questions and concerns about the proposed policy. Of primary concern to CIE was
the issue of multi-authored papers, especially with co-authors from outside the UC system, as well as the potential impact on international researchers working on campus. The committee also wondered what unintended effect this policy may have vis-à-vis promotion and tenure; could junior faculty members be penalized for publishing through Open Access journals at the expense of not publishing in a more standard journal? Finally, CIE expressed concerns about the security of the articles that are deposited (through eScholarship).

WASC Program Review Essay

In June, CIE was invited to review two documents related to UCSB’s reaccreditation through the Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC). The committee chose not to opine on the Educational Effectiveness Report. However, CIE reviewed the draft Program Review Essay and offered a few brief comments. CIE noted that other campuses (e.g. San Diego) include international education in their academic program review process, which is not standard at UCSB. Given the internationalization of our campus, CIE suggested that the campus consider evaluating programs on their success rates of international students.