To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Committee on International Education (CIE) met seven times over the course of the academic year to carry out its duties (three times in fall quarter, once 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>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bjorn Birnir</td>
<td>Chair &amp; UCIE rep</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Cook-Gumperz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Gans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuha Khoury</td>
<td></td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei-Te Lien</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Matthys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Squires</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Campo</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>EAP Campus Director; Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudine Michel</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs; Black Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Bankston</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Associate Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrikant Kulkarni</td>
<td>GSA rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Evelyn Cui</td>
<td>AS rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of Undergraduate International Students

In October, the committee reviewed and accepted the report by the Social Science Survey Center on the spring 2013 survey of undergraduate international students. Overall, CIE was very pleased with the survey as well as the analysis in the report.

CIE noted that international students reported difficulty enrolling in courses. The committee wondered which majors are the most difficult and how the responding students' majors compared to the overall undergraduate international population. The committee also wanted additional information about the transfer students and wondered whether there were any significant differences in the experience of these students versus international students who arrive as freshmen. Finally, CIE requested that the report include an informational data sheet with the profile of undergraduate (international) students at UCSB.

In December, the report was widely disseminated to various campus administrators, including: EVC Gene Lucas; Chancellor Henry Yang; Vice Chancellor for Research, Michael Witherell; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Michael Young; Director of Admissions, Lisa Przekop; Director of the Office of International Students & Scholars, Claudine Michel; Housing & Residential Services Executive Director, Willie Brown; Dean David Marshall (Humanities & Fine Arts); Dean Melvin Oliver (Social Sciences); Dean Pierre Wiltzius (Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences); Dean Rod Alferness (College of Engineering); Dean Jane Conoley (Gevirtz Graduate School of Education); Dean Steve Gaines (Bren School of Environmental Science & Management); Dean Bruce Tiffney (College of Creative Studies); and Dean Mary Nisbet (Undergraduate Education).

Future considerations and recommendations: The Social Science Survey Center – which administered the surveys in 2011 and 2013 – is in the process of being disestablished. Going forward, the survey will be conducted by Institutional Research, Planning, & Assessment, within the Office of Budget & Planning. The committee met with its director and associate director in May, and agreed to continue meeting early next year to finalize the survey instrument so that it can be administered in spring 2015. The Chair met with Interim EVC Joel Michaelsen who agreed to fund incentives for the students to participate in the survey.

Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 600 Series: Salary Administration

In November CIE reviewed the updated revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual regarding salary administration (APM 600 series). For most sections, CIE had either no objection or did not wish to opine. However, the committee did comment on the following sections:

- For APM 290, it was noted that Regents Professors and Regents Lecturers should also include international scholars (there did not appear to be any prohibition therein). The committee suggested that “international education” should be added to the list of Regents' Lecturer's achievements in agriculture, labor, law, and medicine.

- Regarding section 650 (Salary Administration – Technical Assistance Projects), CIE noted that knowledge of local laws and the community (including cost-of-living) is important in determining the appropriate salary rate. The committee noted the importance of keeping current information about salary levels and labor laws in countries where UC is operating.
Response: The brief Divisional response included comments by the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA) and the Council on Planning & Budget (CPB); most groups declined to opine.

Extension Agreements

In June, CIE discussed a memo by Michael Brown, Dean of University Extension, regarding the role of UCSB Extension in international initiatives and agreements. Whereas CIE supported Extension’s effort to broaden the pool of international students that it brings to UCSB, CIE did not support efforts by Extension to initiate bilateral agreements with international institutions, bypassing the departments involved.

The committee was particularly concerned about the potential impact that such agreements may have on departments. While CIE understood that Extension compensates departments reasonably for the impacts that they bear by enrolling non-matriculated students, the committee questioned the appropriateness of such arrangements that are not organized by the departments themselves. The committee had concerns about the ability to fully compensate departments for the impacts that are felt by its students. The committee believed that it would be best to have an academic department make an agreement directly instead of using Extension as a proxy for such an arrangement. The committee opined that having Extension enter into agreements in the place of an academic department may be problematic on the part of UCSB.

CIE also questioned the need of entering into such agreements. In the absence of an exchange component for UCSB students studying abroad, CIE wondered why an MOU would be necessary to enroll such students.

Response: The Divisional response included broad review by several Academic Senate groups, including: Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), Council on Planning & Budget (CPB), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Faculty Executive Committees from L&S, Engineering, Bren and CCS. Some groups commended Dean Brown for his interest in collaborating with departments to develop international agreements and bringing international students to the campus. However, the majority of reviewing groups were not supportive of the initiatives as outlined in the proposal and did not endorse the involvement of Extension in initiating additional international agreements. The main reasons that groups do not support the proposed initiatives are due to a fundamental belief that individual faculty members in departments and/or colleges need to initiate and sustain international agreements, and that the revenue stream from an agreement established by Extension to a specific department is problematic.

Campus Procedures for Enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct

The committee reviewed proposed changes to the campus procedures for the enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct in December. CIE noted that the Faculty Code of Conduct applies to all UC faculty, including those who are in an official capacity while abroad. The committee commented that extra assistance may be necessary to explain or clarify the code and the enforcement procedures for international students and scholars.

Response: The proposal was widely reviewed by several Faculty Executive Committees and other groups in the Academic Senate. Suggestions from the Council on Planning &
Budget (CPB) and other groups were incorporated into the document, which was approved by the Faculty Legislature at its June meeting.

**International Agreements**

This year, the Committee on International Education discussed several agreements between UCSB faculty/departments and international institutions. The committee provided formal comments on only one (Nanjing University). The committee continued to be concerned by the lack of campus procedures or guidelines for the review and approval of new international agreements. Academic Senate staff members have been working with the EVC’s office, the Office of Research, and the Office of International Students & Scholars to develop a draft set of procedures for international agreements. CIE is eager to review them when they are available.

**Nanjing University**

In June, CIE reviewed the two documents “Agreement on Academic Exchanges between University of California Santa Barbara and Nanjing University” and “Agreement on Graduate Student Exchanges between the University of California Santa Barbara and Nanjing University.” CIE was very supportive of the proposed collaboration between UC Santa Barbara and Nanjing University. However, there seemed to be confusion in the review and approval process of such international agreements, and CIE questioned whether the appropriate documents were submitted for review.

CIE’s understanding regarding international agreements was that first an overall “Agreement on scholarly exchange and collaboration” with the partner university is signed and then individual academic units at each university would agree and sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU would spell out the details of the exchanges, either of scholars or students, and the details of the collaboration between the academic units of each university. CIE did not believe there to be a need for one MOU on Academic Exchanges and another MOU on Graduate Student Exchanges; both are covered by the overall agreement and a single MOU between the academic units would be sufficient.

CIE recommended that if an overall agreement between the universities already exists, it should accompany the proposed MOU and if not, CIE provided a template to use as a model.

**Earth Research Institute**

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from the Earth Research Institute was submitted for review in November, but it was later withdrawn as Organized Research Units (ORUs) have the ability to establish agreements.

**Shandong University of Finance & Economics**

In October, CIE was asked to review and comment on a proposed agreement with Shandong University of Finance & Economics. The request originated when Shandong approached the Department of Economics to establish a student exchange program. The department then referred the request to Extension which developed a Memorandum of Understanding. Typically, the Academic Senate reviews international agreements that originate from a department (sometimes from a Dean in one of the colleges) where there is a clear connection between the international institution and the work of faculty in relation to the academic mission of their department. In light of this departure from the norm, the Senate decided to table its
review of this agreement until the role of Extension could be clarified as discussed above. The review of this MOU was suspended.

University of Iceland

In May, the committee discussed an agreement with the University of Iceland. UCSB had a previously existing agreement between the University of Iceland and several departments in the Division of Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences (MLPS). The Senate and CIE believed that there may be some interest on the part of faculty in the Social Sciences and Humanities & Fine Arts (HFA) to also participate in this agreement. A letter to this effect was sent by Professor Bjorn Birnir, coordinator of this initiative (and current chair of CIE) in June 2013. Upon review, the committee questioned language in the newly proposed agreement which indicated that students would not be registered at the respective host institution. CIE was also concerned about the potential commitment of resources by the two deans. The committee’s informal opinion was shared, but no formal response was submitted. In June the MOU between the College of Letters and Science, Divisions of Humanities and Social Sciences and their University of Iceland counterparts, was finalized by Dean Marshall and Dean Oliver.

National Tsing Hua University

In July, the committee was contacted regarding a potential agreement with the National Tsing Hua University (NTHU) in Taiwan. A delegation from NTHU, led by the institution’s president, was scheduled to visit UCSB later in the summer. Due to the timing, a meeting with CIE was not possible. Following informal Senate consultation, the Office of Research agreed to draft a Memorandum of Understanding with NTHU using the existing agreement with Nanjing as a template.

Support for Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS)

In June, the committee discussed the funding of the Office of International Students & Scholars (OISS) and recommended putting OISS’s finances, as part of student and scholar services, on a permanent budget. Information provided to CIE by OISS indicated that the office operates annually with over $200,000 in structural deficit. Furthermore, OISS has seen an exponential increase in the number of international undergraduate students, from 223 in 2008 to 874 in 2013, and this growth is expected to continue. The office has not received corresponding additional resources to service this growing population, which comprises a crucial component of the University’s educational mission.

The Office of International Students & Scholars is an integral part of the facilities that enables international students to come to UCSB, and OISS will continue to play a key role in the services of a growing population of these students. Because of this, CIE believed that the funding of OISS should be regularized and made a permanent part of its core budget. The office has 3 personnel FTEs servicing the student population and it clearly needs more resources for the important work it is performing.

Additionally, CIE felt that international scholars need services that their departments are not able to provide. Just as with the international students, visiting scholars have to seek the assistance of OISS for all of their visa issues and renewals and any additional service that they or their families may need. Currently, OISS has 1.84 FTEs servicing this population. A $50,000 annual allocation to support scholars was allocated by the EVC’s office for 3 years but again, this is not sufficient and those are not permanent funds.
The committee requested the EVC’s consideration to help remedy OISS’s structural budget deficit. A letter expressing the CIE’s concerns and recommendations was forwarded to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Academic Senate Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani in August 2014.

**Senate Bylaw 55**

The committee reviewed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 at their November 1 meeting. CIE had no comment.