

November 8, 2013

Richard Hughey, VPDUE  
Chancellor's Office

**Re: International Recruitment Assessment**

Dear Richard,

The Academic Senate has reviewed the UCSC International Recruitment Assessment prepared by Mr. Ian Little of CDB Solutions, LLC. Responses are attached from the following committees: Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA); Educational Policy (CEP); International Education (CIE); Teaching (COT); Planning and Budget (CPB); and Graduate Council (GC).

The committees' responses are generally supportive of the current energy around the issue of international enrollments. There were, however, some common threads in the responses that deserve particular attention. First, there is a clear recommendation to first hire a Director of Strategic Partnerships and build up to a much more robust staffing infrastructure. CIE in particular wondered how the recent appointment of Dr. Anu Luther as Special Advisor to the Chancellor for International Initiatives relates to these recommendations. Clear prioritization and a timeline for implementation will be key in continuing the forward momentum on these issues.

Second, many committees agreed with Mr. Little's assertion that the Division of Undergraduate Education is not the most effective umbrella for campus-wide international issues. The scope of internationalization at a university is such that direct lines of reporting to the Campus Provost and Chancellor are needed.

Finally, the committees noted a contradiction in Mr. Little's assessment of Senate involvement in international recruiting at UCSC. On the one hand he is complimentary of various committees' involvement in pushing the Office of Admissions to increase the number of international students enrolled for 2013-14. This encouragement from the Senate was vital in increasing our international frosh by over 100 from one year to the next. On the other hand, though, Mr. Little then asks the Senate to step away and let the Office of Admissions do its work without external pressures; those external pressures were necessary for this short period of growth

Thank you for the opportunity to review this report. As you can see, the committees paid close attention and offered many substantive comments. You have our comments above and in the attached responses, and we would like to hear your reactions to the report as well. The Senate looks forward to hearing your response reviewing the administration's plan to prioritize and implement some or all of the suggestions in this report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph P. Konopelski". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and a distinct "P".

Joe Konopelski, Chair  
Academic Senate

Enclosures

CC: EVC Galloway  
Ian Little

October 31, 2013

JOE KONOEPLSKI  
Chair, Academic Senate

**RE: International Recruitment Assessment Report**

Dear Joe,

In its meeting of October 24, 2013, the Graduate Council reviewed the draft of CDB Solution's International Recruitment Assessment Report. The Council did not find much to comment upon with respect to graduate education, but felt this appropriate as the work of the consultant is primarily geared towards attracting non-resident-tuition-paying international students to both enhance the diversity of the undergraduate student body as well as to reach the enrollment numbers mandated by the Office of the President. The Council fully supports the efforts of the consultant to aid us in reaching this goal, and notes that the resulting reclamation of tuition funding is likely to benefit both graduate and undergraduate education on our campus.

The draft report does make one or two points, though, about graduate applicants. According to statistics they have been provided, the acceptance rates for international Masters applicants is quite low, which raises the possibility that students who are desirable both from an academic and financial perspective are not being invited to enter degree programs of interest to them. This is an interesting comment and one perhaps deserving attention. The report also presents statistics on admissions rates of international Ph.D. applicants. In this case, though, the Council wonders whether the relative rate of admissions for domestic and international applicants is a good measure of the ease of access to international students to the campus's Ph.D. programs. If objective measures could be found, it would be interesting to assess the relative quality of domestic and international admits, to understand if potential impediments, such as the high cost of supporting students that are ineligible for in-state tuition rates until advancing to candidacy, is leading negative admissions decisions for highly-qualified international students.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bruce Schumm".

Bruce Schumm, Chair  
Graduate Council

October 30, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair  
Academic Senate

Re: International Consultant Report (Sept 2013) Feedback

Dear Joe,

CPB has read the report submitted by CDB Solutions, LLC and concurs with many points it raised. While we are cognizant of the immense infrastructural changes needed for making international education a success on our campus, the committee holds strongly that UCSC must act on many of the recommendations made in this report with the greatest urgency: internationalization of our campus is not only the right path for us intellectually but also has the potential to be fiscally beneficial for UCSC.

### **Organization and Vision**

We wholeheartedly agree that our campus needs a comprehensive strategic vision for internationalization, and that this vision should be acted on as soon as possible. The report argues for the necessity of hiring a Chief International Officer with a clear vision and authority (reporting directly to the EVC) to oversee coordination and coordinated efforts of international activity at UC Santa Cruz. This is critically important as numerous internationalization issues reach beyond the purview of any single division (e.g. Undergraduate Education).

Equally important and urgent is the point made that the International Education Office (IEO) staff be expanded. With more staff, the logistical restraints on both outbound and inbound international students can be alleviated, allowing other areas to foster various objectives like non-degree programs, academic partnerships, grants, donations, internships, etc. with less resistance. The report offers a model of the ideal administrative set-up of international education, though, the final objective outlined may be beyond our current budgetary constraints. We recommend that a realistic and achievable structural staffing plan be developed, guided by sound financial modeling. Recruitment and support staffing positions seem to be the most critical for short term planning.

Staffing is the most important priority and is a necessity for the long-term health and success of international education on campus. Minimally, the position of the Chief International Officer should be formally created and made full-time, as a separate position from the Director of Education Abroad. We also want to emphasize that it is critical to staff support positions such as immigration services, and international recruitment/admissions as soon as possible, with a credible plan to staff other recommended positions within the next two years (ideally with multilingual individuals who can serve as point of contact for international students and their parents during the recruitment process and once students are on campus). These relatively inexpensive positions can yield significant financial benefits, and add invaluable intellectual wealth to the university as international student numbers rise. However, a commitment must be made to return some of the funding generated by international students to establishing and

strengthening the International Education resource base; otherwise this endeavor cannot succeed in the long run.

### **Strategic Planning**

The report implies several ways in which international yield can be increased at UCSC. They all center on identifying optimal target populations, desirable majors and effective utilization of faculty, administrators, students and alumni on campus to help create, improve and maintain possible sources of exchange programs. First, the report shows likely target populations in the countries with the most hits on UCSC's website: China, India, Canada, UK, Philippines, Puerto Rico. We also have information on the most desirable degrees for international students and likely countries vis-à-vis majors on campus. CPB recommends that efforts should be concentrated on these subject matters and target populations, with a concerted marketing strategy, so that work is not duplicated. CPB also strongly recommends a much higher degree of attention on customer service. For example, have staff and/or faculty (preferably, ones who are able to communicate in the student's native language) contact candidates during the recruitment process, and allocate academic advisors exclusively to this population once they arrive to campus. Other similar tools need to be identified to attract students to our campus and retain them after arrival.

At the same time, information available about application materials, tuition, degree requirements, etc. must be updated as soon as possible on popular search sites for international students (e.g., College Board, Zinch, USAstudyguide, etc.) and communication and outreach efforts should ensure that sponsoring governments are aware of professional or academic accreditation. Finally, data should be collected and analyzed to explain why UCSC is not able to convert acceptances into enrollments, in spite of having the same acceptance rates as other UCs. Supporting pre- and post-arrival customer service should not require an unreasonable amount of resources. At the same time, understanding the reasons for students' going elsewhere will be essential in fixing gaps in outreach efforts, communication or services. We should explore the possibility of sharing data with other UCs to understand where students end up being admitted and where they matriculate. Possibly, a referral system could be set up with UCLA and UCB in the case they are turning away qualified international students.

### **Admissions Procedures**

The report notes that several processes for admitting, registering and guiding international students through their career at UCSC need to be streamlined, expanded and better supported. First and foremost, to facilitate the application process (and help inform parents, government administrators, etc.), the report suggests offering translations of the international website in Arabic, Cantonese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Spanish, Turkish and Vietnamese. Other suggestions include speeding up the admissions process for international students (reduce from two months to six weeks, while extending the application deadline to March 1. International students should be allowed to register for courses at the same time as other frosh (during May and June), this would allow IEO the flexibility to register international degree-seeking students before other constituencies, for example international visitors.

CPB strongly concurs with the recommendation that the international office process I-20 applications year-round, within two weeks of receiving a completed application (incl. proof of

English proficiency, confidential financial certificate). The report suggests, for example, that application deadlines should be more flexible (beyond Nov. 30), and preliminary transcripts should be requested up front to minimize issuing an I-20 to non-qualified students, which leads to late cancellations (this will also help reduce staff work, as non-qualified students don't need to get I-20s processed). It is not clear to what extent UCSC has control over this, but perhaps conversations should begin system-wide to offer more flexibility (perhaps via BOARS). UCSC's application fee of \$80 is the highest in the UC system and compared to other similar institutions outside California.

The report also recommends establishing pipeline programs with ESL, Kaplan, etc. to reach classroom-ready students. This issue should be explored in consultation with Summer Session and/or Extension.

There are several suggestions that require one-time resources that would provide a positive impact on recruitment. CPB stresses that it would not be useful to translate the admissions website(s), which could lead to exorbitant expenses as information changes and has to be updated by legally savvy professional translators. Rather, we suggest hiring undergraduate students who speak foreign languages at native or near-native levels to create multilingual marketing materials that would facilitate outreach to parents and advisors. Staff time will need to be allocated differently as well (e.g., personalized communication with candidates or providing letters of support with which students can begin visa applications). However, the revenues generated by international students make these investments worthwhile, and CPB strongly urges implementing these activities as soon as possible.

### **Financial Issues**

The report raises several points regarding fees and financial awards for international students that are notable. First, it is recommended that international students be charged user fees for certain services (although no specifics are provided). CPB recommends that any such fees should be requested up front as a lump sum, to prevent any revenues generated by these fees from being eaten up by endless staff time processing multitudes of small transactions.

Much discussion has already taken place regarding the \$20,000 in fee waiver undergraduate awards international students receive (distributed over four years) to encourage them to come to UCSC. The CDB report strongly urges our campus to maintain this award, in order to remain competitive among UC campuses and reduce the gap in cost with other competitor universities. CPB requires additional information in order to address this issue, however. Specifically, we need to understand better how much aid the University has to provide students to yield them, and/or if the funds could/should be used more effectively elsewhere. Understanding the price-sensitivity of the students who apply and enroll at UCSC should be a priority for the administration.

### **International Student On-campus Experience**

The final area of impact pertains to international students' experience once they arrive on campus (both undergraduate and graduate). The report recommends that efforts be made to make international students feel welcome, in much the same way as the Undergraduate Student Success Team suggests for first-year domestic students. Their specific suggestion includes

offering airport rides to all international scholars for a fee, an orientation program for graduate students, exchange students, visiting scholars and undergraduate international students as well as a vibrant ESL program before and during the academic year to help provide the necessary bridges to academic success. CPB concurs that study communities, which resonate with UG Champion Jaye Padgett's plans, be extended to international students, and activities organized by College 9 be expanded to other Colleges as well. If airport rides can generate enough income to be self-supporting, CPB is inclined to support them; perhaps a buddy-system program can facilitate individualized arrangements, although insurance and liability concerns may make such an approach prohibitive.

The report also states that international students who are supported by their parents be offered housing on campus (although it is unclear whether this should be the case for the entire duration of studies). CPB suggests that the feasibility of housing guarantees be considered for all international students, though we understand these programs may not be feasible to provide for all four years. However, an exception should be made for female students from traditional cultures, who should receive on-campus housing in same-sex units for the duration of their studies.

### **International Graduate Students**

The report notes that acceptance rates for international graduate students are very low. Increasing the number of qualified applicants who could be accepted at higher rates (with more or less financial support) could potentially be an important source of growth for graduate student enrollments. We identified at least two distinct populations requiring special attention:

1. Highly qualified international graduate students, whom we would support through fellowships. We should consider offering waivers to Departments which admit such outstanding scholars. There is no academic reason why such students would cost more to educate than domestic students. On the other hand, they might increase the prestige of the program, help establish future professional networks overseas, etc. Hence there are clear long-term academic and financial benefits associated with supporting these students. CPB feels that waivers of supplemental tuition should be provided for outstanding doctoral or exceptional masters' students.
2. Qualified international graduate students who can contribute to the academic diversity on campus, but who would also pay their own way (e.g., with family, government or other agency support), should be sought out aggressively, in CPB's view. Income generated by such students (primarily MA/MFA/MS, but also PhDs) could help support other graduate students. Support should be provided to create pipelines for international enrollments in Departments which offer PhDs and MFA programs that are marketable for these populations. Furthermore, CPB wonders if an incentive program, similar to the one currently being discussed to increase MA/MS enrollment, should be extended to MFA/PhD students. More specifically, the campus could consider an incentive program where a portion of the non-resident tuition (and non-resident tuition alone) of international PhD and MFA students who receive no University support be returned to their home Department through their normal block allocation.

Sincerely,

*Isi*

Dan Friedman, Chair  
Committee on Planning and Budget



October 31, 2013

JOE KONOPELSKI  
Chair, Academic Senate

**RE: UCSC International Recruitment Assessment Draft Report**

Dear Joe,

In its meeting of October 29, 2013, the Committee on Teaching (COT) reviewed the UCSC International Recruitment Assessment Draft Report. The committee was favorably disposed to increased activity to recruit and enroll international students, but is concerned with the reports tone regarding Academic Senate involvement. As you are well aware, led by the Committees on International Education (CIE) and Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), in 2012-13 the Senate aggressively pursued the issue of international student recruitment and admissions. Those efforts to report on and modify procedures spurred the campus towards the goal of increased international enrollments. Indeed, the results of those efforts are quite tangible—a marked increase in international enrollments. The tone of the report and the suggestion that further Senate involvement would be “counterproductive” is incompatible with last year’s successes. In an effort to move the campus further towards its goal, the committee encourages the administration to carefully consider the important role the Senate will play.

Sincerely,

/s/

Charlie McDowell, Chair  
Committee on Teaching

October 30, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair  
Academic Senate

**RE: International Recruitment Assessment**

Dear Joe,

The Committee on International Education (CIE) has reviewed the UCSC International Recruitment Assessment prepared by Ian Little of CDB Solutions, LLC. The committee remains supportive of Mr. Little's involvement with UCSC and is pleased with the range and quantity of conversations occurring around campus regarding international recruitment and internationalization in general.

CIE was unable to determine the level of consultation done in the course of drafting this report. Some units, like the Office of Admissions, appear to have been consulted extensively, while others, such as the International Education Office (IEO), appear to have been analyzed without adequate consultation. This may be appropriate as the report addresses international recruitment, but CIE reiterates its assertion that internationalization at UCSC is not limited to the recruitment of international students, and must be tackled by more than the Office of Admissions. In this vein, we disagree with Mr. Little's suggestion that we remove external pressure from the Office of Admissions. If not for these external forces, CIE seriously doubts that UCSC would have 115 international frosh in 2013.

CIE supports Mr. Little's proposed structure for international education at UCSC that reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor via a high-ranking international officer on campus. The committee agrees that many aspects of internationalization have to occur outside of the umbrella of the undergraduate education. The proposed structure in the report may be far beyond what UCSC can implement even in the long run, but we advocated throughout 2012-13 for a centralized unit in charge of all areas of international education on campus. What the report lacks is a clear prioritization of positions and a timeline for implementation. CIE would like to see such a timeline in the administration's response to this report.

CIE found the report lacking information on key areas such as graduate recruitment and faculty research connections. Both of these areas are key to international recruitment and internationalization in general. As Mr. Little continues his contract with UCSC, CIE suggests that he work with the Division of Graduate Studies and Graduate Council (GC) to bolster UCSC's approach to international graduate recruitment and support. Also, CIE has developed and shared a survey on faculty international contacts and experience and is more than willing to share this growing database with Mr. Little as he continues to work with UCSC.

Finally, CIE is curious about the relationship between Mr. Little's assessment and the recent

appointment of Dr. Anu Luther as Special Advisor to the Chancellor for International Initiatives. It appears as though these two initiatives (Mr. Little's consultation and Dr. Luther's appointment) were coincidental rather than related. Having now talked with Dr Luther, the Committee is strongly in support of this appointment. We wonder, nevertheless, is Dr. Luther's current position at UCSC one of the recommended positions in Mr. Little's report? Does her appointment change the recommendations in any way? These are some of the questions CIE would like to have answered in the administration's response to this review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ben Crow".

Ben Crow, Chair  
Committee on International Education

October 25, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair  
Academic Senate

**RE: Committee Response to the International Recruitment Assessment**

Dear Joe,

On October 16, 2013, CEP members discussed the September 9, 2013 draft of the International Recruitment Assessment report prepared by CBD Solutions, LLC . The bulleted list below summarizes the committee's comments.

- The committee supports the recommendation to disperse UCSC's international student population among the campus' ten colleges. Housing international students in one college (or two that are closely aligned, as is the case with colleges Nine and Ten) inhibits the learning of all students at UCSC. Additionally, doing so disproportionately burdens the Core Course curriculum of that college.
- The committee supports the recommendation to establish a clearly identifiable network of resources, codified in a single campus office that reports to the EVC, to help international students navigate the logistical and cultural challenges they face as newcomers to UCSC and the United States. This office should also provide support services to those who work with international students outside of the classroom (advisors, tutors, RAs). CEP has received anecdotal stories of a disproportionate number of international students choosing to transfer out of UCSC, and while these stories may not be consistent with hard data, the obvious need to serve our international students well lest they report ill of us to their peers or transfer to other institutions is one of which we are very mindful.
- The committee warns against accepting the report's characterization of international students as revenue generators for the university; the report does not consider the costs imposed on the campus by that international student population, especially with respect to providing instruction in English and cultural competency.
- The committee argues that planning for supporting curricula (such as English-language programs) should take into account visa restrictions of international students. Pre-quarter or summer work should not be required.
- The committee objects to the report's de-emphasis of faculty involvement in the recruitment and retention of international students. Faculty should be involved with international recruitment and retention at all levels, and such should be coordinated and supported by the previously mentioned "single campus office that reports to the EVC." Many members of CEP suggested that a subcommittee of several UCSC Senate committees (CIE, CPB, CEP, and CAFA) might be an appropriate body to consider the ideal role of faculty and administration in terms of recruitment and retention of international students.
- The committee acknowledges that mutually beneficial business relationships can be established with English-language schools (such as ELS in downtown Santa Cruz). However, the committee cautions against guaranteeing entry to UCSC for students who enroll in these schools.

- The committee understands that undergraduate recruitment efforts do not target students who are interested in specific majors. However, CEP suggests that faculty work with admissions to highlight specific programs that may be of interest to incoming students.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

/s/

Tracy Larrabee, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Senate Committee Analysts

October 30, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair  
Academic Senate

**Re: International Consultant Report Response**

Dear Joe,

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) has reviewed the international consultant report distributed by the VPDUE (submitted by CDB Solutions, LLC). Of particular concern, is that although the consultant did meet with Senate faculty at one of the preliminary campus visits, much of the faculty's advice seems to have not been given much credence. At a very high level, the recommendations of the report feature very little, if any, faculty involvement in the process of recruitment or provision of services for our international student populations. CAFA notes this position critically misunderstands Senate's role in admissions, and it seems obvious that CAFA and CIE should be involved in exercising broad oversight over their respective areas of interest regarding international students.

We are concerned that the lengthy report continues to avoid any critical analysis of our recruitment and admissions process. It is unclear if there was adequate stock taken of all the disparate units, individuals and services provided across campus. It would have been far more useful to provide strategies forming these existing areas into a cohesive effort, rather than the provision of a hefty, and financially improbable international affairs organizational chart. The recruitment targets are oriented towards International Schools and their elite students rather than national schools with highly competitive standards. This approach discourages the hard work of working with national schools in favor of relying on government officials as a broker with a focus on fairs and conferences. This is clearly a market driven approach, using a lens of winners and losers that does not encourage possible collaboration with other UCs. We are hopeful that we will instead, or also invest in efforts which are already underway, to create trusting relationships with people in national schools and universities and to invest in learning about what they have to offer us, not only what we can do for them.

The proposed reorganization does not conform with our campus governance; namely, the roles of Senate committees and divisional leadership. The proposed arrangement remains separate from and with no clear relationship to admissions or retention staffing and programs. There are not intermediary steps or scaled down versions of how we get to a fully developed international institution. Without these tools, we are left guessing at what positions to hire, with no information as to their priority or the placement within our existing organization.

We wish to assert support for the prioritization of:

- The importance of comprehensive campus support for international student recruitment and retention with improved staffing levels and expertise.
- A need to improve the admissions cycle, including overall timing, I-20, financial packages, personalized follow-up, housing issues, and orientation.
- A need to insure ease of timely registration with personalized advising and faculty contact.
- The importance of emphasis on academic programs of interest to international students and level of faculty achievement in those programs.
- The need for improvement of multi-lingual webpages.

- The need for clarity concerning UC-wide policies and procedures so as not to unnecessarily restrict our process.
- The need for in-house Intensive English program.
- The need for attention to details such as airport pickup, housing during breaks, centralized advising and counseling services.
- The desirability of dispersing IS throughout the colleges and provision for summer housing.
- Rolling admissions for international students.

Some weaknesses and issues from the report:

- There is a lack of attention to reasons for low international student admission in previous years, including staff attitudes, lack of collaboration with relevant faculty, and reliance on ineffective recruitment activities. This leads to superficial analysis of our process and the needed reforms. The report does not add significantly to what has already been voiced in various UCSC venues, including CAFA, CPB, and SEC. The increase in admits this year from 14 to over 100 students is not related to this consultancy.
- The proposed organizational changes fail to connect with crucial admissions offices and do not clarify responsibilities in a way that seems relevant to our campus. What kind of authority/budget does that person have in terms of decisions that would cover recruitment, admissions, and retention? The need for stronger leadership has already been accepted but the elaborate changes proposed are expensive and perhaps not relevant to our modest goals. The report provides a model with a large infrastructure but does not provide smaller alternatives or models that would over time perhaps become what is suggested. What would a scaled down version look like that actually matches UCSC?
- The report is repetitive and includes substantial information readily available.
- The report does not utilize intrinsic UCSC “selling-points”, like leveraging opportunities to engage directly with faculty or in hands-on research.

Sincerely,



June Gordon, Chair

Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid