

## **Undergraduate Education Response to Senate Review on International Recruitment Assessment**

The Division of Undergraduate Education appreciates receiving the Senate's thoughtful and substantive comments on the initial report from consultant Ian Little on the recruitment of international students. This memo responds to the questions and concerns raised in the Senate letters of comment. Separately, we will deliver for consultation a proposal that includes plans, recommendations, timeframes, and budget.

### Senate Chair:

The Senate chair noted a "clear recommendation to first hire a Director of Strategic Partnerships and build up to a much more robust staffing infrastructure", noting that internationalization goes beyond undergraduate education and should report to the EVC. Additionally, he asserted that a clear prioritization and a timeline for implementation will be key in continuing the forward momentum on these issues. Finally, he noted a contradiction in the report on the role of Senate involvement in international recruiting.

- *UE enthusiastically supports the appointment of the Special Advisor, Dr. Anu Luther, to a role that includes the development of strategic partnerships. She reports to the Chancellor. We agree that it will be essential for Dr. Luther to have a strong connection to the EVC's office in order to ensure campus-wide coordination of efforts and exchanges of information.*
- *UE's 'Proposal for Support of International Student Growth and Campus Globalization' includes a prioritized timeline and funding needs to ensure that momentum is maintained, and will be formally delivered to the Senate in December.*
- *Continued Senate interest, innovation, and momentum is vital to the success of international recruitment and campus internationalization and ideas for supporting and capitalizing on Senate engagement are included in the above mentioned proposal.*

### **Committee on Planning and Budget**

CPB asks for more information on the reason for low acceptance rates for international Master's applicants and wonders if they are being invited to enter degree programs of interest to them. The Committee also asks what are hurdles (mentioning the high cost of supporting students that are ineligible for in-state tuition rates until advancing to candidacy) are leading negative admissions decisions for highly-qualified international students.

- *These questions are worthy of study; we have asked Mr. Little to discuss these issues with members of the Graduate Division and Graduate Council.*

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).

- *UE agrees that for the campus to be successful in internationalization, a campus-wide approach championed by the EVC and other campus leadership and involving undergraduate and graduate students and faculty is essential.*

CPB supports the expansion of the International Education Office (IEO), though asserts that organizational structure proposed in the report is beyond our current budgetary constraints. The Committee asks for a realistic and achievable structural staffing plan be developed, guided by sound financial modeling, suggesting that recruitment and support staffing positions be prioritized in the short-term. The Committee suggests that addition of a Chief International Officer, separate from the position of Director of Education Abroad.

- *A full staffing plan is included in UE's 'Proposal for Support of International Student Growth and Campus Globalization'.*
- *UE agrees with CPB that a Chief International Officer, separate from the position of Director of Education Abroad, makes sense. With the onboarding of the Special Advisor, we are able to combine undergraduate-focused leadership in the Interim Associate Dean of International Education and proposed successor position, a full-time Associate Vice Provost. The Senate has been asked to review the draft job description, which includes responsibilities for campus-wide leadership on international student success, engaging UCSC faculty in study and research abroad programs, increasing international student participation in UCSC degree programs, and academic oversight of Programs Abroad.*
- *CPB mentioned that multi-lingual individuals should be hired into staff positions in support of international education, a point that UE will discuss with Staff Human Resources to see whether this should be a requirement or preference in hiring.*

CPB recommends the development of a concerted marketing strategy to include popular search sites for international students (e.g., College Board, Zinch, USAstudyguide, etc.) and governments that sponsor students to study abroad. The Committee also suggested developing a system for getting referrals from UCB and UCLA of international students not admitted to these schools.

- *Recruitment staff continue to be actively involved in seeking the best strategies to attract prospective international students by attending key conferences focused on international recruitment and advising as well as seeking input from students themselves and international partners, such as UnivAssist in India. Our 2014 recruitment plan includes various online options: College Board, CollegeWeekLive, Zinch China and a new UCSC Weibo Page (Chinese Twitter). We also continue to purchase qualified student names from the College Board and TOEFL and push out key marketing messages. The new customer relations management (CRM) system is allowing much better assessment of the various strategies. We fully agree with CPB*

*and will continue to annually increase our knowledge of country specific sites to maximize recruitment efforts. It should be noted our own website is our number one recruitment tool. A recent Google analytics report shows an incredible increase in the number and percentage of hits internationally. A total of 27 countries experienced more than a 30% increase over this last year going up through November 6th.*

- *Our campus was one of the first campuses three years ago to push the idea of a non-resident referral pool when others thought it was too political. The 2014 cohort will be the third with the non-resident referral pool, which also includes out of state students. We not only receive the names and communicate directly with students from UCB and UCLA, but others who were not offered admission to any UC campus to which they applied. We have been successful in enrolling students with this strategy. However, there has been some concern expressed that they are seeking transfer options once they arrive.*

The Committee suggests an increased focus on personalized contact (in the student's language) during the recruitment and course enrollment process. And, rather than pay legally savvy professional translators, CPB suggests 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.

- *UE agrees that a personalized approach to working with students, especially international students, is important and, during the last year, restructured some of our staffing to enable this to happen more than ever. As CPB mentions above, communication in other languages is most important for families and other supporters, as we seek undergraduates who will be able to communicate competently in English. We are looking forward to leveraging resident and nonresident students with multiple languages in our outreach process. We will explore different options for supporting multiple languages.*

CPB asks that data 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. CPB suggested the campus explore the possibility of sharing data with other UCs to understand where students end up being admitted and where they matriculate.

- *An initial factor was the long-standing lack of outreach, such that most of our international applicants may have had a different UC as their primary target. Policy changes led to a higher admit rate, and the revised I-20 process and other activities led to higher yield. Compared to Fall 2012 frosh results, among international students (admissions residency), the admit rate increased from 40% to 61% (the highest in the system for Fall 2013), the SIR yield increased from 5% to 12% (lower than desired but closer to SB 13%, R 16%, and D 18%), and the melt reduced from 52% to 37%. Overall, this represented a trebling of enrollment yield: 7.4% of international admits enrolled rather than just 2.4%. With increasing numbers of international students throughout UC, data collection will be increasingly meaningful and important to decision-making. This year, we contracted with International Student Barometer to*

*survey our students within the global university context. Additionally, work is underway with Institutional Research (IR) to implement a college choice survey for 2014 to gain a deeper understanding of student behavior. We are also seeking enrollment information from the National Student Clearinghouse to see where our admits may have enrolled.*

Other suggestions include speeding up the admissions process for international students (i.e., reduce from two months to six weeks, while extending the application deadline to March 1. )

- *UE recognizes that the UC admissions cycle is not optimal for recruiting international students. Because of this, we have been very flexible in accepting late applications from international students given our capacity and their timelines. We have posted on the specific webpage for international students seeking to apply after the deadline the exact steps they can take to submit a late application. We have felt it appropriate to extend as late as the non-resident referral pool which goes until April for qualified students. We will be entertaining strategies to inform highly qualified students of their admission via email prior to the portal release dates to shorten the time between application and notification.*

International students should be allowed to register for courses at the same time as other frosh (during May and June).

- *Like CPB, UE was concerned last year that international students not be disadvantaged by a tiered course registration system. This summer, we piloted a program by which incoming international students were able to remotely enroll during a specific day during summer orientation. This program was successful in that it allowed international students to take advantage of department “gating” practices. This year, we intend to provide additional academic advising (using internet video chats) to make the registration process more understandable and simple for international students.*

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

- *The International Education Office does process I-20 applications year-round within two weeks of receiving notice and all complete paperwork from the Admissions Office of an international student’s intent to register. We recognize that often the first campus to send the I-20 is the one the student chooses to attend. Given this fact we revamped the issuance of the I-20 last year and had it sent prior to the final official transcript being received. This coming year we intend to consider the advantages of allowing students to submit financial documents online (rather than by mail). Given the UC system makes offers of admission from a self-reported transcript, we led systemwide efforts to seek the request of preliminary transcripts from international students upon their offer of admission to strengthen the issuance of the I-20. A campus is legally required to send the I-20 via mail; to speed up that process, we send*

*I-20s to students using overnight mail services.*

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

- *UE began seeking discussion last year to pilot a program that would accept the top ELS academic English course and waive (Admission by Exception, AbyE) the UC English Proficiency requirement. ELS was scheduled to meet with CAFA at one point to share their curriculum for a local pilot. If the pilot were successful, approval could be sought from BOARS, removing students from the AbyE limit. We are hopeful that this may be approved this year, as co-marketing with ELS would be advantageous. We are also building a pipeline with ELS and Cabrillo as many of the students in the ELS program can benefit academically from first attending a community college. The Applied Linguistics Department is considering establishing a Summer Language Institute in summer session.*

CPB recommends that user fees charged to students (e.g., for airport pickups, orientations) 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.

- *UE will work with the appropriate campus committees to ensure that fees charged are essential, appropriate, and in compliance with campus policies. We support the efforts being led by EVC Galloway and VC Latham to streamline financial processes. We will also continue to advocate for enabling students to pay for things on campus using credit cards. Airport transportation has been highlighted as a necessary service for international students. This year we provided this service to all international students who attended an orientation. It was helpful to students and very labor intensive. We are evaluating how best to provide this service as effectively and efficiently with as little risk as possible in the future.*

CPB requires additional information in order to address the issue of the UG Dean's Award. 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.

- *We do not have data on what would have happened without the UGDA. We do have data on admissions and yield since the program was implemented. We have significantly exceeded (by 30%) non-resident admissions targets that were set last Fall. While we propose to maintain the award as it is for the next two years, we suggest a reduction to 10% by 2020 of the non-resident tuition pool, which would be managed in consultation with CAFA. This would enable more nuanced targeting of the award to specific countries and states, need, and merit. Understanding the price-sensitivity of each student upon application or admissions, especially for international students, is*

*exceptionally challenging. This is a key goal of specific questions being tailored for the College Choice Survey to be implemented for the 2014 cohort.*

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.

- *Two years ago Colleges, Housing and Educational Services (CHES) agreed to guarantee housing for the duration of the undergraduate experience for international students. This was intended to be a key differentiator in our yield efforts. Given our new LREP and expected continued growth, we will need to annually confirm capacity.*

The Committee expressed concern about low graduate student enrollment rates and suggested offering waivers to Departments that admit highly qualified international graduate students and aggressively marketing our programs to graduate students who could pay their own way.

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.

- *UE agrees with the approach of incentivising actions that benefit the campus, such as supporting non-resident undergraduate or graduate students, or other campus priorities.*

#### **Graduate Council questions/concerns:**

GC notes that the consultant report is primarily focussed on undergraduates, supports these efforts, and notes that increased non-resident tuition will help the entire campus, including undergraduate and graduate students. Further, GC poses questions concerning the graduate acceptance rate and wonders if a comparison of domestic and international admits should be conducted, especially in relationship to non-resident tuition.

- *Mr. Little will be back on campus next week, and we are setting up a meeting with members of the Graduate Division and Council to further discuss recruitment and support of master's and doctoral students from abroad.*

#### **Committee on Teaching:**

Report has tone suggesting that faculty involvement is counterproductive. The COT encourages the administration to carefully consider the important role the Senate will play.

- *UE believes that faculty involvement is important to international student growth, success, and partnerships. Besides the critical advocacy and oversight role that Senate Committees – particularly CAFA and CIE – have related to international education (including admissions, financial aid, and study abroad), many more committees provide guidance and expertise on issues that intersect with a campus effort to internationalize. For example, CEP, CPE, and COT may have further curricular ideas for undergraduate international students; COR may consider giving preference to projects that are international in nature; CIE, CEP and GC may wish to review international topics and perspectives for minors or designated emphases; CPB, CEP, and GC may wish to review academic programs with an international slant.*

**Committee on International Education:**

CIE supports Mr. Little’s proposed structure that a high-ranking international officer on campus report to the Executive Vice Chancellor, since some aspects of internationalization have to occur outside of the umbrella of the undergraduate education.

- *As mentioned previously, we agree with the addition of senior leader, although as presently structured the position reports to Chancellor Blumenthal, who is always involved in an international partnership agreement.*

The proposed structure in the report may be far beyond what UCSC can implement even in the long run. CIE has since 2012 advocated for a centralized unit in charge of all areas of international education on campus. Like other committees, CIE would like to see prioritization of positions and a timeline for implementation in the administration’s response to this report.

- *Mr. Little’s suggestions for staffing inspired much conversation on campus and within UE. We continue to believe that IEO is the appropriate unit for managing and coordinating international education on our campus. We have studied a variety of models and structures (including some of the organizations noted in Mr. Little’s report) and believe that our structure is appropriate for our campus, though with additional staffing and campus leadership, as detailed in our proposal.*
- *While IEO is housed within the Division of Undergraduate Education, our responsibilities are not defined by that boundary (as with Registrar, Summer Session, and Financial Aid) and instead are designed to achieve the overriding goal of providing effective, efficient, and seamless service to all students (and faculty). For example, IEO assumed responsibility for graduate student visas last year (something that the Graduate Division did previously). Similarly, graduate students are invited to our programs for international students. We do believe that campus leadership that extends beyond UE is essential for ensuring the prioritization, coordination, and achievement of efforts to internationalize the campus.*

CIE saw little in the report about key areas such as graduate recruitment and faculty

research connections and suggests that Mr. Little work with the Division of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Council to increase UCSC's approach to international graduate recruitment and support.

- *Mr. Little will be back on campus next week, and we are working on setting up a meeting with members of the Graduate Division and Council to further discuss recruitment and support of master's and doctoral students from abroad.*

CIE mentioned its support for the appointment of Special Advisor to the Chancellor, Dr. Anu Luther and asked whether her appointment is in line with Mr. Little's staffing recommendation and/or if her appointment changes the recommendations in any way.

- *Because of her ties to business internationally and in Silicon Valley, we expect Dr. Anu Luther's appointment to focus primarily on working with faculty and administrators to develop research and entrepreneurial partnerships, which will undoubtedly connect with immigration, admissions, and other issues. Although it is important that there be division of responsibilities, it is equally important that we see and leverage the connections among these domains.*

#### **Committee on Educational Policy:**

CEP supports the recommendation to disperse UCSC's international student population among the 10 campus colleges.

- *UE is working to make sure that there is broad distribution of international students among the colleges so that all students and staff benefit from the new perspectives that a diverse student body brings.*

Similar to CIE, CEP advocates for the establishment of a single campus office that reports to the EVC responsible for managing resources related to international education and providing support services to those who work with international students outside of the classroom (advisors, tutors, RAs).

- *As noted earlier, we agree with the addition of a senior international champion who advocates for adequate funding and services for international students.*

CIE noted that planning for supporting curricula (such as English-language programs) needs to take into account visa restrictions of international students. Further, they stated that pre-quarter or summer work should not be required.

- *UE thanks CIE for being aware of how immigration laws affect when students can enroll in classes, travel, or work. summer session viable for international students provided they maintain a specific course load. This coming year we are piloting a 7-week summer start program for international students to include intensive writing, advanced English, and an optional Introduction to the American Research University courses. Students will be issued the requisite I-20 to make it legal for them to be in the U.S. Although this program will not appeal to every international student, we believe it*



*will attract enough students to make this financially viable and offer data on the benefits of this type of program to incoming international students.*

The committee objected to the report's de-emphasis of faculty involvement in the recruitment and retention of international students and stated that 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) be asked to consider the ideal role of faculty and administration in terms of recruitment and retention of international students.

- *As mentioned earlier, UE believes that faculty involvement is critical to the university's ability to internationalize. In fact, certain responsibilities (e.g., course review, advocacy, academic integration) are within the purview of the faculty. Additionally, many faculty have international contacts and expertise that will be essential to our ability to identify and prioritize realistic and meaningful partnerships.*

The committee noted that mutually beneficial business relationships can be established with English-language schools (such as ELS in downtown Santa Cruz), but cautioned against guaranteeing entry to UCSC for students who enroll in these schools.

- *UE is hoping to launch a pilot program with ELS, and is not considering admissions guarantees, something that UC policy does not allow. That said, students who have graduated from the top level of ELS coursework may be excellent candidates for admission to UCSC. While it is critical that we not misrepresent that a pathway to UCSC exists, we believe it advantageous to introduce ELS students to the campus and all it has to offer.*

CEP suggests that faculty work with admissions to highlight specific programs that may be of interest to incoming students.

- *UE welcomes information on programs that might interest international students and reviews data to identify patterns and trends in students' interests over time. As the number of international students increases, the data will increasingly be able to meaningfully identify trends among this cohort of students.*

### **Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid**

CAFA took exception to a recruitment strategy that is oriented towards government officials, fairs, and conferences and their connections with (elite) International Schools rather than direct partnerships with national schools with highly competitive standards.

- *UE continues to pursue a variety of strategies to increase the diversity of our student body, including fairs and conferences, embassies, and direct partnerships with national schools. Initially we are prioritizing those strategies that will bring more immediate results with the least amount of financial and personnel costs. We will continually*

*diversify our approaches and priorities over time.*

CAFA echoed other committees' concerns about the staffing model not being prioritized, with a phased approach to full staffing. Questions the relevance of the proposed organizational model to the UCSC campus structure and culture. Also, asks what would a scaled down version look like that actually matches UCSC? Finally, what kind of budget and authority would the people mentioned have over what areas and for coordination between areas?

- *Discussed above and in UE's 'Proposal for Support of International Student Growth and Campus Globalization'.*

CAFA's priorities are:

- comprehensive campus wide approach;
  - more expertise and staffing needed; improve the admissions cycle, including a rolling cycle, more streamlined processing of paperwork and personalized follow up with students;
  - help with registration by advisors and faculty;
  - need to focus on certain programs are more attractive to international students;
  - need for translated information (highlighted webpages);
  - clarity on UCSC vs. UCOP policies re recruitment and admissions to ensure we are not unnecessarily limiting ourselves;
  - need for an in-house intensive Language Program;
  - need for airport pickup, centralized counseling and advising services and activities during break.
- *UE agrees with many of CAFA's list of priorities, most of which are included in the proposal for increased funding to support such efforts. We note that there is disagreement among Senate committees as to the relative priority of and need for certain strategies. We are pleased to see a high level of discussion of the details of international recruitment, retention, and partnerships.*

Asserts there is a lack of attention to the reasons for low international student admission in previous years, and suggests that staff attitudes, lack of collaboration with relevant faculty, and reliance on ineffective recruitment activities have played a part.

- *Prior to the campus reorganization (at the Senate's instigation), Enrollment Management was not able to dedicate resources to international and non-resident recruitment. Due to the timing of the first funding allocation Fall 2013 represents the first fully-recruited class of international students. Additionally, the single application pool significantly disadvantaged non-resident students. UE is pleased that international student recruitment is now on a very positive path to meet campus enrollment targets. Application numbers for 2014 reflect a 50% increase in international applicants. Given the outcomes throughout the 2013 funnel (applications, admits, SIRs and enrollments) along with the preliminary 2014 applications, one can conclude the recruitment strategies have been effective. UE is*

*dedicated to promoting productive and collaborative relationships between staff and faculty, this will continue to be a focus as we move forward.*

Suggests more emphasis on intrinsic UCSC “selling-points”, like leveraging opportunities to engage directly with faculty or in hands-on research.

- *UE agrees with CAFA that there are a variety of selling points that our recruitment materials—including those targeted to international students—should emphasize, among them undergraduate research and the opportunity to work closely with faculty.*

Thank you for your active participation in this discussion. We look forward to continued collaboration with the Senate and campus as non-resident and international enrollments grow. Our upcoming ‘Proposal for Support of International Student Growth and Campus Globalization’ will be distributed before winter closure. Comments on this response and the pending proposal will be welcomed and appreciated.