

**INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT**

**JUNE 5, 2012**

**CO-CHAIRS  
JEANNETTE MONEY  
CARY TREXLER**

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### CO-CHAIRS:

Jeannette Money, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
Cary J. Trexler, Associate Professor, School of Education

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Ruth Uy Asmundson, City of Davis Mayor Emerita  
Professor Leopoldo Bernucci, Spanish and Classics  
Associate Vice Chancellor Lora Jo Bossio, Student Affairs  
Professor Fadi Fathallah, Biological and Agricultural Engineering  
Professor Jacquelyn Gervay Hague, Department of Chemistry  
Associate Dean James Hill, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences  
Professor Douglas Gross, School of Medicine, Department of Anatomy and Department of Pediatrics  
Dean Winston Ko, Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences  
Ms. Vallerye Mosquera, Doctoral Candidate/Human and Community Development  
Mr. Rajiv Narayan, ASUCD  
Professor Christopher Reynolds, Department of Music  
Professor Charles Walker, Department of History  
Professor Li Zhang, Department of Anthropology  
Professor Charles Leshner, Department of Geology

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UC Davis community has a long history of integrating international components into teaching, research, and service. We do many things well, such as attracting international scholars to our campus for collaborative activities and developing short-term international programs for our undergraduate students. However, there are also many areas where we can improve. This report outlines both the areas of strength and the areas of weakness and makes recommendations to place UC Davis in the forefront of internationalization in higher education and to enhance its ranking relative to other institutions. Attracting international students who bring needed resources to the campus has, as its complement, the construction or extension of programs that provide international opportunities for the local community.

To internationalize the UC Davis campus and to make it a model university, we recommend investing in five primary areas: promoting undergraduate participation in studying abroad; integrating international students into the fabric of the campus; attracting international graduate students, developing procedures for faculty to facilitate their ongoing efforts in the international arena, and creating a centralized database to fully account for our efforts. These priorities fit into a broader set of prescriptions to internationalize the campus.

1. Each UC Davis undergraduate must have a quality international experience as part of his/her undergraduate education. We must develop the expectation among undergraduates that they travel abroad to have this experience, with the goal of having 50 percent of our students do so. This requires investing in advising services to help students choose an appropriate and affordable activity (education, internships and service learning) and in developing a seamless system of administration to ensure that students can graduate within four years.
2. International students must be integrated into UC Davis teaching, research and service activities both to provide our domestic undergraduates with alternative and additional international experiences and to make the international students a part of the UC Davis community. This requires two types of investment. The first is to develop an infrastructure that brings domestic students together with international students in meaningful ways: living and learning opportunities, buddy programs, informal meeting opportunities, combined student courses on contemporary issues, etc. But this plan will succeed only if a second investment is made in retention services that provide the necessary resources for foreign students to succeed. Merely recruiting international students will not internationalize the campus by itself.
3. International graduate students must be attracted to the UC Davis campus by assuring that financial incentives are similar to peer institutions in the United States and elsewhere.
4. The UC Davis campus must lift obstacles and create incentives to underpin faculty projects that internationalize the campus.
5. International activities must be tracked in a centralized and usable format to facilitate information sharing and to gauge progress in meeting our goals.

The implementation of these recommendations will take sustained investment in human and physical resources if we are to realize the UC Davis *Vision of Excellence*. We understand that we live in an era of fiscal constraints that is not likely to change in the near future. If the administration cannot find the resources to invest, it would be better to acknowledge that our efforts to internationalize the campus should be put on hold rather than proceed without sufficient resources. We believe that UC Davis has already made great progress in establishing an international presence but will lag behind its peer institutions if it does not adopt an ambitious program of action.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

### INTRODUCTION

#### PART I -- DOMESTIC UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

- a. Current programs and future goals.....10
- b. Barriers to achieving goals and recommendations.....11
- c. Administrative issues.....13

#### PART II -- INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

- a. Current programs and future goals.....14
- b. Barriers to achieving goals and recommendations.....15
- c. Administrative issues.....17

#### PART III -- INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS

- a. Current programs and future goals.....19
- b. Barriers to achieving goals and recommendations.....20
- c. Administrative issues.....21

#### PART IV -- FACULTY ROLE IN INTERNATIONALIZATION

- a. Current programs and future goals.....22
- b. Barriers to achieving goals and recommendations.....23
- c. Administrative issues.....27

#### PART V -- INTEGRATING RESOURCES – MAKING THE WHOLE GREATER THAN THE SUM OF THE PARTS

- a. Organizational structure.....28
- b. Coordination of international activities.....29

### APPENDICES

1. International Advisory Committee Consultants
2. Resources for Internationalization
3. Best Practices for Attracting International Graduate Students
4. Active Agreements of Cooperation in 2012
5. Proposed Amendments to the UC Davis Academic Personnel Manual
6. Letter from Meredith McQuaid



## **CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE**

In April, 2011, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor (PEVC) Ralph Hexter invited Jeannette Money and Cary Trexler to co-chair the International Advisory Committee (IAC). The charge of the committee was defined:

“[T]o (1) inventory the entire range of programs and initiatives the campus currently mounts to foster international engagement, noting the aims of each and making a general assessment of their effectiveness; (2) articulate an over-arching international engagement strategy; and (3) suggest how the campus might best deploy resources to advance this engagement strategy.”

“At the end of this process, the IAC will make recommendations to the PEVC concerning the optimal deployment of resources to advance the international engagement strategy it will have developed. This can involve suggestions for reorganization of current operations and may well recommend a different level of investment. (If that investment is to be greater, the IAC will suggest a source or sources for such new resources.) The aim is not merely to recommend changes in how we support what we are doing now. Rather, the charge of the IAC is, after looking at best practices and taking a very broad view of global developments and “internationalization,” to recommend how as a campus we can fully realize our potential in the international arena.”

After investing a considerable amount of time surveying international activities at UC Davis, with the help of the Committee consultant, Seija Virtanen, the Provost requested that the emphasis of the Committee be shifted to items (2) and (3) of the charge. Thus the report that follows makes no assessment of the effectiveness of our ongoing international activities in terms of scope or resources deployed. We do make recommendations for an action plan to deploy resources in specific international activities.

## INTRODUCTION

The International Advisory Committee recommends that the University of California, Davis become a leader in internationalizing the university.

By internationalization, we mean that every member of the campus community--students, faculty, and staff--should be prepared to work in a global environment to fulfill our missions of teaching, research, and service. That preparation includes developing an understanding of and empathy for peoples who live around the globe and gaining knowledge about their life circumstances. Members of the campus community also need to develop communication skills that allow each of us to interact appropriately with others, whether in their country of origin or here in the United States. International experiences are central to developing each individual's capacity to work in the global environment.

International engagement is a central component of a university, and of a university education, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It has become urgent to modify our ways of doing things to ensure that we have the skills to engage appropriately with other members of the global community through teaching, research and service. The president of Cornell University has recently recognized this principle and has argued, "At a time when other nations are challenging the United States economically as well as on religious, moral, and ideological grounds, we should enlist our colleges and universities to fulfill their potential as one of our most effective and credible diplomatic assets" ("A Global Outreach Plan for Colleges", David Skorton, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 21, 2007). The issue generates some urgency.

UC Davis is not a novice in this endeavor. We do many things well. For example, we attract a large number of foreign scholars to our campus each year. In 2010/11, UC Davis ranked 6<sup>th</sup> in the nation for universities hosting international scholars. Our own faculty is strongly engaged in research and service endeavors in the international arena. In other elements of internationalization we do less well. For example, only about 5.9 percent of our undergraduates study or work abroad during their university career. But the most important lacuna of our efforts at UC Davis is our inability to integrate effectively international students and scholars into the campus community. Attracting and connecting individuals will create an internationalized campus, rather than a campus of internationalized individuals.

In this report, we delineate five distinctive areas of activity where we can improve our practices. We must first generate significantly greater participation of our local undergraduates in international education, work and service learning. Engaging a larger cohort of international undergraduate students provides a resource to promote international experiences on the campus. We must attract the best and brightest graduate students from around the world to participate in graduate education, while also maintaining our prominence in collaborating with international scholars to further the research endeavor. We must engage our faculty to promote international activities in all three dimensions of their jobs, teaching, research and service and develop the information infrastructure appropriately. Finally, we must devote resources to integrate the four areas of activity so that the entire campus community can benefit from the experiences of its individual members.

If the UC Davis administration chooses to engage in greater internationalization, it must provide clear leadership in this area and communicate effectively to the campus community that this is a high priority. It must also invest the resources and create appropriate incentive structures so that the campus community can effectively implement the necessary programs. We recognize that the campus has many goals and priorities. If internationalization is not a central priority, it would be better to scale back expectations and to make small adjustments to our current programs than to exhort change without adequate commitment. However, we believe that the campus administration will see that without a plan to internationalize the campus, we cannot achieve our goal of becoming a top academic institution in the country and around the globe.

## PART I DOMESTIC UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

### 1. CURRENT PROGRAMS AND FUTURE GOALS

**Undergraduate international experience at UC Davis.** UC Davis offers students three University of California study abroad programs: UC-wide Education Abroad Program, Quarter Abroad, and Summer Abroad. Students can also participate in study abroad through independent providers, but only the UC-affiliated independent provider course credits are guaranteed to be transferrable to UC Davis. International internships are also available.

In 2010/11, there were 1,154 UC Davis students who participated in a study abroad program. This is a slight increase over 2009/10, when 1,066 UC Davis students studied abroad. For 2010/11 only about 4.7 percent of the undergraduate student body participated in a study abroad program.<sup>1</sup> An additional 100 to 200 students participate annually in international internships. An unknown number of students have some type of international experience that is not arranged through UC Davis.<sup>2</sup> By comparison, 7.4 percent of the undergraduates at Michigan State University and 13.5 percent of the undergraduates at University of Southern California study abroad each year. The Institute of International Education ranked UC Davis 31<sup>st</sup> for study abroad participation among U.S. doctorate-granting universities.

Of the students who study abroad, just over 50 percent choose the UC Davis Summer Abroad as their international study experience. Over 60 percent of the students who participate in any UC study abroad program are humanities and social science majors, while about 25 percent are from traditional science areas of study such as computer science, agriculture and environmental, or engineering. A student's junior year is the most popular for studying abroad, with 51 percent of students who participate in a UC study abroad program participating at that time. This is above the U.S. average of 38 percent of study abroad participants being juniors. Participation is also high for senior year (28.1 percent), but dwindles for sophomores (15.3 percent) and freshmen (5.6 percent).

**Goals.** The University must change the student culture to one that expects ALL students have an international experience. The goal would be to ensure that at least 50 percent of all entering freshmen leave four years later with an international experience abroad while the other 50 percent have a meaningful international experience on campus.<sup>3</sup> This requires growth rates of 160 percent per year for five years, if we are to achieve the 50 percent goal in the students traveling abroad for their international experience by 2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> 4.7 percent studied abroad; 5.9 percent (cited in the introduction) participated in some type of activity outside the country.

<sup>2</sup> There are also some students, especially those who undertake non-credit international internships, volunteer or work experiences, whose activities may not be recorded.

<sup>3</sup> An international experience on the UC Davis campus requires sustained contact with international students and/or faculty in a meaningful setting.

## 2. BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Important student barriers to achieving this goal are summarized in the University of Minnesota Multicultural Study Abroad Group report to include the “five F’s”: finances, fear, family and friends, faculty (advisors), and academic fit. Our proposal takes as a starting point the model adopted by the University of Minnesota to overcome these barriers. We believe that we must make a wide array of options<sup>4</sup> available to our students to meet their needs. Our campus based Summer Abroad and Quarter Abroad programs complement the University-wide Education Abroad Program (UOEAP) programs and help our students overcome the “five F’s” and achieve other goals as well. By demonstrating that the study abroad programs offered by UOEAP during the academic year are cost effective for students, we can also free up some seats in classrooms for incoming out-of-state students without additional expenditures. This nexus is important to remember.

The impetus for increasing international participation must come from the top academic officers of the university and they must create participation incentives for the program implementing units. We suggest a coordinated effort aimed at entering freshmen that begins with their recruitment and admission to campus.

Communication must be coordinated across all interaction with the entering freshmen. The commitment to ensuring an international experience for every student should be communicated in new student recruitment, in the admissions package, in new student orientation, in departmental advising, in freshman seminars, and in language study (see suggestions in the University of Minnesota report). We need to permeate students with the idea of “planning for an international experience” to overcome the “five Fs”. The incentive structure must help ensure that faculty and departments fully participate in reinforcing these communication efforts to promote international educational activities.

**Finances.** There are both real and perceived costs to studying or interning abroad. We must educate students about the real costs and provide resources to help students meet those costs. When thinking about an international experience, we must recognize two types of costs. First, there are costs to the student, both in real terms and in opportunity costs. The second involves cost to the university itself by providing staff to advise and promote international experiences. We must ensure that we provide programs that minimize the total costs, rather than programs that put the burden on students while alleviating costs incurred by the university. We emphasize that UC Davis needs a wide variety of programs to meet the wide variety of student needs. However, we believe that educating students effectively about the opportunities provided through UOEAP is important in overcoming financial barriers that students face.

Providing financial support through the university to encourage student participation in international experiences is also important to overcoming financial barriers. One suggestion is to appropriate for each incoming student \$300 per year for a four year program of study, \$1200 per student who participates in an international experience.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Options include short term and immersion education abroad programs, research, internships, and service learning through campus programs, the Internship and Career Center, the University of California Education Abroad Program, and third party providers.

<sup>5</sup> If this program is implemented, the total dollar amount of individual scholarships should be made clear so that students taking more than 4 years to graduate do not assume that they will receive additional funds. Moreover, it would be wise to consider what type of scholarship funds to offer to transfer students.

International internships also present an alternative to the classroom setting that education abroad programs provide. As it turns out, most internships cost money, as outside providers must organize the experience for undergraduates, arranging for appropriate visas, living quarters, and actual internships. However, these programs are usually less costly than summer abroad programs. Our Internship and Career Center currently vets a number of internship programs so students have some confidence that the programs they choose provide meaningful experiences.

**Family and friends.** Although university students are adults in the legal sense, they still depend in various ways on family members. We must take this into account in recruiting undergraduates to participate in international programs. We must convince parents that their students can graduate on time and still incorporate an international experience into their university career with minimal additional expense. The communications program developed to educate students about international experiences must include outreach to the families of the students. Participation in international experience while at UC Davis must be strongly communicated to students and their families before and after enrollment.

**Academic fit and faculty advisors.** We need to communicate effectively to students even before they reach the campus that they can achieve their academic goals and enhance their job prospects upon graduation by incorporating an international experience into their program of study; and we must reinforce this information in various forums on campus. This communication must be coordinated among the various units of the university including Undergraduate Admissions, Student Affairs (new student orientation), the Education Abroad Center (EAC), the Internship and Career Center (ICC), Services for International Students and Scholars (SISS), and most importantly, the academic units in which students pursue their programs of study. Curricular or academic integration must be central to our strategy to increase the international experience of our undergraduate students. Each department must ensure that students know about programs that fit into the major and suggested times for undertaking those programs. Every undergraduate advising sheet should include an area that plans for an international experience.

**Fear.** Planning within departments, including faculty, staff and peer advisors, should reduce some of the fear students feel about leaving a known environment for an unknown one. It also presents the opportunity to ensure that students have colleagues participating in the same program, another mechanism to alleviate fear.

**Other barriers.** The junior year abroad experience is no longer the central international education experience students want. More students are choosing to go abroad for a quarter or a semester, rather than a year, and UOEAP as well as the Education Abroad Center on the Davis campus are developing programs to meet these needs. However, these programs generate a new barrier in terms of the availability of short term housing. We recommend that the University consider setting aside dormitory space to be made available for shorter terms than the academic year, to cater to these students who, because of their participation in international experiences, need shorter term housing.

As students seek to achieve their goals of a University of California undergraduate degree, many are choosing to transfer from the Community College system. In Fall 2010, 38 percent of the UC Davis entering class were transfer students. These students are often more constrained in their choices as they are only members of the campus community for two years. We need to understand and plan international activities for these students so they will not be excluded from this important educational activity, while still maintaining their ability to graduate on schedule.

### 3. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

Many faculty and administrators are genuine supporters of students' academic and personal growth through an international experience. However, absent an incentive structure that rewards faculty and staff for the time that is necessary to support students in their international experiences, no amount of exhortation will allow the university to achieve its goals. For example, appointing a faculty liaison in each department is a useful way to promote academic integration and to give students the impetus to participate in an international experience. The administration should consider compensation for this role – either course release time (such as one course every other year) or additional compensation. Similar incentives may be appropriate for staff who already have many jobs on their agenda.

Although there are certainly areas where economies of scale can be exploited in presenting information and administering student programs, advising students about possible international experiences is likely to generate few economies of scale. Units whose central work involves student advising – the Education Abroad Center and the Internship and Career Center – must have access to sufficient resources to do their jobs. Departmental staff and faculty advisors must also be provided resources and incentives to ensure the type of participation necessary for successful academic integration. Central to this success also involves peer advising. Departments should have incentives to hire students with international experiences as peer advisors and/or to hire “student ambassadors” to advise students on international opportunities.<sup>6</sup>

The UC Davis Education Abroad Center has already brought the various international educational programs under one roof. The committee recommends also bringing international internships under the same roof, as well as expanding the staff that help students locate international internships that meet their needs. To maintain the necessary contacts within the Internship and Career Center, the administration should consider at least two full time positions with staff spending 50% time in each location (either daily or weekly) so that representatives are available in both locations at all times without losing the connections necessary to do their jobs successfully.

**Reporting.** Reporting undergraduate international experiences is currently insufficient to adequately track the activities of undergraduate students. The EAC reporting is based on individuals who take programs each year but can double count students who undertake more than one program. On the other hand, many UC Davis students have overseas networks that provide international experiences that are much more than family reunions. The administration should devote resources to developing an information system that allows us to track the actual experiences of our students. One suggestion is to provide students easy access to transcript notation for both education abroad and international internships and then linking the transcript notation system to an international experience database.

---

<sup>6</sup> Students can be very effective in communicating the advantages of international experiences but must be trained, supervised, and supported at the department level.

## PART II INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

### 1. CURRENT PROGRAMS AND FUTURE GOALS

UC Davis has a large number of international programs, some of which are centrally located and others department operated. The programs intended to serve the entire campus in-coming international student population are gathered under the Office of University Outreach and International Programs (UOIP) in the Provost's Office. UOIP is unique in providing a wide range of services to international students and scholars, and in acting as the primary point of interaction for international visitors. UOIP programs for international students include visa and orientation services through the Services for International Students and Scholars Office (SISS). SISS also directs international students to the appropriate offices on campus that can address the students concerns on issues such as childcare and financial aid.

The university also has departmentally-based programs that conduct internationally focused research. Some of these programs unite the interests of multiple departments, such as the Hemispheric Institute on the Americas, and others operate based on the efforts of a single faculty member. The multiple international programs that operate within departments are not well tracked at the central university level, as reporting on the activities is up to the discretion and available time of the individual faculty member.

**Current Context.** In Fall 2010, UC Davis undergraduate non-resident international students constituted just under three percent (3%) of the total undergraduate student body, with 708 students. Between Fall 2007 and Fall 2008, international undergraduate students at UC Davis increased by 34 percent. This increase was almost entirely in students from Asian countries. By comparison, in Fall 2010, 6.7 percent of UC Berkeley's and 5.8 percent of UCLA's undergraduate students were international non-residents. In contrast, nearly 20 percent of the undergraduate students at Purdue University are international students.

At UC Davis, 553 out of 708 international undergraduate students, or approximately 78 percent, were from Asian countries. The majority of these students came from China (225), Korea (131), and Taiwan (61).

Fall 2010 statistics for UC Davis international undergraduate enrollment by college are: Letters and Sciences, Social Sciences at 45% (due to Economics), College of Biological Sciences at 19%, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences at 13%, College of Engineering at nine percent, Letters and Sciences, Math and Physical Sciences at eight percent, and Letters and Sciences, Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies at four percent.

**Goals.** The goals of increasing international undergraduate student enrollment are twofold. We want to increase the diversity of the student population and create interaction among students from different countries with our own students, to increase global awareness and to enhance all students' intercultural skills. We also want to increase the revenue stream to the university by accepting out-of-state and international students to support the university as a whole in the enterprise of research, teaching, and service. While we cannot ignore the goal of increasing revenue, we would like enhance the diversity of students from every region of the world and from every socio-economic class. In order to do so, we strongly urge the administration to use a portion of the fees collected to set up a scholarship fund to support outstanding students from all over the world who would be unable to attend without scholarship resources. By our rough calculations, a 5% return to aid (from 3,000 international/out-of-state students) would provide 90 full tuition scholarships. If the availability of scholarships were clearly communicated, we would provide an incentive for the top students globally to apply to UC Davis.

## 2. BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although it is common knowledge that most of our current (and probably future) international students will come from Asia and South Asia, as these countries have large populations and rapidly growing economies to support an international student population, we urge the administration to consider both a regional and a global marketing campaign. California forms part of the Pacific Rim. Our neighbors in Central and South America have many cultural and linguistic ties to the United States and have middle class populations as well that could afford to support an international student population. We must continue to emphasize regional and global diversity of our student population if we seek to extract the maximum educational advantage for California students and avoid or minimize the possibility of student enclaves from single countries.

There are several “best practices” in marketing educational programs that should be considered (University Leadership Council, 2009). The use of foreign-born faculty, the current international student population, and international alumni should be considered. These individuals can provide positive outreach to potential students and may be able to help screen student applicants, given the growth of “application services” and outright fraud in international student applications (“Increasing International Enrollment: Effective Approaches to Recruiting International Students”, University Leadership Council, 2009). Recruitment from California community colleges is also an inexpensive way of appealing to and adequately screening for qualified international students.

The administration should also consider how University Extension might provide a pipeline for admission to the university. The Global Achievement Program (GAP) currently admits international students who meet all university admissions criteria with the exception of English language skills. Students come for English language instruction and counseling and study skills that improve their chances of success in our institution and enter the regular student population at the end of the first academic year. University Extension also offers summer English language programs that, at present, do not target the student population for possible admission as a full time fee-paying undergraduate.

In order to properly market the educational opportunities at UC Davis, we should develop a profile of campus strengths and advertise these strengths consistently. Several of the strengths that the committee highlighted included: quality of education and educational ranking of UC Davis; the safety and small town atmosphere of the campus; the current ethnic diversity of California and the campus (photographs of the current student population would demonstrate this ethnic diversity); the ability to access the campus and the community via bicycles and public transit; the friendly community atmosphere on the campus. There is a wide variety of majors and a huge diversity of courses available through the various schools, colleges, and professional programs. Moreover, the positive relationship of the university with the broader Davis community could be exploited to good effect. We also believe that specific services and opportunities for international students, if created and supported, would provide an attractive profile for international students (see below). We have an opportunity to construct an environment that creates life-long ties for international students with the campus community and should make that part of the UC Davis profile as well.

The university needs to improve the application process to the university to enhance international student and student family access. An undergraduate international student population may be distinctive from a graduate international student population in its heavier reliance on family. The university should consider investing in language specific websites for international students to facilitate the application process and, as important, to provide family members information about the university in their own language. Spanish and Chinese languages should be considered as priority languages in developing foreign language websites, with the European Union website (with a single click front page to each of the EU languages) as a potential

model. The University Leadership Council also recommends several other modifications to the application process for foreign students that assure that potential applicants receive quick feedback to questions; that applicants have expedited admission decisions; and that student visas are priority mailed.

Efforts to increase our international student population will succeed only if the initial international cohort succeeds. In the era of instant social networking, both failures and successes are broadcast quickly. However successful we are in attracting international students initially, we must provide services that international students need to be successful.

There are two types of services and programs that need to be considered. First are those services employed by all students that may need to be modified to meet the needs of international students. The second are services to integrate the international students with the student and broader campus community.

International students will need on-site orientation, housing, medical and counseling services, just like California students. Housing for freshmen on campus should be guaranteed, as it is for California students, and this should be clearly communicated in the informational material about UC Davis. Student health insurance and medical center services and costs should also be effectively communicated. U.S. health services are widely known to be very expensive and we need to take care to communicate the exact costs and services that are available to our students. We also urge the administration to plan effectively for the provision of counseling services to international undergraduate students. Undergraduate students, especially those away from home for the first time, may be under stress. International students, many thousands of miles away from their homes and support networks, may well be under additional stress. The U.S. has endorsed a culture of professional counseling to deal with these stresses successfully. Other societies may still view professional counseling as a service for the severely mentally ill. We need to make appropriate outreach to international students to de-stigmatize counseling as well as to provide culturally appropriate counseling.

Orientation and English-language learning opportunities should also be part of the plan for receiving international students. International students' visas depend upon the start date of the university and these students often arrive too late to take part in orientation. The administration should consider providing a credit bearing orientation for foreign students to allow early entry onto campus and to ensure that the students are not playing catch up when they should be well settled before classes begin. This program should include not only the topics covered with California students about the campus and academic activities that students will be involved in; it should also cover cultural dimensions of the campus and community. Academic counseling within departments may also need to be modified to ensure that international students' needs are appropriately met.

English language instruction is an important part of ensuring that international students are successful in receiving a university degree. The administration should consider offering summer language programs through University Extension, on campus, or through the community college system. If the program is prior to the regular academic year, international students may well pay for the program to help ensure their academic integration. If so, however, the administration should ensure that the program is seamless for the newly arriving students, wherever the classes are offered. A well-developed program may alleviate the need for higher levels of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction during the academic year, although it is likely that the demand will grow significantly with or without a summer program and the administration should plan for that eventuality. We recommend exploring all available options: classes on campus, classes through University Extension, and classes through community colleges. It is our sense that a summer program prior to university admission may be fee bearing but that ESL instruction during the academic year should be considered part of the university curriculum covered by current tuition and fees.

International students also need visa services to ensure that their stay remains within the constraints of U.S. law. These students will often also need advising on practical matters, such as housing, finances, cultural, personal and academic concerns, etc.

We must also think of ways to integrate international students into the student and broader community. Integration serves two purposes. It helps to ensure that international students are successful in their academic goals and builds life-long positive connections to the campus and to the United States. If our integration efforts are successful, this could be a powerful marketing tool for developing global social networks that will ensure a continuing stream of students, as well as all the benefits that come with international personal and professional networks. Integration also serves to enhance the learning experience and global competences of our California student population. There are a number of mechanisms that could be put into place to ensure that all international students have an opportunity to integrate fully into the local student and broader community, (e.g. learning about local and state bicycle traffic laws), rather than remain in country specific groups or foreign student groups. A “Living-and-Learning” community could be developed to provide specific dormitory space for California students interested in the opportunity, reserving 30 to 50 percent of the living space for international students. The University of Maryland has Global Communities living and learning communities that place the students in the classroom together as well as in an integrated living environment, to complement ongoing activities such as the Hammarskjöld House for International Relations students.

The University of Minnesota has several programs that could be emulated by UC Davis, including the following:

- (1) Culture Corps: A series of projects that bring international perspectives into classrooms and onto campus through the experience and knowledge of international students;
- (2) Small World Coffee Hour: Invites all international and domestic students, faculty, and staff to gather together in a relaxing social environment. Each interactive event has the flavoring of a specific cultural region's activities, foods, and traditions.
- (3) International Buddy Program: Current U.S. and international undergraduates connect with new international undergraduate students;
- (4) Students Crossing Borders: Students are paired with an international or domestic roommate in a residence hall and focus on intercultural learning in one of Housing & Residential Life's Living and Learning Communities;
- (5) Cross-Cultural Discussion Groups: Gathers small groups of domestic and international students and scholars together in an intimate atmosphere to explore their cross-cultural experiences and perspectives;
- (6) Student Organizations: Minnesota International Student Association (MISA) and Global Gophers, a student organization for returned study abroad students, are just two examples of the many student leadership opportunities with an international theme; and
- (7) Community Engagement Opportunities: Encourages international students to become involved with the community to learn more about the U.S. and Minnesota alongside U.S. students and community members.

### **3. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

It is important for the administration to be aware of the costs not only of marketing UC Davis to an international clientele but also the costs of providing the international student population with the necessary services to ensure their success and the integration efforts that serve the needs of both the international student population and the California population. Even “volunteer” programs, such as the Buddy Program, need professional coordinators to match pairs of students and to provide training for the California students. And services for the international students need an adequate number of professional staff. The administration should look for ways to generate economies of scale in appropriate areas, such as the underlying information infrastructure that would facilitate the admission process and tracking of the international students. But in many cases, such as student advising or professional counseling, there are no economies of scale and international students may well take more time than California students.

We have a cohort of professionals on campus who deal with international students on a daily basis, located in Services for International Students and Scholars, the Education Abroad Center, University Extension, and other locations on campus. There are also formal forums in which the staffs from various units meet to discuss issues of common concern (Global and Local Opportunities Begin with Education (GLOBE) and International Programs Advisory Committee (IPAC)). This professional staff has the expertise on the types of services students need, on past practices, both successful and unsuccessful, and on the costs of these services. This staff should be brought into the planning process to ensure that adequate resources are budgeted to ensure the overall success of our efforts to attract a large cohort of international students.

## PART III INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS

### 1. CURRENT PROGRAMS AND FUTURE GOALS

**Current Context.** In Fall 2011, UC Davis degree-seeking non-resident international students constituted about 15 percent of the total degree-seeking graduate student body, with 994 students. Of the academic graduate students, 889, or about 20 percent, were degree-seeking non-resident international students. By comparison, in Fall 2010, 18 percent of UC Berkeley's and 22 percent of UC Irvine's academic graduate students were degree-seeking international non-residents. In contrast, peer universities outside of California have higher enrollments of degree-seeking non-resident international graduate students. For example, in 2011 the University of Michigan had 25% of its graduate students coming from overseas, while Cornell University's percent of international graduate students was 37% and the University of Illinois- Urbana-Champaign exceeded 40%.

At UC Davis, approximately 55% of international graduate students came from four countries: China (32%), South Korea (8%), India (8%), and Taiwan (7%). An additional nine percent (9%) come from other Asian countries.

Current statistics for UC Davis international graduate student enrollments in schools and colleges are: College of Engineering: 38%; College of Letters and Science: 25%; College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences: 19%; College of Biological Sciences: 7%; Graduate School of Management: 6%; School of Law: 4%.

**Goals and Vision for the Future.** The committee's vision is twofold. First, to increase the number of international students thereby fostering more diversity on campus and enhancing the learning experience for all students; and second to increase the stature of the campus through the research enterprise by attracting the very best students regardless of their nationality.

After reviewing the current context, the committee established the following five goals: (1) Advance the research enterprise by attracting the highest caliber graduate students; (2) Increase the number of international graduate students to enhance the education of domestic students; (3) Recruit graduate students globally; (4) Identify ways to support graduate students coming from developing countries; and (5) Waive non-resident supplemental tuition for academic international PhD students.

#### **Existing UC Davis programs and resources to attract international graduate students**

At present UC Davis primarily relies on its reputation to attract international graduate students. The campus, through Graduate Studies, University Extension, and University Office of Outreach and International Programs, promotes campus programs, but resources are insufficient for expansion. On an informal basis, faculty attract graduate students through their research notoriety and by visiting countries outside of the US.

## 2. BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee believes the major obstacle to attracting international graduate students is resource-based. Historically, the campus has invested few resources to recruit international graduate students. With the current financial stresses affecting the available budget, some internationally focused programs have experienced a reduction in resources.

The committee believes that the most significant impediment to attracting high quality international graduate students is Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST). Many US research universities have programs that allow international students to pay in-state tuition if they are employed as teaching assistants or graduate student researchers. If UC Davis followed this same scheme, then a major barrier to access would be eliminated and the campus would be on a level playing field with many of our peer institutions.

**Suggestions for activities to achieve our vision and goals.** The committee offers numerous suggestions that may enhance the campus' ability to attract international graduate students. Many of these suggestions emanate from the 2009 report *Making the Global Vision Real: Supporting Faculty-Led Internationalization Efforts*. The committee suggests (1) establishing a global network of recruiters; (2) providing funds to faculty to recruit when visiting other countries for vacations or organized research (e.g., plane ticket, per diem, and other expenses); (3) improving international alumni coordination for recruitment and fundraising; (4) hiring diverse faculty that represent various countries; (5) attracting international community college students to UC Davis for undergraduate majors that will lead to graduate school; (6) sharing costs across multiple organizations (e.g., universities share recruiters); (7) exploring EAP in-country liaisons and faculty directors roles in the recruitment of students; (8) investing in market research to determine what programs and degrees are in demand; (9) focusing efforts on USAID, World Bank, and Asian Development Bank loan and grant programs and foreign country ministries to fund graduate students; and (10) instituting a seed-grant program for faculty to assist with the recruitment of students.

For professional degree programs, the recommendations include: (1) increasing the number of certificate programs for international graduate students; (2) working with Graduate Studies to speed up the time line for awarding of scholarships and fellowships, particularly for international students; (3) decreasing the response time for graduate student applications; (4) working with US embassies and Fulbright offices to determine when educational recruitment fairs are scheduled; (5) establishing international centers in countries that are targets for recruitment; (6) setting up mechanisms (phone, Skype, Yahoo messenger, etc.) for campus representatives (possibly current graduate students) to answer potential international graduate students considering UC Davis in real time; (7) creating web pages within Graduate Studies that focus on frequently asked questions for potential international graduate students; and (8) promoting the creation of MA degree programs without a research component.

To obtain, in part, the financial support necessary to attract and retain international graduate students: (1) increasing support systems for international students once they come to campus; and (2) investing resources to fund *Development and External Relations* efforts targeted at garnering resources for endowments for international students.

### **3. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

It is important for the administration to be aware of the significant barrier to international graduate student enrollment created by NRST. All international students pay NRST, except for three years after they advance to candidacy. Some departments are reluctant to admit international graduate students because they cannot guarantee financial support to those students for the duration of their studies. The administration may wish to consider programs to further reduce the impact of NRST on departments.

## PART IV FACULTY ROLE IN INTERNATIONALIZATION

### 1. CURRENT PROGRAMS AND FUTURE GOALS

**Current Context.** University faculty global engagement is a significant factor in determining world comparisons. For example, the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*<sup>7</sup> has recently included journal co-authoring with an international colleague to its metric for determining International Outlook, which accounts for 7.5% of universities' overall score. In 2011, UC Davis ranked 38<sup>th</sup> in the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings* and had an International Outlook score of 51.4%. By comparison, of all UC campuses, only UC Santa Barbara had a higher score at 52.6%. Therefore, investment in programs to increase faculty international engagement will increase the stature of our campus.

On the UC Davis campus, the University Outreach and International Programs office (UOIP) supports faculty and the institution in many international endeavors. Currently, UOIP has only one staff member who supports faculty services, which are detailed in the *Existing Programs* section of this report. UOIP's role as "keeper of information" about the faculty and campus international engagement is vitally important. As we seek to further internationalize the campus and increase our stature, keeping track of our level of engagement and our networks around the world will become vitally important. The budget of UOIP is woefully lacking in comparison with our peer land-grant universities. For instance, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, and Purdue University have international program budgets that exceed UC Davis by hundreds of thousands of dollars<sup>8</sup>.

**Goals and Vision for the Future.** The committee's vision is to advance UC Davis' recognition as a leading international university by increasing faculty international research, teaching and outreach. After reviewing the current context, the sub-committee on Faculty International Engagement established the following four goals: (1) increase faculty international experiences to enhance professional competence; (2) enhance international outreach and development engagement; (3) increase international connections to enhance student research and study abroad programs; and (4) capitalize on foreign country programmatic and funding opportunities.

#### **Existing UC Davis Programs and Resources to Assist Faculty to Engage Internationally**

UC Davis relies on faculty to foster international engagement activities. The administration's investment in UOIP assists the campus and faculty with some key programs: Fulbright scholar support; seed grant support for faculty; database of faculty international linkages; coordination of international Agreements of Cooperation (AOC); international Funding Workshops; international Funding Database; and the International Alumni Network (now in Development and Alumni Relations). In addition to UOIP programs, the campus supports several Area Studies programs: (i) East Asian Studies, (ii) Latin American and Hemispheric Studies (HIA), (iii) Middle East/ South Asia Studies (MESA), and (iv) African American and African Studies. These programs help to foster short-term faculty exchanges with international institutions. We must make clear, however, there are few resources allocated to achieving the vision of significant faculty research, teaching and outreach in international settings.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*. (2011). Accessed January 28, 2012 at: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2011-2012/analysis.html>

<sup>8</sup> University Outreach and International Programs (2011). Funding for University International Programs Offices.  
Page 22 of 36

## 2. BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Faculty rewards for international engagement are lacking on the Davis campus. The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) sets responsibilities and reward guidelines for faculty. A review of APM sheds light on the current lack of emphasis on faculty international engagement. The only mention of international engagement comes in APM section 220-18, which spells out language for awarding above-scale professorships. Therefore, it appears faculty international engagement is not a high priority for faculty on the Davis campus and the UC. Moreover, campus funding for international research conferences has dwindled in recent years.

Even without a codified incentive to work in international settings, in Winter quarter 2012, approximately 530 faculty (current and emeriti) and staff were listed in the UOIP database as having international linkages. Given that faculty are not required to enter information in the database and not all faculty are aware of it, this number most likely does not represent the sum of faculty international linkages and engagement. It is important to note that currently, there appears to be little coordination between campus administrative units with regard to collecting information related to faculty international engagement. Deans of schools and colleges can approve international travel, but there is no centralized mechanism to collect data on where faculty travel as part of their appointments. Further, when faculty members leave campus for extended periods of time they are required to fill out the UPAY 573: Sabbatical/Leave of Absence form which is approved by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. There is valuable data contained in the UPAY 573 form related to international travel for faculty and staff, but this is not captured at this time, nor communicated to the UOIP. UC Davis faculty have a strong international presence; with more support and coordination this prestige would quickly increase.

One indication of our international engagement comes from Agreements of Cooperation with institutions abroad; the vast majority are established by individual faculty. Agreements of Cooperation (AOC) are broad-based working agreements that codify a relationship between UC Davis and other institutions. The campus has 155 active Agreements of Cooperation (AOC) with international universities and organizations. Of these AOCs, 41% were initiated by the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences; 16% by University Extension; 14% by the College of Engineering; 6% by HaRCS; and 6% by the School of Veterinary Medicine. The remaining schools and colleges hold 17% of the active AOCs.

By reviewing AOCs, the committee has identified the geographic regions where UC Davis is currently engaged. Asia represents the largest number of AOCs with over 50%, the majority in China, Japan and Korea. European countries represent 25%; Latin America 19%, and the Middle East 3%. Australia and Sub-Saharan Africa have only one AOC each.

As discussed above, UC Davis faculty already have a strong presence in the international arena, with more coordination and support we can reach our place among the top tier universities in the world.

**Barriers to Achieving Vision and Goals.** Several barriers were identified that will impede UC Davis from being recognized as a globally engaged university. Most UC Davis faculty and administrators do not truly value the importance of working internationally. Resources allocated to UOIP are not commensurate with the campus' vision for developing a truly global university<sup>9</sup> and are far below peer universities that are more proactively pursuing internationalization of their systems.

---

<sup>9</sup> University of California, Davis. (2010). UC Davis: A vision of excellence.

UC Davis lacks an integrated system for tracking international engagement. Resources have not been allocated to determine how to develop and implement a system that tracks important indicators of international engagement.

Campus leadership is not proactive in aggressively seeking out strategic partnerships and investing in them. Certainly, limited resources have hampered investing in strategic alliances, but if the campus desires to be a global university, then it should consider allocating resources to expand its physical presence beyond California in strategic locations aligned with faculty interest and UC Davis strengths.

To overcome these barriers, faculty and administration need to agree on the value of conducting research, teaching and outreach internationally. If a shared value is agreed on, then resources must be marshaled to demonstrate a full commitment to internationalization. Only by valuing internationalization can we increase the stature of the campus globally.

**Best Practices and UC Davis' Road to Integrating Them.** The sub-committee reviewed the University Leadership Council's 2009 report *Making the Global Vision Real: Supporting Faculty-Led Internationalization Efforts* and noted four key best practices needed to foster international faculty engagement. Below are highlights of best practices and are taken verbatim from the University Leadership Council's report.

*1. Mapping International Activity:*

*"While most institutions are already engaged in a broad range of international activities, few can say exactly what faculty are currently doing and where they are doing it. This lack of information limits the ability of administrators to identify institutional strengths, provide focused support for faculty, or to manage the risks of internationalization. Universities cannot manage what they cannot measure."*

*"Effective institutions build systems that capture and classify information on international activities in the normal course of business. Individual administrative units continue to manage their own data. All data is coded by country and institution and integrated in a central database, allowing administrators, faculty, and students to search related activities."*

At UC Davis, UOIP maintains a database of faculty international linkages and activities, but it is voluntary, not linked to other data collected by departments and schools and colleges, nor is it linked to data collected in forms required by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The UPAY 573 form: Sabbatical/Leave of Absence required when faculty leave campus is currently only in PDF and therefore cannot be linked to an integrated database of international activities of faculty members. Further, the UOIP database is not regularly maintained because of a lack of human resources.

Other data also needs to be mined to determine the extent of faculty international engagement. For example, the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings* uses co-authored publications with international collaborators as a metric to determine the global impact of universities. Presently, UC Davis' *MyInfovault* systems does not capture this type of information, therefore there is little hope for the campus to highlight the work of our faculty in terms of co-authoring with international collaborators.

*2. Global Administrative Support Network:*

*"Successful universities create an internal network of staff from different administrative units who are jointly responsible for developing new processes to address the complexities of global research. They provide a toolkit for managing common issues as well as a network of global vendors with specialized expertise in areas such as law, human resources, or emergency management. Rather than create a separate administrative team to handle specialized international issues, effective institutions leverage existing staff in*

*a network organization, designating experts in all relevant administrative units. .... Problem areas typically include sending cash overseas, hiring foreign staff, and establishing foreign bank accounts.”*

UC Davis is a very large and complex bureaucracy that separates its personnel, travel, accounting, and emergency management functions. Currently many faculty find it exceedingly difficult to work in international contexts, because there is no identified expertise for dealing with the many issues that arise from working outside of the US.

### *3. Centralize and Standardize MOU Authorization:*

*“Most partnerships originate from individual faculty relationships. Successful institutions encourage faculty to identify potential partners, but centralize authority for signing new partnership agreements. While the provost or president must ultimately decide whether to commit the institution to the relationship, faculty are asked to make the case that the proposed partnership has broad support and a high probability of positive impact. Faculty are best positioned to collect the relevant facts about a specific partner institution, while administrators are in the best position to ensure that certain minimum standards are met across all institutional partnerships.”*

UOIP has developed a very effective process to centralize and standardize AOCs. This process allows the administration to approve, maintain, and keep track of international partnerships. This information should be regularly updated and used to help develop Strategic Partnerships with key universities across the world.

### *4. Strategic Partnership Process:*

*“Successful institutions recognize that while faculty are best placed to launch new partnerships, building a large-scale university-wide partnership requires administrative intervention. Administrators at these institutions establish processes to engage faculty across the institution in deciding which partnerships should be designated as strategic and then support efforts to deepen and expand the relationship between the two institutions.”*

With rare exceptions, UC Davis has not developed a plan for strategically partnering with international collaborators. Institutions other than UC Davis initiated and funded nearly all the partnerships the campus highlights as exceptional (e.g., Brazil, Chile, Vietnam, and China). In this regard the campus has not been proactive in strategically pinpointing regions and institutions with which to pursue new and potentially fruitful relationships.

Some of the best practices described above are in nascent form on the UC Davis campus, but more human and financial support is needed to make them fully operational.

**Recommendations.** The committee offers these recommendations to enhance the campus’ ability to engage more faculty internationally.

(1) Value, recognize, and reward faculty international engagement. To do this, the Academic Senate and the administration need to work jointly to revise the UC Davis APM to include language that recognizes and rewards international engagement earlier in a professor’s career. The committee further suggests the Faculty Senate Research Committee increase funding for Research Travel Grants to show it values international engagement.

(2) Review the effectiveness of UOIP programs and invest in those that most efficiently promote faculty international engagement and programs that contribute to higher international university rankings. For example, the UOIP Seed Grant Program has proven highly successful at catalyzing international engagement, but at present there is no stable funding for this program. Likewise, the International Alumni

Network<sup>10</sup> (IAN) was initiated some time ago, but it has not been fully developed. If organized well, the IAN members could identify trends and funding opportunities for collaborative endeavors in other countries. Another untapped potential funding stream for international engagement is non-U.S. governmental and non-governmental organizations (e.g., The World Bank, Asian Development Bank, ministries from target countries, etc.). The committee suggests that UOIP be provided additional funding to hire staff to identify opportunities and work with faculty to apply for these non-traditional resources. Lastly, the committee suggests that support for campus Area Studies programs be increased, especially for short-term faculty exchanges.

---

<sup>10</sup> The IAN was moved from UOIP to the Office of Development and Alumni Relations. The Development Office is primarily concerned with raising funds, not research, teaching and service in international settings. It appears the administration looks at this network as only potential donors and not as collaborators to further internationalize the campus as the International Advisory Committee envisions.

### 3. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

As described previously, UC Davis faculty engage in much *un-reported* international work. The administration needs to establish appropriate information and data management systems to capture the sum of faculty efforts. The committee suggests several concrete steps to accomplish this. UOIP needs to update, expand, and publicize the current database of faculty working internationally. This could be accomplished rather inexpensively by hiring undergraduate interns to maintain international databases.

An important way to capture the sum of faculty efforts is to link the UPay 573 form to the UOIP database for faculty international engagement. This might require the development of incentives or a requirement for the inputting of faculty international work into database by chairs, MSOs, and Academic Personnel Analysts. Another important step would be to reconfigure *MyInfovault* to keep track of co-authored publications with international collaborators and link this to the UOIP international database. This is vitally important because some metrics for the international university rankings include such data.

Generally the campus has been rather opportunistic and not strategic with regard to international partnerships, with much of the funding for these endeavors coming from foreign initiatives. The administration and faculty need to be more proactive. One way to do this is to explore the development of strategically located regional research and teaching centers based on current AOCs and in countries that are a match for UC Davis strengths. As UC Davis faculty become more engaged globally, it should develop a Global Administrative Support Network across administrative units to address issues arising from working outside of the country and create a Tool Kit for global operations (e.g., hiring personnel, leasing housing and office space, student internships, banking, etc.). These support systems and tools will ease the burden for faculty who wish to work in international contexts.

## PART V INTEGRATING RESOURCES – MAKING THE WHOLE GREATER THAN THE SUM OF THE PARTS

The above activities are part and parcel of the university's efforts to internationalize the campus. Internationalization cannot take place without adequate resources to ensure that these activities are pursued effectively. Yet these activities affect only those who take part – a student studying abroad may well be internationalized as a result of that experience. Yet this remains an individual activity without involving the campus community. We need to integrate those who leave the campus and those who come to the campus into the fabric of the campus and the broader Davis community, to ensure that everyone, including those who stay, has the experience of interacting with and developing empathy for those with experiences different than our own. If we are to have a strategy, rather than “tactics in need of a strategy,”<sup>11</sup> this must be the central component of the strategy.

There are two central aspects to effectively coordinating and integrating our international efforts. The first involves the organizational structure of international activities; the second, the development of an administrative unit that can systematically tie the component parts together.

**Organizational structure.** Currently, many different units are engaged in international activities in some way or another.<sup>12</sup> Several of those units are gathered under the auspices of University Outreach and International Programs (UOIP) whose Vice-Provost, William B. Lacy, reports to the Provost. Others are located in University Extension whose dean, Dennis Pendleton, also reports to the Provost. Still others perform essential roles in the administration of international activities in some way but remain within their respective functionally defined units. There are three potential problems with the current administrative structure. First, there are only informal means to ensure adequate coordination among the various units to ensure that all units are adequately informed and participate in the necessary planning and implementation of various programs. Second, there is no single individual responsible for international activities across the campus, to help ensure efficient, non-redundant administration of the various activities. And third, the current administrative structure is that of a service, rather than activity, without adequate authority to ensure implementation of the necessary international activities on the part of the schools and colleges.

The IAC does not support creating an additional administrative position merely to have a person in command. However, a reorganization that provides a single person in command, reporting to the highest levels of the administration would help assure that the goals adopted by the administration would be properly implemented. Coordination could be engendered by an organizational change of this type. An alternative or supplement to an organizational change would be to create a small coordinating board comprised of the Vice Provost of UOIP, the Dean of University Extension, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on International Education.

---

<sup>11</sup> These are the words of Meredith McQuaid, Dean of International Programs at the University of Minnesota, in her February 27, 2012, report to Provost Hexter.

<sup>12</sup> Meredith McQuaid, Dean of International Programs at the University of Minnesota, noted “the current organizational structure of international programs on campus lends itself both to redundancy, and a lack of synchronization. Both offices responsible for certain international programs are run by experienced, enthusiastic people, and both have good reputations. One seems to generate revenue, while the other needs revenue to adequately serve student needs. In neither case are they fully integrated into the vertical and horizontal hierarchy of the academic community. To have the power and the authority to advance the internationalization agenda, unit leadership ought to be centralized, either with direct report to the Chancellor's office or an enhanced role under your leadership, and a clear mandate to advance the strategy identified.”

The administration should also revisit the division of labor between UOIP and University Extension. These are two administrative units that provide many of the same services but have very different levels of resources and very different incentive structures to provide the services. At a minimum, UOIP and University Extension should share best practices with one another. Also, there should be changes to the innovation incentive structures so that best practices are more widely implemented. But an alternative organization of international activities might improve efficiency and avoid redundancies while rebalancing resources.<sup>13</sup>

**Coordination of international activities.** Internationalization of the UC Davis campus can only be achieved if the whole of our activities is greater than the sum of the parts. We need to better deploy our international and local resources to internationalize. International scholars come, interact with their colleague, and depart, without ever being integrated into campus life. Families of international scholars are often isolated from the broader campus and city communities. International students often reside in national enclaves, a natural human response to a challenging environment that helps provide them the resources to survive. And our own faculty and students have extraordinary international experiences that remain theirs alone, never marking the experiences of their colleagues and peers. We need to use more effectively the resources that are actually already in place.

An international center – whether physical or virtual – is needed to bring all the component parts of the “international community” together. An organization is needed to ensure that means exist to bring the disparate communities together in constructive ways. Local students must have systematic opportunities and incentives to become involved with international students and vice versa; local and international faculty must also have systematic opportunities and incentives to interact with each other and the student population regarding their international activities. Informal gatherings, formal presentations, and coursework must be designed to bring various constituents together. In the sections above, we have delineated some mechanisms for eliciting this type of participation. And, although much of this activity can involve volunteerism, we need a permanent staff to ensure that the volunteerism can thrive. Just one example can illustrate how this might work. We anticipate a larger international undergraduate student population. These students will be more likely to succeed if they are adequately integrated into the broader campus community. One idea is to have a peer advisor/buddy for each international student. However, it will take staff support to screen, train, and link volunteer UC Davis undergraduates with international students. In a period of budgetary austerity, these types of programs may be seen as superfluous. Yet they would be a relatively inexpensive mechanism that helps both the international students adjust to life on the UC Davis campus while, at the same time, informing the UC Davis students about the international community. It is killing two birds with one stone. Moreover, this type of interaction is central to the mission of internationalizing the campus.

A new International Center that physically brings together the various units who administer international programs may be part of the mechanisms adopted to link the local and international communities. However, the four component parts of internationalization – inbound international undergraduate students, outbound UC Davis undergraduate students, international graduate students and scholars, and UC Davis faculty – will remain four separate silos without a support staff that helps coordinate their interaction. The IAC promotes a vision that creates four rooms in a single home.

---

<sup>13</sup> Also see Meredith McQuaid’s report on international activities at UC Davis.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**Consultants to the International Advisory Committee**

INTERNAL CONSULTANTS

Zachary Frieders, Associate Director, Education Abroad Center

Beth Greenwood, Associate Dean, Center for International Programs (University Extension)

Margaret Hellwarth, Assistant Director, Services for International Students and Scholars

William Lacy, Vice Provost for University Outreach and International Programs

Eric Schroeder, Director of Summer Abroad and Quarter Abroad, Education Abroad Center

Walter Robinson, Director, Admissions Office.

Edith Yuh, Don Ho, and Akshaya Ramanujam, undergraduate students

Marcie Kirk-Holland, Career and Internship Center

EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS

Meredith McQuaid, Dean of International Programs, University of Minnesota

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Resources for Internationalization**

University Leadership Council. (2009). *Increasing International Enrollment. Effective Approaches to Recruiting International Students*. Washington, D.C. : Advisory Board Company.

University Leadership Council. (2009). *Making the Global Vision Real: Supporting Faculty-Led Internationalization Efforts*. Washington, D.C. : Advisory Board Company.

Anderson, Lynn C., ed. (2005). *Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum*. Twin Cities, MN: University of Minnesota.

### **APPENDIX 3**

## **BEST PRACTICES FOR ATTRACTING INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS**

The committee reviewed the University Leadership Council's 2009 report *Making the Global Vision Real: Supporting Faculty-Led Internationalization Efforts* and noted four key lessons from the universities from other countries that have been successful at recruiting international students.

These lessons are:

1. Establishing a global network of recruiters
2. Sharing costs across multiple organizations (e.g., universities share recruiters)
3. Investing in market research to determine what programs and degrees are in demand
4. Designing and marketing professional degree programs

With many universities attempting to increase international enrollments, both students and admissions staff commonly confront a range of obstacles. Obstacles fall in five major categories:

1. Scale—implementing a global recruiting strategy with a small staff
2. Complexity—managing the bureaucratic, linguistic, and other differences across applicants from dozens of different countries
3. Speed—responding quickly to international applicants anxious to accept the first offer they receive
4. Product—offering degrees and programs that appeal to international students concerned primarily with English language instruction, professional credentials, and time-to-degree
5. Pricing—setting tuition to attract a broad range of students

Despite their successes, the cases of Australia and the U.K. also indicate that a single-minded focus on enrollment gains can have negative consequences. When the international student population outstrips the supply of student services or academic infrastructure, international groups on campus may become isolated, funding inequalities between different academic departments can arise, and animosity toward international students may appear.

**APPENDIX 4**  
**Active Agreements of Cooperation 2012**

**Asia**

China	23
Japan	115
Korea	13
Vietnam	4
India	3
Taiwan	3
Thailand	3
<i>Asia Total</i>	<i>164</i>

**South America**

Chile	11
Brazil	7

**Europe**

Italy	9
Germany	5
Spain	5
Turkey	3

**Middle East**

Egypt	3
-------	---

## APPENDIX 5

### Proposed Amendments to the UC Davis Academic Personnel Manual

At APM-UCD 220.IV.C.2

Regarding “Merit increases”, the current wording is

2. Merit increases for academic appointments are based on academic attainment, experience, and performance; they are not automatic. The basic standard of superior intellectual attainment in teaching, research and/or other creative achievement, professional competence and activity, and University and public service is the indispensable prerequisite for advancement.

We propose adding a clause to the second sentence:

The basic standard of superior intellectual attainment in teaching, research and/or other creative achievement, professional competence and activity, national and international recognition, and University and public service is the indispensable prerequisite for advancement.

Further at 220.IV.C.4 the criteria for advancement at the upper levels currently specify “national or international recognition”. We propose that this be revised to read “national and international recognition”. We further suggest that in view of the continued globalization of research in the past generation, that we insert into this section a paragraph that includes this wording in describing “promotion to Professor, Step I.”

#### **CURRENT WORDING**

4. Advancement to upper level steps

a. Advancement to Professor, Step VI, calls for "evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching." In interpreting these criteria, there must be evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, in teaching, and in service. In addition, advancement to Step VI requires evidence of great distinction and national or international recognition. The total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a unit, and his or her reputation and influence should be continuing to grow. Many professors will not qualify for this advancement and will remain indefinitely at Step V.

b. Advancement to Professor, Step VII, VIII, and IX, calls for "continuing great distinction, national or international recognition, highly meritorious service, and excellent teaching performance." The record should continue to show superior achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, research, University and public service, and professional competence). Many professors will not qualify for further upper-level advancement and will remain indefinitely at a certain step.

c. Advancement to Professor, above-scale, is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. Mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. The record should show superior achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, research, University and public service, and professional competence). The total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a unit, and his or her reputation and influence should be continuing to grow.

## PROPOSED WORDING

### 4. Promotion to and Advancement in upper level steps:

a. Promotion to Professor, Step I, requires “evidence of sustained and continuing excellence” in scholarship and creative achievement, University teaching, and service, and “great academic distinction, recognized nationally ... in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching.” In interpreting these criteria, there must be evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, in teaching, and in service. In addition, promotion to Step I and beyond requires evidence of national and international recognition.

b. Advancement to Professor, Step VI, calls for "evidence of highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching." In interpreting these criteria, there must be evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, in teaching, and in service. In addition, advancement to Step VI requires evidence of great distinction and national and international recognition. The total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a unit, and his or her reputation and influence should be continuing to grow. Many professors will not qualify for this advancement and will remain indefinitely at Step V.

c. Advancement to Professor, Step VII, VIII, and IX, calls for "continuing great distinction, national and international recognition, highly meritorious service, and excellent teaching performance." The record should continue to show superior achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, research, University and public service, and professional competence). Many professors will not qualify for further upper-level advancement and will remain indefinitely at a certain step.

d. Advancement to Professor, above-scale, is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. Mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. The record should show superior achievement in all the normal categories of performance (teaching, research, University and public service, and professional competence). The total career of the candidate must have distinction when considered as a unit, and his or her reputation and influence should be continuing to grow.

**APPENDIX 6**  
**LETTER FROM MEREDITH MCQUAID**

*Global Programs and Strategy Alliance  
Office of the Senior Vice President  
for System Academic Administration*

*100 University International Center  
331 17th Avenue Southeast  
Minneapolis, MN 55414 USA*

*Office: 612-624-5580  
Fax: 612-626-1730  
www.global.umn.edu  
Email: global@umn.edu*

February 27, 2012

Dr. Ralph Hexler  
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  
One Shields Avenue  
Davis, CA 95616

Dear Provost Hexler:

It was my great pleasure to visit UC Davis on February 22-23, to meet with the many talented people whose job it is to internationalize your campus. I particularly enjoyed the opportunity to discuss with faculty, students, and staff how Davis might advance its internationalization agenda. I came away from my visit with some general and some specific ideas about how UC Davis might become not only comprehensively internationalized, but a leader in this field, once a strategy has been identified and appropriate investments made. I share these recommendations with you now, for your consideration.

First, I applaud your decision to establish an international advisory committee to recommend an overarching strategy for international engagement. As you and I discussed, the current menu of international programs offered by UC Davis, albeit impressive, reflects tactics in need of a strategy. In formulating that strategy, several questions should be considered: What is the goal of internationalization on your campus? Why increase the number of students who study abroad? Other than increasing revenue, why increase the number of international students? The purpose for engaging in any additional or expanded international activity must be identified and promoted by University leaders to adequately inspire, promote, and accomplish comprehensive internationalization. Once a strategy is in place, and concrete goals have been identified, the appropriate investment of resources must follow.

Second, the current organizational structure of international programs on campus lends itself both to redundancy, and a lack of synchronization. Both offices responsible for certain international programs are run by experienced, enthusiastic people, and both have good reputations. One seems to generate revenue, while the other needs revenue to adequately serve student needs. In neither case are they fully integrated into the vertical and horizontal hierarchy of the academic community. To have the power and the authority to advance the internationalization agenda, unit leadership ought to be centralized, either with direct report to the Chancellor's office or an enhanced role under your leadership, and a clear mandate to advance the strategy identified.

The internationalization of higher education is more than a passing fad, as you are obviously aware. It is predicted that, from a year 2000 base, there will be a 150% increase in higher education seats globally to 250 million by 2025, and a more than doubling of student mobility from the current three to more than seven million annually by the same time (J. Hudzik, *Comprehensive*

*Internationalization: From Concept to Action*). UC Davis stands to benefit greatly from this expansion, given its reputation, its location, and the foundation from which it begins to systematically internationalize the campus community. But to succeed, the University must not only *expect* all colleges and departments to increase the internationalization of faculty and staff, but to *assist* them in doing so. Instructors should be trained to lead discussions with domestic and international students to increase intercultural competency; to demonstrate or model meaningful interaction with international students.

The internationalization of a campus is a process that must be led from the top, supported and facilitated from the bottom, and moved sideways throughout the institution. This process takes time and resources, but is one that will surely enhance the life and the careers of graduates, and just possibly lead to a more sustainable and peaceful world.

In terms of specific short-term steps that could be taken at UC Davis to demonstrate its commitment to internationalize, some ideas include: 1) \$1000 incentive “scholarships” for every domestic student to be used towards a study abroad program; 2) reinvigorating the curriculum integration project to promote study abroad which seems to have lost priority with a reduction in resources; 3) consistent and clear messaging, by you and the Chancellor, about the need to prepare your students for the future through internationalization; 4) involvement of the local community in Davis regarding the benefits to internationalization.

I know that you have more needs than resources at UC Davis presently; that there are many constituencies to serve, and priorities to balance. I can think of no other priority, however, that would provide you and your University with more positive energy – or more opportunities to boast - than a true commitment to comprehensive internationalization. And, of course, you have the people and the talent from which to build. I met many of them while I was on your campus.

Thank you again for giving me the chance to see the great work and the enthusiasm among those who serve your international programs. I thoroughly enjoyed our dinner together, and I hope that our paths cross again. Best wishes as you move forward on this journey to comprehensively internationalize.

Sincerely,



Meredith McQuaid  
Associate Vice President and Dean for International Programs  
University of Minnesota

Cc: Dr. Jeannette Money, Dr. Cary Trexler, Ms. Marie H. Carter-Dubois.

