Committee on International Studies and Exchanges (CISE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency:</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Two meetings per Quarter.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed a total 65 GE Petitions, 1 appeal, 1 Task Force report (EAP) and 3 issues (EAP, GE credit review and authority for transfer credit).

0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 1 issue (EAP) continued from the previous year.

0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 2 issues (EAP and authority for transfer credit) continue to the coming academic year.

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee
- Business Action Plan for the Education Abroad Program
- Funding for Study Abroad Programs - Campus-Based Fees
- CISE’s role in determining General Education Credit
- Authority for determining Transfer Credit of non-UC courses
- NUCSA – Leave Policy
- Agreements of Association
- Davis Division Representation at Systemwide UCIE Meetings

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None.

Committee’s narrative:

Over the course of the 2008-09 academic year, the committee spent most of its time addressing and responding to proposed changes to the Education Abroad Program. While doing so, the committee discussed multiple revisions of the EAP business action plan, the character/nature of the EAP (e.g. is it a program or a service), various funding methodologies (e.g. campus based fees, student fees, user/participation fees, and taxes), and considered the EAP from both an academic plan perspective and from a business plan perspective and the shifting of the financial and administrative
responsibility for EAP from UCOP to the campuses. During the discussions and considerations, the committee touched upon the topics of reciprocity, the Campus Administration commitment to increasing internationality of the campus while cutting international programs and funding to such programs, the creation of a website at UC Santa Barbara that would allow faculty from all UC campuses to add their names to a systemwide petition and to read and review relevant documentation on the proposed EAP business plan, and how campuses are not being informed of what is going on at the UC level.

In addition to the EAP, the committee reviewed sixty-five General Education Petitions for EAP Coursework and the criteria and function of the committee in this regard, as well as transfer credit authority, access to programs versus access to services, the Provost directive to increase campus based fees for UC Study Abroad Programs, the status of the Quarter Abroad Program, the potential management of study abroad programs by third-party providers (e.g. the benefits, the costs, the consequences of such management, and the lack of academic oversight), the long distance communication of subject matter instead of subject matter presented by local teachers, the huge marketing promotion of faculty led programs, and the current budget crisis.

The year began with the circulation of the announcement of the 4th Annual UC Davis International Education Week (IEW).

Review of the Proposed Business Plan for EAP

At the end of October, 2008, a response was requested from CISE by Mary Croughan, Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council, on a proposed business plan submitted by Michael Cowan, Acting Executive Director of the Education Abroad Program. The CISE membership reviewed the EAP business plan and provided comments that were incorporated into a response written on behalf of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate by Division Chair Robert Powell and sent to Universitywide Chair Mary Croughan.

CISE submitted its comments on and response to the proposed business plan for EAP by the December 1, 2008, deadline, as requested. Davis Division Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell sent his divisional response to Universitywide Chair Mary Croughan on December 8, 2008. In January, 2009, on behalf of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, Chair Croughan wrote in a letter to UC President Mark Yudof, that “After careful consideration, the Academic Council concluded that the draft business plan is not acceptable,” and enclosed DD Academic Senate Chair Powell’s response on behalf of CISE and other UC Davis campus units. In February, 2009, CISE considered UOEAP Acting Director Michael Cowan’s new strategic plan for UOEAP and the responsive memo of concerned UC Faculty sent to the Regents and courtesy copied to each UC campus chancellor. In May, 2009, UC Davis Provost Enrique Lavernia asked for comments on the draft report of the Office of the President task force charged with reshaping the systemwide administration of the EAP. Eight days later, CISE Chair Frank Verstraete provided comments to DD Academic Senate Chair Powell for forwarding to Provost Lavernia. Also in May, CISE committee member Philip Rogaway drafted a Resolution Regarding the Threat to the University of California’s Education Abroad Program.
Discussions and research revealed the differences between the UC campuses that made deciding what aspects of the EAP to support and what aspects to discard difficult. Academic, political and private programs were considered.

Various methods and strategies for disseminating information regarding the EAP business plans and for engaging UC Davis faculty were considered (e.g. campus directives, various campus list servers, and the lining up of departmental representatives as points of contact). The effective and informative distribution of a systemwide faculty petition across campus was discussed with particularity. As regards the Academic Senate list servers, the committee was informed that the standard practice was to avoid distributing messages associated with a general concern, as it would lead to a mass of email being distributed concerning similar important issues. The open forum section of the Academic Senate website was brought to the attention of the committee as an alternative vehicle for the dissemination of information regarding the EAP business plan.

**Committee Resolution Regarding the Threat to the UC EAP**

In May, 2009, on behalf of the committee, committee member Philip Rogaway drafted a resolution in response to the EAP business plan, its revision and its impact on the EAP. By extension, the business plan’s impact on the Summer Abroad and Quarter Abroad Programs was implied. The thrust of the resolution was to underscore the proposed business plan’s threat to undermine the EAP’s operational capabilities and educational mission. The resolution stated the resolve of the UC Davis faculty to support the action of the Academic Council and UCIE in rejecting UOEAP Acting Director Michael Cowan’s business plan; to remind the UC administration that EAP is an *academic program* that must be treated in accordance with the principles of shared governance; to express concern over changes that make study abroad drastically less affordable for our students; to question the decision to remove UC faculty from study-center positions abroad, thereby compromising academic oversight and possibly student well-being; and to disagree with the dismantling of EAP’s infrastructure in such a way that its institutional memory will be lost and remain unrecoverable after our funding situation improves.

The resolution was finalized, and an electronic committee vote was initialized. Committee voting did not achieve a quorum, so the resolution stayed with the committee.

**Campus-based Fees**

Campus based fees became a topic of discussion at the end of January, 2009, subsequent to Interim Provost Barbara Horwitz’s December 29, 2008, letter announcing that “all registered students should pay all applicable campus-based fees.” The October 15, 2008, report by the Office of Resource Management and Planning, which addressed inconsistent current practices for charging campus-based fees, was discussed, as were the consequences and the impacts of campus-based fees on the EAP and the Summer Abroad and the Quarter Abroad Programs.

The committee informed itself on how student fees were broken out. The writing of a memo of concern on the impact that increasing campus-based fees would have on UC study abroad programs was considered. Although it was universally understood that the
current budget situation would greatly influence the response to the memo, it was understood that the Campus Administration needed to receive such a memo. The consensus of the committee was that the memo should notice the December 29, 2008, Barbara Horwitz letter and address the topics of FTEs, fees (campus based access fees and student services fees), taxes, and reciprocity. The consensus was also that the memo should question how the Campus Administration expects to fulfill its commitment to increase the internationality of the campus by cutting international programs. At the time of the writing of this annual report, the above described memo of concern had not been circulated to the committee.

In response to Interim Provost Barbara Horwitz’s letter regarding campus-based fees, the Quarter Abroad Program put together a restructuring proposal that presented a self-supporting model. The committee discussed this proposal.

**Review of Petitions for General Education Credit for EAP Coursework**

At the inaugural committee meeting for the 2008-09 academic year, the committee was informed that the only GE Petitions that would be presented for review by CISE would be those singling out new EAP courses or EAP courses that had undergone a change. The consensus of the committee was that these petitions would be scanned and posted to the committee’s whiteboard in ASIS and the committee membership would be notified and invited to provide comments electronically and in parallel for the Committee Chair’s benefit.

Ex-officio committee member Charles Lesher, Director of the Education Abroad Center (the UC Davis campus unit of the UC Systemwide EAP), presented the committee with a description of the General Education graduation requirement and provided an explanatory breakdown of the components of the requirement.

After hearing ex-officio committee member Lesher’s presentation, the committee desired clarification of 1) its charge with respect to approving GE Petitions for EAP Coursework; 2) its purpose in reviewing the requests for GE credit in the form of the GE petitions; and 3) justification of its qualifications to perform this charge. In clarifying that the committee’s charge was “To designate approved Education Abroad Program Courses for General Education credit,” the committee was made aware that the courses it would be reviewing would have already been approved by EAP and that the committee was “designating” that it had reviewed the petitioner’s request for GE credit and, in its estimation, based on its member’s expertise as faculty of UC Davis, had justifiably approved or denied the request as part of the campus oversight in such matters.

The first 2008-09 GE Petitions for EAP Coursework to be reviewed and commented on were received at the end of September, 2008. The last of the 2008-09 petitions were received at the end of July, 2009. Fifty-nine petitions were approved. Two of these were re-submitted petitions. Four petitions were denied. Two petitions were not reviewable: one because the course had not been taken yet by the petitioner; one because review authority resided with the petitioner’s department (this was a Petition for Retroactive Change and the issue concerned the student’s responsibility to secure the approval of their department before taking the course they were petitioning for acceptance).
After close review and careful consideration, the committee recommended nonsupport of an appeal of a disapproved Retroactive Drop to the Grade Change Committee of the Office of the Registrar.

**Evaluation of Courses taken Abroad for UC Transfer Credit**

In February, 2009, the committee discussed the issue of who is the authority for determining whether or not a non-University of California course is to be granted transfer credit. The issue was brought to the attention of the committee during its discussion of students participating in non-University of California study abroad (NUCSA) programs.

In March, 2009, CISE Chair Verstraete discussed the matter with Davis Division Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell, Davis Division Academic Senate Executive Director Gina Anderson, Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs Fred Wood, Undergraduate Council Chair Thomas Famula, and Director of Undergraduate Admissions Pamela Burnett. Discussion led to the matter being turned over to the Academic Senate Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ). At the time of the writing of this annual report, the Davis Division CERJ was in the process of drafting a recommendation with justification to ask for a Systemwide ruling from the UC Rules and Jurisdiction Committee.

Subsequent to the meeting referenced in the foregoing paragraph, Chair Verstraete informed the CISE membership that cites regarding the authority for determining transferability of credit are being investigated, that the Admissions Office is well-organized and very capable of managing transfer credit, while CISE does not have the infrastructure to do so, and that, in the case of dispute, the Admissions Office will involve the Department involved or CISE, if applicable, to resolve the problem.

The next steps/requirements depend upon the outcome of the UC Rules and Jurisdiction Committee's review, which will not occur swiftly.

**Non-University of California Student Abroad (NUCSA) Leave Policy**

It is this issue that generated the discussion of the evaluation of courses taken abroad for UC transfer credit and focused attention on the authority for determining transferability of credit.

Following up on his meeting with Davis Division Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell, Davis Division Academic Senate Executive Director Gina Anderson, Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs Fred Wood, Undergraduate Council Chair Thomas Famula, and Director of Undergraduate Admissions Pamela Burnett, Chair Verstraete related that Director Burnett made a strong case in support of her unit’s managing NUCSA, especially her unit’s having transfer credit authority. He related that the Undergraduate Admissions Office knows what it is doing, has been fully trained and has the expertise and administrative infrastructure in place.

After the foregoing had been related to the committee, the question arose: Is the Academic Senate delegating authority to another unit on campus; and it was remarked: If this is the course that is taken, then there should be a mechanism set up for appeals.
**Davis Division, Academic Senate Chair Linda Bisson Response to Non-University of California Student Abroad Leave Policy**

This response was made following a request that the Davis Division Academic Senate Undergraduate Council evaluate reducing the barriers for students to participate in Non-University of California Study Abroad (NUCSA) programs.

Although this response was not a 2008-09 CISE meeting agenda item, the response is mentioned in this annual report, as it was in the 2007-08 annual report, because the response contains the following excerpt which led to the aforementioned discussion on transfer credit authority.

“CISE is presently involved in the evaluation of General Education credit. It would seem that extending their [CISE’s] role to include the evaluation, and equivalence, of coursework across universities is a natural expansion of their duties.”

CISE’s review of GE Petitions was clarified in November, 2008, and, in February, 2009, the authority for granting transfer credit was called to issue.

**Study Abroad Agreements of Association**

These agreements were brought before the committee for consideration in March, 2009. Upon hearing an explanation of the purport of the agreements, the committee consensus was that Chair Verstraete should consult with DD Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell and Executive Director of the Academic Senate, DD, Gina Anderson and provide feedback. After consulting with Chair Powell and Executive Director Gina Anderson, Chair Verstraete shared with the committee that Agreements of Association are non-academic and are to be considered the business items and the purview of the Campus Administration.

**DD representation at UCIE meetings**

Robert Flocchini, the 2007-08 Davis Division, Academic Senate representative to University Committee on International Education (UCIE), continued in this role for the 2008-09 academic year. However, other professional commitments conflicted with scheduled UCIE meetings and prevented him from attending the 2008-09 UCIE meetings. CISE member Robert Borgen attended the November 20, 2008, UCIE meeting in Robert Flocchini’s place, as an approved alternate. CISE was not represented at the March 12, 2009, UCIE meeting or the May 14, 2009, UCIE meeting. Due to Robert Flocchini’s unavailability to attend UCIE meetings, the importance of the issues discussed at these meetings and of having someone report back to CISE on what transpires at these meetings, CISE Chair Verstraete explored the possibility of installing someone else as the Davis Division Academic Senate representative to UCIE and suggested that the next CISE Chair be this representative, unless an interested Academic Senate standing member of the committee wishes to assume this responsibility. Replacing the DD representative at UCIE was considered in May, 2009, but the installation of someone else was discovered to be ineffective and inappropriate.
UCIE Report

During the 2008-09 academic year, UCIE had three meetings: November 20, 2008; March 12, 2009; and May 14, 2009.

Minutes of the 2008-09 UCIE meetings are available by way of the UC Davis Academic Senate web-site.

Per Beverly Bossler, the 2006-07 Davis Division, Academic Senate representative to UCIE, as provided in her overview of her first UCIE meeting, UCIE is an advisory committee only; they cannot make policy revisions.

Respectfully submitted,
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