**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>2</td>
<td>As needed.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed a total 36 GE Petitions, 1 UCIE report and 1 issue (EAP).

0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 0 issues deferred from the previous year.

0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 1 issue (EAP) 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**
- Report of the UC Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education
- Status and future of Education Abroad Program
- Request to change the name of “UC Davis Short-Term Programs Abroad”

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

**Committee’s narrative:**

The committee focused its attention on the issues listed above. Committee Chair Pablo Ortiz drafted a response to the Report of the UC Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education and addressed it to Linda Bisson, Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, and she composed a letter on the same subject and addressed it to Michael Brown, Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the Academic Council.
The status and the future of the Education Abroad Program were discussed at length and in detail prior to Chair Bisson’s letter and Chair Ortiz’s response. The Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education and relevant materials and documents that stimulated the discussion on the status and the future of the Education Abroad Program are posted to the CISE whiteboard in ASIS.

**Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education**

The discussions on this report that CISE had at its May 23, and June 13, 2007, meetings during the 2006-07 academic year were continued at CISE’s first 2007-08 academic year meeting on November 7, 2007. The Winter 2007 Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education was followed up with a November 2007 Report. The November 2007 Report, the upcoming November 15, 2007, meeting of the University Committee on International Education, which had the Report as an agenda item, and new information that became available since the close of the 2006-07 academic year suggested continued discussion of the Report and the composition of a response.

At the November 7, 2007, meeting of CISE, the current status of the education abroad program, reciprocity, and financial and budgeting, administrative and academic considerations were discussed. At the close of the meeting, CISE concluded that more information was needed.

At the January 11, 2008 meeting of CISE, the focus was on drafting a response to the Report. Under consideration were: 1) the developments at the University of California Office of the President as related to UCOP’s plan for handling the Education Abroad Program; 2) the funding of EAP; and 3) the international study centers.

Appendix I contains the response of Chair Ortiz.

Appendix II contains the letter of Chair Bisson.

**UCIE Report**

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. During the 2007-08 academic year, UCIE had three meetings: November 15, 2007; February 7, 2008; and May 23, 2008.

Robert Flocchini, the 2007-08 Davis Division, Academic Senate representative to UCIE, attended the November and the May UCIE meetings. CISE member Robert Borgen attended the February UCIE meeting in Robert Flocchini’s place, as an approved alternate.

Minutes of the 2007-08 UCIE meetings are available by way of the UC Davis Academic Senate web-site.
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 2007-08 CISE meeting agenda item, the response is mentioned in this annual report because the comment is made in the response that “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.”

Respectfully submitted,

Pablo Ortiz, Chair
Robert Borgen
Robert Flocchini, UCIE DD Representative
Niels Jensen
Cristina Martinez-Carazo
Eric Schroeder
Xiaoling Shu
Frank Verstraete
Yvette Flores, ex-officio
Charles Lesher, ex-officio
Wesley Young, ex-officio
Anne Britt, School of Medicine Representative
Prabhakara Choudary, Academic Federation Representative

Diane Adams, EAC Associate Director and Committee Guest
Jodee Ellett, EAC Academic Integration Specialist
Bryan Rodman, Committee Resource Analyst
APPENDIX I

Davis Division, CISE Chair Pablo Ortiz Response Letter to Davis Division, Academic Senate Chair Linda Bisson
Draft of a response to the UC joint administration/senate committee report on International Education

Davis, January 11, 2008

Linda Bisson, chair,  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Dear Linda,

The CISE met today to review the Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education. The CISE applauds the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on their recommendation that the rate of participation of students in international programs should double within the next five years. We also believe that EAP should continue to occupy a central position in a broad portfolio of opportunities for students to study abroad. We think, moreover, that EAP is a valuable Academic Program, and any changes to its structure should be guided by academic considerations, rather than purely financial and budgetary needs, which seems to be the case.

The CISE is concerned with the possibility of an expanded role for third party/non UC based programs. The responsibility of the Academic Senate is to guarantee that the programs and courses that our students take abroad are comparable to their UC counterparts. We agree with the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on the fact that the “the academic credit process for study abroad should be reviewed by the Academic Senate with an eye towards streamlining and simplification.” To that effect, an enormous amount of work has been done over decades on reciprocity agreements and academic integration. Making the results of this work available to the campuses and the academic community at large is a very important part of the role of EAP. A decentralizing effort incorporating large numbers of new and untested partnerships would require faculty time and resources that we simply do not have and cannot afford. What may appear as a cost-saving initiative would become quite the opposite.

The CISE is also concerned with the possibility of a lack of adequate Senate representation in the International Education Leadership Team, appointed by the Chancellors and the President, charged with overseeing integration of the University’s various study abroad programs, including EAP. As we said before, at the UC, the Senate is responsible for the curriculum. The transition plan for the University-coordinated education abroad portfolio, and the future of EAP as well as the campus-based programs are crucial, and we believe that the faculty should be appropriately represented, since these are Academic programs. Therefore, before final decisions are made over budget reductions and different funding models for EAP and other programs, we would like to have the opportunity to examine the options from the point of view of the Senate, and provide our perspective.

Pablo Ortiz, Chair  
CISE
APPENDIX II

Davis Division, Academic Senate Chair Linda Bisson Response Letter to Michael Brown, Chair – Assembly of the Academic Senate
February 11, 2008

MICHAEL BROWN, CHAIR
Assembly of the Academic Senate
Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Report of the UC Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education

The subject proposal was distributed to all of the Davis Division standing committees and the Faculty Executive Committees of the schools and colleges. Comments were received from the International Studies and Exchanges and Planning and Budget Committees and College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Faculty Executive Committee.

We affirm strong support for the academic value of an education abroad experience as central to University of California efforts to internationalize the campus. We also support the goal of expanding participation to 40 percent over the next five years. Indeed, University of California graduates will be at a competitive disadvantage nationally and internationally without such experience. The Davis Division strongly urges that equality of opportunity be recognized as a central goal in the Education Abroad Program. As a state-supported university with the goal of promoting equality of opportunity, this is a special mission of the university.

In light of the goals to support and expand education abroad experiences for UC students, while promoting equality of access, we are skeptical of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee report that these goals can be met primarily through third party providers. The responsibility of the UC Academic Senate is to evaluate the programs and courses taken by our students while abroad ensuring credit will be transferred from courses comparable to UC counterparts. We agree with the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on the fact that the “the academic credit process for study abroad should be reviewed by the Academic Senate with an eye towards streamlining and simplification.” To that end, an enormous amount of work has been done over decades on reciprocity agreements and academic integration. Making the results of this work available to the campuses and the academic community at large is a very important part of the role of the Education Abroad Program. A decentralizing effort incorporating large numbers of new and untested partnerships would require faculty time and resources that we simply do not have and cannot afford. What may appear as a cost-saving initiative on the surface in the end will likely become quite costly to the institution and potentially students/graduates.

Thus, there must be a full analysis of the costs of such programs, not only the cost to students but the indirect administrative costs to the UC system. (For example, third party provider programs provide, at best, transfer credit for enrolled students (no grades or course titles). Where fully-costed programs are competitive to systems in place, programs must be vetted for academic quality on an ongoing basis, comparable to the system that is currently in place for UC Education Abroad Program. Where UC programs have lower costs, those programs should be promoted. One mechanism to expand opportunities, without resorting to third party providers, is to expand UC-sponsored programs by partnering with other universities (consortium agreements). If the Education Abroad Program could open their doors to non-UC students, it could populate valued under-enrolled programs, while at the same time provide opportunities to our students in parts of the world not served by the Education Abroad Program. We encourage exploration of opportunities such as these to meet the anticipated growth in student participation.

While we agree that the organization of education abroad at the University of California must become more efficient and innovative in light of changing student demands and competition from other providers, we must acknowledge and continue to support the current strengths of the program. The Education Abroad Program is widely recognized...
as one of the best, if not the best, education abroad program in the nation. We must also recognize that the reciprocal nature of the current Education Abroad Program in providing an additional avenue of internationalization, as it brings international students from all parts of the world and all socioeconomic backgrounds to UC as well as providing education abroad opportunities for UC students.

With a ten campus system, we believe that there are areas in which economies of scale can be realized through a university-wide office, and, in fact, many economies of scale are already realized. The University of California would therefore be remiss to forego the opportunities presented for efficiency gains generated by these economies of scale. We urge the central office and the campus offices to study carefully the full array of services provided in both locations, to determine the most efficient location for provision of those services, and to make additional organizational changes, as appropriate. It is important to note, however, that whatever funding model is selected, the Education Abroad Program must be supported financially for an interim period to ensure that the expertise and scale economies achieved to date are not dismantled in the interim. This is perhaps the most important issue at this point in time. The Education Abroad Program is a core academic program and issues confronting the Office of the President in terms of budgetary cuts should not overshadow the Education Abroad Program’s important role in the UC curriculum.

The Education Abroad Program is confronting simultaneously multiple challenges and multiple demands, some of which are in direct contradiction. Moreover, it has been unable to meet many of these challenges and demands by constraints imposed upon it, including enrollment caps, cost constraints (inability to charge additional fees for expensive programs), inability to market its services outside the UC community and shifting goals. The Education Abroad Program cannot simultaneously meet all demands. We believe that the University should prioritize its goals over the medium to long term and allow the Education Abroad Program to develop a program that responds to those priorities. In so doing, we reiterate that the Education Abroad Program should be supported financially as it moves to a new, financially sustainable model. In developing its long term plan, the Education Abroad Program should evaluate other successful models at comparable multi-campus public universities. The campus Education Abroad Program directors, together with Universitywide Office of the Education Abroad Program leadership, have already begun this process, and we encourage continuance of this important collaborative effort.

Finally, we are deeply concerned with the lack of adequate Academic Senate representation on the Joint Ad Hoc Committee, appointed by the Chancellors and the President, charged with overseeing integration of the University’s various study abroad programs, including the Education Abroad Program. Our concerns deepen with the knowledge that a request was made to expand the membership to include additional Academic Senate representatives on the Joint Ad Hoc Committee and the request was not supported.

The Regents delegated curriculum oversight to the Academic Senate. Discussion and development of a transition plan for the University-coordinated education abroad portfolio, and the future of the Education Abroad Program as well as the campus-based programs are crucial, and we believe that the Academic Senate (faculty) should have been incorporated into the discussion at the earliest stages since these are academic programs. Therefore, before final decisions are made over budget reductions and different funding models for the Education Abroad Program and other programs, we must have the opportunity to examine the options.

Sincerely,

Linda F. Bisson
Professor of Viticulture & Enology
Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate