I. Consent Calendar
   Approval of the Agenda and Minutes
   Action Taken: The agenda was approved as noticed. Corrections to the minutes can be sent via email.

II. Chair's Report – Chair Sathya Guruswamy
   The Chair thanked everyone for joining and thanked UCEAP for carrying on during the COVID-19 crisis.

III. UCEAP Director's Report – Director Vivian-Lee Nyitray
   The Director stated that UCEAP had suspended all of its programming abroad with two exceptions. One is Canada; it appears that the students would be permitted to come back and would not be subjected to quarantining. There are 3-4 students there. The other place where programming is not suspended is Japan. UCEAP has suspended spring programming but not year-long programming. (NB: Summer programming was later suspended.) The students are already there, they are safe and well in dorms and they have good access to healthcare. The Director gave the example of a student who fell sick in Japan getting assistance from the UCEAP staff to make sure that she got care (this was not a COVID-related illness). Some parents of students who are overseas are concerned that the students would be exposing themselves to greater risk by coming home. A number of students who received the directive to come home ignored it – in some cases that was the parents’ decision if they were in places like Germany. They have had to sign a waiver of liability – they have limited support and their travel insurance will expire in 31 days after suspension of the program. The faculty and staff who are remaining there will do whatever they can should a student need assistance. There will be limited support if the staff is locked down and unable to travel, and there might be issues with transportation. The Director said she had a call scheduled with OGC and UCEAP emergency staff today to determine the status of the students who have elected to stay abroad. UCEAP doesn’t feel that they are in danger, but the situation is fluid and changing.

UCEAP has suspended all of its summer programming. That represents about 20 percent of its programming and a $7.5M hit to program revenue.

Only US citizens and permanent residents are being allowed back into the country. UCEAP is tracking international students who are studying abroad; their visas may become invalid if they are not registered as students. Not that many American students are staying abroad; many are returning today.

The program suspensions began cascading last month. There were study abroad personnel on some of the campuses and some of the senior international officers who were concerned that everyone was not pulled home. Most of the pushback was coming from quarter campuses. But a great many students are actually semester students. They were facing the loss of academic credit, and possibly the loss of financial aid. There was also conflicting advice from UCOP regarding the definition of essential and non-essential travel, as UCOP statements about travel did not specifically address study abroad. UCEAP also needed guidance from its partners as to whether
they were moving to remote instruction. UCEAP and the registrars at the campus are trying to maximize students’ academic benefit and minimize their financial load. The Director said that her staff in Santa Barbara and abroad have been working very hard to assuage the fears of parents, who have at times treated staff very harshly during their anxious phone calls that began immediately after the US travel restrictions were announced. UCEAP had 978 students who were lined up for summer programming in physics who are also making anxious phone calls because their programs are suspended.

Students are running into issues with housing deposits they have made. ACCENT international has agreed to split the cost of non-refundable deposits; in some instances students will have other non-recoverable costs. If they travel within seven days of the suspension, they will be covered on ticket funds up to $200 above the original cost. The Director said it has been wonderful to see people pulling together for the sake of the students. The Department of Education has issued new guidelines and allowed reciprocity students to take online courses. There are students who are unable to get home from China who are allowed to take courses through ILTI. She said that UCEAP’s processes have always been good as they have a lot of emergency response experience, however they have been really put to the test in the current situation. The program has waived all withdrawal fees.

IV. UCEAP Associate Dean’s Report

Associate Dean Hsiu-Zu Ho

Associate Dean Ho said that the AI grant program is still continuing. While the current AI proposal submission deadline is May 1, 2020, she said that due to challenging COVID-19 circumstances, UCEAP will plan to extend the deadline. UCEAP will check with the AI representatives at the campuses to see how many grants they are anticipating and the timeline that might work best for the campuses.

Dean Ho provided results of a survey on the academic disposition of UCEAP’s reciprocity/exchange students. As of May 18, 2020, 758 of a total 1,126 exchange students have responded. Of the 758 respondents:

- 54% plan to attend online classes locally (23% on-campus; 31% off-campus)
- 40% plan to attend online classes from home country
- 3.5% plan to attend online classes from somewhere else (Chicago, Hawaii, Vancouver, etc.)
- 2.5% plan to withdraw from the program

UCEAP will continue to follow up with students as well as our partner universities to figure out who is where and doing what. Dean Ho will provide an update of this survey during the May meeting.

V. Program Reviews

A. 2019-20 Mexico Three-Year Review

Committee member Maureen Feeley presented on the Mexico Multi-Site Three Year Review. Overall, she thought it was a very innovative and impressive program. The program is unique: it is 9-11 months long depending on whether students are enrolled in a semester or quarter long UC campus. It starts with a five-week intensive language program. It has internships and full-time coursework in Spanish. The central goals of the course are to introduce students to the theories and practice of leadership studies and prepare them to do internship positions, both in Mexico City, and through the UC Sacramento center. Student evaluations were very strong, as were the syllabi. Assignments were very well-aligned with the program goals. A unique feature of the program is that it works to develop students’ professional skills, including the preparation of a LinkedIn profile. The program is
brainstorming ways to increase enrollment. It is a small program, and UCEAP would be enthusiastic about enlarging it. The challenge is getting students to sign up. The program usually gets over 100 applications which then whittles down to 4 or 5 at enrollment. When students realize the language requirement and that it is a year-long program they get cold feet. UCEAP will be reaching out to alumni to see if they will be willing to talk about their experience for program promotion.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair
Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair
The Chair addressed the question of P/NP grading and said that UCEP looked at regulations 778 a, b, and 782; those are the regulations that specify that each division has the right to decide how to work on its grading options. Some are doing pass/no pass. She recommended that members write to their divisional chairs to find out how they will take this forward. Students can petition for a letter grade. There are a lot of students who will need a letter grade for financial aid, veterans’ benefits, medical school, etc.

The Regents’ meeting was held remotely yesterday and a number of items dropped off the agenda. Cohort tuition was supposed to be voted on, but it was dropped. The meeting featured a primer on Standardized testing; in May the President will bring forward her recommendations on it to the Regents. It is the Regents who ultimately have the say as to whether the University will continue with testing.

The Working Group on Comprehensive Access, which is the group that was set up post the Dignity Health proposed merger, had to report 90 days after its first meeting. The report that was issued was not a committee report. A significant number of committee members did not endorse the report so the chair sent it as a “chair’s report.” The report says there are two options: deepen affiliations or have zero affiliations. The President has put it up for public comment. As a result she received 2400 comments; she will be looking at all of these and deciding what she will present to Regents about what principles should be put forth for UC Health. That will be considered at Regents in May.

Initially, it was said that the Regents would announce the new president in May; however, that has now been amended to June or July. COVID makes it difficult to conduct interviews. The Academic Advisory Committee is screening candidates as the Regents consider their decision. There is also a search for a chancellor of Merced and the search result is likely to be announced in May.

The wildcat strikes at Santa Cruz continue to be an issue. Forty-four graduate students were eventually fired by the administration because they would not turn in their grades. These graduate students will have their benefits covered until their grievances are heard or until the end of spring quarter – whichever comes first. There have been a number of unfair labor practices documents filed.

There is an admissions audit being conducted by the State in the wake of the nation-wide admissions scandal. The Office of Ethics and Compliance has completed phase one of an admissions audit and is working on phase two. UCOP is hoping to go to the state and say that it has done its own audit.

The GO bond did not pass, which is a substantial loss to the University.

The Senate Chair said that she set up an online degree task force at the beginning of this year to examine if UC should consider a full time online undergraduate degree. That was brought up by Irvine which wanted an online degree for transfer students. She thinks that the task force will have some recommendations in May/June. She has also established a task force on extending faculty diversity.
VII. Information Items
A. Program Closures
University of the Arts London – This agreement is about to expire, and UCEAP is choosing to let it expire. The program just never took off. It started out with five colleges and had to whittle it down to the London College of Communication. In the end, the students were struggling at their host universities. It was up for a three year review and it just did not work out.

Thai Studies, Thammasat University—The program has not been able to make the minimum enrollment in the past two years. Two programs (International Economics and Public Health) will continue to run for the summer. In addition, they are looking at a possible internship program for the summer.

B. Re-Establishment of the University of Canterbury Program
UCEAP is restarting the University of Canterbury program in New Zealand. It had closed it fairly recently, but UCEAP had eliminated the New Zealand “holding tank,” so students could apply to exactly the university they want to attend. There is already more demand than space in the partner universities in the south island, so this will allow UCEAP to accommodate more students. UCEAP thinks that this will be a very popular program.

C. Proposed Program Reviews for 2020-21
Ten year reviews and three years reviews are upcoming. Members are asked to please nominate their fellow faculty members based on the recommendations included in the packet. Nominations are due by April 17. Korea and China were both slated for 10 year reviews, but they were postponed.

VIII. Initiative to Recognize International Activities and Engagement in Merit, Tenure, and Promotion

UC Davis Associate Vice Provost of Academic Programs Michael Lazzara
UC Davis Vice Provost and Chancellor of Global Affairs Joanna Regulska

The Chair asked members to report back what they had heard from their campuses about the white paper put forward by Professor Lazzara and Professor Regulska.

Berkeley- The campus was not able to gather any comments.

Davis – The committee endorsed the white paper and it is now with the Division Chair, who will likely bring it up in their executive council.

Irvine (reported via email) – In general, members were very supportive of the white paper and provided the following comments:

● Greater financial support is critical to fund international activities. Resources should be committed commensurable with the efforts that go along with international activities.
● There is a need to recognize that building an international reputation is expensive.
● Clear pathway is necessary to recognize the work of teaching faculty.
● The Study Abroad Center recognizes the level of commitment from faculty not only in leading study abroad programs but also in the preparation prior to the trips and after the trips.
● Since engagement vary from a wide range of activities from mentoring students on campus to leading PhD students in a foreign country, the levels of engagement should be differentiated and recognized accordingly.
● It was cautioned that an international activities statement differs from a diversity statement. There should be clarity in defining both statements.
● International activities statement should be elevated to a level that is worth an extra bucket.
• International activities contribute to better recognition of the UC system outside of UC Berkeley and UCLA. UCI could become better known.
• Diverse students could be stigmatized as “other” students.

UCLA – The regular committee member was not present to report back.

Merced – The white paper was reviewed campus-wide by CAP, the Committee on Research, and Undergraduate Council since Merced does not have a committee on international education. CAP felt that there was enough room in the current language to incorporate international education; there was no support for the paper or the creation of a working group.

Riverside – The committee discussed it and there was general consensus that this is a really good idea. There were questions about how to implement the process and how to credit international activities. Overall, there was positive feedback, but it will need to be re-reviewed when it has some implementation details added.

San Diego discussed it at their committee meeting. There was support for formation of a workgroup and the white paper, but a lot of questions about the details of how it would be implemented. The majority wanted to look at how to integrate this work into existing standards of promotion however.

San Francisco – The member will take it up with his campus

Santa Barbara – There was strong support for the white paper and the task force. UCSB does not have a senior international officer so this conversation served as an opportunity to emphasize this need.

Santa Cruz – The CIE discussed it and were supportive and getting things into the APM. Convening a working group would be helpful. The member tried to get this in front of the campus senate executive committee but it has been suffering with the wildcat strike, which has overtaken campus discussions. There are a lot of headwinds against adding language to the APM.

Associate Vice Provost Lazzara thanked committee members for the consultation and said that the results were quite interesting. He agreed that there were challenges about implementation. He asked how the committee felt that he and Vice Provost Regulska should move forward. The Vice Provost noted that six campuses seemed supportive and that input was still needed from UCSF, UCB, and UCLA. Maybe input should be collected from those campuses first to get a better sense of the feeling systemwide.

The Chair asked that the three campuses that had not responded at the meeting to reply via email regarding the proposal so that the committee could make a decision at the May meeting. The chair also said that engagement with UCAP might be helpful. The Vice Provost and Associate Vice Provost said they were hoping UCIE would take it forward with the Senate Chair if they thought it had merit. The Chair said that Fall might be a better time to bring this forward because the campus CAPs are busy at this time with merit and promotions in the COVID-19 environment.

IX. Supporting International Students on Campuses

The Chair had asked the campuses via email to report back on COVID-19 related issues as part of their role in supporting the wellbeing of international students on the campuses.

Campuses reported some difficulty with synchronous and asynchronous teaching, particularly with
larger classes. Most campuses reported working in “triage mode” and coping to the best of their abilities. Campuses are trying to accommodate students in need through loaner laptops and loaner hotspots. Food and housing insecurity continue to be issues for some students. No issues of xenophobia have been reported with the exception of a “challenge” that was not campus-based but reported by the committee member. A number of students who were in the UCSC wildcat strike were international students and have been fired or not renewed.

Campus report that is not COVID-related:
The Riverside member related a series of events that had taken place at her campus. She said that last summer she had been a part of a search for a new VP for International Recruitment. At the end of the search, the campus appointed an interim VP despite the considerable time spent interviewing candidates. Then in early February, she was informed that the Director of International Students and Scholars was going to be let go from an office that was already stressed. In addition, the VP of International Affairs is resigning because of the way the administration handles international activities. The International Education Committee is wondering how all of these changes will affect international students. The committee was hoping to have a conversation with the provost on his vision and strategy for international activities, but then COVID-19 got in the way.

The other campuses representatives weighed in with how international activities were housed at their campuses. There was considerable discussion.

X. Program Reviews
A. 2019-20 Mexico Three-Year Review

*Action Taken:* The proposal was approved 10-0-0.

The committee adjourned at 3:25 p.m.