FEEDBACK SUMMARY STATEMENT  
THEME 4: GLOBAL OUTREACH  

Student Response Summary  
Twenty-two responses were submitted about the plan that included the following comments:  
• Do not increase the burden on undergraduates by making the international offerings mandatory. Such a requirement is also redundant as various general education classes under Foundations of Society and Culture focus on global topics.  
• Hopefully this initiative with institutional support and encouragement will encourage students to be global citizens and active participants in world affairs. There also needs to be more participation by UCLA alumni.  
• Given the lucrative nature of many of the opportunities identified in this report, oversight is extremely important. An oversight committee for UCLA’s global engagement should be convened and include members selected by UCLA’s representative institutions (USAC, GSA, Staff Assembly, and Academic Senate).  
• Expand international internships, offer course credit, and provide more financial aid to a greater number of international undergraduate students.  

Faculty Response Summary  
Although general support was expressed for the plan and recommendations advanced, many weighed in with various opinions, concerns, and suggestions that have been summarized as follows:  
• Concern about increasing exchange programs and establishing international campuses. Increased funding to bring prominent faculty from foreign countries for high profile visits, as well as international faculty and postdocs, would generate strong and deep bonds.  
• More international faculty need to be hired, promoted, and counted as part of the campus diversity discussion.  
• Instead of increasing undergraduate course requirements, broaden offerings that are tied to teaching effectiveness goals. Every course should include international perspectives.  
• UCLA lacks the ability to effectively financially administer overseas projects. Engaging in global endeavors is rendered nearly impossible by the bureaucracy and crippling inefficiency of the travel accounting department and risk management. A major overhaul of these administrative areas would have to occur before UCLA could become globally engaged on a grand scale.
• UCLA should create the infrastructure needed to put together international models of healthcare education and delivery that is cost effective and becomes a standard of care for everyone.

• Keeping up with the "academic Joneses" for UCLA to remain competitive is not a strong argument for designating global outreach as its own category of strategic planning. It should be integrated into Education, Research, and Community Engagement. In addition, the Civic Engagement report argues for eliminating the word "outreach" in its programs and strategic planning; however it is included throughout the Global OUTREACH initiative. There needs to be consistency within the overall plan.

• Skepticism is expressed with regard to an "international champions" approach as well as the need for $400,000 in research grants and new support for existing initiatives. Rather than incentivize, why not staff up existing programs, projects, and courses to ensure better coordination and enhancement of International Institute capacities? Why the focus on global, but not on ethnic studies and the Institute of American Cultures?

• Where is the focus on the fact that we are already recognized as an international site of excellence? Where is the commitment to ensuring that we maintain or rise in international rankings as a site of research and educational excellence? Why does this report continually shift core missions away from faculty and departments to amorphous campus wide "initiatives" like this "international course requirement for undergraduates?" Who decides what's in that course, who decides what's given up? And how does a single course like that make our students smarter, more involved internationally or add to the university's global standing?

• The International Institute tries to be too many things to many places and cultures and does not have sufficient power to monitor and control its centers. An external review of the International Institute is needed to streamline activities and revisit its academic profile before adding to its roster, as it is already heavily staffed and houses too many small (MA) programs and underfunded ($5K a year) centers. A faculty advisory board could be a good start.

• Finance and enable more study abroad programs for undergraduates. Outreach to more international alumni through faculty lectures in other countries and make better use of alumni cruises to generate interest in foreign enrollment and build on institutional loyalty and potential partnerships. There is a large disconnect between the Alumni Office and Development.

• Global has become a desirable adjective for institutions, but what does it really mean and what do we want? More international enrollments? More international placements for them? Non-US sponsors of our programs? More undergraduate opportunities?
• "International objectives" should be more specifically defined and focused on problems that cross borders, such as the (related) issues of refugees, pollution, and climate change. The UCLA Grand Challenges are already international in scope and well-coordinated; perhaps the international objectives could be more visible locally through departmental disciplinary perspectives for one year and then move to a second year of cooperative interdisciplinary research.

**Staff Response Summary**

Feedback from staff was generally supportive but included numerous specific comments, concerns and suggestions that have been annotated and summarized as follows:

- The global components of the strategic plan are exciting and a global component to UCLA’s mission statement is long overdue. The undergraduate international course requirement will help students understand how we all can play a part in impacting and changing the world.

- The UCLA Global Online component is a very strong access point and has the potential to change lives around the world. Its success hinges on full integration with academic departments that are willing to embrace the changes suggested in Theme 1 (Education Innovation).

- Successful institutes require a significant amount of financial investment and strong leadership that can coalesce effectively – both of which appear to be lacking with the International Institute.

- UCLA needs more effective channels to connect alumni with the campus and to each other.

- Rather than create a specific International Grand Challenge, an international component could be added to the existing grand challenges to leverage UCLA’s international reach to strategically establish/enhance partnerships in other countries.

- UCLA must expand its capacity to enter into contracts and consultant agreements with non-US entities or otherwise risk damage to the university’s reputation, funding and student opportunities. Key international funding agencies have severed relationships with UCLA due to difficulties with the university’s contracting functions; thereby losing opportunities for student involvement, independent study, research travel, and career mentoring, as well as a wake of negative feedback. UCLA has garnered a reputation for being unable to administratively engage in international transactions. In addition, non-US consultants have encountered delayed payments, conflicting guidance, and unprofessional communication. The following steps are recommended:

  1. Appoint International Champions within administrative units including OCGA and units that manage purchasing, tax services, travel, insurance and risk management, and industry sponsored contracts.
(2) Conduct an assessment survey of the views of UCLA amongst its non-US donors/sponsors.

(3) Assess the effectiveness of UCLA’s administrative units related to international activities.

(4) Establish a protocol for academic departments to immediately resolve administrative issues. This might include a point person departments could approach with such problems.

(5) Conduct training for administrative officers and program directors regarding international administrative protocol.

An additional nine individual responses were submitted that were both specific and consistent in their messaging:

- The report conveys an apparent lack of understanding of the existing structure and scope of international activities at UCLA as it calls for the International Institute to take the lead in negotiating all education and study abroad agreements; however, the largest part of this program – the Education Abroad Program – is negotiated and managed by UC. There is no mention in the report of UCLA’s relationship with UCEAP – a program in which a substantial number of UCLA students participate every year.

- The International Education Office was not represented on the Global Outreach Task Force or consulted although it plays a critical role in promoting international education at UCLA. Consequently many important functions, details, needs, and perspectives are misstated, misinterpreted, or excluded from the report altogether.

- While the International Institute is the current academic and intellectual home for areas of global research, the International Education Office is the hub for undergraduate international activities. Over 2,000 UCLA students participate annually in successful international programs and another 1,500 international students come to UCLA through programs managed by the IEO. It is the largest mechanism for students to gain international exposure/education.

- Designating the International Institute as the central hub may create a barrier to achieving full internationalization in all aspects of UCLA life, particularly with regard to curricular and co-curricular activities. A clear commitment to include those entities that carry out co-curricular activities (e.g., the Dashew Center, IEO, Residential Life, Bruin Resource Center, Community Programs Office, etc.) in the vision is imperative, as there is the potential for these important units to go unrecognized and unsupported. They are, in fact, important complements to academic activities. International Institute acting as a central clearinghouse of information seems more appropriate.
• It is impractical for the International Institute to be the "central clearing house of ALL international activities on campus." The International Institute is already a valuable asset to this campus but it is not practical for one unit to oversee the number of programs, events and needs of this large campus population. A multi-pronged approach would better suit all of the needs of the various campus constituents more comprehensively: academic/research, student and international/visiting groups.

• The report suggests that UCLA is “lagging a bit behind in terms of its offerings” – a statement that is not supported by the data. In the 2017 Open Doors Report (https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/US-Study-Abroad/Leading-Institutions), UCLA ranked #11 in Leading Institutions by Study Abroad Total (up from #14 in 2014-15). UCLA also leads the UC campuses in undergraduate study abroad students. The International Education Office, home to Travel Study, UCEAP, and exchange programs, has increased UCLA undergraduate participation in the last 2 years from 20%-25% and is on pace to achieve 30% undergraduate participation in Study Abroad in the next few years.

• Consideration should be given to investing in existing study abroad opportunities to resolve administrative, academic, and financial challenges, and to guarantee financial aid and coursework transfer for participating students.

Alumni Response Summary
Responses were supportive and acknowledged that UCLA is already one of the strongest global universities (with an international brand) and should build off that narrative to connect global work to a social mission of supporting diversity, scholarship and innovation. The initiative should be expanded to entrepreneurial divisions and UCLA’s reach should include underprivileged countries. Greater emphasis should be placed on promoting study abroad programs and providing scholarships and financial assistance to lower-income students who may not consider such opportunities due to cost considerations. UCLA needs to maximize its potential by becoming an actively engaged global university that is making a global impact. This is an area where alumni are underutilized and not empowered (https://www.pearson.com/corporate/about-pearson/innovation/the-networked-university.html)

Donor Response Summary
One of the two responses conveyed feedback indicating that the plan needs additional work: it is very general, lacks comparative benchmarks and specifics, and includes too many recommendations. There is agreement, however, on revising the mission statement. A direct quote from the second response: “Collaborative sharing of knowledge, people, and trade is a treasure we should be embracing and needs to be not only encouraged but protected.”
**Other Response Summary**

Of the two responses submitted one described the plan as very interesting and valuable while the other recommended removing global impact from the UCLA Strategic Plan altogether stating that the University's resources (financial, intellectual) need to be focused on local issues before considering the move to a "global" setting.