

Special Faculty Council Meeting with Dru Marshall - November 5th, 2013

International Recruitment and Student Support – Third Party Providers?

It is a controversial topic on campus. There is a common understanding on the plans. There is no proposal to discuss yet. Academic and research plans, and seven priorities were developed. One of them being International Strategy is to be developed.

Four Broad Goals:

1. Increasing diversity;
2. Cultural competencies;
3. Education and research partnerships; and
4. International development.

Report of GFC Subcommittee:

- Recruitment (in house; recruitment agents; third party providers)
- Foundation/pathways program (in house; third party provider)
- Recommendation: explore possibility of retaining a third party provider to aid in international recruitment and develop a foundation/pathways program

A third party provider option was explored further and consultations took place with GFC/Board; Arts, Science, Engineering and Business faculties, TUCFA, AUPE, MAPS, SU, GSA. The idea will go forward to University Town Hall and then to GFC for approval in February/March of 2014.

Major Third Party Providers:

- INTO (British established, recently purchased by the US)
- Kaplan Inc. (US)
- Navitas (Australian)
- Study Group (currently Australian)

Some of those third party providers have already signed contracts with Canadian Universities.

Key Areas:

- Description
- Purpose
- Programs
- Academic Control
- Students
- Finances
- Possible risks

Outsourcing is not inclined to compromise reputation; no loss of control of Brand is allowed; academic control is maintained through sound contract; provider also hires same instructors as University at same pay rate. Academic quality would be maintained. Royalty payment from providers typically provides sufficient funds to pay for space requirements. Space is an issue we will have to pay very close attention to. There is a concern about third party workers doing academic work. We already have precedence for this. Promise of guaranteed progression to University for students: students are granted entry provided they successfully meet University standards for admission.

Fees/profits:

Fees are comparable to what we would charge international students. No up-front financial commitments from the University; proceeds are shared. Once a student transfers to University, revenue stays with the University.

Potential Benefits:

- Demonstrated results for student success
- Increase diversity and cultural competencies
- Better subjective experience for academic staff in the classroom with students who are prepared
- Opportunity to meet international goals sooner
- Potential to serve as a southern hub for international recruitment
- Diversification of revenue

Is there a possibility to use an in-house provider?

- Third party providers would come to look at the landscape of the University. For in-house we would need to pay ~\$1.2 million, more time, we might need to add elements to compete. In order to do so, we would need to relocate funds on campus again.

Is there a chance of something going wrong?

- Examples of students that have been cheated by similar program providers and protested unanimously.

What about the stream of instructors to teach those students?

- Arts and Science would benefit from this program in many ways. In part, it would be a choice for departments. Many retired professors could also do a course or two in this program.

Is it important for some part of those courses taught by the international college to have very clear quality control?

- It is absolutely a critical issue. A contract that does not have quality pieces will not be signed.

What is the incentive of these third party providers? What is the comparison of those in-house and third party providers?

- As shown in the presentation, we do get certain numbers of tuition, and the other portion is being kept by the third party provider.

The issue is having a private company. However, understanding the issue at hand, this concern about a private company may fade away. Students from other countries may come to the University that do not meet our standards. High quality interaction between students and professors is observed in the universities that have those programs in place. One more reason is, of course, the money. It is in all of our interests to have an academic institution that has more generated funds at the institution.

The suggestion is to pay a lot of attention at what has been done in Australia: one thing is that the revenue stream generated by international students is pretty volatile. Another thing is the pressure build up on curriculum. A worry is not to put ourselves into the position if we aggressively go after the revenue stream.

- Canada is not Australia. There are issues on what Australia decided to do. As we have the role to play in the province and country, the University of Calgary is very far behind on this issue and we are very behind in the area that is competitive on this issue. The majority of students will come from China, Korea and India. In a decade, those countries may become importers and not exporters of students. We are hoping to close this gap.

Intellectual Property – another question? Who owns the material taught?

- The third party provider teaches courses on behalf of the University. Intellectual property and academic freedom issues are no different than at the University.

If you would like to view a copy of Dru Marshall's presentation, it is posted at the bottom of the following link <http://ucalgary.ca/provost/international-student-recruitment> .