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Executive Summary

International outreach is key to the mission of Loyola University Chicago as a university in and of itself and an important part of helping us reach other goals, such as financial stability and expanding our future applicant pool outside of the shrinking college age demographics of the Midwest. The last two years have seen a collapse of international programming and the enrollment of international students at Loyola. Major programmatic decisions, such as the effort to close the English Language Learning Program, were made outside of established university procedures and with little effort beforehand to gauge their financial and educational impact. As a result, Loyola performs poorly on key metrics in this area and has also taken a financial hit of considerable (though difficult to determine precisely) dimensions.
I. Why Does International Engagement Matter?

International engagement has been at the heart of the Jesuit tradition since its inception. Within a year of the approval of the Order in 1540, the early Jesuits began what would become one of their most distinctive characteristics—being a force for knowledge, education, mission, and solidarity to India, China, Japan, the Philippines, Latin America and eventually Africa. As a result, global engagement lies at the core of the educational mission of every leading Catholic, Jesuit university. ¹ As our University Senate has noted, the Jesuit Mission of Loyola University Chicago provides us with both an obligation and goal of being “a diverse learning community that values freedom of inquiry, the pursuit of truth and care for others”² and helping our students to develop “an educated awareness of society and culture, a sense of being interrelated and interconnected, and a commitment to act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed.”³

Global engagement remains essential for any dynamic university in the twenty-first century. The recruitment of international students is critical for increasing cultural and linguistic diversity on campus and creating avenues of international exchange for students from the US. Opportunities for international studies and service help students to acquire deep knowledge of global realities and the skills required to successfully navigate and address those realities. International research initiative and partnerships help attract and support the work of cutting-edge, grant-funded faculty.

Thus, guided by deep commitments to Jesuit identity and academic excellence, as well as our location within the cosmopolitan city of Chicago, global engagement was explicitly highlighted as strategic Priority 4 in Loyola University Chicago’s Plan 2020. Plan 2020, developed in 2014-15 to guide the university’s development over the next five years, explicitly mandated the university to build on its already strong infrastructure of international programming. Specifically, the plan called for the university to advance programming and initiatives to “Integrate knowledge gained through direct engagement with our local and global neighbors with the resources of our extensive Jesuit network of institutions.”⁴

¹ As Boston College, staffed with a Vice Provost for Global Engagement, notes: “The Jesuit, Catholic liberal arts tradition...is in its essence international” (https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/sites/global-engagement.html). Likewise, Georgetown University foregrounds the critical nexus of global engagement and Jesuit identity for the advancement of excellence in student education and faculty research: https://global.georgetown.edu/.


⁴ Loyola University Chicago, Plan 2020, Priority 4, “Engage Local and Global Societal Challenges through Partnerships,” available at: https://www.luc.edu/strategicplanning/plan2020/4engagelocalandglobalsocietalchallengesthroughpartnerships/
II. The Current Situation

As of January 2018, Loyola boasted a robust portfolio of programming that fostered international engagement by building options for Loyola students to study abroad as well as for recruiting and welcoming international students to Loyola’s campuses. With three international campuses (Rome, Vietnam, and Beijing), as well as profitable enrollments in Loyola’s English Language Learning Programs (138 unique students), Loyola was moving forward to expand our global partnerships and advance international engagement.

Unfortunately, since January 2018, international programming has experienced a series of shocks that has seriously undermined the university’s ability not only to fulfill its mission, but also to claim credibility as an excellent national university. The AAUP is greatly concerned about the university administration’s failure to appropriately staff oversight of global engagement, the precipitous decline that has occurred in international enrollments over the past three years, and the decimation of Loyola’s English Language Learning Program. This negligence, as well as direct actions taken against international programming, have compromised Loyola’s ability to serve important parts of its mission, as represented in the specific goals of Plan 2020. Moreover, they have harmed our financial bottom line and fiscal vitality. And this dramatic reversal of course has taken place outside of the established channels for academic decision-making laid out in Loyola’s own procedures and the national standards of the American Association of University Professors.

A. Global Engagement Staffing

In June 2018, the Vice Provost for Global Programs Patrick Boyle resigned. As of February 2020, he has not been replaced at the Vice-Provost or Associate Provost Level.5 In February 2019, the Executive Director of the Office of International Programs (OIP) Jennifer Engel also resigned; she was likewise not replaced and no search for a new director has been opened. Thus, since June 2018, international programming been attempting to move forward in the absence of senior leadership. This mirrors a larger pattern at Loyola in the last three years, in which key senior leadership positions have gone unfilled, been filled on an interim basis for extended periods of a year or more, or been combined so that one person holds positions formerly split between two individuals. These positions include the Provost, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the Law School, the Dean of the Medical School, the Dean of the Institute for Pastoral Studies, the Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer, the Director of Development, and the Chief Business Officer.

In November 2018, it was announced—without any appropriate process of consultation with key stakeholders or shared governance—that Loyola was ending its relationship with the Beijing Center effective May 2019. We are unable to find evidence of any advance discussion or consideration of the consequences of this action with faculty whose research, teaching, and programmatic work included the Beijing Center. The Director of Asian Studies, for example, found out about the decision by reading the Phoenix. This negatively impacted Loyola’s prestigious Ricci Scholars program, as well as eliminating a significant opportunity for Loyola students to study in China. Although enrollments at the Beijing Center had been modest (2014-2019: 30, 41, 41, 32, 29, 23), China was consistently in the top six destinations for study abroad chosen by Loyola students.

The Chicago Center was Loyola’s path for international student exchanges, with two full-time staff administering programs through 19 partner universities. It met a similar end, being forced to cease all operations after the Spring 2019 semester. Four of its nineteen programs were active and scheduled for visiting student programs to LUC for Summer 2019; these programs then had to be cancelled after the announcement of the ELLP closure (see below). The Chicago Center hosted exchange students by arranging for transportation, meals, and housing in the International House at Loyola (which has also subsequently been closed and been turned over to Loyola Student Housing), arranged special cultural excursions, and generally tried to offer a warm welcome with the expectation that our partner universities would do the same for our students abroad. Oftentimes, special exchange student groups would request ESL courses with their degree-credit courses, and Loyola’s ELLP would provide those classes.

---


7 Loyola University Chicago Ricci Scholars website: https://www.luc.edu/ricci/index.shtml. Matteo Ricci made his mark by building bridges between the West and China, rather than with Vietnam. Whether this connection was important to the donor whose gift established this program is unclear.

8 See annual Loyola University Chicago annual “Study Abroad Reports” posted at https://www.luc.edu/oip/aboutoip/studentmobilityreports/.
B. Precipitous Decline in Loyola’s International Student Enrollments

In the two years since these cuts were made, Loyola has sunk to the bottom among peer institutions for international student enrollments. Illinois-based and other urban Catholic/Jesuit universities boast the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total International Student Enrollment (Open Doors Report 2019, percentages as compared with 2018)</th>
<th>International Student Enrollment as % of Overall Enrollment (Open Doors Report 2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>13,497 (up 7.8%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University Evanston</td>
<td>5,665 (up 5.4%)</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>5,756 (down 7.1%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois – Chicago</td>
<td>5,290 (up 12.5%)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>4,466 (up 5.2%)</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>3,147 (up 6%)</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,911 (up 8.4%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>3,299 (up 8.2%)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>1951 (down 5.6%)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Chicago</td>
<td>942 (down 12.6%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 The first five institutions report the top five highest international enrollments in the state. Overall, in 2019 international enrollments at these five institutions rose 2.8% from 2018. Data for the Georgetown, Boston College, St. Louis University, and DePaul University is provided for comparison with other Catholic/Jesuit institutions in major US cities. Green indicates increase in enrollments over previous year; red indicates decrease. Unless otherwise noted, the data are derived from the 2019 Open Doors report issued by the Institute of International Education.

10 The University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign is the #1 public university with regard to international student enrollments in 2019. See Katie Watson, “Illinois Ranks No. 1 Global Destination for International Students, Leader in International Education,” December 4, 2019: https://blogs.illinois.edu/view/6231/804542?fbclid=IwAR2eDHyA6fONaEWyQ8pqrvuapsJbiKOr0Ld5A9djDkH8aRmBuSrzFoT0dxY

11 This was a record for Boston College: https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/bcnews/campus-community/students/international-student-population-rises-to-new-record.html

12 Number of international students as of January 1, 2020.
In other words, against benchmark local (Chicago/Illinois) and national Catholic and Jesuit universities, **Loyola stands at the bottom on three key measures**: (1) total number of international students; (2) international students as a percentage of overall student body; and (3) performance of international recruitment relative to 2018. All but one of these universities boast double-digit percentages of overall enrollment. Loyola has only 5.5%. Only Loyola has fewer than 1,000 international students. While seven of these ten universities saw significant increases in international enrollment in 2019, Loyola stands alone with a double-digit—12.6% drop. Notably, the two institutions on this graph with decreases from 2018—IIT and DePaul—have both chosen to invest in their international recruitment to bring these numbers up. Both have implemented new pathway programs coordinated with their English language programs.

In a document entitled “ELLP Data and Context” provided to the University Senate for its November 22, 2019 meeting, Loyola’s interim provost Margaret Callahan reported that Loyola’s 40% decrease in entering international students from 2017-2019 “is not unique to Loyola,” placing blame for the decrease on the actions of the Trump administration.13 (See attached “ELLP Data and Context.”) While the policies and statements of the Trump administration have created challenges for recruiting international students, the Department of Education estimates that 42% of American universities increased their international enrollment last academic year, and the number of students coming from abroad to study in Illinois increased modestly from academic year 2017-18 to academic year 2018-19.14 Why has Loyola been unable to attract significant numbers of international students when other universities have? Are our leaders aware of our poor performance?

The collapse in international enrollments happened at the same time as Loyola’s administration was calling faculty and staff attention to the challenges posed by changing demographics. For example, budget presentations by Chief Financial Officer Wayne Magdziarz in the Fall of 2019 called attention to a projected 16% decline in the number of high school graduates in Illinois by 2028. Magdziarz warned of that the 15% decline in enrollments in at four-year private universities forecast by economists might result in a loss of $50 million in revenue for Loyola.15 Greater international visibility for Loyola would appear to be one logical response to this challenge. Why did our leaders not see this?

---

13 The interim provost’s document was provided to the University Senate in response to its May 14, 2019 resolution discussed further below.


C. Decimation of Loyola’s English Language Learning Program

History: The English Language Learning Program (ELLP) has been in existence at Loyola University Chicago in various forms for over forty years. It has provided English language instruction, tutoring, and assistance for many of the thousands of students from all over the world who have made Loyola their home. What originally began as one-on-one intensive English language instruction for international students developed over time into a self-supporting language center that, in addition to having served as a crucial tool in international student recruitment, provided language support to Loyola's international students, faculty, and staff, served as a basis for university partnerships and international exchanges, offered ESL support to the local international community, as well as ongoing services for the Archdiocese of Chicago's many international priests and clergy. The ELLP’s diverse offerings and services have included:

- The standard Intensive English Program (ESL) for those needing to gain undergraduate and graduate proficiency in English;
- The International Conditional Admission Program (ICAP/GCAP) program developed with all undergraduate majors and four professional schools (Law, Communication, IPS, and Business) to enable those schools to enroll students demonstrating academic achievement but needing additional English language preparation and academic support to succeed in their English-taught courses; A significant portion of LUC international undergraduate and graduate applicants lack the TOEFL 79/IELTS 6.5 requirements for their intended program of study. Via the ICAP/GCAP program, departments can now formally admit these students to Loyola on the condition that they complete all required ELLP coursework in order to ensure that they are fully prepared for success within their prospective degree programs. By offering conditional admission, the ELLP helps to keep these students at LUC instead of denying their admission and turning such applicants away. Moreover, the ELLP addresses not only language proficiency; it prepares students for eventual success at LUC in terms of crucial skills not measured by the TOEFL/IELTS exams: writing formats (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.), class discussion styles and techniques, professor expectations (academic, administrative), US classroom culture, group work and peer collaboration, interpersonal etiquette on a U.S. campus, etc.);

16 The university administration has claimed that Loyola’s ELLP program is not necessary, as international students can take ESL courses at DePaul University or elsewhere in Chicago. This position is, however, extraordinarily ill-informed. Often, international students—coming from abroad or already based in the Chicago area—simply wish to improve their English language skills at Loyola University Chicago. Not only does this reflect the reputation of Loyola’s ELLP program and the University, but many students who take our ESL program have subsequently decided to pursue a degree at Loyola and therefore have requested to move to conditionally admitted [ICAP/GCAP] status. Likewise, many students who pursue language proficiency at other universities will then matriculate at those universities.

---

16 The university administration has claimed that Loyola’s ELLP program is not necessary, as international students can take ESL courses at DePaul University or elsewhere in Chicago. This position is, however, extraordinarily ill-informed. Often, international students—coming from abroad or already based in the Chicago area—simply wish to improve their English language skills at Loyola University Chicago. Not only does this reflect the reputation of Loyola’s ELLP program and the University, but many students who take our ESL program have subsequently decided to pursue a degree at Loyola and therefore have requested to move to conditionally admitted [ICAP/GCAP] status. Likewise, many students who pursue language proficiency at other universities will then matriculate at those universities.
• Ongoing language support for admitted international undergraduates and graduate students. Some international students admitted to the University are found by professors and/or advisors to lack the English language skills required for success in their degree programs. Though such students were able to present a passing TOEFL or IELTS score for direct admission into LUC and their programs of study, they find themselves experiencing a great deal of difficulty in their classes due to language. Nationwide, a prominent reason for international student attrition in higher education is a lack of requisite English language skills. The ELLP formerly was able to provide support to these students via ESL courses and one-on-one tutoring, thereby assisting both the students and their departments. In addition, the English Department has provided writing courses specifically for international students through the ELLP, drawing on their specific expertise. Although the ELLP has provided the instructors for those courses and has born the personnel costs involved, the revenues for those courses have been accounted to the English Department;

• Similar support for faculty and staff. The ELLP provides free one-on-one pronunciation tutoring for Loyola University international faculty to help them improve the overall quality of classroom instruction. Though many of our international faculty members are fully fluent in English, some benefit from further developing skills such as pronunciation, intonation, high-order grammar, and speech delivery. The ELLP has therefore offered free tutoring to LUC international faculty, as its contribution the Plan 2020 goal of recruiting “a diverse international faculty and those with significant expertise in global issues, representing 15% of our faculty” (Priority IV, Strategy 8, Tactic 8A.);

• Customized programs for partner universities and institutions. LUC has partnerships with 19 universities in 11 different countries. Over the years, the Office of International Programs has created exchange programs and special customized programs, many of which have contained an ESL component through the ELLP;17

• the Archdiocese of Chicago, visiting clergy, and professional groups. Examples of such service include English Pronunciation classes for local priests, the IPS Posillipo Theological Exchange Project, and the English Pronunciation and Parish Enculturation Program through IPS and the Archdiocese of Chicago. Such programs also brought in added revenue to the program;

• And programs for prospective applicants in their final year of high school. One form of international student recruitment comes in the form of offering pre-collegiate programs—two/three-week university experience programs mixed with English language skills instruction for international high school students in their senior year—during University breaks. The ELLP offered such programs in order to support the

---

17 The ELLP has maintained active agreements with the following institutions to host student groups during this and/or future summer terms: Universidad Loyola Andalucia (Spain), ISC Paris Business School (France), ISG International Business School (France), GPI-US/Hiroshima High School (Japan).
University in its international recruitment efforts while also bringing in added revenue to the ELLP and Loyola University.

The ELLP exists not only to guarantee the success of our Loyola students in their academic, personal, and professional endeavors. It has played a critical role in enabling the University's efforts to bring young minds from diverse backgrounds to Loyola so that all of our students can benefit from diverse international perspectives in the classroom and beyond.

The English Language Learning Program gained its present name in 1996 when there were just ten students and two teachers. Over time, the ELLP grew to include five full-time and several part-time faculty and staff who nurtured thousands of students over its twenty years, while also maintaining one-on-one, individualized support and instruction. Moreover, ELLP has been able to consistently cover its operational expenses in order to bring profits to the University. For its first decade, the ELLP reported average annual enrollments around 80-90 unique students. Over time, the ELLP grew to include five full-time and several part-time faculty and staff who nurtured thousands of students over its twenty years, while also maintaining one-on-one, individualized support and instruction. Moreover, ELLP has been able to consistently cover its operational expenses in order to bring profits to the University. For its first decade, the ELLP reported average annual enrollments around 80-90 unique students. From 2011-2016, the entire university-based English language program industry in the US experienced a huge influx of students due to government-sponsored programs from Saudi Arabia (SACM) and Brazil (BSMP), seeing the highest enrollments ever experienced in the 70-year history of the industry. Revenues in ELLPs increased to million-dollar peaks nationally, with direct profits for Loyola’s ELLP reaching at least $825,000 in FY2015. Both the SACM and BSMP have curtailed enrollments in recent years; as a result, ELLP programs nationwide are returning to a “new normal” with numbers slightly above pre-2011 enrollments while, as noted above, continuing to rise. (See attached chart “IEP Enrollment (Total US) 1978-2018”). Loyola’s ELLP enrollment data mirror these national patterns. ELLP’s peak year of 2015 saw an average of about 377 enrollments (225 unique students). In FY 2018, the number of unique ELLP students was 138, again slightly above 2011-enrollments, generating a direct profit for the unit of almost $200,000.18 Only with the announced closure of the ELLP programs in Spring 2019, did the ELLP enrollments collapse.

Recent Events: In February 2018, the ELLP Associate Director, Beth Lair, was terminated. A new Associate Director, Ryan Nowack, was not hired until December 2018. As noted, at this time the ELLP was still covering all costs and bringing in a healthy profit to the University, even though it continued to maintain faculty/staff levels required by the demands of the SACM/BSMP boom years of 2012-2016. The new Associate Director was charged with (1) increasing enrollment; (2) charting a course for a more profitable future for the ELLP; (3) pursuing intensive recruitment, marketing, and advertising efforts; (4) building productive partnership programs for the University; and (5) adapting the ELLP to national and international changes.

In March 2019, university administration stunned the ELLP and the Loyola community by announcing that the ELLP would cease operations as of June 30, 2019. No teach-out plan for

---

18 See Callahan, “ELLP Data and Context.” Due to the lack of administrative oversight of the Office of International Programs mentioned earlier, the “International Students and Scholars Report,” previously available on the Loyola University website, has not been posted for FY2018 or FY2019. See: https://www.luc.edu/oip/aboutoip/studentmobilityreports/.
current students was provided. University administration neither consulted with nor informed any of the key stakeholders regarding this decision, including: the ELLP; the University Senate; Faculty Council; the University Writing Programs; the Executive Director of Loyola’s International LLM Program; the graduate program directors involved in the ICAP program; graduate program directors seeking to increase international enrollments; anyone in the Office of International Programs; or the Deans (to our knowledge).

The University Senate included the closure of the ELLP on its agenda during its April 26, 2019 meeting. The minutes of that meeting report that although Mr. Nowack had prepared a twenty-six point ELLP business and recruitment plan for Loyola leadership, he was never given a chance to present his report. To our knowledge, nobody in the Provost’s office has engaged with the substance of Nowack’s recommendations. He further prepared reports for the President and Provost outlining revenue streams for the ELLP, “but he was never given a chance to present this information.” The university administration also failed or refused to provide the University Senate with documentation, claiming that “it was a collective bargaining issue and therefore they are unable to discuss the matter.”

In response to this situation, on May 14, 2019, the University Senate passed a resolution calling for the administration to cease the closure of the ELLP pending a re-evaluation of its consequences; to release all relevant documentation; and to re-evaluate the process by which the decision to close the ELLP was made. The university administration has largely failed to comply with this resolution.

While on paper the ELLP remains open, the administration’s actions have decimated the program. In theory, the ELLP continues to be permitted to admit ICAP and GCAP students;


23 Per Slate, at the graduate level alone, the GCAP program launched in 2016 had begun to see success; even though it technically remains open, the number of new students enrolled annual almost immediately fell to zero.
however, as noted in footnote 23, those admissions have dropped to almost zero. Except for Mr. Nowack, all full-time faculty and staff were terminated. Our understanding from former staff members is that Nowack now not only serves as program director, but has assumed all the responsibilities of the former ELLP coordinator and serves as the only full-time instructor. Though hired to recruit international students, he is no longer allowed to do so.

Financial Consequences of the ELLP Retrenchment: The reason given for the university’s initial action was that the ELLP was losing money. We have difficulty understanding this claim, for the following reasons:

- **The ELLP—even without calculating indirect revenues generated by tuition from students whose matriculation it made possible—was generating a significant profit until the university announced its closure.** The interim provost cites a very small loss (~$72,000) for FY2019. This ‘loss’ resulted entirely from four factors: (1) cancelling all summer 2019 admissions in March; (2) cancelling all prospective summer programs with partner universities; (3) having no Director of OIP or Associate Director of ELLP for almost all of 2018; which resulted in (4) having no recruitment, advertising, or marketing from January 2018 to the present. What is more, this purported loss is insignificant when compared to the profits generated from FY2015-2017 and substantially smaller than consistent losses generated by other academic units at Loyola.

- The administration has cited a cost-savings of $750,000/year due to the closure of the ELLP. We do not understand where this figure comes from. The interim provost’s own data show that total direct costs for the ELLP program in 2017-2019 were only ~$430,000/year. Until the University’s action against the program, expenses were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GCAP Admits</th>
<th>GCAP Enrollees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2017</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2018</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2019</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2020</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures do not include undergraduate ICAP enrollments. For total ELLP enrollment figures prior to the program closure, see Appendix 1, “ELLP Data and Context.”

24 Not only do the interim provost’s figures omit key sources of revenue (e.g., all related ELLP application fees) as well as tuition-sharing agreements between the ELLP and various Loyola academic units, the reports provided to the units also do not provide details on how the administration calculates BI.
always covered by revenues. Even in FY2018, with no Provost-office level or Associate Director, the ELLP generated almost $200,000 in profit for the university. One can reasonably assume that with proper oversight, leadership, and vision for international programs, those profits would be significantly higher. Therefore, the administration’s action has not saved the university any money; simply per the direct Profit and Loss statements for the ELLP, the administration’s action has cost the university money.

- The administration’s action does not take into account indirect revenues generated by the ELLP via other University programs. Former ELLP staff members inform us that roughly 97% of ESL/ICAP students (its ‘unique’ students) subsequently matriculated into degree programs, generating millions in tuition revenue for the university that is captured in other program budgets. For example, the ICAP program brings significant long-term revenue to the University. A modestly-sized group of ten ELLP matriculated students brings the University as much as $2.4 million dollars over the course of their eventual four-year degree programs, though this revenue would inevitably be captured in the budget of other units, not the ELLP. Please also note that all such ICAP students are those who could not otherwise attend Loyola due to language proficiency issues. (This figure is based on $61,000 a year for tuition, room and board per student, less whatever discount rate is applied for tuition. Standard and Poors estimated that as of 2017, the average discount rate for the university was 33.8%; much lower discount rates are generally the case with international students).25

Thus, the argument given to justify the closing of the ELLP—that doing so would save the university substantial funds that could be better spent elsewhere—is not supported by the available data. Rather, we estimate that in closing the ELLP, the administration has, at minimum, lost several million dollars annually for the University. The ELLP may have been becoming less profitable, but this seems more the product of the retrenchments in international programming and enrollments discussed earlier in this report, rather than because of any inherent problem with the ELLP.26

In the context of a $600 million annual budget for all university operations, these amounts may appear at first glance to be insignificant. Yet by even the most conservative calculation, the retrenchment of the ELLP program has cost the university more money than it claims to be saving annually by closing the Loyola University Museum of Art ($1 million) or by switching health insurance providers to Aetna (also $1 million).


26 For example, while the downsizing of the SACM program has affected all universities, it has hit Loyola particularly hard because Loyola lacked a diversified international recruitment strategy, relying heavily on this one program that approached Loyola. Now that the SACM is significantly diminished, Loyola has been left with no plan, no OIP director to make a plan, no leadership housed in the Provost’s Office with experience in international student affairs, and no leadership in Enrollment Management in international recruitment. Where other universities have adjusted their strategies to adapt to the post-SACM reality and have, thus, increased their international student enrollments, the Loyola administration’s response has simply been to close its programs.
III. The Future of Global Engagement at Loyola University Chicago

As indicated by this report’s discussion of the many consequences of retrenchment in international programming, governing a university is a complicated matter. Decisions taken to serve one goal or address one problem – reducing expenditures, for example – reverberate in complicated ways that can affect an institution’s financial health and academic mission. That is why American universities have over the last century developed a well-articulated set of principles for how they are to be governed. As the joint declaration of the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, states, “the variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.”

Loyola’s stated governance policies adhere to this standard. Its Faculty Handbook singles out the University Senate as “a representative body of the University faculty, staff, students and administrators engaged in a system of shared governance and which exists for the purpose of ensuring broad review and discussion of issues, plans, and policies of general University interest.” The University’s “Chart of Reviews and Approvals for Academic Matters” (informally known as the “Rainbow Chart”) stipulates that “elimination of existing department and faculty” and any “reorganization/redirection of existing department” requires review and recommendation by the University Senate.

Practice has been another matter. The enormous changes in the last two years documented in this report involved no process of discernment or consultation. Although international programs are clearly matters of “general university interest,” the decision not to replace Patrick Boyle and Jennifer Engel, and to eliminate the ELLP Program were made without the review and recommendation of the University Senate.

What should be the way forward for ELLP and international programs more generally? If the analysis and explanations in this report are correct, then it would seem that filling the leadership vacancies with highly qualified and experienced leaders and restoring the ELLP Program to its former scope would offer Loyola the chance to regain its international reach and shore up its bottom line in the process. Indeed, were Loyola to grow its international student body to the average level of peer Catholic and Jesuit Universities (an average of 12.5%), it would generate millions, possibly tens of millions, of dollars each year from this added tuition.

---


28 Loyola University Faculty Handbook (2015), 23.

29 See https://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/academicaffairs/pdfs/chartofacademicapprovals-100318.pdf.
And it would build a larger pool of future applicants as its traditional base in the Midwest declines.

But it is not the AAUP’s role to formulate policy. That is the prerogative and responsibility of administrators and co-governance bodies such as the University Senate and Faculty Council. They can only live up to this responsibility if they have a transparent, rigorous, and accurate financial picture of the sort neither provided by the administration nor within our capacity to develop. We urge our new provost and faculty colleagues to take up this challenge with the haste and urgency that the importance of international outreach to our Catholic, Jesuit mission demand.

AAUP Loyola Officers

President: Benjamin Johnson, History
Vice-President: Ian Cornelius, English
Appeals: Devorah Schoenfeld, Theology
Past President: Rhys Williams, Sociology
Secretary: Sherrie Weller, English
Media: Elizabeth Coffman, Communication
Treasurer: David Ingram, Philosophy
Membership: Abby Annala, Library
At-Large: Reuben Keller, Institute of Environmental Sustainability
          John Pincince, History
          Alec Stubbs, Philosophy
          Paige Warren, English

AAUP Loyola Research Committee

Chair: M. Therese Lysaught, Neiswanger Institute & Institute of Pastoral Studies
Members: Laura Gawlinski, Classics
         Hille Haker, Theology
         Sarita Heer, Art History
         Alec Stubbs, Philosophy
         Paige Warren, English

---

30 This necessarily rough calculation is based on Loyola’s Fall 2019 enrollment of 17,159 students. At 12.5%, this would be a total of 2,144 international students, or an increase of 1,202. At tuition of $42,000 a year, this is $50,484,000; if one applies a (very high) discount rate of 50%, this still yields $25 million. Yet some of these hypothetical students would replace domestic admitted students, so $25 million may overestimate the amount. (Others would enter graduate programs that have experienced declining enrollments in recent years due in part to the decisions documented in this report). The ultimate figure is impossible to determine. We lay out these calculations in order offer a rough estimate and to point to the gross inadequacies of the financial accounting offered by the administration to explain this retrenchment.
Below are presented enrollment and financial data for the ELLP program. Table 1 shows enrollment and credit hour information for the program over the last decade. The data show the precipitous decline in student enrollment and credit hours since fiscal year 2014-2015. Each fiscal year consists of (in chronological order) the second summer session, fall semester, spring semester followed by the first summer session. For the current year (2019-2020), the data for the second summer session and the current fall semester are presented. The second column shows the number of individual students who enrolled in ELLP courses, the third column is the sum of all credit hours generated by ELLP courses for the fiscal year, and the final column shows the average number of credit hours taken by each student. Figure 1 shows the credit hour data graphically.

The data below clearly show the decline in students entering ELLP.

**TABLE 1: Enrollment and Credit Hours for ELLP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Number Unique Students</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Credit Hours/Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3776</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4980</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4572</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (partial)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This trend is consistent with other patterns of enrollment observed at Loyola. Fig. 2 shows the number of international students entering Loyola each year as first year undergraduates. There has been a 40% decrease in entering international students over the last two years. This trend is not unique to Loyola.

Several recent articles ([https://www.forbes.com/sites/stuartanderson/2019/11/19/new-international-student-enrollment-in-us-has-fallen-10-since-2015/#7309045d1ae9](https://www.forbes.com/sites/stuartanderson/2019/11/19/new-international-student-enrollment-in-us-has-fallen-10-since-2015/#7309045d1ae9), [https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/20191115-GunCulture?cid=db&source=ams&sourceld=4837891](https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/20191115-GunCulture?cid=db&source=ams&sourceld=4837891)) along with many others discuss the variety of reasons why international student enrollment in the United States continues to decrease. These articles cite a number of reasons for the decline in international students enrolling in US colleges and universities, including policies of the current federal administration, students’ fear of violence in the US, unfavorable exchange rates, and the existence of more liberal policies surrounding post graduation employment opportunities in other countries.
Table 2 below presents the tuition revenue generated by ELLP along with the total direct costs for operating the program over the last ten years.

### TABLE 2: Tuition and Costs for ELLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TUITION REVENUE ($)</th>
<th>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS ($)</th>
<th>REVENUE-COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>394,782</td>
<td>235,588</td>
<td>159,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>772,092</td>
<td>357,835</td>
<td>414,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>1,110,732</td>
<td>588,693</td>
<td>522,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>1,587,865</td>
<td>808,309</td>
<td>779,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>1,495,887</td>
<td>671,356</td>
<td>824,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>1,306,038</td>
<td>688,437</td>
<td>617,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>865,511</td>
<td>634,561</td>
<td>230,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>653,269</td>
<td>457,205</td>
<td>196,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>351,558</td>
<td>425,359</td>
<td>-73,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (partial)</td>
<td>22,189</td>
<td>94,992</td>
<td>-72,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total direct costs include salaries and benefits for all faculty and staff as well as the direct operating costs of the program (travel, materials, computer purchases, photocopying, catering, etc.) The final column shows the difference between tuition revenue and direct costs for the program for each fiscal year.

While these data clearly show the decline in tuition generated by the ELLP (and the decreasing net of revenue minus costs), it is also helpful to provide additional context to fully understand the impact of this trend. Many of us are familiar with the phrase “Loyola is a tuition driven university”. To put this quantitatively, 66% of Loyola’s total revenue is generated by tuition. This is comparable to the average of our peer benchmark schools (you can see the list of these schools at [https://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/oie/PeerGroupComparison2019.pdf](https://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/oie/PeerGroupComparison2019.pdf)). For these schools, 63% of their total revenue is derived from tuition payments.

Thus, tuition has to cover more than just the instructional and direct costs necessary to offer the program. Tuition derived revenue must also cover the salaries and benefits of Loyola staff, as well as pay for shared services such as facilities, computers, the library and so on. When all of these factors (staff salary, shared services) are taken into account, academic programs should generate roughly twice as much tuition revenue compared to their direct expenses to reach an overall “break even” status.
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