

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 4, 2011

Present: Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair-UCSB), Ann Craig (Vice Chair – UCSD), Edward Dimendberg (UCI), Kalju Kahn (UCSB), Richard Kern (UCB), Margaret Morse (alternate – UCSC), Robert Powell (Academic Council Vice Chair), Andrew Rawls (undergraduate student representative - UCSB), Elizabeth Sciaky (graduate student representative - UCSB), Michelle Yeh - Chair of the Council of Campus EAP Directors (UCD), UCEAP Director Jean-Xavier Guinard (UCEAP Consultant), Ann Marie Plane (UCEAP Consultant), Mary McMahon (UCEAP Consultant), Todd Giedt (UCIE Analyst), and Martha Winnacker (Senate Executive Director)

**I. Chair's Comments**

**REPORT:** Chair Bhavnani briefed members on the last meeting of the UCEAP Governing Committee. She also outlined the priorities of UCIE this year, which include faculty/academic reviews.

**DISCUSSION:** The Berkeley member mentioned that study abroad is now under Summer Sessions at Berkeley; therefore, faculty oversight is essentially removed study abroad. At the same time, Berkeley's goal is to triple its participation in study abroad; the goal is to have 1/3rd of its students study abroad, as defined broadly (e.g., EAP, third-party providers, campus-based programs of all durations).

**II. Consent Calendar**

**A. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION:** Members approved the agenda.

**III. Executive Session**

*Minutes were not recorded for the executive session.*

**ACTION:** Academic review will be placed on the March 2012 agenda.

**IV. Director's Report**

**REPORT:** Last year, UCEAP experienced record enrollments at 4,808 participants (up six percent), which translated into 2,681 FTEs (up 2%). UCEAP experienced strong growth in the summer; moderate growth in semester/quarter enrollments; and stable year-long enrollments. Growth was also evenly distributed across the regions. Amongst the campuses, the enrollments at UCI, UCLA, UCSB, and UCSD were stable, and UCB, UCD, UCM, UCR, and UCSC experienced significant growth. 1,731 reciprocity students came to the UC system last year. For the 2011-12 academic year, UCEAP is projecting 4,600 participants, which is down about four percent from last year. Enrollments for summer 2011 did increase by six percent. UCEAP is currently projecting a 20 percent drop in year-long enrollments, but anticipates steady semester/quarter enrollments. Although this pattern follows the national trend, it is also prompted by the ever-increasing student fees. Merced continues to grow; all of the other campuses have fallen in their enrollments, especially Davis, which fell approximately 40 percent last year.

Director Guinard outlined the funding model. UCEAP retains all student fees; UCEAP will not receive any General Fund monies beginning in 2013-14. Last year, UCEAP distributed 4.8M to the campuses (via the EVCs). However, due to Funding Streams, this is the last year that UCEAP will know exactly how much money is going back to the individual campuses. As UCEAP will be assessed by UCOP with

those monies redistributed to the campuses; nothing will be earmarked. UCEAP will try to report how much it estimates would be distributed per campus though. Director Guinard also briefed members on some details from last year's budget: Revenue from student fees increased by \$2.375M (+8.4%); return to aid paid increased by \$680K (+8.4%); home office expenses were \$380K less than budgeted (-5%); and international study center & reciprocity costs were only \$200K over budget (+1.4%). As a result, UCEAP has a budget surplus of \$5.8M. Out of this surplus, UCEAP is also funding its contingency reserve by \$1.5M, and it will erase its deficit of \$928K. It is also considering some form of revenue sharing with the campuses with the remaining \$3.8M, along with other strategic initiatives<sup>1</sup>. However, instead of revenue sharing, the UCEAP Governing Committee suggested eliminating the subventions to UCEAP (e.g., \$1.1M in the Opportunity Funds) – either partially or completely. If this suggestion were implemented, then UCEAP's ability to revenue share with the campuses would be significantly reduced. However, campuses would still benefit from monies invested in strategic initiatives.

Last year, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for administrative services was signed between UCEAP and UCSB; it became effective July 1, 2011. UCEAP will remain a systemwide program, and a firewall between UCEAP and UCSB budgets was established. Director Guinard also briefed members on UCEAP's strategic plan, which has three components: Study abroad for all; academic excellence; and best business practices. The strategic plan was developed through a process that gathered input from all of UCEAP's stakeholders (Council of Campus Directors, campus Associate Directors, UC students, study centers, and campus EAP administrators). UCEAP's strategic areas include new program development, marketing, scholarships, alumni engagement and development, the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration, the business model, student management, and the Director's Office initiatives. UCEAP is currently recruiting a Director of Development, as well as a staff person to coordinate academic integration. As part of its marketing initiative, UCEAP will be setting up a program of "student ambassadors", who would go to the classrooms to engage students and promote EAP. Faculty-in-Residence Professor Plane will be the faculty lead on academic integration. Towards that end, UCEAP is creating a core of campus advisors who will assist UCEAP in academic integration. With respect to international student recruitment, UCEAP has offered the use of some of its study centers to help with this effort. Director Guinard also informed members of scholarship awards for EAP students – ten percent of Gilman scholarships awarded nationally in 2010-11 went to UC students (89% were UCEAP students); \$220,000 in scholarships were awarded to EAP students from the Linda Dutton Scholarship Fund; \$55,000 in UCEAP scholarships were awarded this year for semester and year length study abroad students. In addition, the Jasmine Jahanshahi scholarship was established this past year, which includes two \$5,000 scholarships. UCEAP has also experienced the following emergencies in recent months: strikes in Chile, floods in Thailand, political unrest in Egypt, and some individual cases. Finally, UCEAP will be celebrating 50 years this year. It is targeting the EAP community, faculty, students, senior administrators, alumni, and donors in its planning for a number of academic events related to this celebration.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee discussed the issue of giving up all UCEAP subventions. On the one hand, this would advantage UCOP in its relations with the campuses; however, members asked how it would advantage UCEAP. Director Guinard responded that cutting all subventions would not disadvantage UCEAP as long as its business model is sound and functional; this assumes continued growth. He feels that most likely UCEAP will compromise by giving up some of its subvention, but not all of it. One member asked how dependent UCEAP is on ever-increasing student fees. Director

---

<sup>1</sup> \$55,000 went to scholarships this year. Over the next three years UCEAP is planning to allocate \$200,000 to scholarships, \$300,000 to academic integration, and another \$300,000 to other strategic initiatives.

Guinard replied that UCEAP is more dependent on enrollment growth. The model relies on the assumption of an eight percent growth in student fees per year; every year this projection is revised three years going forward. Chair Bhavnani opined that revenue sharing is a risky proposition in that UCEAP may not be able to guarantee that such monies would be used support advising for EAP programs. Instead, revenues might be better utilized for scholarships. Members also cautioned that EAP could be put into a box of a self-sufficient revenue-generating program with little faculty involvement and engagement with little visible value to the campuses. The “formula” needs to be transparent to the EVCs so that the local CIEs can argue that equivalent amounts of money should be funneled to the international offices. Director Guinard responded that its model of academic oversight will help to ensure that faculty remain integrally involved with EAP.

Members also opined that the campuses are becoming increasingly inclined towards developing their own programs. On that point, Director Guinard noted that UC, as a whole, only sends about 20% of its undergraduates abroad; there is room for growth amongst all segments (EAP, campus-based programs, and third-party providers). One student member asked for the percentage of UCEAP’s budget that is devoted to local staff at the study centers, remarking that it seemed that his study center could have done more for the students. Director Guinard responded that study center staff FTEs did indeed decrease by 30% over the last couple of years as part of a reorganization in order to be more efficient, but UCEAP currently adequately covers student needs through its current study center personnel. In addition, EAP fees cover a range of student activities throughout the year. He added that UCEAP's market research has shown that students indicate that they want to pay less up front, and not get as many excursions, rather than paying more and receiving more of these activities. After the fact, they often wish that they had indeed paid more for more of these activities however. One member asked for an update on the coordination between EAP and campus-based programs, especially summer programs. Director Guinard responded that about 10-15 years ago, UCEAP chose not to get into the area of faculty-led programs; instead it chose summer programs and has been successful in this endeavor. The campuses, for their part, chose faculty-led programs. That said, it is important for EAP to continue to grow. UCEAP is now discussing alternate models that will include a few EAP faculty-led programs. Experience shows that there has not been any problem in filling duplicate programs. It is the mission of UCEAP to provide a wide portfolio of programs. With respect to language acquisition, EAP differentiates itself by being able to fit in almost one year of language acquisition in an overseas location.

Finally, Chair Bhavnani asked about the lack of consultation over the strategic plan with the Senate. Director Guinard acknowledged that while he did meet with local CIE faculty representatives on the campuses, it is indeed true that UCEAP consultants did not make an official request to UCIE for input.

## **V. UCEAP India Programs**

**ISSUE:** Director Guinard noted that the impetus behind the reform of the India programs originated in financial (the study center has run a significant deficit for a number of years), personnel, and legal issues, but also because of significant reservations from alumni on the academic quality of the program. Given that most of problems concerned operational matters, UCEAP did not initially consult with faculty, which proved to be a mistake. After receiving significant feedback from the faculty, UCEAP pulled its initial proposal and asked for input from former India Study Center Director Juan Campo (who served as an ombudsperson). At the request of UCIE, UCEAP also formed a special India Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), and is now coming back to UCIE for a revised set of proposals for UCIE's consideration.

Professor Plane briefed members on the history of these programs and the evolution of the program proposals currently before UCIE. She remarked that Professor Campo recommended the establishment of a relationship with Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU); however, all of UCEAP's efforts to initiate such a relationship have been rebuffed. Another recommendation concerned that manner in which UCEAP would deliver Hindi language instruction if UCEAP did not continue its relationship with the Landour language school. The International Education of Students (IES) program already has a relationship with both JNU and one of the undergraduate colleges at Delhi University (DU). IES also utilizes the same instructor for Hindi language that EAP has used in the past. The FAC has reviewed the IES curriculum, and found it to be adequate. UCEAP also agrees with the India FAC that the IES program should be viewed as a provisional program, which would be reviewed and evaluated at the end of three years. There is a proposal for an administrative restructuring at Hyderabad as well, which would resolve EAP's legal problems while not making changes to the curriculum. Finally, there is a need to develop major-specific programs in India, which was recommended by the 2007 India FAC. Towards that end, UCEAP is putting forward the Pune summer program and Manipal program proposals. In the proposed semester-length program at Manipal, students would enroll in a semester-length program in which students enroll in a couple of core classes, followed by service projects in a range of internships related to their major. Manipal is an up and coming university; it would also allow EAP to move into a new geographical area. The Pune summer program, which is focused on public health, allows students to add either the Hyderabad, Delhi, or the Manipal programs for a combined summer/fall program.

**DISCUSSION:** Members observed that UCEAP is not trying to introduce new reciprocity agreements at this time. Consultants responded that historically, EAP has received fewer reciprocity students from India than other regions. Members opined that it is important to retain EAP's presence in this emerging region; this may be difficult if UCEAP only partners with third-party providers. Director Guinard responded that his primary duty is to provide study abroad opportunities for UC students. Members also stressed that a solid review of these programs must take place in three years. UCIE's comments on the three programs are summarized below:

- **Delhi (IES):** Chair Bhavnani commented that the Delhi IES looks promising as a provisional program; it was a mistake to put undergraduates together with graduate students. On the other hand, Chair Bhavnani commented that the academic quality of Ramjas College is lacking, and there are logistical issues as well. Professor Plane reassured the committee that UCEAP can modify the IES program as it sees fit. Members agreed that Delhi is acceptable with a stringent on-site review after three years. Ramjas College should not be part of the program however.
- **Pune:** This program is also acceptable to UCIE. UCEAP feels that Pune has very important strengths, which could benefit UC.
- **Manipal:** Members remained concerned about the academic quality of this program, and rejected this program. They also noted that there is no reason to unfold all of these programs at once. As enrollments in the Delhi and Pune programs increase, then UCEAP should consider adding Manipal.
- **Hyderabad:** The FAC was fairly uniform in its opinion that this program is acceptable.

**ACTION:** UCIE approved the Delhi (IES), Pune, and Hyderabad (CIEE) programs, but rejected Manipal at this time. They also urged UCEAP to reconsider its position in India during this three-year provisional time period. These programs will be reviewed in three years.

**VI. Formal Review Committee Membership Nominations & Review Questions for the Denmark/Sweden Formal Review**

- A. Denmark/Sweden: Kalju Kahn (UCSB)**
- B. Ireland: Ann Craig (Vice Chair – UCSD)**
- C. South Africa: Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Chair – UCSB)**
- D. Paris Summer Language & Culture (Richard Kern – UCB)**
- E. Review Questions for the Denmark/Sweden Formal Review**

**ACTION:** UCIE approved the review questions for the Denmark/Sweden formal review.

**VII. New Program Proposals**

**A. Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei (Chinese language program)**

**ISSUE:** Beginning in 2011-12, UC students may no longer enroll in intensive traditional Chinese language courses at National Taiwan University. Last year, UCIE approved a one-year affiliation with the CIEE program in Taiwan based at National Chengchi University. To replace the provisional arrangement with CIEE, UCEAP is proposing an affiliation with the National Taiwan Normal University's Mandarin Training Center intensive Chinese language program as an option for UCEAP students during summer and fall terms.

**ACTION:** Members approved the Mandarin Training Center program at National Taiwan Normal University.

**B. UCEAP Affiliation with CIEE Senegal**

**ISSUE:** The Africa FAC recommended that UCEAP pursue a relationship with CIEE to offer their Senegal summer program. The Senegal program is designed for students majoring in French/Francophone studies, African studies, international relations, and development studies, and is largely a French language and Senegalese culture program. All CIEE courses are taught by Senegalese faculty, many of whom hold faculty appointments at Université Cheikh Anta Diop.

**ACTION:** Members approved the UCEAP affiliation with CIEE Senegal.

**C. 50th UCEAP Anniversary Faculty-Led Summer Programs (5 programs)**

**ISSUE:** UCIE is requested to review the following five summer programs that will be offered as part of EAP's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration: 1) *Food, Religion, and Culture in Egypt and the Middle East*, offered by Juan and Magda Campo (UCSB), and includes travel to Egypt: Cairo, Alexandria, Sinai Peninsula/Sharm al-Shaykh; 2) *21st Century Technologies and the Digital Divide: A European Perspective*, offered by Isaac D. Scherson (UCI), and includes travel to France (Paris and/or Rennes and/or Lille), Belgium (Brussels), and The Netherlands (Amsterdam); 3) *Jews in Germany from the Middle Ages to the Present*, offered by Glenn Levine (UCI), and includes travel to Germany (Frankfurt; Cologne; Hamburg; Berlin), Austria (Vienna), and the Czech Republic (Prague); 4) *A Journey Through Time: How Our planet Has Shaped Civilization*, offered by Peter Schiffman (UCD) and Doug MacDougall (UCSD), and includes travel to Edinburgh and Cambridge, UK; and 5) *Religion, Secularism, and Civil Societies*, offered by Vivian-Lee Nyitray (UCR), and includes travel to Amsterdam, Utrecht, Leiden, and The Hague, The Netherlands, Berlin, Germany, Washington, DC, and possibly Denmark.

**DISCUSSION:** The rationale for EAP faculty-led programs is two-fold: 1) celebrate EAP's 50th anniversary; and 2) try faculty-led programs. UCEAP is requesting approval from UCIE for these

programs to become regular credit-bearing courses for EAP students. Some of these programs are existing courses on the campuses; all of them will be taught by UC faculty. The syllabi are not changing. Some of these courses may be repeated, and some may only be taught one time. Members asked about the mechanism for future assessment of faculty-led programs. Director Guinard responded that UCIE would vet these programs; or alternately UCEAP could ask the local CEPs to approve them (for those already existing on campuses). Members applauded UCEAP's initiative in this area, but voiced concern about the transportation costs associated with some of the programs. Consultants noted that faculty arrange logistics, but they are compensated by UCEAP for this work. UCEAP is trying to reduce costs within a reasonable level, but some students are willing to pay for more expensive programs, and financial aid is available.

**ACTION: Members approved all five faculty-led programs associated with 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration.**

### **VIII. Update on Faculty Oversight**

**REPORT:** Last year, UCEAP considered a model that would eliminate all SCDs, but increase faculty oversight through FACs, UCIE reviews, and liaison positions. UCEAP received significant push-back to this plan, and UCEAP decided not to pursue it further. UCEAP is now considering a revised model that would continue to use some SCDs (somewhere between 6 and 12 SCDs), but also utilize UC faculty in visiting professorships, who would also involve themselves with the academic oversight of EAP programs. This is seen as a welcome alternative to two-year SCD obligations for departments. Typically, visiting professors would teach a core course to UC students, and/or a course that is offered to both UC and host-institution students. Professor Plane and the Regional Directors are currently working on a plan; Professor Plane envisions a model that would be sufficiently flexible to satisfy regional needs, but would also ensure systemic consistency so that every EAP program is under some kind of oversight on a regular (but non-crisis) basis. With respect to the FACs, some FACs will be discipline-specific and some will be regionally-specific. Adding visiting professorships will help to buoy academic oversight, but keep much of the administrative work in the hands of trained local staff. UCEAP will bring a formal proposal for UCIE to review sometime in the near future.

**DISCUSSION:** Members voiced the concern that faculty research often times lasts longer than a single semester. Consultant Mary McMahon responded that the visiting professorships do indeed vary in duration, adding that faculty may elect to use the visiting professorship to defray transportation costs, and then stay on to continue/complete their research. UCEAP is also experimenting with a hybrid model in which a visiting professor would not only be teaching a course at the local university, but also be compensated for overseeing course grades for UC students. Director Guinard remarked that the faculty consultant model has worked at some locations, but represents an ad-hoc model that makes oversight more complex. That said, UCEAP is open to this on occasion when it proves beneficial. Members generally applauded the visiting faculty approach in that it provides a UC presence at many EAP sites, and involves the faculty, thereby internationalizing UC campuses. One concern about the visiting professor model is continuity for the students themselves; students would not get the chance to get to know these faculty members over time in many cases. Director Guinard responded that these visiting faculty members would get the chance to know EAP students if they are teaching some of their courses. With respect to continuity, local staff already provide this. The committee also brought up the issue of equitable pay for staff, urging UCEAP to retain quality staff in its operations. One member asked for operational guidelines for the FACs. It was noted that retired faculty may also be good candidates as visiting professors. Members are also interested in sharing and coordinating the templates for program reviews, which are being developed by UCIE, and the template for faculty oversight.

**ACTION: UCEAP consultants will provide general operational guidelines for the Faculty Advisory Committees to UCIE.**

**IX. UCEAP Information Items**

**A. New Japan Program Option: Osaka Summer Institute for intensive beginning Japanese Language Study**

**REPORT:** Two years ago, UCEAP consolidated its Japan programs from a large number of under-enrolled programs. At that time, the UCEAP Japan Reorganization Committee also recommended expanding program options at Osaka University to allow enrollment for UC students with lower Japanese language skills, including short-term programs. In the aftermath of the earthquake, the Japanese government is also making available funding to increase the number of foreign students studying Japanese in Japan for short periods of time.

**B. Closure of the Language and Culture Program, Bahia, Brazil**

**REPORT:** Based on the recommendation of its faculty consultant, along with numerous complaints from student groups, UCEAP is closing its Language and Culture Program in Bahia, Brazil for security and academic quality reasons. Beginning Portuguese EAP students will enroll at PUC-Rio, who will study beginning Portuguese in the ILP alongside other immersion students.

**X. Senate Introduction, Overview, & Updates from the Academic Senate Leadership.**

**REPORT:** Robert Powell commented on the changes taking place within the University of California. He remarked that the issue of third-party providers probably would not have come up five years ago, stating that it is paramount that undergraduates receive an “UC experience” while studying abroad. The University is also looking at enrolling more international students, which is important. The big change in funding is “funding streams”, which requires that revenue created by the campuses goes directly to the campuses; UCOP will be funded via a tax (this year’s negotiated rate is 1.6%). The State’s General Fund to UC is still \$2.4B. Currently, these monies are allocated on historical enrollment patterns, which advantage the older campuses, especially those campuses that experienced significant growth in their graduate programs after 1996. “Rebenching” refers to a process by which these monies are being reallocated to the campuses in a more equitable fashion. The Rebenching Committee will send its recommendation to President Yudof by the end of the winter quarter. With respect to admissions, UC has also just changed its undergraduate eligibility construct to 9 percent. This has some potential to shift the make-up of the student body. The second shift is a movement towards holistic review, which has been mandated by the Regents. Finally, Vice Chair Powell mentioned Governor Brown’s proposal on state pensions, which is designed to impact UC. He added that the University successfully reformed its pension system about one year ago; approximately 70 percent of what the Governor is proposing, the University has already done.

**DISCUSSION:** Members briefly discussed the UCEAP strategic plan, which was put into place without formal UCIE review. Council Vice Chair Powell stressed that historically, the Academic Council has been very outspoken that EAP maintains its academic quality and faculty governance. Indeed, the Academic Council can point to a number of statements where it strongly supported EAP when its future was in doubt. Chair Bhavnani remarked that on the whole, UCEAP cooperates with UCIE quite well, but she is concerned about this particular incident. Members also briefly discussed broadening UCIE’s charge to include study abroad opportunities outside of EAP.

**XI. New Business**

*UCIE meeting minutes– November 4, 2011*

*There was not any new business.*

**XII. Executive Session**

*Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Attest: Kum-Kum Bhavnani, UCIE Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst