

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 15, 2007

I. Chair's Announcements – *Chair Lobo*

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Lobo announced that system-wide Senate Vice Chair nominations are due by January 4, 2008. Analyst Todd Giedt made a short presentation on the Academic Senate Document Database (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/docs/>); the February 7, 2008 meeting agenda will be posted on this pass-word protected site. Members will be sent log-in information and passwords. The 2007-08 meetings are February 7th, May 8th, and May 9th.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the 2006-2007 Annual Report

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.

III. EAP Director's Report – *Michael O'Connell*

REPORT: Professor John Marcum retired in June 2007, after leading UCEAP for 17 years. Director O'Connell was appointed to address the deficit of \$2.2 million. EAP's reporting structure has been reorganized; the chief financial officer now reports to the Director and the Regional Directors report to the Associate Director. Since June, the number of positions have been reduced from 100 to 94. One-third of UOEAP's office space will also be subletted. Cost controls have been instituted through enrollment management; student enrollment will be reduced in programs that have high per student costs, enrollments will be increased in those programs that have high fixed costs (includes Russia and Cairo). High-cost programs are being reviewed with attention being paid to academic necessity (mostly in Western Europe). The bad exchange rates of the dollar vis-à-vis the Euro and the Pound Sterling have especially hurt EAP's programs in Europe. Where possible, the number of Study Center Directors (SCDs) will also be reduced; staffing levels at certain targeted study centers are also being considered. The Office of the President (UCOP) has told EAP to prepare for a 10% budget cut due to the anticipated state budget deficit. Enrollments are up 9% over last year to approximately 4,500 students, which is the highest in EAP's history.

Director O'Connell briefed members on the Ad-Hoc review report. He noted that an interim report come out in spring 2007, but contained many omissions from EAP's point of view. The Senate constitution of the initial review committee was also flawed in that proper consultation with the Committee on Committees had not taken place. In January 2007, an expanded committee was formed, but it met only once. The final report represents a broad-brushed effort, but it does contain some positive elements. Additional documentation would have been helpful, including critiques of the initial report, campus views on UCEAP, etc. He summarized the salient points as the following:

- UCEAP endorses increasing the percentage of UC students to study abroad. However, these increases are resource-dependent; UCEAP's resources are currently constricted.
- UCEAP supports a statement of support from the President of the University. However, financial support, especially for campus EAP offices, also needs to be pledged.

- UCEAP supports the recommendation that EAP should occupy the center in a broad portfolio of international programs, including a number of campus programs. EAP is more cautious about the use of third-party providers, noting that they are usually more expensive for students.
- UCEAP is also in favor of increased support for the campus offices.
- UCEAP supports increasing faculty consciousness of EAP and other international programs, but are concerned about the omission of UCEAP's academic integration activities from the report.
- Recommendation eight ('Financing EAP') seems to contradict the Kissler report, which advocates increased funding through student fees and less through core funds. On the other hand, recommendation 8 makes a case for both increasing core support and financial aid.
- Director O'Connell also urged that the Senate be involved in the formation of an 'International Leadership Team'.

Director McConnell also noted that UCEAP views the Kissler report with interest, but it has some doubts about the actual numbers though. UCEAP staff is modeling possible funding structures that will provide long-term sustainability. UCEAP will need some support from UCOP; it cannot be entirely based on student fees. He also remarked that EAP is an academic/instructional program. However, the Kissler report suggests that EAP is a service-provider to the campuses.

IV. Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education – Jerry Kissler

REPORT/ISSUE: Jerry Kissler opened his remarks with the statement that the EAP funding model is dysfunctional and unsustainable in the current budget climate; it relies on the state's General Fund to subsidize its programming. Campus EAP offices rely on their local campuses for funding, and have been historically under-funded. The overhead at UCEAP is also disproportionately high in comparison to the campus offices, and the Study Center Director (SCD) budget too large when compared to other education abroad programs at other universities and colleges. In his review of EAP, four values emerged as being paramount: 1) Education abroad is important; 2) 'Immersion' is even more valuable than simply going abroad; 3) it is desirable to have foreign students in UC's classrooms; and 4) Research collaboration between UC faculty and faculty at foreign universities is important. Dr. Kissler concluded that there were two alternatives to the current budget model: Either 1) cap EAP's growth with all new growth in international programming coming from campus programs and third-party providers; or 2) Change the funding model so that EAP gets the student fee money, and provide campus offices with the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI) revenue. He is recommending the latter option, which would also allow EAP to grow as student fee revenues grow. The plan also creates incentives for UCEAP to design programs based primarily on student interest, which would increase participation rates. Campuses will also want to increase participation rates, as this will create more space on the campuses, which can be filled with full fee-paying foreign students. UCEAP would need to cut \$3-4 million in the short term and \$6-7 million in the long-term to make this recommendation work. In order to mitigate the high costs associated with study center directors, Dr. Kissler proposes to create \$15,000 research awards for UC faculty who wish to conduct research abroad while on sabbatical. These research awards would carry some EAP-related responsibilities, but not the entire slate of responsibilities that are currently assigned to a

study center director. Sabbaticals in residence might be one option, where they would not be on campus but on-site abroad. The money for this would come out of the campus share in the budget.

Dr. Kissler proposes to double the number of students who study abroad. Currently, only 18-21% of UC students study abroad, which is approximately 9,000 students across the UC system (about 4,000 of these students studied abroad through EAP). However, this percentage is relatively low when compared to other institutions, which have participation rates as high as 30-45%. He also recommends increasing the numbers of foreign undergraduate students in UC classrooms by about one to two thousand by admitting them as freshmen or juniors. Dr. Kissler has had discussions with USC officials that validate his claim that UC, as a system, could recruit an additional one to two thousand international students. While he does not advocate eliminating the EAP reciprocity program, he feels that it is important to augment this program through the active recruitment of foreign students through regular admissions. These students would have the benefit of not only increasing the diversity of UC classrooms, but also provide additional revenue to the University.

DISCUSSION: UCEAP consultants remarked that EAP will continue to look more critically where UC uses faculty as SCDs. EAP will probably be reducing the number of SCDs it deploys. UK was reduced to from three to two; the Hungary SCD position will soon be eliminated, and in France and Spain, the number of SCDs will be reduced from three to two respectively. Italy is another location where the number of SCDs could be reduced from two to one.

Members were interested in how UC's international programs might be doubled or even tripled. It is Professor Binion's belief (see the minority report) that the University can double its student participation through EAP and campus programs alone. It is Dr. Kissler's opinion that while the campuses will grow their programs to some degree, they will not bridge this gap entirely. Council of Campus Directors (CCD) guests pointed out that it is not that campuses do not want to grow, but resources are constrained. Dr. Kissler added that the level of General Fund support for campus programs is much more limited than it is for EAP as well. In addition to allowing UCEAP to collect student fee revenue, he advocates a little more than \$1 million of General Fund (from opportunity funds) money for UCEAP to allow it to both grow and keep program costs affordable. In fact, he argues that on average EAP programs should cost no more than it costs a student to spend one year (or one semester) on campus. The challenge is growing EAP in such a way that does not cost the University more money; the answer is cutting the study center director budgets, among other things. Given the state deficit, The Regents will want to close as many gaps as possible (including EAP) to reach such goals as increasing faculty salaries.

Education abroad programs at other universities have budgets that only have about 1% of their funding coming from the state; the rest usually comes from student fees. EAP is an anomaly at the national level. At the University of Minnesota, every time the state cuts the budget, tuition has to be raised, thereby growing student fee revenue for their programs. As a result, Minnesota has been able to keep their programs more or less affordable. Director O'Connell pointed out that Minnesota may not have return-to-aid, which would reduce EAP's student fee monies by one-third. Dr. Kissler believes that in the current budgetary environment, it is unlikely that EAP will continue to see such significant state support as has been the rule in the past, or a reduction in

Comment [TAG1]: It was noted that this statement is in error at the February 2008 UCIE meeting. Only 2% of the funding for the University of Minnesota's education abroad programs come from the central administration; the rest come from fees. Therefore, as tuition rises, fees do not necessarily rise as well.

return-to-aid. Right now, return-to-aid is lost to the system; under this new system, return-to-aid will be identifiable, traceable, and can be returned to EAP students. Members noted that advising needy students is always more time-consuming, and requires more resources.

Partnering with other universities, or even third-party providers, was also raised. There are more than 100 third-party providers. Many students are already choosing these providers on their own. Therefore, a mechanism for screening third-party providers would be valuable; a referral arrangement could also be established. In fact, Dr. Kissler recommends that EAP works out a referral system with preferred third-party providers to supplement their revenues. In such a system, third-party providers would discount their own programs by a negotiated amount for EAP-referred students (\$600 in Dr. Kissler's model). In turn, EAP campus offices would impose a surcharge of the same amount on all students participating in such third-party programs, which would be used to fund the respective campus office. UCEAP would also be asked to match this amount. Currently, UCEAP funds campus offices by \$200 per student. He estimates that such a plan would double the current revenues that campus offices receive. Members raised the fact that it may be difficult to negotiate such a discount with third-party providers, as many of them are under-funded themselves. Also, there would be significant implementation costs that would only erode the funding base of the campus offices further. These referral 'discounts' could also be viewed with suspicion if they are not totally transparent. It was also raised that consortiums already exist, which UC could participate in. Otherwise, the Senate and/or EAP would have difficulty continually monitor such third-party providers. EAP already has some relationships with national universities already, but student participation in these programs is very small.

V. Education Abroad Travel Policy Restrictions and the Study Abroad Industry –

Chair Lobo

ISSUE: UCEAP consultants noted that the UCAF memo is erroneous in its claim that EAP is supported by student fees; it is supported by state funding. The second issue is that the travel warning policy is an EAP policy; it does not come directly from UCOP, but it is supported by UCOP. The principles behind the travel warning policy are two-fold: 1) the safety and security of EAP students; and 2) legal liability. UCEAP uses the State Department travel warnings because these warnings provide the only index for safety and security. EAP also does not have the expertise or the staff to evaluate the safety and security of countries on its own. EAP has also been advised that a signed waiver would not hold up in court by the Office of General Counsel (OGC). There is also a distinction between UC programs and third-party provider programs. While students may use federal student aid on third-party provider programs, they cannot use UC student aid.

DISCUSSION: Members acknowledged the bad press surrounding this issue. While there is a Regental mandate to facilitate the participation of UC students in third-party programs in Israel and other locations for which a travel warning exists, consultants pointed out that neither The Regents or UCOP have explicitly asked EAP to open up Israel, or not to follow EAP's travel warning policy. Two guests (CCD members) felt it appropriate for UCEAP to ask UCOP to issue its own policy on travel warnings, which would remove EAP from any political controversy. Consultants clarified that the UCAF memo asks two things: 1) Allow UC students to take UC student aid with them on third-party provider programs; and 2) If EAP campus office employees are receiving 'kick-backs' from third-party providers? The former is blatantly illegal.

Indeed, on some campuses such as Davis, students cannot use any financial aid (either federal or UC) while they are on leave and participating in third-party provider programs.

Members and consultants also discussed ‘kick-backs’ to third-party providers, which was described as a slippery slope. On the one hand, The Regents have asked EAP to facilitate and assist students to participate in programs from third-party providers, yet such facilitation requires valuable state resources to promote private commercial products. In one sense, this is an unfunded mandate. While some of third-party providers do pay for trips to third-party provider program locations for EAP campus office staff in order to increase their knowledge about these programs, it is still an open question as to whether these are really ‘kick-backs’.

It was moved to make a statement that UCIE does not have the necessary competence to deliver an opinion on this matter. However, the motion failed on lack of a second. This issue was postponed until executive session.

ACTION: Members discussed this issue in executive session.

VI. Report and Recommendations of the Japan Reorganization Committee – Scott Cooper

ISSUE: One year ago, UCIE approved reorganization for EAP’s UK programs; this is serving as a model for Japan. Traditionally, Japanese universities limit the number of slots that they offer to international and/or American students, which allows EAP to streamline and reduce the number of Japanese partners (currently 13). The reorganization committee recommends: 1) eliminating both the Tokyo Institute of Technology (TIT) and Kyoto University; 2) Monitor Keio University; and 3) retain the other nine universities.

DISCUSSION: Although TIT is a top-tier university in Japan, it is being cut because it only allows one student per year. At Kyoto, there have been a number of logistical and curricular problems. For example, their English program was too basic (e.g., course offered in English). Kao is a private university, is high quality, but it duplicates programs in at other sites. As the Japan programs must accommodate students with variable language levels, a wide range of programs is necessary. Agreements are negotiated on a five-year basis, and programs could be expanded as agreements are renewed. It was also noted that Keio University is planning on expanding its international exchange opportunities. The committee also recommended shifting towards a more graduate-level program at Tokyo University; however such a move does not threaten or eliminate the undergraduate program at Tokyo University.

ACTION: Members approved the Japan Reorganization Committee’s recommendations.

VII. Closure of the EAP Ferrara and Sheffield Programs – Scott Cooper

ACTION: Members approved the closure of Ferrara and Sheffield with one abstention.

VIII. Survey of Faculty Interest in an EAP Program in Argentina – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: EAP is interested in cautious exploration of a new program in Argentina, and expert faculty opinions were solicited through questionnaires. Such a program would have a large student appeal and not duplicate other programs. Buenos Aires, Cordoba, and Mendoza were

recommended as possible sites. However, consensus has not been reached on the type of program yet. The University of Buenos Aires is viewed as the most attractive partner university. The only concern expressed was that an Argentine program might deplete Chile's students. However, the Argentine program would be designed as a niche program that would be differentiated from the Chile programs in many ways. UCEAP consultants asked UCIE for approval to continue cautious exploration of the program with a student survey. If successful, the program evaluation process would begin.

ACTION: UCIE approved a student survey for an EAP Program in Argentina.

IX. Status of the Strategic Faculty Advisory Committees for Shanghai, India, and the Arabic/Islamic World – Scott Cooper/Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: While most program development has been put on hold due to current uncertainties, EAP identified these three areas as regions where it quickly develop new programs; a faculty advisory committee (FAC) has been established for each region. The India FAC has met, and recommends concentrating on the Delhi area; thereby moving forward with discussions with Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU). The FAC also recommends maintaining the program with the University of Hyderabad (UH). The Shanghai FAC, which will eventually expand into a China FAC, will sort through a number of diverse proposals for the Shanghai area. The Arabic/Islamic World FAC has not met. It is most important to expand programming at a site where Arabic instruction and Islamic Studies can be offered; only the American University of Cairo (AUC) can offer this currently. However, AUC is one of the most expensive programs, and is therefore financial prohibitive to expand. On a related note, the UC Language Consortium has initiated a program called "Arabic without Walls."

DISCUSSION: In terms of expanding Arabic instruction, UCEAP consultants noted that there may be possibilities in Alexandria, Cairo (besides AUC), Jordan, or Morocco (although Morocco is Francophone). At Grenada, there is a strong Arabic Studies program that robs students from EAP. The Arab Emirates, Tunisia, and Qatar were mentioned as other possibilities suggested. The problem with Tunisia is that French is the base program.

ACTION: UCIE will continue to monitor program development in Shanghai, India, and the Arab world.

X. Approval of Review Questions for the Rome, Russia, and Santiago, Chile Formal Reviews – Scott Cooper

ISSUE: These questions were used by the site-visit teams in the summer; UCEAP consultants asked members to approve the questions.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that financial questions were omitted from the Rome questions. A more-detailed account of the previous problems at the Rome site should also be provided. Members also pointed out that they are being asked to approve questions retroactively, as they have already been asked or are being asked currently. Consultants noted that this is a relic of the traditional approval process before site visits existed; these questions were considered later in the academic year. Given that, members tabled action until after approval of item XI. 'Streamlining of the UCIE Formal Review Process' and was received as information only.

XI. Streamlining of the UCIE Formal Review Process – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: UCEAP asked that UCIE approve the programs slated for formal review for the following year (e.g., 2008-09) at the November meeting. The existing protocol dictated that programs for formal review were approved at the May meeting. Questions would then be approved at the May meeting at the latest. At the May 2007 meeting, UCIE proposed to eliminate the appointment a special UCIE subcommittee to review the review committee's report; instead it was suggested that the review report simply be presented to the committee at large by the UCIE formal review representative; a final report will also be written by the UCIE representative.

ACTION: Members approved the proposed changes to the formal review process.

XII. Approval of Countries/Programs for the 2008-09 Formal Review Cycle (Barbados, Hungary, Singapore, and Taiwan) – Bruce Madewell

ACTION: Members approved the formal review of Barbados, Hungary, Singapore, and Taiwan programs for the 2008-09 academic.

XIII. Recruitment and Selection Cycle of 2008-09 Study Center Directors and UC Instructors – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: 2008-09 SCD applications are due by January 11, 2008. The recruitment and selection process was described as follows: All applicants must be interviewed at least once. After the first-round interviews are completed, a committee develops a short list of candidates for a second interview. The second-round interviews will include the UCIE Chair and the UCEAP Director. UCIE makes the final SCD final recommendations at its May meeting. UCEAP is recruiting for Chile, China (Beijing), India, Italy (immersion programs), Japan (Tokyo), Mexico, The Netherlands, Russia, Spain (Granada), and Spain (Madrid). Consultant Madewell also mentioned that there are a number of non-SCD faculty teaching opportunities, which include Lund (4 positions), Meiji Gakuin University (1 position), Yonsei University in the summer (15), Shanghai, and International Christian University in Tokyo, Japan.

XIV. New Business

ISSUE: There was not any new business.

XV. Executive Session

[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Attest: Errol Lobo, UCIE Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

