

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 8, 2007**

Present: Susan Berg, Beverly Bossler, Scott Cooper, Ian Coulter, Todd Giedt, Anita Guerrini, Nancy Guy, Chip Lester, Glenn Levine, Errol Lobo, Bruce Madewell, John Marcum, David Mares, Richard Matthew, Casey Moore, Michael O’Connell, David Pion-Berlin, Vincent Rush, Val Rust, Buchanan Sharp, Jianwen Su, and Khatharya Um

**I. Chair’s Announcements – Anita Guerrini**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Guerrini welcomed the Council of Campus Directors (CCD). She also briefed members on the activities of the Ad-Hoc Review Committee, noting that the review report is scheduled to be finalized on Monday, February 12<sup>th</sup>. She explicitly mentioned two recommendations coming out of the review report: (1) the splitting of EAP Director John Marcum’s position into two positions; and (2) a revision of the EAP funding formula.

**II. Consent Calendar--Approval of the November Minutes**

**ACTION:** Members unanimously approved the minutes with minor amendments.

**III. EAP Director’s Report – John Marcum**

**REPORT:** Director Marcum opened his remarks by noting the incredible change which the study abroad sector is undergoing. One such change is the growth of summer as the most popular time for undergraduate students to study abroad (both locally at EAP and nationally). The causes for this phenomenon are diverse, but they include lower costs (cheap flights); parental concern about the time to graduation; and the fact that going abroad during the summer is the current trend among young people. Both EAP and other study abroad providers have responded to this trend. For example, Harvard has recently been emphasizing its summer abroad programs. A related phenomenon is the relative crowding of popular study abroad locations during the summer (student housing, etc.).

The budget is another on-going issue. Since EAP is funded on the basis of full-time equivalents (FTE) without any funding from education fees, along with a gradual reduction in the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI), the Office of the President (UCOP) has come to the understanding that the budget is not viable for the long-term. Jerry Kissler, who served in the UCOP budget office, is now a consultant to UOEAP on the design of a new budget model. In the meantime, UOEAP will continue to operate at a deficit for the foreseeable future in part due to increasing costs as well as the lower value of the dollar. He noted that although EAP’s total participation is still above 4,000 students, it has fallen in the past year (the highpoint was 4,400 students in 2002). Generally, EAP’s participation rates follow the national trends with enrollment in year-long programs continuing to fall. For example, EAP enrollment in year-long programs has decreased by 22% over the past year (it currently stands at 770 students as opposed to a little over 1,000 in 2005-06). Regionally, some of the Asian programs have experienced some growth, with Taiwan and Hong Kong enrollments increasing; Japan also seems to be fairly strong, although the International Christian University (ICU) enrollment numbers are not growing as fast as anticipated. Some of the new programs, such as Madrid Summer and the

Australian Immersion Fall, have done well. While UOEAP is still not allowed to develop new programs until current budgetary issues are resolved, it is allowed to do program planning. Proposed programs include first-year Chinese, as well as a summer program in Paris. Argentina and Greece are other regions targeted for possible expansion in the future.

Security and safety is another area of concern which the campus offices must also address. Director Marcum recently made an emergency trip to Ghana, in response to the accidental death of an EAP student, who died in a bus accident. While it is clear that adjustment for most American students is difficult in Ghana, it is still the most logical place to hold a program in Africa. Local perception of American behavior has also created some problems. He stressed that often times, students simply do not pay close enough attention to the rules, regulations, and guidelines laid out by EAP. Drug use and binge drinking is also problematic, as evidenced by the recent incidents in India. All of this speaks to a comprehensive orientation both at UC and abroad. He also raised the question of how much young California students can tolerate in terms of adverse conditions.

Director Marcum moved onto prospective issues, many of which center on the internationalization of the University; EAP is just one entity in this process. Towards that end, he reminded members that he laid out some of his ideas on how study abroad can drive this process in his “[Challenge 2006](#)” piece. He also remarked that for the first time, UC alumni groups are forming around the world. The first of these is associated with California House in London, which has created a trust through which Europeans can donate money to UC. Another program is called ‘adopt a student’, which matches students with local families (located in London and Paris). In London, a special fund has also been created to support student research projects. Another development is an umbrella agreement with the University of Utrecht, which grew out of EAP’s relationship with Utrecht. In Mexico, the Casa de California project is also close to being realized. Other projects/agreements include the Knowledge and Innovation Community (KIC) in Shanghai as well as a joint program in international studies in Fudan, China; and the joint summer program in Lund. Yonsei University has also recently approached EAP about opportunities for approximately 30 UC faculty members to teach in the summer, which would be mostly funded by Yonsei (EAP would pay for housing).

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked about the budget deficit. Director Marcum clarified that UCOP is still financing its deficit, but UOEAP is not allowed to start new programs at this time. UCOP is currently concerned with how it relates to the campuses, and EAP certainly falls within that analysis. He added that he is uncertain how the budget process will be integrated with the EAP review. Chair Guerrini reminded members that the review committee is only dealing with the budget in a very general way; a more budget-specific review committee is being formed.

Other members expressed disappointment that EAP is moving away from year-long programs, but they acknowledged this reality nonetheless. Members emphasized that repeat business by students, who go abroad as undergraduates and then study abroad again as graduate students, is important. Director Marcum noted that while some specific graduate programs have been established at some sites, the numbers have been quite small. He is unsure whether graduate program options can be developed on a large scale. He added that EAP has tried to meet specific

campus needs in developing these graduate programs, such as the Wageningen graduate program in The Netherlands, which was developed specifically with the needs of UC Davis in mind.

Members also discussed campus and third-party providers. While quality campus programming should be encouraged, it needs to be coordinated much more systematically than it has been. Members noted that there is much variability in the existing campus programs in their coordination with existing EAP programs. Towards that end, UCLA has a central website publicizing both campus and EAP study abroad opportunities. Review criteria for third-party providers need to be developed and systematically implemented. They remarked that the quality of third-party providers is sometimes questionable, as many of them have never gone through a faculty review. Other members emphasized that if UC/EAP is serious about academic integration, departments must play a huge role in this process (especially in the review of third-party providers). Finally, they also asked if the 19% rate of full-year participants is ahead of other comparable programs; Director Marcum responded that he believes it is higher than other institutions.

#### **IV. EAP Status and Strategy Reports – John Marcum/Scott Cooper**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Scott Cooper presented the status and strategy reports. He briefed members by country, and he highlighted important developments. In **Australia**, EAP has closed its biology programs at James Cook University and the University of Tasmania (however, EAP still runs a year-long program at Tasmania); and suspended its relationship with Flinders' University. Consultant Bruce Madewell added that more and more Australian students now want to travel to the US as reciprocity students. While EAP Australian program enrollments have been declining, students have recently shown a renewed interest in some of the new semester programs. The **Barbados** program is fairly stable, with an enrollment of about 25-30 students. The **Brazil** programs are growing, especially with the Salvador program as well as a variety of new semester programs, which are well-subscribed. Brazil is also undergoing a UCIE formal review. **Canada** is traditionally a relatively small program, with about 15-20 students, who attend the University of British Columbia (UBC). There is also a number of UC/University of British Columbia faculty affiliations. Canada is also undergoing a UCIE review. The **Chile** programs have grown a great deal recently. Last year, EAP formally reviewed the language and culture program in Concepción, which has significantly improved that program. **China** is the source of much of EAP's current efforts, and it is hopeful that eventually a first-year Chinese program can be established there. At Beijing, EAP has always had core programs at Peking University and Beijing Normal University (BNU), and BNU has acknowledged that they would be able to host a first-year Chinese language program. EAP offers a number of opportunities/programs in Shanghai—a language and culture program at East China Normal University, a business/economics program at Fudan University, and teaching opportunities for UC faculty at Fudan. A faculty advisory committee (FAC) has also been established for Shanghai to develop a variety of programs including film studies. In **Costa Rica**, enrollments are strong at Monte Verde, but down at the University of Costa Rica. In **Denmark**, there is a strong program at Copenhagen University (although enrollments are declining). This program is difficult for Californian students to cope with (both the language and the system of higher education there). Last year, EAP suspended its architecture program (DIS) in Denmark. **Egypt** is undergoing a formal review, which will be discussed later. On a related note, a FAC is being set up to look at program options for study abroad in the Arabic world. **Germany** is undergoing a formal review

as well. EAP has also recently set up a FAC for its **India** programs. There have been some problems with language instruction in the Hyderabad program. The FAC will not only be looking at this, but also the general future of EAP's presence in India. Finally, Scott Cooper Members directed members to the UOEAP website for additional data (<http://eap.ucop.edu/staff/research/>). He clarified that the data for 2006-07 are projections.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked about the closure of James Cook University in **Australia**, and asked if there was any chance for revisiting this. Scott Cooper responded that we have kept the door open in the cases of the budget situation improving. The UCIE member on the **Canada** review team remarked that both American and Canadian students do not think of the US and Canada as studying abroad. On that subject, consultants reaffirmed the tremendous value that site visits add to the program reviews. One member asked there is any connection between the UC's 10+10 program and EAP's endeavors in **China**. Scott Cooper responded that there is not any connection. Another member added that the Chinese government is formally encouraging Chinese universities to send their graduate students abroad. Under the 10+10 program, these students, who are being funded by the Chinese government, would be primarily non-degree seeking students on a year-by-year basis. Another member asked about EAP's legal status in China. Director Marcum explained that the Chinese government has not created a legal structure in which EAP can exist as a legal entity in China. Right now, EAP is operating through affiliation with various universities. Members also remarked on the decline in **Italy** program enrollments. Scott Cooper explained that the reasons for this decline include the reduction from five to three Siena programs; the closure of the Trento program; and general declines in the participation of year-long Italy programs. However, the Rome program is growing. Members also asked about the current status of **Imperial College in England**. Consultants reminded members that this program has been approved, and the program will accept its first cohort in fall 2008. Finally, members asked about faculty oversight at the **Taiwan** program, as there have been some concerns that there is not enough faculty oversight over some of EAP's programs where local liaison officers are used. Consultant Cooper replied that it has been proposed that the Shanghai SCD could also make periodic visits to Hong Kong and Taiwan. Members remarked that there could be some pragmatic, and possibly political, problems with this arrangement. Finally, members asked about the current status of **Israel**, specifically whether there is any way to increase opportunities, as well as removing barriers to studying in Israel. Consultants responded that although the wording is varied in different travel warnings, they are not classified in terms of severity. Director Marcum stressed that a travel warning is a travel warning, and EAP is constrained by its travel warning policy. Legal counsel has advised that EAP's liability would be extreme in such cases, and waivers would not hold up in a court of law. That said, UC students are studying in Israel independently and receiving course credit for that study.

Members also talked about safety concerns. Consultants stressed that orientations are comprehensive, and most unfortunate incidents involve students not following rules/regulations/recommendations. Graduate-level exchanges were another concern. Consultant Bruce Madewell explained that most agreements allow graduate exchanges. Members asked if UCEAP could compile a list of such agreements. They also asked if EAP has ever considered accepting non-UC students. Scott Cooper responded that EAP has thought about selling some of its programs to students at other universities, but that would be a very

complicated undertaking. Director Marcum added that EAP is part of the [California Study Abroad Council](#), which looks at study abroad across the post-secondary segments (UC, CSU, California community colleges, and private institutions). One major issue for UC is the participation rate of students in community college study abroad programs, and whether those that transfer to UC campuses enroll in EAP study abroad programs again. The Council has agreed upon the importance of study abroad for all segments, including the privates.

**ACTION: Consultant Bruce Madewell will compile a list of institutions that allow graduate students.**

**V. Faculty Opportunities Update – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Bruce Madewell handed out distribution one, updating members on faculty teaching opportunities abroad. He reminded members that faculty who teach abroad typically do so as part of their assignment as a SCD, participate in visiting professorships, or teaching assignments. One such teaching assignment is the availability for three teaching positions in the UC-Fudan University Joint Program in International Studies (JPIS) for fall 2007. Consultant Madewell asked that any interested faculty contact him immediately. Another is the opportunity for about 10-12 UC faculty to teach in Yonsei University's summer program in South Korea. Some 54 faculty have responded to this call, and 30 have been selected. It is anticipated that this will be an annual summer opportunity for UC faculty.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked how faculty members would be compensated, and whether they could take family along. Consultants clarified that there would be no extra compensation for family, but Yonsei would assist faculty in making housing arrangements. For JPIS, consultants said that EAP pays the department for faculty release time (which is set up similar to SCDs).

**VI. Study Center Director Recruitment Update – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Madewell handed out distribution two, noting that UCEAP will be starting the campus interviews soon. He remarked that sometimes UCEAP has trouble filling a SCD position; in cases like these, UCEAP utilizes administrative appointments. He assured members that administratively appointed SCDs are well-qualified and experienced. UCEAP is in the process of finalizing two administrative appointments, for the Granada, Spain and the Rome, Italy programs.

He also informed members that UCEAP is considering reducing the number of UK study centers from three to two study centers, which comes partially from the report from the reorganization committee on UK study centers. This task force recommended the closure of seven UK programs, which is currently being implemented. In addition, the three current UK SCDs have recommended reducing the SCDs from three to two for a number of reasons. These SCDs noted that UK institutions have expanded their student services, thereby making such a reduction viable. This option also makes sense from a cost-savings perspective, but more importantly, because the closure of seven programs means that such extensive oversight is no longer needed. The likely choices for the remaining SCD sites are Edinburgh and London.

**DISCUSSION:** Consultants informed members that currently 702 students are studying in the UK. A CCD member (who served as a UK SCD in the 1990s) expressed his concern that

students' advising time will be significantly reduced; and (2) the welfare/workload of the two remaining study center directors would be negatively impacted. Other members echoed these concerns. Consultant Madewell explained that a commensurate increase in staffing would be needed to compensate the loss of one SCD. He also reminded members that a single SCD currently costs EAP approximately \$120,000 per year. In the UK, these costs are even higher, due to the high cost of living there. While UCEAP currently maintains 25 SCDs, its budget only allocates 20 SCDs. He reiterated the fact that UK universities are now in the position of providing some services that SCDs provided in the past. Consultant Cooper reminded members that the Study Center Task Force delegated a number of the student services functions to staff (leaving diplomatic functions to SCDs). Another related factor included the automation project, which facilitates a higher level of service to students not only in the UK but throughout EAP's network of study centers (much of the paper processes will be converted to electronic processes). Members also asked why the UK was chosen for the elimination of a SCD, given its complexity, as opposed to other sites that may be less intensive. Scott Cooper responded that most of the countries that have low enrollments are now managed by liaison officers, not SCDs. In addition, low-enrollment programs at institutions in other countries that do have SCDs (and sometimes multiple SCDs), do not provide the same level of student services that UK partner institutions now provide. Another member noted that from his own experience, students often demand the service of SCDs (and will not accept assistance from staff) in extreme situations (i.e., abortion, depression, suicide, break-ups, etc.).

**ACTION: Members elected to informally communicate their opinion that the three UK SCDs be retained to UCEAP Director John Marcum.**

#### **VII. London Fall Semester Program Update – Scott Cooper**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Cooper reminded members that EAP's most expensive programs are its 'Great Cities' programs (Rome, Paris, and London). In Rome, UOEAP has worked with ACCENT to find cost savings. In Paris, UOEAP has cut the spring program. For London Fall, SCD Michael Cowan has streamlined the program, cutting the number of courses in the fall semester program from nine to four required courses. He has also renegotiated contracts with both ACCENT and program instructors, as well as moving EAP's offices.

#### **VIII. Egypt Formal Review Report – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** The UCIE subcommittee response report was not completed in time for the meeting. Members will comment on that report either at the May meeting or over email.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked UOEAP consultants what happens when a UCEAP response does not agree with the recommendations made by the formal review committee. They said that typically they only comment on areas where they do not think that EAP could not implement specific recommendations. Members also asked about Arabic language instruction, which was highlighted by the report. Consultant Madewell noted that EAP has a number of partners in the English-speaking world where Arabic is offered. However, within the Arabic world, the only program that offers Arabic instruction is Egypt (mainly due to safety concerns); and many of the Egypt students take language instruction at the Arabic Language Institute (ALI). That said, there may be other opportunities to study Arabic beyond the American University of Cairo (AUC) within Egypt. He remarked that the Cairo program is small, and future expansion is limited by

the high costs of that program (it is capped at 25 students). He added that EAP could balance this program if it had a better reciprocity with AUC; however they have been reluctant to send more students to UC. There may also be some opportunities at the graduate level, but AUC is not predominantly a graduate institution (although they do have some masters programs). AUC has also not been very interested in faculty exchange. He added that UOEAP is considering a strategic planning committee for the Middle East region in general. It is anticipated that demand for Arabic programs will be high (given that Arabic courses at American institutions generally fill up and are impacted).

**ACTION: The Egypt Formal Review was postponed to the May meeting. Analyst Todd Giedt will forward an example of a UCIE formal review from last year.**

**IX. 2007-08 Formal Reviews – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Madewell reminded members that new programs are reviewed after three years and existing programs are reviewed on a ten-year cycle. This means that three to four programs are reviewed per year. Beginning this year, these reviews also include site visits. He asked members to approve the following slate of programs to undergo a formal review in 2007-08: Chile (ten-year review); Rome (three-year review); Russia (ten-year review); and Taiwan (ten-year review).

**DISCUSSION:** Members suggested the following faculty members as good candidates to participate in the reviews: Sarah Cline (UCSB) for Chile; Cynthia Kaplan (UCSB) for Russia; and Jane Kuo (UCSD) for Taiwan (lecturer). UCIE member Vincent Resh expressed interest in Russia; and Nancy Guy and Beverly Bossler are interested in serving on the Taiwan formal review committee.

**ACTION: Members approved the slate of programs for formal review for the 2007-08 academic year.**

**X. Lower/Upper Division Course Distinctions – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Madewell handed out distribution 3, and reminded members that for every course that is approved for UC students, a course approval request (CAR) is generated from the local study center, which UCEAP reviews. He informed members that for new courses, a CAR is generated and sent to UCEAP. If a student is already taking a course under the assumption that it will be accepted as upper-division (when it is actually a lower-division course), UCEAP generally approves the course as upper-division for one year only (so as not to disadvantage the students currently enrolled in the course) with the proviso that it will be lower-division beginning the next year. For whatever reason, UK CARs were not being generated by study center staff, but by UOEAP staff. One year ago, UCEAP returned this responsibility back to the study center. Students on the campuses preparing to study in the UK were often told that a course (if it had not been taken before) would probably count towards specific requirements (GE, breadth, major requirements); they were also told whether the course would be lower- or upper-division. The problem arose when a number of courses came into question. There was also some confusion as to how UCEAP was making these lower- and upper-division distinctions, which UCEAP clarified for UK study center staff (see handout 3). He noted that there is a lot of variation in lower- and upper-division courses across the campuses, so it is not surprising that there is similar

variability among the courses at different host universities. He noted that this problem has been solved.

**DISCUSSION:** Members remarked that this is a significant problem for students studying abroad. They encouraged consultants to develop a rational way of facilitating this process. They added that it would be beneficial if all campuses recognized an upper-division course once it has been approved as such by UCEAP. However, they assessed the current UCEAP practice of course approval as reasonable.

**XI. System-wide Review of the Coordinating Committee Affairs (CCGA) Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 694 and Proposed New Senate Regulation (SR) 695 –**

*Anita Guerrini*

**ISSUE:** Analyst Todd Giedt briefed committee members on the background of this issue.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the relevance of this senate regulation to EAP. They acknowledged that although EAP does not have a substantial amount of graduate programming currently, this could change in the future. They felt that it was important to request that a clause be added to remove EAP programs from the definition of ‘off-campus’, as contained in the second paragraph of the revised Senate regulation 694.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter stating that EAP is exempt from the definition of an ‘off-campus’ center by February 15, 2007.

**XII. “In Association with UC” Degree Proposal – Anita Guerrini/John Marcum**

**ISSUE:** Chair Guerrini noted that this proposal was rejected by the Academic Council.

Consultant John Marcum presented a revised draft of the proposal, noting that the new proposal (1) limits these degrees to a select few institutions would be chosen carefully with consultation with UCIE; and (2) it is also more specific as to what is required of students to earn these degrees. He reminded members that the rationale behind this proposal is that all of the academic institutions with which EAP partners have been “accredited” by UCIE. Since these institutions send reciprocity students who take a significant amount of UC courses, their diplomas should note this in some way. He emphasized that these degrees are not and should not be considered dual degrees. The benefits of “in association with UC” degrees include increasing the value of the academic work that reciprocity students do at UC, as well as giving EAP more leverage/influence with partner institutions. He reemphasized that all “in-association” institutions/programs would have already received Senate validation through UCIE.

**DISCUSSION:** Consultant Scott Cooper outlined some of the benefits that EAP would enjoy if this proposal was enacted. First, it would increase participation in EAP’s academic programs, which gives UOEAP a certain amount of currency with these partners to negotiate alternate types of agreements when 1:1 exchanges are not possible. He also refuted a number of points made by the standing committees on Academic Council. First, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) maintained that UC has no control over the content or quality of the degree awarded by the partner institution. Consultant Cooper said that all EAP programs have been vetted and approved by UCIE for their academic quality. He added that UC has direct control over the content of the courses that reciprocity students enroll in while they are studying at a UC



campus. He noted that all EAP graduate reciprocity students are vetted with the appropriate graduate department (however, many ‘undergraduate’ reciprocity students do enroll in graduate courses on an ad-hoc basis). Finally, the revised proposal adds specificity to the original proposal. Some members felt that UCEP’s concerns stem from the fear that UC does not control the rest of the degree (outside of UC) that these reciprocity students earn; therefore UCEP did not feel comfortable with having the UC imprimatur on their diplomas. Consultant Cooper responded that this may be a problem of semantics; it may be better to state that these students participated in a UC program for specified amount of time. Members brought up the notion of giving these students a certificate; however Consultant Marcum informed them that this is already possible so it would not add much. He added that this is envisioned as stepping stone to an eventual dual degree.

Members acknowledged that the demand for such degrees among reciprocity students is certainly high, but they also recognized that selecting certain partners could be problematic in the sense that other institutions might be irked or even insulted by not being selected for such a program. At the same time, they felt that convincing Academic Council to accept this proposal with the intent of allowing all EAP partners to participate in the program would not be easy. A number of members also felt that if this proposal were to go forward, one year should be the designated amount of time that reciprocity students should study in residence at a UC campus in order to earn such a degree. That said however, members expressed the viewpoint that overcoming the stated objections from Academic Council would indeed be difficult.

**ACTION: Members unanimously voted to withdraw the current proposal, however they decided to correct a number of the misconceptions contained in Academic Council’s response.**

### **XIII. Executive Session**

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

**ACTION: Write a letter to John Marcum regarding the UK—suggest reconsidering this proposal and retaining the third SCD.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m

Attest: Anita Guerrini, UCIE Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst