

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 20, 2008

I. Chair's Announcements – Chair Lobo

Chair Lobo did not have any announcements.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.

III. EAP Director's Report – Michael Cowan

REPORT: Director Cowan remarked that coming into this position he felt that one of his initial priorities would be the development a five-year plan for EAP, not necessarily working on the budget. Such a plan would have focused on strengthening the ties between UCEAP and the campuses, as well as integrating EAP activities with campuses and third-party provider programs. In mid-August, President Yudof directed him to develop a budget plan along certain guidelines and to focus solely on the next three years in doing so. President Yudof has asked him to provide an analysis of EAP income and expenditures, as well as restricted and unrestricted funds (EAP does not have any restricted funds); a detailed budget of UCEAP that is broken out by function; and a more detailed analysis of the study center reductions. He also reported that President Yudof has asked UCEAP to prepare for a 10% cut to its budget. Incidentally, last year UCEAP was asked to cut its budget by 15% and the number of staff positions by 20%. UCEAP reached both targets; it is now down to 80 staff members. However, Director Cowan stressed that one of EAP's major goals of EAP should be enhancing access to international education even in tough times, as there is evidence that third-party provider programs are skewed towards upper-income students.

He also asked UCIE to consider the following six 'policy' questions in its deliberations:

1. What constitutes an appropriate subvention from General and Opportunity Funds for EAP, given its nature as a formal UC instructional program?
2. How valuable to the Academic Senate are EAP's immersion and exchange programs?
3. How valuable to the Academic Senate are EAP's Language and Culture programs?
4. How valuable to the Academic Senate are EAP's course-crediting and curricular integration arrangements?
5. Are there viable academic oversight models for UC students abroad that do not require the presence of UC faculty as study center directors? [*UOEAP has suggested reducing the number of faculty study center directors and increasing the amount of liaison officers. This raises the issue of whether there are mechanisms that would allow faculty from California to provide oversight over particular programs. They are looking for Senate advice on such models.*]
6. Are the administrative expenditures attributable to UCEAP appropriate to the services provided and functions performed by that office? [*This does not include campus operations or study center operations.*]

DISCUSSION: Director Cowan noted that Jerry Kissler recommended a one million dollar subvention in the Ad-Hoc Review Report to defray the cost of unusually high EAP programs, but it is not clear where this number came from. UCEAP currently receives \$17 million per year from the General Fund; this excludes education and registration fees (education fees are returned to UCOP, which are distributed to the campuses). UCEAP also pays a certain amount per student to the campuses to help defray the cost of foreign students. The new budget model would reverse this arrangement whereby the portion of MCOI monies that UCEAP has traditionally received would be gradually reduced, and would be substituted with student fees. Therefore, the new budget model would depend on current enrollments (registration fees) rather than the history of past enrollments (MCOI as part of the base budget). Another issue is the accountability of funding for the campuses, which play a critical role in generating students. Under this model, campus funding would have to come out of the General Fund. Members commented that such a funding model contains a number of pitfalls. If campus offices are not appropriately funded by their respective EVCs to support recruitment, then UCEAP will not receive the funding it needs to support EAP programs. UCEAP is also cutting back on its expenses, and a number of services (that were previously provided to the campus offices) are being lost. Members wondered if these monies could be earmarked as a budget line item. It is also expected that the number of EAP students may fall. One option to replace this funding (and share costs) through the development of consortia with other universities, but this will take time. Another issue is that if UCEAP shifts to a fee-based model, then certain fees (such as registration fees) cannot be used for academic purposes, but must be used for student services. It was noted that The Regents have expressly delegated academic oversight to the faculty; therefore, it is important that EAP retains its academic components. Director Cowan noted that there are certain academic functions that EAP is not doing (e.g., research). That said, there are certain academic services that EAP could provide to UC faculty and other units of the University via its study centers. Guest CCD Chair Chip Leshner added that EAP does not have any faculty FTEs; one really cannot call EAP an ‘academic program’ without faculty FTEs.

IV. Study Center Academic Oversight/ UCEAP Faculty Appointments through 2012: Study Center Directorships and Visiting Professorships– *Chair Lobo/Bruce Madewell*

ISSUE: Bruce Madewell recounted the fact that over the past year, UCEAP’s budget was reduced 15% and its staff reduced by 20%; UCEAP’s budget may suffer another cut of approximately 10% this year. In the first round of cuts, 85% of them were made in the systemwide office; EAP study center costs may need to be reduced to meet these additional cuts. The proposed budget plan would markedly reduce study center costs through the elimination of some study centers and consolidations of others. The notion of having UC faculty abroad also needs to be examined critically. There may be less need for faculty at all sites now. UCEAP is proposing that over time it will look at each study center with study center faculty directors, and as the directorship appointment expires, look at the need for a directorship at that location critically. The plan is to reduce the number of directorships by two-thirds. There are three models of oversight: faculty directors, non-faculty resident directors, and liaison officers. There are already examples of non-faculty resident directors at some study centers (Siena, Italy), and liaison officers at other sites (mainly in Asia). Each faculty study center director costs EAP approximately \$120,000; some European sites are even more expensive (e.g., London). Liaison officers cost much less (approximately a .20 FTE commitment); some are even free. Currently, Brazil is one site where an alternative model of oversight could be implemented, as UCEAP has

located a faculty member at UCI who is willing to work either as a full-time study center director or on a part-time basis with occasional trips to Brazil. The appropriate use of technology, as well as competent staff members, would be key components of such arrangements. Many of EAP's partner universities now have very comprehensive international student offices, which is different from the past when many study centers were created. Director Cowan remarked that he would be interested in developing ongoing groups of faculty, or 'advisory committees,' that could provide additional oversight over specific programs that have these alternate study center directorship models in place. As a final note, he added that eliminating or significantly modifying the study center director model also has the advantage of opening up positions of academic oversight to whole new cohorts of faculty (e.g., junior faculty, faculty with children, etc.).

DISCUSSION: One member articulated the following issues: 1) current arrangements will need to be fine-tuned in light of the current fiscal environment; 2) the continuity of liaison officers; 3) academic oversight issues with not having someone in the field; and 4) face-to-face consultation with students. It was mentioned that there is a kind of synergy with UC faculty members who come back to the campuses in terms of talent development. While faculty members on their respective home campuses could address some of these issues, there would be some loss (familiarity with students, culture, etc.). Chair Lobo remarked that one must maintain EAP's status as an academic entity; which often involves sending faculty members abroad for the purpose of oversight. Director Cowan responded that many non-EAP programs send faculty abroad as teaching faculty. Consultant Madewell said that a number of liaison officers have been with EAP for relatively long periods of time. EAP also have a number of former UC students/faculty all over the world who understand UC culture and can be hired. Some services could actually be done by 'sensitized' staff. Another member noted that this mandate is getting in the way of a sensible policy. This is a great opportunity to cut-back, but it is a bad idea to deconstruct all study centers within a three-year time frame (e.g., a catastrophic collapse of all study center directors); a five- to ten-year time frame might be more appropriate. Parental concern is still another issue, many may not like the fact that there is not a UC faculty member abroad to watch over their children; without study center directors, they may not want to send their children abroad. Other members observed that this seems to be a knee-jerk response; the cost of rebuilding these programs later on when funding is restored would be very significant. Council of Campus Director Chip Leshner also noted that much of the costs of oversight would fall onto the campuses as UCEAP's budget is cut further. Currently, campuses do not have the funding to adequately address this.

V. State Department Travel Warnings: The Rothberg School, Hebrew University–
Chair Lobo/Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: Director Cowan related that it seems that President Yudof is interested in reopening EAP Israel. He reminded members that when EAP suspended its operations there in 2002, it concerned safety issues, not academic concerns. A secondary issue is the administrative cost of reopening the program at this time, which could be prohibitive, as there is not a reciprocal relationship (at least in the first year). The costs to students are about \$10,000 per year. Bruce Madewell noted that other closed programs are all now travel warning countries (The Philippines, Kenya, etc.). UCOP would like to see students studying in Israel by fall 2009. He noted that Hebrew University is still a prestigious university, and has maintained a very high

ranking. Instruction is in English, but students are required to study Hebrew while they are at that program. Courses outside the Rothberg School are in Hebrew, so students would need appropriate language proficiency to take those courses. EAP will not have a study center; therefore, university staff, and perhaps a liaison officer, will need to be hired. It is EAP's preference to only have year-long students enrolled in the program. This would require an 'exception to policy' (of the travel warning policy), which UCOP would need to do. The University would also have to accept the significant liability costs. Since 2002, UCOP has hired an international risk assessment firm is IJET. Regional assessments are also done. UCOP's risk management office expertise and capacity has also increased. Finally, a more elaborate waiver form is being envisioned that students will need to sign if they want to study in countries that carry a state department warning.

DISCUSSION: Members expressed some concern over giving 'preferential treatment' to Israel, when other programs that carry State Department travel warnings are still closed.

ACTION: Members approved the plan for reopening the Israel program at The Rothberg School at Hebrew University.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership – Martha Winnacker/Todd Giedt

REPORT: Executive Director Martha Winnacker described the protocol for the Senate. Senate bylaws govern communication between the standing committees, the Academic Council, and the Administration. In brief, the Chair of the Academic Council and the Senate communicates to the President, and the President communicates directly to The Regents. She noted that the budget is a significant issue this year; UCPB, UCFW, and the Academic Council are receiving regular updates on the budget. UCRP is also under stress. Establishing a solid shared-governance relationship with President Yudof is also a priority. The Assembly will meet on December 10th; any Senate member has the right to attend, but not to make motions or vote.

VII. Budget: Draft UOEAP Business Model – Chair Lobo/Director Cowan

ISSUE: Members asked for the key differences between the current proposal and the budget proposal that was rejected by UCOP last year. Director Cowan responded that there are two differences: 1) Make more explicit the funds that are used to help fund campus activities; and 2) that a larger base funding remain in the budget (approximately \$4.4m). He also clarified that there really was not a 'budget model' submitted last year; UCEAP asked for an \$8m subvention, which was rejected. The Kissler model proposed that the cost to the students be no higher than if the student had remained on his or her own campus; this restriction was removed in President Yudof's instructions to Director Cowan in preparing this budget. The new budget also specifies which cuts UCEAP will take to reach its budget goals (e.g., cutting study center director operations). A couple of fee changes have also been proposed. There is also no guarantee that the funds that would be taken from UCEAP would go directly to the campuses; this is a campus issue, which must be dealt with via campus structures.

DISCUSSION: Guest CCD Chair Leshner remarked that even with sympathetic campus administrations, everything is being cut in these hard economic times. One member asked why non-UC students are not encouraged (or even allowed) to participate on EAP programs, which could be a potential revenue source? Director Cowan replied that this is an appropriate critique,

but it is outside the limits of this specific budget plan. If and when a five-year plan is developed, such initiatives would be included. Members suggested that instead of looking at third-party providers, EAP should become one. It was also noted that this budget plan does not address the campus issues either. While the current value of UCEAP can be debated, it does do certain things that cannot be replaced by the campuses. For one, it has relationships with partner universities, which is actually a real resource. Members also discussed the most appropriate presentation of the committee's points to Academic Council, which might include the documentation of past agreements, the role that EAP plays in the academic integration of students' study abroad experience into their UC curriculum, health and safety issues, and the high ranking of EAP institutions (within the top tier universities).. Documenting the student participation rates at various universities are also important. However, it was noted that these student participation rates often mixes apples and oranges. Presenting participation as FTEs is important, as simple participation rates (such as the ones reported in the Kissler Report) often include two-week student trips. It was also noted that The Kissler report treats reciprocity agreements as an encumbrance. Rather, reciprocity students are the crème de la crème of these top international universities; they add international value to UC campuses, as UC has a relatively low level of internationalization. UCEAP is also putting together a case for the role that EAP plays in language learning as well, especially through its immersion programs. EAP's Academic integration is also a key component. Members agreed that if one were to build an education abroad program from scratch, one would want to build many of the structures that already exist within UCEAP. If EAP does cease to exist, many other universities would grab a number of the agreements that UCEAP currently maintains. Finally, members doubted that UCEAP could raise fees "in a manner that will not unduly discourage student participation in EAP programs." (slide 3 of the proposal)

One member also asked about the underlying tendency to decentralize EAP to the campuses. Director Cowan explained that it is coming directly from The Regents, and more specifically from Monitor, which is in-line with UCOP's restructuring efforts. Although UCEAP is one of the few 'academic' units administered by UCOP, it is being treated as a business unit. The campuses may want to bid on UCEAP, which would remove approximately \$30 million of funding for UCEAP off UCOP's books.

ACTION: 1) Director Cowan will provide more policy documents and other documentation over the next two days. 2) Chair Lobo will draft two letters—one in response to the budget plan and the other will address accountability.

VIII. New program options; changes to options within existing programs and projected start dates – Bruce Madewell

a) Engineering and Science Research, Osaka University, Japan, Fall 2009

This is a new option at Osaka, and is a research-oriented program where students will have the opportunity to actively engage in research. The program option will have a 3.0 GPA requirement and the instruction will be in English.

b) International Relations, University of Tokyo, Fall 2009

This is an opportunity in the University of Tokyo's School of Public Policy for graduate students, especially masters' students.

c) Interdisciplinary Thai Studies, Thammasat University, Summer 2009

While this program is somewhat limited in coursework and units, it will be attractive to students; it grew out of the program review committee's report from two years ago of the Thailand program.

d) Concepcion: Universidad de Santo Tomás, Fall 2008

The Concepcion program was reviewed favorably by UCIE two years ago. Because of some logistical problems with the former university, UCEAP has moved the program to the Universidad de Santo Tomas, which is only being used as a platform for the program. As in the past, local Concepcion faculty hired by UC will teach in the program.

e) Foundation for the Educational Exchange between Canada and the United States of America (Killam Fellowships Program); MOU

There is a program in Canada at the University of British Columbia (UBC); the problem is that UC students do not want to go to Canada. The Killam Foundation provides opportunities for Canadian and US students to engage in reciprocal exchanges with partner universities. In the first year, EAP would send its students to UBC; Killam would send its students to UC campuses. If successful, EAP would open this program up to other Killam university partners within Canada. There is a provision for only two UC students per year, who will get a \$10,000 stipend, health insurance; they also are required to travel somewhere else in Canada as part of the program.

ACTION: Members accepted these program options.

IX. UC Freshman Summer Start on EAP; preliminary discussion– Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: Bruce Madewell noted that over the years EAP has expanded summer programs, sophomore programs, etc. However, EAP has not paid attention to entering freshmen students. Lancaster University in the United Kingdom is receptive to hosting UC freshmen on their campus; they already have a 'pre-sessional' program for their own students. Lancaster University provides good services for students, and would be a safe place to test this. Other locations might include the Monté Verde program in Costa Rica would be one possibility. Consultant Madewell asked members to consider the following questions: What kind of requirements would we want to impose on these students? What type of high school GPAs should EAP consider?

DISCUSSION: CCD Chair Leshar noted that 77% of high school seniors do want to study abroad; however, only two percent of college students actually do. Such a program would facilitate increased participation rates. Chair Lobo articulated the need for some kind of vetting process. Members remarked that it would not necessarily be GPA as the prime criterion, maturity might be better. Bruce Madewell noted that a cost proposal has not been put together yet, but it would be a reciprocal relationship and would have a very small net cost on EAP.

ACTION: UCIE members supported the initial proposal; Consultant Madewell will develop it further.

X. Good Academic Standing and Study on EAP: A Pilot Study– Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: EAP consultants presented an initial proposal to allow all UC students in good academic standing on a UC campus to have access to study abroad on certain EAP programs

(those that will allow them). This proposal would increase by 14% the cohort of eligible students for EAP programs. Last year, UCIE approved lowering a number of programs' entry GPA requirements to 2.85.

DISCUSSION: One criticism (of such a policy) is the lowering of academic standards. Consultant Madewell responded that this policy would not apply to immersion programs, but self-construct programs. Another member commented that it could ruin some students' good standing if they were to fail in their courses while abroad. Certainly, campus offices would want to interview low-GPA students. Director Cowan remarked that this should be looked at in terms of an experiment, from which one would want to accumulate data.

ACTION: Members gave tentative approval for this initiative/pilot study.

XI. New programs under exploration: Bogazici University, Istanbul– Bruce Madewell
Consultant Madewell noted that there is student interest in opening a program at Bogazici University in Istanbul Turkey. Other EAP programs in Turkey include Bilkent University and Middle Eastern Technical University.

ACTION: Bruce will present a full program proposal in the spring.

XII. EAP Russia Program– Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: While the Russia program remains of great strategic importance to EAP and the University as a whole, UCEAP needs to ask itself it can afford this program. UCEAP must pay for the facilities, the study center director, staff, and the International University of Moscow (IUM) faculty. In short, UCEAP loses money on each student who participates in the program. IUM may increase its fees this year as well. IUM is not an academic partner, but views EAP as a funding source. The program was reviewed last year, and it did receive high marks. Recruiting new students is key to keeping this program viable, but it may not be enough if IUM imposes draconian fee increases. UCEAP is asking for support to 'suspend' (not cancel) this program for fiscal reasons if it becomes absolutely necessary. Director Cowan remarked that some sort of consortia might be possible with this program, but this will take time to develop. There is not enough existing English language instruction at other universities in Moscow to move the program to another institution.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if a study center director is needed for this program. Consultant Madewell responded that given the nature of the program, a director is necessary. UCEAP is committed to a study center director for the next two years.

ACTION: The committee gave tentative (yet reluctant) approval to suspend this program on a purely fiscal basis if it becomes absolutely necessary (e.g., IUM fees are raised).

Post-Meeting Note: IUM did not raise its fees for the 2008-09 academic year.

XIII. New program options; changes to options within existing programs and projected start dates – Bruce Madewell

Consultant Madewell noted that the site-visits for the Barbados and the Hungary (Richard Matthew) programs were recently completed. The programs reviews for Singapore and Taiwan have been postponed to the spring

a) Taiwan Review

Action: *Members will send a UCIE nomination to replace Jianwen Su (UCSB) on the Taiwan Review Committee*

b) Approval of 2008-09 program review questions for Barbados and Hungary

ACTION: *Members approved the program review questions. Members also agendized the timing issue of the questions for the March 2009 meeting.*

c) Approval of program reviews to be conducted 2009-10: Korea (ten year review cycle), China (ten year review cycle); JPIS and Fudan-Shanghai (three year review cycle); FU-BEST-Berlin (three year review cycle); and Madrid Summer L/C (three year review cycle)

ACTION: *Members approved the review schedule.*

d) UCIE recommendations for UC faculty to serve on 2009-10 Program Review Committees (see c. above) are requested for February 2009 meeting

ACTION: *Members will transmit their recommendations to UCEAP consultants in time for the February meeting.*

XIV. New Business

ACTION: *Members approved the 2007-08 UCIE Annual Report with minor amendments.*

XV. Executive Session

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

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