

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 7, 2008**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Chair Lobo*

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Lobo remarked that this is an important meeting, given the proposed 15 percent cut and the Senate response to the Ad-Hoc Report on International Education.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the Minutes from the November 15, 2007 Meeting

C. Draft Correspondence Regarding UCAF's Request on the EAP Travel Restriction Policy

ACTION: Members approved Items A. and B. of the consent calendar with minor revisions to the minutes; Item C. was moved to executive session.

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

REPORT: Director O'Connell reported on the proposed EAP budget cut of 15 percent, as well as progress made on the budget over the past year. He stressed that a ten percent cut would have been bearable; a 15 percent cut cannot be done without really cutting some of EAP's academic programs. Since July 2007, UCEAP has cut its FTEs by 9.5 percent; another 10.5 percent will be cut by June 2008, for a total of approximately 20 percent. UCEAP will also sublet one-third of its office space. Much of its print material will also be moved to web sites. In all, 60 percent of the savings will come from down-sizing at UCEAP. Five study center directorships have been cut--in the United Kingdom, Hungary, France (in Bordeaux), Rome, and the Netherlands. UCEAP is also requesting approval from UCIE to cut the Critical Studies and AUP programs in Paris, Toulouse, and the Monterrey Tec in Mexico. UCEAP has also begun to cap programs with a high per student cost—one example is the American University of Cairo (AUC). UCEAP is also asking for an administrative supplement of \$1,100 for the 'Great Cities' programs in London, Paris, and Rome. Finally, UCEAP will cut 25 percent of the supplemental funding that it currently gives to the campus offices (\$250,000 of the current one million dollars). That said, there is certainly pressure from UCOP to cut more. UCEAP is currently looking into cutting one study center directorship in Spain (Granada) and China. On the positive side, these cuts are forcing an acceleration of consolidating many of UCEAP's processes. However, it renders mute the entire ad-hoc report, which had projected a goal of doubling enrollments of students studying abroad; EAP had been placed at the center of that growth. The proposed program in Argentina has also been put on hold. While UCEAP continues to look at future programming in the Middle East, any recommendations will need to be considered in that context for the time being.

UCOP has also asked UCEAP to move to a fee-based budget model. In response, UCEAP presented a revised version of the Kissler model, which included a General Fund appropriation of about \$9.5 million, but this was rejected. UCEAP believes that the 'Kissler' numbers will not work, but would result in a 40 percent cut and would require a completely different kind of EAP that exists today. UCEAP has established a strategic planning group to look at all of its programming and processes (including its financial processes) over the next five years.

DISCUSSION: Chair Lobo asked for a table comparing UCEAP budget numbers and the Kissler numbers; the UCEAP proposed budget was also requested. Director O’Connell explained that UCEAP proposed budget would set student fees at \$8,600; this would produce revenues of approximately \$21 million. However return-to-aid of 30 percent reduces that revenue to only \$15 million, which is simply not enough to run programs. Kissler had proposed that EAP would be given \$3.5 million in the short-run, but this is still not enough as it costs about \$25 million to run the current slate of programs even with a number of cut-backs. For example, even if all study center directorships were cut, UCEAP could still not operate its programs under the Kissler budget model; study centers themselves would have to be cut severely (along with the ‘Great Cities’ programs) to make such a model begin to work. In sum, the UCEAP proposal showed that EAP would still need an approximation of \$9.5 million to run its programs. There is also the issue of re-defining EAP. If it is an academic program, it should retain General Fund allocations. If it is only a service provider, then moving to a funding model based on student fees is more appropriate. UCEAP’s proposal is a hybrid of these two models. Director O’Connell also reported that in terms of recruitment, UCOP has not begun recruiting for a permanent director; Scott Cooper will be stepping down at the end of June 2008, but Bruce Madewell will also be staying on. UCEAP is also taking advantage of UCOP’s Voluntary Separation Program. A workload analysis has also been put together.

DISCUSSION: If the point of departure is simply that going abroad is a good thing, then one could theoretically compromise the quality of certain programs while saving as many programs as possible. However, if the philosophy is different—e.g., preserving the best of EAP, a different model is warranted. For example, one might want to restrict access to certain students to a few solid programs, as well as study center directorships, in order to ensure quality of these few programs. Director O’Connell responded that maintaining academic quality remains a priority. Cairo is one example. While there was pressure to eliminate Cairo, it was decided academically that they could not live without a program like this in the Middle East even though it made financial sense to cut it. Moscow is another example. Members were also interested the ‘Great Cities’ programs; consultants clarified that they are expecting an answer from UCEAP at the end of the week regarding these programs. Council of Campus Directors (CCD) members suggested that it may make sense to cut some of the larger enrollment programs in favor of the quality programs. There will also be some services that may need to be moved to the campuses due to the cuts in central staffing at UCEAP. The only way to handle the cuts at the campus level is to reduce the number of students going abroad in these programs; campus advising will simply significantly be curtailed. It was stressed that the academic program/course approval processes will not be cut; faculty will still approve these. While research shows that study centers are important, the real question is whether EAP needs faculty or staff at these study centers. One model may be to rotate faculty through a number of study centers in order to maintain a faculty presence. Another issue is that local staff at study centers are often protected by local labor laws; it is difficult to cut them quickly.

Director O’Connell suggested that it may be appropriate for UCIE to request that UCEAP only be subjected to the 10 percent cut that the rest of the University is facing. Chair Lobo emphasized that the justification of EAP as an ‘academic program’ really needs to be made. Another option is to ask UCOP to forgive repayment of UCEAP’s debt, and give that to the

campuses; this was supported by the CCD Chair, who is a guest of the committee. Associate Dean Bruce Madewell also briefed members on the recruitment process, noting that there are only a small number of study center directorships available with relatively few candidates of interest (only 15).

IV. Strategic Planning Group Charge/Program Suspensions/Cancellations – UCEAP

Associate Director Scott Cooper

ISSUE: In order to accommodate the 15 percent UCOP cut, UCEAP is forwarding the recommendation of its ‘Strategic Committee,’ which is proposing to close the AUP and Critical Studies programs in Paris, as well as Toulouse and Monterrey Tec. UCEAP is also shifting to a model based on fewer UC faculty, while relying more on local faculty. Consultant Cooper also announced that UCEAP is administratively suspending the ‘cross-border’ comparative program at Mexico City for one year. The Casa de California campus has also remained mostly unoccupied due to seismic concerns and subsequent retrofitting. It was also announced that the London House and the Shanghai Center are being closed. The following programs are slated for closure:

- The **AUP program** has been controversial from its beginning, as a number of faculty have felt that it was never up to UC academic standards. It is also a very expensive program. AUP is also planning to move its campus towards the outskirts of Paris as well. Students will be redirected to the Paris Center, where the language requirement (one quarter/semester) has recently been eliminated.
- The **Critical Studies program** is slated for closure due to its high costs. Students may be redirected to other programs that have Critical Studies curriculums; Sciences Po will be retained.
- The **Monterrey Tec** is duplicative with chronic low enrollments. Students with an interest in Monterrey Tec will be diverted to UNAM.
- The **Toulouse program** duplicates programming at Grenoble and Bordeaux. Toulouse suffers from a number of logistical problems such as strikes as well. This closure will also allow EAP to have one less study center director in France.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if the strategic committee will be looking at other study abroad programs (e.g., moving towards third-party providers)? Consultants stated that if a ‘vision’ for EAP is to be constructed, it must be realized in the larger context of campus-based programs. There may be alternatives out there, but there are clear obstacles to going to the Kissler model. There needs to be an acknowledgement of the obstacles; an analysis also needs to be done. Members expressed concern over the absolute removal of the language requirement at the Paris Center program. They felt that it may seriously compromise the character of this program; the suggestion was made to just suspend the language requirement for the Paris Center this year only. It was explained that UCEAP is responding to the campus requests to have an English-only Paris program. Members agreed it would be prudent to suspend the language requirement for the Paris Center program for one year only (and revisiting it next year). Two motions were made and seconded--to close the AUP program and to allow UCEAP to waive the prerequisite of the French language requirement with the provision of remedial French language on-site.

ACTION: 1) Members unanimously endorsed the strategic planning group’s recommendations (closure of AUP, Critical Studies, Monterrey Tec, and Toulouse); and 2) a one-year waiver of the language requirement for the Paris Center program.

V. Status and Strategy Reports – UCEAP Associate Director Cooper

ISSUE: Consultant Cooper briefed members on the status and strategy reports, which are the annual ‘report cards’ for EAP programs.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired into the status of the various centers (London, Mexico City, and Shanghai), as well as the programs in Ghana, Rome, and Russia. It was clarified that these centers were initially established through UCOP’s Office of International Academic Activities (OIAA). It was clarified that both the Shanghai and London centers are most likely closing, but ‘Casa de California’ is being seismically retrofitted (UC owns the building). Regarding the Rome program, and given the current budgetary climate, a Rome director cannot be justified. One member criticized this decision as a purely administrative one without the benefit of the formal review report. Consultant Madewell explained that there is a resident director, there is an immersion study center director nearby, and a local service provider maintains the logistical integrity of the program. He added that there is not another program within EAP’s universe that has the benefit of a sole study center director. Consultants remarked on the Ghana program, observing that although quality is an issue with the Ghana program, its existence speaks to diversity. UCEAP also sent a faculty member this past fall to address issues of safety in that program. The Russia review has been completed and will be seen at the May UCIE meeting.

VI. Systemwide Review of the Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education – Chair Lobo

DISCUSSION: Consultant Cooper remarked that the Report represents a sea-change in the funding model. Regarding the outsourcing of programs to third-party providers, Senate Chair Brown emphasized that if a particular approach to funding jeopardizes particular academic programs, then the Academic Senate should raise the appropriate academic concerns. Members also briefly discussed the international research initiative, agreeing with Chair Brown that it is more of a research initiative; it is not a broader international initiative. One member raised the fact that UC has spent considerable time and resources in the cultivation of a number of international partners abroad only to have the University pull the plug on many of these initiatives.

It was also acknowledged that the formation of the ad-hoc review team was less than optimal. The CCD Chair, speaking as a guest, expressed his concerns that the analysis performed by the CCD should be considered in the final analysis of the ad-hoc report. Consultant Cooper noted that EAP has already received a 15 percent budget cut; it is odd that this was done before the Senate’s response to the ad-hoc review report is in. Chair Brown remarked that the current State budgetary environment is driving the 15 percent cut to EAP, but he clarified that UCOP does not need to consult the Senate on the budget, but the Administration is required to consult on cuts to administrative structures that support academic functions—however, the Senate is not determinative on these issues. UCEAP Director O’Connell remarked that in September UCEAP was told to prepare for a ten percent cut; in December UCEAP was told the cut would be 15 percent. UCEAP has a number of commitments to students and faculty. At the same time,

UCEAP was told that if they switched to a student-fee based model, some of these cuts might be absolved. However, UCEAP's proposal for a fee-based model was recently rejected. Director O'Connell expressed his concerns about the pace about which it was done, and the lack of real understanding of the consequences. Chair Brown responded that he is taking his charge from what comes out of the Senate review.

The committee also expressed concern about EAP's growing programs; attention needs to be paid to quality programs. However, there are certainly tensions between the Kissler report and the ad-hoc review committee. Members agreed to send the divisional international committee reports to Analyst Todd Giedt, who will formulate a UCIE response. That said, members expressed the concern that student access to quality programs remains important.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a UCIE response to the ad-hoc review report for submission to Academic Council.

VII. EAP Budget Cut Proposal – Chair Lobo

DISCUSSION: Chair Lobo agreed with the consultants that a ten percent cut is something that EAP could live with; a 15 percent cut is simply too high. The impact of these cuts on the campuses needs to be stressed, as many services will be exported to the campuses. UCEAP is cutting by 23 percent; cutting back the study centers is more difficult due to the existence of certain labor laws. UCOP has dictated that the Great Cities programs should not be cut. Consultants clarified that in order to break even, UCEAP should be charging \$3,300 per student in these programs, but it is only proposing a \$1,100 student fee. A ten percent cut would probably not mean a campus cut; UCEAP and the study centers could absorb a cut of this magnitude on its own. That said, some workload may be exported to the campuses. One cannot argue that UCEAP is not making administrative cuts, as 60 percent of the cuts are taking place at the UCEAP office. The administration is simply responding to the larger budget crisis. It was also observed that at UCOP, there are some units that are not being cut, some are being cut by five percent, some are being cut by ten percent, and some even more.

VIII. State Senate Resolution No. 18 – Chair Lobo

ISSUE: UCEAP consultants noted that the State Department travel warnings have traditionally informed EAP's sense of the absolute safety of EAP programs. UCEAP does not have the expertise to gauge the safety of a country based on the language in a travel warning. For instance, Israel and the Philippines were suspended because of travel warnings. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) supports this policy as well. While external programs may use 'waivers' for travel warning locations, OGC has advised UCEAP that such waivers may not totally remove UCEAP from responsibility in the case of adverse consequences. Further, EAP has a physical presence in Israel in the form of a study center. The resolution asks UCEAP to allow students to go to programs where the risk is 'less severe.' The language in the travel warning simply does not delineate 'more severe' and a 'less severe' risk. The resolution also mixes 'advisory' and 'warning' inappropriately. There is also no differentiation between a student who is on 'leave' and those on EAP.

DISCUSSION: The Regental mandate to facilitate study abroad in those countries with travel warnings has prompted the OGC to provide language for waivers for non-EAP programs. In a

court of law, few may discern the difference between a UC student on an EAP program and one on a non-EAP program. Waivers may also implicate EAP legally. Consultants noted that UCEAP has not received any dictate from the OGC requesting them to change the travel warning policy as a result of this resolution. In principal, committee members noted that they would very much like to send students to countries with travel warnings, such as Israel. However, the legal protection is simply not there. In addition there is a larger moral question of whether EAP wants to send students to places that are potentially for risky. Factual inaccuracies in the resolution were also mentioned—the resolution states that the travel warning policy forces students to forfeit student aid, which is not true. It also states that it jeopardizes readmission to the University; and it says that they would lose credit because there is no guarantee that units will transfer. These statements are false. A couple of other statements of fact were also noted: 1) Student fees do not go to students, but only financial aid; and 2) this is not an EAP policy, but a UCOP policy.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will formulate a UCIE response to State Senate Resolution No. 18 based on the comments, which will be submitted to Council Chair Brown.

IX. New Business

ISSUE: There was not any new business.

X. 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