

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 14, 2009**

Present: Errol Lobo, Vincent Resh, Ian Coulter, John Haviland, Marc Cioc, Chip Leshner, Jan Kieling, Juan Campo, Michael Cowan, Martha Winnacker, Jorge Busciglio, Geoffrey Manley, Bruce Madewell, Todd Giedt, Alison Crossley, Bjorn Birnir (UCPB/EAP Task Force), and Mary Croughan, Henry Powell, and Interim Provost Larry Pitts

I. Chair's Announcements – Chair Lobo

Chair Lobo did not have any announcements.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Approved.

B. Approval of the Minutes

ACTION: Approved, with minor amendments.

C. Approval of the Questions for the Madrid Summer Language

Action: Approved.

D. Proposed Change to the Director's Manual

ACTION: Approved.

III. EAP Director's Report – EAP Director Michael Cowan

REPORT: Director Cowan commented on the consultancy between UCIE and UOEAP, and regretted that it has not been adequate, especially in the case of the recent study center closures. With regard to the swine flu outbreak, EAP's Mexico City operations are suspended, but students are still able to access the study center in order to finish their coursework. An immediate concern is whether the Mexico City program should be reopened in the summer and fall. He noted that UOEAP has drafted a letter to President Yudof to make an exception to the State Department Travel Warning policy, as in UOEAP's view, the risk of swine flu in Mexico City is no greater than the United States at this time. He asked UCIE for its approval to reopen the Mexico City program for summer and fall 2009.

Director Cowan also addressed the recent study center closures of Padova, Italy, Grenoble, France, and Göttingen, Germany. He acknowledged that a large number of letters and emails that have been received regarding the Padova Study Center closure. He emphasized that all of the programs in Italy, Germany, and France are first-rate. Quality is therefore not an issue, but given the low enrollments and revenues, UOEAP cannot continue with the present administrative structures for these programs at this time. He differentiated between cutting the structure of the study center and cutting the program itself—he hopes that these programs can be reopened at some point in the future. Enrollments for Italy, France, and Germany are down for academic year 2009-10.¹ In particular, the Grenoble program has only had four science and engineering

¹ Consultant Bruce Madewell reported that the Germany enrollments are down from 148 in 2008-09 to 76 (projected) in 2009-10; the Italy enrollments are only at 456 for 2009-10, which can be compared to a five-year

students since 2004. Part of this problem is based in the fact that most science and engineering students do not have the requisite language skills to successfully complete this program. Like Grenoble, immersion programs require a certain level of language; all of these programs have suffered because of this requirement. While intensive language programs (ILPs) have helped in this regard, they are really expensive. The Padova program itself is running a \$300,000 deficit. In terms of savings, he said that UOEAP will accrue approximately \$400,000² from the closure of these study centers/programs. UOEAP is also running a deficit, which it must continue to pay down to UCOP as well.

Director Cowan welcomed any forthcoming UCIE comments on his February Strategic Plan, which was distributed with the March UCIE agenda. The Strategic Plan addresses a five-year plan for recruitment on the campuses, fund raising, and building an EAP endowment that could be used for student scholarship and other activities. He also briefly spoke of EAP becoming a third-party provider to both the UC campuses and others. Such EAP services will have to be competitive with those offered by other third-party providers however. Indeed, there are programs and services, such as UC faculty-led excursions, that the campuses can do much better than EAP. In that sense, Director Cowan does not see UOEAP in direct competition with campus programs. There may also be things that third-party providers can do better than EAP, but these programs/services may come at higher cost to UC students.

DISCUSSION: Members spoke of an alternative strategy of investing in EAP's programs, rather than cutting them in this downturn. Some members observed that cutting these programs is very bad for EAP from a public relations perspective; the process was problematic as well. The relationship between UC and the University of Padova will also be hurt; this should also be considered. Another member commented that given that the Padova staff were already terminated on April 1st, it really did look like a *fait accompli* without any real consultation with UCIE. The thoughtful responses from study center directors and others have also been rendered irrelevant. Director Cowan responded that while the Padova staff are first-rate, they are also numerous and very expensive. If there is a way to operate the program on a less-expensive basis, UOEAP remains open to these options without the administrative burden. He also urged the establishment of processes that will allow for due diligence in a timely manner. He added that the comments from the study center directors are indeed very thoughtful, but they do not make comparisons between programs or study centers. Absent an unlikely infusion of cash, hard choices need to be made. The staff reductions are in part necessary due to Italian labor laws, which require mandatory cost-of-living increases. Director Cowan stressed that it is hoped that EAP can reopen its program at Padova within a couple of years, and the Göttingen agreement can still be used to promote the exchange of graduate students. On the other hand, Grenoble is more troubling, as it is very difficult to attract significant numbers of science and technology undergraduate students with the required language skills (two years of French language). Director Cowan emphasized that EAP has been promoting programs in science and technology for some time, particularly in Asia. However, the Grenoble program does not appeal to a specific constituency.

average of 551. France enrollments are estimated at 401 for 2009-10, which is actually up from a five-year average of 351.

² The \$400,000 is a complicated figure, and is not intended to be taken as an exact figure of savings accrued this year.

One member remarked that more and more students are going to third-party providers, but at the same time, there is some controversy over the actual number of students going on third-party providers. The lack of formal records by the Registrars is problematic due to lack of funding, as these records could be used to evaluate how many students are studying abroad on third-party programs. EAP Director Cowan argued that mechanisms need to be put into place that would systematize the collection of this information. Consultant Bruce Madewell added that the Registrars are poised to start collecting a minimum amount of data.

IV. EAP Task Force Update, Part A

ISSUE: Director Cowan briefed members on the financial model that the Task Force is considering, noting that EAP students would not pay their Education and Registration fees while abroad, but they would be paying an “EAP fee”, and remain registered on their home campus. There is also a proposed subvention of \$4 million for the 2009-10 fiscal year. It was asked if the EAP fee going to increase at the same rate as the Education and Registration fees. Director Cowan responded that that is his understanding, but the proposed Governance Board would oversee EAP fee rate increases. Bjorn Birnir, who is a member of UCPB and is serving on the EAP Task Force, remarked that these fees should be enough to sustain EAP as long as UOEAP is not required to support reciprocity students. Director Cowan also noted that the EAP Task Force will not decide where UOEAP will be relocated; this decision will be left to a proposed governance board. One thing that UOEAP is looking at are places where a UC faculty resident director will add value and those sites where local liaison officers add specific value. Student support is an important issue—to what extent can this support be provided by local staff and which services must be provided by UC study center directors? In England and Australia, UOEAP is looking at alternate models with respect to study center directors. One such model would be a remote director on a campus that would periodically travel to the respective country.

Regarding governance, Director Cowan noted that there is a proposal to form a governance board, which would consist of representatives of campus senior administrative leadership, a UCOP budget representative, UCIE/Senate representation, and representatives from the campus EAP offices. This group would be responsible for the performance/leadership of UOEAP; the financial aspects of EAP’s operations; and the review and recommendation of annual budgets to the Provost. It would not replace UCIE in terms of its plenary authority over curriculum. The consulting relationship between UCIE and the Governance Board needs to be worked out however. It is anticipated that this group will be formed by the start of the next fiscal year.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that historically UOEAP has been isolated, and from that standpoint the establishment of a governance board is good. However, it could be problematic if the Governance Board has the authority to review the director. Senate representation is another important issue, however it is very difficult to separate academic concerns from purely administrative ones. However, if the Governance Board sees itself more as a managerial board, then a host of issues could ensue, and this is fundamentally different than a consulting relationship. Chair Lobo remarked that the Governance Board is being developed on the model that was developed for UC Press; however, UOEAP is very different from the UC Press. As it stands now, the Governance Board will be headed by an EVC; UCIE will have representation. UCPB Guest Bjorn Birnir commented that it is important to maintain a line

between the Governance Board and UCIE. Chair Lobo proposed that UCIE should submit its own comments on the ideal form of an oversight board to present to the EAP Task Force.

The future of EAP study centers is another issue that the EAP Task Force is addressing. Vice Chair Resh recommended that UCIE form a subcommittee to deal with this issue. Director Cowan added that UOEAP is looking for specific skill-sets in its future study center directors, such as building and maintaining institutional relationships. He added that study centers that receive distinct value from faculty directors with specific skills (e.g., language skills, institutional knowledge) may be important to preserve. Institutions with strong student support structures do not necessarily need study centers either. Accordingly, study centers in the United Kingdom and New Zealand have been the first ones to be cut. The question is also being asked to what extent (at those institutions without strong student support) can those functions can be provided by local staff rather than faculty directors. UCPB guest Birnir said that another role for study center directors is the academic oversight of the programs. One member remarked that in the short-term, we may want to make these closures and/or remove study center directors from certain sites with the caveat that they can be easily reopened in the future. Chair Lobo added that one of the reasons for the establishment of the EAP Task Force is the transformation of EAP into a third-party provider to non-UC students, which has not been addressed.

Regarding the budget, Guest Chip Leshner (CCD Chair) cautioned that it is unrealistic to believe that the campuses will be able to solely support reciprocity students. Bjorn clarified that the question is whether campuses will receive money from the General Fund to pay for these reciprocity students; it is not intended that this money would come out of the existing campus budgets.

V. Program Development and Partnerships – Bruce Madewell

REPORT: Consultant Madewell described the following development initiatives:

- A. Preliminary Proposal for Elementary Japanese Language Program, Japanese Language Institute, Tokyo: This is a proposal to open a nine-week summer intensive Japanese language program through the Intercultural Institute of Japan, which would be designed for students with no prior Japanese language training or instruction. The rationale for the program is the limited access to beginning Japanese language courses on several UC campuses; Japanese partner institutions also have a pre-departure prerequisite of at least a semester or more of Japanese language study.
- B. The University of Paris – Sorbonne (Paris IV): This is a proposal to open an EAP immersion program at Paris IV for approximately ten UC undergraduate and graduate students. Students may enroll either for a full academic year or qualified students in the Paris Center fall semester program may extend to the program for the spring semester. All instruction is in French, and Students must have at least two years of UC French study or the equivalent and a minimum 3.2 cumulative and language GPA prior to departure. The anticipated start date of the program is AY 2010. The rationale is the reputation of Paris IV as one of the world’s most prestigious universities, as well as the capacity of the UC Paris Study Center to support an additional immersion program at little or no extra cost.
- C. UC-CIEE Partnerships on Future Programs: EAP is exploring possible collaboration with the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), a large and respected

organization that administers study abroad along with other international education programs.

- D. Program Development Possibilities: In Europe, EAP is exploring opportunities for UC students at the Berlin School of Economics and Law and the Danish Institute for Study Abroad (DIS) in Copenhagen. In South America, EAP is looking at Argentine universities in Buenos Aires to replace its recently closed program in Concepción, Chile.

DISCUSSION: One member commented that the Japanese program could be more of a universal model to supplement UC's language instruction. Members asked if it is sensible to develop any new programs at all given the very difficult budgetary environment. Consultant Bruce Madewell responded that these program options represent very little additional cost, as they would be run out of the confines of already existing structures and study centers. He added that participants in the DIS program would be charged an additional fee to make that program feasible.

VI. Study Center Directorships, 2010-12 – Bruce Madewell

REPORT: As a result of budget changes, OP review, and consequent restructuring and reorganization of UCEAP, the call to faculty for Study Center Directors was temporarily suspended in 2008-09. A special call to faculty will be used to recruit and hire faculty to serve as study center directors in 2010-2012: France, Japan (Tokyo), Egypt (Cairo)—Joint appointment with AUC, residency in-country July thru December each year, and Mexico (Mexico City)—shared directorship with UCOP—Casa. Applications for these positions will be due in the summer and the interview process will begin in the fall. The directorships for 2011-2013 are yet to be determined. EAP Director Cowan asked the committee for their input on site-specific job descriptions, rather than the generic job descriptions that are used now.

VII. Selection of 2009 Program Review Committees – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Madewell noted that at the March 2009 meeting, he asked for members' preferences on the nominees for the 2009 program review committees.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt sent UCIE's preferences to consultant Madewell via email after the meeting.

VIII. Formal Program Review Reports, 2008-09

UCIE was not able to complete the Hungary review because Richard Matthew was not available.

REPORT: As a member of the Barbados review committee, UCIE Member John Haviland presented his report. In short, the major findings of the review committee were 1) that the University of West Indies could serve as a model for EAP partnerships—there are many opportunities for cultural immersion; and 2) the partnership is currently under-utilized. Another issue in the advising area is that many students interviewed remarked that they had been discouraged from going to Barbados. Therefore, buttressing the advising for this program is important, as it contains opportunities for science, particularly marine science, art, and law. At Barbados, there is a liaison officer at a UC office, but this is just one of many other responsibilities for this person. Other recommendations included administrative reorganization; expansion of the number of internships, and changing the calendar.

ACTION: UCIE could not approve this report at the meeting due to a lack of quorum.

IX. Executive Session, Part A

Minutes were not taken for the executive session.

X. EAP Task Force Update, Part B

ISSUE: Provost Larry Pitts described the Task Force’s first meeting: 1) There was a willingness to assess the future functions of UOEAP; 2) an immediate recognition that historical information sharing had been mediocre; and 3) there are internal problems with the operation of UCIE (meetings, timely consultation, etc.). One functional suggestion was the establishment of a governance board, which would include administrative representatives, campus representatives, and Senate representatives. As currently envisioned, this body would meet three times a year and consider budget and UOEAP relations. In addition to the general governance board, there would be two sub-groups—1) a subgroup on budget (that would be temporary—six months to one year); and 2) a subgroup on planning. Over time, the governing board may also want to work on marketing and recruitment. He described the funding/budget model as follows: Students would pay an “EAP fee”, which would be equivalent to the Education and Registration fees, but would not cover all of EAP activities.³ As there will be a delta between the revenue that UOEAP needs to operate on the Education and Registration fees, Provost Pitts opined that it may be reasonable for a portion of the MCOI to accrue to UOEAP to cover this delta. He added the caveat that “green money” freed up from the new budget model (i.e. the budget for 2009-10) are supposed to be applied to campuses’ internationalization efforts as a whole, but not specifically “ear-marked” to the campus EAP offices.

Provost Pitts also spoke about course articulation, drawing a comparison to BOARS. He proposed that obtaining general education (GE) credit while on EAP could be a very simple systemwide process (and not require a substantial amount of UOEAP staff work); however, earning major course credit would still be a departmental process that cannot be done on a systemwide basis. Towards the latter goal, the current “MyEAP” could be enhanced and utilized as a database of already-approved courses at UC departments to assist departments in major course credit articulation completed on EAP. Provost Pitts also expressed his doubts over the need for “academic oversight” of the programs vis-à-vis study center directors. He remarked that 95% of the activities that a faculty study center director does could be done by local staff or a local liaison officers. He suggested that UC faculty members could instead engage in “airplane tours” to satisfy the requirements for academic oversight, which includes maintaining the academic quality of EAP programs. He said that he remains unconvinced of the need for faculty study center directors to be on-site in order to guarantee “academic excellence”.

DISCUSSION: One member asked about the relationship between UCIE and the Governing Board. He suggested that the Governing Board could assist in defining the pure academic issues that UCIE would be asked to comment on. Council Chair Croughan remarked on the “green money” issue, which is technically unrestricted, drawing a comparison to the money that is supposed to be directed towards graduate support, but in some cases is not. She added that this seems to create a similar system of fungible money, which is also not being audited or tracked.

³ Students would still count as students on the campus.

Provost Pitts responded that this will ultimately fall to the EAP Governance Board. One member commented that this implies that the Governing Board is not a governing body for UOEAP, but for “international education” on the campuses; Provost Pitts confirmed this observation.

Members also broached the subject of the value of study centers and study center directors; it was proposed that a blend of models being suggested might be the most appropriate. There are issues of local culture that a liaison officer simply could not handle. Members noted that study center directors are especially helpful during times of emergencies, such as earthquakes. Other issues include gender/racial discrimination, and sexual harassment; in general, local liaison officers/staff are not very effective in dealing with these situations. Provost Pitts responded that UC needs to make sure that universities have appropriate harassment policies to address these situations. Members commented that the error in this type of thinking is that it ignores the many incongruences between the two institutions that always arise; a faculty study center director has the ability to negotiate such differences. Chair Croughan articulated a number of issues and functions that faculty directors routinely address and perform: student security, safety, and welfare; academic operations and advising; risk management; reciprocity applications and exchange, program development, negotiations of academic standards, local community relations, and relations with partners, institutions and research. Another member remarked that it is really a question of balancing the cuts between study center directors and UOEAP. Provost Pitts responded that so much of these are “one-off antidotes”; Chair Croughan countered that many of these things are much more routine. Provost Pitts stated that there are a couple of options if EAP cannot pay its bills: Either UCOP can agree upon a subsidy amount to run EAP, or the Governing Board, along with the Provost and the Chancellors, can decide if it is worthwhile for EAP to continue. He added that the Task Force is trying to preserve the best parts of EAP, as opposed to closing it entirely.

Chair Croughan raised the issue of UOEAP becoming a third-party provider to students from other universities; this was one of the reasons to form the Task Force, but it still needs to be addressed. Provost Pitts commented that unless EAP can be cheaper than other external programs, this will not succeed either. Chair Lobo remarked that UCIE is establishing two subcommittees on budget and study centers to provide the Task Force with alternatives. Provost Pitts remarked that whatever plan these subcommittees comes up with, it must be executable and financially viable. He added that the third-party provider issue also needs a timeline. Provost Pitts asked that UCIE become actively engaged in a series of teleconferences over the next eight weeks. .

XI. New Business

A. Mexico City Programs, Summer and Fall 2009

ACTION: UCIE approved and supports UOEAP reopening the Mexico City programs for summer and fall 2009.

B. Monthly UCIE Teleconferences

ACTION: Members approved monthly UCIE teleconferences to conduct UCIE’s business and to increase regular consultation with UOEAP.

C. UCIE Subcommittees

ACTION: UCIE approved two subcommittees—a Subcommittees on Budget and a Subcommittee on Study Centers. The membership of the Budget Subcommittee includes

Vince Resh (UCB, Vice Chair), Geoffery Manley (UCSF), and John Haviland (UCSD); the membership of the Study Center Subcommittee includes Errol Lobo (UCSF, Chair), Ian Coulter (UCLA), and Juan Campo (UCSB). These task forces will provide feedback to the Joint EAP Subcommittee.

XII. 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: Vincent Resh, UCIE Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst