

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 23, 2008**

**I. Chair's Announcements – *Chair Lobo***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Lobo noted that the meeting was changed to accommodate the new acting Executive Director of UCEAP, Michael Cowan.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**A. Approval of the Agenda**

**B. Approval of the Minutes from the February 7, 2008 Meeting**

**ACTION:** Members approved the consent calendar with minor revisions to the minutes.

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

**REPORT:** Acting Executive Director Cowan reported that he has urged Provost Hume to begin a search for a permanent UCEAP Executive Director as soon as possible. Provost Hume has charged Director Cowan with the development of a five-year strategic academic plan that is supported by a viable fiscal/business plan for EAP. This will entail revising the ongoing planning process, developing a sustainable funding model, cutting expenses, eliminating processes that do not add enough value for the cost incurred, and investing in processes and initiatives to make EAP more efficient over time. Two examples include the enhancement of UCEAP's IT capabilities (e.g., 'My EAP') and its various outreach efforts. It is vitally important to increase student participation in EAP's programs. It is also important not only to focus on head-count, but on FTEs, which are an indication of the health of the organization. In recent years, there has been an emphasis on growing short-term programs, which do not contribute as much FTEs as traditional year-long programs. Marketing to students and academic outreach needs to move even more rapidly. UCEAP also needs to reduce the attrition that occurs at various points and which varies from campus to campus. While attrition can be partly attributed to the weakening U.S. dollar, there are other factors at play as well. It is clearly something that UCEAP, together with the campuses must address. Academic integration is an important part of this outreach process and we need to reach out to UC faculty as departmental buy-in and support for EAP is key.

The role of the campus International Education committees, as well as UCIE, is also very important. Director Cowan was struck by the multi-faceted Senate responses to the Ad-Hoc Report. He said that there needs to be more Senate involvement at both the systemwide level and the campus level. He urged members to engage the Senate leadership and other committees on their respective campuses, as the campuses are significant funding sources for local EAP operations. Unless the campuses invest some of their own resources, EAP will not get very far; it can not all come from UCEAP. There should also be effective out-reach to EAP alumni; there are 63,000 alumni out there – only two campuses have done anything with respect to identifying these alumni and contacting them. UCEAP also needs a better way of managing its interactions with the campuses, multi-directional communications, and better publicity.

Development of the strategic plan must be based on systematic research. He has discovered that there is a tremendous amount of research that has not reached the campus level. UCEAP has simply not assisted campuses in identifying this research. There are also some campuses that have been engaged in very productive research on their own that has not been disseminated. The sharing of best practices between campuses could be facilitated without the heavy hand of UCEAP. A final charge has to do with participating in UCOP's formation of a 'Management Group' or 'Council' to move EAP forward. The membership of that committee will need Senate participation.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked what EAP is planning on doing for non-EAP students that participate in education programs internationally. Director Cowan responded that EAP needs to find a way to collaborate in those efforts on the campuses; it also needs to find a way to measure this phenomenon. He said that we need a better sense of how these operations are being funded by the campuses. That said, EAP cannot get itself trapped in unfunded mandates. UCEAP's goal is to meet campus needs in this area. At the same, time EAP should not be taken for granted. Other members reflected on data that suggests only 15% of students are going to third-party summer programs and that 10% of these never bring their course units back. Director Cowan stressed that it is the Senate that has authority over curriculum. It seems that as the campuses move more into faculty-led seminars and third-party arrangements, it is essential that the Senate play an active role in these operations; appropriate faculty oversight is a key factor. UCEAP Consultant Scott Cooper clarified that EAP loses about 20% of students from the time of application to departure.

Chair Lobo asked Director Cowan about the status of EAP as an academic entity as opposed to a service entity. Director Cowan responded that all academic units have service elements. He has been assured by UCOP that EAP is an academic program. On the campuses, the academic and student service structures are organizationally located in different places in the campus hierarchy. UCEAP is in the unique situation of being an academic program that delivers its programs abroad, thereby taking on the role that is normally assigned to student affairs on campuses. Depending on where EAP students study, many host universities have developed very robust student services, but this varies a great deal from program to program and place to place. At some EAP sites, study centers have come to play both student services and academic programmatic roles. Chair Lobo also asked if Director Cowan is looking to reorganize EAP. He responded that UCEAP is a servant of the campuses and their aspirations. At the systemwide level, UCEAP can provide a variety of services that would be difficult at the campus level. He suggested that campus EAP offices can be a forceful presence on their own campuses in ensuring that they get the sufficient resources to operate effectively. On the other side, we have to make sure that the campuses are adequately supporting their international operations. One member expressed his concerns that service decisions are being made without regard to academic impact. Director Cowan shares that view and noted that EAP was not the only unit that received a cut of this kind. UCOP is looking for low-hanging fruit and because EAP has been too isolated from the decision-makers, UCEAP did not have the support to resist this. We have to be more effective informing decision-makers. He has been working to stop the 'bleeding' and UCOP has not imposed the 'Kissler' funding model. They did however impose a draconian \$3 million cut and decide for now to not yet forgive the \$2.5 million one-time deficit or cut us any slack in terms of the mandate to reduce the number of FTEs.

There is about six months before UCOP and The Regents develop a budget; this does not give UCEAP much time to make their case to UCOP. Director Cowan hopes that the UCPB report will be taken seriously; these recommendations were much more sensitive to preserve academic quality. The bottom-line was a focus on equitable funding – students who study abroad deserve as much funding as those students who study on UC campuses. If that was accepted as a principle, there are a host of things that could follow from that position that might help EAP move out from its present dilemma.

The 2008-09 budget provides the campuses roughly the same amount as last year. UCEAP has already absorbed a \$3 million in ways that has not affected the campuses. UCEAP has lost 20% of its staffing. Everything has its costs; there are certain benefits that may not be worth its cost. Over the next three to six months UCEAP will need to engage the campuses as they move towards looking at private enterprises and fundraising as a way to bridge funding gaps. However, UCEAP does not have any grant-writing expertise; we will try to partner with the campuses on potential grant opportunities. With regard to Scott Cooper's departure at UCEAP, that FTE is part of the budget cut. One member asked if adjuncts could be appointed to fill Scott's position. Director Cowan is giving serious attention in how to involve faculty more effectively.

#### **IV. Proposed EAP GPA Policy – UCEAP Associate Director Scott Cooper**

**ISSUE:** Associate Director Cooper provided some history on the EAP GPA policy. When EAP was formed in the 1960s, it was viewed strictly as an honors program. There was a feeling that if students were struggling on their home campuses, they would struggle even more abroad. In the 1990s, several other types of programs were created and the required GPA for a subset of these programs was reduced to 2.5. As this is an academic requirement and standard, UCIE is the appropriate body to approve this policy. In 2005, a new policy was formulated, but proved to be too complicated. Students often did not know if they were going or not until the last minute. The Ad-Hoc Review Committee asked why the GPA policy even exists given that UC serves the top 12.5% of students in the state; the constraint is EAP's partner institutions, who apply the same standards to UC students as they apply to all other foreign students. Issues of translation are tricky, but through experience, there is some flexibility. In the past, UCIE has delegated to campus directors the power to approve up to a 2.85 GPA. Put simply, it is proposed that students must meet the listed GPA requirements at the time of selection; waivers and conditionals would be eliminated. UCEAP research shows that GPA does not have a significant bearing on academic performance abroad; of the 330 students who went abroad on waivers; 64% had GPAs between 2.85 and 3.0.

**DISCUSSION:** It was clarified that the 3.0 GPA requirement is usually dependent on the host institution as well as UC GPA requirements for reciprocity students. Consultant Cooper clarified that grade inflation may be an issue in the research, but in general there is no difference with those students with GPAs between a 2.85 and 2.99 and those students with GPAs above 3.0. Philosophically, there is no reason why only the bright students should have the opportunity to study abroad. Another member asked how many students are turned down for waivers. The Chair of the Campus Directors (CCD) said that the campuses do not even begin to process a waiver if they do not feel that the student is qualified. There are cases where a student has a GPA below that which is required by the host institution; in those cases a special case needs to be made.

Another member said that on his campus, they were opposed getting rid of the waivers altogether, and would be in favor of simplifying the process rather than getting rid of the waivers altogether. The CCD Chair said that the GPAs tend to be lower for science and engineering students. Some mechanism is needed for those students that do not hit the 2.85 GPA threshold, but that would be a very small number. Another option would be an appeal process of some kind. Consultant Bruce Madewell clarified that a student with a 2.83 GPA is conditional; the student is offered the opportunity to improve their GPA by the next quarter/semester. The Council of Academic Directors (CAD) Chair remarked that lowering the GPA would capture more students than they would lose, but he would like to retain some sort of a waiver mechanism. The CCD Chair said that he rejects 80-90% of students with GPAs below 2.85 who ask for waivers. Consultant Cooper said that these waivers create a tremendous amount of workload on the part of UCEAP and the partner institutions; there must be equity between UC and the partner institutions.

Another issue is whether this requirement applies to exchange students/non-resident transfer students. There is a systemwide transfer GPA requirement of 2.8. The only evidence comes from other sources (e.g., third-party providers). This evidence could be used to obtain more flexibility from some host-institutions. Another thing is to determine if UC's present demands regarding reciprocity are appropriate. In terms of workload, one of the goals should be to get the applicants over to the host-institution as fast as possible. One of the problems is that attrition contributes to unused capacity. That said, there are certain places where making this case will be less successful as in other cases. One member offered the caveat is that we are obligated to not place students in situations in which they are ill-prepared and for which they cannot succeed. Consultant Cooper added that lowering the GPA would lower the number of waivers from 300 to 100. A suggestion was made to allow the campuses to retain 'waivers' and not 'exceptions' for one year. Members continued their discussion of this issue in executive session.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the following policy: “Students must meet the listed GPA requirements (see attached chart) at the time they are selected by the campus offices for participation in EAP and their files are forwarded to UOEAP (no conditional approvals will be allowed). A limited number of waivers will be allowed for students in exceptional circumstances who are applying to programs with a 2.85 GPA requirement during the 2008-09 recruitment cycle. UCIE delegates discretionary authority for approving such waivers to the appropriate Campus Director. Any waivers must be approved by the time that students are selected by campus offices for participation in EAP and their files are forwarded to UOEAP; however, actual student participation in the targeted program also will depend on final approval by the hosting institution. GPA requirement waivers for student participation in programs with 2.85 GPA requirements will not be considered for students with GPAs less than 2.6.”**

**V. Proposed Denmark Program Option: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, Copenhagen – UCEAP Associate Dean Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** EAP programs focusing on the study of architecture at the University of Ferrara in Italy and the Danish Institute for Study Abroad in Copenhagen were recently closed due to on-going problems relating to high program cost and workload, as well as low student numbers and waning student satisfaction. To fill this important disciplinary gap for UC architecture students,

particularly those at UC Berkeley, UCEAP proposes to offer limited course work in architecture to EAP students in Denmark beginning fall 2008.

**DISCUSSION:** It was asked if there was consideration to move the Lund program to a campus. Consultant Cooper clarified that this has not been considered because they did not think it would be of interest to campuses because there would be so many faculty involved (five faculty) as opposed to one faculty member, which is typically the model of a campus program. The idea is to leverage what you already have or ‘sell’ it. Consultant Madewell said that they are trying to transfer the Wagenaen program in Germany to the Davis campus for example. There are not mechanisms to facilitate cross-campus conversations to facilitate transferring some of these programs. UCEAP could send data on the costs of this program to the campuses (Lund). It was moved and seconded to ‘suspend’ the Lund program indefinitely, rather than ‘closing’ it.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the Denmark program option.**

**VI. Proposed Program Closures – UCEAP Associate Dean Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** 1) Proposal to close EAP’s program at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) in Kumasi, Ghana; effective in AY 2009-10; 2) Proposal to terminate the Joint Summer School program with Lund University in Sweden (“*Europe and America: A Dialog on Critical World Issues*”), effective summer 2009; and 3) Proposal to close EAP’s Psychology Program at Maastricht University in The Netherlands; effective in AY 2009-10.

**DISCUSSION:** The Maastricht program is a similar to Kumasi – for both academic reasons, small enrollment, and the high cost of the program. The following four administrative closures for particular terms were also announced for Thomsett University in Thailand (summer 2009), Hong Kong University for Science and Technology (spring 2009), Canada (spring 2009), and Hyderabad in India (spring 2009).

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved closing EAP’s programs at KNUST in Kumasi and the Psychology Program at Maastricht University in the Netherlands; they also unanimously approved suspending the Lund program indefinitely.**

**VII. 2007-08 Formal UCIE EAP Program Reviews – Chair Lobo**

**ISSUE/DISCUSSION:**

Moscow, Russia

There is pressure from Moscow to increase the fees and tuition. The review committee felt that EAP needs Moscow; a UC faculty member is extremely important at this site. Smaller issues included that the one English course being taught was quite weak; however, professors were open to modifying this course. Students expressed concerns about staying in home stays where they were basically ignored. This was an issue that surfaced and the committee had a number of recommendations on how to better integrate students into Russian culture and society. Overall, committee members thought that the program review was favorable. It was suggested to form an informal committee to look at increasing the numbers on this program. There is a one-year extension on the current cost of the program.

Santiago, Chile

The reviewers felt that there are some serious problems with a course being taught in the Chile program, and students are still complaining about it. They felt that the course really needs to be rethought and be multi-disciplinary, rather than collection of several disjointed lectures on the subject. The only issue with which the review committee differed on with the director was over this issue of the director exerting control over this problematic course.

Rome, Italy

Members discussed the necessity of a study center director at Rome. The bigger picture is that the program should involve UC faculty. Consultant Madewell remarked that there are some programs that absolutely need study center directors; if one compares these sites to Rome – Rome is more ideal. Director Cowan said that the review was a good wake-up call for the European Director of ACCENT. He also expressed his belief in the need for appropriate academic involvement with programs to ensure quality academic oversight and that unless we can find a way of obtaining more resources; we will be facing a slow down-ward spiral. A member spoke to the issue of support for acting director, including research support. Study center directors cost on average about \$120,000 each. At the moment, this is simply a cost-saving measure.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the both the Russia, Chile and Rome program reviews.**

**VIII. Appointment of Faculty Members to the 2008-09 UCIE Formal Review Committees**  
– *Chair Lobo*

**ISSUE:** Over the last two years, UCEAP has sent faculty to all sites being reviewed; usually there were three or four faculty members on each trip. Consultant Madewell proposed reducing the size of the committee members to three – two expert faculty members with one UCIE member. However, the UCIE member would not be sent abroad.

**DISCUSSION:** One member spoke against this proposal, stating that the reviews have been compromised when the two ‘expert’ reviewers did not have EAP experience. While he is not against reducing the size of the committee, there is a tremendous advantage of sending a UCIE member as well, especially if that person is an ex-study center director. The problem is budget. Another member stressed the importance of appointing ‘experts’ who also have EAP knowledge. Richard Matthews and Jianwan Su will need to be invited back to the committee as they will be cycling off the committee.

The following UCIE members were assigned to 2008-09 formal review committees: **John Haviland** (Barbados); **Richard Matthews** (Hungary); **Vincent Resh** (Singapore); and **Jianwan Su** (Taiwan). Members agreed to draft a letter insisting on the presence of UCIE members for site members. It was noted that UCIE members need to approve the report as it would require too much filtering.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the motion to send a letter to Director Cowan about the importance of sending UCIE members on site visits for the review teams.**

**IX. New Business**

**ISSUE:** There was no 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