

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 13, 2010**

Present: Errol Lobo (chair-UCSF), John Haviland (vice chair-UCSD), Rick Kern (UCB-alternate), Phillip Rogaway (UCD), Volodymyr Bilotkach (UCI), Olga Kagan (UCLA), Yang Ye (UCR), Kalju Kahn (UCSB), Debra Lewis (UCSC), Daniel Simmons, Henry Powell, Michael Cowan, Kat Um (CCD guest), and Todd Giedt (analyst)

I. Chair’s Announcements – Chair Lobo

Chair Lobo did not have any announcements.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the Draft UCIE Minutes from the November 5, 2009 Minutes

C. Review of Program at National University of Singapore, 2008-09

D. Review of Program at National Taiwan University, 2008-09

E. Review questions for FU-BEST 3-year review, 2009-10

ACTION: Members approved the agenda and the FU-BEST 3-Year review questions. Members moved items B, C, and D to new business.

III. EAP Director’s Report – UOEAP Director Michael Cowan

REPORT: Bruce Madewell is now fully retired; Director Cowan is the remaining faculty member in the Goleta office. Director Cowan spoke briefly on his efforts as to facilitate better programmatic decision-making through timely dissemination of information and programmatic options to UCIE, especially in light of the current difficult budgetary environment. He also offered UCIE members the opportunity to interact informally with UOEAP staff between meetings. Director Cowan endorsed almost all of UCIE’s draft comments on the Task Force report, with the exception of a transfer to a campus. Instead, he argued that an earlier decision regarding a move to a campus is important for the following reasons: 1) A successful search for a new UOEAP Director is more likely if this information is already known; 2) informal negotiations with certain campuses, which may already be underway, would likely positively influence formal negotiations; 3) a chancellor of a likely campus may be able to persuade UCOP to forgive part or all of EAP’s outstanding debt. He also asked UCIE to reconsider their informal categorical policy that “all new program development needs to be halted.” He urged members to reconsider this policy in light of the need for well thought-out and UCIE-vetted programs that would add revenue by increasing new student enrollments while not cannibalizing its existing FTEs. Such new programs would be of high UC quality with appropriate academic monitoring controls; would generate new enrollments of students who would not otherwise participate in an EAP program; would contain an operating structure that would ensure its efficient management, including Senate faculty oversight; and its expenditures would not exceed the net revenue generated by the program’s fees¹.

¹ The program should also be able to generate a reserve contingency fund.

Director Cowan also updated members on program closure options:

- **Russia:** He is in agreement with UCIE that Russia should remain open for academic and strategic reasons, even with a possible subvention from UOEAP. Currently, the program only needs 28 students to break-even (there were 25 participants in the program last year). Current application data show that UOEAP is very close to this target.
- **Hungary:** This program needs roughly 35 students in both of the fall and spring cohorts to break even. UOEAP has formed a small group of faculty members to facilitate recruitment for this program. In addition, UOEAP and Rutgers are currently working on a bi-lateral agreement, which would further increase enrollments. UOEAP will need to make a decision on the Hungary program by UCIE's March meeting.
- **Siena:** Director Cowan reported that the Resident Director at Siena has agreed to the following arrangements: 1) A reduction in the salaries for all faculty and administrators in the program; 2) a reduction in the number of administrators from 5.5 to 3 staff members; 3) consolidating the number of facilities from two to one; and 4) reducing the number of courses by eliminating those that are undersubscribed. UOEAP is evaluating Siena on a quarter-by-quarter basis; Siena will need at least 60 students (180 total) enrolled in the summer, fall, and spring 2010-11 for the program to continue (last year there were only 35 students enrolled in the spring program). UOEAP will need to make decisions on the summer and fall programs by February 5 and early March respectively. There is also consensus that the program should be moved to Florence, where UOEAP can partner with other universities; some administrative costs may also be outsourced. However, a full vetting process will be done before such a move is initiated.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired if UOEAP is working towards engaging with other universities on joint programs on a broader scale. Director Cowan replied that while UOEAP is beginning to cautiously engage with other universities in joint partnerships, it is very difficult to develop partnerships with private universities primarily due to different fee structures. However, UOEAP is looking into a potential partnership with SUNY; a partnership with CSU may also be possible, but that one is farther afield and needs further study. He added that UOEAP already has a partnership with the University of Illinois in Barcelona, which has been very successful. In short, decisions on future partnerships with other universities and/or third-party providers need to be made on a program-by-program basis. That said, UOEAP is not considering opening up all of its programs to all students at U.S. institutions (thereby acting like a third-party provider).

Members were also concerned about possible contingencies, as well as the level of subsidization that UOEAP is willing to engage in support of some of its programs. Particularly, it was asked what would be the outcome on the Russia program if UOEAP's partner in Moscow raised their fees; Director Cowan replied that, as of yet, they have not asked, but this is a possibility that remains a concern. Regarding Hungary, members asked how much UOEAP would be willing to subsidize that program. Director Cowan said that currently this program is being subsidized by approximately \$8,000/student; that figure needs to be lowered to under \$1,000/student. One member also inquired into the operational difficulties that may make it necessary to abandon Siena in the long-term. Director Cowan replied that the Siena program was opened before the Rome program and catered to students with few or no, as well as intermediate, Italian language skills. Although Siena has proved to be very popular, Rome has apparently drawn away many introductory-level students, especially from its fall enrollments. The number of intermediate

Italian students has also fallen at Siena. If UOEAP moves the Siena program to Florence, the most probable form is the Belgrano model, in which students are enrolled in language courses with a number of other international students, thereby not increasing the administrative overhead for UOEAP. Chair Lobo asked why EAP, especially given its status as a “Cadillac” study abroad program, could not attract students from other universities? Director Cowan responded that while this is possible, it requires a significant amount of investment in marketing and infrastructure. Another issue is that EAP’s principal competitive advantage over third-party provider programs to UC students lies in the automatic award of UC credit; this would not apply to external students.

Regarding the balance between the halting all new program development and the development of certain kinds of programs, one member remarked that there seems to be two different kinds of programs—1) the Russia model, which includes programs that are strategically important to retain; and 2) the Siena model, which are typically fairly popular and are located in places where there are numerous partner-institutions. Especially under the current financial strains, how would a principled development plan reconcile these opposing viewpoints—strategically important programs and programs that are more like cash-cows? Director Cowan responded that there are only a limited number of projects that UOEAP can work on at one time. He places his priority on those that have been critically important for some time. On the one hand, programs that generate profit are important simply because they can subsidize other important programs. Another issue is the significant expansion of overhead when programs are expanded. Therefore, these points are not necessarily in conflict, but need to be balanced. He added that many of UOEAP’s past troubles can be attributed to a certain lack of discipline in starting new programs, as well as the lack of a contingency reserve.

IV. Russia Program

ISSUE: Director Cowan remarked that he is fundamentally in agreement with UCIE’s position that the Russia program should continue to be supported and he plans to go forward with the program for next year. That said, a faculty workgroup needs to be set-up that will look at alternatives that would lower costs in future years.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that Russia programs across the country were quite strong until the early 1990s, when they fell into a period of decline. Recently though, these programs are experiencing a reinvigoration of sorts. Russia is also one of the six languages that the US government has identified as critical for national security. UC’s Russian programs have worked very closely together over the year, which includes agreements on curriculum and textbooks. Regarding the Russia program itself, Moscow is indeed very expensive, and there could be arguments for moving the program to a less-expensive location. However, it would take considerable time and effort to make this happen (including site-visits). The committee agreed that taking a wait-and-see approach towards moving the program is reasonable in these difficult economic times. It was argued that St. Petersburg would be as expensive as Moscow, so that would not be a suitable option. Director Cowan added that it may indeed be costly to initiate a study that would investigate the merits of alternate locations for the program, but at the same time, UOEAP does not want to be caught out if costs in Moscow increase dramatically. He said that Russia returnees may be able to assist in marketing the program.

ACTION: Members approved the draft letter.

V. UC Faculty Governance of, Management of, and Involvement in EAP

ISSUE: Director Cowan presented his white paper, which looks at strengthening faculty involvement at all levels of EAP. Explicitly, this includes the formal governance and maintenance of EAP’s academic quality. Implicitly, this includes holding UOEAP management accountable for their stewardship of EAP. Departments also play an important role; good articulation basically means an accommodating departmental attitude towards EAP courses. UCIE has not found a way to have these kinds of discussions with departments for the most part. There is a need for more faculty advocates who would be willing to advocate on behalf of EAP. Some of the recommendations described in the report may depend on amending current Senate regulations. For example, UCIE’s bylaws do not give the committee the power to determine eligibility criteria (akin to BOARS’ authority to determine eligibility patterns for the University as a whole). Another issue is the certification of instructors who teach EAP courses abroad. Senate Regulation 538 states that UC courses can only be offered by “officers of instruction”. How does this play out with instructors in EAP’s self-construct programs? Are they officers of instruction? Another issue is the fact that both Study Center Directors and faculty members employed by UOEAP in Goleta are asked to sign-off on grades on courses that are well outside of their areas of expertise (e.g., they are considered the “instructor of record”). Director Cowan remarked that he would like to see a process by which an agreement ensures that EAP instructors at these partner institutions are not only of equivalent quality as those faculty members at UC, but also have equivalent grading standards, and can serve as both de facto and de jure officers of instruction and instructors of record. One reason for doing this is simply the cost that is currently associated with these functions, as well as the time involved, which could be used by faculty abroad for other purposes. He also advocated that the Senate take greater responsibility for the EAP program reviews (both practically and financially).

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that this function (the “instructor of record”) has been historically done by the Associate Dean at UOEAP, who is a UC faculty member. Overall, members expressed a reluctance to take immediate action on many of these issues, citing the priority of many other problems (financial, program cuts, etc.). Members also asked if UOEAP is moving forward with grant development and other fund-raising. Director Cowan replied that while this is built into EAP’s five-year plan, nothing has been done in this area so far due to the lack of staff with appropriate expertise.

VI. UCIE Program Reviews

A. Principles and processes governing UCIE program reviews

ISSUE: Director Cowan identified a couple of separate issues related to program reviews: How many reviews does UOEAP have the resources and time to do in one year? What is the mix of on-site and off-site (at UOEAP) reviews? And, who will pay for these reviews? UOEAP’s budget is quite limited for these purposes. He noted that UOEAP only started on-site reviews in 2005. For the most part, successful off-site reviews are dependent on the quality control mechanisms present at EAP’s partner institutions.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the merits of on-site reviews. Members were concerned about the cost of the on-site reviews, as well as the components included in these

reviews. Director Cowan responded these reviews are owned by UCIE and they have historically included the review report, Director's report, UOEAP response, campus response, and a UCIE response/summary. He added that UOEAP did budgeted money for the on-site reviews, but these funds were subsequently restricted by UCOP's travel policy (UCOP approval was required for any travel above \$500). While UOEAP recently received an exemption from this travel restriction for this year, this exemption may not be forthcoming next year.

B. Proposed program review calendar for 2010-11 (China, Korea, Australia, and New Zealand)

ISSUE: For 2010-11, UOEAP is proposing to conduct off-site reviews in Australia and New Zealand; as well as China and Korea, which should preferably be on-site due to the nature of the issues involved (administrative issues and study center consolidation). UOEAP would also like to identify faculty who have expertise and familiarity with these countries.

ACTION: Members did not specify an immediate action for these reviews.

VII. EAP Programmatic Issues

A. Change of venue for Japan ILC

ISSUE: UOEAP is proposing to move its late-summer Japan ILP beginning in 2010 from its current location at the Intercultural Institute of Japan (IIJ) to a more stable location (both in terms of better administrative support and IIJ's own financial situation to the Japan Women's University (JWU). Per the Japan Study Center Director Ito's memo, JWU was identified as the most suitable venue for the ILP in terms of (1) academic quality, (2) location and environment, (3) housing, (4) campus facilities, and (5) costs, all of which would be comparable to that offered at EAP's other very successful and highly regarded early-summer ILP at the International Christian University.

DISCUSSION: One member expressed concern that the issues noted by UOEAP about ICJ were not made known when it asked for approval of an ICJ program just a couple of months ago. Director Cowan apologized for this, acknowledging that UOEAP acted in haste over that program proposal.

ACTION: Members expressed support for the move of the Japan ILP to the Japan Women's University (JWU)

B. Further consolidation of the Japan programs

ISSUE: Director Cowan said that UOEAP needs to further examine its Japan programs and consolidate them, making sure that the total configuration is appropriate. He would like to pull together a faculty advisory group to consider this. He asked for a volunteer for this group.

C. Possible alternate location for the Vietnam program

ISSUE: The UC EAP Liaison Officer for EAP in Vietnam has suggested that EAP consider an alternative location for the EAP program in Hanoi City, Vietnam, as this program has not yet attracted sufficient UC student numbers for financial stability. In addition, urban congestion in the rapidly developing national capital is increasingly putting UC students at risk and challenging EAP's objective to put students in locations in which social, cultural, and linguistic

immersion is easily achieved by UC undergraduates. It has been suggested by some UC faculty and staff that EAP explore alternative city locations and/or a partnership with another U.S. institution already actively engaged in Vietnam. Working in collaboration with another institution would also likely minimize instructional and program costs. Toward this end, UOEAP would like to investigate a collaborative partnership. As a result of several inquiries and consultations with possible institutions or third part providers, our Vietnam Liaison Officer recommends that UOEAP investigate the program associated with the State University of New York (SUNY)-Brockport campus, which has been active in Danang, Vietnam, for the last decade. That said, UOEAP plans to continue to run its current program with Hanoi University until an alternative location and viable partner is found and proposed to UCIE for consideration and approval. Besides the proposed partnership, another option may be moving the program to Saigon. Director Cowan mentioned that he would like to pull together a faculty advisory group and asked for a volunteer. This group would also look at all EAP programs in Southeast Asia as a whole.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that Hanoi City is relatively less congested than many other Southeast Asian cities. It was also mentioned that many heritage families do not wish to send their children to study abroad in Hanoi for political reasons.

VIII. Academic Senate Review of the Report from the Joint Senate-Administrative EAP Task Force

ISSUE: Members considered their final response to the Task Force's report.

DISCUSSION: One member criticized recommendation #1 (mission statement) as an apparent sleight of hand; there seems to be a switch in the use of the acronyms of UOEAP and UCEAP with UCEAP being designated as the University of California Education Abroad Program(s) and UOEAP being the central administrative office for EAP. The mission statement is for the former, not the latter. However, the former does not formally exist as a bureaucratic entity. Therefore, this mission statement denies that UOEAP represents an academic program; it seems to reinforce the notion that UOEAP is indeed more of a service provider. UCIE Chair Lobo clarified that this was not deliberate. Members agreed that steps should be taken to clarify this nomenclature and correct it.

Another member expressed his view that UCIE's response should be more-or-less negative, and should note that this review is essentially moot, as it comes too late, as many of the recommendations have already been implemented. He advocated including many of the local CIE responses, as well as the CCD response. An addendum could be added to comment on the specific recommendations and to clarify certain issues, which include campus EAP office funding, return-to-aid components of the new EAP fee, support for reciprocity arrangements, and the so-called "articulation" issue. It was noted that while reciprocity may not directly benefit the individual campuses, it keeps overall program costs low, which maintains access for the majority of UC students. Members did not really reach a consensus on the merits of moving UOEAP to a campus at this time, but emphasized that the misconception that UOEAP "articulates" courses needs to be corrected.

ACTION: John Haviland will draft the UCIE response. The CCD response will be included with UCIE’s response.

IX. EAP Governing Committee Report

ISSUE: Kalju Kahn provided an overview of the proceedings of the November EAP Governing Committee meeting. He reported that there was strong support within the Governing Committee for UCIE to send a strong letter to Director Cowan regarding the Siena program. At that meeting, Senate representatives expressed support for an requirement that an “academic” to serve as the new director of UOEAP; Senate members also wanted this person to report directly to the Provost, but it is unclear whether this will be accepted in the final version. The Governing Committee will play a role in choosing the next director; a search committee will be formed soon, presumably with some input from the Governing Committee. Regarding the Governing Committee Charge and Membership, there was also concern that the faculty campus directors are not represented. Regarding the tenure of individual members, Provost Pitts’ view is that different members will serve for different tenures (one year, two year, and three year terms). There was also much discussion devoted to moving UOEAP to a campus; some members expressed concern that EAP’s debt should be alleviated or forgiven before such a move takes place. Apparently, informal and exploratory conversations, regarding a possible transfer of UOEAP to a campus, have been initiated with individual administrators.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the EAP Director position, and noted that a separate financial director should also be hired.

X. UC Faculty Governance of, Management of, and Involvement in EAP

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that Director Cowan’s presentation illustrated the fact that he is indeed the lone academic at UOEAP (since the retirement of Bruce Madewell). Members also appreciated his frank communication regarding faculty governance concerns at UOEAP.

XI. New Business

A. Approval of the Minutes from November 5, 2009 Meeting

ISSUE: One member raised the issue of whether the committee actually voted to close the Leiden, Netherlands program; this action was not listed in the minutes.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed whether the committee actually voted to close this program. It was noted that the minutes did not specifically state that the committee voted to close entire slate of programs. In the end, members agreed not to amend the minutes, as the committee did not vote to close the entire slate of programs. Instead members focused on the Hungary, Russia, and Siena programs. Chair Lobo added that some small programs simply lack the resources to continue, and therefore will need to be closed, whether or not all members agree with such closures. Another member remarked that this is a structural problem. Director Cowan confirmed that last year, the programs, which UOEAP brought before UCIE for closure, were indeed already in the process of being closed. That said, if UCIE had made objections, then adjustments could have been made in that process.

ACTION: Members approved the draft November 5, 2009 minutes as written.

B. Approval of the Formal Reviews of Singapore and Taiwan

ISSUE: These reviews were removed from the consent calendar. Director Cowan acknowledged that UOEAP has already implemented a number of recommendations contained in these reviews. One issue that has been raised in the past is that students often report that they are not receiving adequate pre-departure information and advice. He also outlined the process with each of the reviews; campus input is part of this review process. He added that if this is not a satisfactory process, it can be changed, as the process is owned by UCIE.

DISCUSSION: Members held a short discussion on UOEAP's role in the follow-up on these reviews, as well as the recent history of these reviews. Towards that end, Director Cowan advocated that UCIE require a report from UOEAP in one year's time on many of the recommendations made in a review. Members agreed with this suggestion. They also discussed changing the way UOEAP responds to actually show what they have done in response to a particular review. The committee also talked about UCIE's response to these reviews; members acknowledged that its own responses to these reviews have suffered in light of other budgetary priorities. Some members felt that it might be worthwhile for UCIE to reinstitute a formal response to these reviews that would highlight certain issues and demand follow-up by UOEAP. However, any follow-up may be mitigated by UOEAP's current resource-constrained state.

ACTION: The Singapore and Taiwan review programs were approved. The following members agreed to draft short summary responses to the respective reviews: Hungary: John Haviland; Taiwan: Yang Ye; Barbados: Debra Lewis; and Singapore: Phillip Rogaway.

C. Dissolution of the Berkeley Committee on International Education

ISSUE: The Berkeley Divisional Senate has proposed eliminating its local Committee on International Education (CIE), although it is being proposed that two current CIE members would be placed on Berkeley's local Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which is already a large committee with a corresponding large charge. The reason for doing this is cost. It was noted that a local bylaw change may need to be reviewed by Rules and Jurisdiction.

DISCUSSION: Senate Chair Powell remarked that each division has a significant level of autonomy, but that UCIE should continue this discussion. Members advocated writing a letter to Senate Chair Powell insisting on reinstating the Berkeley CIE.

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