

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 4, 2010**

**Present:** John Haviland (chair-UCSD), Olga Kagan (vice chair-UCLA), Richard Kern (UCB), Jeanette Money (UCD), Volodymyr Bilotkach (UCI), Cristian Ricci (UCM-T), Yang Ye (UCR), Errol Lobo (UCSF), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (UCSB), Giacomo Bernardi (UCSC), Robert Anderson (Senate vice chair-ex-officio), Ronald Aruejo (undergraduate representative), Khatharya Um (CCD-Chair guest/consultant), Jean-Xavier Guinard (UCEAP Executive Director-consultant), Martha Winnacker (Senate Director), and Todd Giedt (Senate Associate Director and analyst)

**I. Systemwide Senate/Chair's Announcements – Chair Haviland**

**REPORT:** Chair Haviland reminded members that UCIE is charged with the Senate's oversight over all international education at UC, not only UCEAP. In this vein, he remarked that the membership of this committee has not been in the habit of bringing forward issues of import from the Divisional committees to this body that may have systemwide implications, but he encouraged them to do so. Chair Haviland also welcomed the Chair of the Council of Campus Directors (CCD), Khatharya Um (UCB), and requested that she be made a regular consultant in addition to UCEAP Associate Provost and Executive Director Jean-Xavier Guinard.

Academic Council Vice Chair Robert Anderson briefed members on the results of the post-employment benefits process. He believes that the President's [recommendation](#) to the Regents is a good outcome in terms of the benefit structure. On the other hand, the budget situation continues to be quite challenging, given the large unfunded liability of the pension system. The Council resolution on downsizing the University is currently out for review, which was adopted by Academic Council last spring by a narrow margin, and advocates reducing the size of the University to preserve quality given constrained resources; there was an alternative statement from UCLA, which differed in some smaller ways. Council also established a special committee tasked with examining this issue (Academic Council Special Committee on a Plan for the University of California); it is currently working and is expected to deliver a report in late November. The University is also under pressure from the Legislature and the Regents to increase its transfer rates. The public perception is that there are significant numbers of community college students wishing to transfer who are confused by the lower-division major pre-requisites, which are quite different for the different campuses. On the other hand, the Senate wants individual departments to be able to innovate and differentiate themselves, which requires some diversification of major pre-requisites. In response to recent state legislation, Provost Pitts and Council Chair Simmons jointly wrote a letter to department chairs in five different disciplines (psychology, math, computer science, history, and biological sciences), inviting them to Oakland to discuss differences in major pre-requisites. These meetings will take place in Oakland. Also out for review is the [policy on self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs](#). Council Vice Chair Anderson remarked that increasing income to departments offering professional degree programs is certainly one driver of the growth in such programs. One of the dangers inherent in significantly increasing the numbers of these programs across the

board is that they may divert resources from both undergraduate programs and graduate academic programs.

**DISCUSSION:** Members held a brief discussion on transfer students who study abroad, noting that it does indeed extend their term by a couple of quarters and/or semesters.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

### **A. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION:** Members approved the agenda (with the addition of the new business on the *Selection of Study Center Directors (SCDs) for France, Spain, Chile, and Mexico.*

## **III. UOEAP Director's Report**

**REPORT:** Jean-Xavier Guinard reported that the downsizing and restructuring at UCEAP is complete. UCEAP's budget deficit will also be eliminated by the end of 2010-11. UCEAP is now at 70 staff FTEs (from 120 FTEs a couple years ago) and at 75 FTEs abroad. The new funding model, which is based on student fees, is now being implemented with General Fund appropriations declining to zero by 2013-14. Going forward, the challenges for UCEAP include: 1) A variety of funding and operational models at the campus study abroad offices; 2) two distinct oversight bodies in the form of UCIE and the UCEAP Governing Committee; and 3) increasing enrollments. With respect to the last point, the number of EAP participants is rising, but FTEs are steady from year-to-year. This is due to the increasingly popularity of shorter-term programs, with year-long immersion programs continuing to decline (this mirrors the national trend). In 2008-09, 4,337 students participated in EAP programs; in 2009-10, 4,528 participated; and in 2010-11, 4,189 are currently participating thus far.

Director Guinard also spoke about the key priorities for UCEAP going forward. These include increasing student access for study abroad, maintaining and improving academic excellence within EAP's programs, and implementing best business practices at UCEAP. He noted that UCIE is important to UCEAP in the following functions: 1) UC faculty support and advocacy for study abroad and EAP in particular; 2) program approval, review, and academic oversight; 3) faculty participation in the UCEAP Governing Committee; 4) the identification of opportunities for increasing study abroad access; and 5) benchmarking (institutions, programs, and methods). With respect to business practices, UCEAP will work closely with UCEAP Governing Committee to determine the best operational direction, as well as keeping the Senate and the UC community informed of UCEAP operations and administration. Director Guinard's immediate objectives include a number of campus visits; developing a budget to present to the UCEAP Governing Committee and Provost Pitts, and developing an administrative partnership with the local campus (UCSB).

Director Guinard also spoke about the importance of faculty governance as it moves away from a strict study center director (SCD) model, and towards some sort of a faculty consultant model. Given that UCEAP can no longer be the EAP that was established 50 years ago with a SCD at almost every site, remote faculty governance becomes even more important. One such mechanism may be the faculty advisory committee, which can be regionally or discipline-based (see below).

**DISCUSSION:** Members briefly discussed the need for UCIE to not only review UCEAP's proposed budgets, but also approve them; this discussion was postponed to executive session.

**ACTION:** Director Guinard will provide UCIE a list of past SCDs in order to improve faculty collaboration and oversight of EAP on the campuses.

#### IV. Proposed Formal Reviews of EAP Programs for 2011-12

##### A. Ireland

##### B. Paris Summer Language & Culture (three-year review)

##### C. Scandinavia

##### D. South Africa

*Two of the reviews are preliminarily scheduled for Fall 2011; the other two are scheduled for Winter/Spring 2012. No site visits are planned. Members will be asked to select UCIE representatives on the review committees at their May 2011 meeting.*

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the importance of on-site reviews; there was also discussion with respect to the budget responsibility for formal reviews (Senate, UCEAP, or UCOP). Chair Haviland proposed that UCIE develop a thorough and well thought-out proposal for formal reviews, which would opine on the importance of onsite reviews. Members cited the importance of conducting an on-site review for the Paris program due to the fact that there is now only a regional study center in France. Members asked why the China formal review is being postponed. Director Guinard responded that these four reviews have priority over China. Members requested a list of all of the programs with their last review date to be sent to UCIE members. UCIE agreed to create an agenda item for its January meeting on the scheduling of formal reviews. Members also remarked that South Africa warrants close scrutiny due to past incidents at this site.

**ACTION:** 1) UCIE accepted the slate of formal reviews, as currently proposed; 2) UCIE requested a list of all of EAP's programs with their last review date; and 3) UCIE will draft a proposal for future formal reviews; and 4) upcoming formal reviews will be placed on the January agenda.

#### V. UCEAP Faculty Advisory Committees – UOEAP Director Jean-Xavier Guinard

##### A. Faculty Advisory Committee on UCEAP in China, Taiwan, & Hong Kong

*This faculty advisory committee has been appointed for a two-year term, beginning in 2010-11; see the enclosure for more details.*

##### B. Faculty Advisory Committee on UCEAP in Southeast Asia

*This faculty advisory committee has been appointed for a two-year term, beginning in 2010-11; see the enclosure for more details.*

##### C. Faculty Advisory Committee on UCEAP in Turkey

*This faculty advisory committee will be established in Fall 2010 to consider a UCEAP strategy for growth in Turkey, including reciprocal partnerships in Istanbul. It is anticipated that UOEAP will submit a program proposal in January 2011 based on Advisory Committee recommendations.*

##### D. Faculty Advisory Committee on UCEAP in the Middle East

*This faculty advisory committee will be established in winter/spring 2011 to examine language, thematic, and multi-location study opportunities in that region. Based on recommendations from the Committee, UOEAP may put forward a proposal for new development in spring 2010.*

**DISCUSSION:** In part due to the transition towards less study center directors, Director Guinard indicated that these faculty advisory committees (FACs) are indeed pilot models of long-term faculty oversight and campus engagement, and should be differentiated from past FACs that have historically been used to investigate the possibility of creating new programs in certain geographical regions. He also commented that these FACs can and should be constructed around subjects or disciplines; not only geography; towards that end, Vice Chair Kagan proposed a FAC on heritage language programs (and agreed to chair such a committee). Members also encouraged Director Guinard to solicit input from UCIE when constituting these advisory committees in order to get a broader spectrum of the faculty. Members also commented that it would be important to place value on the participation in these committees for tenure and promotion. With respect to the “faculty consultant” role, Director Guinard commented that they would indeed receive a stipend of between \$6,000 and \$8,000 for their work, but that members of the FACs would not receive such a stipend.

**ACTION:** 1) Members approved the slate of the FACs; and 2) asked Director Guinard to investigate the possibility of establishing a FAC on heritage language programs.

## **VI. Preliminary Program Proposal Briefings**

*Note: UCIE passed a resolution to “ban” any new program development in spring 2009.*

### **A. English Language Business/Economics Program in Spain**

**BRIEFING:** A proposal will be submitted in spring 2011 for an English-language business/economics program in Spain. Academic information about the proposed programs at Carlos III and Pompeu Fabra will be compiled and distributed to relevant UC faculty and campus EAP offices for review and comment regarding which program would best meet the needs of UC students. It is anticipated that the Carlos III program may attract 50 students, while the Pompeu Fabra program will attract between 10 and 30 students. Director Guinard remarked that there is student interest for an English language business program in Spain, and that this would not be a “construct” program as these Spanish universities have significantly increased their English course offerings.

### **B. Reinstatement of the Denmark Institute for Study Abroad program in Architecture & Design**

**BRIEFING:** Due to interest expressed by EAP campus offices as well as limited EAP study options for students majoring in architecture and design, UCEAP is currently exploring reopening the Denmark Institute for Study Abroad (DIS) program. UCEAP offered this program from 1998 until 2006, when it was closed for reasons of cost. UCEAP’s new budget model makes it possible to offer the program without financial loss for UCEAP. Current plans are to offer the program in the Fall, Spring, and Summer to qualified juniors and seniors (numbers are anticipated to be between 10 and 30 participants). Pending successful negotiations with DIS, UCEAP anticipates submitting a program proposal to UCIE for approval at its January 2011 meeting. Pending UCIE approval, the anticipated program start date is Spring 2012.

**DISCUSSION:** With respect to the so-called UCIE “ban” on new program development, Chair Haviland remarked that he is now more willing to consider new programs given that UCEAP is in a better working condition and on firmer footing than it was in 2009, when this resolution was passed. Members expressed a desire to find a balance between stopping all program development and developing new programs that are planned in thoughtful manner. Members agreed that a set of criteria needs to be developed on which to base the development of new programs. Generally, concerns were expressed that there are not any new programs being proposed outside Europe, which are more traditional study abroad sites. However, other members commented that getting students abroad in any way possible, including programs in Europe. Director Guinard added that there are other programs being developed across all of the regions. UCEAP is also in the process of writing grant proposals to develop new programs in less-popular regions and/or disciplines in order to increase the diversity of EAP’s programs; philanthropy is also a possibility for funding. One member asked that UCEAP investigate new heritage language programs (see above), where the goal is not second-language acquisition, but improving students’ heritage language skills, which may have been spoken at home. Creating a consortium of similar universities for common programs is another possibility in order to increase the pool of student participants in these less popular programs. Finally, some members expressed skepticism over the need for the Spain programs; however, one member vouched for the academic excellence of the faculty/programs of the Spanish universities mentioned in this proposal.

**ACTION: UCIE authorized that UCEAP move forward and continue to develop these two programs.**

## **VII. Preliminary UCEAP Budget**

**REPORT:** Director Guinard outlined the following budgetary challenges for UCEAP: Eliminate the \$2.6M deficit created in 2004-05 and 2005-06; and 2) on-going restructuring of UCEAP’s funding sources, from primary support from the General Funds, to a funding model that will rely almost entirely on students fees; 3) reduction of General Fund revenue over a three-year period - going to \$0 in FY 2013-2014; and 4) The consequent reduction of UCEAP’s overall net revenue by \$6M (21%) between 2007-08 and 2009-10.

UCEAP’s response(s) to these challenges include rapidly reducing expenditures, instituting program fees, promoting greater UC student participation, strengthening collaborations between UCEAP, campuses, the Academic Senate, and UCOP, and preserving quality and access. Another issue is reciprocity, which is a key part of UCEAP’s model. With the drive to increase revenues on the campuses, it has been questioned whether the income derived from these reciprocity students is less than what would be received from international students enrolling independent of EAP on the campuses. Reciprocity students who participate on UCDC now must pay the full cost of participation in this program, as UCDC is now on a self-supporting budget model as well. In terms of reciprocity, a number of the newer programs have been less inclusive of reciprocity, and have been designed more as stand-alone programs. However, the numbers of reciprocity students is actually stable, given that FTE growth is concentrated in many of the semester programs, which do not rely on reciprocity. There is also significant pressure from the campuses to revise the reciprocity model.

The proposed budget covers 2010-11 to 2013-14, and allows for a contingency and operating reserve, which will be developed over a three-year time horizon. By 2013-14, the contingency reserve and operating reserve is scheduled to reach \$4,600,000 and \$1,492,000 respectively. This reserve is not something that UCEAP can draw from. The proposed budget eliminates the deficit by the end of this year (currently at \$929,000). With respect to appropriations, UCEAP would still receive Opportunity Fund monies (~\$1M+) from UCOP, but General Fund monies will eventually decline to zero by 2013-14. Student fees are scheduled continue to rise with a one-time fee increase of about 7% next year. For the subsequent two years, UCEAP assumes a market-based fee increase on the magnitude of 3% per year. Enrollments are based on steady state of 4,700 for the next two years, then an increase to 4,900 the following year, and an increase to 5,100 for 2013-14. However, FTEs are scheduled to remain flat until 2013-14. That said, participant growth is assumed to be at 2-3%. The “Other” category includes UCEAP’s miscellaneous endowments. “Return to Aid” represents a tax. “Total Internat’l Offices & Reciprocity Expenses” are lumped together.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked how UCEAP manages financially with more participants, but steady FTEs. Director Guinard replied that this is accomplished through economies of scale within EAP’s semester programs. Therefore, the increased impact on staffing is minimal. Chair Haviland remarked that while it may be economical for UCEAP, it is probably not so for the campuses who have to recruit individual students. However, Director Guinard said this is softened by the increased role and responsibility that UCEAP is taking on in terms of recruitment on the campuses (website support, etc.). Streamlining of UCEAP processes will also help to lessen the impact on the campus offices. In general, members expressed the concern that the economics may not have been fully considered (especially its impact on the workload on the campus offices). With respect to special program-option fees, there is a request from Provost Pitts not to “socialize” programs by raising the fees on all programs to subsidize the less popular (and more expensive) programs. Members also talked about shared services between the campuses and UCEAP; it was noted that the budget allocation from UCEAP to support campus offices in place for the current year, but will be discontinued in future years.

### **VIII. Governing Committee Topics**

Members brought up the issue of international full fee-paying students, as opposed to reciprocity students. Director Guinard remarked that this is not currently within UCEAP’s portfolio, but it could utilize it centers abroad for the recruitment of international students. There is certainly some disparity among the campuses in this area. For example, UCB can boast 20% of its enrollment from international students; UCR’s share is significantly lower. UCB also has a significant degree of asymmetry in terms of exchange. It was noted that there are many graduate students who want to come to Berkeley, but UCB sends relatively few graduate students. On the other hand, Berkeley sends many undergraduate students, but receives very few reciprocity undergraduates. One member asked about bi-lateral agreements. Chair Haviland mentioned that one observation from the Australia review is that EAP’s reciprocity agreements with Australia are one-sided in that far fewer Australian students come to UC than should. EAP students could also be used as ambassadors for the “other” campuses (besides UCB and UCLA). Director Guinard remarked that the relative status of the other campuses is indeed rising.

One member asked about the details in moving away from the SCD model; he suggested bringing more details to the Governing Committee meetings. Director Guinard explained that while UCEAP may have less on-site faculty members at its SCs, it may actually increase UC faculty oversight/involvement in EAP programming via such structures as faculty advisory committees, thereby making faculty governance more efficient in the long-run (see *Item V. UCEAP Faculty Advisory Committees* above). Another issue is the potential administrative partnership with a campus. Possible models for such an administrative partnership may be simply be the provision of some services to UCEAP (e.g., information technology, human resources), to a complete move of UCEAP to the Santa Barbara campus. Director Guinard emphasized the need for UCEAP to continue to be perceived as a systemwide program, even it does indeed move to the UCSB campus.

**IX. Issues Under Review**

*Members declined to opine on any of these issues.*

**X. New Business: SCD Candidates – Executive Session**

**ACTION: Members made final recommendations on the appointment of SCD Directors for Chile/Argentina, France, Mexico (Mexico City), and Spain.**

**XI. Executive Session**

*Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.*

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

Attest: John Haviland, UCIE Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst