

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
iLINC MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 17, 2014

Present: Rick Kern (Chair, UCB), Isaac Scherson (UCI), Jyu-Lin Chen (UCSF), Ben Crow (UCSC), Rebecca Sweeley (Guest-UCM), Virginia Adan-Lifante, Eduardo Macagno (UCSD), Andres Resendez (UCD), Christina Schwenkel (UCR), Bill Jacob (Academic Council Chair-Ex Officio), Jean-Xavier Guinard (UCEAP), Linda York (UCEAP), and Todd Giedt (analyst)

I. Welcome/Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda.

II. UCEAP Director's Report – UCEAP Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director Jean-Xavier Guinard

REPORT: Director Guinard reported that UCEAP is on track to reach its enrollment target of 4,600 students in 2013-14, which would represent an increase of approximately 2.5% from the previous year. He noted that UCEAP experienced a significant increase in its summer enrollment by approximately 10%, but declines in the enrollments of its year-long programs continue. For 2014-15, UCEAP aims to increase its enrollments to 4,800 students, and reach 5,000 students two years from now. The regional enrollment picture is mixed. UCEAP enrollments in Region 1 (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Russia, and Sweden) fell. Region 2 (Botswana, China, Ghana, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, and Vietnam) and Region 4 (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Spain) enrollments have both rebounded. Region 3 (Australia, Barbados, Canada, Egypt, India, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Morocco, Multi-City Program, New Zealand, Turkey, and the United Kingdom) experienced significant growth. On the campuses, there is strong activity at UCLA and UCSB, but much of this activity is related to interest in summer programs; UCB, UCM, and UCSD are stable; and UCD has also rebounded. Unfortunately UCSC has experienced a significant decline in applicants to UCEAP programs.

With respect to UCEAP's finances, the contingency reserve is now fully funded at \$4.6M. Going forward, UCEAP will focus on investing these funds in order to garner better returns. They are also investing in their strategic plan initiatives, especially scholarships. Program option fees are an ongoing concern – UCEAP's goal is always to reduce these; some cross-subsidization of some of the more expensive programs may be possible. UCEAP also recently met with the Council of Campus Directors (CCD); a significant portion of the agenda included academic integration initiatives – specifically how to build so-called “maps” of certain majors for better articulation. UCEAP is also considering grants to award to teams of faculty and staff members to develop better course articulation in certain majors. UCEAP and the CCD will now meet monthly, in addition to face-to-face meetings twice a year. The faculty recruitment of new study center directors (beginning in fall 2015) and visiting professorships is now underway. Visiting professors are needed in China, Italy, The Netherlands, Japan; study center directors are needed in Chile/Argentina, China, France, Italy, Japan, Northern Europe, and Spain. As indicated by its discussions with the CCD, academic integration remains a core initiative. Towards that end, Associate Dean Stopples has visited a number of campuses; a more substantial report will be submitted later this year.

DISCUSSION: For the purposes of course articulation, Chair Kern asked how UCEAP addresses courses that are not stable, with fluid curricula. Consultant York responded that UCEAP asks academic departments to focus on programs with greater stability and less variability in their courses when looking at academic integration. Committee members were also interested in the reasons behind the variability in enrollment declines or gains across the campuses. Director Guinard responded that the reasons vary, but UCEAP always offers its help. Staff turnover at some campuses may be one reason; outreach varies as well. In response to a question about enrollment statistics by discipline, Director Guinard noted that UCEAP does indeed monitor enrollment by discipline very carefully. He added that while enrollments within academic majors are fairly stable across the board, the Social Sciences and the Humanities remains the staple of UCEAP’s enrollments. That said, UCEAP is working hard and diligently to increase enrollments in the STEM fields.

III. UCEAP Strategic Plan – UCEAP Executive Director Guinard

BRIEFING: Director Guinard informed members that the strategic plan is now finalized and is being implemented.

IV. Program Reviews

A. Costa Rica/Monteverde Review

REPORT: Merced representative Virginia Adan-Lifante, who authored the UCIE review of this review, noted that while the Costa Rica/Monteverde program is quite good, one of the main concerns is a need for new equipment.

DISCUSSION: Chair Kern commented that some reviewers wondered if ecology is keeping up with the state of the art in the field, and whether terming this program as a “biology” program is the correct programmatic framing? Should the program be relabeled and perhaps marketed in another way? UCIE recommended that UCEAP only investigate this issue further. With respect to the needed equipment, members suggested that some campuses might be able to donate some surplus equipment. However, others cautioned that surplus equipment is usually outdated and derelict, and may not be worth the effort to obtain it. The committee was also in favor of the Mexico Study Center Director Frank Joyce making additional visits to the Costa Rica/Monteverde site.

ACTION: UCIE will send a letter incorporating its comments to UCEAP.

B. United Kingdom Review

REPORT: Chair Kern asked for supplemental information and some fact checking of the statements made in the review.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard remarked that UCEAP’s view is that the report is more incomplete, rather than incorrect. He wishes that there had been more feedback on the programs in Scotland. Even if UCIE asked, it is more than likely that they will not be able to address Scotland at this point. He added, in response to UCIE’s recommendation against consolidation, he added that sometimes UCEAP must consider consolidation of its programs despite reservations on the campuses. Chair Kern urged that Leeds and York not be suspended unless there is greater substantiation than what is found in the report. At this point, the only justification is a drop in year-long enrollments. Director Guinard noted that such enrollment declines are a serious business consideration, despite the fact that both programs are academically solid. Chair Kern countered that Leeds and York are both valuable partners academically, and should be preserved if at all possible.

ACTION: Members approved the UCIE review of the UK review.

C. Questions for the 2013-14 Netherlands Review

BRIEFING: Consultant York commented that this review includes extraordinary and specific questions on student participation (especially enrollments in Maastricht), lower grades in courses taken in this program, special pedagogy at Maastricht, and a possible expansion with a summer program.

DISCUSSION: UCEAP confirmed that there is no study center director at The Netherlands, but there has been a special consultant assigned to this program in past years. Currently, there is a UC visiting professor at Utrecht. Consultant York commented that the grading issues may be a combination of the rigor of the courses, as well as grade translations. One member commented on the relative level of the program fees, especially for the multi-site program in art, and suggested that high cost could be one factor influencing the decline(s) in enrollments. Consultant York noted that the academic year programs are exchange-based, so the cost is quite reasonable. Costs will be a major point of consideration in any discussion of a new summer program in The Netherlands.

ACTION: UCIE approved the questions for The Netherlands.

D. 2014-15 Proposed Ten-Year Reviews: France, Ghana, & Spain

ACTION: Members approved France, Ghana, and Spain to be placed on the slate for the 2014-15 ten year reviews.

E. 2014-15 Proposed Three-Year Reviews: CIEE Africa – Botswana, Senegal, & Tanzania(with Ghana review); Pompeu Fabra (with Spain review); and CIEE Russia

ACTION: UCIE approved CIEE Africa, the Pompeu Fabrua, and CIEE Russia to be placed on the slate for the 2014-15 three-year reviews.

V. 2013-14 Program Portfolio Proposals: Technion – Israel Institute of Technology

BRIEFING: UCEAP proposes to partner with the Technion Israel Institute of Technology in Haifa, which is Israel's primary science, technology, and engineering university. This partnership would give EAP's STEM students access to courses at Technion's International School from a broad range of fields, including engineering, science, architecture, medicine, and management, as well as unique summer internship programs in entrepreneurship and engineering for developing countries. Programs would include summer, semester, and yearlong engineering exchanges with internships. This relationship would be a hybrid model in that it would be both fee- and exchange-based; indeed, UC campuses would host some some Technion reciprocity students.

DISCUSSION: Chair Kern raised the issue of the calendar; the fall semester runs from October to February, and the Spring semester is from March to July. For Berkeley and Merced, the calendar would only work for the spring semester. For the quarter campuses, students studying at Technion would have to take either fall and winter quarters or both winter and spring quarters off. Director Guinard added that they are hoping to see larger numbers of students going in the summer, but they would accommodate any students showing interest in studying for a year. The summer calendar would run from the end of May until the end of September, which would be designed to accommodate UCEAP students in the form of an eight-week summer program. Technion has also offered to work with UCEAP to create industry internships in the summer. Another member asked how financial aid issues

would impede the summer program? Director Guinard responded that this is a campus issue, and it depends on when the financial is distributed; the program itself meets all of the requirements for financial aid. Members were also interested in the total percentage of engineering students that enroll in UCEAP programs currently. Director Guinard remarked that these numbers are growing from the single digits (e.g., 3-5%); he is hopeful that programs like Technion will expand these enrollments even further. Indeed, summer is one time when there might be a gap in the engineering students' crowded course schedule. One member cautioned that some STEM disciplinary faculty might be resistant to students introducing a study abroad program to their already-packed course(s) of study. The Committee also asked whether the summer courses would be taught in English exclusively. Director Guinard clarified that most of the courses taken by UCEAP would be in English. Finally, it was asked how Technion compares to other programs in Israel on a cost-basis. Director Guinard said that cost has always been an issue with programs in Israel. Beyond scholarships, one way to mitigate the high cost is the establishment of one-to-one exchange for the semester program. UCEAP hopes that the summer is not cost-prohibitive; if so, program option fees may become necessary.

VI. Information Items

A. New Global Health Summer Program with Existing Partner Thammasat University

BRIEFING: Thammasat University, within the School of Global Studies, would offer qualified EAP undergraduate students an opportunity to take classes in Global Health through its Global Health Summer Program. The program focuses on “Border Health”, and would include two three-week courses – “Mobility and Border Health” and “Health Realities and Border Populations.” Each of the three week courses comprises a week class-based, a week field-based, and a week with a social innovation lab-based component.

DISCUSSION: Members asked which kinds of undergraduate majors would honor the units students receive via this program, given that public health is not a common major for undergraduates? Director Guinard replied that pre-health or pre-med majors would be viable for the program, but there are also some public health majors emerging on campuses, with some minors as well (e.g., Berkeley’s Global Poverty minor). Development Studies (e.g., the Global Poverty major at UCB), Asian Studies, Anthropology, and Sociology would also be candidates for this program.

B. UCEAP India Program Exploration & Development Status Report

BRIEFING: UCEAP is in the process of consulting with a newly formed India Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) to explore options for initiating new academic relationships with institutions in India. A call went out to the group for new ideas and comment on possible affiliations listed in the meeting enclosure, which highlights some notable institutions in terms of their academic quality and/or support services. UCEAP welcomes UCIE’s comments on any or all of these developments at this preliminary stage.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that India has historically been very expensive from a programmatic point of view. Director Guinard commented that this is mostly due to what UCEAP is being charged by its providers, and has hurt UCEAP’s recruitment for these programs in the past. The UCSC member mentioned that the Santa Cruz has recently signed a MOU with Punjab Technical University. Directory Guinard commented that smaller institutions are generally not viable as UCEAP partners, as they are not large enough to attract sufficient numbers of students. These smaller institutions tend to draw students from niche areas and then only from a small number of campuses.

VII. Vision Statement of International Education at the University of California

ISSUE: Chair Kern asked for comments on the recent revisions made to the *Vision Statement*. With respect to the “recommended actions” in the *Statement*, he said that these might accompany the *Statement* in a cover memo.

DISCUSSION: Member expressed the concern that the *Statement* looks more like a UCEAP vision statement. Instead, it should comment on the holistic internationalization of the University as a whole. UCEAP is only one part of a larger effort to internationalize the University. It might be wise to therefore to include the recommended actions in the actual *Statement*. Other members opined that the *Statement* also seems to take the point of view that international education is only an augmentation of the core undergraduate curricula at UC, instead of a central part of it. An important question is how does international education add to the profile of UC as a system? Director Guinard added that while the *Statement* does lay out a vision, the second part of the document could better aspire to set policy. That said, he remarked that the timing of such a Senate *Statement* is right with new leadership at UC. Finally, he noted that there is no mention of, or specific reference to UCEAP anywhere in the current document. Another member commented that in its current form, the statement seems dated as well. Indeed, UCIE’s agendas have not addressed the establishment of new strategic partnerships with foreign institutions. In short, UCIE has not realized the breadth of its mandate. Chair Kern responded that the aim of the *Statement* is to express the values that would lead to the desired policy development, and not so much to lay out specific actions. Director Guinard added that leadership in international education seems to have migrated from UCOP to the campuses.

ACTION: Rebecca Sweeley and Ben Crow volunteered to re-draft the Vision Statement by February 1.

VIII. New Business

IX. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken during executive sessions.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Attest: Richard Kern, UCIE Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst