

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 21, 2011

Present: Linda York, John Haviland, Todd Giedt, Giacomo, Yang Ye, Vincent Resh, Volodytnmyr Bilotkach, Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Jean-Xavier Guinard, Kat Um, Ronald Arruejo (student rep), Ann Craig, Jeanette Money, and Errol Lobo (T)

I. Chair's Comments

Chair Haviland welcomed Linda York, who is a new consultant for UCIE and is a Regional Director at UCEAP. He also itemized some of the “action items” from the last meeting: 1) A proposal on formal reviews, which includes making a request to the Senate Chair to share the cost of site visits; 2) a proposal to investigate a faculty advisory committee (FAC) on heritage language(s); 3) an update on the study center director (SCD) appointments; and 4) the so-called “ban” on new program development.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard responded that UCEAP is still looking at how to divide up the various FACs, including expanding some of the existing FACs. Some members commented that this may mean more than just expanding an existing FAC (e.g. a FAC on heritage language). With respect to this FAC in particular, Director Guinard said that UCEAP is indeed aware of this request, and remarked that one option is expanding the Spanish language FAC.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the Draft Minutes from the November 4, 2010 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the agenda and the minutes with some amendments.

III. Director's Report

REPORT: Director Guinard provided an update on some of his initial goals, which he related to UCIE at the November 2010 meeting. His visits to the campuses are almost complete. He will now be compiling this information into a report, and begin engaging in strategic planning – both at the systemwide and at the campus levels (CADs and CCDs); study centers will also be included.

Enrollments: EAP enrollments are up from 4,528 (2009-10) to 4,872 (2010-11); the number of FTEs have risen by about 100 each year for the past three years. Applications for the 2011-12 academic year are up by approximately nine percent as well. Director Guinard acknowledged that these numbers may possibly reflect the general increase in enrollments at the University; if these enrollments were to decline, then EAP's enrollment numbers could decline as well.

Programmatic updates: UCEAP is responding to Secretary of State Clinton's 100,000 Strong Initiative in China; each campus already has a number of China-based initiatives. That said, China Beijing enrollments have fallen recently. Travel restrictions are being lifted in Cuba. UC Davis has a program there; UCEAP would like to work with Davis to develop a new program in Cuba.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): UCEAP is working on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for an administrative partnership with UCSB; the first draft was submitted to the Governing

Committee in November 2010. UCEAP is currently refining this draft. The critical components of the MOU include retaining UCEAP's systemwide identity and instituting a firewall between UCSB's budget and UCEAP's budget. In short, the MOU will lay out a fixed flat tax for general administrative services (e.g., Human Resources), as well a supplemental fees for certain services. Another driver is to get UCEAP staff off UCOP payroll in the MOU. Technically, UCEAP staff are on the UCSB/UCLA payroll and pay rate schedule. There is some consultation taking place with the Divisional Academic Senate regarding the MOU. Although there is some consideration to moving UCEAP onto the UCSB campus at some point, this is not likely in the near future. UCEAP's current lease expires in 2013-14. Although the lease is expensive, UCEAP is subletting space in the building, which partially offsets some of the cost. UCEAP will also recruit a faculty member from UCSB to assist Director Guinard with a planned start date of April 1. They will also be increasing student interns from UCSB.

Reciprocity: The white paper on reciprocity, which was requested by Provost Pitts, is almost finished and will provide some information about the nature/financials of the reciprocity exchanges. In short, UCEAP is able to make study abroad affordable because of its many reciprocity agreements. However, an additional fee may be assessed on reciprocity students on some campuses who participate in the UCDC program, given its new status as a self-supporting program. UCEAP recently submitted a resolution stating that it is not in a position to pay for reciprocity students' UCDC fees. If one looks at the distribution of reciprocity students, EAP has a much more balanced distribution than what is typically seen in the *Open Doors* data. Contrary to popular belief, most reciprocity students are undergraduates (95% of the total).

Budget: It is not anticipated that Governor Brown's proposed \$500M cut will significantly impact UCEAP because of the already scheduled (and planned for) deep cuts (\$700K this year), which would be close to UCEAP's share of the \$500M cut. That said, UCEAP is well-prepared to handle some additional small cuts, although campus cuts to EAP/international program offices will hurt participation in EAP programs. Although UCEAP no longer subsidizes the campus offices, it is interested in specific projects that may lessen burdens on students. One such project is funding the cost of obtaining passports for students at UC Merced and UC Riverside.

Faculty Oversight/Academic Integration: Faculty oversight is changing to achieve a better balance of SCDs, liaison officers/resident directors, and faculty consultants (FCs). There is a stipend of between \$6,000 and \$8,000 associated with the FC position. The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) is another instrument of faculty oversight. The FACs are moving away from regional foci to thematic or subject area foci. With respect to academic integration, there is an interest in systematizing across the system. Most students want approved courses by discipline or major. The problem for EAP students is more complex than it is for transfer students, as the courses in question are far more wide-ranging. UCEAP is not looking to reduce faculty oversight, but actually increase it.

EAP Initiatives: UCEAP is trying to align some of its programs to better fit a quarter schedule. It has proposed the "Gap Summer Abroad" program for transfer students to study abroad during the summer. There is also an offer on the table to develop a proposal to use UCEAP's study centers as key parts of an international student recruitment strategy. Development is another important area, and UCEAP would like to work closely with the campuses to raise funds for student scholarships. For instance, some of EAP's some 80,000 alumni may be interested in earmarking their contributions for study abroad scholarships. UCEAP is interested in hiring a development officer as well. UCEAP and UCLA are writing a grant to the Luce Foundation begin new programs in the Philippines and Indonesia. Finally, UCEAP has submitted a proposal for UC's on-line instruction initiative, which would provide

on-line instruction for three courses (a pre-departure course, an internship course, and a research methods course).

DISCUSSION: Chair Haviland asked if Director Guinard has been able to talk with the upper levels of management at the campuses. He responded that he has met with Chancellors, EVCs, and Deans/Provosts on a number of campuses, and commented that there are a number of misconceptions about the reform at UCEAP, which he tried to correct. Another member asked about expanding EAP programming into graduate education. Director Guinard responded that this does indeed come up from time-to-time; UCEAP is interested in doing something about this and would like to explore some options. He added that reciprocity students, while not specifically related to EAP graduate programming, represent a recruitment opportunity for future international graduate students. UCIE continues to monitor UCEAP's size, and asked about current staffing levels. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP stands at approximately 71 FTEs, which will grow to 73 FTEs within the next couple of years in order to strengthen a couple of critical areas – academic integration and development; a faculty position (“dean”) will also be needed. The current lease expires in 2013-14; UCEAP has a couple of sub-leases. Chair Haviland asked that the UCSB Divisional Senate consider the MOU first, and then refer it to UCIE, which could consider at its next meeting in March. With respect to reciprocity, it was noted that some countries, such as Australia, produce too few reciprocity students. Consultant Linda York responded that most of the Australia agreements are indeed 1:1; there are indeed a few places around the world where it is difficult to find reciprocity students to go into the UC system. With respect to SCDs, UCIE asked about the lowest level of SCDs that it could expect. The current plan calls for a reduction of SCDs to somewhere between six and eight; UCEAP is currently at ten SCDs. As a way of comparison, EAP maintained between 25 and 30 SCDs just a couple of years ago. If UCEAP finds itself in a financial position to create a revised SCD model, that could be place on the table at that time. Utilizing former SCDs as FCs will certainly be a first step in implementing a faculty consultant model; the challenge going forward will be in using newer faculty who do not have direct experience as former SCDs. Director Guinard added that the use of local faculty has been much more widespread in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East; this is certainly not a new model. A basic SCD costs UCEAP about \$120,000 annually, which includes the faculty's salary, as well as housing/cost of living allowance(s); the faculty's department now receives \$50,000 per SCD. Adding faculty regional directors to the regular staff regional directors is still another way to improve faculty governance. With respect to academic integration, members did express an interest in creating a systemwide database of approved courses. Director Guinard commented that the focus of the new position in academic integration would be to coordinate an effort to create such a database. One caveat is that just because a course was approved on one campus does not mean it will be approved on another campus. One member remarked that while expanding the disciplinary focus in academic integration is reasonable, this involves a shift in student culture when they consider study abroad options (from geographical location to major). Director Guinard said that UCEAP is seeing this shift already, and there are early indications (from market research) that a disciplinary focus is indeed coming much more into vogue. That said, one member remarked that many student are still interested in location first, major second. Chair Haviland added that by and large, departments have been taking the lead in this area, and directing students to specific programs. Another member added that UC students go abroad for a host of reasons – and location does usually play a role, but the ability to provide a menu of diverse options is key. The challenge is making it useful to them in terms of their major requirements. One member asked if there are any indications of whether scholarships are facilitating study abroad, adding that small scholarships may be enough to push students into making the choice to study abroad. Director Guinard said that the data only shows indirect evidence for that, but they are convinced that it would indeed make a huge difference. Parents – especially first-generation parents – also make a key

difference, and may constrain some students from studying abroad in some cases. Therefore, selling the parents on study abroad is important.

III. Academic Integration

ISSUE: The Senate has been asked to think about academic integration in general. UCSD is one place where academic integration (AI) has been working well. Consultant York remarked that both UCSB and UCSD have been active in AI, and this is not only limited to course approvals. At the forefront, AI efforts include examining learning outcomes, rather than specific courses, which, at some places (e.g., Sciences Po), change every couple of years.

DISCUSSION: Members suggested posting specific and actual examples of what might work with respect to major credit. Similarly, departments could put up their own pages. Chair Haviland remarked that AI has multiple constituencies (e.g., students and their advisors), but it also includes the faculty as a whole. For instance, many faculty in a number of disciplines (even those that are well-aligned with study abroad) do not think about international education at all. One thing that UCSD has done is to have regular meetings with department chairs. Director Guinard added that AI efforts are taking place on all campuses to incorporate not only UCEAP programs, but also programs from third-party providers and other campus options. Chair Haviland remarked that what seems to be missing is the lack of outreach to under-represented minorities. UCIE should encourage local CIEs to look at those special populations that are not currently included in outreach efforts. He also cautioned that some “global seminars” are in competition with EAP summer programs, as well as special summer programs put on by individual or small groups of faculty members (e.g., archeology digs). While presenting all relevant data is important, some of this “data” is not statistically significant (e.g., the numbers on time-to-graduation). As an aside, another member added that she did do a quantitative study on her campus that showed there was no difference in time-to-graduation for study abroad students vis-à-vis regular or non-study abroad students. Members also applauded UCSD’s program(s) in both preparation and post-experience re-immersion, adding that it is often difficult to get students to reflect on their academic experience(s), as opposed to the personal growth aspects of study abroad. Members also remarked that these types of seminars or courses often fall into the gray area between academic affairs and student affairs. With respect to UCEAP’s proposal for on-line instruction, members suggested a link-up to the Gates Scholarship program.

ACTION: Members will send feedback on the white paper to the Analyst Todd Giedt.

IV. Recruitment of UCEAP SCDs and Visiting Professors

ISSUE: Members received an update on various SCD appointments. There is now one SCD for Chile and Argentina, as well as one SCD for all programs in France, which will be based either in Lyon or Bordeaux. UCEAP is in talks with the Provost regarding ways in which Casa de California can be aligned with EAP, thereby increasing its functionality. The SCD for Egypt will also have responsibility for EAP’s Turkey programs. The Beijing SCD position is being consolidated under the Shanghai SCD position. In Japan, UCEAP is recruiting for a faculty representative/short-term instructor at the Tokyo study center, and a visiting professorship in Meiji Gakuin.

ACTION: UCIE approved the recruitment and charges for these positions.

V. EAP Program Reviews

Members emphasized the importance of UCEAP follow-up with respect to the outcome(s) of these reviews. In particular, UCEAP’s responses to these reviews should be less general, and respond to

specific recommendations made in the review.

A. New Zealand and Australia Review Reports

REPORT: Chair Haviland reported that under the new modality of no site-visits, the data provided was central to this review. However, if these data are not significant or intractable, there is very little value in the review, with the main concern being that the data provided was not sufficient to answer some of the questions. Another issue was the lack of an opportunity to meet with returnees, which may have helped.

ACTION: Vincent Resh will review Australia review documents and report back to the committee in March.

B. New Zealand Report

REPORT: One issue is grade inflation and/or grade conversion. There are some reports that the courses in New Zealand are “tougher” than UC courses. Indeed, there was some evidence that the grades received were somewhat higher than these students' GPAs would suggest. Some New Zealand institutions are interested in partnering with UC; this should be looked into. There are also reciprocity issues – mainly in unequal flows of students (more UC students going than New Zealand students coming). There is also an issue of grade transfer for the New Zealand reciprocity students. The different exchange ratios for the different New Zealand institutions may also be problematic; some institutions will take as many as the agreement allows, while others will only accept the same amount of students that they are sending.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard remarked that the challenge for UCEAP is to have consistency in its grade conversions across programs and study centers. With faculty SCDs, this is generally not a problem; with liaison officers, it can be a problem.

ACTION: Kum-Kum Bhavnani volunteered to review the New Zealand documentation and report back at the March meeting.

C. Questions for the Korea and China Reviews, 2010-11

DISCUSSION: Members suggested including a question about the different writing systems (as opposed to Taiwan). With respect to question three, where did the information about a 30% grading curve at Fudan come from? One member familiar with Fudan said that he is unaware of such a grading curve; Director Guinard said that this question will be removed. What are the other “context courses” referred to in question five? Consultant York responded that various EAP programs have sometimes required these types of courses (e.g., African History for the Ghana program and Central European History for the former Budapest program). Members remarked that these types of courses are not available on all UC campuses, but on-line instruction may be a possibility for such courses. Chair Haviland suggested that a background statement accompany some of these questions to place them in a better context for the review committee. He added that committee members must attend to two different goals in these reviews: 1) the quality of the academics of the program in question; and 2) specific issues, concerns, and problems, which can be both academic and non-academic in nature. The review committee could use some guidance on these related, but distinct goals. Members also discussed the value of general questions vis-à-vis specific questions, acknowledging that some general questions are indeed necessary. Developing quantitative and qualitative measures across programs is also important; general questions should reflect such data. Another member suggested dividing the questionnaire into different sections with both standard questions (associated with particular objectives)

and tailored questions. Director Guinard agreed with this approach, but remarked that this process seems subject to change, as members on UCIE change and request changes to the process. Finally, one member noted the dearth of questions relating to a summer program in China; Director Guinard responded that UCEAP could add a couple of questions on the summer program.

ACTION: Members recommended some email exchanges with Yang Ye (China) and Cristian Ricci (Korea) before the China and Korea questions are finalized.

D. Singapore Review Update from 2008-09

REPORT: Director Guinard reported that Singapore is challenging from a recruitment perspective, but it is a great program from an academic prospective.

DISCUSSION: One member (who was on the formal review committee) remarked that some Singaporean students were disappointed with American students who were simply using Singapore as a base to travel throughout Southeast Asia. This also has an impact on the academics of the program (e.g., frequent travel diminishes students' full integration into the cooperative learning style of pedagogy in place at the University of Singapore). Members recommended emphasizing the uniqueness of Singapore itself in the promotional materials, as opposed to promoting it as the center/hub of Southeast Asia.

VI. Program Proposal for new Semester and Year-Long Programs at Bogazici University and Koc University

PROPOSAL: There is a growing interest in studying in Turkey, especially in Istanbul; current programs are located outside of Istanbul in Ankara. UCEAP has decided to offer programs at two institutions (as opposed to only one), which are quite different in their strengths and offerings. While these two programs may compete with other programs in Ankara, it is not clear whether this will actually happen, but UCEAP will monitor this dynamic going forward. The Egypt SCD will visit Istanbul once per year and these programs will fall under his or her oversight. Liaison officers will also be onsite. Istanbul may also be a site to explore Farsi language studies.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the minimal costs of the programs and its enrollment projections. Director Guinard said that adding these programs to EAP's portfolio do not represent a significant investment of time and effort at the campus offices. They are expecting an initial cohort of about 50 students.

ACTION: Members approved both programs.

VII. UCEAP Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) on Spanish Language and Culture

REPORT: Director Guinard said that the creation of this FAC is in response to feedback from faculty on a number of advisory committees for EAP's Spanish Language and Culture programs around the world. The proposed membership of the committee is composed of both Academic Senate members and chairs/instructors in Spanish language departments on a number of UC campuses.

DISCUSSION: It was mentioned that on some campuses, language instruction is "balkanized," meaning that it is divided up between as many different departments and Faculties with different constituencies in each one (e.g., UCSD). Therefore, some FAC members may have less power/authority than others on a particular campus.

VIII. New Business

ISSUE: Chair Haviland raised the issue of the so-called “ban” on new program development. Members will entertain this issue in their executive session. The original reason for the ban was a perceived erratic creation and elimination of programs. Chair Haviland added that it is unreasonable to assume that EAP can grow without the permission to move forward on the development of new programs. Director Guinard remarked that EAP is moving away from longer immersion programs to ones that are shorter, and emphasize internships and service learning.

ACTION: UCIE made the following resolution with respect to the “ban” on new programs:

“UCIE agrees to consider new program proposals with the expectation that new programs will be reviewed on an ad-hoc basis, will be self-supporting, and that faculty consultation will take place through the relevant FACs, which should be involved at the preliminary stages of the development of the new program. UCIE should be informed that such planning is taking place.”

IX. Executive Session

No minutes were taken 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