

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 27, 2011

Present: Kum-Kum Bhavnani (chair), Ann Craig (vice chair), Rick Kern (B), Guacomo Bernardi (SC), Ed Dimendberg (I), Kalju Kahn (SB), Jeanette Money (D), Carlos Quicoli (LA), Elizabeth Sciaky (graduate student representative-SB), Andrew J. Rawls (undergraduate student representative-SB), Todd Giedt (analyst), Khatharya Um (CCD representative), Jean-Xavier Guinard (UCEAP Director), Mary McMahon (UCEAP Regional Director, and Ann Marie Plane (UCEAP Faculty-in-Residence)

I. Executive Session/Chair’s Comments

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda.

B. Approval of the Minutes

ACTION: Members approved the minutes from the November 4, 2011 meeting.

III. Director's Report

REPORT: The Governing Committee approved a business model that cuts UCEAP’s general subsidy by half until UCEAP’s general subsidy reaches zero in 2015-16. This action is predicated on the assumptions that UCEAP will continue to enjoy enrollment growth of approximately 3.5% going forward, along with tuition increases of 8% per year. The Governing Committee also approved plans for the surplus that was generated this past year (and in future years): a \$500K scholarship program (for each of the next three years), investment in strategic initiatives, academic integration, and some revenue sharing with the campuses (about \$1M per year for the next three years). If tuition increases do not materialize and/or growth in student enrollments are not realized, then UCEAP will eliminate revenue sharing with the campuses. Planning for EAP’s 50th Anniversary celebration is underway, along with a new website (<http://eap.ucop.edu/anniv/Pages/default.aspx>), and a schedule of events. He highlighted some of these events: 1) A UCSB Alumni Weekend (April) – William Allaway, EAP’s first director, will be honored; 2) a UCB academic conference with UC Berkeley’s Center for Higher Education in late October/November that will focus on the value of study abroad in undergraduate education (former EAP Director John Marcum will be honored); and 3) the CIEE conference in Shanghai, China (also in fall 2012). At the January Regents meeting, Director Guinard made a presentation on EAP’s history/50th Anniversary, which is leading to a resolution in the State Legislature. UCEAP also recently hired a new Director of Development to energize its fund-raising efforts among its alumni base for student scholarships.

UCEAP will be facing a number of enrollment/budgetary challenges in the coming year however. Last year, UCEAP experienced record enrollments, with 4800 students; this year, enrollment stands at approximately 4600. For 2012-13, UCEAP estimates that there might be further reductions in enrollments, especially in year-long enrollments. Indeed, UCEAP experienced a 20% drop in year-long enrollments this year. UCEAP speculates that the fee increases over the past three years have changed the thinking of students with an emphasis on graduating as soon as possible. As a result, students seem to be reconsidering studying abroad. Director Guinard should have a better idea of next year’s enrollments at the March meeting.

DISCUSSION: One member asked about Director Guinard’s long-term vision for EAP’s faculty-led programs. He noted that there are five faculty-led programs in the works for now; these are being held in conjunction with EAP’s 50th Anniversary. After these five programs are evaluated, UCEAP will make a decision about future faculty-led programs. The key question is whether EAP is replicating what the campuses are already doing with their own faculty-led programs. The short answer is no, UCEAP does not want to simply replicate campus-based programs. Another member asked about the 20% drop in year-long programs – is UCEAP engaging in any special recruiting efforts/campaign to reverse this trend? Or is it just a question of student finances? Director Guinard responded that although UCEAP is quite enthusiastic about new shorter-term program, it continues to push for year-long immersion programs through its marketing campaigns. In addition, some of EAP’s scholarships will try to target year-long immersion programs. That said, UCEAP is responding to the market; he noted that there is a well-documented trend towards interest shorter-term programs with a corresponding fall in the demand of year-long programs. There is particular potential for growth in summer programs. In short, this means that UCEAP will continue to develop shorter semester-length and summer programs going forward. UCEAP Faculty-in-Resident Ann Marie Plane added that UCEAP is responding to students concerns over the high costs of the year-long programs, along with the transfer of course credit. New scholarships that specifically target year-long programs should help to alleviate some of these costs. With respect to course credit transfer, UCEAP is targeting certain programs for certain majors, thereby maximizing students’ chances of receiving major credit for the courses that they do take on these programs. One member asked UCEAP utilizes EAP alumni to market its programs? Faculty-in-Residence Plane responded that UCEAP uses returnees as interns, but also puts them in contact with other prospective students. The campus offices also have “student ambassador” type programs. Another member asked if there really is a problem with delays in time-to-graduation for EAP students, especially in the longer term programs? Director Guinard responded that it is more of a perception than a reality that study abroad delays graduation. Faculty-in-Residence Plane announced that UCEAP is launching a major initiative with an academic integration workgroup, which will work to address this misperception. Regarding future EAP enrollments, Chair Bhavnani commented that while UCEAP is relying on 8% fee increases for its budget model, yet it is precisely these increases that are decreasing the enrollment in EAP’s programs. Director Guinard agreed with this observation.

IV. 2011-12 Formal Review Questions

A. Questions for the Ireland Formal Review

DISCUSSION: Chair Bhavnani commented that there are small numbers of students going to areas in Ireland outside of Dublin. She asked if these programs might be consolidated in some way. Director Guinard agreed, and said that he would ask the review committee to consider this question.

ACTION: Members approved the questions for the Ireland Formal Review.

B. Questions for the South Africa Review

ACTION: Members approved the questions for the South Africa Formal Review.

V. New Program Proposals

A. CIEE Prague, Czech Republic

PROPOSAL: In partnership with the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), UCEAP proposes to offer UC undergraduate students two programs to study in English for a fall or spring semester in Prague, the Czech Republic. The Prague proposal represents UCEAP’s effort to

re-introduce programs in Central Europe with two different tracks/programs. One is the Central European Studies (CES) program option and the other is Film Studies program option. The CES program option would be designed for students with an interest in the Czech Republic, Central Europe, and issues relating to political, social, and/or economic transformation from state control to democratic market-based systems. The Film Studies program option is specially designed for students with a film studies major and a strong background in applied film, and offers two concentrations, one in film production and the other in screenwriting. UCEAP anticipates that the Film Studies track will require a program option fee, which is an area of concern. However, if there is a large group of students attracted by this option, UCEAP might be able to drop the fee. In its marketing surveys, UCEAP has found significant student interest in the Czech Republic generally, and Prague specifically. UCEAP is partnering more and more with CIEE because it allows UCEAP to maintain these programs without a minimum number of students.

DISCUSSION: One member asked about a strategy/philosophy to balance EAP's own programs with those programs that EAP partners with third-party providers like CIEE. In addition, how does UCEAP plan to balance immersion programs with shorter term programs? Director Guinard responded that the first goal is to offer as many immersion programs as possible. The second goal is to offer stability and sustainability; cost is the principal reason that UCEAP has been forced to close so many of its former programs. CIEE allows EAP to offer programs with few numbers of students. With respect to balance, Director Guinard said that he would keep these third-party provider programs to a relatively low number, except if it makes sense strategically to increase their numbers. UCEAP partners with two main third-party providers – CIEE and ACCENT International. Another way to look at this is the percentage of partners that UCEAP maintains. UCEAP currently has relationships with 250 partners in 36 countries. Of these, third-party providers currently comprise about five, which is still very low overall. Members also voiced concern over the academic rigor (as expressed in the student evaluations) of the Czech program and the grading (e.g., 70% of the grade being for participation). Director Guinard will highlight these concerns to the Regional Directors. One member requested that some form of reciprocity be arranged with this program, especially for the Film Studies track. While this may be possible, Director Guinard mentioned that reciprocity has recently come under fire as campuses try to increase their recruitment of full-paying international students. Reciprocity will be a topic on the March UCIE meeting agenda.

ACTION: 1) Members approved both tracks of the CIEE Prague Program with the caveat that particular attention be paid to the student reviews regarding academic rigor; and 2) reciprocity will be place on the March UCIE meeting agenda.

B. CIEE Afro-Brazilian Studies Program in Salvador de Bahia, Brazil

PROPOSAL: UCEAP wants to restore a presence in San Salvador, Brazil; they are proposing a program in Brazilian Studies with CIEE, which would allow EAP students to study in Salvador da Bahia – either at Universidade Catolica do Salvador (UCSal) or Universidade Federal da Bahia (UFBA) – with the opportunity to take core courses that address Afro-Brazilian topics.

DISCUSSION: One member noted that last year UCEAP closed its program in San Salvador for reasons of student security and academic quality; this proposal aims to work with the same group of faculty as the previous program. With this in mind, it might be advisable to do further study on the San Salvador program. Director Guinard responded that this portrayal is somewhat inaccurate because UCEAP is now partnering with CIEE, which is a different partner. He added that UCEAP's

main problem was with the former program’s organization. UCEAP is trying to fast-track this program because of high student demand. UCEAP is also proposing a different type of program. Previously, UCEAP offered a language and culture program in San Salvador; this new program is more focused on the cultural component – in particular on Afro-Brazilian Studies. With respect to security, he remarked that it was more a problem with a set of student behaviors, as opposed to security per se. With the change in program type, UCEAP is trying to attract a different kind of student, which should alleviate this problem. Another member asked about language background – would students with a background in Spanish be able to handle Portuguese? UCEAP has been informed that students with some Spanish should be able to complete the program. Regional Director Mary McMahon added that past Spanish-language students have done well in Brazil, but it ultimately depends on the students’ motivation and work ethic. That said, this remains a faculty concern. One challenge is the lack of Portuguese language instruction on some UC campuses. UCEAP will offer a four-week Intensive Language Program before the start of the program. One member mentioned that this program seems very similar to the one in Rio in terms of its requirements. Director Guinard acknowledged that EAP may lose a few students from Rio, but he does not think that these numbers will be significant.

ACTION: UCIE approved the Afro-Brazilian Studies Program in Salvador de Bahia program with the proviso that UCEAP checks to see if the same faculty pool is being used as the former program; this suggestion will be forwarded to the faculty advisory committee.

VI. UCEAP Information Items

A. Proposed Plan for Academic Oversight of UCEAP

ISSUE: Faculty-in-Residence Plane will forward a final plan for approval at the March UCIE meeting. This plan will also be circulated among the campus administrative directors (CAD), as well as current and past study center directors. UCEAP is planning on eight to ten study center director FTEs for next year (currently at 6.5 FTEs); the ad-hoc faculty advisory committees will now be regularized by making them standing committees. Finally, UCEAP will be increasing the number of visiting UC professors at many of its locations (there are three to four visiting professors currently).

DISCUSSION: With respect to teaching assignments, it was asked if UCEAP identifies the needs of its partner institutions and then puts out a call. UCEAP Regional Director Mary McMahon responded that sometimes UCEAP is able to identify a need; at other times the faculty can teach whatever he or she wants to teach. Chair Bhavnani asks that if revenues do decline, she assumes that UCEAP will not be able to add new study center directors. Director Guinard confirmed this.

B. Update on UCEAP Strategic Plan: New Program Development/Consolidation Initiative

ISSUE: UCEAP’s aims to establish ten new programs this year; however, this number is not definitive. All proposals go before the Council of Campus Faculty Directors (CCD) and the CAD for review and comment. UCEAP acknowledges both the importance of reciprocity and the need to balance EAP’s own programs with those from third-party providers. At UCIE’s March meeting, UCEAP will present an updated “wish-list” of desired programs.

VII. New Business – Program Approval Process

DISCUSSION: Chair Bhavnani expressed UCIE’s recommendation to receive new program proposals initially in meeting #1 and approve it in meeting #2; thereby instituting a two-stage program proposal process. Such a process would allow UCIE members to discuss the proposal, as well as take it back to their respective campus committees. Director Guinard responded that ad-hoc faculty committees

already develop these programs with faculty input. Given that UCEAP meets only a couple of times per year, such a process could mean significant delays for new programs. To mitigate this, members agreed that votes could be taken over email. In response to questions about the amount of anticipated new programs, Director Guinard added that it is difficult to determine the number of all anticipated programs for any given year. Besides that, a definite number may not be that helpful anyway, because some programs are quite small, while others are very significant. The CAD representative made the point that new programs – both large and small programs – have a definite impact on campus resources.

ACTION: UCEAP agreed to pursue this new process; UCIE agreed to re-evaluate this process once the academic oversight plan is in place.

VIII. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Attest: Kum-Kum Bhavnani, UCIE Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst