

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 16, 2012

Present: Kum-Kum Bhavnani (chair), Ann Craig (vice chair), Piya Ch. (UCR), Rick Kern (B), Giacomo Bernardi (SC), Ed Dimendberg (I), Kalju Kahn, Jeanette Money (D), Elizabeth Sciaky (graduate student representative-SB), Todd Giedt (analyst), Jean-Xavier Guinard (UCEAP Director), Mary McMahan (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 January 27, 2012 meeting.

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

REPORT: At the last Governing Committee meeting, UCEAP presented its realistic assumptions that its enrollments will not grow this year, and student fees will remain flat until summer 2012; after that time, UCEAP is assuming a six percent tuition increase. Given the staggered nature of the tuition increases last year, UCEAP lost approximately \$1.45M in income, as they did not implement the fee increases until the spring. Therefore, Governing Committee members agreed to scale back UCEAP's earlier objectives, as outlined in its strategic plan. Instead, the Governing Committee opined that UCEAP should concentrate its efforts on maintaining its subsidy reduction plan (which declines to zero dollars in 2014/15), as well as its revenue sharing plan with the campuses. UCEAP will continue to fund its other strategic priorities (see below), albeit at a lower level than before. Any surplus will be used to continue to build UCEAP's contingency reserve fund, as well as investing in scholarships. It is expected that the contingency fund will grow to \$2.3M by the end of this year, to \$3.5M by 2012-13, and to \$4.6M by 2013-14.

With respect to enrollments, UCEAP reported an estimate of 4,650 enrollments for 2011-12; this number will be finalized in late April. This represents a decline from the 4,800 students that UCEAP enrolled last year, which can be accounted for in two ways. First, enrollments in year-long programs have declined by about 20%. Second, UC Davis experienced a sharp decline in its EAP enrollments. For 2012-13, UCEAP is projecting between 4,300 and 4,700 enrolled students in its programs. On the whole, there seem to be three reasons for the campus declines this year (and possibly next year): 1) A general environment of fee/tuition increases, which causes students (and their parents) to carefully reconsider their study abroad options; 2) a reduction in the staffing of some campus EAP/international offices; and 3) a growth in campus-based programs.

UCEAP recently conducted a mid-year review of its strategic plan, and is scaling down some of its planned activities and extending the time-line for some of them. In sum, UCEAP has given equal footing to its nine initiatives. The *academic integration* and the *international student recruitment* initiatives have now been moved to Director's Office. The other initiatives include *new program*

development, the 50th anniversary celebration, student management, business model, and scholarships. Two initiatives that are now scaled down are the *marketing* and the *alumni engagement and development* initiatives. The *marketing* initiative has been changed to a *website* initiative. The alumni engagement initiative is now focused on building an alumni association. The *new program development initiative* has been scaled back from developing ten new programs per year to five new programs per year. Due to the push-back from the campuses, UCEAP will now not issue a broad call for faculty-led proposals. Instead, UCEAP will respond to ad-hoc needs in terms of its faculty-led programs. UCEAP could also aid those campuses that do not have sufficient resources to develop their own faculty-led programs, with revenues returning to that campus. An academic integration task force is also being formed, and will be co-chaired by Professor Juan Campo and Associate Director Plan. As such, it will involve the Council of Campus Directors (CCD). The 50th Anniversary Celebration will commence with a big event on April 28 and 29 as part of the Gaucho Conference at UC Santa Barbara, honoring former EAP Director Bill Halloway. The EAP Annual Conference will run from June 18-20; UCEAP will invite former staff and faculty to the conference in order to celebrate EAP's 50th Anniversary. UCEAP is also working with former Provost Judd King to set up a conference sometime in October, which will honor former EAP Director John Marcum.

DISCUSSION: Chair Bhavnani asked about budget implications with respect to the enrollment declines. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP's income will simply be less, and some components of the Strategic Initiatives Plan will receive less funding. He added that UCEAP now has a Development Director, which should help to buttress scholarships. One member asked if recruiting non-UC students was ever considered as a strategic initiative? Director Guinard responded in the affirmative, noting that opening up EAP programs to non-UC students is still in the exploratory stages. With respect to immersion programs, UCEAP is looking at ways to partner with other institutions, thereby forming consortia in order to boost enrollments in these programs.

II. Proposed Plan for Academic Oversight of UCEAP – Faculty-in-Residence Ann Marie Plane
REPORT: Faculty-in-Residence Ann Plane reported that most comments on the Proposed Plan for Academic Oversight were quite positive. The most significant issues concerned visiting professorships, particularly on how these faculty would be recruited. Professor Plane explained that the calls/notices for these positions are distributed through the local Divisional Academic Senates. Other concerns included locations for visiting professorships, how they will be selected, and what will they do. Non-Senate faculty are another issue; UCEAP is asking for UCIE's input on the participation of non-Senate faculty. UCEAP has always considered Senate lecturers to be equivalent to ladderized Senate faculty members.

DISCUSSION: In general, members applauded UCEAP for undertaking the work on the Proposed Plan. Vice Chair Craig made a number of comments – first, regarding non-Senate faculty, UCEAP should consult with General Counsel to determine who would fall under Unit 18 contracts. Measurable assessment of the oversight plan will also be important with four goals being most prominent – faculty roles, uniform system for assigning academic credit and grades, academic integration, and consistent standards. She also asked about the role of UCIE (p. 2); it appears that UCIE is constrained to program reviews. She noted that UCIE's bylaw is considerably broader. This should be articulated in the document. Another member asked how would non-Senate faculty (e.g., lecturers) be reviewed if they spent a semester or year abroad? They are normally only evaluated on their teaching, not other service. UCIE encouraged Professor Plane to talk to the Administration on this point. Another member commented on the need to construct a systemwide database of approved and/or previously taken courses. Professor Plane responded that this is something that the academic integration workgroup will

be addressing. There is also an interest among many faculty to reinvigorate the study centers around the world; UCIE urged UCEAP to keep these study centers in at strategic locations around the world on the agenda even if the current budget prohibits significant investments at this time. Director Guinard responded that as UCEAP increases its numbers of Study Center Directors, it will also increase the scope of its Study Centers, but this is contingent upon UCEAP's available resources. Another member opined that there is still some concern over program review site visits; there is still some concern about on-site visits. One option would be to make site visits the default for each program review, which could be cancelled on a case-by-case basis as necessary for budgetary or other concerns. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP would be happy to change the wording to this effect in the Academic Oversight Plan.

ACTION: UCIE unanimously approved the Oversight Plan, making their approval contingent on the noted revisions.

III. Program Reviews – Regional Director Mary McMahon

A. Paris Review Committee Nominations

ACTION: Members nominated Carrie Nolan (UCI) and Jeff Fort (UCD). Rick Kern is already on this review committee as the UCIE representative.

B. 2012/13 Program Reviews – Costa Rica, Italy, and the United Kingdom

ACTIONS:

- **United Kingdom: Jeanette Money volunteered for the UK review. Members suggested Cecil Leidel (UCSD) and Gayle Binion (UCSB) as other possible members for this review.**
- **Costa Rica: Members will collect names for Monte Verde Costa Rica review. Vincent Resh (UCB), David Woodruff (UCSD), and Karen Hall (UCSC) were also suggested for the Costa Rica review. UCIE will select its own representative for Costa Rica at its fall meeting if a nomination cannot be made at the May meeting.**
- **Italy: Giacomo Bernardi volunteered to be the UCIE representative for the Italy review.**

IV. New Program Proposals – Regional Director Mary McMahon

A. Middle East Language and Culture Program

PROPOSAL: There are two options for language (Arabic) and culture programs in Morocco. Option one is a *Language & Culture Program* in Rabat, Morocco with CIEE (in conjunction with the Université Mohamed V, Souissi and the Qalam wa Lawh Arabic Language Center). Option two is an *Area and Arabic Language Studies Program*, at Rabat and Ifrane, Morocco with AMIDEAST (in conjunction with Mohammed V University – Agdal and Al-Akhawayn University). In addition, and in case a back-up program is needed for Egypt, UCEAP is proposing a possible *Business, Engineering, & Arts & Sciences Program*, in Sharjah, United Arab Emirates (UAE) with CIEE (in conjunction with the American University of Sharjah). UCEAP is not sure about the potential for student enrollment for Morocco, therefore partnering with CIEE is a better option than competing with an existing program. A cost run-down will also be performed on both of the Morocco programs.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if new programs could be placed in a regional chart showing current programs in the geographical region with their relative enrollments. Concern was also expressed over the safety of female students studying in the UAE. On that note, it was suggested

that UCEAP investigate what kind of partnerships other American academic institutions currently have in the UAE.

B. Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel

PROPOSAL: Pursuant to discussions in 2012 between President Mark Yudof, University of California Office of the President (UCOP), and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (BGU), and with subsequent encouragement from UCOP to explore an affiliation with BGU, UCEAP proposes to offer UC students a semester immersion program there beginning in Fall 2013. This is intended to augment existing programming at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rothberg International School. UCEAP would also like to increase its numbers in Israel, which have not grown because the current EAP program in Israel is very expensive. This proposal would bring back an institution with which UCEAP formerly had a relationship. UCOP is also willing to assist UCEAP with scholarship support.

DISCUSSION: Chair Bhavnani mentioned the possibility of opening a program in the West Bank, as opposed to opening another program in Israel. Director Guinard responded that currently, opening up programs in the West Bank and Gaza are impossible due to safety and security concerns. One member asked about estimated student enrollments, and stated that this program should fall under same guidelines for cost-effectiveness that all other EAP programs are subject to. The Committee discussed this item further in executive session.

C. UC Construct Program in Cuba

PROPOSAL: This proposed summer program, set primarily in Havana, will offer the one course for eight UC quarter units, in an intensive and flexible framework. Lectures will be offered every morning in the Casa de las Americas and other similar facilities. The course will be taught exclusively to UCEAP students. The course will be taught by Greg Landau, a lecturer in the Latino and Latin American Studies program at UC Santa Cruz and who has led similar courses in Cuba for the City College of San Francisco. Logistics for the program, including travel arrangements, lodging and meals, transport within Cuba, and basic security will be handled by Global Educational Facilitation. Academic oversight and student services during the program will be coordinated between Greg Landau and Paul Bardwil of Global Educational Facilitation.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that UC Davis has a program in Cuba; this program might compete with that program. Director Guinard responded that the Davis program is a quarter abroad program, which is offered in the spring. The UCSC member noted that his campus received a number of proposals for summer faculty-led programs; however, UCSC is not able to run any of these programs because of financial concerns. UCIE members remarked that while there may not be direct conflict with a campus program in this case, the potential for such conflicts exist in the future. Director Guinard responded that this is one of the reasons why UCEAP has scaled back its initiatives for faculty-led programs. The topic of competition is also a conversation between Director Guinard and the EVCs currently. One member noted that given that the program is only four weeks long, the credit hours would need to be expanded to meet the traditional five-week summer session.

D. Multi-site European Program (London/Paris or Madrid/Rome) with ACCENT International

PROPOSAL: UCEAP proposes to introduce multi-site programs in Europe, starting in spring 2013, in collaboration with ACCENT International. Two of the programs will be offered during the

spring quarter; a third semester option will include the quarter program plus an internship. The programs respond to the demonstrated shift in UC student enrollment towards shorter term stays abroad as well as student survey data indicating an interest in multi-site programs and internship experiences. The *Global Cities, Urban Tribes* program, which would be offered in Paris and London, will introduce students to the complex social, political, and economic issues brought about by immigration, increasing diversity, and urban conflict. The *Media and the Shaping of Society* program, which would be offered in Rome and Madrid, will explore the evolution of media technology and its ability to mediate, manipulate, and influence two contrasting societies. The Rome and Madrid program will also include a semester option with an internship.

DISCUSSION: Members expressed their appreciation for programs such as these. Chair Bhavnani cautioned against the use of term “tribes” in the Paris/London program. Likewise, UCEAP may also want to reconsider the title of the “Lifting the Veil” course. UCEAP consultants mentioned that the cost of traveling from site to site is actually manageable. Members asked if there would be a language requirement associated with the various internships. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP is hoping for a broad portfolio of internships, but some may indeed require proficiency in a foreign language.

E. Multi-site Thematic Summer Program, University of Hong Kong (HKU)

PROPOSAL: UCEAP is currently exceeding capacity for enrollment at HKU in the regular academic year terms; UC is restricted to sending no more than 70 UC students in any given term. The basis for the relationship is reciprocal exchange. Of the full range of summer programs offered at HKU, two appear of equivalent caliber and appropriate course credit for consideration by UC and might not compete with other UCEAP program options in East Asia already available to UC students. These would be programs offered by the Faculty of Social Sciences, *Asia as the Global Future*, and the Faculty of Business and Economics, *Global Business in Asia: New Horizons*. UCEAP has begun a dialogue with HKU to explore whether these options might be open for EAP participation as part of its ongoing exchange.

DISCUSSION: Members did not comment on these programs at this time.

F. Update: Prague Central European Studies Program with CIEE

REPORT: The film studies component to this program has been eliminated because of its significant expense.

G. Update: Afro-Brazilian Studies Program, Salvador do Bahia, Brazil with CIEE

PROPOSAL: Director Guinard requested that this program should not count towards its target of five new programs per year because it is replacing another EAP program.

V. EAP Reciprocity

REPORT: The Reciprocity White Paper provides an analysis of EAP’s reciprocity program, along with its inherent advantages. It is a controversial topic, due to financial reasons, because it allows reciprocity students to attend UC campuses for up to one year only paying a limited amount of fees. However, this arrangement also allows for affordable study abroad programs for UC students. Therefore, UCEAP does not intend to do away with reciprocity. That said, UCEAP has tended to stay away from reciprocity arrangements with a number of its new programs (in part due to campus concerns), but is encouraged to hear from UCIE that it values reciprocity arrangements in future programs.

DISCUSSION: In light of declining numbers of study centers, it was asked which entities or persons are advising potential reciprocity students. UCEAP consultants responded that in many cases the partner institution's international office takes the lead; in other cases EAP students will talk with potential reciprocity students while they are abroad. Consultants acknowledged that this support is somewhat limited, but existing study centers are still involved. Another member asked how reciprocity has grown over the past five years or so. Director Guinard responded that EAP's reciprocity numbers continue to grow and generally correspond with the growth of its numbers of outbound UC students. That said, reciprocity students slightly outbalance outbound students on the whole. However, each contract must balance out these numbers at the end of the three to five year contract period, and this is very carefully modeled and monitored. Chair Bhavnani remarked that with respect to the recruitment of future reciprocity students, the more third-party providers EAP employs, the more difficult it is to increase reciprocity students. Consultants remarked that reciprocity students are counted as non-degree students, and not tallied as part of a campus's total of international students.

VI. Academic Integration

REPORT: Faculty-in-Residence Plane briefed members on the strategic initiative on *Academic Integration*. She opened her remarks by noting that the more challenging aspects of academic integration include working with individual academic departments to develop buy-in of integrating their undergraduate majors with study abroad programs. Therefore, UCEAP needs a process that respects the differences between campuses, and includes leadership from each campus. The *Academic Integration* strategic initiative is therefore a joint effort with the Campus of Council Directors (CCD). Juan Campo, the UCSB EAP Faculty Director, is the co-chair. It is important to have an initiative that both respected the differences between campuses and included faculty leadership, along with local staff participation. Professor Plane acknowledged that there have been many academic integration initiatives in the past – both at the systemwide level, as well as campus-driven initiatives. Putting in place faculty and staff liaisons on each campus is indeed a stated goal of this initiative, but it is one that may not be reached this year. There will also be an academic integration staff conference at the Annual Conference in June. Professor Campo and Professor Plane will also be giving a presentation on the workgroup at the UC Academic Advisors conference in June as well. Finally, they will be part of a panel at the CIEE conference in Shanghai in October. Director Guinard added that UCEAP is currently hiring a senior analyst to support both the scholarship and academic integration initiatives. Professor Plane emphasized that staff will not be left out of this effort, as they are critical to its success. She added that a broad list of potential goals has also been developed for this workgroup.

DISCUSSION: Members applauded this initiative, and praised the wise, cautious, and thorough approach that Professor Plane is taking on this effort, which seems to respect the differences between the individual campuses.

VII. New Business – Third-Party Provider Programs

ISSUE: UCIE raised the issue of third-party providers, and particularly, how and when they should be used by UCEAP. In short, members asked that the use of third-party providers be more transparent to UCIE. There seems to be three types of programs – UCEAP construct/partner programs (with academic institutions), third-party/UCEAP programs, and finally, third-party provider programs (separate from EAP). UCIE is interested in how these programs are different from the student perspective, implications for faculty oversight, as well as their financial characteristics, and any other relevant dimensions. In particular, UCIE is interested in the advantages and disadvantages of such third-party providers.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard responded that UCEAP works primarily with CIEE and ACCENT International when it partners with third-party providers. UCEAP tries to standardize the academic nature of these programs; the academic quality of these programs should be very similar to what students will get on other EAP programs. Faculty oversight and academic integration of these programs is very similar to what is done for traditional EAP programs. The logistical support from third-party providers is indeed critical to UCEAP, and the financial arrangements of these programs are discussed with the Governing Committee to a significant extent. Director Guinard added that UCEAP is not keen on expanding these relationships unless there are clear advantages – usually along the lines of internships and engaged learning.

This will be a May UCIE agenda item. Chair Bhavnani also asked what is the role of UCIE with respect to the UCEAP budget? She added that even though UCIE is responsible for all academic matters of EAP programs, the UCEAP budget impacts the academics. She subsequently asked for a copy of the budget as it was discussed at the Governing Committee meeting. Director Guinard noted that there are six Senate representatives on the Governing Committee. He said that he would need to ask the Provost and the Chair of the Governing Committee regarding her latter request. Members also asked that line items be added to show how much UCEAP expends on UCIE related items (e.g., academic oversight, etc.).

ACTION: EAP Third-Party Provider programs will be placed on the May UCIE agenda.

VIII. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

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