

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – OCTOBER 17, 2012

Present: Rick Kern, Karin Sanders, Jyu-Lin Chen, Richard Matthew, David Bernstein, Jeanette Money, Todd Giedt, Jean-Xavier Guinard, Mary McMahon, Ann Marie Plane, Juan Campo, William Jacob, and Martha Winnacker

I. Chair’s Comments

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda.

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

REPORT: UCEAP Director Guinard briefed members on UCEAP’s 2011-12 enrollments and projections for 2012-13. He reported that in 2011-12, UCEAP recorded a slight drop in enrollments (from record high of 4,808 in 2010-11), which included 4,684 participants or 2,539 FTEs. UCEAP did experience continued growth in summer enrollments and stable semester/quarter enrollments. However, there was a significant drop in year-long enrollments, which is indicative of a long-term trend. 1,812 reciprocity students came to UC for up to a year of non-degree study. Campuses EAP enrollments were fairly stable with the exception of Davis, which experienced a 36% drop. UCEAP is currently predicting 4,450 total participants in 2012-13 (down 8% from 2011-12), with summer 2012 enrollments increasing by 8%. Consistent with the long-term trend, UCEAP is also anticipating a 20% drop in year-long enrollments, along with a slight drop in semester/quarter enrollments. Director Guinard explained that continued fee increases mean that UC students are looking to graduate faster and are therefore reconsidering the feasibility and value of study abroad. Shorter (summer) options are also increasingly preferred. Some UC campuses are growing their summer faculty-led programs and in some cases, quarter and semester options as well. In addition, UCEAP has been reducing a number of its program-specific subsidies in its effort to become self-supporting. Despite UCEAP’s revenue sharing with the campuses, the loss of fee revenues for the campuses under UCEAP’s new business model is proving to be a difficult obstacle to overcome. Finally, decentralization at UC means that such systemwide programs as UCEAP may become increasingly marginalized. Looking forward to 2013-14, UCEAP finds that its current application activity is midway between that registered in 2011-12 and 2012-13.

UCEAP initiated a strategic plan two years ago, which included such initiatives as new program development, the 50th Anniversary celebration, scholarships, alumni engagement, the website, student management, academic integration, and international student recruitment. With respect to one of these initiatives – the scholarship initiative, UCEAP received over 2,500 applications for this academic year; 1,400 complete applications were reviewed by UCEAP staff, which resulted in 250 scholarship awards (17% of completed applications received awards). The average scholarship award was \$1,730 over 11 categories (\$3K for the year; \$2K for semester/quarter; and \$1K for summer). UCEAP also continues to offer the Duttonhaver scholarships, which total approximately \$250K every year.

Director Guinard also updated members on UCEAP's budget. In brief, UCEAP met its goals for 2011-12, which included continued subsidy reduction (from \$3M to \$2M in 2012-13, and a subsequent halving each year to \$0 in 2015-16); funding of its contingency reserve (\$1.15M yearly to \$4.6M over four years); and funding of its strategic initiatives – scholarships (\$500K), academic integration, a reduction of Program Option Fees (POFs), and revenue sharing with campuses (\$1M). With respect to revenue sharing, UCEAP incentivized campuses through the application of specific bonuses for reaching targets in different categories. There is also a new academic oversight model in place, which incorporates UCIE and the Campus CIEs, Faculty Advisory Committees, UCEAP campus faculty directors, visiting professors, academic liaisons, faculty study center directors, and UCEAP office faculty. Finally, UCEAP has been engaged in its 50th Anniversary Celebration this past year, which included various events, seminars, and even some special faculty-led programs.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired into the reasons for the different decreases in EAP enrollments across the campuses. Director Guinard responded that one reason is the different staffing levels on the campuses. On one end of the spectrum, staffing levels at UCSD and UCSB have not fallen. However, on other campuses, EAP enrollments may be suffering from competition from native campus-based programs. Given decentralization, if only some campuses invest in EAP and others invest in their own programs, this would result in UCEAP no longer being sustainable. This issue of campuses using their own programs as fund-raising mechanisms was also raised. Director Guinard responded that these programs do indeed generate income with some funds going directly back to the academic departments that organize the programs (e.g., UCLA), and in other cases funds flowing more to the administration (e.g., UCD). However, five campuses are either suspending some or all of their summer programs, or delaying their initial launch(es) simply because they would not be profitable at this time. In order to be profitable (and successful), enrollment (or projected enrollment) must reach a certain critical mass first. UCEAP Regional Director (RD) Mary McMahon added that from the student perspective, these campus-based programs are attractive to students because they are offered by familiar faculty, and offer courses that they know will count towards their majors. UCEAP did offer three faculty-led programs for its 50th Anniversary, but will not do these types of programs in the future unless they are approached by a campus. The Davis member remarked that at Davis, the primary academic driver behind these programs is a better curricular fit. Director Guinard added that while the Davis programs may be generating some surplus, on other campuses these programs have actually run at a deficit. However, even Davis does not receive huge margins from its programs.

Chair Kern asked if there is any accounting of UC students who study on third-party provider programs. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP reports all of its numbers to Open Doors, which conducts an annual survey on the number of US students studying abroad. Likewise, the campuses are supposed to report their own numbers for programs longer than three weeks that provide academic credit. One outcome from the Presidential mandate to allow UC students to study in non-UC Israel programs (when UCEAP's Israel program was suspended) was the development of a mechanism to allow UC students to study on non-UC programs while still being enrolled on a UC campus. These enrollment numbers are reported from some campuses, but not all. There are also mechanisms to track students participating in department-based research programs. Chair Kern asked if the declines are particular to UCEAP, or if they are indicative of an aggregate drop in study abroad participation. Guinard responded that across UC, it seems that study abroad enrollments have peaked for credit bearing programs, and have even started to decline.

UCIE also asked about the main driver(s) of the Program Option Fees. Director Guinard responded that the POFs were reduced for the first two years ago, but last year UCEAP was not able to do this

primarily because of fee increases in the United Kingdom (UK). However, for many other programs, living expenses are less than what they are at UC campuses. Indeed, only 20% of UCEAP programs have POFs attached to them. UCEAP also no longer cross-subsidizes its programs. Members also expressed interest in academic integration, and inquired into the possibility of a central list of “approved courses” across UC campuses. Director Guinard remarked that this is more complex than it sounds, as one must contend with differences between campuses and even between departments, which cannot agree upon universally approved courses. Chair Kern added that all EAP courses may count towards a degree, but not all courses will necessarily articulate to the student's major. Director Guinard reminded members that UCIE did draft a white paper on academic integration, and UCEAP has a strategic initiative devoted to academic integration. UC Online Education (UCOE), which is a systemwide initiative to develop credit-bearing online courses for UC and non-UC students, will also look at cross-campus course articulation, which may benefit UCEAP's efforts in academic integration. Faculty-in-Residence Ann Marie Plane added that there are two departments at UCSD that allow “automatic” approval for major elective approval; UCEAP would like to replicate this model on the other campuses. Chair Kern also asked how UCEAP will capitalize on its large numbers of EAP alumni. Director Guinard remarked that UCEAP wants to pursue alumni development not only for the purposes of fund-raising for scholarships, but also for “in-kind” contributions (e.g., networking, internships, etc.).

IV. Proposal for the Relocation of the UCEAP Vietnam Program

PROPOSAL: UCEAP proposes to move its fall semester program in Vietnam from Hanoi University in the north to Can Tho University (CTU) in the south Mekong Delta, and to change the UC academic oversight from a Resident Director to UC visiting professors. Continued student dissatisfaction with and limitations to regular University coursework taught in English, the recent resignation of a long-standing Resident Director, and UC faculty and staff concerns about perceptions of UC's base in the capital in the North, have all compelled UCEAP to explore other locations for the program. Enrollment has continued to decline. There has also been push-back from families about having a location in North Vietnam, urging UCEAP to relocate in South Vietnam. At its height, the program enrolled 24 students; its current enrollment stands at 14. Enrollment numbers seem to be suppressed by heritage student reluctance to study in North Vietnam. The proposal comes from two UC Davis faculty, who suggested that the current program (Vietnamese language course, a UC faculty-taught core course, and community service), be relocated to CTU. Consultants emphasized that Hanoi is not sustainable, but it is important for UCEAP to maintain a program in Vietnam for historical and strategic reasons. Therefore, relocation is a much more attractive option than suspension of the program.

DISCUSSION: RD McMahon noted that this proposal has been expanded to reflect what is offered at CTU. Students who have expressed interest in this program are not from one particular major, but are often “heritage” students who have a broad interest in studying culture, history, and other interdisciplinary topics. Chair Kern stated his concern about the sustainability of a program that is based on the research interests of two faculty members from one campus. Director Guinard countered that this type of program naturally lends itself quite well to a visiting professorship model at some time in the future (once it gets off the ground). Consultant McMahon added that these two faculty members would be the first two visiting professors for the first two years. At some point the program would indeed be opened up to other UC faculty. Another member asked about the location itself – why not Saigon or Ho Chi Minh City, which would be considered more as cultural centers of Vietnam? RD McMahon said that UCEAP initially looked at a partnership with CIEE at these locations, but that organization has recently suspended its Vietnam programs (along with a number of other third-party providers and American colleges and universities). Other problems include traffic, crime, and other

complications. Another obstacle was finding an institution that was vested in international education and capable. She added that two long field trips will be incorporated into the program so that students will have opportunities to see other parts of Vietnam.

Chair Kern asked about the quality of the language program. RD McMahon responded that the program proposers have visited the department that offers the language program. Chair Kern recommended that someone actually visit the classroom to assess the quality directly, which UCEAP accepted as a viable option. Committee members continued to stress academic integration, and inquired into the opportunities for students to enroll in other courses besides the six unit course offerings. Director Guinard responded that while this is possible, there are very few courses offered in English. Also, the style of instruction is quite different than what is typical in UC courses. Members opined that while this is part of the EAP experience, students today may have different expectations. Members asked to review a detailed curriculum, with course description and syllabi, before it grants final approval. Director Guinard clarified that what UCIE is being asked to approve is the partner, rather than the individual courses. For visiting professors, UCEAP does not “define” the courses for UC faculty. The UCEAP courses would come to Faculty-in-Residence Ann Marie Plane for consideration. These courses were also vetted by the appropriate FAC, but not the Senate. Given that these would be new courses, members insisted that these course descriptions be forwarded to UCIE for review. Chair Kern articulated two separate issues: 1) Moving the program to CTU; and 2) the approval of the core course that would be taught by the UC visiting professors. Chair Kern subsequently made a motion to approve the change in venue from Hanoi to CTU, but that UCIE review the course descriptions/specifics for the core course and language instruction at its January 2013 meeting.

ACTION: UCIE unanimously approved the relocation, but deferred a decision on the courses until its January meeting when it will receive the individual course descriptions for the core course and the language instruction.

V. UCEAP Program Reviews

A. Ireland Review Committee Report

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard commented that this is a positive report, but consolidation continues to be an issue for programs in the UK, including Ireland. Members asked about any reputational costs to the University when UCEAP consolidates its programs. Consultants responded that there are indeed such costs, and this is one of the reasons that UCEAP often delays closures with certain partners.

ACTION: David Berenstein volunteered to review the Ireland report.

B. Review Questions for the Costa Rica, Italy, and United Kingdom Reviews, 2012-13

ACTION: With respect to the Italy review questions, members suggested amending the last clause of the last sentence of question six as follows (additions are in bold and underlined): “... please assess whether the pre-1850 course requirement, **or other course options**, should remain in place **with possible amendments**, or if it should be removed.”

C. Nomination of a UCIE Representative for the Italy Review Committee, 2012-13

There is a site visit component for one person on the committee (generally not the UCIE representative). Consultants noted that site visits were restored for one member of the review committee(s). **NOTE: Giacomo Bernardi is the confirmed UCIE representative for the Italy review.**

VI. Program Suspensions/Closures

REPORT: Director Guinard noted that UCEAP considers suspending any program that has had three consecutive years of declining enrollments,. At the University of British Columbia, UCEAP will suspend sending UC students in order to correct a substantial imbalance with reciprocity students. UCEAP is also seeking to suspend student recruitment for the École Normale Supérieure (ENS) and the CIEE Critical Studies programs in France effective June 30, 2013. In Japan, UCEAP is suspending the University of Tokyo due to low enrollments (the overhead cannot be justified given the numbers of students). UCEAP will close the University of Adelaide in Australia, as it was already suspended last spring. In Turkey, while there is student interest, it is concentrated in Istanbul. Therefore, UCEAP is proposing closure at Middle East Technical University (METU) due to low enrollments.

DISCUSSION: Some members objected to the closing of ENS because it is important for graduate students to make connections at such a prestigious university abroad; it also carries symbolic and strategic value for the University. However, with very low enrollments, the overhead is quite high, despite the fact that graduate students do not use resources in the same way that undergraduate students do. In response to UCIE’s objections, Director Guinard committed to continuing UCEAP’s relationship with ENS, but suggested setting up a different kind of program for graduate students and senior undergraduates at ENS.

VII. Update on the Constitution of the Faculty Advisory Committees

REPORT: Director Guinard informed members that UCEAP will be forming two new FACs form on the STEM fields and Environmental Sciences; the other FACs are listed in the agenda materials.

VIII. Senate Introduction, Overview, & Updates from the Academic Senate Leadership

REPORT: Academic Council Vice Chair William Jacob briefed the committee on a number of issues of concern to the University and the Senate:

- **Proposition 30:** This proposition would amend the California Constitution to increase the state’s sales tax by a quarter-cent for four years and increase personal income tax rates on incomes above \$250,000 (above \$500,000 for joint filers) for seven years. In their role as University employees, UC staff and faculty cannot campaign for this measure. They can, however, do so as individuals.
- **Regents' Meeting:** Recently, the Regents held a retreat to talk about ways to save on the University’s expenses. UCOP conveyed to the Regents that the University has cut practically everything that can be cut.
- **Funding Streams/Rebenching:** Funding is the initiative that states that revenues generated on the campus stay on the campus; it is ongoing. Rebenching is in its first year, which is a 6-8 year plan to restore equity of state funding to the campuses.
- **Total Remuneration Study:** The Senate is advocating for another total remuneration study, which is important for restoring faculty salaries to market levels.
- **Enrollment Management:** Enrollment management is related to the rebenching initiative. The Senate is concerned that unless proper enrollment management takes place on all UC campuses, the University may fail to fulfill its historic commitments to the Master Plan. Council Vice Chair Jacob noted that there is debate about the true cost of educating a UC student. Depending on how one calculates this number, there are between 12,000 and 35,000 unfunded students in the system currently.
- **UCOE:** Although UCOE continues to move forward, some Senate Divisions have created on-line courses independent of the UCOE initiative. However, UCOE is looking at how to manage cross-enrollment for UC students, which may reap some benefits for EAP students.

- **Senate Meetings in Sacramento:** A few of Senate committees (BOARS, CCGA, and UCORP) will meet in Sacramento to better inform legislators on what UC does and what its faculty actually do. The Senate also wants to communicate what constitutes “UC quality”.

Executive Director Martha Winnacker briefed members on confidentiality, Senate membership, and logistical concerns; much of this information is covered by the [Guidelines for Systemwide Senate Committees](#), [Arranging/Booking Senate Travel](#), and [Getting Reimbursed for Senate Travel](#).

IX. New Program Proposals

Director Guinard noted that some of the following proposals are options with existing UCEAP partners.

A. Summer Lab Research Internship at NTU

PROPOSAL: National Taiwan University (NTU) is a current UCEAP partner institution, which has an existing summer research option for international students. The NTU program is predominantly a summer-term laboratory research option in which UC students would join a team in one of NTU’s modern, well-equipped laboratories to undertake projects in a variety of science or engineering fields. A series of lectures, cultural activities, and excursions to introduce students to Taiwan society and culture is a smaller component of the NTU Summer+ Lab Research Program. The targeted cohort would be UC science and engineering majors suited to match with the labs seeking students. Most UC requirements allow 8-12 elective units toward the degree. Depending on which lab they are placed in, students would be given a field assignment. This program would begin in Fall 2013.

ACTION: Members approved the Summer Lab Research Internship option at NTU.

B. Engineering Program at Carlos III in Madrid, Spain

PROPOSAL: UCEAP proposes to expand its agreement with Carlos III University of Madrid to open its Engineering departments to UC students for Fall and Spring semesters, beginning Fall semester 2013. There is demand from STEM students who would like to go to Spanish-speaking countries, but would prefer to take their courses in English. UCEAP has had a formal relationship with Carlos III University since 1999.

ACTION: Members approved the Engineering Program at Carlos III in an on-line vote.

C. Summer Program in Cuba

PROPOSAL: UCEAP’s market research has shown that Cuba would be a prime location for a new study abroad site in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean area. Now that the licensing restrictions for academic programs have been reduced, UCEAP is exploring options this year for UC students to study in Cuba. UCEAP is currently revising its original proposal, taking into consideration the feedback from UC faculty. The program would likely involve two courses (one in Cuban history and culture and another to be chosen by the faculty) for a total of nine UC quarter units (or six semester units). The program would last between four and five weeks, and the courses may include openings for guest lecturers and excursions within, and perhaps, outside Havana.

DISCUSSION: Chair Kern asked why there is not a language requirement for this program. Director Guinard responded that they wanted to open such a program up to more students by offering it more broadly, which is in line with industry standards and trends. He added that UCEAP already offers many programs that include Spanish language instruction. Chair Kern advocated for incorporating a modest Spanish language requirement into the program requirements. Consultants raised the issue of pre-

departure language testing; Chair Kern commented that in his view, a transcript of two years of high school Spanish (equivalent to one year's worth of college-level instruction) would suffice. Director Guinard agreed to a modest Spanish language requirement for this program.

X. Study Center Directorship Candidates

Members made recommendations in executive session; minutes were not taken for executive session.

XI. New Business

UCIE did not have any new business.

XII. Research on International Students – John Douglass, Center for Studies in Higher Education

PRESENTATION: In assessing the quality and effectiveness of universities, much attention is paid to the faculty in an institution's principal missions of teaching, research, and community service. This research focuses on the student side of this equation – what is their experience and contribution to this tripartite mission? Towards that end, the Student Experience in Research Universities (SERU) consortium¹ is devoted to creating new data sources and policy-relevant analyses to help broaden our understanding of the undergraduate experience in peer research universities.

There is certainly significant growth in the population of international students (studying outside their country of origin) at American colleges and universities, from .8M in 1975 to 3.7M in 2009 (OECD, UNESCO estimates). It is also a growing proportion (as compared to world population). There are estimates that this number could rise as high as 7.2M by 2025. That said, the US does not have strong undergraduate programs that attract large numbers of international students. For instance, at the undergraduate level, the US does not provide financial assistance to undergraduate international students (as other countries do). There are also capacity issues. Therefore, it can be said that while American universities are competitive in graduate education, they are not competitive for international undergraduate students. It is interesting to note that the top community colleges have the highest numbers of international students, and they recruit them for financial reasons. Many international students also see community colleges as a route to UC, and are therefore entering US universities as transfers. For instance, at all non-UC AAUs, 41.2% of international students are transfers, while only 18.7% of US domestic students transfer. In terms of reported family income, international students do indeed come from families of higher income and higher levels of educational attainment than their peer domestic students (even if the income levels do not correspond to US income categories).

The survey seeks to measure international student satisfaction levels, as well as their choice of major. In general, the choice of major is significantly influenced by career choice. Indeed, most international students go into the sciences. As such, they express some frustrations in getting courses for their majors (or prerequisites for their majors). In short, they are here to get training for a specific job/career. While satisfaction levels are both sets of students (international and domestic) are fairly high, generally speaking, international students are less satisfied than their domestic counterparts. International student perception of the value of the education that they are receiving (for the money paid) is also less than that of American students. In the UC system, there is slightly less satisfaction with their educational

¹ SERU domestic members include the nine UC undergraduate campuses, Rutgers University, the University of Florida, the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, the University of Oregon, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Texas, the University of Southern California, the University of North Carolina, the University of Virginia, Texas A&M University, the University of Iowa, Indiana University, and Purdue University. International partners include the Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Hunan University, Nanjing University, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Amsterdam University, College University of Cape Town, University of Bristol, and the National Research University – HSE.

experience than domestic students. It seems that the more career-oriented the student is, the less satisfied the student may be, but further research is needed. Regarding favorable campus climate, international students significantly reported lower on this data point than domestic students. It is worth pointing out that the larger the grouping of international students (at a particular campus or university), the higher their satisfaction levels. For international students, the pricing model (especially for public universities) has changed dramatically, which will inevitably change international students' perception of their UC experience.

John Douglass completed his presentation by summarizing the key findings from his study:

1. International student profile mirrors domestic students in these institutions, with a greater tendency to come from families with high educational capital and marginally higher entrance test scores.
2. Among US students, a higher level of international student density is positively linked to their satisfaction with educational experience, engagement with studies and spending more time in academic efforts and employment.
3. The increasing presence of international students has a positive impact on both US and international students, especially in terms of the academic aspects of the student educational experience with more engagement in academic activities and spending more time in academic efforts.
4. As the price of a US education continues to rise and outpaces most other universities found in an increasingly globally competitive world, international students are less satisfied with their overall academic and social experience, and are less sure than their US domestic counterparts about the value of their US education.
5. In comparison with their US counterparts, international students also are less likely to state that they would choose the university at which they are currently enrolled if they had the chance to make that choice again.

XIII. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for UCIE's executive session.

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

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