

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

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

I. Chair's Comments

Chair Haviland express the need for the local Committees on International Education (CIEs) to meet before the May UCIE meeting to discuss important new program proposals. Towards that end, he requested that UCEAP deliver their agenda materials sooner than earlier (at least a couple of weeks earlier), so that the agenda can go out at least two weeks before the meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the Draft Minutes from the January 21, 2011 Meeting

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

III. Director's Report

REPORT: Director Guinard addressed the following areas of interest: budget/MOU, the status of EAP's Japan programs, enrollment numbers, reciprocity, strategic planning, and the annual conference/50th anniversary celebration:

- **Budget/MOU/Campus Funding:** Due to the fact that UCEAP is already on a schedule to eliminate its state appropriations by 2013/14, it is unlikely that it will face new significant budget cuts. That said, there may be some loss in scholarship funding. The draft for the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between UCSB and UCEAP has been finalized; UCEAP is looking forward to its implementation and transition by July 1. The MOU will be distributed to UCIE members. With respect to campus funding, Director Guinard made a presentation at the last COVC meeting (included in the agenda). Funding for EAP recruitment varies on the different campuses, with some of it being fixed, and some of it being tied to enrollment. In addition, staffing on some campuses have either been cut or staff have been redirected towards recruitment for campus programs. In short, there are a range of options to cushion the problem of campus funding, which include giving UCEAP the responsibility of distributing General Funds associated with UCEAP to the campuses; UCEAP directly managing/funding a portion of campus "international office" to support EAP through campus payroll (e.g., putting EAP campus staff on UCEAP payroll); and UCEAP becoming more involved in *all* study abroad programs on the campuses (e.g., acting as a systemwide "clearing house"). Thus far, only the smaller campuses seem interested in this last option, but it is doubtful that UCEAP will pursue this option for a number of reasons.
- **Reciprocity:** The EAP Governing Committee received the reciprocity white paper. While the Governing Committee appreciated the value of reciprocity in general, Provost Pitts' comments concentrated on the financial aspects of reciprocity, which UCEAP will flesh out further. It goes without saying that if reciprocity were to disappear, then UCEAP would have to completely re-evaluate its operations. In a similar vein, UCEAP wants to facilitate the work of the campuses in the

recruitment of international students. UCEAP is requesting input from UCIE on this issue.

- Japan: UCEAP had 77 students in Japan at the time of the tsunami; most have now returned to California, and all of the Japan programs have been suspended. 46 students were scheduled to go to Japan in the spring on programs that have also been suspended. UCEAP hopes to reopen its Japan programs by summer. The associated loss in enrollment represents a financial loss of revenue of approximately \$250K. The additional loss of revenue from the suspension of the Egypt program (\$25K) underscores the need for a contingency fund.
- Enrollment: Before the Japan tsunami, enrollment in EAP programs stood at 4,876 in numbers of participants and 2,703 FTEs. However, even with the loss of enrollments due to the Japan crisis, UCEAP's enrollments are still higher than last year, which represents a three to four percent increase.
- Strategic Planning: UCEAP is currently soliciting input from the campus faculty directors, associate directors, staff in the systemwide office, and overseas study centers directors and liaison officers for the purposes of strategic planning. UCEAP will also include information gathered from student focus groups. In May, UCEAP will be asking UCIE approval for a number of new programs, along with a new model of academic oversight.
- Annual Conference/50th Anniversary: UCEAP is planning for the EAP Annual Conference this year (June 13-15), which is returning after being placed on hiatus this past year. UCEAP is also preparing for its 50th anniversary celebration.

IV. Program Review

ISSUE: Chair Haviland emphasized that the process of academic program review is clearly something that UCIE should be doing. Chair Haviland compared this process to academic reviews of programs and departments on the campuses. In doing so, he cited two important components. One is having adequate information – both in the form of interviews and statistics and/or facts. Interviews would include conversations with study center directors, liaison officers, counterpart faculty on the exchange universities, and students – both past and present. Statistical information could provide insights on how the program has served students in terms of their academic majors and careers. One issue is how to guarantee that this sort of statistical information is available at all. When site visits are not possible, other modalities should be encouraged, such as using faculty who are traveling for other purposes. Certainly, the quality of information would vary from review to review. Chair Haviland requested feedback on this topic in writing by the May meeting. The time line for a final document is the end of this year.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard remarked that with the new oversight model, these reviews would become even more important than they have been in the past. One member asked whether the student evaluation is a standard instrument used by UCEAP. Director Guinard confirmed that this is indeed a standard and a quality instrument, and it is responsible for collecting a significant amount of data. It may need a few adjustments however. Chair Haviland asked that this evaluation be distributed to UCIE. He also asked about surveys conducted by the host-institutions. Director Guinard responded that besides the study center director's report, this does not regularly happen. Chair Haviland added that guidelines for grade conversion would also be helpful to see.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will forward an evaluation form to committee members. Chair Haviland will write a white paper by the end of the year.

V. Academic Integration

ISSUE: Provost Pitts asked that Chair Haviland put forth a white paper on academic integration. Chair Haviland believes that the Provost is particularly interested because there is a push to make more consistent academic standards across the campuses, due in part to transfer issues. He requested feedback from committee members on this topic.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard remarked that course articulation is the main problem. Students want to make sure that they get credit courses that they take abroad, which is one of the main obstacles towards increasing study abroad enrollments. Director Guinard added that some campuses have departmental liaisons in place to aid in this process. However, Chair Haviland remarked that many of these liaisons are staff, and not faculty members, which can sometimes limit their effectiveness.

ACTION: Chair Haviland requested that members send him any feedback on this issue; he will be drafting a white paper on this topic.

VI. Programmatic Information Items

A. Exploration of New Programs in India

REPORT: Director Guinard noted that India EAP enrollments are currently low; there are also a number of operational inefficiencies associated with this program. Towards the end of improving its India programs, UCEAP would like to present a proposal to UCIE to affiliate with both CIEE and the Alliance for Global Education with the stated purpose of opening two new discipline-focused immersion program options in Mumbai and Manipal, as well as a structured curriculum with a field research component in Pune. All programs would open in Spring 2012. Consultant Linda York added that a couple of discipline-based Faculty Advisory Committees (FACs) will review these two new options. There will also be a wider review of EAP's India programs, but this will be part of the strategic planning process.

DISCUSSION: Chair Haviland remarked that there seems to be some urgency in the development of these programs. He therefore urged UCEAP seek out the faculty opinion prior to formally making these program recommendations. Director Guinard commented that UCEAP has observed that current student demand for its programs in India is not commensurate with the importance and relevance of India in the world. UCEAP is therefore seeking input from students and other groups to make sure that they are designing programs that will fit student demand. Chair Haviland asked individual CIEs to identify India experts on their own campuses, and make them known to Director Guinard.

B. Peking University Spring Options

ISSUE: This is the recommendation of the study center director, and would add opportunities for Chinese language instruction throughout the year. It would be instituted by Spring 2012. Director Guinard noted that Beijing student numbers are indeed down, when compared to the Shanghai's enrollment numbers. Chair Haviland reported on his visit with Beijing students earlier this year, who commented on the need for language instruction and more time for it.

VII. Faculty Recommendations for EAP Formal Program Reviews

ACTION: The following members agreed to serve on the following committees: 1) Ireland: *no member selected*; 2) South Africa: Vince Resh and Giacomo Bernardi; 3) Paris: Jeanette Money and Olga Kagan; and 4) Scandinavia: John Haviland. Members will submit additional names by the May meeting.

VIII. Program Proposal for a CIEE Taipei intensive Chinese language

ISSUE: In Taiwan, UCEAP is facing a number of issues relating to cost. Although UCEAP has a good relationship with National Taiwan University (NTU), UCEAP is sending EAP students to two different components within NTU – to NTU directly and to a language institute within NTU. Unfortunately, the billing arrangement is not very cost effective. Although UCEAP wants to retain the non-Chinese language component with NTU, it needs to develop better options for Chinese language instruction. UCEAP is proposing to work with CIEE in the short-term to offer a Chinese language option in Taiwan. After consultation with the *FAC for China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan*, UCEAP is asking UCIE for approval of a pilot program.

DISCUSSION: One member (who is on the FAC) remarked that while he agrees with this action, but only to the extent that it is a temporary solution to the problem. Director Guinard remarked that UCEAP only uses CIEE when there is added value inherent within the relationship. Another member was concerned about the affiliations with specific organizations (and political agendas) that EAP students may be involved with through internships and the like.

ACTION: Members approved the relationship with CIEE as a temporary solution, with the understanding that UCEAP will be working on reestablishing a functional relationship with NTU. UCIE will follow-up in one year.

IX. EAP Formal Review of Australia

The New Zealand formal review was postponed until the May meeting.

REPORT: UCIE member Vince Resh remarked that while this is a very good program, but the process of the review was somewhat counterproductive.

DISCUSSION: Chair Haviland asked what kind of follow-up can be expected. Director Guinard responded that there is a process in place where follow-up takes place, but that UCIE also asks for a status update. Chair Haviland remarked that the Australia review committee was asked for suggestions on how to increase the enrollments of under-subscribed programs. Towards that end, the review committee came up with a number of specific suggestions. He said that it is not clear what happens after this point. Director Guinard reiterated that a follow-up is in place; he added that Scott Reed (who was on the review committee) will be serving as a faculty consultant for Australia.

ACTION: Vince Resh's report on the Australia review will be sent out to the committee before the May meeting; a formal vote will take place in May.

X. Executive Session

No minutes were taken for this portion of the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Attest: John Haviland, UCIE Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst