

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 13, 2011

Present: John Haviland (Chair), Olga Kagan (VC), Jeanette Money (D), Volodymyr Bilotkach (I), Yang Ye (R), Ann Craig (SD), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (SB), Giacomo Bernardi (SC), Dan Simmons, Ronald Arruejo (std. representative), Jean-Xavier Guinard (consultant), Linda York (consultant), Khatharya Um (consultant), and Todd Giedt (analyst)

I. Chair's Comments

Chair Haviland did not have any comments or announcements.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

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

ACTION: Members approved the agenda and the minutes.

III. Director's Report

REPORT: Director Xavier-Guinard briefed members on the following issues:

- *Memorandum of Understanding:* Director confirmed that the MOU has been signed, commencing an “administrative partnership” between UCSB and UCEAP. There is no change in UCEAP's relationship to the campuses because of the MOU; there is a change in UCEAP's relationship to UCSB in administrative matters (e.g., human resources). In terms of reporting lines, Director Guinard now has a “dotted” reporting line to UCSB EVC Gene Lucas, but still reports directly to Vice Provost Dan Greenstein. The MOU takes force on July 1st.
- *Strategic Planning:* UCEAP is moving forward in its strategic planning, which has been going on since January. Most recently, UCEAP conducted focus groups at UCSB, UCD, and UCLA. UCEAP is also working with a consultant to help with the implementation phase. The strategic planning is being conducted in the following context: 1) UCEAP's enrollments are currently at 4,834 students and 1,117 reciprocity students, which is up 5% from last year (FTEs are only slightly higher because most of EAP's recent growth is in short-term programming); 2) 2011-12 is the year in which UCEAP will eliminate its budget deficit; 3) UCEAP is ready to begin increasing its contingency reserve¹; 4) UCEAP operates in an environment of shorter and shorter programs; and 5) UCEAP's business model does not allow it to redistribute General Fund monies from UCOP to the campus offices. As a result, UCEAP has no control over campus office allocations. Unfortunately, not all of these funds are making it to the campus offices, and the money that does reach these offices is sometimes used to support campus-based programs. The strategic plan will center on the following three components: 1) Study abroad for all segments of UC's student population; 2) academic excellence, and 3) best business practices.
- *Budget Cuts:* There may be some small additional cuts to UCEAP's budget (however \$700,000 is already being cut this year).
- *Egypt/Japan:* UCEAP executed the respective student evacuations of Japan and Egypt quite well, with the aid of UCOP's risk services unit and iJet, which is the University's security provider.

¹ UCEAP does approximately 80% of its business in foreign currencies. The Egypt/Japan crises cost UCEAP about \$400,000. Both of these points underlie the need for a contingency reserve.

However, such actions take up significant resources. UCEAP has announced a resumption of some programs in Japan with the exception of the programs in the vicinity of the affected nuclear power reactors and areas of extensive tsunami destruction. That said, it is likely that Japan will suffer in the longer term from lower enrollments due to lingering perceptions of the safety in Japan in the wake of the tsunami/nuclear accident. With respect to Egypt, UCEAP will require students to live in the dorms of the American University of Cairo for safety reasons.

- *International Student Recruitment:* As part of its strategic plan, UCEAP will be participating in international student recruitment efforts in order to increase non-resident enrollment – specifically training and forming an EAP student ambassador core to assist in this effort. Director Guinard is participating on a work group that is co-chaired by Vice President Judy Sakaki. However, EAP will not become a recruiting agency. UCEAP is interested in growing some of its study centers into “Learning Centers” that would do some student recruitment, offer some extension courses, etc. That said, EAP is not proposing to become an on-line global learning center.
- *UCEAP Personnel:* UCEAP is beginning its recruitment of a “faculty in residence” and is finishing hiring a Director of Marketing.
- *Annual Conference/50th Anniversary Celebration:* UCEAP will be hosting the EAP annual conference in June. A Vision Committee is now working to capitalize on EAP's 50th anniversary in 2012 by organizing a number of celebratory events next year.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed how money is being spent on the campuses, and lamented that it is practically impossible to track how this money is being spent. That said, Chair Haviland encouraged the local Committees on International Education (CIEs) to do their best in tracking this money. Director Guinard reported that the total amount of money that was distributed to the EAP campus offices was \$4.84M; how much of this money actually funds EAP programs is in question. This is complicated by the fact that the same staff persons sometimes work on both campus-based and EAP programs. Senate Chair Dan Simmons encouraged UCIE members to involve their local Committees on Planning Budget (CPBs) to get involved. Director Guinard added that with respect to campus funding, UCEAP will work on two fronts: 1) Incentivize EAP participation by the campuses via certain initiatives; and 2) advocate changing campus funding distribution formulas. One member asked if the student FTEs participating in EAP programs go up, would a bigger pool of money be available? The answer would be yes, but not because that pool of money grows (at least until 2013-14), but because UCEAP would generate a surplus and be able to distribute some money back to the campuses (via incentive programs).

IV. Proposal for Academic Oversight of UCEAP

ISSUE: Director Guinard remarked that UCEAP has been forced to significantly reduce its number of study center directors mostly for financial reasons, but UCEAP has also actively considered alternate forms academic oversight at various times over the past ten years or so (e.g., the UCIE-UOEAP Task Force on Study Center Directors from 2005). He assured members that UCIE would retain control of the approval and review of new and existing programs primarily through a strengthening of the program review process. The most significant change would come in the form of an increased use of liaison officers, who could be a local faculty member at the host institution (preferably with a UC PhD or from another American university), or a local PhD who would oversee the study center (e.g., a resident director). The liaison officer would either oversee academic matters only or oversee both operational and academic matters. Their academic duties align very well with the academic advising that goes on at each of the UC campuses. At many locations, administrative details are being handled by staff at host institutions so liaison officers would not need to become involved in these functions.

Director Guinard emphasized that UCEAP is heading towards a model of zero study center directors, noting that the study center model is out-dated. . Indeed, over the years the recruitment of study center directors has become increasingly more difficult as the pool of available faculty has shrunk over time. However, this does not mean reducing the degree of academic oversight. To the contrary, it will mean increased academic oversight, as UCEAP will bring in more faculty members in oversight efforts. Towards that end, UCEAP will make more use of faculty advisory committees (FACs) and issue-specific ad-hoc advisory committees. “Faculty consultants,” who are UC faculty members based on a UC campus (and often former study center directors), are being used in this transitional period, but UCEAP is not planning on using them permanently. Currently, Director Guinard is signing off on all courses, but this will change once a faculty member in residence is hired.

DISCUSSION: It was asked if emeriti faculty could be used as study center directors; Director Guinard responded that it may not be a good fit with the exception of a few cases. Chair Haviland asked how the faculty member in residence would have the authority to “work with campuses, departments, and majors” in academic integration efforts. Director Guinard responded that this is not so much about authority, but rather having another champion of academic integration. He added that this is only a half-time position, as UCEAP is under strict restrictions in terms of its staff FTEs. Chair Haviland expressed some healthy skepticism, noting that some of the most successful approaches have involved recruiting allies within the department, rather than utilizing external persons to further the aims of academic integration. One member asked if the academic liaison role could be performed by local faculty members; Director Guinard responded that this model works in many places. Another member asked why the faculty consultant model will not be used permanently. Consultant Linda York responded that one issue is that the majority of faculty consultants are prior study center directors, but this pool will eventually be depleted. It would be hard to utilize persons as faculty consultants without study center director experience. Director Guinard remarked that faculty consultants could be used occasionally, but these people would need to be country experts.

Chair Haviland stressed that the driving reason behind the decline of study center directors was financial. Director Guinard added there was also a great deal of inefficiency involved in the role of study center directors. He added that the application of best business practices dictates a more efficient model than one that has traditionally been used. Another member expressed concern that the conscientiousness of liaison officers could be widely variable. On the program reviews, UCIE does not go too much in-depth on the particular courses because the institutions have been chosen carefully. Another member commented that if we are now going to have to trust the academic liaison officers, whose quality will prove to be widely variable, then the burden will fall upon UCEAP and UCIE to institute more rigorous program reviews. This uneasiness was echoed by other members, who remarked that these are individuals who are not directly employed by UCEAP and must balance their liaison officer responsibilities with a myriad of other obligations. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP is indeed moving towards an increased role for both UCIE and the FACs, and that UCEAP will be beefing up its formal reviews of programs, which may include on-site reviews. With respect to third-party providers, it was asked how many programs are using third-providers and what kind of oversight is done? Director Guinard responded that approximately 20 programs use third-party providers (e.g., ACCENT and CIEE). Consultant York added that with ACCENT, someone with a PhD is providing oversight. With CIEE, their resident directors usually have PhDs.

ACTION: Members asked for a complete list of duties/responsibilities/functions (both academic and administrative) for liaison officers. The proposal for academic oversight will be forwarded to

the local CIEs.

V. 2011-12 Formal Review Committee Membership Nominations

Members communicated their nominations for the following formal program reviews directly to consultant Linda York: Ireland Immersion Program, Paris Summer Language & Culture Program, Scandinavia, and South Africa.

VI. Program Review Reports

ACTION: Members/consultants agreed that a one-year update is reasonable for formal review.

A. Australia

ACTION: Members approved the UCIE report for Australia; formal follow-up will take place in one year.

B. New Zealand

REPORT: Although the review committee found the academic quality of the New Zealand program very high, review committee members made the following suggestions: 1) Increased graduate student exchanges; UC film and media studies departments should be encouraged to link up with the strong Film, TV, and Media department at the University of Auckland; and 3) UCEAP should promote programs that specialize in the study indigenous peoples, which speaks to the wider issue of diversity. There does not seem to be a strong demand for New Zealand students to come to UC. Semester programs are a good idea for this program.

DISCUSSION: With respect to New Zealand reciprocity, consultant York commented that it may be a cost issue. It was mentioned that both Australia and New Zealand have a tradition of sending students to England, however this pull may not be as strong now. The report also indicated that the Auckland University of Technology did not meet UC standards. Members said that introducing graduate scholarships might be one way to increase graduate student exchange. It was also mentioned that racially-motivated crimes (at Massey University) is another issue for New Zealand.

ACTION: Members approved the UCIE report for New Zealand; formal follow-up will take place in one year and should focus on initiatives with UC film/media studies departments, indigenous studies programs, and increased semester programming. Professor Bhavani will update her review report with a bulleted list of follow-up issues.

C. Korea

REPORT: A UCIE summary is not available at this time. Members inquired into the divergence between the review committee's description and the study center director's description of what is happening on the ground (e.g., housing).

ACTION: This report was postponed until the June meeting. UCIE's consideration of the China review report will also take place at the June meeting. Giacomo volunteered to write UCIE's review of the China review.

VII. New Program Proposals

Members discussed the individual proposals in executive session.

ISSUE: Director Guinard briefly outlined the different program proposals that UCIE is asked to take

action on at this meeting:

- *Tsinghua University (Beijing, China)*: This program will provide a UCEAP option in mainland China for engineering and science students. Course work is in English and there is no language prerequisite, although interested students may study Chinese along with their disciplinary coursework.
- *Hong Kong Polytechnic University*: Hong Kong Polytechnic offers course work for a fall program² in a broad array of subjects with strong course offerings in engineering, health sciences/biology and marketing/management/accounting/finance.
- *Pompeu Fabra University (Barcelona, Spain)*: This would be the first program to offer coursework for business/economics majors in English.
- *CIEE Mumbai, Manipal University, and Pune (India)*: Director Guinard noted that Juan Campo (UCSB) will serve as an ombudsman and coordinator for faculty input for the development of these India programs. It is expected that by the end of the quarter, Juan Campo can get back to UCEAP.
- *Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) International Summer School*: CUHK has opened a summer school offering a range of courses in the humanities, social sciences, business, and engineering. No UCEAP summer options are currently available in Hong Kong.

Director Guinard also briefed members on other UCEAP programmatic options currently under development:

- *Argentina*: There is student interest in Argentina. UCEAP's proposed partner is an up-and-coming university. It would be intensive program with family housing, where students would earn 12 units.
- *Australia*: After repeated requests for a summer program (the Australian winter), UCEAP is looking into a program at the University of New South Wales, which runs for six weeks in various locations throughout the country. This proposal also comes in response to the Australia review.
- *Germany*: UCEAP's partner in Germany, Free University, has a summer school that UCEAP is currently utilizing for summer intensive language. The option would be to use the summer program as a stand-alone summer program.
- *Ghana*: UCEAP has just hired a new resident director; UCEAP is currently in talks regarding the development of a new summer program there.
- *Ireland*: UCEAP is interested in offering a six-week summer internship program on two tracks – Irish history and business; students would be placed in Irish businesses and agencies.
- *Singapore/Malaysia*: The National University of Singapore has invited UC to participate in a summer biodiversity program which includes a week-long field trip to Pulau Tioman in Malaysia.
- *South Africa*: UCEAP is working with the University of Cape Town to plan a summer program option. Regular UCT courses in a wide range of subjects will be offered with service-learning types of projects available.
- *United Kingdom*: UCEAP is exploring an option to enroll highly motivated UC students in one or two sessions of intensive studies at the London School of Economics. Each session runs for three weeks. Students can take one course per session and choose from several discipline areas: Accounting and Finance; Economics; International Relations, Government & Society; Law; and Management.
- *Multi-site programs in East Asia and Southeast Asia*: UCEAP is exploring the possibility of launching multi-country semester study programs with a thematic emphasis in East Asia and Southeast Asia. Working with new and current partner institutions in Korea, China, and Japan, and with new and current partner institutions in Southeast Asia, possible locations include Thailand,

² UCEAP has exceeded capacity in Hong Kong with current partners.

Singapore, and a third country yet to be identified.

DISCUSSION: One member expressed the desirability of identifying engineering faculty connections between UC campuses and Tsinghua University (à la Imperial College). Another member asked that in programs where English is the language of instruction, how proficient are the instructors and the fellow students? Director Guinard remarked that it is true that all European business schools are now offering instruction in English. With respect to the business programs, members were interested in the rigor of the course work, as well as the kind of student that would seek them out. Are they primarily designed as networking opportunities? Director Guinard emphasized that none of these programs, while different from traditional programs are academically light. In fact, they are rather intensive. He added that as UCEAP actively engages its alumni, networking opportunities may indeed increase, but it is not UCEAP's specific responsibility to provide for networking opportunities. Reservations were also expressed over the internship programs, especially related to whether these should be academic unit bearing programs, etc. Director Guinard responded that the research and internship programs will be augmented by on-line instruction – an on-line internship course and an on-line research methods course. Affordability was mentioned as another concern. The finance staff have looked at this and signed off that they are in-line with UCEAP's standards on affordability, as UCEAP is not really interested in creating programs that carry program-option fees.

With respect to the newer summer programs, members were interested if students would be enrolled with students from other institutions. Director Guinard responded that it depended on the program, but in some cases they would be (e.g., Australia, London School of Economics, and Germany), in other cases, it could be an island program (e.g., Ghana). Members observed that these new programs seem to be designed to attract a cohort of students that have not been previously tapped by EAP. UCIE also expressed concern that additional staff FTEs may be needed for these new programs. Director Guinard responded there will indeed become a point in time when new FTEs will be necessary, and UCEAP is under a fairly tight cap in terms of staff FTEs, but this is something that could be possibly revised if UCEAP can show the corresponding growth in student enrollments. On the other hand, self-supporting programs could generate seed money to support additional staff FTEs. Consultant York added that summer programs are simpler than year-long immersion programs because the courses are known in advance. With respect to the multi-site programming, it might be attractive to have a program in Hong Kong, but include travel to these other locations, especially for Asian-American Studies students. One member asked how the FACs work? Director Guinard said that while face-to-face meetings are rare, they are regularly consulted electronically. This process seems to be working well, but the addition of one face-to-face meeting per year may be possible and welcome. He added that he would not put the burden of proposing all of the new EAP programs upon the FACs. Another member asked if UCEAP would be closing any more programs in the foreseeable future. Director Guinard responded that UCEAP had closed a significant number of programs last year and the year before; he does not foresee additional program closures in the near future.

A. Tsinghua University, Beijing

ACTION: UCIE approved the Tsinghua University EAP program.

B. Hong Kong Polytechnic University

ACTION: UCIE approved the EAP program at Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

C. Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona

ACTION: UCIE approved the Pompeu Fabra University Program in Barcelona.

D. CIEE Mumbai Tsinghua University, Beijing

ACTION: UCIE postponed its decision on the India program proposals.

E. Manipal University

ACTION: UCIE postponed its decision on the India program proposals.

F. Pune Summer Program

ACTION: UCIE postponed its decision on the India program proposals.

G. Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) International Summer School

ACTION: UCIE approved the CUHK International Summer School program.

VIII. Academic Integration White Paper

ISSUE: Chair Haviland is proposing to write a white paper on from a Senate/faculty point of view. He feels that only part of what is typically referred to as “academic integration” by study abroad professionals involves faculty. He added that it is often difficult to lay-out what courses a student should take over the next four years.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard remarked that a good white paper should make recommendations. He urged that UCIE write a focused white paper that includes recommendations. Chair Haviland asked members for suggestions on possible recommendations. One possible recommendation is that every department should have an international education officer.

ACTION: Chair Haviland will draft a white paper by the June 7th UCEAP Governing Committee meeting.

IX. Program Review White Paper

ISSUE: Chair Haviland asked for suggestions on UCIE's own procedures for program review.

DISCUSSION: Director Guinard suggested that on-site reviews may need to become the default. Chair Haviland suggested that the “cost” of the programs should include the cost of on-site reviews.

ACTION: Chair Haviland will draft the white paper.

X. 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