

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 12, 2009

I. Chair's Announcements – Chair Lobo

Chair Lobo did not have any announcements.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda, the minutes from the November meeting (with minor amendments), and the review questions for the Singapore and Taiwan 2009-10 formal review. Members pulled the study center closure items (c., d., and e.) off the consent calendar and placed them under new business.

III. EAP Director's Report – Michael Cowan

REPORT: Director Cowan reported that he was pleased to receive the Senate's response to the November proposed business plan. He has incorporated many of these comments into the revised strategic plan. Director Cowan touched on five concerns:

- *Nature of EAP:* There is now general agreement, including from the Office of the President, that EAP is an academic program. That said, because EAP students' academic work is taking place outside the boundaries of the United States, EAP must also be concerned with other aspects of their lives, and must also be a student-service provider. It is therefore appropriate that EAP receive funding both for the academic programs it offers and for the necessary student services it provides.
- *Planning and Implementation Time Frame:* Director Cowan agrees with UCIE's view that a five-year time frame would be a more desirable time frame for planning and implementing streamlining reforms and other cost-cutting measures. UCOP believes that, given the major budget cuts that the University as a whole as well as all individual UC campuses are facing, it cannot afford to give EAP five years to phase in the mandated cuts. However, UCOP has agreed to allow UOEAP to run up a deficit for the next several years and then give UOEAP adequate time to pay off the deficit, which will ultimately depend on attracting larger numbers of students to EAP programs but will require a considerable amount of strategic and program planning, marketing, and action over the next year to do so.
- *Academic Oversight:* Strong academic oversight of EAP programs is absolutely crucial. UCIE has been delegated the authority and responsible for this oversight by The Regents and the Academic Senate, which, in turn, has delegated the management of some aspects of this oversight to UOEAP's academic leadership. Academic oversight not only refers formally to authority delegated by the Regents' Standing Orders (SORs), but also plausibly refers to several other important but not formally mandated elements such as activities that have partially or predominantly non-academic elements and/or over which the Senate does not have necessary or exclusive authority. EAP is one of those "academic agencies" mentioned in SOR 105.2. Faculty also have authority over and responsibility for ensuring that "all

courses and curricula” used by students toward their degree meet UC standards. UCIE exercises this authority by approving formal agreements with specific partner universities—it being understood that such approval carries with it the overall approval of the academic courses offered by that partner university that are equivalent in nature to UC courses and of the partner university faculty who teach those courses; by approving EAP’s self-construct programs and the curricula for those programs; by presiding over periodic UC faculty reviews of each program. It is UOEAP’s delegated responsibility: to ensure that EAP students actually enroll in UC-equivalent courses; in EAP self-construct programs, to ensure that the faculty teaching those courses are qualified to do so; to ensure that grading standards in all courses are equivalent to UC standards.

- **Study Center Concerns:** EAP has programs in 33 countries, and presently operates 34 of its own offices in these countries to serve those programs, some of which are quite dispersed. UOEAP’s current strategic plan calls for merging only three study centers with other study centers. Of EAP’s 34 on-site offices, 20 are presently led by UC faculty serving as Study Center Directors. The other 14 are led by local partner university faculty (“liaison officers”), and, in two cases, are called “Resident Directors.” In the case of our self-construct programs, these administrators also play a major role in identifying qualified faculty to teach EAP’s courses. They typically have all the responsibilities that the UC faculty Directors have with one exception: they do not serve formally as “instructors of record.” That role is formally played by UOEAP’s Academic Dean, Bruce Madewell.

The strategic plan proposes two things: 1) Expanding the number of local program administrators where it makes functional sense to do so; and 2) identifying individual UC faculty and small clusters of UC faculty who, while based in California, are willing to help in a number of ways, and would be modestly compensated. These include assisting EAP in the management of those aspects of regular academic oversight that can be managed effectively from California electronically—for example, certain “instructor of record” functions and certain aspects of academic advising; advising study center personnel and UOEAP personnel about specific country and-program issues as they arise; and are available to travel to the specific study center and program sites to help EAP with such matters as program development and the maintaining and strengthening of good relations with partner universities. UOEAP will work out the details of such arrangements over the next five or six months, after receiving the advice of the joint task force and in consultation with UCIE, and to begin implementing such arrangements at carefully selected program sites beginning in 2010-11. UOEAP estimates that it can get by with as few as six UC faculty Directors at key EAP program sites. If EAP does end up with eight or ten or a dozen UC faculty Directors, it must pay for them in one or more of four ways: 1) By persuading UCOP to increase its General Funds subvention of EAP’s administrative operations; 2) by reducing other administrative or instructional costs in our study centers beyond the reductions already being planned for; 3) reducing the administrative costs at EAP’s headquarters in Goleta beyond the additional \$500K already being planned for; and 4) by charging EAP students an additional “administrative” fee to cover the cost of these faculty Directors.

- **Campus Funding:** Director Cowan noted that he has convinced UCOP that all General Fund monies previously used will continue to be used to fund campus offices.

- *Faculty Involvement in EAP:* The San Diego CIE report urged the Senate to adopt a series of measures to integrate EAP into the departmental level. However, for many departments, this would be a very low priority. Stimulating more wide-spread UC faculty support and involvement will require our addressing the matter of incentives, with monetary considerations being not inconsequential. It is not surprising that some UC faculty should be attracted to leading short-term summer study abroad programs organized by their campuses. For a month or five or six week's of summer work, they augment their salaries, enjoy some time abroad at a favorite spot, and still have half the summer for their own research. He asked that committee to think about the appropriate incentives that could motivate faculty in a UC academic department to take the time to encourage their students to participate in an EAP program, to advise those students as to how to make the most productive academic use of their time abroad, or to help those students ensure that at least some of the EAP courses they took would count toward their majors or minors.
- *Activist UCIE:* Director Cowan also encouraged the committee to become more active in the international activities of the University. While acknowledging UCIE's budgetary limitations, he made the following suggestions: 1) The committee could hold monthly issue-focused conference-call meetings; 2) UCIE could form small standing or ad-hoc sub-committees to consider specific issues, using UOEAP as a resource for data, and reporting back to the full committee; and 3) the committee could periodically invite an EVC or chief campus budget officer or campus dean of international education to a UCIE meeting to discuss matters affecting EAP or other study abroad opportunities.

DISCUSSION: Members were interested in UOEAP discussions with third-party providers. Director Cowan responded that UOEAP is currently having discussions with a number of high-quality third-party providers, which includes a fact-finding exercise (options, academic quality, etc.). UOEAP is also interested in these third-party providers' administrative costs, but this is often proprietary information, and therefore difficult to obtain. UOEAP is narrowing down the list of quality third-party providers, with the intent of finding out if there are places where these third-party providers could provide services for EAP students where EAP itself cannot fund its own programs. UOEAP is also interested in exploring ways in which the staff of these third-party providers could provide administrative support, while UOEAP retains academic oversight. Of course this needs to be done in a cost-effective manner. Towards that end, four third-party providers have already been in discussions with UOEAP; there are three others that UOEAP would like to initiate dialogue with. He also remarked on the complex process associated with the introduction and approval of new courses, which would have to be integrated with any third-party providers that UOEAP partners with. Currently, course credit from third-party providers is typically treated as transfer credit (especially from those third-party providers that are associated with major universities and colleges). Members asked about the status of the budget plan. Director Cowan responded that initially UCOP asked UOEAP to draft a budget plan based a three-year budget time frame, in which UOEAP had to operate under a new funding model and get its expenses down. In the meantime, UCOP has backed off of years two and three of that plan; the only alternative UOEAP has in the following years is to go into debt while it works on budgetary issues. He has also tried to develop a frame for a longer time period. Director Cowan is hopeful that the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force can assist UOEAP in establishing a

viable funding model for the following years that is tied into an appropriate academic plan. Chair Lobo clarified that the task force was formed in order to get things ‘in order’ for the years to come. Interim Provost Pitt’s intent is to go over the budget, modifying it in order to preserve the programs as they are. At the same time, another goal is to improve communication between UOEAP and the campus offices in terms of increasing student recruitment, etc. Finally, one member asked if EAP would take on the role of a third-party provider itself to peer institutions. Director Cowan remarked that EAP already has such relationships with four universities. This is not a currently priority, but it is part of a five-year plan. He briefly stated that there are only two ways to really do this—either working with individual departments at these institutions, or generally opening up certain programs to students from external universities that meet EAP’s qualifications.

IV. UOEAP Programmatic Updates – Chair Lobo/Bruce Madewell

A. Intercultural Institute of Japan: New venue for Japan ILP

REPORT: Beginning Academic Year 2009-10, the Japan summer intensive language program (ILP), formerly at the Japanese Language Institute (JLI), will be relocated to the Intercultural Institute of Japan in Akihabara, Tokyo. The Institute also organizes opportunities for students to interact with locals, such as volunteers and individuals from schools and colleges.

B. Peking University (PKU) Summer Program

REPORT: The interest in programs taught in English in Asian countries, especially China, has increased beyond EAP’s current capacity. EAP presently offers two programs taught in English at Fudan University in Shanghai where the demand is now well above the capacity. PKU is introducing a 5-week summer program to begin summer of 2009 for international students. The program will offer limited coursework taught in English in addition to Chinese language study at the beginning, intermediate, or advanced level. The addition of this opportunity is supported by the current Study Center Director in Beijing and UO faculty leaders.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if EAP would be acting as a third party provider by offering this option. Bruce Madewell said that this is not the case, as EAP will be attracting students from UC campuses. PKU recruits international students in general to their program; EAP would be a large component of the PKU program (similar to the Yonsei Summer Program in Korea).

C. Reopened Israel Program, beginning 2009-10

REPORT: Beginning in fall 2009, UC EAP will reopen its program in Israel, which has remained suspended since 2002. The program would be offered as a flexible, interdisciplinary yearlong or semester option, comprising Hebrew language and Jewish, Israel or Middle East studies, and a diverse range of courses spanning the humanities, social sciences, and sciences taught either in English at the Hebrew University (HU) of Jerusalem’s Rothberg International School, or in Hebrew at the HU. The program will be administered on-site by a faculty Liaison Officer at HU. Regarding safety, HU employs a 24-hour security network with guards located at all campus entrances and units patrolling the campus, dormitory complexes, and the vicinity of the University. There is an officer on duty at all times. Most security officials are officers in the reserve of the Israeli Defense Forces. The University's Security Department maintains close contact with government security agencies.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the current status of Israel directorship. Consultant Madewell responded that a director had been in place when the program was suspended; a new director has been recruited, however a UC faculty member will not be on-site there now. A liaison officer will be selected. One member also took issue with the phrasing of Israel in the agenda enclosure as “a relatively stable Middle Eastern country,” and suggested rewording of that statement. Members also took an interest in the pre-departure orientations for Israel. Consultant Madewell responded said that these orientations will be based in part on the numbers of students enrolled in the program. Part of the orientation will be done in California from HU telephonically.

V. UCIE 2009-10 Campus-Wide Review Committee Recommendations/ Nominations – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: Consultant Madewell asked for faculty nominations for the following scheduled from reviews (2009-10): China (2-3 expert faculty and 1 UCIE representative), Korea (2 expert faculty and 1 UCIE representative), Free University (2 expert faculty and 1 UCIE representative), and Madrid (2 expert faculty and 1 UCIE representative). No site visits will be needed for the Free University and Madrid reviews.

VI. Certificate Program at Casa de California in Mexico – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: EAP is proposing a pilot program that would establish a "Certificate Program" in Mexico at its site at Casa de California. Mexican students from UNAM who enroll in this certificate program would also enroll in the Comparative Program's courses. Given that the program is already in place -instructors, staff, and space-, there would be only a minimal additional expense to put on this certificate program. After successful completion of the program, students enrolled in the certificate program would receive a certificate officially issued by UC. UOEAP would need Senate approval for this program, as certificates are governed by Senate Regulation 730.

DISCUSSION: Members suggested opening up the program to other qualified Mexican students at other local Mexican universities (beyond UNAM).

VII. Proposed Budget Model/Strategic Plan and the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force – Errol Lobo/Interim Provost Larry Pitts

ISSUE: Provost Pitts remarked that an EAP budget model has been developed and reviewed by the Senate. Agreement was reached that the budget would move forward in its first year of existence, but the budgets for further years would be reviewed anew. Among the key questions for the task force to consider are: Where does EAP most appropriately fit within the larger university structure? The important role that the campuses play in EAP should also be acknowledged. Where should EAP be administrated—entirely at a campus, systemwide, or somewhere in-between? And what should the ‘principles’ that would become a five-year budget should look like?

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the President's views on the “academic” status of EAP. Provost Pitts responded that President Yudof is open to a well-constructed argument on how to best manage EAP. Members also asked about the consultative process with the campuses. Provost Pitts responded that the individuals on the task force will go back to their constituent

groups. Provost Pitts will keep information flowing to the EVCs as well. He emphasized the fairly quick time-line for the task force, which is the end of the summer for a final product/report. Members commented on the dearth of faculty on the task force. Provost Pitts responded that the faculty names were sent to him by UCOC; he tried to achieve an appropriate campus distribution of the task force's membership. He urged individual members to express individual concerns to Chair Lobo, who is also on the task force. Senate Vice Chair Henry Powell added that UCIE members and guests should go through their local and systemwide Senate processes if they wished to provide input to this task force. Provost Pitts also described the final product, which he envisions as an agreement on which components of EAP should remain in UOEAP, and which components should be located at the campuses. Other questions that need to be addressed are what kind of organization is best suited for vetting of programs? What a funding model should look like? Can EAP be successfully marketed to external students? What should the comparable role(s) of the central office and the campuses be? The scope of the task force is a recommendation for a five-year budget.

One member asked the question of whether it is indeed an institutional goal that all UC students should have some sort of international experience. Provost Pitts responded that this is really a question for individual departments. He added that while there is a value to studying abroad; it is not clear that this has permeated the University as a whole. That said, Provost Pitts is more than happy to pose this question before the task force. Chair Lobo remarked that 'internationalization' is still important, but current economic conditions have detracted from its appeal recently. Provost Pitts remarked that UCOP has indeed eliminated the Director of International and Strategic Initiatives position, which is a reflection of current institutional priorities. Members also asked about third-party providers. Provost Pitts responded that this is really a market issue; some students like the "look" of certain non-EAP programs. He added that he what he would like to achieve a balance of local campus programs vis-à-vis EAP programs. Third-party providers will always remain as competition to UC programs. However, it will need to be decided if EAP wants to market itself externally.

VIII. Interim Provost Larry Pitts

This discussion was incorporated into Item VII.

IX. New Business: Program/Study Center Closures

A. Concepción

ISSUE: The curriculum at the Concepción program (originally housed at Universidad de Concepción in Chile) changed from Spanish language acquisition towards linguistics in recent years, which was not appropriate for UC students. EAP tried to create its own program, hiring a faculty director and utilizing local instructors, but failed in this endeavor. EAP then found another host institution at Universidad Santo Tomás (UST), but found this institution lacking in academic quality, so EAP continued to use locally hired faculty. However, students were not happy with the facilities and the accommodations at UST. While UCEAP received approval at the last meeting to 'suspend' Concepción at the last meeting, they have since reached the conclusion that there is not an adequate institution in Concepción to host the program at this time. It is anticipated that a new program can either be developed in Chile or Argentina.

DISCUSSION: Members asked which other programs are available as immediate alternatives for the Concepción program. UOEAP Consultant Madewell responded that students could be sent to the two other programs in Santiago, Chile, but they may not be able to accommodate those Concepción students who did not have prior language study; there may be opportunities in Mexico. Members remarked that, if closed, there would not be any South American programs for beginning Spanish language learners. There is a beginning Spanish program in Morelia, Mexico, but the question remains whether students will want to go to a program in Mexico as opposed to Chile. Consultant Madewell added that student evaluations were very poor, and it does not make sense to continue the program in its current form at UST. It was also mentioned that the last formal review of Concepción was completed three years ago, and while it did receive a relatively favorable review, there was a significant amount of criticism regarding the linguistics-heavy nature of the curriculum. Consultant Madewell expressed confidence that EAP could develop a reciprocal program (e.g., without any net costs) with an existing partner in South America.

B. Padova Study Center Closure

ISSUE: Although the primary rationale behind this proposal is financial, Consultant Madewell explained that another motive is to reduce the ‘clutter’ of overlapping programs in Europe, and especially Italy, which seems to confuse students. While EAP would like to close the Padova Study Center, it anticipates maintaining the exchange relationship with the university in Padova in order to send year-long immersion students. The remaining sites in Italy include Bologna and Bocconi (which has a number of English-language programs). He also mentioned that the year-long immersion programs are suffering in large extent due to the value of the U.S. dollar and the downturn in the economy. Students are also more interested in studying in locations in Asia. If this closure is approved, there will be one study center remaining in Italy at Bologna; there is also a resident director at Rome (that study center was closed a couple of years ago).

DISCUSSION: Director Cowan clarified the differences between a ‘study center’ and an administrative site, which is the case at Rome. For example, EAP has a program in Siena, but it does not have a study center there. Instead, it employs local staff who run a first-rate self-construct program, which focuses on Italian language, and is very popular with UC students. Therefore, the lack of a study center at a particular location does not mean that EAP does not have a presence at that location. The Chair of the Campus Administrative Directors (CAD) remarked that Italy is not one of the countries that administrative directors feel is extremely ‘cluttered’; Japan and the UK would be better examples of this. Consultant Madewell mentioned that Europe in general is cluttered, as EAP started its operations in this region, and has not done a good job cutting European programs over time. That said, the guiding principal remains cutting the number of duplicate programs, thereby not decreasing the EAP options available in Italy. Members asked if there are any third-party providers available in Padova if students still want to pursue a program there. EAP Director Cowan responded that there are a number of third-party providers in Italy, which could provide options for such students.

ACTION: Members discussed this issue in executive session.

C. Closure of the Göttingen, Germany Study Center

ISSUE: The proposal on the table is to close the Study Center in Göttingen, thereby consolidating the Germany undergraduate programs at Free University, Humboldt University, and Technical University in Berlin; there is also an undergraduate language and culture program at Potsdam. While the study center would be closed, EAP would maintain its agreement with Georg-August University, which is the host institution in Göttingen. Georg-August is benefiting from the European Research Initiative or the “Excellence Initiative” (receiving funding for internationalization), and there is considerable interest among UC faculty regarding research collaborations, as well as dual-degree programs, which hold future promise. In short, UCEAP feels that it is within their best interest to leave the current agreement in place, while working towards the exchange of graduate students. It was also noted that the last formal review of the Germany programs took place three years ago in which all of them were reviewed favorably.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that EAP is pulling out of Göttingen just when that university is becoming more and more international; it was clarified that the agreement remains in place, only the study center would close. One member, who is quite familiar with the German higher education system, added that the Excellence Initiative is really making a big difference in German universities, especially at such institutions as Georg-August. Consultants justified the proposed closure by noting that EAP just does not have enough undergraduate students to justify the existence of an administrative center in Göttingen. They added that currently, graduate exchanges are very ad-hoc; it would be fairly easy for UOEAP to add an addendum to the exchange agreement to incorporate graduate students.

ACTION: Members discussed this issue in executive session.

D. Closure of the Grenoble, France Study Center

ISSUE: Consultant Madewell explained that the justification to close the study center in Grenoble is financial; there is a need to reduce costs in Europe. The rationale is based on anemic student interest, as well as the high costs for this program/study center; the student FTEs at Grenoble are not increasing, in fact, they are rather low. While this closure will probably not result in any less total FTEs for France, but it will reduce opportunities for students with French language skills to study at a host university that is especially strong in science and technology. He added that the current Study Center Director at Lyon/Grenoble has put forward a justification for keeping the study center open, as he disagrees with UOEAP’s position. The major obstacle to growing this program is that it requires students with both a solid science background, as well as at least two years of university French language instruction; there is simply not a large enough cohort of undergraduate students with this combination to keep the program/study center viable.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that Grenoble enjoys a high academic ranking, even higher than that of Bordeaux. Consultant Madewell emphasized that the proposed closure is due to student interest; there is simply more student interest to study at Bordeaux than Grenoble. Members also asked about Grenoble Study Center Director Chris Newfield’s argument that the low numbers are due to poor advertising, implying that a more-focused advertising campaign could be implemented to compensate for the current low numbers. The CAD Chair remarked that Study Center Director Newfield lays out a strategy of recruitment, which could be implemented if the will was there. That said, it is always more difficult to recruit science and technology students. Director Cowan re-emphasized the difficulty in finding enough science and

engineering students with sufficient fluency in French. Indeed, the enrollment in high French language courses among general students, and especially science and engineering students, have been dropping over time; this speaks against maintaining the study center. Consultant Madewell added that most EAP science and technology students are choosing to go to those locations with English-language instruction; there are at least a dozen options in English for these students above Grenoble.

ACTION: Members discussed this issue in executive session.

X. Executive Session

[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]

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

Attest: Errol Lobo, UCIE Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst