

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
NOVEMBER 10, 2004

**I. Chair's Announcements** (Enclosures 1 & 2) – *Fred Burwick*

Chair Burwick welcomed everyone and asked members to introduce themselves. He then gave an overview of UCIE's charge and logistics.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**A.** Approval of May 14, 2004 minutes (Enclosure 4)

**ACTION: The May 14, 2004 minutes were approved with minor amendments.**

**B.** Approval of 2003-04 Annual Report (Enclosure 5)

**ISSUE:** There were two contingencies noted in the annual report that have since been addressed. The Beijing, China program has added a language component as part of its orientation. The Ferrara, Italy program is now a systemwide program.

**ACTION: The 2003-04 Annual Report was approved with minor amendments.**

**C.** UC Merced representation on UCIE

**ACTION: Todd Giedt will contact the Merced Task Force to select a Merced guest/representative.**

**D.** Updates from previous year:

- UOEAP Associate Dean status: The search for this position is currently in-progress. This position's purview includes faculty relations (faculty exchange, cycle of study center director appointments), academic quality (course approvals, student petitions, grades, study center academic oversight), and academic integration. UOEAP consultants noted that UOEAP growth necessitated the additional faculty oversight provided by a third FTE.
- UC faculty Site Visit to Hong Kong: John Hawkins, who was originally selected to conduct the site visit, had to cancel due to health problems. UOEAP asked John Jameson, a UCB emeriti professor, who is currently in Shanghai, China, to conduct the Hong Kong site visit in his place.
- Formal Review Committee Site Visits (short-term UC-construct programs): These site visits have just been completed.

**E.** Future meeting schedule: Two two-day meetings have been scheduled for 2005:

- February 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> (joint-meeting with the Council of Campus Directors (CCD))
- May 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>

### **III. Overview of the Office of International Academic Initiatives and EAP Activities** (Enclosure 6; Distribution 4) – *Presentation by John Marcum, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs & Universitywide EAP Director*

#### EAP Activities

Currently, there is an enrollment cap of plus or minus five percent of EAP's 2002-03 enrollment numbers. Over the next two years, EAP will go from no growth to slow growth, which will occur mostly in short-term programs. EAP's attention has been focused on increasing administrative efficiencies and modernizing its data base system. The growth of short-term programs over the last couple of years has increased the ratio of UC students to reciprocity students from 2:1 to 4:1. In terms of costs, some large short-term programs (Siena, Italy) are very economical, however many others are quite intensive. Short-term programs can be more labor intensive than year-long programs (with more short-term programs, there are also more students to process/advise). The total UOEAP budget is about \$20 million, which is augmented by a small amount of additional fund-raising (about \$300,000). Director Marcum reviewed the history of the campus 'buy-out', which would have standardized campus services and changed campus office funding structures. This plan has been shelved.

#### 110% Unit Cap

The State of California is asking UC to limit state support for students who take over 110% of credits required for graduation (historically this figure has been at 120%) beginning in 2005-06. In other words, students would pay the entire cost for any units they take over 110% of the units required for graduation. Director Marcum noted that since neither AP credits nor transfer credits will count as part of this 110% cap under the proposed plan, some students may elect to go on non-EAP programs in order to avoid this financial penalty. At this point, EAP has not been granted an exception to this unit cap. EAP has determined that 63% of EAP students typically go over the proposed unit cap of 110%. One reason for this is the mandatory intensive language component in many EAP programs. However, students in certain high-credit programs, such as engineering, would be exempt until they reached a specified 'high-unit' amount. In addition, all unit overages that occurred in the first four years would not be subject to any financial penalties. UOEAP is currently seeking an exemption from this unit cap. Academic Council (AC) Chair Blumenthal said that UCPB and UCPT have commented that this cap would adversely affect students with double-majors and those who change majors.

#### OIAA/EAP Activities

Director Marcum announced that EAP is looking into moving the Hungary Study Center from the Humanities Division to the Social Sciences Division at Etvoş Löränd University. There will be a special event at the House of Commons on November 18<sup>th</sup> that commemorates the relationship between California and the UK in higher education. A 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration of the academic partnership between UC and the International Christian University in Japan will be held in January 2005. Casa de California will open soon and will host the Comparative Perspectives program. OIAA is also in conversation with the University of Utrecht about developing a comprehensive agreement that will involve research and graduate students. An innovation and learning center is also under consideration in Shanghai, China.

#### **IV. Overview of EAP Strategic Planning, Research, and Academic Integration**

(Enclosures 3, 7-10; Distributions 1-3, 5-6) – *Presentation by Scott Cooper, Associate Director & Academic Dean, UOEAP*

##### Overview of EAP

EAP's mission is to provide high-quality academic exchanges for UC. Because all academic credit earned abroad counts as UC credit towards graduation, it is important that all EAP coursework is of UC quality. A major EAP goal is academic integration of EAP coursework into the campuses' curriculum. EAP now sends over 4,200 students abroad every year to 35 different countries and to 140 host-institutions with 240 program options. Enrollments have been growing steadily until last year, when an enrollment cap was placed on EAP. Programs include:

- Full immersion programs, in which students take host-university courses with host-university faculty and students.
- Language and Culture programs, which are short-term with a focus on language acquisition.
- General Education (GE) programs, in which students primarily take lower-division courses that satisfy GE requirements upon their return to UC. (London Fall and Sussex Summer).
- Special focus programs, which are discipline- or topic-specific programs (tropical biology in Costa Rica, economics and business and cognitive psychology in Maastricht, peace and security in Tokyo, and a variety of special biology programs in Australia). Topic based programs include Lund Summer, where Lund and UC faculty collaborate on courses reflecting the "Transatlantic Dialogue on Critical World Issues" that are taught to both UC and Swedish students; Another program in development is ICIS, Beijing, which will focus on globalization and China.
- Internships and/or independent study are also possible on many EAP programs and the focus of a few programs (Field Research Program in Mexico).
- Graduate programs, which are specialized for graduate students (ENS in Paris). It was noted that graduate students may also participate in many other EAP program as well.

The EAP administration consists of the campus offices (faculty directors, campus administrative directors, and staff advisors), study centers abroad, and the Universitywide Office (UOEAP). Campus offices deal with students (recruitment, selection, advising, and orientation) and faculty. Study centers (53 world-wide), 27 of which are headed by UC faculty with liaison officers (local faculty or administrators) administering most of the remaining 24 study centers. Faculty study center directors generally have two-year terms. UOEAP is headed by John Marcum (Director), Scott Cooper (Associate Director & Academic Dean), and Jerry Lowell (Chief Administrative Officer).

##### Overview of Strategic Planning

Recent strategic planning has emphasized academic quality, operational efficiency, and academic integration. The annual strategic planning process consists of three steps. The first step is a report card on each country, called the 'Status and Strategy Report', which includes status updates, improvements, problems, and future plans. The second step is a program development meeting, where the information contained in these reports are combined with current research on international economic, foreign relations, and political trends along with an assessment of UC student demographics to develop plans for various programs and areas of study. The third step is a 'nuts and bolts' meeting on the best ways to implement these plans for both existing and new

programs. The program development process emphasizes (1) the feasibility of any new program proposals due to the difficulties in retracting programs once development begins or after they have been established; and (2) faculty involvement. Plans for new program development include an expanded relationship with the University of Utrecht, a program between the School of Agriculture at UC Davis and the University of Wageningen in the Netherlands, an economics and business program in Shanghai, and a summer program in engineering.

#### Campus Non-EAP Programs

Many campuses now affiliate with third-party program providers to develop their own international programs. Some of these programs are very short-term ‘island’ programs, lasting only two to eight weeks, while others are semester-long programs. Campus offices feel that many of these programs are complementary to EAP (especially the two- to eight-week programs), as they get students interested in participating on a longer EAP program. EAP does offer full summer programs (at least eight weeks), but does not have an interest in developing shorter programs.

#### Overview of Academic Integration

The main goal of academic integration is to have campus academic units view EAP courses as their own. This means that campus departments integrate EAP programs into their curriculum, giving credit for major and GE requirements, and including them as part of course sequences. Promotion of EAP programs by faculty/teaching assistants in UC courses is another goal of such integration. To facilitate this process, UOEAP has developed an academic integration website (<http://eap.ucop.edu/ai/>), which instructs faculty/departments on academic integration. EAP is also collecting data on the various EAP courses that have already been approved to fulfill major requirements. A long-term goal is the development of a web-based tool that would allow departmental advisors to approve courses on-line and to archive these approvals.

UOEAP employs a number of strategies to facilitate academic integration. As a first step, EAP campus faculty directors and their staff will meet with advisors, faculty, and chairs within departments and colleges to describe how EAP works and provide important resources. As a follow-up, the campus offices develop web-based ‘advising sheets’ that are linked directly to the department’s website telling students exactly why, where, and when they should go on EAP. Course lists can also be provided, along with the requirements that certain courses fulfill. UOEAP has also been conducting systemwide discipline-specific workshops at its annual conferences for some of the biggest undergraduate majors. In 2003 and 2004, biology and political science workshops were held respectively. EAP also responds to individual campus requests to develop discipline-specific course lists and other programmatic information. UOEAP also employs an academic integration analyst, and supplies funding for up to two course releases for each faculty campus director to work on academic integration. Finally, UOEAP has a matching fund program for staff support for academic integration at the EAP campus offices.

### **V. UCIE Representation on Formal Review Committees (Enclosures 11-19)**

**A. Short-term programs (London, Paris Center, American University of Paris, and Siena)**  
**ACTION: The short-term programs’ meeting will be held in Santa Barbara on January 28, 2005. Francoise Sorgen-Goldschmidt was confirmed for this review**

**committee. UCIE approved the review questions without changes (all in favor, 0 opposed).**

**B. Hong Kong**

**ACTION: The Hong Kong meeting will be held in Santa Barbara on February 4, 2005. Yingjin Zhang was confirmed for this review committee. UCIE approved the review questions without changes (all in favor, 0 opposed).**

**C. Ghana**

**ACTION: The Ghana meeting will be held in Santa Barbara on February 7, 2005. Anita Guerrini was confirmed for this review committee. UCIE approved the review questions without changes (all in favor, 0 opposed).**

**D. Spain**

**ACTION: The Spain meeting will be held in Santa Barbara on January 21, 2005. David S. Pion-Berlin was confirmed for this review committee. UCIE approved the review questions without changes (all in favor, 0 opposed).**

**VI. UCIE Representation on Standing Curriculum Committees/other Sub-Committees**

**A. French and European Studies Program at UC Center in Paris Curriculum Committee: ACTION: John Graham was confirmed for this curriculum committee.**

**B. Mexico-U.S. Comparative Perspectives Program Curriculum Committee: ACTION: Charles Leshner was confirmed for this curriculum committee.**

**C. London Fall Semester Program (UC-London Bloomsbury) Curriculum Committee: ACTION: Peter Young was confirmed for this curriculum committee.**

**D. Rome through the Ages Program at the UC Center in Rome Curriculum Committee: ACTION: Janice Humphreys was confirmed for this curriculum committee.**

**E. UCIE Sub-Committee on Study Center Director Questions (UCIE specific reviews): ACTION: Francoise Sorgen-Goldschmidt and Fred Burwick were confirmed.**

**F. Standing Sub-Committee for Program Development: ACTION: John Graham and Ralph Frerichs were confirmed.**

**VII. Study Center Task Force Update (Enclosure 20; Distribution 7) – Report by Scott Cooper**

**ISSUE:** The Study Center Task Force (SCTF) is a joint UCIE-UOEAP task force composed of past study center directors, UCIE members, and several people from UOEAP. Peter Young and Jean-Xavier Guinard are the UCIE members on this committee. The three main issues facing the SCTF the structure of study centers structured, study center director workload, and academic oversight. Regarding workload, UOEAP has found that the workload varies according to a number of variables (enrollment, number of host-institution partners, UC-construct, etc.).

Study Center Structure

There are three main study center models: (1) UC faculty study center directors (two-year terms); (2) liaison officers (who are faculty members/administrators at the host-institution); and (3) permanent resident directors. Given the problems of high-cost and continuity associated with the predominant model (UC faculty study center directors), the sub-committee is considering these other models.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee expressed the concern that it is difficult for study center directors to perform the varying array of duties that is required of them (administrative management, advising, host-institution relations, etc.). The issue of UC-responsibility was also raised in relation to using local liaison officers in lieu of UC faculty as study center directors.

**ACTION: Jean-Xavier Guinard (no longer on UCIE) was confirmed to remain on as the Co-Chair of this committee (all in favor, 0 opposed).**

**VIII. Process for Waiving Minimum GPA Requirements/Academic Probation (Enclosure 21) – Report by Scott Cooper**

Waiving Minimum GPA Requirements

**ISSUE:** For some programs, EAP can waive the 3.0 minimum GPA down to a 2.85, and occasionally even lower. On the other hand, EAP does not accept any applications under 2.6 for most programs and 2.5 for language and culture and short-term programs. At issue is the waiving of GPA's between 2.6 and 2.85. Requesting waivers for such GPA's has traditionally been initiated by the campus advisor, and is submitted to the Regional Director at UOEAP, who consults with the study center director.

Because GPA requirements are a Senate purview, setting policy for the waiving of the GPA requirements is also under Senate purview. In the past, UCIE has given the EAP campus faculty directors the discretion to waive GPA's down to a 2.85.

**DISCUSSION:** UCIE's main concern was that the current process appeared to be somewhat cumbersome and complicated. Given the relatively low numbers of waiver requests per year (about 40 to 80), they felt that waivers down to a 2.6 GPA for 3.0 programs should be granted by Campus Faculty Directors and should not be delegated to anyone else. Reserving waiver authority for the Campus Faculty Directors would not only streamline the process, but also preserve faculty oversight. Before making a final decision however, the committee wanted to get input from the Campus Faculty Directors on this issue. Therefore, it will be discussed at the next CCD meeting (December 7), and will be finally decided at the joint UCIE-CCD meeting in February.

Students on Academic Probation

**ISSUE:** Currently, students who go on academic probation the quarter or semester before departure become ineligible for participation in EAP programs. The problem is that at some campuses academic probation is based on a quarter-by-quarter performance. Therefore, a student's cumulative GPA in some cases does not fall below the minimum EAP requirement (even if the student is on academic probation during that particular quarter/semester). At issue is

whether to drop the requirement for participation that students must not be on academic probation.

**DISCUSSION:** Members expressed the viewpoint that the cumulative GPA, rather than the GPA from the most recent quarter/semester, is a better indicator of a student's success abroad. One option discussed was simply to delete the current section on academic probation from EAP policy. The committee felt that issues of student performance and academic quality were already adequately addressed by the minimum GPA requirements, and that there was no need for additional structures relating to academic probation.

**ACTION:** Action on both issues (waiving minimum GPA's and academic probation) was tabled until the February joint UCIE-CCD meeting.

**IX. Reports on Delays in Grade Processing** (Enclosure 22) – *Report by Scott Cooper*

**ISSUE:** A large proportion of grades come in within two months after the end of the program, however, delays remain a problem in some programs. Statistics show that EAP has improved in reducing delays over two months. It was noted that many of the delays relate to host-institution specific characteristics such as faculty culture (summer breaks) and faculty holding more than one job (Ghana). Some of the worst delays are associated with the Ghana, Germany, and France programs. Graduating seniors and juniors who are applying for graduate or professional schools are most affected by grade delays.

**DISCUSSION:** Members with experience in Europe also noted that such delays are built into the system of higher education there. For example, German seminars are structured so that students have the summer to finish their papers, and as a rule do not turn in their papers at the end of the semester, but at the end of the summer. Therefore, faculty will wait until all of the papers come in before submitting grade reports. At other locations, grades are simply not as important as they are in the American system (Sweden, Germany). In Ghana, promises have been made that (1) a special exam for foreign students will be instituted; and (2) the University of Ghana is exploring the possibility of paying faculty 'per-capita' for the actual students who take the exam. To date however, neither of these reforms has been instituted. The committee inquired into the differential between the delays of fall vs. spring program grades.

**ACTION:** The data regarding the differential between the fall and spring program grade delays will be reported at the February meeting.

**X. Timeline for Recruitment, Selection, and Appointment of Study Center Directors** (Enclosure 23) – *Report by Scott Cooper*

**ISSUE:** Study Center directors are appointed one year in advance. UCIE members are asked to participate in first-round interviews. After the first-round interviews, a short-list meeting will be convened (CCD Chair-designate, a UCIE representative, Associate Director Scott Cooper, the UOEAP Human Resources Director, and the appropriate UOEAP Regional Director). UCIE Chair Burwick and EAP Director Marcum conduct the second-round interviews (from April 25 to May 6). At the May meeting, UCIE study center directorship recommendations are finalized. Both UCIE's and Director Marcum's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost and Senior

Vice President for Academic Affairs, who makes the final decisions regarding study center director appointments (with UC Presidential approval and final appointment).

**ACTION: Francoise Sorgen-Goldschmidt was confirmed as the UCIE representative for the short-list meeting.**

**XI. Announcements from the Academic Senate Office** – *Presentation by George Blumenthal, Chair, Academic Senate, Clifford Brunk, Vice Chair, Academic Senate, and Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

AC Chair George Blumenthal welcomed new and returning committee members. He stressed the importance of becoming liaisons between the members' local committees and the systemwide CCGA committee. He identified some issues that will be affecting the AC this year:

#### Long-Range Planning

UC administration is looking 10, 15, 20, and 25 years into the future. Chair Blumenthal noted some changing realities for UC, including the increased difficulty in recruiting foreign graduate students, changing California demographics, and state funding issues. Of particular importance are (1) how a long-range plan will be funded; and (2) the importance of graduate education.

#### Budget

Next year, the Compact with the governor calls for a 3% increase in funding to UC; graduate student fees will be raised by 10% and undergraduate fees will be raised by 8%; and there will be money to fund 5,000 additional students at UC. Return-to-aid percentages this year are 50% and 25% for graduate and undergraduate students respectively. The Compact is a floor and not a ceiling. Members were encouraged to think of initiatives that could be added to the Compact.

#### Political Advocacy

Over the past year, the Academic Senate has become more politically active. To that end, it has assigned one staff person to follow legislative issues. At the same time, UC began an advocacy campaign to convince the Governor, the Legislature, and business leaders of UC's important role in California's economy.

#### Miscellaneous Items

- Merced Division: The Merced division should be established by the end of this year (May). It will be finalized once the AC and Merced approve an operational budget.
- Senate Regulations: The AC will be asking committees to look at Senate regulations.
- Compendium: Six years ago, the measure was adopted that organized research units (ORU's) would no longer be reviewed on the systemwide level, but on the campus level. This measure needs to be reviewed in order to be made permanent.

#### Labs

The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory is up for competition, which UC will most likely compete for. It is anticipated that the Los Alamos Laboratory will be up for bid by the end of this year, however no definite information is known at this time. Lawrence Livermore

Laboratories is not scheduled for competition for two more years. Opinion polls showed that both UC faculty and undergraduate students are in favor of competing for the labs.

### Research Issues

- “Strings” on Grants: “Strings” are constraints that granting agencies append to their grants to universities, and restraints on the types of activities that universities can engage in. An UCORP report opposed such “strings”. The AC approved a resolution that it is inappropriate for an unit/department/school/campus of the university to take a vote and decide to refuse funding from a source based solely on the source of the funding (i.e. tobacco funding). The AC is sending this resolution to all systemwide committees/divisions for comment.
- California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal-ISI’s): The AC is concerned about the Senate’s role in the review process for the Cal-ISI’s.
- Research Environment at UC: The AC has suggested that UCORP does a comparison of the UC research environment with those at other comparable institutions.

### Admissions

- Eligibility criteria approved by the Regents.
- Report on AP Honors (anticipated soon)
- Admissions Tests (BOARS)
- Geographic principles based on proximity are not appropriate (BOARS).
- Junior Transfers: There is a perception that UC does not do as well as CSU with junior transfers. However, UC not only maintains a 60:40 (upper- to lower-division) ratio, but also has shown that its junior transfers do just as well as its native students. The AC is currently reviewing an articulation proposal specific to major requirements, which would stipulate that if four campuses approve a course for academic credit transfer, then it would be approved at all campuses.

### Graduate Education

Professional doctorates are becoming an issue, as some professions are requiring doctorates; UC will have to decide if it will pursue offering more joint-doctorates with CSU.

### University Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Issues

(1) UCRS is still fully funded until 2006; (2) no change in health plans; and (3) the recall of recently retired faculty members for a three-year period (50% time).

Executive Director Barceló described her duties as the Systemwide Senate Executive Director. Her primary responsibility is the management of staff and budgetary resources so that the Senate Committees receive the support they need in order to accomplish their missions. She also reviewed the travel policy (UCLA Travel) and the new web site policy. Public agendas (does not include discussion items, enclosures, and informational items) will be posted on the Senate website under UCIE. In addition, all approved minutes will be placed on the website. There will be a members’ only page (password-protected) where members can go to find complete agendas, minutes, and finalized documents. Finally, she made note of the Senate Source as the official publication of the Academic Senate (distribution 8). There will be a web page, as well a box for updates, devoted to legislative issues in the Senate Source.

**XII. Executive Session** – *members only*

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Attest: Fred Burwick, UCIE Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

**Distributions**

1. EAP Overview PowerPoint Presentation
2. EAP 2005-06 Brochure
3. UCEAP Organizational Chart
4. EAP/OIAA Accomplishments/Goals
5. UCEAP Enrollment by Country and Program Type, Academic Year 2003/04
6. UC Study Abroad Participation
7. Overview of UCEAP Study Center Director and Liaison Officer Responsibilities
8. November 2004 Senate Source