

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 9, 2006**

Present: María Bertero-Barceló, Beverly Bossler, Scott Cooper, Todd Giedt, Anita Guerrini, Nancy Guy, Errol Lobo, John Marcum, Richard Matthew, Paulo Monteiro, Casey Moore, David Pion-Berlin, Val Rust, Jianwen Su, Khatharya Um, and Linda York

**I. Chair's Announcements – Anita Guerrini**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Guerrini welcomed new members. She reminded members to read the annual report. She informed members that the ad-hoc review committee will be submitting a report within the month of November. She remarked that the ad-hoc committee is not addressing the budget, but it has made the recommendation that another subcommittee be established to evaluate these issues. The ad-hoc review committee's report will examine such issues as those related to Study Center directors, the EAP model (reciprocity), among others.

**II. Announcements from the Academic Senate Office**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Senate Chair John Oakley and Vice Chair Michael T. Brown could not attend the meeting. Senate Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló described the policies and procedures regarding the Academic Senate office.

Senate Process

Director María Bertero-Barceló reminded members that Chair Oakley and Vice-Chair Brown are ex-officio members of this committee. She remarked that divisional feedback indicates that shared governance is very strong. Director Bertero-Barceló informed members about the Senate review process. After an issue has been identified and approved by Academic Council, it goes out for systemwide review, which entails collecting comments from both systemwide standing committees as well as from the Senate divisions. Generally, systemwide committee chairs decide if a given issue is relevant to the charge of his or her committee. She advised members to inform their respective divisions about issues originating out of UCIE, which go out for systemwide review. As a case in point, she noted that UCIE's 'Association with UC Degrees' has encountered some resistance in the Senatwide review process. It will be sent back to UCIE for further work, along with a request for more information.

She stressed the importance of Bylaw 40, which states that when a standing committee wants to make a recommendation to the President, it must present the report/memorandum to the Academic Council. She also recommended that the committee try to complete all of its memorandums, reports, etc. by April; otherwise, the approval process could easily stretch into the following year. Travel policy is also important. The Office of the President (UCOP) is strictly enforcing its 21-day travel reimbursement policy, which means that only reimbursement requests submitted within 21 days after the date of the meeting will be honored. She also referenced the [Guidelines for Systemwide Senate Committees](#), which details the Senate processes and the various roles of its members. Per these guidelines, the committee must go through their faculty representatives when communicating with administrators. She stressed that standing systemwide committee meetings are closed and private; therefore all guests must be

formally invited through the Chair of the Senate. Once approved, minutes are public documents and posted on the Senate website (UCIE minutes/agendas are posted at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucie/>). Once minutes are finalized by the committee, they cannot be redacted or withdrawn for any reason. If the committee wishes to post any other document on the public side of the Senate website, it must be approved by Academic Council. Analyst Todd Giedt also introduced members to the password-protected [Senate Document Repository](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/docs/) (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/docs/>). He will post all related final and working documents, drafts, minutes, agendas, as well as correspondence coming out of the committee. Members also have the right to post working drafts in this repository. Documents posted in the repository do not need to be approved by Academic Council (because it is password-protected). Upon their first visit to the repository, members will need to request a password. The log-in is the member's first and last name in lower case separated by a '.' (i.e. 'john.smith'). Another useful document is the [Acronym Glossary](#), which lists the acronyms commonly used by the Academic Senate and UCOP.

### **III. Consent Calendar**

#### **A. Approval of the 2005-06 UCIE Annual Report**

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked about the program cuts, which UCIE approved last January. UOEAP consultants clarified that because of the UCOP intervention, the only program cuts made were DIS (Denmark), Brea (Italy), and the Tasmania semester program in biology (Australia). They explained that these cuts were not related to the budget crisis, but were made in order to consolidate and streamline EAP, as they duplicated offerings found in other programs.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the annual report.**

### **IV. EAP Director's Report – John Marcum**

**REPORT:** Director Marcum opened his remarks by describing the 2006-07 academic year as a year of transition for both himself and EAP. He announced that he will be retiring next year and a search for his position will be underway soon. To that end, it is anticipated that his position as EAP Director will be filled by July 2007. He reported that Provost Rory Hume, Dan Greenstein (systemwide university librarian), and Joyce Justus (Interim Vice Provost -- Educational Relations) met with UOEAP officials yesterday in Santa Barbara. They are touring the campuses, talking about the respective roles of UCOP and the campuses. For EAP, this year's important issues include the budget formula, the structure of the program, as well as his own retirement. He also remarked on EAP's ten-year review. In those ten years, EAP grew approximately four-fold and has about 4,000 participants (which are different than full time equivalents). Participants are predominantly single-term; only a quarter of EAP participants are now studying abroad for a full-year. EAP has also been under an enrollment cap since the state budget crisis of 2003; therefore EAP has been growing qualitatively since that time. As a result, it has instituted automation academic integration (AI), as well as a number of other efficiency projects.

#### **Budget**

It is very important that the budget model be reviewed and synchronized with the report of the ad-hoc review committee in order that proper funding can be secured. EAP's understanding is that these things are being merged together in an appropriate way. Jerry Lowell has just

completed a survey on the funding models of thirteen study abroad institutions that compete with EAP. It is interesting to note that none of them are funded in the same way that EAP is. Many are funded on tuition (fees) basis, or by simply paying for the cost of programs. This information is intended as information and analysis, and does not make any recommendations as to how EAP should be funded. It is hoped that this analysis will support the effort to create a new budget formula, which will not only facilitate EAP's future growth, but also support the campus offices.

### Strategy/Direction

Study abroad should be seen as part of a larger academic strategy. Unlike any other program in the US, EAP has study centers and faculty abroad, which should serve a broader purpose and as a resource. This has already happened to some extent with the California House in London, which is located in Bedford Square. California House now supports a number of activities, including internships, which links into alumni activities. Establishing a similar UC center in Mexico City has struggled with funding. Its original proposal was to create a presence for UC in Mexico City using funds from [UC MEXUS](#), which led to the purchase of a bank training center in Mexico City. Financing the seismic upgrades has been an ongoing issue, but now Provost Hume has agreed to move forward with the center. There is one structure within that facility that will be used to house EAP. Director Marcum anticipates that the seismic upgrades will be completed within eight weeks. At Shanghai, EAP will open an office in December in the 'Knowledge and Innovation Center', which is close to Fudan University. The College Board, Fudan University, and other top Asian and French universities will also be there. Finally, EAP has signed an umbrella agreement with Utrecht that involves English language instruction (adding another 100 courses to the already existing 100 English-language instruction courses for EAP students); some faculty research opportunities; and a lecture series, among other things. A new European Research Council is also being developed (UC is contributing one million dollars annually). The number of teaching opportunities for UC faculty has increased at [Yonsei University](#) in South Korea, [Meiji Gakuin University](#) in Japan, and in the [Joint UC-Lund Summer](#) program.

### Relationship between UCOP and the Campuses

During his visit, Provost Hume described his view on UCOP's relationship with the campuses with the following catch phrase, "Common when it serves, and customize when it counts." This means that while some basic level of commonality is desirable, the campuses should be distinctive and have different strengths/foci. This philosophy views UC as a confederate system with the campuses as the main clients of UCOP.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked whether the ad-hoc review committee will recommend a new budget formula. Director Marcum is not sure whether the ad-hoc review committee will make a case for a new budget formula, but an eventual new formula would have to account for the range of services that EAP provides as a result of this review. Consultant Scott Cooper reminded members that last year the issue was remanded to the [University Committee on Planning and Budget](#) (UCPB), which recommended turning the budget issue over to the ad-hoc review committee. As Chair Guerrini mentioned earlier, the ad-hoc review committee has determined that they do not have the necessary expertise to conduct a financial analysis. Therefore, Provost Hume is bringing in a consultant (Jerry Kissler) to work this out in the

meantime in tandem with the review. Jerry Kissler will be working with Jerry Lowell and discussions will begin in the next week or so. Director Marcum anticipates that this process will be co-terminus with the recommendations of the ad-hoc review committee. The reason for the delays is that UCPB took it up and handed it off at the end of the academic year as the academic year ended. Director Marcum added that UCOP has also been preoccupied with other issues, such as compensation. He emphasized that the budget issue was not to be neglected, and it is moving ahead now. While UOEAP is not advocating a particular solution, they are advocating a solution is needed. Members also commented on the general under funding of the campus offices. Director Marcum responded that he has made this argument consistently. He reiterated that the new budget formula must address the campuses, UOEAP, and the study centers abroad. The Santa Cruz member mentioned that UCSC is going ahead with an audit of its EAP office, which is chronically under funded. Director Marcum remarked that other systems are often better funded than EAP, but he stressed that EAP does remarkably well with the limited funding that it does receive. UOEAP consultants confirmed that it is their understanding that the deficit will continue to be covered by UCOP.

Members asked if John Marcum's replacement will also be an associate provost (Director Marcum is currently also the Associate Provost for International Academic Activities). He responded that he believes the job should be split, and be assigned to two people. The Associate Provost for International Academic Activities needs to be located at UCOP, and should have a national outreach. There is also a need for much broader research support for higher education abroad. He added that the ad-hoc committee invited him to send express his view on the future of this position, and the Provost has read his statement. Chair Guerrini added that the ad-hoc committee's report will acknowledge Director Marcum's opinion, and it will recommend two positions. She also invited comments on this issue from members.

The [Council of Campus Directors](#) (CCD) representative noted that at the ground level, the campus offices are simultaneously feeling three contradictory forces—the deficit, the push for EAP enrollments, and a push towards addressing non-EAP issues. She hopes that these contradictions are being addressed by UCOP. Director Marcum acknowledged that Provost Hume is very much aware of this situation. Chair Guerrini added that the ad-hoc committee is also trying to address these contradictions. She said that it is important to look at the bigger picture and where EAP fits within that picture.

## **V. Program Development – Linda York**

### **A. New Programs Update**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Linda York updated the committee on new program options. The introductory program in Madrid opened last spring and was very successful. EAP is also recruiting for the joint UC-International Christian University (ICU) program in Tokyo, Japan. It is taught in English to UC and Japanese students, with instructors coming from both UC and ICU. UOEAP is also in the process of establishing a number of faculty advisory committees (FAC's). The first of these will be India, which will be chaired by the outgoing India study center director. UOEAP anticipates that India will continue to be an area of interest to students in the future. Another FAC under development is Shanghai, which is an area that has generated a large degree of faculty interest. A third FAC will look at the Middle East, as it is likely that the demand for Arabic language study will increase. This FAC will not only consider the

recommendations from the Egypt Formal Review Committee, but it will also take into account the necessary safety considerations. A Ghana FAC will also be established.

### **B. Imperial College (UK) Proposal**

**ISSUE:** Imperial College is a very highly ranked university. While EAP is interested in an eventual broad-based program at Imperial College, there are currently opportunities in engineering and earth sciences (one area for future growth is the natural sciences). It would be a small exchange at ten FTE per year, and it would primarily be year-long. The reason for the longer term is that most Imperial courses are year-long and not semester-based. UOEAP is hoping that the prestige of Imperial College will stimulate demand among engineering students. She reminded members that a delegation of Imperial College representatives toured the UC campuses last spring, and met with a number of UC faculty. This proposal was also factored into the UK Strategy Committee's recommendations, which did endorse this proposal.

**DISCUSSION:** One member inquired about the cost of the program. Consultant York said that it will be a 1:1 reciprocal exchange. While members were overall enthusiastic about the proposal, one member was concerned about some faculty comments that cautioned that students may not be very interested in such a program. Consultant York responded that the initial small size of the program works to EAP's advantage in this regard. She said these comments reflect the traditional difficulty in attracting engineering students to study abroad programs. Consultant Madewell added that the grounding for this proposal began with Bob Sawyer, who initially opened up discussions with Imperial College a couple of years ago. From the start, there was an acknowledgement of the importance of motivating UC faculty to encourage their students to study at Imperial College. The Imperial delegation was cognizant of this when they visited UC. Given the fact that the program at Imperial College would be one year in length (and it is often difficult for engineering students to get away from their departments), one member asked about academic integration (AI) issues and other engineering program options available in the UK. Consultant Cooper responded that EAP has just opened a new engineering option in Edinburgh. At the same time, the University of Manchester is merging with their Institute of Technology, and EAP is looking closer at that institution. Consultants also stressed that the long vetting process between Imperial College and UC faculty is very important to the eventual success of this program. Other indicators of its long-range potential include the prestige of Imperial College, along with the possibility of expansion in the future.

**ACTION: A motion was made to approve and seconded. Members unanimously approved the proposal with one abstention.**

### **C. Flinders University Discontinuance (Australia)**

**ISSUE:** Consultant York noted that Flinders University has traditionally been used as an overflow institution by EAP students. As UOEAP opened up other Australian program options offering the same academic fields that are available at Flinders, students have simply elected not to go there. Therefore, UOEAP consultants recommended phasing the program out.

**ACTION: A motion was made to approve and seconded. Members unanimously approved the discontinuance with one abstention.**

**VI. Rome Program Status – Bruce Madewell**

**A. Re-institution of Rome/Siena Study Center Director**

**ISSUE:** UOEAP has reinstated the Rome study center directorship. Consultant Madewell reminded members that cutting the Rome study center director position had been evaluated as one way to reduce costs last year. After significant opposition from faculty, this decision was put on hold until a faculty review could be completed. In the end, the decision was made to continue the Rome program along with the study center directorship position. He added that the Rome program is popular enough that EAP could expand it to include students from other universities. Whereas UC students would be paying regular fees, EAP would charge students from other universities ‘full freight’, which would include a small profit margin in order to support other EAP programs.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked if the number of participants in the Rome program increases, would the costs decrease? Consultant Madewell responded that UOEAP will have the class room space to grow, but housing continues to be an issue (and a significant cost) that would need to be addressed.

**B. Program Cost Reduction Update**

**ISSUE:** As part of this process, UOEAP looked at a number of budget scenarios, including running the program on its own. Both on-site program directors in Italy and ACCENT proposed budget plans. After evaluating both proposals, it turned out that ACCENT can offer the program at a lower cost (savings are approximately \$80 to 100,000 over EAP running the program on its own). Also included within the ACCENT proposal is a less costly site for classroom facilities.

**VII. Program Review Appointments – Linda York**

**A. 2006-07 Formal Program Review Committees**

1. Brazil

**ACTION:** David Pion-Berlin was selected for the Brazil formal program review committee.

2. Canada

**ACTION:** Ian Coulter was selected for the Canada formal program review committee.

3. Germany (meets February 2, 2007)

**ACTION:** Casey Moore was selected for the Germany formal program review committee.

4. Thailand

**ACTION:** Nancy Guy was selected for the Thailand formal program review committee.

**B. 3-Year Joint UC-Lund Summer Program UCIE Review Committee**

**ACTION:** Professor David Pion-Berlin and Val Rust were selected for the three-year Joint UC-Lund Summer Program UCIE review committee.

**C. UCIE Subcommittee to Evaluate the Egypt Formal Review**

**ACTION:** Errol Lobo and Jianwen Su were selected for the UCIE subcommittee to evaluate the Egypt formal review.

### **VIII. UK Immersion Strategy Committee Report – John Marcum**

**Issue/Report:** This consisted of a four-month review of the EAP's programming in the UK. Director Marcum explained that EAP had been over-extended in the UK, maintaining redundant programs at a number of study sites. He commented that the selection criteria were very comprehensive. Director Marcum endorsed the committee's recommendations.

**DISCUSSION:** UCIE UK Immersion Strategy Committee members noted that the process was very comprehensive, which is represented in the report. Consultant Cooper said that the committee tried to create a diverse portfolio of programs (i.e. Durham, St. Andrews, East Anglia), which they hope will provide a variety of experiences for students. Academics were another key priority for the committee, and they tried to balance the academic disciplines and the types of institutions. One member asked how much attention was given to administrative tasks and functions, such as selection of students and timely reporting of grades, etc. Consultant Cooper responded that those institutions with significant administrative problems sometimes are also those that are of the highest academic quality, and therefore desirable EAP partners. UOEAP consulted with these institutions prior to the conclusion of the committee's deliberations, and most promised to correct their administrative shortcomings. That said however, UOEAP will continue monitoring these programs to ensure that these promises are acted upon. He noted that UOEAP has decided to eliminate Birmingham from its portfolio of UK program options, given its falling enrollments.

**ACTION: A motion was made to approve the report and endorse its recommendations, which was seconded. Members unanimously approved the report.**

### **IX. Faculty Opportunities and Study Center Directorships – Bruce Madewell**

#### **B. Faculty Opportunities on EAP**

**Issue:** Consultant Madewell reminded members that the faculty exchange program, albeit relatively modest, allowed UC faculty to travel abroad to teach at some EAP partner universities. It also allowed faculty members from these partner universities to teach at UC campuses. While this exchange program was not uniform across the regions that EAP serves, it did allow for some sort of faculty exchange. However, when EAP faced its budget shortfall last year, UOEAP cut the faculty exchange program, choosing instead to support opportunities for students to study abroad. However, EAP continues to honor formal faculty exchanges included in the language of agreements with EAP partner institutions. Consultant Madewell has assembled an inventory of the opportunities for faculty participation in EAP, as well as suggestions on how to engage more faculty members. He noted that there are distinct advantages in having UC faculty actively participate and teach in EAP programs (i.e. the Joint Lund Transatlantic program, Fudan University, and Yonsei University in Korea). Visiting professorships are also possible at Meiji Guakin in Japan. UC faculty are also used in a variety of advisorial committees. Faculty members serve on formal review committees, FAC's, program development committees, and steering committees. Standing FAC's are those committees that provide advice and consultation for certain active and ongoing programs. As mentioned above, UOEAP is also looking forward towards developing strategic planning FAC's with Shanghai, Islamic Studies/Arabic Languages/Middle Eastern, and UK immersion foci. At the campus level, there are opportunities for faculty members to serve as faculty campus directors. In many departments, there are liaison faculty member with EAP, who also assist with AI. On some campuses, faculty members

sometimes give orientations or even freshman courses to students who are preparing to study abroad. Potential opportunities might also include faculty members who are traveling/staying abroad, who could be then be linked up with study centers. These faculty members might be interested in giving guest lectures at partner institutions; serving as liaison with their institutional collaborators/officials; contribute to alumni-building activities; and working with select students for special research projects. Consultant Cooper also noted that UC faculty produce approximately 28,000 publications per year. Collaborators on some of these publications are often located abroad, which provides an insight into possible research links. While EAP has not been traditionally proactive in seeking extramural support, this is another area that EAP is looking to explore in the future (i.e. the Lincoln Foundation).

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked if UOEAP would provide remuneration to faculty who might serve study centers in various capacities while residing or traveling abroad. UOEAP consultants responded that in the past, EAP has usually offered air fare and a modest per diem for a four-week program. However, depending upon the future budget model, EAP might consider some modest form of remuneration. They also noted that some study centers are also beginning to raise funds through alumni activities (i.e. London House), some of which could be set aside for visiting faculty. EAP is also looking towards the [Netherland-America Foundation](#) for additional support. There will also be a web page on the Utrecht initiative up shortly on the EAP website. Members also suggested canvassing the faculty directly to reach those who might be traveling or residing abroad. However, Consultant Madewell cautioned that there are some issues using Senate list-serv's, and UOEAP may not be able to do this very easily.

**B. Study Center Director Task Force II Update – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** About one year ago, UCIE approved the Study Center (S/C) Taskforce (TF) I report. While this report defined the models that might be used to direct EAP's study centers around the world, it did not address some of the more pragmatic issues. The second TF examines these issues more closely. The committee's co-chairs are UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell and David Pion-Berlin. Other TF members include UC faculty members Gordon Kipling (UCLA), Juan Campo (UCSB), Carey Lockey (UCD), as well as Deb Karoff and Barbara Gilkes from UOEAP. The committee has collected its data, and it has had one face-to-face meeting. They are currently writing a draft report, which will be ready in time for the February UCIE meeting. This TF is addressing such issues as: who should be S/C directors and what their qualifications are; the purview of S/C directors; how S/C directors are compensated; family issues; how S/C directors are recognized and evaluated, and how a S/C directorship might influence subsequent personnel actions. The TF is also looking at the typical barriers to becoming an S/C director for most faculty members.

**C. Selection Process for New Study Center Directors/Open Study Center Director Positions – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell announced that the deadline for S/C director applications is January 12, 2007. More information is available at: <http://www.eap.ucop.edu/faculty/directorrecruit.htm>. He noted that while some sites are relatively easy to attract faculty to, such as the UK, others are more challenging (i.e. Egypt, Mexico, Italy-Rome, China, and Scandinavia). This recruitment information has gone out to all UC faculty members via the Senate list-serv. He also outlined the recruitment timeline.



Interviews are conducted in February and March on the campuses. Every candidate gets a formal interview, which are typically 45 minutes in length. The interview team includes a UCIE representative, an advisor from the campus EAP office, the Campus Director, a recently-returned student, and the Associate Dean (Bruce), and the Campus Administrative Director. After the interviews, there is a short-list committee meeting. The short-list committee will reduce the number of candidates in half or better. These second-round candidates will be invited for a second interview in either the north or the south in late April and early May. After those interviews, everything is presented at the May UCIE meeting, which is confidential. After the May meeting, the recommendations will be forwarded to Provost Rory Hume. Director Marcum will also send his comments to the Provost. The Provost reviews both letters and goes forth with the recommendations to President Dynes, who sends the actual invitation letters out to the candidates. In light of the planned changes to the UK program offerings, UOEAP will rethink the assignments of the UK S/C directors. There will be at least one, and as many as two or three S/C directors in the UK.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked if the dates for the campus interviews have been set. Consultant Madewell said that some tentative dates have been set and they will be communicated to the members. He assured members that if they are unavailable on the date of the campus interview, a substitute will be chosen. UOEAP consultants urged members to spread the word about these opportunities as well. One member noted that a proposed evaluation-letter (from last year, which would go to the campus) stated that personal research is precluded. Consultants responded that a number of faculty members do indeed have the time and opportunity for research, and such a statement would not be included in any merit letter. The San Francisco member also asked why UCSF is excluded from the recruitment. He noted that UCSF is very active internationally, citing its global health network for graduate students. Consultant Cooper responded that UOEAP has been trying to find ways to expand services to the health sciences fields; they have been talking with Tom Novaty at UCSF, as well as being active within the systemwide Senior International Leadership Group. Consultant Madewell said that any UCSF candidates would be interviewed at the Berkeley campus.

#### **X. Academic Integration – Scott Cooper**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Cooper opened this discussion by stating that the ultimate goal of academic integration (AI) is that UC faculty members view EAP courses as their own. To that end, he noted that key people are already in place in the form of faculty directors, faculty liaison officers, EAP office staff etc. As part of its AI efforts, UOEAP provided faculty release funding as well as a matching fund program for EAP campus staff. Another important component is the appropriate contact with the faculty and departmental staff advisors to evaluate how well EAP is meeting the departments' needs. EAP assumes that this is a distributed network with one of the core parts being the major advising pages (MAPS), which are web pages (hosted on both the department and EAP websites) that inform students about when, where, and why students should study abroad; list recommended programs; the type(s) of course work available; and the major requirements. UOEAP has also worked to improve the ease and speed in which coursework is approved. UOEAP is creating a large archive of EAP courses that fulfill major and general education (GE) requirements. Advisors can use this information to assist students in making their study abroad decisions. Academic departments can also make this information available to

students. Finally, UOEAP is looking specifically at certain courses that can lead up to and away from study abroad.

UOEAP also ran a comprehensive survey on AI last spring. There are two parts to the report—part one summarizes the results of the survey, while part two presents possible initiatives for the future. In addition, UOEAP is looking at projects that could be done on a systemwide basis. They are also setting goals for the next five years. For the 2006-07 academic year, a set of priorities for this year has already been established, and an academic integration assessment workgroup has been created, which will look at the effectiveness of EAP's AI efforts. Consultant Cooper also noted that the automation efforts are also moving forward, which will move EAP away from paper processes towards electronic processes. Other minor projects include an updated on-line course evaluation tool, a 'myths' page about EAP; and a collection of discipline-specific quotes. Every year, UOEAP picks a certain discipline to evaluate in terms of AI (this year the discipline is psychology), and a discipline-specific flyer is usually generated from this effort. AI sessions are always held at EAP's annual conference as well.

Professor Rust also gave a short presentation on the AI efforts at UCLA. He said that UCLA hosts 32 MAPS on its website. UCLA EAP staff have created a database of approved courses from the last six years (15 to 20,000 courses) and they have tracked them in terms of the requirements that they fulfill. Using EAP's matching funds, UCLA assigns work-study students to assist departments in AI. Finally, UCLA has created an African Studies course, which leads up to a study abroad experience in Africa. This is a core course that is academic, but it also contains an AI and orientation component. Professor Rust teaches a course every quarter for students who come back from EAP who work as peer advisors.

Related to AI (but not integrally tied to it) are research projects/internships that students complete abroad, which UOEAP continues to develop via a special workgroup. There are four categories of such projects/activities. Some students sign up for independent study while abroad (about 200). Programs in which research projects are required (about 100 students) represent a second category. The Field Research Program in Mexico and the Ghana program are two examples. Finally, EAP has demonstrated that at some sites, unique opportunities exist for service-learning initiatives. In Siena, Italy, students serve as museum curators and work in local schools. While these projects are an integral part of a student's academic experience, UOEAP is not trying to figure these activities into AI per se. More often than not, a student's field experience becomes the base of a thesis that he or she complete when the student returns to his or her home campus.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked if AI funds were cut last year. Consultant Cooper responded that EAP eliminated one of two course-releases for faculty members who assist in AI efforts. The matching fund program for EAP staff has not been cut. Both of these programs will continue indefinitely.

## **XI. Executive Session**

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

*UCIE meeting minutes– November 9, 2006*

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m

Attest: Anita Guerrini, UCIE Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst