

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 10, 2005**

I. Chair's Announcements

Chair Burwick introduced new members of the committee and outlined the committee's business for the coming year.

**II. EAP Director's Report
ISSUE/REPORT**Enrollment

Director Marcum reported that current EAP enrollment stands at approximately 4,300 students. At this point, UOEAP does not have good data on the number of applications for the coming year, as it is still too early in the application cycle.

Finances

UOEAP is at a critical juncture in terms of its budget. Director Marcum stated this year's budget is being cut by a magnitude of about 15%. While there are a number of external and internal reasons for these cuts, he noted that until 2003 EAP had been growing by about 15-20% (in order to meet the goals of Tidal Wave 2000). At that time, enrollment growth was suddenly halted (currently held to only 50 FTE per year). Over the last several years, EAP has also witnessed a paradigm shift in its enrollment patterns, as more and more students have shifted from year-long to semester/quarter length programs. Subsequently, the short-term programs, which require more resources to administer, have grown at the expense of the year-long program. EAP is also funded on a full time equivalent (FTE) basis, and not by the number of participants, which, according to Director Marcum, is an outmoded budget formula. Other conditions that led to this budget crisis include (1) the high cost of EAP-construct programs, which often require provider-payments that are not typically required in agreements with host universities; (2) the fate of the dollar exchange rate, making it more expensive for UC students to study abroad; (3) a partially funded summer program in which some campuses were funded, while others were not; (4) movement away from the use of reciprocity in exchange agreements with host universities (which have been insisting on fee payments instead); and finally, (5) EAP is increasingly being required to formally legalize itself in many of its program locations, which has been another drain on its finances.

In response, UOEAP is currently analyzing its budget for the purposes of making the appropriate budget cuts. UOEAP is also asking UCOP to treat it as a campus for budgeting and funding purposes. UOEAP will also be initiating longer term negotiations with the aim of reformulating the budgeting equation applied to UOEAP. Director Marcum said that every effort will be made to protect programs, and the budget cuts will initially focus on administration. An announcement will be made on December 1st regarding the budget cuts.

Emerging Competition

Director Marcum noted that EAP is facing emerging competition from the various UC campus extension programs and summer schools. Some of these programs are not subject to the same type of Academic Senate oversight that EAP programs have. These programs' pricing policies and admission standards also differ significantly from those of EAP.

Miscellaneous Updates

- *Automation:* UOEAP will be rolling-out its pilot on-line reciprocity application on November 15th. UOEAP is also developing a web-based system for UC out-bound students. This system would provide students on-line access to data across the various sectors in EAP, including on-line course and grade approval processes and student accounts. The anticipated roll-out date is Spring 2007.
- *New Programs:* Associate Director Scott Cooper briefed the committee on the new program options that are being offered this year. He noted that the new offerings this year were already in the pipe-line before the budget crisis emerged, and nearly all of them are considered “cost-effective” programs.
- *Academic Integration:* Associate Director Cooper also reported on academic integration efforts. He cited the EAP Economic and Business Workshop as one example, which was held at UCI in October.
- *Summer Planning Conference:* EAP held its annual conference this past summer in Santa Barbara, where UOEAP and EAP campus staff collaborated on strategic planning.
- *California Study Abroad Council:* Director Marcum noted that EAP is part of this intersegmental council, which consists of community colleges, the California State University (CSU) system, UC, and private universities.
- *California House:* The California House in London is moving to Bedford Square, which is in the heart of London's academic sector.
- *Fudan University, Shanghai:* EAP will have a new office in Fudan University's new Knowledge and Innovation Community.
- *Casa de California:* EAP has submitted a proposal to UCOP that would enable EAP to open an office after eight weeks of seismic retrofitting and construction work. If the proposal is not approved, EAP will obtain space at the university or at another location.
- *University of Utrecht:* UC is pursuing an umbrella partnership with the University of Utrecht (which would include EAP). The University of Utrecht is moving towards English instruction in courses within the university proper.

III. Consent Calendar

A. UCIE Annual Report

ACTION: Members approved the annual report without amendments.

B. Appointment of UCIE Representatives to the Standing UC Faculty Advisory

Committees for the Siena Language & Culture and London Semester Programs

ACTION: Christine Kennedy (UCSF) was appointed for the Siena program; Casey Moore (UCSC) was appointed for the London program.

C. Appointment of a UCIE Representative to the Standing Subcommittee on Program Development

ACTION: Charles Leshar (UCD) was appointed to this committee, and John Graham (UCI) is extending for another year. UCIE members also voted unanimously to waive Chair Burwick’s responsibility to serve on this committee this year due to his obligation as Co-Chair on the EAP Review Committee.

IV. EAP Review

ISSUE: Chair Burwick discussed the upcoming EAP Review and handed out a list of talking points which outlines some of the issues of potential concern to the review committee (see distribution item 1). He will be co-chairing the review committee with Jenny Lang from the University of New South Wales (UNSW), who is Director of UNSW International. UCIE Vice Chair Anita Guerrini will also be on the review committee. UCOP has budgeted monies for the services of a number of consultants, who will assist the committee as needed. He noted that a charge is currently being developed, which will mandate that the review be conducted within the context of not only other ancillary UC international programs and initiatives, but also external competition that EAP is facing from independent providers. Chair Burwick mentioned that possible articulation between UC and the international activities of CSU and the California community college system is also important. Other issues of concern include reciprocity, foreign language instruction and course articulation, faculty appointments abroad, Study Center Directors, student preparation, graduate opportunities, and grants and other forms of financial support.

DISCUSSION: Members were interested in looking at the results of the last EAP review from 1992. The interplay between the campus-specific international education programs and EAP was also discussed. Members had questions about academic oversight and assessment of these programs. Consultants responded that they are developing (or looking at) a number of tools to assess similar EAP programs, which would evaluate both the language acquisition and internationalization/growth (personality development, cross-cultural sensitivity, etc.) of returning students. Regarding the review committee itself, members were interested in strengthening the external credibility of the committee. Chair Burwick reassured members that the presence of an external Co-Chair would help ensure this. Members suggested conducting an accounting of the numbers of students who participate in the various international programs: EAP, UC campus, UC Extension, and non-UC programs.

ACTION: (1) Distribute Response to the 1992 EAP Review to UCIE members; and (2) Post analysis of divisional international committee bylaws on UCIE website.

V. Study Center Task Force I Report

ISSUE/REPORT: UOEAP Consultant Scott Cooper discussed the report from the first Study Center Task Force, which is currently out for comment. He reminded members that this task force concerned itself primarily with the organization of study centers, their leadership structures, and the relevant job descriptions for key leadership positions. One of the guiding principles for this task force is the need for faculty oversight of all EAP programs. Such oversight can either be UC or local faculty oversight (if local faculty are used, then UOEAP Associate Director approves grades, etc.). He noted that the kind of oversight at each Study Center is highly variable and depends on the history, characteristics, and enrollments of its programs, and the task force made a number of suggestions regarding the best way(s) to

determine appropriate faculty oversight (either UC or local) for the different types of Study Centers. He listed a number of recommendations that came out of this report: (1) Assign appropriate tasks to the relative talents of Study Center Directors; (2) Staff Study Centers appropriately (creating administrative “MSO” type staff positions at many Study Centers); (3) Implement a decision tree methodology to determine leadership structures; and (4) Institute appropriate reporting lines (keeping staff and faculty roles separate).

DISCUSSION: Members were interested in the possible outcomes that might emerge from the work of this task force. UOEAP Consultant Scott Cooper said that at this point it is hard to predict exactly what will be implemented, but he did outline a number of possible outcomes: (1) Defining and rationalizing a process by which to better define Study Center governance structures—historically study centers have been organized in a very ad-hoc way; (2) Hiring additional faculty liaison officers instead of Study Center Directors to solve the problem of local knowledge and continuity (especially in countries where finding UC faculty members to serve has been historically difficult such as Hungary and Russia); (3) Balancing leadership decisions against costs (Study Center Directors are expensive); and (4) Instituting the preferred decision tree methodology to reorganize the number of study centers (i.e. in France). Members also discussed instituting some type of faculty exchange, whereby liaison officers could gain valuable UC experience and knowledge. Consultant Cooper responded that the report recommends applying the existing UC faculty oversight mechanisms, such as the standing faculty advisory committees, to work with the various liaison officers at Study Centers where these officers are used. He added that a number of liaison officers are UC graduates, so many of them are already knowledgeable regarding UC policies and practices. Senior UC graduate students are also occasionally used, especially at locations for which recruitment of UC faculty members is difficult (such as Russia).

ACTION: The Study Center Director job description will be discussed at the February meeting, after the EAP administrative review is completed.

VI. Study Center Task Force II

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell discussed the charge and the issues that this committee will be addressing. He noted that the first task force (see above) did not address many of the operational issues involved in the selection and management of the study center leaders. He mentioned the following elements of this task force’s charge: Study Center Director and liaison officer qualifications, recruitment, personnel issues (such as evaluation and compensation), and barriers to participation. It is anticipated that the task force will complete its charge by May 2006. This task force is a “joint UCIE-UOEAP committee” and its membership will consist of representatives from UCIE, UOEAP, as well as some external Senate members.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the manner in which the external members would be appointed to this committee. Academic Council Cliff Brunk expressed the preference to Consultant Madewell that he would like to defer appointing external Senate faculty members to this committee until after the formal EAP Review is completed. The sentiment was expressed that Senate faculty members appointed to this task force should have expertise in international education generally, and experience with EAP specifically. In order to facilitate this, UCIE Chair Burwick suggested that he nominate two Senate faculty members from various divisional

international education committees to Council Chair Brunk for service. Both Committee Analyst Todd Giedt and Senate Executive Director Mariá Bertero-Barceló noted that all external subcommittee members (to the parent committee or any other systemwide standing committee) must be approved by the Committee on Committees (COC). Because this committee is a “joint administrative UCIE-UOEAP” task force (and not a subcommittee of UCIE), there was some disagreement and discussion as to if external Senate faculty members had to be confirmed by the COC, or if they could simply be appointed by the Academic Council Chair. It was further clarified that as long as this task force is considered a joint Senate-administrative task force (and not a subcommittee of UCIE), then the Council Chair makes the appointments of all external Senate faculty members.

ACTION: (1) Chair Burwick appointed David Pion-Berlin (UCR) and to the task force; (2) All members voted to authorize Chair Burwick to nominate two additional members from local divisional international education committees to Council Chair Brunk for this task force; (3) UCIE members voted unanimously to approve the charge of this task force.

VII. Announcements from the Academic Senate Office

ISSUE: UCIE Chair Burwick introduced Senate Chair Cliff Brunk, Senate Vice-Chair John Oakley, and Executive Director Mariá Bertero-Barceló. Chair Brunk and Vice-Chair Oakley described the structure of the Academic Senate and stressed the importance of service to the Senate.

EAP Review

Council Chair Brunk briefed the committee on the EAP Review, which will be conducted this academic year. He noted that the review will be as broad as possible, surveying the various educational opportunities provided by UC. The review committee has the advantage of being small, and its members will have access to a number of consultants. This should allow the review committee to work efficiently and in a timely manner. To that end, a charge and a timeline are being developed with the goal of producing a report by the end of this academic year.

Administrative Matters/Issues

Executive Director Mariá Bertero-Barceló informed committee members about relevant administrative matters affecting the business of the committee. She encouraged members to read the recently approved “[Systemwide Guidelines for Senate Committees](#)” on the Academic Senate website under [Resources and Guidelines](#), which is a hand book for members on all systemwide Senate committees. She also made special mention of [UCIE’s Senate web page](#), where all approved committee meeting agendas and minutes will be posted for public access. Director Bertero-Barceló updated committee members on the Senate’s work in legislative affairs and analysis. She noted that the Senate regularly tracks legislation of interest to the Senate, and have created a [Legislative Activities website](#) dedicated to that purpose. As part of his responsibility as UCIE Chair, she also informed Chair Burwick that he may be called upon to comment on certain legislative issues with very short notice. The Senate also produces a bi-monthly newsletter, [The Senate Source](#), which she encouraged members to reference on a regular basis for Senate activities and current issues. She reminded members that they are required to use UCLA Travel (at 1- 800-235-UCLA) when flying to committee meetings. The main advantage of UCLA travel

is the fact that all reservations are completely refundable. Complete Senate travel regulations can be found at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregs.pdf>.

DISCUSSION: Members expressed their concerns about the current state of graduate education at UC. Chair Brunk acknowledged this concern and said that he is currently serving on a Senate-administrative task force that is addressing the issue of graduate student support. He mentioned that President Dynes has recently allocated all of the savings recouped from the Strategic Sourcing Initiative to go towards graduate student support. He stressed the importance of finding new monies (such as the potential funding derived from Strategic Sourcing), as reallocating existing monies is generally problematic and difficult to accomplish. He did note however, that a reduction in non-resident tuition fees to 25% after advancement to candidacy has recently been approved.

VIII. Task Force on Graduate and Professional Students

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell briefed the committee on the new Task Force on Graduate and Professional students, its charge, and its membership. The need for this task force stems from the fact that, whereas EAP typically sends about 4,200 undergraduate students abroad annually, only about 75-100 graduate students study abroad on EAP annually. Current graduate student opportunities include graduate student specific programs, graduate student participation in undergraduate programs, foreign language instruction, and some limited independent study. The task force should be representative of the various academic disciplines (humanities, social sciences, and the physical and biological sciences) and its membership should include UOEAP Consultant Madewell, a UOEAP Regional Director, a CCGA member, a UCEP member (ideally someone who is also a social scientist), a Graduate Dean, a UCIE member, and a graduate student representative.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the possibility of allowing foreign reciprocity students to become actual degree candidates on UC campuses. Director Marcum explained that the reciprocity program is technically a “no fee, no degree” program. The only way that a reciprocity student could become a degree candidate would be if he or she paid retroactively the fees that were not paid for the first year of graduate school. If these fees could be waived, it would allow such students to become degree candidates. Some members noted that this could be one way to help alleviate UC’s current problem in attracting high-quality foreign graduate students. Currently, reciprocity students are not counted as foreign graduate students at UC.

ACTION: (1) UCIE member Janice Humphreys (UCSF) and graduate student representative Kelly Holt were appointed to the task force; (2) Council Chair Brunk will nominate a UCEP representative; and (3) UCIE members voted unanimously to approve the charge.

IX. Approval of Formal Review Committee Questions

A. Concepción

ACTION: All members voted to approve the questions for the Concepción program.

B. Egypt

ACTION: All members voted to approve the questions for the Egypt program.

C. France

ACTION: All members voted to approve the questions for the France programs.

D. Pembroke and Sussex

ACTION: All members voted to approve the questions for the Pembroke and Sussex programs.

X. Letters of Evaluation

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell discussed the letters of evaluation, which have traditionally been issued at the request of a returning Study Center Director or his/her Department Chair. These letters are a professional courtesy, and are considered a reward/recognition for EAP service. Over the years, the letters have evolved from letters of recognition to formal evaluations of the Study Center Directors. Recently, a few Study Center Directors have expressed concern over the nature of these letters. Particularly, they are interested in who provides input into these letters, and whether they are considered letters of evaluation or recognition. The current EAP policy is to provide letters of evaluation when the Study Center Director or the Study Center Director's department Chair asks for a letter of evaluation. Consultant Madewell informed the committee that this issue has been folded into the charge of the Study Center Director Task Force II (see above).

DISCUSSION: Members asked if an automatic honorary letter still went out at the end of a Study Center Director's term. Consultant Madewell responded that these letters are done on an ad-hoc basis. Members expressed the sentiment that it would be a nice gesture to have these letters go out routinely simply to honor the service and sacrifice of a Study Center Director. EAP Director Marcum clarified that most of the time departments are simply interested in knowing about the activities that their faculty member was engaged in for the past two years, while he or she has been absent from his or her department. One of the issues is that these letters are a way of trying to gain recognition that a Study Center Directorship is a presidential appointment and not simply more "service". Under the tenure of Provost Jud King, letters would come from both the Provost and the EAP Director with input from EAP administration. The outgoing Study Center Director would also be invited to add any material to a dossier. A more controversial issue is whether any criticisms should be included in these letters. Members suggested that UOEAP remind returning Study Center Directors that UOEAP is not only willing to write such a letter, but also prompt them to inform their department head about such a letter for their personnel file.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously to fold this issue into the charge of the Study Center Task Force II.

XI. Vietnam Program Update

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Linda York updated the committee on the Vietnam program. She noted that the program is moving from Vietnam University to Hanoi University of Foreign Studies (HAUF), where more coursework is being offered in English. She explained that the new relationship would help alleviate the problem of trying to find English-language instructors in Vietnam. She also mentioned that the current Vietnam program is currently at capacity. UCIE should expect a new Vietnam program proposal in May.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the composition of the students enrolled in the program. Director replied that the majority of students are Vietnamese-American heritage students with a wide variation in the levels of language ability.

XII. Study Center Director Recruitment Update

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell briefed the committee on the progress of this year's Study Center Director recruitment process (see distribution item 2). He said that a recruitment call has already gone out to all campuses with an application deadline of January 17, 2006. He also reviewed the time line.

XIII. Faculty Exchange

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell reviewed the current state of the international faculty exchange (within and outside EAP). He noted that there are about 40 faculty exchanged annually through the International Faculty Exchange Program, which EAP actively manages. (see distribution item 3) In light of the budget crisis, he mentioned that, although traditional exchanges are secure, newer ones could be in danger. He reviewed a couple of exchange models. In some reciprocity contracts, one faculty member is hosted at UC per "x" number of UC students sent to a particular host institution. In other faculty exchanges, each exchange actually costs each of the institutions a little bit of money. There are also ad-hoc exchanges that are sometimes made on an individual basis in which EAP is not necessarily involved.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that faculty exchanges are excellent preparation for faculty members who want to become Study Center Directors. Members also discussed the possibility of moving some of the ad-hoc exchanges under the EAP umbrella. UOEAP Consultant Scott Cooper responded that ad-hoc faculty exchanges should be included under the EAP review's charge.

XIV. San Diego Grades Pilot Project

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Bruce Madewell presented the San Diego Grades Pilot Project, which submits grades electronically. Currently, EAP uses a paper grading process. Paper grades are submitted from the Study Centers to UOEAP, which then submits paper grades to the various campuses. This project speeds up part of this process, but does not alleviate the often significant delays in obtaining the grades from the faculty at EAP's host institutions. Security and privacy issues played a major role in this project. He mentioned that while this type of thing may not be feasible for all EAP programs, it should be presented as a model to emulate.

XV. UOEAP Operations Policy Manual Update

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Scott Cooper told the committee that the UOEAP Operations Policy Manual has been updated which incorporates a number of measures that UCIE approved last year (waiving minimum GPA requirements). The language of the Manual has also been revised to be much more succinct.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

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