

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 5, 2009**

**Present:** Errol Lobo (chair), John Haviland, Rick Kern (UCB-alternate), Phillip Rogaway (UCD), Richard Robertson (UCI), Olga Kagan (UCLA), Yang Ye (UCR), Kalju Kahn (UCSB), Debra Lewis (UCSC), Ronald Arruejo (UCLA UG student representative), Helen Saad (graduate student representative), Chip Leshner (CCD Chair), Zak Frieders (CAD Chair), Todd Giedt (analyst), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director/staff), Henry Powell (Council Chair), and Michael Cowan (UOEAP consultant)

**I. Chair's Announcements – Chair Lobo**

*Chair Lobo did not have any announcements.*

**II. Consent Calendar**

**A. Approval of the Agenda**

**B. Approval of the Draft UCIE Minutes from the October 8, 2009 Minutes**

**C. Approval of a New Japan Program Option: Elementary Japanese Language Program, IIL, Tokyo**

**ACTION:** The agenda and the draft minutes were approved; the approval of the new Japan program was moved to new business

**III. Formal Reviews of the Australia and New Zealand Programs**

**ACTION:** Members approved a motion to postpone all formal program reviews for one year.

**IV. EAP Director's Report – UOEAP Director Michael Cowan**

**REPORT:** Director Cowan provided members with a budget update. On July 1, UOEAP started the fiscal year with \$4.1M in General and Opportunity funds, which represents approximately 20% of UOEAP's roughly \$20M in expenditures. In August, UCOP informed UOEAP that they would receive a \$400,000 cut; next year an additional \$700,000 will be removed from the budget; in 2012, UOEAP's budget will be cut by another \$800,000; and in 2013, there will be an additional \$900,000 cut. This means that UOEAP will eventually have a subvention of only slightly above \$1M. Director Cowan informed members that UOEAP is planning to reduce its ongoing expenditures by \$1.1M for next year. This is in addition to the planned two-year \$1M reduction in expenditures, which will be split between its overseas operations and the systemwide office. There has already been a 30% staffing cut at UOEAP alone; similar cuts have taken place at EAP's overseas operations. By December 2009, UOEAP will only have 70 FTEs, and they have committed themselves to another cut of 5 FTEs the following year. The crucial question is how much of these cuts can be made up through student fees. Per the new budget model, which will be in effect in three years, state revenue will only account for about 5% of UOEAP's budget; all other revenue will need to come from student fees. Director Cowan also noted that EAP's FTE year-to-year enrollment decline will be slightly less than 10% (the number of participants is roughly the same however). This equates to about 2,500 FTEs, but 4,500 participants.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the budget actions of the last couple of years, and UCIE’s participation in those decisions. Members also asked about a possible relocation of UOEAP to a campus. Director Cowan responded that the Governing Committee is considering an administrative relocation; a physical relocation would be a different matter. An administrative relocation would garner some savings for UOEAP, but some of these costs will simply be shifted to a campus. At the next Council of Vice Chancellors meeting, a possible Request for Proposals (RFP) will be discussed.

#### **V. UOEAP’s Marketing, Outreach, and Retention Strategies**

**Report:** Director Cowan laid out his proposed marketing and recruitment plan. As background, he noted that the current recruitment structure yields only 80% of the number of FTEs of EAP participants that EAP will need in order to be financially stable under the new funding model. Traditionally, EAP recruiters have included students, alumni, faculty and departments, campus EAP offices, UOEAP, and EAP overseas offices. In brief, Director Cowan proposed that UOEAP can directly target four cadres of UC students: 1) Students who have decided they definitely want to participate in EAP; 2) students who are definitely motivated to participate in study abroad; 3) students who are considering participating in study abroad; and 4) students who have not seriously considered study abroad and know little or nothing about EAP. Director Towards that end, Director Cowan made the following recommendations: 1) Enhance the EAP website, thereby making it possible for students to begin and complete their EAP application on one website/place; 2) provide “helpdesk” assistance to applicants; 3) admit students directly to some of EAP’s programs, thereby shortening the wait time from submission of application to admission; 4) offer incentives to UC campuses to increase EAP participation; and 5) involve EAP overseas offices in recruitment.

**DISCUSSION:** Members recommended involving more faculty and departments in recruitment than has been the case in the past. Director Cowan responded that the Regional Directors are looking into creating “faculty groups”, which would involve a number of relevant departments and faculty. For example, UOEAP recently invited a number of environmental studies departments to send notices of a major environmental conference in Scandinavia. Increased faculty involvement also represents a very limited investment of UOEAP staff time. Throughout his presentation, Director Cowan emphasized that he wants to avoid stepping on departmental toes (or the toes of campus offices), but he is strongly motivate to increase EAP’s recruitment of UC students.

**ACTION:** Members endorsed Director Cowan’s direct marketing, outreach, and retention strategies, as described in the enclosure and the PowerPoint presentation.

#### **VI. Education Abroad Program (EAP) Overseas Reductions, 2008/09 - 2010/11 and Study Center Consolidations, 2008/09 – 2012/13**

**Report:** Director Cowan outlined the planned consolidations and closures in both programs and study centers from 2009-10 to 2012-13. Director Cowan classified Hungary, Siena, and Russia as “at risk” programs, which may need to be closed unless corrective actions are taken or alternatives are found:

- *Australia*: UOEAP will eliminate its remaining study center director (SCD) in Australia, and is being replaced with a faculty consultant. The study center in Melbourne is also being relocated to less expensive quarters.
- *Costa Rica*: UOEAP will close the University of Costa Rica program primarily due to low enrollments, but it will keep the popular Monteverde program, which is well-subscribed and well-run.
- *France*: France is moving from two SCDs to one SCD with a resulting loss of one FTE.
- *Germany*: EAP is consolidating its operations in Berlin and Potsdam; a local (faculty) director (liaison officer) will replace the remaining SCD in Berlin (however, local staff will remain). The undergraduate program in Göttingen was suspended in 2008-09.
- *Hungary*: This is a program where UOEAP is losing a significant amount of money in part due to falling enrollments. UOEAP is exploring a partnership with Rutgers University with the aim of sending additional 8-10 students per year, which would help.
- *India*: UOEAP will eliminate its SCD in India, and is replacing this position with a faculty consultant.
- *Italy*: The Siena program ran a deficit of \$200,000 last year and this deficit is close to \$400,000 in 2009-10; the UOEAP Regional Director thinks that this could be reduced to a \$100,000 deficit with some adjustments, but that is still fairly high. Director Cowan noted that if Siena will indeed be closed this action will need to happen very soon (late November/early December) in order to inform the campuses.
- *Mexico*: UOEAP recommends that Morelia be suspended due to low enrollments. Mexico City is another program that UCIE will need to consider in the future due to its relationship with UC-owned Casa de California.
- *The Netherlands*: UOEAP is planning to eliminate its program in Leiden in 2010-11; Utrecht and Maastricht can handle all of the students currently going to Leiden. There will also be a reduction in staff by .5 to one staff member. UOEAP will use a faculty consultant, a former SCD in The Netherlands, for these programs; he will be available for virtual consultation and possible on-site visits if necessary.
- *Russia*: This program needs additional enrollments; opening up a summer program at St. Petersburg might be one possibility. The other problem is that the host university does not provide enough services. Another issue is whether this is a location that absolutely needs a faculty SCD.
- *South Africa*: UOEAP recommends that this program be closed (academic quality and safety issues).
- *United Kingdom*: UOEAP is planning to reduce its study centers from two to one, and eliminate all SCDs, replacing them with UC-based faculty consultants. He noted that EAP's partners in the UK are very much like UC campuses with robust student support structures in place.

**DISCUSSION:** One member performed an analysis of the Siena, Hungary, Russia, and South Africa programs. He noted that while *Siena* had the best “academic quality” rankings among this group, its high staff costs and related deficit is unreasonable. He advocated applying additional pressure on the Resident Director at Siena. Besides the high costs, Siena’s language instructors are good; the program was formally reviewed in 2005. Chair Lobo remarked that if UOEAP could invest \$10,000 to send a new review committee to Siena with an emphasis on costs, which might produce results. One member spoke for the quality of the Siena program, but

noted that the cost is the major issue. This is a semester long immersion program for less-experienced Italian language and studies students in homestays; it is a language and culture program. Siena does have an unusually large office. While members discussed the possibility of charging a differential fee of about \$4,000, they agreed that a message needs to be sent that something is seriously wrong. They also discussed the option of starting a summer self-construct program. Members moved to close the program if these losses cannot be reversed. They also voted to do a formal review of Siena that is targeted on the finances (February/March). Margaret Brose and Rick Kern were suggested as possible members of such a review committee; the review committee should also be charged with negotiate with the resident director.

One member remarked that the *Hungary* program ranks below Siena in terms of academic quality. UCIE's main concern about the Hungary program is its lack of academic focus. It is not a language program, and it is unclear what focus it has. Its costs are moderately high as well. That said, a number of members spoke out in favor of Hungary, noting that 1) it is EAP's only presence in Eastern Europe; and 2) a recent formal review praised its academic excellence. It is also a great place to go to study high-level math.

Director Cowan noted that *Russia* is very close to breaking even (it only needs approximately four additional FTEs to do so). One issue is that the program currently requires a SCD for half of the year. UC Russian faculty have advised UOEAP that a summer program might be helpful and/or a move to St. Petersburg might be beneficial. Another alternative may be moving it to a smaller city, outside of either Moscow or St. Petersburg. One member, who is familiar with the Russia program, noted that although Russia has experienced an historical downward enrollment trend, they are currently increasing. Overall, members felt that retaining the Russia program is of strategic importance to UC, and all options should be explored before closing it. Towards that end, the committee agreed that an academic justification, along with viable financial and programmatic alternatives, should be drafted.

Members also briefly discussed the programs slated for closure in *Costa Rica* (University of Costa Rica), *Mexico* (Morelia), and *South Africa* (University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg and Durban), agreeing that these programs should be closed.

**ACTIONS:** 1) *Russia*: Members reached consensus that the Russia program is worth saving; analyst Todd Giedt, Olga Kagan, and Phillip Rogaway will draft a justification/alternatives. 2) *Hungary*: Members agreed that Hungary may be worth saving, given that it is the only EAP program in E. Europe. 3) *Siena*: Members agreed that Siena is a valuable academic program, but its current \$400,000 deficit (or \$4,000 per student loss) is both unacceptable and unsustainable. Towards that end, UCIE recommends an expedited formal review of the Siena program, which would be targeted on the finances of the program, and be conducted to determine the viability of the program. If the losses cannot be stemmed, then the program should be suspended/closed. The review committee would complete its work by February/March and should also be charged to negotiate directly with the resident director. 5) *Closures*: UCIE agreed to suspend/close the following EAP programs/offices: Morelia, Mexico; UKZN PMB & Durban, South Africa; and the University of Costa Rica program/office.

## **VII. UCIE-UCPB Task Force – Chair Lobo**

**ISSUE:** Chair Lobo raised the possibility of forming a task force composed of UCPB, UCEP, and UCIE members. The basic purpose of this task force would be to 1) prepare for the meetings of the EAP Governing Committee (e.g., coalition building); and 2) address specific multi-committee issues as they arise.

**ACTION: Debra Lewis and Errol Lobo agreed to be on this task force; analyst Todd Giedt will revise a charge for the proposed task force.**

## **VIII. Report from the First Meeting of the EAP Governance Committee – Chair Lobo and Kalju Kahn**

**ISSUE:** Chair Lobo noted the following actions from the Governance Committee meeting:

1. EAP will charge a fee to students participating on its programs (the so-called “EAP Fee”).
2. Students participating on an EAP program (thereby paying the EAP fee) will not pay Education and Registration Fees to their home campuses for the duration of their EAP program.<sup>1</sup>
3. The EAP Fee will be collected by UOEAP and booked as a combination of discrete components: an Education Fee, a Registration Fee, a supplemental Program Options Fee (charged only for specific EAP programs)<sup>2</sup>, and miscellaneous additional fees (a program administrative fee<sup>3</sup> and a nominal contribution to the EAP contingency fund<sup>4</sup>).
4. The Board of Regents will be informed about EAP fee levels as part of the normal reporting on budget and fee items.
5. The Education and Registration Fee components of the EAP Fee income may be taxed by the Office of the President at a rate of between 2% and 6% comparable to the rate that applies to Education and Registration Fee revenues generally.
6. The program components of the EAP Fee (i.e., the Education Fee, Registration Fee, and POF, but not the Program Administrative Fee or contingency reserve contribution) will be treated as a systemwide fee for financial aid purposes.
  - a. There will be return-to-aid from total EAP Fee revenue to the systemwide University Student Aid Program (USAP).
  - b. The three components of the EAP Fee will have return-to-aid built in. For the Education and Registration Fee components, return-to-aid will be set at 28% in 2010/11. The return-to-aid from any future increases in these components will equal

---

<sup>1</sup> The Education and Registration Fee components will be equal to those that apply to all UC students as set by the Board of Regents.

<sup>2</sup> The supplemental Program Options Fee (POF) will be set annually by the Provost with advice of the Governing Committee. Program Option fees are currently associated with 25 of EAP's more than 275 program options. POFs vary widely in origin and cost, from a current low of \$300 to a high of \$4,000, with an average of \$1,300.

<sup>3</sup> The Program Administrative Fee was introduced in 2008 to offset the indirect expenses of application processing with host institutions, database development and other study abroad preparation, and registrar services. The fee level will be set annually by the Provost with advice of the Governing Committee.

<sup>4</sup> A nominal contribution to EAP's contingency and emergency reserve fund will also be assessed for all participants as part of measures being taken by EAP to ensure its long-term financial stability. The contribution level will be set annually by the Provost with advice of the Governing Committee.

- the return-to-aid percentage from increases in the Education and Registration Fee (i.e. 33%). For the Program Option Fee component of the EAP Fee, the return-to-aid will be set at 33%.
- c. Consistent with systemwide fee charges, the program components of the EAP fee will be included in the determination of adequate systemwide funding levels for UC systemwide grants and in-campus financial aid allocation.
  - d. Campuses will treat the program components of the EAP Fee like any other educational expense in determining EAP student financial aid packages. Consistent with this treatment, EAP participants with grant eligibility will receive additional grant support to cover the higher EAP Fee.

In addition to the EAP Fee, the Governing committee also agreed to the following:

- Solicit input from UCIE and others about program actions proposed for 2010, and to meet again at the end of November to finalize a recommendation to the provost.
- Encourage the EAP Director to communicate with campus staff about the EAP programs that may be closed or suspended in 2010/11 so they could advise interested students accordingly.
- Gather input from UCIE on the EAP Executive Director Job Description and to consider the job description and process for appointment it at its November 23 meeting.

Chair Lobo added that it was mentioned that there should be a sliding scale, and increase the fees for people that could afford it, but this was rejected. Students on EAP would be eligible for financial aid.

#### **IX. Academic Senate Review of the Report from the Joint Senate-Administrative EAP Task Force**

**ISSUE:** The formation of the Governance Committee came out of the task force. One of the things that was discussed by the task force was the role of UC faculty members in EAP.

**DISCUSSION:** One member complained about the lack of Senate representation; Chair Lobo noted that there was in fact significant Senate participation from UCIE and UCPB. The task force took up the budget issue in a major way, and seems to have adopted Kissler's plan of using student fees to support EAP. One member suggested not commenting on the process that led to the formation of this task force, but instead to focus on its final report.

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a review letter on this report.**

#### **X. Proposed Job Description for the UOEAP Director**

**ISSUE:** Chair Lobo noted that UCPB is recommending that the UOEAP Director be an academic; he sees this request as reasonable and something that UCIE should also espouse.

**DISCUSSION:** Members emphasized that this should be an academic position. In addition, the incumbent should be someone who has experience running an institute, etc. Members also questioned whether the Vice Provost is the most appropriate supervisor for this position, and considered if the position should report directly to the Provost.

**ACTION: A UCIE subcommittee was charged with rewriting the job description.**

## **XI. EAP Courses Taken for Major Credit Abroad**

**ISSUE:** UCIE invited three UOEAP Academic Specialists to participate in the meeting by phone conference to provide an overview of this process and UOEAP's role in it. First, they noted that they do not prefer the term "articulation"; UOEAP does not articulate courses, but provides important information to academic departments (e.g., cataloguing the courses that students take for all partner institutions for all nine campuses), which grant major credit to students who study on EAP. In brief, there are four UOEAP academic specialists who catalogue the courses that students take for all partner institutions for all nine campuses (UOEAP does not catalogue syllabi however). If the departments had to undertake this task themselves, this would represent a significant workload increase, as well as redundancies between the campuses. Further obstacles include actually finding the course information, as well as convincing the departments to do this type of information gathering. They cautioned that this type of information is not easily found—it is sometimes password-protected at the university level or it is not even found on-line at all. Even if someone is very web-savvy, knowing the structure of the university is also very important. If students were to gather this information themselves, little uniformity in the type and amount of information would result. There is also the possibility of different campuses offering a different number of units for the same course taught in the same semester to students at different campuses; UOEAP's central cataloguing avoids this. The specialists also noted that this process has been significantly streamlined over the past couple of years, which includes a reduction in the number of personnel assigned to these associated tasks. Finally the academic specialists spoke to the issue of creating a systemwide shared database; they said that the Course Approval Requests (CARs) already constitute such a database. While an extra field could be added in theory to denote if a particular course had already been approved by another department at another campus; this may not add much value, as many times one course is only taken every ten years or so (for immersion students).

## **XII. New Business**

### **A. Approval of a New Japan Program Option: Elementary Japanese Language Program, IIL, Tokyo**

**ISSUE:** UOEAP is proposing to open a nine-week summer intensive Japanese language program option through the International Cultural Institute of Japan (ICIJ) beginning in summer 2010. It is designed as an elementary program for students with no prior Japanese language training or experience; it would provide introductory language-intensive instruction equivalent to first year Japanese within the UC system. This item was initially reviewed at the October meeting.

**DISCUSSION:** Several members objected to the approval of this program on the following grounds: 1) Some campus Japanese/Asian Studies programs and local Committees on International Education (CIEs) were not consulted in the design of this program (and not all Japanese experts in campus departments knew of this program or the ICIJ; 2) concerns over the about the specific venue at ICIJ; and 3) last-year's UCIE subcommittee on budget made a recommendation that "*all new program developments be halted.*" Regarding ICIJ, members acknowledged that ICIJ does not seem to be situated in a Japanese university; not a lot is known about it as a language-learning institute; and placing students in a setting without access to other

Japanese students is problematic. There was also strong opinion that students do not benefit very much from first-year elementary language programs when they do not have any background in the language. In other words, it seems that this program is something that could be duplicated on a UC campus in California. One member also questioned whether enrollments in Japanese study abroad programs are actually rising and if Japanese language courses on the campuses have been cut, as there is some conflicting evidence from some campuses against these two points. Some members objected to the fact that this program had already been advertised before it had received final approval from UCIE ([http://www.eap.ucop.edu/our\\_programs/countries/japan/elementary\\_japanese\\_III.shtm](http://www.eap.ucop.edu/our_programs/countries/japan/elementary_japanese_III.shtm)). The financial projections are also dubious given current economic conditions (\$10,596 loss in the first year and a projected \$1,416 profit in the second year).

However, one member lent his support to the proposal; he speculated that most of the students studying on this program would actually have some Japanese language background.

**ACTION: Members voted against approval of this program (4 against, 2 in favor, and 3 abstentions); analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter to go to Director Cowan.**

### **XIII. 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