

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION  
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 10, 2007**

Present: Anita Guerrini, Errol Lobo, Casey Moore, Richard Matthew, Linda York, Jianwen Su, Bruce Madewell, Nancy Guy, Bruce Madewell, Ian Coulter, John Marcum, Scott Cooper, Beverly Bossler, and Todd Giedt

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Guerrini announced that UCIE will review the proposed position of Vice President for International Affairs. She also said that although the EAP Ad hoc Review Report has not been approved by the Academic Council, it has been sent to key individuals and parties.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**A. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION:** Members approved the agenda.

**B. Draft Minutes from the February 8, 2007 Meeting**

**ACTION:** Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

**III. EAP Director's Report – John Marcum**

**REPORT:** Director Marcum reported on EAP enrollments for fall/year 2007-08 (enrollment data is not yet available for spring 2008). Overall, 4,333 students are enrolled in both kinds of programs, which represents a 13% increase from 2006-07 (3,835). He noted that new programs accounted for the bulk of the enrollment growth, with 39% of the students enrolling in new programs introduced since 2001-02. There are 765 students enrolled in year-long programs, which is only 18% of the total enrollment. This is the first time that this percentage has fallen below 20% and year-long students have declined by over 400 from four years ago. By contrast, the program enrollment numbers are at their highest point ever for the fall semester and summer programs, standing at 2,385 and 1,443 respectively. These statistics are preliminary, and relative changes in retention rates may alter them. Some students also often enroll in two programs with the intention of dropping one. However, if the retention rate remains the same, then the fall/summer numbers should increase by about 400 students. That said, UOEAP does not expect that the actual gain will actually be 400 new participants (due to attrition). He noted that since UC is primarily a quarter institution, it is harder for EAP to send large numbers of students to spring programs. Regarding program development, he reminded members that EAP does have 'permission' from UC Office of the President (UCOP) Provost Rory Hume to move ahead with two new programs—first-year Chinese at Beijing Normal University (BNU), as well as a summer first-year French program in Paris.

Director Marcum also commented on student behavior issues, noting a bus accident in Ghana, a drug overdose in India, and a case of binge drinking in Italy. Subsequently, he made a site-visit to Ghana, in part to address these kinds of student behavior issues. While living conditions in Ghana are substandard, much of the problems come from students being overwhelmed by their environment and not following the guidelines and restrictions laid out by EAP. Although there

was serious consideration of suspending the program, after considerable discussion UOEAP will be sending a renowned Africanist from the San Diego campus, Professor Bob Cancel, to Ghana who will be in residence in the fall semester as a visiting UC faculty member. He will work with EAP's liaison officer there to improve the program.

UOEAP is anticipating mapping the various functions of the UOEAP office, as well as looking at the budget formula. He reminded members that UOEAP is the only large system-wide instructional program. Traditionally, discretionary funds have been distributed to the campuses, so that is no longer available for EAP's system-wide operations. He commented that this is a political problem as much as a budgetary problem. That said, he is confident that solutions will be found for these problems, as international education is being viewed with increasing salience at UCOP.

The catalytic function of EAP, along with the [Office of International Activities](#) (OIAA), is important as study abroad should not be seen as a segment that is unrelated to other things, as it opens up other kinds of opportunities. Director Marcum and Consultant Cooper were recently in Utrecht for the purpose of pursuing an institution-to-institution relationship between UC and the University of Utrecht. Opportunities at Utrecht include the Humanities Research institute (HRI), which distributes small 'seed' grants for faculty from both institutions to work together. There are also short-term resident chairships at Utrecht for which UC faculty will be given priority. In developing the relationship with Utrecht, EAP has become aware of the [European Research Council](#), into which the European Union (EU) is putting in one billion Euros per year for peer-reviewed research grants. Because of UC's relationship with Utrecht, UC faculty could apply jointly with Utrecht faculty for these grants. Another kind of model is represented by EAP facilities, such as California House in London and Casa de California. California House in London is facilitating the creation of a trust to benefit UC programs and institutions. Other activities include visits by Chancellors, alumni outreach, etc. EAP is also moving ahead with renovation of building C at Casa de California. By fall 2007, EAP will be quartered there. At the University of Fudan in China, EAP/OIAA will be opening its offices within the Center for Knowledge and Innovation Community in Shanghai in June.

**DISCUSSION:** Members thanked Director Marcum, who is retiring at the end of June, for his years of service to EAP. They also asked about the relationship between EAP's student enrollment numbers and its funding formula. He stated that at this point, EAP only receives funding for full time equivalents (FTEs) and it does not receive any student fees. Therefore, increasing participation in semester programs does not really increase funding via the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI). The MCOI rate has also gone down over the last few years. The growth of new providers of education abroad programs, which provide programs with varying degrees of academic quality (both internal and external to UC), has also contributed to a more competitive environment. While EAP provides academic programs that are under the Senate microscope for quality, this is not true for most campus-based programs and certainly for many external programs. On the other hand, EAP is run on a non-profit basis with the maintenance of UC academic standards being of utmost importance. One member asked Director Marcum if and how EAP should actually respond to this competition, remarking that UC should simply run the best quality program that it can. Director Marcum responded that when considering external programs, there are really two factors to keep in mind. First, EAP is an honors program; some

students will go on honors programs and less-qualified students will go on other programs. The other issue is what students are actually getting credit for when they enroll in these other programs. While these courses sometimes qualify for transfer credit, it begs the question of what UC is giving transfer credit for (and who monitors this process). That said, there is a national attempt to apply some standards, but he suggested that there should be some sort of clearing house of information on programs that are worthy of academic credit. Consultant Cooper added that some UC campuses have umbrella offices that not only advise on EAP programs but also on external non-UC programs. Therefore, UC resources are being used to promote non-UC programs. Members wondered who should vet non-UC programs for academic quality. He added that there has been a national movement towards the accreditation of some of these third-provider exchange programs. He suggested that UCIE could insist that programs be accredited before transfer credit is granted. Transfer programs, which are often not under faculty authority, are another issue. There is wide-spread confusion between EAP programs and these other programs. There are also a number of UC, but non-EAP, programs. UOEAP recently did an analysis of these programs and discovered that their enrollments are overwhelmingly seniors who participate in the summer. This means that in most cases, these programs are not stepping stones to higher quality and more academically-orientated EAP programs.

Director Marcum said that UC also lacks a research center that is looking at higher education around the world. Consultant Madewell added that the proposal to establish a Vice President for International Affairs underscores the point of making ‘internationalization an imperative’ for UC. Members also briefly discussed drafting a resolution advocating for a research center dedicated to examining higher education in an international context, but in the end decided to wait on such a resolution.

Members also asked about the report from the Ad Hoc Review Committee. Chair Guerrini commented that this is an interim report, which acknowledges a general lack of data on the international activities of most students. Consultant Cooper added that there are some national movements for ‘accreditation’. Consultants also observed that in non-EAP programs where UC faculty are playing leading roles, there are generally very few problems. However, EAP has found that in some extension programs, faculty oversight is lacking. There is also a perception that there is an overlap between EAP and campus programs. There really is not.

#### **IV. Program Development Update – Linda York**

##### **A. Introductory Chinese at Beijing Normal University (BNU)**

**ISSUE:** Consultant York noted that EAP is opening up the existing BNU program to students taking introductory Chinese. The introductory Chinese language option is scheduled to be available in summer 2008.

##### **B. Paris Summer Language and Culture (Paris Center)**

**ISSUE:** Although this program was approved a couple of years ago, it had been on hold due to the budget crisis. It will be offered by the Paris Center and it will offer beginning French. The program will be launched with an initial capacity of 50 students. The main constraint to growth is the availability of housing. The curriculum was developed two years ago by UC French faculty.

**C. Paris Center Fall Program (Sorbonne)**

**ISSUE:** Consultant York noted that graduate student instructors (GSIs) are used in the Paris Center Fall Program. She mentioned that increasingly these GSIs have had difficulties in obtaining visas because they must be affiliated with a local university to do so. The Sorbonne has agreed to invite up to five GSIs as visiting researchers. In return, the UCLA Department of French will open a one year lectureship to a graduate student from the Sorbonne. Currently, this arrangement is documented in a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for next year. However, EAP is trying to negotiate a longer-term agreement.

**D. Granada, Spain**

**ISSUE:** UOEAP will introduce a semester-length immersion fall program in Granada, Spain. However, the calendar dictates that students will need to take fall and winter quarters to complete the program. This program is slated to begin by summer 2008.

**V. Faculty Advisory Committees – Linda York**

**A. Shanghai Faculty Advisory Committee**

**ISSUE:** UOEAP is establishing a faculty advisory committee (FAC) to provide recommendations on academic programming in Shanghai, China. Currently, there is already the business and economics program at Fudan in the spring and the Joint Program in International Studies (JPIS). Both of these programs are extremely popular. A large group of faculty has agreed to participate in this FAC with Professor Wen-hsin Yeh from Berkeley serving as the Chair. The Shanghai FAC will have its first meeting before the end of the academic year.

**B. India Faculty Advisory Committee**

**ISSUE:** This FAC had its first teleconference about one month ago. It acknowledged that EAP needs to look for additional capacity in India, but it is recommending that EAP move slowly. The first recommendation is to look at Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), which is located in New Delhi. Another possibility is to institute a field research program, which would also be anchored in New Delhi.

**VI. Revised Student Evaluation Instrument and the Student Perceptions Survey – Scott Cooper**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Cooper noted that one of the chief recommendations regarding the EAP student evaluations is to make them more quantitative. Multiple stake-holders have been involved to create this new student evaluation/student perceptions survey. The Rome Center has just begun using this tool. The main advantage to this tool is instant feedback. The next step will be to survey the study centers; UOEAP will customize the tool for their use; a course evaluation survey will come next. Although some host institutions and study centers administer their own course evaluations, UOEAP is developing a standard form, which will be useful not only for advisors but also for formal reviews. The research unit has also been looking at transfer students; program extensions; and short-term and year-long enrollment patterns. Student perception of EAP and the ways that it promotes itself is another issue that has been under study (see distribution 1). Finally, EAP has been gathering data on the amount of major work completed abroad. According to a recent survey, about 60% of students intended to do major work, and 97% of these students actually did major work. Of those who did not plan on doing major work abroad, 40% did.

**DISCUSSION:** Members emphasized that the real issue has always been the abysmal response rate of student evaluations. Frankly, it is hard to force students to complete these surveys. Some members suggested that EAP may want to insist upon completion of the survey before releasing grades. Consultant Cooper noted that in some places there were good responses, but these were mainly due to the efforts of individual study center directors. However, with the advent of the electronic surveys, response rates have fallen. Consultant Madewell commented that UOEAP does not want to do anything that might further delay grades (there are already significant issues in certain programs with grade delays). Another issue is that students must wait until everything is completed before filling out evaluations. Consultant Cooper added that the new tool is not only more succinct, but also assures true confidentiality.

**VII. Proposal for a Formal Agreement between the University of California and the Università di Siena, Italy – Linda York**

**ISSUE:** Consultant York described the request to allow advanced students to take one course at Siena in lieu of the one culture course offered at the study center. Although most students would have sufficient language skills to handle such a course, students will be offered tutorial support at the study center. UOEAP consultants expect between eight to ten students per semester to take advantage of this option. The University of Siena is also interested in sending a graduate student to UC. Although the University of Siena is on a modular system, students do have an oral exam at the end of the course. However, EAP encourages students to produce something written as well.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the formal agreement.**

**VIII. Japan Strategy Committee – Linda York**

**ISSUE:** This initiative is similar to the UK streamlining initiative that reduced the number of partners in that region. Historically, EAP had a number of Japanese partners with very small student enrollment caps. For the most part, students traditionally enrolled in year-long immersion programs in Japan. However, the academic landscape in Japan is changing, and Japanese universities are now competing for enrollments. As is the case elsewhere, students are increasingly enrolling in semester programs, as opposed to the traditional year-long immersion programs. The Japan strategy committee's charge will include reviewing this changing landscape, and make recommendations. Unlike the UK initiative, which had a fixed goal; UOEAP is open to whatever the committee suggests. It is anticipated that the strategy committee will have three at-large faculty members, an EAP campus director, a UOEAP member, and a UCIE member. The first meeting of the committee is tentatively planned for early fall.

**DISCUSSION:** Members approved the creation of this committee. UCIE nominated Beverly Bossler as the UCIE representative.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the creation of the Japan Strategy Committee and approved the selection of Beverly Bossler as the UCIE representative.**

**IX. Study Center Director Task Force II Report – Bruce Madewell**

**ISSUE:** Consultant Madewell provided some background to this report, noting that a Study Center Director Task Force I had been convened in 2003, and its report had been approved by UCIE last year (see informational enclosure 1 in the agenda). That committee looked at the structure of EAP's academic leadership abroad and provided clarity on those key leadership positions. Its final report included position descriptions for study center directors (SCDs) and liaison officers, as well as suggesting possible models for the staffing of the study centers. UOEAP has implemented some of the recommendations from the first task force. The Study Center Task Force II was approved as an administrative-faculty committee that would look at some of the pragmatic underpinnings of the SCDs. The committee was co-chaired by Consultant Bruce Madewell and UCIE member David Pion-Berlin (UCR). The committee membership also included three at-large faculty members, an EAP Regional Director, and the EAP Human Resources Director. He remarked that some of these recommendations are reiterations of processes that are already in place. Since the release of the report of the first task force, some problems or issues have been already been addressed. One such issue was clarity on compensation schemes for SCDs, which has been improved upon in the meantime. Consultant Madewell asked for approval of the report.

Consultant Madewell noted that the report nuances much of the current standards and practices in place. One example is the qualifications necessary to be a SCD. Heretofore, EAP recommended that SCDs be only tenure-track faculty Senate members. The task force is recommending expanding the pool to include lecturers, especially those with 'continuing appointment', in some circumstances. The task force has also expanded SCD qualifications to include emeritus faculty. If adjuncts are being considered for SCD positions, they must have some sort of teaching assignment in addition to a research assignment. However, the task force does not generally recommend using graduate students as SCDs because in most cases they will not have the appropriate teaching experience or maturity to serve as SCDs. However, under compelling circumstances, an argument for the use of a particular graduate student to work as a quasi-SCD might be made, as long as the student operated under faculty supervision. The task force has also added some clarity to the use of faculty liaison officers (LOs) at certain program sites. The report also includes a table of LOs used at EAP sites. In the past, LOs have been appointed in a local ad-hoc basis, as the need arose. The report tries to systematize the LO appointment process.

With regards to SCD recruitment, the task force only reinforced the role of using a campus academic director (CAD) in the SCD recruitment process. While the task force also agreed that two-year assignments are appropriate in most cases, extension of a SCD assignment to a third year is warranted under some circumstances. Regarding compensation, the task force recommends using the Department of State advisories/guidelines for the stipend that EAP provides, which covers housing and cost of living expenses. Consultant Madewell noted that compensation is based not only on level of expertise, but also on the location of the study center. In making this recommendation, the task force is making it clear that compensation is not provided for partners or spouses. Regarding personnel review, UOEAP has tried to elevate the SCD appointment to the level of 'extraordinary service'. He reminded members that Director Marcum has provided evaluations to the faculty member's department Chair upon special request. The task force is recommending that this evaluation becomes a matter of routine, which

would be completed during the SCD's term or at the end of his or her service. The task force also believes that regular SCD evaluations might also improve SCD performance in general. In cases of substandard SCD performance, the task force also confronted those cases when the faculty member is not doing his or her job as a SCD. In looking at these extreme cases, the task force differentiated between the role of the SCD as an administrative appointment from the role of the SCD as a faculty member. As faculty members are regulated by the faculty code of conduct (APM 015), they can be removed if they violate that code. However, non-performance as members of the faculty has not historically been a problem. If anything, SCDs will be derelict in their administrative duties. The task force noted that the SCD position is an administrative appointment, which is made at the direction of the UOEAP Director. Therefore the UOEAP Director (after consultation with the UCIE Chair and the UCOP Provost) can also withdraw the SCD at will, when it is determined that the he or she is found to have failed in performing his or her duties as a SCD in an adequate manner. As the SCD would be removed for administrative reasons, there would not be any paper trail impugning the academic qualifications of the faculty member. The report also lists the liaison officers working for EAP. The way that the faculty liaison officers work is that they have been appointed in a local circumstance. Therefore, the task force wanted to systematize this process.

**DISCUSSION:** Members expressed their concerns about compensation for professional faculty members (often in medical/health fields), noting that most of the time they will lose income as a result of their SCD service. While UOEAP consultants suggested that these types of faculty members can take a sabbatical during part of their SCD appointment, members countered that the duties and responsibilities associated with a SCD appointment means that it would not really be a sabbatical. Members also remarked that the role of the spouse is not really acknowledged, which, for many SCD applicants, is a real barrier. One member suggested the possibility of a joint-appointment, or perhaps offering a position in some academic capacity to a spouse (in those cases where the spouse is also an academic). In a joint-appointment, two people would share one salary. Consultants noted that in some cases departments may not be willing to approve such arrangements, but faculty spouses working ½ time is certainly not without precedent. Other members wondered if spouses/partners might be included in some of the orientation activities. Consultants agreed that spouses play an important role in the activities at EAP study centers. Consultant Madewell commented that one limitation on spousal support is the liability issue. In the past, some SCDs have engaged in nepotism, where spouses have been hired as an instructor or in some other administrative capacity. Such practices have created some problems with local staff. He also clarified that the cost-of-living stipend is set at the 'family' level, per the State Department guidelines. Finally, one member commented on the changing nature of the SCD position, noting that the first task force emphasized the teaching and research components of the position in addition to its traditional role as a service appointment. Such a change should be acknowledged by the second task force's report. This is especially important for academic personnel review and promotion, where service is not valued as highly as research and teaching. After some further discussion, members agreed to approve the report, but they felt strongly that statements regarding spousal support, as well as its concerns about professional positions, should be made.

**ACTION: Members approved the report and its recommendations unanimously, along with a letter that makes a recommendation regarding spouses and the concern about professional positions.**

**X. Egypt Formal Review – *Errol Lobo and Jianwen Su***

**ISSUE:** While the subcommittee felt that the Egypt program is sound, they did have some concerns related to reciprocity, especially its expense to EAP. There were also issues relating to housing and the language courses. In addition, the American University of Cairo (AUC) will be moving to the outskirts of the city, which will affect the study center and its staff. Consultants noted that most EAP students like to live in the city proper. Once the AUC campus is moved, this will become more difficult.

**DISCUSSION:** Consultants said that the study center has been exploring ways to diversify EAP's program in Egypt; UOEAP is also looking at alternatives, perhaps Alexandria or even Jordan. Expanding EAP's programs in the Middle East is further hampered by the fact that most potential partners are located in countries where travel warnings exist. Tunisia has also been mentioned as a possibility from time-to-time, but its main drawback is that it is francophone.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the subcommittee report on the Egypt formal review.**

**XI. Canada Formal Review – *Richard Matthew and Casey Moore***

**ISSUE:** The subcommittee reported that Canada and University of British Columbia (UBC) received a very positive formal review. It acknowledged that the formal review seems to focus on science however. Subcommittee members commented that UBC is an excellent institution for UC students. The report also suggested that the program be expanded and developed.

**DISCUSSION:** Subcommittee members brought up the issue of reciprocal exchange as impediment to further expansion. UOEAP consultants commented that it is indeed a 1:1 reciprocal exchange. For the same reasons that American students do not find Canada very attractive, Canadian students do not find California very attractive.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the subcommittee report on the Canada formal review.**

**XII. Thailand Formal Review – *Beverly Bossler and Vincent Resh***

**ISSUE:** Subcommittee members noted that the Thailand program seems to be functioning quite well with the exception that summer students may not have the requisite language skills. Recommendations include making Thai language instruction more accessible, however with the caveat that a significant proportion of the students do not wish to go beyond a very basic level of Thai. An intensive language class and a 'summer tours' program were also suggested, however the subcommittee was somewhat skeptical of the efficacy of a 'summer tours' program. Some students indicated that housing is a problem, but UOEAP noted that students have access to 'temporary' housing as long as they want.



**DISCUSSION:** UOEAP consultants clarified that if EAP were to put on a summer program, it would be a full eight week program, not a ‘summer tour’.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the subcommittee report on the Thailand formal review.**

**XIII. Lund Joint Summer Program Review – Linda York**

**ISSUE:** Consultant York noted that because this was a program with an active faculty oversight committee, the Lund Summer program was internally reviewed by UCIE after three years. The UOEAP review response agrees with the UCIE review, which states that declining UC enrollments are among the main concerns. Such enrollment declines jeopardize the program because it is a joint program. She said that UOEAP will be talking to advisors responsible for recruiting for the program to better promote this program. UOEAP would also like to replace the steering committee with a faculty advisory committee (FAC).

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked consultants why enrollments are declining. Primarily, they cited the high costs of the program. Although interest in Sweden at one point peaked; it seems to be declining now. Members remarked that there is a fair amount of faculty interest in the program. They also asked if there had been any movement in changing the start date. Consultants stated that this is difficult, but there might be some room to move it back a few days. That said, there is also a Swedish holiday that impacts what can be done at Lund.

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

**XIV. Candidates for the 2007-08 Formal Review Committees – Linda York**

**ISSUE:** Consultant York requested nominations for faculty members to serve on the following review committees: Chile, Rome, Russia and Taiwan. Particularly, UOEAP is interested in the following academic disciplines: (1) political science, history, Latin American studies, economics, and art and performance; Rome—social sciences and humanities; Russia—Russian Studies and Russian language; and Taiwan—China and East Asian languages/cultures, international and global studies, and economics/business. She added that since the three-year review report on Concepción was completed last year, it will be excluded from the Chile review. Site visits are also now integral to these reviews.

**DISCUSSION:** Members nominated the following faculty for the formal review committees:

- Chile: Victoria Langland (Davis), Ian Coulter (UCIE)
- Rome: Sally McKee (Davis), Errol Lobo (UCIE), and Michael O’Connell (UCSB)
- Russia: Paula Garb (UCI), Cynthia Kaplan (UCSB), and Richard Matthiew (UCIE)
- Taiwan: Nancy Guy and Beverly Bossler (UCIE)

**ACTION: Members approved the slate of UCIE representatives for the formal reviews.**

**XV. New Business**

**ISSUE:** Chair Guerrini scheduled a conference call in early June to complete the two remaining reviews for Brazil and Germany. Chair Guerrini and Ian Coulter volunteered to write the Germany report, and Jianwen Su and Richard Matthiew volunteered to do the Brazil report.

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will schedule an early June conference call.**

**XVI. Executive Session**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

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