

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
TELECONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 4, 2006**

Present: Fred Burwick (Chair), Anita Guerrini (Vice-Chair), Francoise Sorgen-Goldschmidt (UCB), Charles Leshner (UCD), Geoffery Symcox (UCLA), David S. Pion-Berlin (UCR), Casey Moore (UCSC), Ellen Comisso (UCSD Alternate), Errol Lobo (UCSF Alternate), Edris Rodriguez (Student Representative), Peter Schiffman (Guest-UCD), John Marcum (UOEAP Consultant), Scott Cooper (UOEAP Consultant), Bruce Madewell (UOEAP Consultant), and Todd Giedt (Committee Analyst)

I. John Marcum's Remarks

ISSUE: Director John Marcum briefed the committee on the London Fall program. He argued against instituting a terminal year for the program, as the good instructors would not have an interest in only teaching in a program that would end in one year. He explained that this left UOEAP with two options: (1) Either to close London down immediately; or (2) retain and run the program at a much lower cost. The current Study Center Director, Michael Cowan, has submitted a proposal that pursues the second option.

Director Marcum also noted that the proposed budget has been amended and it was submitted to members in late December. It includes the following changes:

- The application fee has been replaced with a participation fee.
- One course release for EAP Campus Academic Directors has been restored.
- The CIEE program in Paris has been extended for one year.
- Rome: Rome costs are being reduced with the goal of a sustainable program.
- Leiden: For one terminal year, limit Leiden enrollment to students who can not get what they need at Utrecht.
- Sussex/Pembroke Summer: UOEAP has agreed to a transitional year, during which the final locus of this program will be decided. He noted that a formal review was recently carried out on this program. With regard to that review, there are three options that UCIE needs to consider: (1) Do not issue a report; (2) Issue a report based on the information collected; (3) Schedule another meeting of the review committee to complete remaining steps (perhaps telephonically).

Director Marcum also reported that UCOP is requiring a concrete plan within a flexible, but reasonable time frame. He noted that during this time it will be important to design a new budget formula that will sustain EAP going into the future. Associate Dean Bruce Madewell also updated the committee on the Study Center Director extensions, which was mentioned at the last meeting. He reported that UOEAP has only been able to extend two Study Center Directors (Robert Maniquis (France-Lyon) and Efrain Kristal (France-Paris)). EAP will not be able to extend Michael Cowan's (UK) directorship because of tax issues. Given this situation in the UK, Bruce Madewell noted that the Study Center Directorship openings have already been announced for the UK, and there are quite a few applications already.

II. Discussion Questions

DISCUSSION: Members posed a number of questions to the UOEAP consultants for the purpose of gaining clarity over the remaining action items.

Role of the Committee in Budget Discussions

Members requested clarification on the role of the committee in the budget process. Chair Burwick clarified that UCIE is responsible for the approval and discontinuation of any academic program. UCIE is only involved with budget decisions as far as they impinge upon academic programs. With that response in mind, members also wanted to know if they would eventually be voting on a new budget formula for EAP. Consultants responded that a new budget formula is not under consideration at this time; however UCIE would be kept apprised of any developments in this area.

Budget Issues and Related Documents

Members were interested in the anticipated time horizon for the budget cuts. They expressed the sentiment that it is better to have a longer time frame, as that would allow decisions to be made that are based more on academics rather than on finances. Director Marcum stressed that an agreement for a plan that includes a definite process has been reached, but there is not any determined time frame or end date (but within a “reasonable” period of time). He noted that if EAP makes progress under this plan, it will be in a better position to argue for a revised budget formula. Associate Dean Scott Cooper speculated that an eventual new budget formula would probably be some sort of fee based on participation numbers, rather than the current marginal cost of instruction (MCOI), which is based on full-time equivalents (FTE). With the growth of short-term programming, it is becoming increasingly important that EAP be funded according to actual head-count, as that is what determines work-load, not year-long FTE’s. Director Marcum also noted that the nature of the eventual formula will determine the kind of programs that EAP will be able to offer. He said that it will be important to have faculty support for a working formula in order to both create and sustain the types of EAP programs that the Academic Senate would like to have.

There were also a number of questions relating to the documents sent out by UOEAP. Some members were perplexed in reconciling the spread sheet to the summary of the budget cuts. Associate Dean Scott Cooper responded that the two documents are not comparable. He explained that the budget cut narrative is a summary of the budget cuts that are currently on the table. The spread sheet is a more dynamic document going into the future. In response to an UCIE query, He noted that the difference between the “2005-06 academic year original” and “2005-06 academic year revised” columns in the UOEAP category is about \$500,000, which reflects the internal administrative cuts UOEAP made when it learned about the budget shortfalls. On the other hand, the Study Center category shows a five million dollar increase. This increase represents an accurate accounting of Study Center expenses, through which UOEAP learned that it was actually spending about \$15 million instead of the \$9 million UOEAP thought it was spending on Study Centers. After that, it is assumed that the remaining expenses will still go up due to inflation, etc. Members also asked UOEAP consultants to explain the category of

temporary annual support. Associate Dean Cooper explained that temporary annual support is money given to the campuses. This figure also includes start-up funding for UC Merced for this year only. Finally, members noted that the figure in the final column under the category “revenue over expenses” (-\$971,000) makes it look like EAP would still be \$1.1 million in the red after three years’ time. Scott Cooper explained that this figure represents the unpredictability of costs going into the future. That said however, he made special mention that under these static predictions, EAP’s deficit would be eliminated by 2009-2010. He also noted that if EAP decides to follow the proposed plan for London Fall (thereby not eliminating it entirely), it would take EAP five years to eliminate the budget deficit.

Program Options

Members expressed general support for the UOEAP proposals regarding the specific program options. Members generally felt that a conference call would be adequate to complete the work of the formal review committee for the Sussex and Pembroke programs. Members were also concerned with the ability of students to afford to study at Sussex without EAP support (or financial aid) if that program is indeed eliminated after this year. Regarding London Fall, there was general support for Michael Cowan’s proposal for a “reduced” London Fall. They felt that this is a far better option than eliminating it entirely. Finally, UOEAP consultants also noted that the Paris CIEE program has been extended for one year, during which time all of the France programs will be under review. This review will aid in the reorganization and revamping of not only the CIEE program, but all of the other Paris programs as well.

Miscellaneous Issues

On the topic of course relief, members applauded UOEAP’s decision to fund one course relief for campus Academic Directors. Both members and UOEAP consultants agreed that it will be important for campuses to match UOEAP’s commitment to course relief as well.

III. Action Items ¹:

A. In-Progress Program Cuts (those outside of the four principles)

ISSUE: UOEAP has proposed the following program cuts, which lie outside the four principles, as outlined in the budget cuts narrative:

- Netherlands: Eliminate the Leiden program.
- Italy: (1) Cut the winter and spring quarters at Siena; (2) Eliminate the Brera program; and (3) Delay the proposed move of the second year Italian program from Siena to Padova. The Italian Study Center directors have already indicated that they think this delay is appropriate.
- France, Paris Center Program:
 - (1) Eliminate the second semester of the Paris Center program. This would return the program to its initial configuration as a “Fall Only” program, and assure that we have a critical mass of students in the fall program to justify offering a full contingent of core courses.

¹ Please note that the action items were discussed in a different order than the order listed in the minutes.

(2) Postpone the start-up of the new Paris summer first year French language and culture program. The valuable work that the Faculty Advisory Committee has already put into designing this program will not be wasted, because the course descriptions and syllabi that they have produced are already being introduced into the Paris Center program language courses, significantly improving these courses.

- UK/Ireland: Introduce enrollment caps of 8 students each at Ireland-Cork and Ireland-Galway.

DISCUSSION: Members generally agreed with the UOEAP proposed cuts.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve these program cuts. Members voted unanimously (8 votes in favor) to approve these cuts with zero abstentions.

B. Principle One Program Cuts

ISSUE: Eliminate any EAP self-construct programs if there are alternative EAP programs with similar coursework available. All remaining self-construct programs must be redesigned during 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 to be cost-effective by June 30, 2008. (For the purposes of this principle, “cost effective” shall be defined as having a per student FTE program cost that does not exceed the amount of MCOI funding that UOEAP receives for enrollment growth per FTE, i.e., \$5,260). Programs to be eliminated: London Fall (discussions are underway with SCD regarding timing and other issues). Programs to be redesigned: Italy, Rome and the Paris UC Center.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the process by which Study Center Directors have been able to submit alternate proposals in response to these budget and programmatic cuts. They noted for example that the London and Rome Study Directors submitted alternate proposals, which have saved the Rome program and may save the London Fall program from elimination. Consultant Scott Cooper responded that these Study Center Directors (in Rome and London) are in a special position in that they administer self-construct programs where EAP has control over costs. On the other hand, Study Center Directors who run programs at host universities do not have such control over costs. At best, they can enter into negotiations with these institutions to try to lower costs; however such negotiations are not always successful.

Members discussed Michael Cowan’s proposal for a “reduced” London Fall program. Before voting however, members sought clarification that they were not approving a specific plan at this time. EAP Director Marcum assured members that they were only voting on a redesign of London Fall, which would come before the committee at a later date. Scott Cooper suggested rewording the principle to “redesign the Great Cities programs to make them cost-effective”, which members agreed to.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded the following amendment to principle one: “Redesign the Great Cities programs (London Fall, UC Rome, and Paris UC Center Fall) so that they become cost effective as soon as is possible. (For the purposes of this principle, "cost effective" shall be defined as having a per student

FTE program cost that does not exceed the amount of MCOI funding that UOEAP receives for enrollment growth per FTE, i.e., \$5,260). The London Study Center Director at the Bloomsbury Center has provided a proposal for a cut-down version (4 courses) of the London Fall program which will greatly save costs. In due course, formal approval for the London program will be sought from UCIE. The Rome and Paris Fall programs will run with the same curriculum as at present but with economies made in their administration.” UCIE unanimously approved the amendment (six votes in favor, zero abstentions²).

C. Principle Two Program Cuts

ISSUE: Eliminate all summer programs, except those that are language & culture or special focus. Programs to be eliminated: Sussex Summer and Pembroke College summer. (Both will run for Summer 2006. Fees will be raised to make programs break even for Summer 2006.)

DISCUSSION: Consultant Scott Cooper clarified that while EAP will no longer run these programs after Summer 2006, students will be able to either enroll in these programs directly or a UC campus may host these programs (most likely at a higher cost however). Members initially inquired if fees could simply be raised to make these programs break even. Scott Cooper responded that for next summer alone, the fees are being raised \$600-\$700 per program. He added that if EAP held onto these programs, it would take much longer to retire the deficit because the substantial fixed costs associated with these programs would remain. The suggestion was made to restate this principle so that the Sussex and Pembroke Summer programs be reviewed after one year, rather than eliminated. Consultants argued against restating this principle in this way because doing so would weaken EAP’s budget proposal that will be submitted to UCOP. Consultants stressed that a coherent plan is necessary to convince UCOP to carry EAP’s debt. It is also very likely that these programs would be hosted by another UC entity (such as a campus), as they represent an attractive package because they have already gone through the UCIE vetting process. The final decision regarding a new UC aegis for these programs would arise from a very deliberative process (most likely via the EAP formal review, which is currently ongoing). In response to this argument, Chair Burwick presented an amendment to this principle that would make the elimination of these programs contingent on their transfer to one of the UC summer programs.

ACTION: (1) A motion was made and seconded to eliminate the general summer programs (Sussex and Pembroke) provided their administration and management can be passed to another UC entity (e.g., campus summer sessions). Members voted unanimously (six in favor, zero abstentions) to approve the motion. (2) Members agreed to continue and complete the formal review of Sussex and Pembroke telephonically. The next scheduled conference call for the formal review committee is January 29th.

² Note: Two UCIE members had to leave the call early at this point.

D. Principle Three Program Cuts

ISSUE: Eliminate duplicative, subject-specific programs within a specific country. Programs to be eliminated: Australia, Tasmania, Fall and Spring Semesters, Env. Sci. & Bio. Program; Australia, James Cook University.

DISCUSSION: UOEAP Consultant Scott Cooper informed that under this principle the Tasmania and James Cook programs will be eliminated with those students being redirected to the Queensland Biology program, which is not being cut. One of the primary concerns was whether Queensland could accommodate these students. Scott Cooper responded that Queensland should be able to accommodate all of the fall semester students that now attend these three programs. He proposed that spring semester students will be directed to the new immersion spring programs in Australia. Some members expressed concern that a certain number of students would withdraw simply because of the change in venue, noting that Tasmania is very different than other parts of Australia.

One member also noted that the Alcala program has been reinstated (from an earlier budget summary). Consultant Scott Cooper responded that this was done because UOEAP realized that Alcala is actually a separate and unique program, so it didn't fit the criteria of "duplicative".

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Australia cuts under principle three. Members voted unanimously (seven in favor, zero abstentions³) to approve these program cuts.

E. Principle Four Program Cuts

ISSUE: Eliminate any program that has a total FTE count of less than 15 and total program costs exceeding \$20,000. Programs to be eliminated: Australia, Tasmania; Denmark, DIS; France, Paris Critical Studies Program with CIEE; and Russia. For geopolitical reasons, the Director of EAP has exempted Russia from this cut.

DISCUSSION: Chair Burwick noted that the committee had approved principle four at the last teleconference, but not the actual program cuts themselves. UOEAP Consultant Scott Cooper informed the committee that the only real program cut is DIS in Denmark, as the Paris CIEE program has been extended for one year and the Tasmania program was included among the program cuts in principle three. Given that the DIS program only enrolls students from UCB and UCD, some members were concerned about the opinions of the Campus Directors at those campuses. Scott Cooper responded that UOEAP has been working with Mike Martin at UCB, who will be the next Study Center Director in Sweden and Denmark. He reported that Professor Martin does not like the DIS cut, but he is willing to live with it given the current budgetary environment. Peter Schiffman (UCD) noted that while there are approximately seven UCD students who enroll in DIS per year, they can be accommodated elsewhere. Members also asked Scott Cooper for the actual cost of the DIS program, who responded that it costs EAP \$11,000 per FTE (or \$66,000 per year). He also noted that UOEAP has been engaged in

³ Note: One UCIE member had to leave the call early at this point.

UCIE Teleconference Minutes, 1/04/05

negotiations with DIS for many years to lower these high costs, but these negotiations have not been successful. Finally, Members inquired as to why Russia is exempted in the program cuts under this principle, given that it is a very expensive program and not very cost-effective with relatively small enrollments. EAP Director John Marcum responded that although Russia has had certain logistical challenges in the past, it is well-established and is a program of high quality. For a number of cultural and geopolitical reasons, it is important that EAP maintains a presence in Russia. The enrollment in the Russia program currently stands at 19 students.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to eliminate the DIS program in Denmark and final approval of principal four. Members voted unanimously (eight votes in favor, zero abstentions) to cut this program.

Meeting adjourned at 12:14 PM.