

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 23, 2006

I. Chair's Announcements – Fred Burwick

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Burwick updated the committee on the progress of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of International Education at UC (ad-hoc review committee). He reported that a charge has been established with a final reporting date of January 2007. He stressed that the charge is quite large, which will try to place EAP within the larger context of international education at UC. A mission statement has also been developed, which delineates 19 principles that will guide the ad-hoc review committee. The ad-hoc review committee is currently taking an inventory of all international educational-related activities—both formal and ad-hoc—taking place within the UC system. This inventory is scheduled to be completed by March 5th. At the end of March, the ad-hoc review committee will invite a number of consultants to a special meeting in Oakland. These consultants are persons who are responsible for the various international education programs and initiatives across the system. In April, the EAP-specific review will commence with an emphasis on its contextual relationship to these other international educational activities.

DISCUSSION: Members asked for more information on the actual review of EAP's operations. Chair Burwick responded that it is still too early to answer that question, as the ad-hoc review committee is waiting for the EAP response to its self-assessment questionnaire. Members also had concerns about the inventory currently being taken across the UC campuses. They felt that it would be difficult to document all activities relating to international education. While formal programs (both EAP and non-EAP) are easier to tally, many activities are very informal and ad-hoc (especially research involving graduate students), which would be very difficult to document. By including such types of informal and ad-hoc activities, members feared that the total data set is bound to be incomplete. One member cited the fictional example of a paleontology professor taking some graduate students on research expedition to Madagascar, Egypt, and Wyoming to illustrate the difficulties in collecting such types of data. The member pointed out that the principal investigator would need to remember only to report the trips to Madagascar and Egypt, but not to Wyoming. Other members remarked that the time period of only three years may not be representative; they suggested that a five-year time period may be better. Others suggested that truncated or erroneous information could have serious adverse effects. Chair Burwick acknowledged that taking this inventory is difficult and he admitted that it may never be totally complete, but he stressed the importance of its collection. He reiterated that a sincere effort is being made to garner this type of information.

In light of the recent financial crisis, members speculated as to how EAP will be viewed (either favorably or negatively) against the backdrop of ad hoc faculty-driven initiatives in international education, which this data will presumably document. They noted that many of the non-EAP international programs that the ad-hoc review committee is surveying operate at a profit, whereas EAP is currently facing a shortfall. However, other members pointed out that all UC programs must undergo reviews from time-to-time, regardless of their profitability relative to other

programs/initiatives. A UOEAP consultant asked for clarification on the role of Gretchen Kalonji in the ad-hoc review, who is the Director of International Strategy Development at UCOP. Chair Burwick responded that she is one of many consultants to the committee. Finally, several UCIE members regretted not having been properly informed or consulted on matters such as the charge to the Review Committee or its mission statement although they had initially requested a review of EAP.

ACTION: Chair Burwick will forward the mission statement from the ad-hoc review committee and the self-assessment form to UCIE members.

II. EAP Director's Report – John Marcum

ISSUE/REPORT: Director Marcum updated the committee on EAP activities. EAP has moved into its new center in London, which is located in Bloomsbury (Bedford Square). EAP has not been able to move into the Casa de California in Mexico. While the Casa de California is owned by UC and is being used for various UC events and activities, EAP has not yet received permission to go ahead with the retrofitting of Building C (which was designated as a possible site for an EAP office). EAP is moving into its new headquarters in Shanghai, China, at the Knowledge and Innovation Community, which is a large campus that combines research institutions and businesses, and contains a very large academic center as well. The California Study Abroad Council is now online, at <http://www.globaled.us/calabroad/>. This is an intersegmental organization, with cooperation from the CSU, UC, community colleges, and some private colleges and universities. Its main goal is to prepare students to study abroad by working with high school and community college counselors.

Director Marcum also reported on the latest enrollment figures for EAP programs. He said that there is a 2-3% dip in enrollment nationally in study abroad. EAP has received 125 less applications than it had this time last year, which constitutes an approximate 3% fall in enrollment (specific trends include a decrease in enrollment in European and UK programs and a rise in the enrollments of the China programs). Both nationally and at EAP, enrollment in year-long programs continue to fall. While there is probably not one single reason for this phenomenon, experts believe that it results from the cumulative effects of terrorism, a fall in the value of the dollar, rise in university fees, and pressures to graduate on-time. Certainly contributing to EAP's enrollment losses are the self-imposed enrollment cap, competition from other study abroad enterprises, and State Department travel warnings, which have forced EAP to suspend some program offerings (Philippines and Israel). Of the program suspensions, Israel is the most contentious. Several legislators met with a group of UC students who were studying there independently. EAP has recently sent out a survey to UC students who studied in Israel independently to gather more information on their experiences there. While UC has not changed its policy on Israel, other institutions are now offering (or reopening) programs in Israel.

While commenting on the importance of the EAP Review, Director Marcum stressed that the current budget formula is not viable. He said there is a general understanding of this at UCOP. EAP's current budget crisis hit suddenly, but it can be attributed to a number of internal and external factors. Internally, UC raised education fees, but reduced the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI) by \$1,000 per student, which funds EAP. Participation patterns also changed. EAP went from an 80% participation rate in year-long programs to 80% participation

in short-term programs, which increased the workload per FTE. Other external factors include the fall in the value of the dollar, and an increase in the operation budgets of Study Centers. He urged UCIE members to support a change in the budget formula. He said that unless the formula is changed, EAP will be forced to cut programs.

DISCUSSION: Members asked Director Marcum if he had a commitment from UCOP to change the budget formula. He responded that he has an acknowledgement that there is a genuine problem with the formula and this issue will be on the March UC Planning and Budget committee (UCPB) meeting agenda. He added that UOEAP and the campus EAP offices are not in competition with one another. Both groups need to be served with a new budget formula. Some members stressed that EAP should be defended pragmatically on the unique value that it brings to the University at a relatively low cost.

III. Program Development Announcements: International Christian University, Japan; Imperial College, UK; and Hanoi University of Foreign Studies, Vietnam – Linda York

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Linda York updated the committee on two program development initiatives, which will be coming to UCIE at the May meeting. Both initiatives were already underway before the budget crisis emerged. The first is a semester program at International Christian University (ICU) in “Contemporary Japanese Culture”, which is located in Tokyo, Japan. UOEAP is about to send the program proposal out for vetting. In Vietnam, EAP is affiliating with a new host institution, Hanoi University of Foreign Studies. The program under development would be a hybrid program that would include both English courses at the host institution as well as instruction within EAP’s own construct program. Explorations at Imperial College in London are continuing with some campus visits planned for Imperial University staff and faculty in April.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the earlier delays in the development of the program at Imperial College. Linda responded that the delays have not hampered the relationship between UC and Imperial College. Recalling the fact that Imperial College is insisting on a year program, members noted that it is usually difficult for engineering students (the cohort that the program will be targeting) to study abroad for one year. Consultant Bruce Madewell confirmed that it will indeed be a year-long program and faculty members from both institutions are cooperating to make this happen. He said that the campus visits in April will facilitate this collaboration.

IV. Status and Strategy Reports – Scott Cooper

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Scott Cooper asked members for any questions on the status and strategy reports that were included in the agenda. He also invited questions about current enrollment figures.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired about total enrollment in EAP programs (not applications). Professor Cooper said that total EAP enrollment has fallen this year from approximately 4,200 students in the 2004-2005 academic year to 4,149 students enrolled in EAP programs this year. Members asked about Taiwan. Scott said that the enrollment numbers for Taiwan are up this year, at 14 for the fall semester and 12 for the year program. Other programs that experienced increases in enrollment are Japan Year, Chile, Germany, New Dehli, BNU, Madrid Summer, and UK/Ireland Fall.

Members asked Consultant Cooper to specifically comment on EAP's offerings in Africa. He said that EAP's host institutions in Ghana are facing many of the typical challenges that universities in developing countries must deal with—increasing student enrollments and declining resources. This results in packed class rooms, a general lack of space, and problems with the infrastructure (running water, electricity, etc.). Quality of instruction is also uneven. In order to offset these problems, EAP has set-up an independent study/research project, which allows students to take full advantage of their location. He briefly commented on EAP's programs in South Africa. He noted that although the University of Cape Town is a fast-developing research school, it is very expensive for UC to send to students there. In contrast, the University of Kwa Zulu-Natal is more problematic for EAP. The university has recently reorganized itself and incorporated five surrounding universities, thereby significantly increasing enrollment. They also keep changing their rates without consulting with EAP.

Members briefly discussed the Lund Summer Program. They stressed that recruitment efforts need to be made on each campus specifically for this program. Other members urged UOEAP to move the start date of this program forward by about three or four days. The problem is that the program begins one day after the end of spring quarter, which creates problems for students who want to walk in graduation ceremonies. Consultant Cooper also provided an update on the Netherlands. For the Leiden program, He said that the Netherlands Review Committee recommended EAP should (1) lower enrollments because of problems with course planning and quality, as well as substandard student housing; and (2) concentrate a program in legal studies given its location near The Hague. However the budget crisis intervened and EAP is planning to divert students from Leiden to Utrecht. At Utrecht, EAP has two programs with a significant amount of course work in English. At Maastricht, there are two special focus programs in psychology and business/economics. Finally, there are programs at University College at Maastricht, which are designed for advanced students. Director Marcum added that UC has a research alliance with Utrecht, which has become one of the best research institutions in Europe. Finally, Consultant Bruce Madewell reminded members about the newly established Wageningen program, which is designed for UC Davis students. He reported that EAP has received four applications for this program.

There was also a brief discussion regarding the creation of “in association” degrees. Director Marcum advocated the establishment of such degrees with some of EAP's major host institutions. He described them as an intermediary step towards a joint degree, where a UC diploma would state that the student had received his or her degree “in association” with another university abroad. He has consulted with legal counsel, which informed him that there are not any legal barriers to establishing such degrees. Some members thought that the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) might be a good place to start discussing the creation of these types of degrees.

V. Study Center Task Force (SCTF) Report and Recommendations – Scott Cooper/Bruce Madewell

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Scott Cooper reviewed the findings of the SCTF report and recommendations. He reported that the task force concentrated on leadership structures to create a rigorous and rational process to decide what sort of government structures that EAP should

maintain abroad. The task force tried to categorize Study Centers across a continuum of different characteristics and considered the kinds of government structures that are best suited to each type of Study Center. Consultant Cooper noted that the SCTF was guided by a number of principles. These included adequate academic oversight, as well as appropriate division of labor between faculty and staff. Through their recommendations, the SCTF clarified the Study Center processes, job descriptions, and reporting structures, established a decision tree methodology, and evaluated a number of different implementation strategies.

In response to the report, the SCTF received a number of responses. They received three responses from Study Center directors and one from the Council of Campus Directors (CCD). The Chief Administrative Officer at UOEAP, Jerry Lowell, also wrote an analysis/report commenting on the SCTF recommendations from an administrative/operational perspective. Consultant Cooper clarified that this analysis is solely Jerry's report, and it is not the position of UOEAP. On a separate but related note, Consultant Bruce Madewell reminded the committee that UCIE approved the establishment of a second Study Center Task Force (SCTF II), which was established to consider the pragmatic issues of the Study Center directorships (recruitment, selection, orientation, compensation, and evaluation of Study Center directors and liaison officers). He said that this task force has not yet convened due to problems in making faculty appointments.

DISCUSSION: Both CCD and UCIE members applauded the work of the SCTF. Both groups were primarily concerned with Jerry Lowell's report and its implications on EAP's Study Centers. First, members asked about the compensation for Study Center directors. Consultants clarified that the faculty member's home department continues to pay the salary, prorated to an 11-month appointment. UOEAP pays the department for release time. Members directed their attention to the tangible and intangible benefits of maintaining faculty Study Center directors, which is a key issue raised by Jerry's report. They commented that former Study Center directors not only add value to their home campuses when they return, but they also help to maintain the institutional memory of EAP. Such institutional memory aids the development of new programs and promotes academic integration, processes in which former Study Center directors often play a key role. The flow of new Study Center directors into the programs helps to keep EAP vibrant as well. Other members noted that the tangible benefits that accrue to faculty who serve abroad are also important. Such benefits include the establishment (or re-establishment) of connections, which often benefits future research. Diplomacy and negotiation of UC-EAP exchange agreements are also facilitated by the presence of UC faculty abroad. Benefits aside, members stressed that the Study Center director recruitment and selection processes are paramount and should be strengthened, as they weed out the ineffective Study Center director candidates.

Members speculated on the provocative nature of Jerry's report, noting that one of the options it considers is either eliminating Study Centers altogether or significantly curtailing their numbers. Jerry states that such drastic measures may not be necessary if EAP is able to reformulate its budget formula with UCOP. They argued that such a move (elimination of study centers altogether) may not be necessary, and given the intrinsic benefits of Study Centers, may be unwise and somewhat premature. UCIE and CCD members agreed that a counter-document (to Jerry's analysis) is needed. They stressed that whatever decisions are made should be based on

programmatic and academic concerns, and should remain within the purview of this committee. Other members remarked that there are other non-financial issues with Study Center directorships that still need to be resolved, such as turn-over/continuity of the Study Centers, the role of faculty members abroad, and the professionalization of staff to name a few. Above all, this counter-document should not simply be a defense of Study Centers for the sake of defending Study Centers. Rather, it should be an endorsement of the SCTF report and should reflect the arguments made in the discussion above.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt and UCIE Chair Fred Burwick will draft an endorsement of the SCTF Report.

VI. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the November 10, 2005 Meeting Minutes

ACTION: The minutes from the November 10, 2005 meeting were with minor revisions.

B. Approval of the January 4, 2006 Teleconference Minutes

ACTION: The minutes from the January 4, 2006 teleconference minutes were approved.

C. Appointment of a UCIE Representative to the Standing Faculty Advisory Committee for Siena, Italy

ACTION: Errol Lobo was appointed as the UCIE representative to the Standing Faculty Advisory Committee for Siena, Italy.

VII. Selection of Program/Countries for the 2006-07 Formal Reviews – Linda York

ISSUE: Consultant Linda York proposed that the Russia and Italy formal reviews be postponed until the following year due to resource constraints. She explained that Russia is a good candidate for postponement because the Russian Studies' faculty has been working with UOEAP to redesign the curriculum. She said that it would better to wait one year to see how these curricular changes work out and evaluate them at that time. Given the uncertain future of the Rome Center, she also said that it would make good sense to wait a year on the Italy review as well. Finally, she informed members that a joint faculty steering committee (composed of both UC and Lund faculty members) continues to oversee the Lund Joint Summer program. She added that all of the Sweden programs would be formally reviewed in six years, but she asked members if they would like an opportunity to carry out a short and preliminary review of the Lund Joint Summer program before that time. This review could be conducted by one UCIE member and would be completed next year. The remaining candidates for formal reviews are Brazil, Canada, Germany and Thailand. She reminded members that they would be asked for the names of faculty members who would make good candidates to serve on these review committees at the May meeting.

ACTION: (1) David Pion-Berlin was appointed as the reviewer for the Lund Joint Summer Program; (2) Members unanimously approved Brazil, Canada, Germany, and Thailand to be formally reviewed in the 2006-07 academic year.

VIII. Appointment of UCIE Formal Review Response Subcommittees – Linda York

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Linda York asked members for volunteers to serve on the UCIE subcommittees that will comment on the formal reviews conducted this year (France, Pembroke/Sussex, Chile (Concepción), and Egypt).

ACTION: (1) John Graham and Anita Guerrini were appointed to the France subcommittee; (2) Françoise Sorgen-Goldschmidt and Casey Moore were appointed to the Pembroke/Sussex subcommittee; (3) Chip Leshner and Nancy Guy were appointed to the Chile (Concepción) subcommittee; and (4) Fred Burwick and Errol Lobo were appointed to the Egypt subcommittee.

IX. Agreement with the Bologna Accademia of Art – Linda York

ISSUE: Consultant Linda York asked members to formalize an informal agreement between EAP and the Bologna Accademia of Art. She explained that this would allow EAP to publicize the opportunity for UC students to take art courses at the University of Bologna.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the differences between studio art and art history. Linda clarified that one of the main problems with EAP's former partner at Brea (in terms of art) was that it offered only studio art. This new agreement would allow students take studio art at the Accademia and art history/theory courses at the University of Bologna.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the agreement between EAP and the Bologna Accademia of Art.

X. Proposed Discontinuance of EAP Programs at Alcalá, Spain – Linda York

ISSUE: Consultant Linda York explained that the Alcalá program was originally on the list of programs slated for closure that UOEAP presented to UCIE in November 2005. She noted that it was taken off this list because the Study Center Director did not have the time to find out if the Hispanic Studies Program at Carlos III could accommodate the Alcalá semester students. He has since confirmed that the Hispanic Studies can accommodate these students, and he recommends suspension of the Alcalá program.

DISCUSSION: Members stressed the importance of giving CCD members the opportunity to respond to proposed program suspensions. Professor Peter Schiffman, the CCD representative, said that he had sent out an email requesting comments on all of the proposed program cuts to CCD members and other constituencies, but he did not receive any comments back on the Alcalá program.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously to suspend the Alcalá program.

XI. UK Reorganization Committee – Scott Cooper

ISSUE: Consultant Scott Cooper explained that EAP currently has a complex network of 24 institutional partners in the UK (excluding Ireland). This is because the host institutions in the UK have traditionally maintained very strict limitations on how many students EAP could send (generally between four and six students per year per institution). As enrollments in the UK grew over time, EAP was forced to steadily increase its partners in order to accommodate students who wanted to study in the UK. The current arrangement is further complicated by the fact that UK Study Center directors spend a significant amount of their time traveling to the various host institutions during their tenure. However, given the declining UK enrollments over the past couple of years, Scott said that EAP is now ready to reduce the number of host institutions, thereby streamlining the program. He proposed a joint UOEAP-UCIE committee to make

recommendations on how best to reorganize the programs in the UK. He added that this proposal has been vetted with the UK Study Center directors. He also said that UK partners are now more interested in reciprocity than they had been in the past. Therefore, he thinks that there is an opportunity to not only decrease the number of partners, but also increase the capacity per partner. The committee would have one UCIE representative, as well as faculty members from CCD, UOEAP, and Berkeley. Consultants would include the current UK Study Center directors, Paulette Greisner (head of reciprocity at UOEAP), and Anne Haberkern (UOEAP Regional Director). Professor Cooper requested that UCIE approve the charge and appoint a UCIE member to the committee.

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether a new arrangement with fewer host institutions could accommodate a rise in UK enrollments. Scott responded that the task of the committee would be to evaluate all 24 partners and complete a detailed analysis of the current arrangements according to a specific set of criteria. Ideally, the new arrangement would be able to accommodate future increases in enrollments without adding additional partners. It would also add to the diversity of the program offerings in the UK by including more semester programs (rather than the year-long programs that have traditionally been offered in the UK). Given that a significant number of science students have GPA's below 3.0, members also felt that it was important to lower the current GPA requirement of 3.0 (or above in some cases) for many of the current UK programs. Consultants clarified that the 3.0 requirement is often set by the host institution (especially in the UK). When the host institution does not specify a GPA requirement of 3.0 or above, EAP can waive students down to a 2.85 GPA. UCIE members suggested that lowering the GPA requirement might be used as a negotiating tool when forming these new UK partnerships. Consultants added that they would need to explore this issue further, as UC admissions policy may play a role in setting these GPA requirements from the reciprocity end.

ACTION: (1) Members voted unanimously to approve the charge of the committee, and (2) appointed Nancy Guy as the UCIE representative.

XII. Study Center Directorship Recruitment Update – Bruce Madewell

ISSUE: Consultant Bruce Madewell provided members with an update on the Study Center directorship recruitment. He said that the interview teams have been constituted. He reported that some Study Center directorships were withdrawn for the following reasons. The Study Center directorships in France (Lyon, Paris), Russia, and UK/I London at Bloomsbury were withdrawn primarily for budgetary reasons. The contracts with the Study Center directors in France and UK/I London were extended, while Russia will be managed with a graduate student with regular visits by UOEAP has not been able to find a Study Center director for the Siena Italy program (no applicants), so Siena will be incorporated under the Padova Study Center. He also said that he is currently negotiating with someone who he hopes will be able to be the Egypt Study Center Director.

ACTION: Members asked Bruce to provide interview timelines earlier to accommodate UCIE members' schedules.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

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

Distributions

1. Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of International Education at UC Mission Statement
2. Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of International Education at UC Self-Assessment Form