

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 12, 2006**

I. Chair's Announcements – Fred Burwick

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Burwick did not have any announcements.

II. Berkeley Committee on International Education Resolutions/Ad-Hoc Review Committee

ISSUE/REPORT: The Berkeley representative briefed members on the enclosed resolutions from the Berkeley divisional Committee on International Education (CIE) to the Ad-Hoc Review Committee (ad-hoc committee). These resolutions note that the Berkeley CIE is looking forward to receiving the final report, but members need enough time to properly review it and instruct its UCIE representative as to how it should be accepted. Second, the Berkeley CIE invites members from the ad-hoc committee to a meeting to discuss the work of the ad-hoc committee. The Berkeley representative added that there was some confusion among CIE members with regard to the ad-hoc committee's charge, name change, and what it is actually doing. Specifically, Berkeley IE members were interested in learning how the ad-hoc committee's charge was expanded beyond the review of EAP that UCIE had requested in 2005.

Berkeley CIE members also felt that the current mission statement of the ad-hoc committee, entitled "Principles of International Education at UC", is overstated and unrealistic. Instead, they suggested adding Principle 1 from this document to the March 2004 endorsed mission statement, which would make a much better mission statement. The rest of the "principles" could be converted into questions, which can be used as part of the review process. The Berkeley CIE stressed that one important task of the ad-hoc committee is to sort out the various groups that are involved in international education at UC, i.e. EAP and OP, and their respective roles.

DISCUSSION: Chair Burwick responded that the ad-hoc committee's report is due in January 2007, and it will be distributed to divisional international education committees very soon thereafter. He emphasized that nothing in the report would be withheld from UCIE or the divisional committees. He reminded members that the ad-hoc committee is an administrative committee, which was jointly appointed by the Chair of the Academic Senate and Provost Rory Hume. Its membership includes one external member (who is also co-chair of the committee), Jennie Lang from the University of New South Wales. Other members include UCI Dean Sharon Salinger and UCD Vice Provost William Lacey. The other UCIE faculty representative on the committee is Anita Guerrini (UCSB). Regarding the invitation, Co-Chair Jennie Lang will be meeting with CIE members, and the committee will meet again with Mary Kay Duggan in her capacity as a former London Study Center Director. Chair Burwick said that ad-hoc committee members can make an effort to visit some of the other divisions in order to inform and clarify the ad-hoc committee's charge.

UOEAP consultants clarified that the ad-hoc committee has issued three sets of questions as part of its review process. The first set is directed towards the study center directors; the second set is

intended for CCD members; and the third set is for UOEAP. Chair Burwick added that UOEAP has now been instructed to provide answers to its set of questions, rather than simply using them as talking points in their response to the ad-hoc committee.

ACTION: Chair Burwick accepted the Berkeley CIE resolutions. Ad-Hoc Review Committee members will meet with divisional international education committees as needed.

III. June Ad-Hoc Review Committee Meeting

ISSUE: Chair Burwick asked for two volunteers to attend the next ad-hoc review committee meeting on June 2nd. He also asked for nominations of former study center directors with recent experience and wide geographic representation, who could attend the June 2nd meeting.

ACTION: Members selected Chip Leshner and Val Rust to attend the ad-hoc review committee meeting. On the second request, members nominated Mary Kay Duggan (London), Ian Coulter (Australia), Cara Strom (Lund), Bob Goldman (India), and Arnie Bauer (Chile).

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the February 23, 2006 Meeting Minutes

ACTION: The minutes from the February 23, 2006 meeting were approved with minor revisions.

V. EAP Director's Report

ISSUE/REPORT: UCEAP Director John Marcum provided a brief report on EAP activities, as well as universitywide actions relating to EAP.

Budget/Enrollment

He said that Provost Rory Hume has given his approval allowing EAP to run a deficit this year, thereby not making any program cuts this year. In the meantime, EAP is working with UCOP administrators to develop a new budget formula that will sustain it over the long term. Director Marcum envisions four elements in such a formula: (1) Funding for participation rather than full year full time equivalents (FTE) count; (2) appropriation of some portion of the educational fee to EAP; (3) one-time funding of the EAP automation project, which will facilitate and increase the efficiency of the communication between UOEAP, campus offices, and EAP study centers and offices abroad; and (4) funding for campus support. Director Marcum also asked members to consider EAP's current pricing structure. He noted that EAP is restricted in the amount it can charge for any given program, which makes it very difficult to offer expensive programs and compete with more market-based programs offered by UC campuses and other institutions. He raised the possibility of instituting some mechanism by which EAP could charge more for certain programs, thereby making them more competitive.

Not surprisingly, the shift to single term enrollment has continued. In general, enrollment in Asia and Latin America is growing; participation in European programs, particularly year-long programs, has declined. For the long term, Director Marcum believes that academic integration

is critical. He also emphasized the important role that the campus offices play in the recruitment, selection, and preparation of the students. As noted above, these activities must be financed.

Travel Warning Committee

Director Marcum reminded members of the Israel and the Philippines program suspensions, and he reported that an ad-hoc committee has been convened to reconsider this policy. This committee has met three times and has outlined two options for EAP in this area. First, EAP could continue to recognize travel warnings as the basis for program suspension decisions, but approach the independent participation of students differently by removing certain obstacles to participation and/or provide students with more information on independent study opportunities. Another element associated with this first option is the fact that students must ‘withdraw’ from UC. Such terminology creates the impression that students will have trouble re-entering UC after their participation in such an independent program ends (even though this does not happen in practice). Therefore, there has been some discussion towards changing the language from ‘withdraw’ to ‘going on leave’. The other option available to EAP is the establishment of a committee to regularly assess the safety and risk for particular programs, and maintain ongoing monitoring of these conditions and the levels of risk in those countries. He added, however, that legal counsel has informed EAP that waivers will not hold up in court.

Study Center Task Force

The Study Center Task Force is entering a new phase. Consultant Bruce Madewell announced that faculty representatives will soon be appointed to this committee. He reminded members that this committee will address human resources type issues associated with study center directors and liaison officers in the field. Such issues include recruitment, selection, orientation, retention, evaluation, compensation, and spousal issues. Membership of this committee includes three faculty representatives, one UCIE representative (David Pion-Berlin), one Regional Director, the UOEAP Human Resources Director, as well as UOEAP Associate Dean Bruce Madewell.

New Developments

Director Marcum announced that a representative from the CCD has been invited to join the weekly UCEAP Management Council meetings (Michael Connell from UCSB). He also reported that the London California House is officially opening soon. There is a trust associated with the California House, which will help raise funds for scholarships and student activities. EAP has also received approval to use Casa de California in Mexico for the first two weeks of a comparative perspectives program. Provost Hume is reconsidering utilizing the Casa de California for EAP programs as well, which would open a number of program development opportunities. In China, EAP now has two study centers at Beijing and Fudan in Shanghai. The Joint Studies Program (JPIS) is being moved to Fudan. Another office (joint office with the UC Office of International Activities) will be opening at the Knowledge and Innovation Center, which is near Fudan. This site will have excellent facilities for conferences, faculty use, and outreach.

DISCUSSION: One member made a motion to set an EAP enrollment goal of 12,000 students by 2012. Members held a brief discussion on the viability of such a proposal. UOEAP consultants explained that currently EAP sends about 4,000 students abroad each year. They believe that a similar number of UC students are going abroad on non-EAP programs.

Therefore, about 10% of the UC undergraduate population studies abroad (by the time students graduate). They also noted that there are many third-party providers, but they lack the kind of Academic Senate oversight that EAP enjoys. Assuming budgetary commitment, there are quick ways to grow by modeling new EAP programs on these types of programs (where costs are already well-known). Chair Burwick noted that while the ad-hoc review committee is advocating growth, its members have not attached any numbers to such growth. Members pointed out that in the past seven or eight years, EAP has more than doubled, but it has been constrained over the past couple of due to the enrollment cap. Overall, members appreciated the positive nature of the motion, and they agreed that it gives UCEAP a strong mandate.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously (eight in favor, one abstention) of the following optative resolution: “UCIE strongly urges EAP to set a goal of enrolling 12,000 students by 2012.”

VI. Proposal for ‘In Association With’ Degrees

ISSUE/REPORT: Director Marcum stated that ‘in association with’ degrees would formally recognize reciprocity study at UC on the diplomas of reciprocity students. He clarified that these degrees would not be joint degrees. Rather, it would be recognition of significant study at UC. He added that such ‘in association’ degrees would also be useful as a recruitment tool for reciprocity students.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the notion of a ‘substantial’ amount of study at UC. Some members felt that one year’s study at UC should be specified as the minimum amount of time necessary to earn an ‘in association with’ degree. To that end, one member made a friendly amendment to the proposal, specifying one year as the minimum amount of study required at UC to earn an ‘in association with’ degree. However, the friendly amendment failed.

ACTION: UCIE unanimously endorsed (8 in favor, 1 abstention) the proposal for ‘in association with’ degrees between UC and EAP host institutions for students who study at UC for a substantial amount of time.

VII. Proposal to Streamline Immersion Programming at EAP Centers in Italy

ISSUE: Chair Burwick explained that this item proposes to eliminate the Trento fall semester program. UOEAP consultants clarified that Trento has not worked out well for EAP. For example, the on-site language training is poor, which means that EAP must import the language instructors from Padova. Also, although Trento’s social sciences courses are strong, nearly all of the courses offered at Trento can be duplicated at Padova. The Italy immersion programs study center director, Margaret Brose, who administers the Padova program, also supports this proposal. This proposal would close the Trento center in December 2006, and send the next group of semester students to Padova starting in January 2007. Any year-long Trento students would be transferred to Padova as well.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously to approve the streamlining proposal, which eliminates the Trento program by December 2006.

VIII. Italy Study Center Director for “Self-Construct” Programs

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Burwick explained that this action item concerns the joint letter from Margaret Brose and Aldo Antonelli, which argues for the reinstatement of a study center director for the Rome and Siena self-construct programs. The letter also advises against using ACCENT as a provider in Rome. They claim that it is simply too expensive, and the services that it provides are inadequate. He also noted that this letter supersedes the former letter from Antonio, which laid out draconian measures in order to save the Rome program.

DISCUSSION: UOEAP consultants clarified that the decision not to use a Rome study center director was made under the pressure of the budget crisis last fall. In addition, there were not any candidates available for the position either. Currently, 100 students are enrolled in the Rome program per year (fall and spring programs). They added that this will continue to be an expensive program, making it impossible to manage this program at the marginal cost of instruction. There are three components to the high cost of this program: the study center directorship, ACCENT, and rental class room space. At the same time, there is strong faculty support for this program. With regard to budget issues, consultants reminded members of the recent program consolidations that have been made in Italy. EAP has closed Brea and has moved to the Fine Arts Academy at Bologna. There is also a good chance that the architecture program at Ferrara will be closed as well.

Members commented on the difficulty in attracting viable study center director candidates for Italy. They noted that there is a question of equity between the Italy study center directors and those study center directors in other countries/programs, which often do not enroll as many students as the Italy programs do. Consultants mentioned that Italian laws and regulations add another layer of complexity to the tasks of Italian study center directors as well.

Members also discussed EAP's future relationship with ACCENT at the Rome site. Director Marcum commented that using ACCENT is not a foregone conclusion. EAP contracts with ACCENT on a year-to-year basis, and they must make a competitive bid to run the program. Bids from both Aldo Antonelli and ACCENT will be entertained. Some members compared the Rome program with other programs, and wondered if it would not be possible for EAP to handle the logistics on its own. Consultants pointed out that a main difference between the Rome program and other programs (including those in France and Japan) is the relationship with a host institution. In Rome, there is simply not a host institution that EAP can partner with. This has two implications: (1) EAP must manage (and pay for) all logistics on its own (or hire a provider like ACCENT to do so); and (2) EAP cannot reduce costs through one-to-one exchanges.

Above all, members agreed that maintaining a study center director at Rome is critical. They urged UOEAP to cut costs whenever possible, but not the study center directorship.

ACTION: UCIE members unanimously endorsed the maintenance of a Rome study center directorship and instructed UOEAP to launch a new search. UOEAP will provide an update on the Rome program (especially with regards to costs) at the fall UCIE meeting.

IX. Program Development Proposals

A. Fall Joint Semester Program at International Christian University (ICU), Tokyo, Japan

ISSUE: UOEAP Consultant Linda York briefed the committee on the new ICU program proposal. She noted that ICU, one of EAP's long-time partners, is one of Japan's most international universities and has a substantial curriculum in English. This program would provide both an historical and cultural context for understanding contemporary Japan. The program would have one core course, which would be co-taught by an ICU professor and a UC professor. The rest of the curriculum would be drawn from courses already offered by ICU. Therefore, the costs for the new program are quite minimal, requiring EAP to only pay for the core course. ICU has also committed funding for a UC professor to co-teach the core course (if the study center director is unable to do so). Japanese language is optional for students, although some students (those with less than a quarter of Japanese language instruction) would need to take a remedial Japanese language course. Concerning reciprocity, ICU maintains that it has not yet reached its saturation point in terms of sending reciprocity students to UC.

ACTION: UCIE members voted unanimously to approve the fall joint semester program with ICU.

B. Revised Academic Program and New Host University Linkage at Hanoi University of Foreign Students (HUFS), Hanoi, Vietnam

ISSUE: This is a proposal for a hybrid UC construct program with a new host university in which EAP would retain its core courses, but have access to a number of courses (in English) offered through HUFS. This allows UC students to take courses in English alongside Vietnamese students. UOEAP Consultant Linda York added that HUFS has a strong program in business, and it is developing an international studies program.

ACTION: UCIE members voted unanimously to approve the revised academic program and New Host University Linkage at HUFS.

X. Formal Review Committee Response Reports, 2005-06

A. France

ISSUE: Members reviewed the UCIE subcommittee response to the formal review committee's report on the France programs.

DISCUSSION: Subcommittee members identified a number of issues. The first of these is enrollment, with the formal review report showing decreasing enrollments. However, statistics obtained from UOEAP showed increasing enrollments. UOEAP consultants explained that the formal review committee was referring to enrollment in year-long immersion programs, which are decreasing if the enrollment numbers for the 2006-07 academic year are included. Members noted that there is not a clear downward trajectory, especially if one considers the enrollment numbers for 2006-07 as an outlier.

The formal review report examined a number of the Paris programs, including the Critical Studies program and the various programs at the 'Institutes d'Etudes Politiques' (IEP's). The AUP and UC Center (Accent) programs were reviewed last year. Regarding the Critical Studies program, subcommittee members agreed that the program should be retained; a pre-ILP program

should be established; and a fall semester option should be investigated. The response subcommittee also felt that the academic quality of the program is high. While they thought that it would be possible to put a non-CIEE program together, they did not think that it would necessarily reduce costs. Overall, members agreed that the Critical Studies program is a good example of an excellent hybrid program that is flexible—giving students the best aspects of both the American and French educational systems. The programs at the IEP's (especially Sciences Po Paris) represent the better institutions in the French educational system. The subcommittee wondered if semester immersion options might be a possibility, and they argued that it would be best if EAP had a good mix of year-long and semester-long offerings. UOEAP consultants said that they will work with UCIE to investigate such options.

Finally, members commented that study center directorships should be retained for all sites in France. They also identified graduate studies as one area that needs to be further developed. They noted that although study center directors have praised the intensive language programs (ILP's), they have been getting shorter every year due to various calendar changes at the host institutions.

ACTION: Members unanimously accepted and endorsed the response subcommittee's report and its recommendations.

B. Concepción (Chile) Language and Culture Program

ISSUE: Members reviewed and endorsed the UCIE subcommittee response to the formal review committee's report on the Concepción language and culture program. They highlighted some of the review committee's key recommendations: (1) the development of a new 12-unit course focused on language acquisition that would replace the existing language modules; (2) sending UC faculty to Concepción; (3) workshop on pedagogy; and (4) the addition of a new course that looks at Spanish in the world. They also encouraged UCEAP to explore new ways to involve Chileans on cultural trips and excursions. Volunteer opportunities should also be promoted to UC students, and UC credit for such service should be facilitated.

DISCUSSION: One member (who was also a member of the formal review committee) noted that even though students were put into two groups (one with less Spanish and one with more Spanish), some students' actual conversational language skills did not entirely correspond to their respective groups. Subsequent investigation revealed that the placement test was inadequate in that there was only a listening portion, but nothing devoted to reading comprehension or oral interview components. Therefore, part of the proposal is to change the placement test. UOEAP consultants confirmed that this change would only apply to Concepción program and not other programs in Spanish-speaking countries.

ACTION: Members unanimously endorsed the subcommittee response to the formal review report.

C. Pembroke and Sussex Summer Programs

ISSUE: The UCIE response subcommittee identified the following key issues. First, at Sussex too many units were being offered for an insufficient number of contact hours. Particularly, six

quarter units are being offered for 16 contact hours. Second, grade inflation could be a problem (70% of students get A's during the summer; 51% of the students get A's during the year).

DISCUSSION: Members reminded each other about the proposed solution to these problems from the current Study Center Director, Gayle Binion. She suggests two four-unit classes with one well-supervised independent study (also worth four units). One member argued that it is almost impossible to teach students how to successfully navigate the British tutorial system that relies on independent study in only one semester. Instead, it is far better to institute a more American style academic system that utilizes day-to-day assignments, etc.

UOEAP consultants clarified that the British academic system is based on outcomes and the mastery of the material regardless of the amount of contact time. Given that the Sussex courses go through the same faculty formal review process that govern all UC courses, UCEAP must trust its Sussex partner to accurately quantify the Sussex courses in terms of contact hours. They summarized that the solution proposed by the study center director is not really feasible (specifically adding a four unit independent study). The Sussex faculty already have a high teaching load, with EAP students constituting about 50% of their summer teaching. Therefore, asking them to increase their workload by adding an independent study for 240 EAP students is not really tenable, and it would damage the UCEAP/Sussex relationship (it would also increase the costs of the program). At best, UCEAP could ask Sussex to do an independent study in place of one of the courses, but not in addition to the already existing courses. There are also other drawbacks to these recommendations. One issue is the total amount of academic units that students would receive for their study. If UCIE decided to only value these courses at four units each, that would result in students only receiving eight units of instruction. Another issue is the fact that only 1/3 of the courses offered at Sussex during the summer have 16 contact hours. The other courses have more contact time. Therefore, if UCIE changes the unit requirements for 1/3 of the courses, this impacts all of the courses. They added that it is also somewhat disingenuous to compare the Sussex and Pembroke programs. The Pembroke program was specifically designed in response to UCEAP needs, with the imposition of the American system of contact hours on the Cambridge faculty. Finally, they noted an apparent contradiction in the recommendations of the study center director. On the one hand, she advocates adopting the British system at Pembroke, but at the same time suggests aligning Sussex on a UC model.

One member of the site visit team noted that she was very impressed with the courses at Sussex. She reported that the courses were very rigorous, with no more than 12 students per class. The site visit team felt very strongly that each of these courses were indeed worth six units of academic credit. She added that the program at Pembroke is more like UC than Sussex. Regarding the quality of the faculty teaching in both programs, she commented that they are fairly homogeneous in the sense that the faculty for both summer programs are drawn from a large regional area and the same or similar pool. While the Pembroke summer program is located at Cambridge, most faculty teaching in that program are not regular Cambridge faculty members. Members also discussed the differences between the Sussex semester/year and summer programs, and they concluded that in general there is a willingness on the part of British universities to attract American students during the summer. UCEAP consultants added that courses in both the summer and year programs are vetted through the same faculty review process.

Grade inflation is another problem. Some members wondered if part of the problem could be attributed to British assumptions of UC expectations. UCEAP consultants explained that even though the study center director is the instructor of record, British professors assign scores, which are then directly translated into UC letter grades. Some members thought that it may be necessary to adjust some of the scores in cases of grade inflation. Consultants also noted apparent differences between the types of students who participate in the Sussex summer and semester/year programs. The summer students are typically third- and fourth-year students taking general education (GE) courses, while focusing on one course at a time. Therefore, one would expect them to do well. On the other hand, Sussex semester students are taking five to six upper-division courses in their respective majors.

ACTION: The subcommittee will amend their response, reflecting the discussion above. Members scheduled an e-vote (via email) after July 1, 2006, once a revised response report is completed and distributed among the members.

XI. Formal Review Committee Appointments, 2006-07

A. Brazil

ISSUE: Members nominated faculty members who might be able to serve on the Brazil formal review committee for 2006-07.

ACTION: Members nominated the following faculty members: Ray Williams (UCR), Tom Holloway (UCD), Scott Desposato (UCSD), Candace Slater (UCB), Stanley Brandeis (UCB), Thomas Csordas (UCSD), Nancy Scheper-Hughes (UCB), Peter Evans (UCB), Estelle Tarcia (UCB), and Natalia Brizuela (UCB)

B. Canada

ISSUE: Members nominated faculty members who might be able to serve on the Canada formal review committee for 2006-07.

ACTION: Members nominated the following faculty members: Bill Chandler (UCD), Sarah Cline (UCSB), Nelson Graburn (UCB), Elizabeth MacDonald (UCB), and Betty Davies (UCSF).

C. Germany

ISSUE: Members nominated faculty members who might be able to serve on the Germany formal review committee for 2006-07.

ACTION: Members nominated the following faculty members: Bill Hagen (UCD), Jocelyn Holland (UCSB), Hans Wagener (UCLA), Robert Moeller (UCI), Harold Marcuse (UCSB), Eckhart Meiburg (UCSB), Elaine Tennant (UCB), Nicklaus Laugier (UCB), Tom Shannon (UCB), and Kathleen James-Chakraborty (UCB).

D. Thailand

ISSUE: Members nominated faculty members who might be able to serve on the Thailand formal review committee for 2006-07.

ACTION: Members nominated the following faculty members: Bill Chancellor (UCD), Soichi Iwasaki (UCLA), Khatharya Um (UCB), Bonnie Wade (UCB), Susan Kepner (UCB), and Jeff Romm (UCB).

XII. Executive Session

Members did not hold an executive session.

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

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