University of California Education Abroad Program Governing Committee Meeting
Meeting Notes
June 7, 2011

UCEAP Governing Committee Participants
Chair: Provost Lawrence Pitts
Members: Lynn Anderson, Peter Cheung, Pradeep Chhibber, Glyn Davies, Daniel Greenstein, William Ladusaw, Errol Lobo, David Lopez, Jean-Xavier Guinard, John Haviland, David Marshall, David Pan, Cynthia Skenazi and Pat Turner.
Committee Analyst: Andrea Delap
Absent: Gretchen Bolar and Olga Kagan
Also in attendance for portions of the meeting: Dennis Dent (UCEAP Budget and Finance Director) Michael Clune (Director, UCOP Budget and Capital Resources)

1. Introduction & Updates from UC Provost and UC Governing Committee Chair – Provost Lawrence Pitts

Provost Pitts opened the meeting noting that the major development since the UCEAP GC last met was the signing of the UCOP:UCSB Memorandum of Understanding. The MoU, signed in May by President Yudof and Chancellor Yang, outlines the new administrative partnership between UCEAP and UCSB. The MoU will take effect July 1, 2011.

Provost Pitts briefed the UCEAP Governing Committee (GC) on the current UC budget environment and the potential impact on UCEAP in the coming months.

The Provost outlined the University's challenge in dealing with cuts to state funding while also being given specific direction on the funding of certain programming. At this time there is no further information on an "all cuts budget". An "all cuts budget" would mean an additional $500 million cut to UC. At the last Regents meeting, UC administrators advised that any additional cuts would have to be covered by student fees. Measures to cover additional cuts with student fees could be implemented as early as January 2012. If there are no additional cuts to UC's budget, over and above the $500M currently planned, it was noted that there will be no increase in student fees.

The Provost reported that there is no anticipated impact on the UCEAP budget. As UCEAP continues to move to a completely self-supporting budget model, the reductions in general funds to zero in 2013-14 are already planned. The Provost noted that the decision to move UCEAP to a student fee-based model, and transition as aggressively as occurred, had been painful for many in the University but he felt it was necessary. However, it has caused problems particularly regarding resources to support UCEAP on the campuses. The topic of campus funding of UCEAP was discussed later in the meeting.

Provost Pitts stated that UCOP is not anticipating we will ever take a profit from UCEAP. Therefore, even if there are additional cuts to UC, they shouldn't affect UCEAP directly.

2. Approval of Minutes

Decision: Minutes from the March 9, 2011 UCEAP Governing Committee meeting were approved by the Committee.

Action: If any member has any additional changes they should submit them to Committee Analyst Andrea Delap.

3. Report from UCEAP - Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director Guinard

Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director Guinard reported that UCEAP is having an excellent year and that is primarily due to UCEAP's new budget model and as well thanks to former UCEAP Executive Director, Michael Cowan, and the staff at UCEAP. AVP&ED Guinard went on to highlight key achievements since the last UCEAP Governing Committee meeting.

- 2010-11 Enrollments

4,834 UC students participated in UCEAP in 2010-11, up 5% from the previous year. 1,717 reciprocity students attended a UC campus for up to a year of non-degree study. Enrollment projections for next year vary by campus, with some currently showing stable enrollments, others going up or down. AVP&ED Guinard noted there are a number of reasons for the declining projections on some campuses. He highlighted the overall UC budget and the effect of increased student fees on students' plans to graduate more rapidly as one possible reason for a decline in certain campuses' enrollment. He also suggested the reorganization or downsizing of some the of campus offices providing UCEAP support to students has had an impact. He advised the UCEAP GC that this trend is concerning for him and that the issue of campus funding to support UCEAP is a priority and will be addressed later in this meeting.

- Budget Model

With the new budget model UCEAP retains all student fees (Tuition, Student Service fees and UCEAP Specific fees) excluding campus specific fees. The new model ties UCEAP's budget closely to student fees. When fees rise, UCEAP retains the fee increase (net of RTA). If EAP enrollment increases, UCEAP retains the fee revenue (net of RTA).

UCEAP is on target to receive no General Funds beginning 2013-14 and will retain Opportunity Funds ($1.1M); to be replaced by a systemwide assessment. UCEAP distributes to campuses RTA (on all fees), campus-based fees, nonresident tuition and professional fees, etc. Campus funding for UCEAP is included in the new funding streams to the campuses; it is not earmarked. And there is where UCEAP's main challenge for the future resides.

- Budget 2010-11

AVP&ED Guinard reported that in 2010-11 UCEAP cured its cumulative operating deficit of $900K. UCEAP student fee income grew 5.3% more than budget (net of RTA & after Regental Fee Increases). UCEAP Student FTE enrollment grew 2.7%, while student participation enrollment grew 5.8% and summer enrollment grew 16.4%. UCEAP will pay $8.7M in RTA to the campuses. UCEAP also reported a modest budget beat on expenses overall (1.4% under budget).

UCEAP home office expenses were under budget 10% overall for the year. All major line items (excl. benefits) were under budget. AVP&ED reported that these results provide UCEAP with the ability to fully fund budgeted allotment of its contingency reserve for this fiscal year. The results also provide UCEAP with the ability to cover other contingencies including new obligations to OP under funding streams model, new obligations to UCSB for administrative support, foreign currency exposures (i.e. weak U.S. Dollar) and funding for strategic plan initiatives.

- UCSB: UCOP Memorandum of Understanding

The MoU outlining the new administrative partnership between UCEAP and UC Santa Barbara was signed at the COC/COVC meeting in May of 2011 by President Yudof and Chancellor Yang. AVP&ED Guinard outlined the key elements of the MoU; UCEAP will remain a systemwide program, a firewall has been created between UCEAP and UCSB budgets and it is anticipate that the new administrative arrangement will provide opportunities for administrative efficiencies, new programming, and study abroad advocacy. The MoU takes effect on July 1, 2011.

Provost Pitts asked if any pitfalls had emerged or if it is a convenient and comfortable administrative arrangement. AVP&ED Guinard replied that it is a convenient and comfortable arrangement and added that Human Resources is the area where most benefits can be realized. He urged the UCEAP GC members to do all they can to make it clear, across the system, that UCEAP is a UC systemwide program and to help manage any perceptions to the contrary.

The Provost repeated Guinard's request and reminded the UCEAP GC that there are other systemwide programs such as UC Sacramento Center that receive business support from a campus but are still systemwide programs.

- UCEAP Annual Conference

After a hiatus due to budget, UCEAP resumes it Annual Conference June 13th-15th, 2011 at UC Santa Barbara. Over 120 participants from across the system have registered. The Conference will focus on the presentation of the new strategic plan, discussion of collaborations between UCEAP and UC Campuses and preparation for UCEAP's 50th Anniversary.

- Human Resources Update

UCEAP created a Marketing & Communications unit and hired its director – Emilia Doerr, in May 2011. Guinard also reported that UCEAP is currently recruiting for the UCSB Faculty (Advisor)-in- Residence position. It will be 50% administrative appointment – 1-3 years starting September 1, 2011. The main focus of the position will be academic oversight and academic integration. Guinard advised the UCEAP GC that the new Study Center Directors have been selected and oriented for France, Spain, Mexico, Chile & Argentina, and Egypt & Middle East. The start date for these positions is July 1, 2011. He noted that given the new Academic Oversight model recommendations that have been presented to UCIE, these could very well be the last traditional SCDs in the field.

- UCEAP Program Update

AVP&ED Guinard provided the following program updates;

o   Resumption of programs in Japan (with all partners except those affected by the Department of State Travel Alert)
o   Resumption of program in Egypt (with restrictions on student housing and travel)
o   Status quo in Mexico
o   Restructuring of programs in India (ad hoc review by Prof. Juan Campo, UCSB)
o   Programming in Vietnam to be paused for 2012 (restructuring)

▪ Reciprocity

AVP&ED Guinard reported that, as requested by the Provost at the last meeting of the UCEAP GC, he is working on providing additional information regarding reciprocity. However, he realized that this will take a more extensive program by program analysis and proposed that the report be submitted in the fall or winter of 2011-12.

Provost Pitts agreed that a full analysis is necessary but asked that the report be produced no later than next winter.

Action: AVP&ED Guinard will submit a Reciprocity Report to Provost Pitts and the UCEAP GC by the winter UCEAP GC meeting. Reciprocity will be added to the agenda of the winter meeting.
Action: UCEAP GC members should focus on reciprocity. The Committee needs to be able to make recommendations back to the campuses (from the Provost to EVCs) about the reciprocity model.

▪ International Student Recruitment

AVP&ED Guinard participated in the Nonresident Recruitment Strategies and Related Efficiencies Work Group. He highlighted the section of the Work Group's report that related specifically to UCEAP.
I. Recommendations for Nonresident Recruitment (Domestic and International)
A. Coordinated Student Recruitment
4) International Recruitment Assistance. Utilize the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) offices in 35 countries as hubs for information, recruitment, applicant retention and cultivation of UC brand; train and equip UC faculty and staff in residence, visiting UC faculty, UCEAP students, and reciprocity student alumni with systemwide materials.

He stressed that UCEAP's role in this effort is one of facilitation. UCEAP is eager to assist the campuses with their recruitment efforts but is not interested in becoming a recruitment agency.

▪ UCIE

Guinard reported that it has been a pleasure working with UCIE and its chair, Professor John Haviland. He noted the most significant matter for UCEAP was the lifting of the UCIE imposed ban on UCEAP program development. Other key items outlined were; program reviews for Australia, New Zealand, China and Korea, proposals for new programming, proposal for new model of academic oversight and UCIE's White Paper on Academic Integration.

▪ New strategic plan – June 2011

Guinard briefed the Committee on UCEAP's strategic planning efforts. Working with a external consultant, Steve Dewart, the plan was informed by input from the Systemwide Office, study centers, the Council of Campus Directors (CCD), the Council of

Administrative Directors (CAD), campus administrators, students (focus groups) and benchmarking.

The Provost thanked AVP&ED Guinard and asked for questions, concerns or additional issues from UCEPA GC members in response.

Issue: Increase in UC fees
Associate Vice Chancellor Glyn Davies asked that if UC fees are raised again this year and UCEAP budget no longer requires the gradual reduction in General Funds by 2013-14, would UCOP consider removing all General Funds more quickly?
The Provost noted that if UC fees rose dramatically as to significantly alter the current projections for UCEAP fees in its model, UCOP would consider making alterations to the General Funds planned reduction to zero by 2013-14.

If UC fees rise as to exceed the cost of a UCEAP program, can UCAEP reduce fees in some areas to provide less expensive program options?
AVP&ED Guinard noted that at this time UCEAP does not have the authority to reduce fees below the UC standard amounts. However, if the scenario outlined arose, it is certainly an option he would bring to the UCEAP GC for discussion.

Committee members cautioned that UCEAP should be very careful not to dissipate any surplus as there will be expenses, know and unknown, that have to be covered.

Guinard noted that UCEAP was looking at ways to alleviate the consequences of increasing UC fees for UCEAP students including the introduction of a development effort at UCEAP and the creation of a strong scholarship program.
The Provost advised Guinard that UCEAP can modify the student aid package from year to year (or the aid it determines it can provide to the student pool). He added that UCEAP will not want to modify the funding model in a way that might not work in future years or cover the expenses of future years. As an example the Provost noted that if UC fees covered the costs of UCEAP programs it would be possible and beneficial to reduce the Program Option Fees (POFs). However the Provost opined that if this is not the case, then students choosing to go on higher cost programs should bear the costs of those programs.

Guinard agreed that UCEAP needs to exercise caution regarding it funding model noting two major variables that can affect the budget; any reduction in student enrollment and the devaluation of the US dollar.

The Provost named Non-Resident Student fees as an example of where UC campuses alter their student aid package based on an annual base. The Provost advised that UCEAP can choose annually to use it student fee resources to support the program as it sees fit, after expenses are covered and the contingency reserve is funded. UCEAP can determine that some of those funds can be used to support a scholarship package that would help the attractiveness of the program and reduce costs to students.

4. UCIE Report

Professor Haviland reported on UCIE activity for the year. He focused on two topics 1) the UCEAP Program Reviews and 2) UCIE Academic Integration Report.

1. Program Reviews

Professor Haviland outlined five key areas that will be addressed in a formal proposal on UCEAP Program Reviews that will be disseminated by UCIE shortly.

- Make up of Committee
- Preparation of materials/data for review
- Areas to be covered in review
- Site visits, in some form, should be default expectation
- Follow up on review recommendations

Issue: Schedule of reviews

Dean Anderson noted that the standard in the field is to review programs every five years. She added that sitting in on classes is often part of the review but noted that this could be difficult in host institutions. Dean Marshall suggested that particularly as UCEAP is moving away from have UC SCDs on site, it is necessary to have thorough multi level reviews looking at various aspects of the program over 10, 5 and 3 years. He also cautioned about the effectiveness of using UC faculty on sabbatical for the site visits.

The Provost agreed that as UCEAP moves away from the SCD model, program reviews can be very useful. However, when he compares to other types of reviews and the cost versus functionality/usefulness arguments that always arise, he voiced concern about how best to get the necessary information most efficiently.

Professor Lopez noted that most of the issues that arise in programs are dealt with by internal UCEAP mechanisms and reviews. AVP&D Guinard agreed noted that UCEAP has many internal controls to review the quality of programs.

Dean Marshall advised that any new process for reviews needs to be a smart system, suggesting that it wouldn't make sense to do blanket reviews.

Issue: Review of Student Health and Safety Issues

Professor Lobo advised that the reviews should not skimp on the student health and safety aspects.

AVP&ED Guinard advised that the reviews in questions were academic reviews and that UCEAP has many controls in place to review student health safety and security outside of the UCIE reviews including personnel and other mechanisms at UCEAP, UCOP, iJet etc. The Provost added that this aspect of UCEAP's programming is extraordinarily well covered and that the faculty wouldn't be able to add to this in the academic reviews.

Action: AVP&ED Guinard and UCIE Chair will review the report from UCIE and make recommendations to the Provost regarding providing quality reviews at an affordable cost.

Action: UCIE Program Reviews will be added to the next UCEAP GC meeting agenda.

Provost Pitts also suggested that UCIE might consider a standing sub-committee on Program Reviews to give greater functionality.

2. UCIE Academic Integration Report

Professor Haviland drew the Committee's attention to the UCIE Academic Integration White Paper that had been submitted to the Governing Committee and highlighted the four major recommendations made to the Senate:
 1. Administrative support to UCEAP and campus education abroad offices to support AI efforts and internationalization.
2. Although a database of programs abroad and individual courses can be useful, nothing can guarantee that particular courses will continue to exist etc. The creation and maintenance of such a database should be given appropriate priority.
3. Approval and formal review of EAP programs and the partner institutions.
4. Faculty promotion of study abroad and departments taking a proactive role in achieving academic integration.

Issue: Support for Academic Integration (AI)
Dean Anderson agreed that there needs to be support of AI in study abroad from faculty, including at the very highest levels at UC, she also stressed that AI needs focus and resources on every campus.
The Provost agreed, noting that continued campus support is critical to the continued success of UCEAP and other study abroad programs.

Professor Haviland explored the idea of having a UCEAP liaison in each department. This would be someone in the department who was identified as having an interest in internationalization and could be a point person for UCEAP and study abroad in general.

Action: The Provost will send the UCIE AI report to the COVC, with cover notes, to emphasize the need for support of study abroad programs. He agreed with Dean Anderson that these programs need support at the very highest levels, noting that it is a serious issue that needs to gain traction.

Action: Provost Pitts asked Governing Committee members to have local meetings with their own Chancellors/EVCs to discuss the issues of study abroad on their own campuses.

Action: If Committee members have additional input on the AI White Paper they should send to it Professor Haviland, Provost Pitts or AVP&ED Guinard.

5. Report from UCEAP GC Finance Sub-Committee

Chair of the UCEAP GC Finance Sub-Committee, Professor Lopez, reported a good meeting of the sub-committee had taken place in May and advised GC members that detailed notes had been distributed to them with this agenda.

Professor Lopez advised of the dangers of committing any UCEAP surplus at this time. He advised that there are many challenges facing UCEAP that will need to be covered using these funds.

Professor Lopez noted that the primary topic of conversation at the sub-committee meeting has been funding for support of UCEAP at campuses and proceeded to outline the main issues discussed. He noted there was frank conversation about the 4.48M in General Funds returned from UCEAP to the campuses. The sub-committee was sympathetic with the idea that funds be used as leverage to gain support for UCEAP on the campuses. However, it was generally felt that these funds had been permanently

reallocated to the campuses and there was no leverage left. As an alternative the sub-committee strongly supports finding other methods of creating financial and moral incentives to generate support for UCEAP on the campuses.

6. Campus Funding

AVP&ED Guinard outlined the three key topics from his perspective as related to campus funding in support of UCEAP.
1. Future of the 4.48M in the Funding Streams model
2. Possible new ways to redistribute the 4.48M to more adequately reflect campus UCEAP enrollment
3. Future financial incentives

Director Michael Clune, UCOP Budget and Capital Resources, told the Committee that the 4.48M was redistributed to the campuses in 2008-09, as part of their permanent allocation, with no restrictions. He also noted that at the moment there are no plans to revisit the way the funds are distributed..

Action: The Provost will convene a small sub-committee to think about this issue and specifically how to create a pool of funds that could be controlled and used as incentive for support of UCEAP. The Provost will then distribute the findings of this group to the UCEAP GC for discussion.

Action: The Provost will bring the item of campus funding to support UCEAP to the COVC in the fall with AVP&ED Guinard and Director Clune.

7. UCEAP Strategic Plan

AVP&ED Guinard outlined the process of the strategic planning initiative to date and went through the list of prioritized projects and tasks as they fall under the three components of UCEAP's vision statement; study abroad for all, academic excellence and best business practices.

Study Aboard for all
1. New Program Development
2. Marketing
3. Scholarships
4. Alumni Engagement and Development

Academic Excellence
5. Academic Oversight
6. Academic Integration
7. 50th Anniversary

Best Business Practices
8. Fine Tuning UCEAP's Business Model
9. Student Management
10. Study Center Management

The Provost stated that he was delighted to see UCEAP focus on areas that he would consider priorities for UCEAP at this time and very supportive of the initiative.

Vice Provost Turner asked about the Scholarship Program and funding for it, specifically asking if development funds would be used for merit based scholarships. Committee Analyst Delap, explained that she is leading the scholarships project at UCEAP. At the moment, as UCEAP is only in early stages of establishing a development campaign, the scholarships will, for the most part, be directly funded by UCEAP.

The Provost noted that UCEAP funding scholarships, whether merit or financial need based, is very much in line with campus practices.

Professor Chhibber noted that UCEAP will need to proceed carefully with a development campaign. AVP&ED Guinard agreed that UCEAP will be proceeding in cooperation with the campuses.

8. UCEAP Membership

The Provost has asked Vice Provost Turner to chair the 2011-12 UCEAP Governing Committee. Vice Provost Turner, and the UC Davis Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor, have agreed to the appointment.

The Provost will continue to participate in the UCEAP GC but needs the GC to be put on a solid trajectory for the future.

Action: Provost Pitts will work with Senate to determine the Senate membership on the UCEAP Governing Committee for 2011-12.

Action: The Provost will review the membership and determine a rolling three year membership for administrative appointments and make any new appointments necessary.