The Committee on International Education (CIE) met three times so far: on October 9, 2007; on December 5, 2007; and on January 24, 2008. A fourth and final meeting for the year will take place later this month. These meetings are scheduled around the quarterly meetings of the system-wide Committee on International Education (UCIE), which are attended by the CIE chair (me), who then reports back to our committee about main developments. CIE has been unusually busy this year, for several reasons. Most significantly, we were asked to comment on a substantive report by the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education, including the controversial "Kissler Report" attached to it, in which major changes to the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP) were proposed. (Our committee's official response to this report is attached; so is a relevant recent letter by Michael O'Connell, the Interim Director of EAP.) In addition, several other developments affecting international education caught our attention, including: the creation of new administrative committees for international developments, both at UCR and system-wide; the search for a Vice Provost for International Affairs at UCR; and changes affecting UCR's International Education Center. In what follows, I will say more in each connection, in particular about ways in which these developments have raised noteworthy worried for us.

The UC International Education Program is undergoing far-reaching changes, mostly driven by financial considerations. For several reasons, EAP accumulated a non-negligible deficit two years ago. These reasons include not only what are perceived to be inefficiencies on the side of the EAP administration, but also the following: significantly higher costs due to the low exchange rate of the dollar; and a general funding scheme for EAP that is proving to be more and more inadequate, among others because of shifts in how UC students have come to use EAP (more short term stays abroad, rather than whole year immersion programs). In addition, John Marcum, the long-term director of EAP, retired a year ago, to be replaced by Michael O'Connell as the Interim Director. Moreover, a general audit of EAP was undertaken not long ago, resulting in several reports, in particular the above mentioned Joint Ad Hoc Report, in which changes to EAP have been proposed. Until recently, the two main outcomes of these developments were: First, EAP started to streamline its operations drastically, both by cutting back on administrative costs (reducing the size of the Santa Barbara office) and by eliminating or downsizing some of its offerings to students (eliminating a few programs, cutting back on the number of study center directors, etc.). Second, fundamental changes to the funding structure of EAP began to be pursued seriously (including the one proposal by Jerry Kissler, an external consultant who also visited UCR last year). The most recent outcome, however, is that these new funding structures have been found unfeasible; and as a result, the Office of the President has decided to keep the old structure in place for now, but require EAP to reduce its budget for 2008-2009 by 15%. This is a very deep cut, deeper than for many other programs; and it will surely have a negative effect on EAP's ability to operate. (For EAP's own analysis of the situation, see the attached letter by Michael O'Connell; it paints a vivid picture of the overall impact of all the recent changes.) This cut will also affect UCR directly, as our International Education Center relied on funding from EAP to provide adequate on-campus advising.
Our committee’s main reactions to these developments were, very briefly (compare the attached official CIE response): We are pleased to see that, with the above mentioned reports, international education is taken seriously again in the UC system; we strongly reaffirm the central role of EAP in this connection; we believe that a new funding structure for EAP is called for, although we are skeptical about the ones proposed so far; and most importantly, we are worried about both EAP’s ability to keep functioning at all, given the severe financial cutbacks mentioned above, and about the ability of UCR’s International Education Center to keep fulfilling its corresponding role. Concerning the former, it should be noted that the recent changes involve cutting, or curtailing severely, actual academic programs, not just more minor services to our students. Concerning the latter, the worry is that it seems unlikely that our administration will be willing, or able financially, to provide the funding needed for the Center, i.e., to take over what will be lost due to EAP cutbacks.

Turning to other issues affecting international education at UCR: Our committee noted three additional developments that, from the point of view of the Academic Senate, should be seen as worrisome. First, both at the system-wide level and at the campus level advisory committees for international initiatives were formed without Academic Senate representation (system-wide: the International Initiative Steering Committee; on campus: the International Advisory Committee). This is worrisome, among others, because academic programs will most likely be affected by the committees’ recommendations. Second, the search for a Vice Provost for International Affairs at UCR was aborted, or at least postponed, due to general financial considerations, something that also doesn’t bode well. (As the Chair of CIE, I was involved in the interviewing of candidates for this position, on the invitation of the Chair of the Academic Senate.) Concerning the ability of UCR’s International Education Center to continue fulfilling its function properly (see above), a third issue should be mentioned. Namely, it has come to our committee’s attention that there are plans to move the Center to a different location on campus; but very low priority seems to be given to providing appropriate, not to speak of attractive, rooms for it. This is again a worrisome development for international education, since the advising provided by the Center is crucial and needs to be secured in general. We believe that the Academic Senate should urge our administration to give higher priority to this issue.

These are tough times for international education in the UC system. Our committee will, no doubt, stay busy monitoring related developments for some time to come.

E. Reck (Chair); I. Ethell; B.-L. Li; G. Xu; Y. Ye; and L. Zanello; also S. Duffy (UNEX Acting Dean); D. Elton (Director, International Education Center); C. Pratt (Interim Director, UNEX IEP); and K. Tomoff (Director, Education Abroad Program).
The Committee on International Education (CIE) has been asked to respond to the Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education, dated November 2007 (and hereafter called the Report). We discussed it at two CIE meetings: on December 5, 2007, and on January 24, 2008. (The committee found the report so important overall, and the changes faced by the Education Abroad Program so significant and potentially damaging, that we added a meeting to our usual schedule.) In giving our response, we will start with some background information.

**Background**

The Report is the outcome of a series of developments over the last 3-4 years, including: the discovery of an unexpected deficit by the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP); the subsequent audit of that program; the formation of the original Ad Hoc Committee on International Education, resulting in an initial, less widely distributed report (with little input by the Academic Senate, it seems); the expansion of the committee to the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education (with more Academic Senate participation); the financial analysis and corresponding recommendations by Jerry Kissler, an external consultant (not strictly part of the Report and not endorsed by the Joint Ad Hoc Committee, but appended for further consideration); the production of the Report itself, by the expanded committee; and the addition of a minority report by Gayle Binion, one of the committee members, in which some disagreements are expressed.

For ease of reference, the sixteen main recommendations in the Report are appended below. They fall under four general rubrics: (i) expanding student participation in study abroad programs; (ii) reorganization of EAP; (iii) funding EAP and the new “study abroad consortium”; and (iv) transitional planning. Our committee’s response is based on discussions of the Report (made available to us in mid-November), but also on additional information provided, at our request, by the UCR Faculty Campus Director, Kiril Tomoff, and by the Director of the International Education Center, Diane Elton. (The latter information includes statistics about the participation of UCR students in education abroad activities over the last few years, in comparison with other UC campuses.) Our response will focus on the Report itself. We will start with general comments, then elaborate on a few of them, and conclude with suggestions of our own.

**General Comments**

To begin with, our committee is pleased to see that, with the Report and related discussions, international education in the UC system is finally taken seriously again. We also want to express support for several general points in the Report, namely:

(1) The acknowledgment of the value of study abroad experiences for UC students; the corresponding goal to increase participation in exchange programs significantly (but see
(6) below); also the suggestion to increase the number of international students enrolled at UC campuses.  [Compare Recommendations 1., 2., 7., 15.]

(2) The attention paid to, not just EAP, but a whole menu of choices, including: exchange programs administered jointly with other universities in the US; research agreements with universities worldwide; and, at least to some degree, the use of “third-party providers” (but see (7) and (11) below).  [Recommendations 4., 6., also 9., 12., 13.]

(3) At the same time, the recognition of the crucial role EAP will, or should, continue to play for UC students (compare (10) and (12)); and consequently, the importance of finding ways of saving, and if possible strengthening, this UC program in a time of financial deficits, cutbacks, and other pressures.  [Recommendations 3., 8., 10., 15.]

(4) Moreover, the recognition of the essential role the campus offices for international education play in providing opportunities for study abroad, by providing information and advice to students, not just concerning what EAP has to offer, but also other opportunities (but compare (8) and (13)).  [Recommendations 5., 11.]

However, we also have a variety of criticisms, questions, and worries:

(5) A first criticism concerns the fact that the financial analysis by Kissler, in particular, but also the Report itself, tends to present EAP as a service program, rather than an academic program.  We think this is a serious distortion (compare (10), also (11)).  [A partial exception is Recommendation 14., which should be much more prominent.]

(6) While we welcome the plan to increase the number of UC students going abroad, we wonder whether it is realistic to double that number within five years [Recommendation 1., Kissler Report].  We are skeptical especially because there is no provision for the amount of financial support to go up accordingly.  In fact, that amount will almost certainly go down, perhaps drastically, in the near future because of the financial crunch the university is facing (see comment (15)).  With student numbers going up and financial support going down, the quality of international education must surely suffer.

(7) A big part of the growth in student numbers is supposed to be absorbed by “third-party providers”, including various non-UC organizations, often of a commercial nature, that offer study abroad programs [see the Kissler report, but also Recommendations 4.].  But we had a whole range of questions about them that should be answered, or at least investigated in a preliminary way, before relying so heavily on them (see (11), (14)).

(8) There are various tensions, or incongruities, between the Joint Ad Hoc Report and the Kissler proposal.  A particularly glaring one is that, in the Report, the essential role played by campus centers is recognized [Recommendations 2., 5.], while in the Kissler proposal no clear provisions are made for how to secure their financial support.  The hope seems to be that individual campuses will take over much of that support; but that seems overly optimistic, to say the least.  (Compare (12), (13) below, also (15).)

(9) Finally, we are surprised about the haste with which decisions are being made and implemented in this connection.  The Joint Ad Hoc Report is long and multi-faceted; its recommendations, and even more those in Kissler’s plan for financial restructuring, are far reaching; but our committee received the whole package only in mid-November.  Nevertheless, important steps in the transition plan are about to be taken or have already been taken [Recommendation 16., compare p. 15 of the Report].  Financial pressures seem to be driving a lot of the proposed changes, while their academic
implications are not thought through fully. As a consequence, there is a real danger that several of these changes will do substantial harm to an established academic program. At the very least, careful and ongoing oversight of their effects seems called for (see (14) below.)

Elaborations

(10) EAP as an academic program: Students taking part in EAP remain registered as UC students during their time abroad; they take classes at host universities for which they receive credits towards their UC degrees; also, currently sustained attempts are under way—by the EAP Faculty Director at UCR, in collaboration with members of various departments—to improve and facilitate academic integration further; and finally, CIE, as an Academic Senate committee, has as one of its explicit charges to oversee EAP. For all these reasons, it should be clear that EAP is an academic program, not just a service provided to students. Changes to it, including drastic changes to its financial structure and viability, will directly affect academic affairs.

(11) Third-party providers: Clearly these providers can, and already do, serve useful and commendable functions. For example, there are various parts of the world in which EAP does not have study centers or other arrangements, so that they become accessible to UC students only through third-party providers. It seems also hard to deny that, if the number of UC students participating in study abroad programs is to go up significantly in the near future, EAP will not be able to accommodate all of them. And it is well known that some of the third-party providers offer high quality services, also educationally. Nevertheless, many questions about them remain, especially from an academic point of view, including the following: (i) As the quality of such providers seems to vary widely, are there any reliable procedures in place for evaluating them, so that UC can advise and direct its students accordingly? (ii) More basically, is any research available about the effect on the academic success of UC students using these providers, e.g., about how many and what kind of credits they receive for classes taken abroad, about the ways in which using them affects the quality and the length of the students' education, etc.? (iii) Are there any studies about the financial effects of choosing third-party providers, i.e., about how much more expensive they are compared to EAP, if so? And (iv), what about investigations into whether UCR students are taking advantage of third-party providers to the same degree as students from other UC campuses? Question (iv) has the following relevant background: As is well known, UCR has an unusually large percentage of first-generation students, minority students, and students from low-income families. In connection with such students, depending on third-party providers may have unexpected, and potentially undesirable, effects at UCR, partly also elsewhere.

Concluding Suggestions

(12) EAP has come under intense scrutiny and criticism recently, especially because of its financial difficulties. (They are not entirely due to mismanagement, as may be worth adding—the low exchange rate of the US Dollar, especially compared to the Euro and the British Pound, did not help either, among other factors.) A careful look at EAP’s structure, and at possible ways of streamlining its operations, seems justified. In addition, current initiatives to broaden the menu of options available to UC students for going abroad are welcome. At the same time, EAP constitutes a very valuable academic program, one that should not be treated in any light or dismissive way. In addition to the questions about third-party providers just listed, the following kinds of
considerations play a role here: EAP has an established infrastructure that will be hard, as well as expensive, to duplicate or replace by other programs; it has an excellent track record of keeping students abroad safe; and the kind of immersion program EAP offers remains invaluable educationally. For these reasons it would be a big mistake to undercut EAP so much, financially and otherwise, that it was no longer able to function properly. Put more positively, EAP should remain at the center of UC’s study abroad initiatives.

(13) Similarly, the various UC campus centers, including UCR’s International Education Center, play a core role in study abroad. They are not only indispensable for the functioning of EAP; they are also the main places for students to get information about related programs, including those provided by third-party providers, and especially, information about programs we can recommend to UC students in good conscience. It is very important, then, to ensure that the campus centers can continue to function properly, especially by being able to provide substantive advising to interested students. (There are recent studies showing the number of students studying abroad to be directly proportional to the amount of advising available at campus centers. To undercut, or neglect, the funding for campus centers would be in direct conflict with the goal of increasing that number, as well as with making UCR a global research university.)

(14) Given the relative disregard for the academic nature of EAP, the various questions about third-party providers mentioned above, and the worries expressed about adequate funding for both EAP and the campus centers, it would seem important to keep track of the changes brought about by the Joint Ad Hoc Report and, especially, by Kissler’s and similar recommendations over the next few years. One possibility might be for the Academic Senate, at UCR or systemwide, to request the formation of a new Ad Hoc Committee, this time focused squarely on academic affairs and effects in this connection.

Added Remark

(15) At the systemwide CIE meeting on February 7, 2008, the following points became clear: a) The shift towards a fee-based funding model for EAP, as proposed in the Kissler report, is off the table, at least for the moment. b) EAP has been asked to make a 15% cut to its budget for next year, not just the originally expected 10% cut. c) Cuts to the budgets of the campus offices, usually supplemented by EAP funds (so as to be able to advise and adequate number of students), will be a direct consequence. Several of the issues raised above seem thus even more acute (especially (6), (8), (12), and (13)).
APPENDIX: Main Recommendation in the Joint Ad Hoc Committee Report

Recommendation 1. Taking into account recent growth in UC study abroad, the importance of providing this experience to students, and the relative proportions of students studying abroad at comparable universities, UC should set a five-year goal of doubling the participation rate at each UC campus. (Campuses currently have significantly different levels of participation.)

Recommendation 2. The President of the University should issue a statement on international education, expressing commitment both in educational and final terms, and request release annually of a major paper on international education at UC. These statements will explore the increasing global context of knowledge advancement and the value of study abroad for preparing the next generation of leaders for private and civil life. Such a central commitment to international education will strengthen the position of all study-abroad programs at UC as a core component of the overall education experience.

Recommendation 3. The Education Abroad program should continue to occupy a central position in a broad portfolio of student study opportunities that include campus and third-party programs. Together, this portfolio of options will accommodate a diverse range of student needs and interests as appropriate for a university with large number of students with different majors, aims, and personal circumstances.

Recommendation 4. The entire menu of choices—EAP, campus-based programs, and approved third party provider programs—must be centrally and prominently publicized so that students at all campuses can weigh all their options, study their individual features, and then seek advice from professional staff with experience and expertise in the area.

Recommendation 5. Campus-based student advising must also be understood as an essential element of the study abroad experience and services in these areas must be better supported. Every UC campus must make a careful inventory of available advising and invest sufficient funds to make this aspect of international education available to all students who need it.

Recommendation 6. Faculty and administrative leadership of the University must articulate the goals of international education and take steps to integrate a global perspective into commonly held belief systems about higher education.

Recommendation 7. As the number of UC students participating in study abroad grows and as Tidal Wave II subsides, the University should consider enrolling a much larger number of degree-seeking international students, building at the undergraduate level where numbers are very small.

Recommendation 8. The University must adopt an overall financial plan for study abroad that includes significant continued core University support, including adequate financial aid. In particular, financial aid must account for expenses in high-cost areas and the impact of loss of student earnings while studying abroad.

Recommendation 9. Implementation of new policies on the granting of academic credit for specific programs of international study should be reviewed by the Academic Senate on each UC campus with an eye toward streamlining and simplification. Consistency of
reviews of courses taken by students while abroad, as well as timeliness and efficiency in decisions to grant specific types of academic credit (particularly within majors), are serious problems at present.

Recommendation 10. Wherever centralized services can be provided in a more efficient and cost-effective manner, they should be performed as a system.

Recommendation 11. With the envisioned expansion of participation rates by UC students, as well as a need to streamline the process currently employed by UOEAP, campus responsibilities for study abroad will necessarily be expanded, while those conducted systemwide more sharply focused.

Recommendation 12. In order to establish an integrated framework for international education at UC, comprised of a broad portfolio of programs, an International Education Leadership Team, appointed by the Chancellors and the President, will be charged with overseeing integration of the University’s various study abroad programs, including EAP.

Recommendation 13. The International Education Leadership Team will oversee development and implementation of a transition plan for the short term, designed to facilitate a new universitywide coordinated effort to provide expanded options for international education. In the long term, the Leadership Team will act as a governing/advisory group for EAP and other elements of the new portfolio in international education. Authority for oversight and direction of EAP will be vested in this body.

Recommendation 14. The prerogatives of the Academic Senate for ensuring quality control and managing the course articulation process must be preserved.

Recommendation 15.

1. Ensure that EAP programs are accessible and affordable to all UC students.
2. Correct the imbalance inherent in the current funding formula, which causes EAP to absorb state budget cuts but does not allow EAP to benefit from offsetting student fee increases.
3. Give EAP an opportunity to compete with other service providers based upon the quality of its programs.
4. Provide the stability for better planning and adequate resources for future growth so that EAP can help the University achieve aggressive goals for increasing the number of students who have studied abroad.
5. Develop a long-term funding of international education that will provide UC students access to a wide portfolio of study abroad opportunities including those offered directly through EAP, campus-based programs, and preferred third-party providers. Develop and maintain a UC systemwide online repository of information about these opportunities, as well as substantially augmented staff on each campus to advise students adequately.
6. Provide funding for research to ascertain student needs, selection and outcomes relating to study abroad (that is, “market information”) for use systemwide in program planning and marketing.
7. Encourage the development of outstanding educational programs that are responsive to student interests and based upon cost-effective management principles.
8. Adopt a self-sustaining budgetary model with the understanding that a subsidy from UCOP to EAP will be necessary for some of the more expensive programs.
9. Provide additional funds to support campus international offices.

Recommendation 16. The University should develop a detailed implementation plan for installing the new structures outlined and recommended in the report. The International Leadership Team should be appointed and charged with drafting this plan. It should also assume responsibility for carrying it out. The plan should be finalized no later than February 2008 in order to synchronize with the 2008/09 budget cycle.
To: Professor Michael T. Brown  
Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
University of California, Academic Senate

From: Michael O’Connell  
Interim Universitywide Director  
Education Abroad Program

Re: EAP in the wake of the Joint Ad Hoc Report and funding cuts for 2008-09

Dear Michael,

Now that the Academic Council and both systemwide and campus committees have responded to the Joint Ad Hoc Report on International Education, I want to provide some further reflection on the report and the consequences for the Education Abroad Program. Together with the senior leaders of EAP I have already responded to the report itself. But after ten months as Interim Director of EAP, I want to consider in more detail the fate of the review, EAP’s current funding, and what I understand as possible future planning for its funding. Despite excellent assessments from the Joint Ad Hoc Report about the value and centrality of EAP for meeting UC’s international goals, the intentions of the Office of the President toward EAP and the implementation of those goals remain unclear and require continued Senate concern. The only response from OP thus far has been a budget cut that has necessitated sharp reductions in EAP staff and threats to its programming abroad. Even more alarming is the possibility that it may intend to redefine EAP and to move it to a funding model that would jeopardize its scope and character.

The report as a review of EAP

The Academic Council is right in finding the Ad Hoc Report remiss at a basic level in assessing EAP. There appears to have been considerable confusion about the nature of the review, which apparently began as a review of EAP, then was broadened to encompass international education generally in the University of California. There was also, as you know, confusion about the composition of the committee from the beginning. The committee was assembled without sufficient consultation or representation from the Academic Senate, and three new representatives of the Senate were added in the final year of the committee’s work. The UCOP-appointed administrative staff assistant to the committee also changed midway through the review process, leaving the committee without the experience of Julie Gordon. In fact, the expanded committee apparently met only once; it never met with EAP, in spite of requests from its leadership, and none of the committee ever met with the new leadership that was in place after John Marcum’s retirement in June, 2007.
The committee as constituted before the three additional members were added issued a report in April 2007. That report contained a number of basic errors about EAP and its operations; it was clear that the committee had not been able to review the program in sufficient detail to understand important elements of EAP’s structure and processes. Several groups responded to that report, including the leadership at UOEAP, the Council of Campus Directors, and the Campus Administrative Directors, all pointing out the errors and omissions in the preliminary report. The leadership of EAP had hoped that these errors would be corrected, and in fact this was promised by the expanded committee, but the final report issued in November 2007 did not mention or address the errors.

None of this criticism is meant to deny the utility of the report in providing a preliminary overview of international educational opportunities in UC and some direction for providing enhanced study abroad opportunities for UC students. As I’ve already indicated in my response to the Joint Ad Hoc Report, the leadership of EAP found the report a strong voice for the necessity of expanding these opportunities. And it placed EAP at the center of this expansion.

The final report contained a financial analysis by Consultant Jerry Kissler, which centered on a possible new funding model that proposed that EAP’s funding be altered from a general fund appropriation to a student fee-based model. Kissler’s analysis was based on considerable work with EAP financial records; his questions about these records were highly valuable to the leadership of EAP, particularly to its director of budget and finance. But Kissler had not been charged with any analysis beyond the financial, and his own report did not provide detailed discussion of alternate funding models for a university that wished to maintain a significant and growing program for international education. His recommendations on staffing, for example, seemed arbitrary and based on an a priori need to reduce general fund appropriations to $3M (falling to $1M) without a sense of what this would mean to the academic structures of EAP. There may have been some hope that the Ad Hoc committee would make use of this limited analysis in its own analysis, but because the committee itself had not devoted sufficient attention to the structures and processes of EAP, let alone its funding and financial workings, this did not occur. The result was a puzzling disconnect between Kissler’s work and that of the rest of the committee. In fact, as we noted in our response to the Joint Ad Hoc Report, the funding suggestions in the Kissler report fell far short of what would be needed to maintain EAP in its present level of operation, let alone grow in the way larger report envisioned. We did, however, feel that Kissler’s report provided a potentially useful model of an alternate way of funding EAP that may be worthy of further exploration, but only if this were combined with a firm sense of EAP’s academic nature and goals.

**A New Funding Formula for EAP**

The major disappointment for EAP in the work of the Joint Ad Hoc committee and its final report is its failure to arrive at and to propose a new funding model for EAP. It has been recognized by a number of authorities that the current funding, by which EAP receives an appropriation based on a fixed percentage (70 percent) of the marginal cost of instruction for enrollment growth, but returns the student education fees to the campuses, has become increasingly problematic. As MCOI declined significantly from early in the decade to the middle, the University raised student fees. But EAP did not receive any part of this enhanced funding. The Kissler report proposed switching these two funding sources, allowing EAP the education fee revenue and giving the MCOI-based funding to the campuses. But the difficulty for EAP is that education fee-based funding requires a 33 percent return to aid, which effectively reduced this
revenue stream to the point that EAP was even further disadvantaged. On April 21, 2006, Provost Hume wrote to Professor Stanton Glantz, chair of the University Committee on Planning and Budget:

EAP has proposed to UCOP that its funding be adjusted to reflect the realities of running study abroad programs. EAP had also proposed to UCOP a budget incorporating cuts that would bring it back into balance over a period of several years, but would entail eliminating a number of academic programs. I asked EAP not to cut academic programs but to reduce administrative support to save funds, while permitting a deficit for the current year. *It is my intent that the budget will be brought into balance through a combination of such reductions and a change to the funding model* [emphasis added]. Because the funds needed to protect EAP programming are too large to be accommodated by adjustments to the MCOI and Ed fee distribution formulas as had been proposed initially by EAP, EAP would require a needs-based allocation to address its current budget deficits, while protecting current programs. Additional funding would also be needed to conceptualize, design, and offer new EAP programs.

Since that time EAP has brought its budget into balance, in large part through a significant downsizing of its administrative office (through reduction of its staffing FTE and subleasing of a third of its office space as well as consolidation of operations and programs abroad). And in spite of the plural reference to budget *deficits*, the deficit that was discovered in 2005 was a one-time event and has remained constant at $2.4M. At the close of the memo to Professor Glantz, Provost Hume referred to an *annual* difference between revenues and expenses of $2.84M, suggesting continued accumulating deficits in this range. But this was incorrect; EAP has not added to the 2005-06 budget deficit, which UCOP has allowed EAP to carry forward over the past two years. Since 2005-06 EAP revenues have been in balance with EAP costs.

In spite of the Provost’s intentions, EAP remains, two years later, without a change in its funding model. Given the unsettled situation in the Office of the President over the past year, this is not, perhaps, surprising; clearly the overall budget situation in the University has been perplexing in the extreme. The leadership of EAP was taken aback to hear that the Provost had gone before the Academic Council in November and declared that EAP was a “failed program” and incapable of reforming its financial situation. It is difficult, to say the least, to understand what the Provost may have meant by this judgment. With record high student numbers (4500 in 2007-08), strong faculty support (as evidenced in the campus and senate responses to the Joint Ad Hoc report), and its prestigious reputation nationwide in the professional study-abroad community, EAP would appear to remain one of UC’s most obviously successful operations. Even if he was referring to the one-time deficit incurred in 2005, the irony is that EAP’s finances were even then being brought into balance, and until the announcement of a 15 percent funding cut, repayment of the deficit had been planned to begin in the 2008-009 year.

**Instead, Funding Cuts**

Rather than a new funding model that would address EAP’s genuine needs, EAP has instead endured a funding cut for 2008-09 of 15 percent. A cut of 10 percent was originally proposed in September, 2007. Because of EAP’s overseas commitments and the need to project programs for students and faculty directors a year in advance, the 10 percent cut was difficult enough to accommodate. But then in December the amount was raised to 15 percent, with the directive that the plan for this budget cut be presented by mid-January. Most perplexingly, EAP was told it might dodge the 15 percent cut, and perhaps be absolved from its deficit, if it came up with a student-fee-based funding model. The EAP leadership, in consultation with the campus EAP offices, constructed such a model, one which, because of the mandated return-to-aid, still required a general fund appropriation of approximately $9M (around
45 percent of the current appropriation) to maintain current programming. This model was rejected by UCOP without discussion, and EAP was instructed to present a budget that would simply reduce funding by 15 percent.

In its response to the Joint Ad Hoc Report, the Academic Council goes on record as opposing this cut, but UCOP had already mandated the presentation of this budget by the end of January, well before the Academic Council could present its response.

The need for this funding cut was presented to EAP as simply meeting UCOP’s need for the reductions that had been mandated for the Office of the President. The leadership of EAP recognized the severity of the situation at UCOP. It felt, however, that the situation merited some discussion of the implications of the reductions for its programs and processes. There appeared no sentiment for such discussion in the office of the Provost, and the end result was simply the demand for the 15 percent cut. EAP has responded to the 15 percent funding cut by directing 63 percent of the reductions to the operations of the University Office of EAP, including a reduction of 20 percent in its staff FTE. It also reduced its spending abroad by $1.37M through reductions in the number of faculty study center directors and the elimination of some programs. But the reductions abroad coincided with a further weakening of the dollar against the Euro and other major currencies and compounded the effects of the budget cuts.

The future

At present – and with new interim leadership as Professor Michael Cowan takes the helm at the beginning of May 2008 – EAP is being told to prepare to develop “a new business model” over the next year. On the one hand, it appears difficult to say what this means. One would presume, for an academic program like EAP, that a business model must follow from academic goals and needs, and EAP’s academic model, while varied in the diversified programming it has developed over the past decade, is well established and depends on the Academic Senate for oversight and approval. On the other hand, EAP has been told that its per-student FTE funding should not exceed $7000, a figure that must include total EAP operations, including UOEAP, study centers, and all programming abroad. This figure is well below the current figure, which stands around $10,000 per student FTE. So a “business model” dependent on a figure of $7000 would mean a further reduction of EAP’s funding by 30 percent.

How EAP is understood and defined by UC.

The essential question that stands behind the question of funding level is whether EAP will continue to be defined as an academic program of the University or whether it will be redefined as a mere service provider to the campuses. The Academic Council has decreed that EAP is an academic program on the UC campuses; students earn UC units and grades, its programs are overseen by UC faculty, and its academic operations are subject to oversight by the Academic Senate. If an academic program, it would seem obvious that EAP’s funding must reflect this status and remain consistent with the average of on-campus funding of upper-division undergraduate students and not be subject to an a priori limit that seriously disadvantages EAP in relation to other undergraduate instruction.

Perhaps as a result of the budget deficit of 2005 EAP has recently been characterized as administratively heavy. This characterization has sometimes been accompanied by a comparison to other US study abroad programs that operate on smaller overall budgets. What is needed is an explanation of the basic character and structure of EAP in relation to those programs and whether the differing structures, expectations, and policies of UC have necessitated a substantially different model for study abroad.
Does EAP determine its own “business model,” or is that model determined by UC’s policies, its academic culture, and the federal character of UC?

There can be no doubt that study abroad programs at such institutions as the University of Minnesota, Indiana University, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Michigan have funded their programs at a lower cost than the University of California. They do so by making heavy use of third-party provider programs and providing far fewer of their own programs, either programs that the university has constructed or exchanges they have negotiated with host universities. (In fact, exchange plays a very small part in the programs of these universities, while reciprocal exchange continues to be the very coinage by which EAP negotiates its immersion programs; it further serves to enrich UC with a richly diverse cohort of international undergraduate students.) The use of third-party providers essentially passes on the generally higher cost of these study abroad programs to the student consumer. In some cases the universities noted above are able to accept the academic programs of these third-party providers for credit, and they waive their own fees for their students. This is not possible in UC policy; students cannot be given UC units or grades unless they pay UC fees and are taking courses that have been subject to faculty approval and oversight. Faculty response to the idea of using third party providers in the Joint Ad Hoc Report, it should be noted, was uniformly and steadfastly negative across the campuses. It seems clear that if there were to be a change in EAP’s business model, it would need to be preceded by a thoroughgoing change to UC’s own business model. A radical change in faculty perspectives on non-UC programs receiving UC credit would also be essential as well as changes in Senate rules and regulations.

In fact the structures, procedures, and policies of EAP mirror UC structures, procedures, and policies quite precisely. Perhaps the most significant instance of this is the insistence on academic quality that must be certified at every point by UC faculty. Every new EAP program has been subjected to thorough academic review before it is brought to UCIE for approval. New programs are subject to third-year review; the programs in every country are reviewed on a ten-year schedule, just as academic departments on the campuses are. Academic review is a constant and continuing process for all EAP programs through the annual analysis produced by its faculty study center directors and liaison officers. Student evaluations are completed and reviewed for every EAP program. All EAP courses {some 7,000 a year} are reviewed by the Academics section of UOEAP for their conformity with UC requirements, then individually approved by the faculty associate dean, a process that mimics the work of senate undergraduate course committees and college offices on campus. The faculty administrators at UOEAP, its director, academic dean and associate dean, oversee all elements of the program and its academic processes. In every respect EAP’s concern for faculty-certified academic quality expresses precisely UC’s concern for the same.

A second way in which EAP, in its evolution over 46 years, has responded to the character of UC is its creation of a structure that makes study abroad available to the federal character of the UC system. In accordance with the fundamental tenets of UC, EAP provides academically rigorous programs that are both accessible and affordable to UC students. But no other study abroad program in the country has the need to coordinate its own programs for ten co-equal campuses of an overarching university of more than 200,000 students. EAP does so by concluding agreements for the UC system with some 120 foreign universities, developing programs in which all nine undergraduate campuses participate, and overseeing the work of 47 study centers abroad. EAP’s responsibilities, whether for immersion programs based on reciprocal exchange or for those constructed by UC faculty and taught abroad by faculty overseen by EAP, are assumed for the entire UC system. In virtually all respects, UOEAP functions in part as a college office does on the campuses, but a college office with responsibilities to ten campuses and to hundreds of departments. Further its Operations structures serve the campuses in
the work of efficiently coordinating the movement of over 4500 UC students abroad over the course of a year. Over its history, EAP has evolved structures and efficiencies for these operations, but its complexity cannot be underestimated.

Conclusion, recommendations

None of the above is meant to suggest that EAP would not continue to benefit from internal efficiencies and continued analysis of its programs, procedures, and policies. In fact, by virtue of its tripartite structure -- a central administrative office in Santa Barbara, nine campus offices, and 47 study centers abroad -- EAP is a remarkably self-critical, self-correcting academic organism. Moreover, it is subject to academic oversight by an academic senate committee as well as critical review by the various faculty committees that it empanels for particular purposes. The deficit crisis of 2005 and the imposed budget cut of 2007-08 have focused its attention decisively on the need to maintain a balance between costs and programming. That much of EAP’s operations occur in an economically volatile international arena makes “balance” something of a high-wire act. Add to this the dire economic prognostication of the recent UCPB “Cuts Report,” which projects the possibility of an economically hobbled UC into the next decade.

If UC continues to value international education, and it is unimaginable that it should not, it is crucial that EAP be afforded funding stability in the near term, that it not be subjected to the “new business model” pressures that in fact mean a further 30 percent cut in funding. EAP is an academic program of UC, not simply a provider of study abroad programs to the campuses, and as such its funding must follow from its academic character. Like all academic programs, EAP must respond to the funding constraints of the University, but these constraints should be sensitive to the complexity of a program with far-flung economic commitments and not simply a function meeting immediate cost-cutting needs.

In the longer term, a new funding model for EAP must be found that allows it to grow in ways consistent with University goals. The funding model espoused by Kissler is simply untenable and unworkable. It is now universally recognized that an international component should be a significant part of students’ university study, just as the ideal of a liberal education has traditionally included elements of humanistic, social science, and scientific study. Whatever its budgetary constraints, UC cannot afford to disengage from something it pioneered 46 years ago, and just at a time when other universities are discovering its necessity and expanding possibilities. The challenge will be to find a way of funding EAP so that it can fulfill the ambitious goals of the Joint Ad Hoc report.

It may indeed be questioned whether EAP is administratively well placed in its current reporting line to the Provost of the University, or whether it would receive more nuanced understanding of its operations and programs via another reporting relationship. As a systemwide program, it may make abstract sense that EAP should report to the systemwide administration, but there are instances of universitywide operations run efficiently from an individual campus. In fact UCOP is a largely an administrative unit with few structures for understanding or evaluating academic programs. Because the essential academic work of UC occurs on the campuses, one may wonder if campus placement of EAP would make better sense. The Provost and the Joint Ad Hoc Report have proposed an International Leadership Team composed of representatives from the campuses. EAP would not, presumably, report to such a committee, but rather use it as a potential source of information about campus goals and needs for study abroad. In any case, Senate representation on such a committee is essential.
I’ve enjoyed my several opportunities to reflect with you on the role and challenges of the Education Abroad Program over the past ten months. Please share these thoughts with whoever may find them useful.
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Management Council of EAP