



ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
LOS ANGELES DIVISION  
3125 MURPHY HALL  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1408

PHONE: (310) 825-3851  
FAX: (310) 206-5273

December 5, 2008

Mary Croughan  
Chair of the Academic Council  
University of California Academic Senate

**In Re: Education Abroad Business Plan**

Dear Mary,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the Education Abroad Business Plan. Upon receipt of the plan, I invited all Senate Committees to review it, but specifically requested responses from the Committee on International Education (CIE), the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), and the Graduate (GC) and Undergraduate Councils (UgC). The Executive Board, which speaks for the Division on such matters, also reviewed the document.

UCLA cannot support the Education Abroad Business Plan as written, and hopes to be included in the review of future drafts. I will outline the major criticisms of the report presently. However, the responses by CPB, UgC, and CIE outline further detailed criticisms, which are also endorsed by the Executive Board, and are attached for your review.

- The process by which the plan was written is incommensurate with an academic planning model. Given that the UC Education Abroad Program is highly regarded, if no longer entirely fundable, any cost-containment plan should start with an assessment of programmatic strengths (e.g., UC Faculty engagement in the program; centralized administration eliminates duplicative efforts throughout the system), mission-critical aspects of the program, as well as program weaknesses and non-essential components. The cost-containment plan would then proceed to reduce funding while preserving programmatic strengths and mission-critical aspects of the program, while pruning away weak and non-essential areas. This plan shows no evidence of any such consideration.

Moreover, the plan contains no discussion of alternative models that were considered and subsequently rejected. Has the UC System investigated building partnerships with other research universities (Michigan, Stanford, Texas, Virginia)? How do other large, public institutions provide international educational experiences for their students?

- If funding is to be shifted away from the centralized office to the campuses, the plan should include a mechanism that ensures transparency of funding allocations to the campuses. Without such transparency, campuses will be left with no means of assessing where the money went and if it was used in the way that most supports international education efforts.
- There is great concern that the proposed business plan will have the consequence of limiting international educational experiences to affluent students. Detailed financial projections, including fee structures, are necessary to better understand and better evaluate the impact this plan will have on students of varying economic means.

UCLA understands that the current EAP model may well be a luxury we can no longer afford. However, the process by which this plan was constructed, its informational gaps and oversights lead us to conclude that this business plan cannot be supported.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Goldstein", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Goldstein  
UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director UC Academic Senate  
Jaime R. Balboa, CAO UCLA Academic Senate

**UCLA Committee on International Education Response  
to UOEAP Business Plan Recommendations  
October 2008**

**November 19, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

2008-09 Committee on International Education (CIE)

Francesco Chiappelli

Diane Gu, Graduate Student Representative

Olga Kagan

Michael Lofchie

Jonathan Post

Ian Coulter, *CHAIR*

## **Introduction**

In an earlier UCLA CIE letter dated February 4th, 2008, sent to Elizabeth Bjork, Academic Senate Chair in response to the proposed changes to EAP, the committee stated the following:

*There is a very real danger that a program that has been the flagship of UC International Education and the envy of other institutions throughout the world, that has a long and enviable history, could be seriously undermined by some of the recommendations.*

## **New EAP Model**

Both in the earlier *Kissler Report*, and in President Yudof's recent Directive to UOEAP to cut their budget, there has developed the opinion that while EAP is a quality program it is a very expensive program and given the proposed cuts in other areas it should also undergo cuts. This same attitude was expressed by Provost Rory Hume at a meeting with the UC Committee on International Education on May 23, 2008. He saw the EAP as a heavily subsidized program with an out-of-control budget. Provost Hume further suggested that EAP's structure be changed drastically to become a **service-driven enterprise**, citing **UC Press as the optimal model for change**.

There are two contentious issues with this position:

1. The first is that EAP is an academic program with oversight from the Senate. It is not a service program.
2. It is not a subsidized program in any sense different from other academic programs. EAP is a formal UC instructional course for which students receive UC credit and grades. The UC Academic Senate, faculty, and staff are extensively involved in all aspects of the program. The programs receive formal external reviews within three years of initiation and every 10 years by the Senate. The fact that is EAP is funded out of the General Fund through the Presidents Office does not alter either of the above facts. The question therefore should be whether this program is over funded for the services it provides.

## **Quality vs. Quantity**

All parties seem to agree that it is an outstanding program of very high quality. It is therefore legitimate to ask if EAP is being unfairly singled out for what is a drastic budget cut. To date neither the *Kissler Report*, information from the President's Office or budget information emanating from EAP itself, enables us to determine if this is an over budgeted program, whether the current size budget is necessary to perform the functions EAP does, or maintain the quality it has established, or whether EAP can survive the size of the proposed budget cut being. This lack of crucial information makes it almost impossible to evaluate what is being proposed.

## **The Proposed Business Plan**

In the proposed budget the cuts to UOEAP are drastic (see Table 1).

The funding from the *General Fund*:

- In 2005-06 was **\$20,156,000**,
- By 2008-09 was reduced to **\$18,507,000**
- By 2011-12 will be reduced to **\$4,393,000**

In the same period the *contribution from student/other fees*:

- In 2005-06 were **\$4,532,000**;
- By 2011-12 will be increased to **\$20,431,000**.

## **Other Expenses**

The category "other" would include campus specific fees for services and facilities used by campus students while participating in UOEAP programs. So the **first consequence** is what amounts to **cost shifting**, from the General Fund to the students. It is difficult to see how the program will remain accessible to all students under that plan but no data is given to show the impact of this on those students who are economically challenged. At the same time, **scholarship funding will drop**:

- In 2005-06 it was **\$1,506,000**;
- In 2008-09 reduced to **\$933,000**;
- By 2011-12 it will be reduced to **\$261,900**.

The **second drastic change** will be in expenditures for UOEAP, which will drop from what it was in 2005-06, **\$8,492,000**, to **\$6,465,000** in 2011-12. This of course must be reflected in **reduced staff**.

### **Staffing and Services**

In the past year the staff dropped from June 2007 until September 2008 from **FTE 103.21 to 81.76**. At the same time it is contemplated that EAP will **increase its services** to the campuses and expand the program. It is difficult to see how these two things can be rationalized: cuts to staff and increased services.

We should also note that during these cuts, **the number of students in EAP reached an all time high in 2007-08 of 4,529 students**. One suggestion for expanding the service is more efficient use of IT but no evidence is given to show either this is achievable or that the IT staff can do this or that that is what the clientele wants or will tolerate. It also ignores the morale impact of the cuts, present and future, on the staff.

The **quality** of the program is dependant on attracting quality staff and retaining them. Another large change is in the cost of *International Field Operations*:

- In 2005-06 this was \$16,241,000
- In 2008-09 it was reduced to \$15,901,000
- In 2011-12 it will be reduced to \$13,564,700

This will be accomplished in several ways. The first is moving away from **UC faculty appointed country Directors**. A second is to **reduce the number of offices in countries** (through both amalgamation and closures). The third is to **reduce the staff and the costs of the offices in the host countries**.

This may involve more use of liaison faculty, appointing country Directors and not UC ones, closing program that are deemed to be too expensive, and cutting overhead costs. There are numerous problems with this scenario:

1. It ignores the real contribution that UC Faculty Directors make both to the experience of the students but also in the very good relationships we tend to enjoy with our international partners.
2. Second, it has the potential to reduce the safety and support systems that are in place for our students.

The **first obligation of EAP**, and we would suggest, UC, is the **welfare of the students**. All past Directors can tell of student crises that were either solved or mitigated by having a UC Director on the ground and each can tell of parents whose anxieties were greatly relieved by having one as well. The resident UC Director has been a strength of this program.

In some cases our presence might be demanded by the importance of the country for language and cultural exchanges such as the program in Russia and in Africa even if the demand is not great. Further, we see quite large fluctuations in programs from one year to the next. Programs that were in demand wane for a short period and then bounce back in popularity. Thirdly, one of the strengths of EAP is its **stability**. It takes a considerable time to establish a program with all the legal, academic and administrative infrastructures in place. These programs are not like a water spigot that can just be turned on and off yearly. Last but not least, many of these programs are exchange programs and **we sign contracts with international partners for these programs**. If we wish to continue signing contracts with only prestigious institutions that are considered to be of the same quality as UC canceling such programs would hurt our reputation.

Still another large change as shown in the EAP funding model is that the **Campus EAP support** will be **reduced to zero from \$933,000 in 2008-09**. This would have a big impact on UCLA where approximately a third of the EAP budget comes from this transfer of funds. Even if the proposed \$16 million reduction from the General Fund to EAP is allocated to the campuses, there may be two problems. The first is whether the President's Office will in fact allocate those funds to the campuses and the second, if they are transferred to the General Funds of the campuses, whether they would go to EAP programs.

## **Impact**

The budget proposals therefore will have a drastic impact on EAP as it is currently operated. Given that it might be appropriate to contemplate what will be lost. EAP has been the flagship program for International Education. In this era of globalization, the UC system should be seeking the means and resources of expanding programs that offer students the opportunity to immerse themselves in the culture, language and institutional environment of other nations.

We offer several considerations below that are important in any proposed cuts to EAP:

1. EAP is the program with full UC Senate oversight for both its academic quality and administration. Such an oversight should be the norm for all international education programs offered by UC.
2. EAP currently is the most experienced of all UC offices in the development of bilateral agreements with credible universities and is the depository of the most knowledge and experience with international legal and technical requirements related to international programs.
3. EAP is also the most experienced UC institution for evaluating international program offerings both initially and through its regular 5 year and 10 year reviews.
4. The EAP exchange program has been a unique achievement and is both desired and highly regarded by our foreign partner institutions.
5. The full year or semester-long programs remain the richest immersion program available to students and should remain the top priority for international education.
6. While other programs are fulfilling import niches and needs, they are in fact inferior in terms of cultural immersion which we continue to feel should be the priority objective of our programs.
7. The EAP program has been built around the concept of exchanges. It is not just a program of placing UC students overseas but of bringing international students (and faculty) to our campuses. The very nature of the exchange programs has been a mechanism for keeping international experience affordable for our students. It is important to maintain it as an exchange program.

8. EAP is an academic program with all that it implies including full Senate oversight and it has been funded in the same manner as other academic programs. Since we do not expect other academic programs to be self sustaining, why should we expect EAP to be so?

### **Conclusion**

There is no doubt that EAP cannot survive in its present form with this kind of drastic cut in their budget. So the question becomes whether drastically reducing EAP would be in the interest of UC and its students. The 63,000 alums from EAP would probably answer in the negative. Can the individual campuses step in and pick up the program? Some probably can and will, while smaller campuses may not be able to. It is very unlikely that any campus could create the full range of services EAP provides or fully match EAP expertise. Furthermore, it would not appear to be cost effective to have each of our campuses develop their own programs abroad.

Whatever are the answers to these questions, what will result is a fragmented system with variations across the campuses. This will replace a centralized program that is equitable for all of our campuses and for all of our students and which ensures all the campuses share equally in the exchange of students coming to UC. We will lose the office that has the expertise and the infrastructure to efficiently organize international programs and that is universally recognized as one of the best such programs in the US.

# EAP Funding Model

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF SELECT REVENUE & EXPENDITURE DATA			
	2005-06 (Actual)	2008-09 (Estimated)	2011-12 (Estimated)
<b>Revenue:</b>			
<b>Appropriations</b>	\$20,156,000	\$18,507,000	\$4,393,000
<b>Student Fees / Other</b>	\$4,532,000	\$6,393,000	\$20,431,000
<b>Expenditures:</b>			
<b>UOEAP</b>	\$8,492,000	\$7,134,000	\$6,465,000
<b>Int'l Field Operations</b>	\$16,241,000	\$15,901,000	\$13,564,700
<b>Scholarships</b>	\$1,506,000	\$1,271,900	\$261,900
<b>Campus EAP Support</b>	\$959,000	\$933,000	\$0
<b>FTE</b>	2566	2355	2255
<b>Impact on Campuses</b>	n/a	n/a	\$11,409,000

- This new plan facilitates two major goals; 1. achieves major economies and efficiencies and 2. remains a “gold standard” of affordable, high quality programs
- By 2011-12 the Business Plan will reduce EAP’s General Fund Appropriations by a total of 85% or \$16M from the 2005-06 level
- In return EAP will collect and retain student fees, less return to aid
- In line with projected revenue, EAP will make additional cuts in expenses at UOEAP and in International Offices
- Among the cuts will be the replacement of most UC faculty International Office Directors residing abroad
- Academic oversight and quality control will be ensured through appointing host university faculty liaison or program officers where UC faculty previously served; in depth, focused program reviews; California based UC faculty providing on-going consultation, academic administration and problem solving
- Administrative costs overseas will be reduced. In EAP “self-construct” classes the cost of instruction will be reduced by managing class size and the number of courses offered
- EAP will eliminate programs that are too expensive and those with minimal enrollment
- UOEAP will continue reducing overhead through further streamlining of operations, eliminating redundant processes and relying more fully on I.T. for efficiencies.
- EAP will retain \$4.4M in appropriations as a base budget – amount sufficient to provide essential and scalable services.
- The plan provides a projected positive financial impact to the campuses of \$11M (as projected for 2011-12), principally due to the pass-through of appropriations removed from EAP’s annual budget and transformation of the UC faculty International Directorship model

December 2, 2008

TO: Michael Goldstein  
Chair, Academic Senate

FR: Joseph Bristow  
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

RE: Response to the Education Abroad Program (EAP) Business Plan

---

Dear Professor Goldstein:

The Council on Planning and Budget would like to be in a position to provide an informed and constructive response to the detailed proposals for radically downsizing and decentralizing the activities of EAP. Unfortunately, despite our repeated invitations over the course of the past month, we were not able to make contact with Professor Val Rust, who heads UCLA's EAP. It is regrettable that we did not have the opportunity to hear Professor Rust's views on the likely effects the EAP business plan will have on students' opportunities to study abroad, particularly because the cutbacks in the program are severe. This situation proved especially frustrating because CPB was left with a number of pressing questions that arose in light of our meeting with Professor Ian Coulter, Chair of the International Education Committee. As a result, the feedback I provide in this letter is not as detailed or complete as CPB would like.

In his presentation to CPB on November 17, Professor Coulter explained that the recommendations of the Kissler Report are largely responsible for the devastating cuts in EAP's budget. Currently funded at over \$20M, EAP will have in the near future an operational budget of \$4M. This means that the EAP office based at Goleta, which has had some 120 staff members in the past, is becoming much smaller in size. Correspondingly, the number of education abroad study centers (currently forty-four in number) will shrink, if not vanish altogether. It appears that opportunities for faculty members to head an EAP study center will come to an abrupt end. Further, the EAP business plan proposes that funding for education abroad will be routed through UCOP to the EVC of each campus. On this basis, it will be at each EVC's discretion to disburse the funds for EAP.

Professor Coulter mentioned the Kissler Report insisted that EAP had been overfunded. He contended that it was difficult to determine the basis on which the claim of overfunding had been made. Professor Coulter added that it was clear that the implementation of the EAP business plan meant that the cost of studying abroad would increase considerably for students. While he stated that private companies offer study-abroad opportunities for UCLA students, Professor Coulter did not clarify how these

businesses had in the past competed with EAP. Nor could he elucidate how private companies might serve our students in the future. The lack of hard data about the funding of each student made it hard for the Council to assess whether EAP was indeed as expensive as it might first appear.

Thus CPB remained somewhat unclear about a number of points arising from Professor Coulter's observations. As a consequence, members of the Council raised the following questions—ones that we hoped Professor Rust might be able to answer:

- Is it likely to be the case that the diminishment of EAP will mean that the opportunity to study abroad will be available only for wealthier students? In other words, will EAP become a program for the financially privileged?
- How long have private companies offering study abroad program been active on the UCLA campus? How have their programs compared financially and academically with EAP? Who has approved these privately run programs? Do these private programs have overseas institutional contacts that differ from those of EAP?
- Has the UC system considered building links for study abroad programs with other major public universities, such as Michigan, Texas, and Virginia? How do other large public institutions operate programs of this kind for the students?
- How might the removal of study centers headed by a UC faculty member affect the welfare of our students studying abroad? Can the UC system always rely on host institutions to provide the counseling support that our students may need when they reside in a foreign country?

In sum, CPB concluded that it is of course highly desirable for UC in general and UCLA in particular to maximize students' opportunities to study abroad—so long as such programs of study are operated economically and responsibly.

The Council remains extremely disappointed that Professor Val Rust did not have the courtesy to respond to any of our invitations to meet with us. Perhaps Senate Executive Board would like to undertake some follow-up to see if there is a reason why the UCLA head of EAP was unresponsive to the Council's requests to meet with her.

Sincerely,



Joseph Bristow  
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate

December 3, 2008

To: Michael Goldstein, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Dorothy Wiley, Chair  
Undergraduate Council



**Re: Proposed Changes University of California Education Abroad Program Recommendations**

The merit and possible pitfalls of broadly altering the way in which international educational experiences are offered to University of California students has been reviewed extensively elsewhere. After careful consideration of these materials, we recommend that the University abide by the following principles:

1. Preserve the cultural and language immersion wherever possible. As a mission of undergraduate education is to offer high quality educational experiences, it is particularly important that language instruction include opportunities to experience spoken and written language in a natural setting among those who are fluent. Also, it is difficult to recreate cultural experiences in a classroom and there is substantial educational value to a lived *laboratory* experience of immersion in another culture. Culture is difficult to recreate in a classroom as it reflects the interaction of human communities, their language, and environment.
2. It is important to monitor the redistribution of funds to the campus level when funding is reallocated. If the intent of this change is to create international educational experiences that better reflect local campus priorities, it is similarly important that insure accountability. It would be disheartening to dismantle such a highly valued program only to find that the *block-grant* type of funding produces fewer and lower quality of educational experiences for students.
3. The University should seek to establish uniform policies that standardize grading and credit awarded to student participants. It is especially important that integrity of the *educational* experience be assured for student participants as we move from this largely centralized program to a decentralized model of administration.
4. It is important that the Academic Senate and UC administration come to consensus about policies governing UC support or sponsorship for programs administered by third-party providers. Although our first priority should be the quality and integrity of the educational experience, we have a moral obligation to maximize the safety of our students. The developmental norms of older adolescents and young adults often lead them to underestimate risk. It is as important to evaluate the safety of settings and services provided by external contractors as it is for UC-generated programs.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me (x 5-0803; [dwiley@ucla.edu](mailto:dwiley@ucla.edu)) or Judith Lacertosa, UgC Principal Policy Analyst (x51194; [jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu](mailto:jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu)).

cc: Jaime Balboa, Academic Senate, CAO