

## Closing Plenary

Mr. Michael McCarry

Executive Director, Alliance for International Education and Cultural Exchange

“Lessons Learned from U.S. Initiatives to Promote International Education”

I am going to talk about lessons learned from international education and exchange activities, with particular focus on the Paul Simon/Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Initiative, which is not yet a program because that legislation has not yet been approved by Congress. I would like to give you a kind of policy context for all these activities, and talk about some of the lessons learned, particularly as related to the study abroad field.

The Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange is an organization that consists of about 78 U.S.-based associations and non-governmental organizations that coordinate international education activities and exchanges. It has a very diverse membership. That makes the Alliance the only collective voice for the exchange community when it comes to policy matters. It is not the only voice, but the only *collective* voice, because many organizations, such as NAFSA and the higher education associations, are very well equipped and staffed to make their policy announcements, and support and advocate for their policies. Our mission is to promote policies that support exchanges, and fundamentally, the appropriations for the programs that are funded by the US State Department. Every year we are looking for as much money in that Congressional appropriation as possible. We also look for program regulations that are permissive and allow people to come to the US in a responsible way, and for visa policy that supports these goals. These are fundamentally our three issues. I am a lobbyist for the exchange community.

A headline is the most important: “An Investment in National Security.” This is an ad the Alliance put in *The New York Times* a few years ago. And I show it to you to both to talk a little bit about politics and to focus on that theme. An “investment in national security” is the argument we have been making on behalf of the exchange community in various forms, but putting an ad in *The New York Times* is not cheap. And we thought a lot about whether it was worth doing. You are in *The New York Times* one day, and probably every senator will read *The New York Times* and certainly will see this ad, but what will be the impact? It turned out to have a lot more staying power for us than typical for a one-day ad, because we put it on our website and we emailed it to all of our members as a PDF. They emailed it to their members, so NAFSAs around the country, the AFS host families and others, could then turn

around and send this to their member of Congress with a note that says “support this.” And so we got a lot of political bounce from this ad for an extended period of time. And our members loved it because it activated their grass-roots networks of members.

Turning to the policy matters, I do not think that public diplomacy is a commonly understood term for Japanese. Public diplomacy is a word very few Americans knew until 9/11, and now suddenly it has become a kind of a well known term, at least in policy circles. Public diplomacy, in simple terms, refers to the international activities a government undertakes overseas to increase mutual understanding between our country and Japan, or whatever country we are working in simultaneously, and to increase support and understanding at home for our policies and our interests. There is a huge focus now on public diplomacy in policy circles in Washington, and exchanges are a big part of public diplomacy. That is the mutual understanding part.

Exchange and international education is the part I want to talk about. Shortly after 9/11 happened, the “Why do they hate us?” question was common here in the US. Because this is such a big question here in Washington, there have been 30 different reports on the subject of public diplomacy – the Department of Defense, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Heritage Foundation, Council on Strategic International Studies, and other well known think tanks and organizations have put out these policy descriptions on how to fix public diplomacy. In those 30 reports, the single most common recommendation was more funding for exchange programs. There is a bipartisan consensus in Washington about the importance of these kinds of activities.

I will show you a slide in order to point out that the trend for money for State Department exchanges has increased from 2003 to 2008 and 2009. For a five- year span, the funding for exchange has doubled, from \$250 million to \$500 million. But I would also say \$500 million is not nearly enough.

I am going to talk about a couple lessons in this process that have impacted the policy process. The State Department has become good at conducting surveys. I am going to just pull out a couple of statistics from these surveys. For example, 99% of visiting Fulbright students to the United States say that the program increased their knowledge and understanding of the United States. A big majority of U.S. scholars who go overseas incorporate what they learn from the Fulbright experience into their teaching. And that is why you run these programs, because you want to have the teachers multiply the effect of their participation with their students. The Muskie Program, a program for the countries in the former Soviet Union, brings people in business, journalism and economics and so forth to the U.S. for graduate work. The conclusion based on data proves that the Muskie program succeeded in producing

professional leaders with skills and power to implement reform. That was a policy goal of the program, and it worked. Finally, one more example would be FLEX, Future Leaders Exchange, a high school exchange program with the former Soviet Union. There was much funding when the Soviet Union dissolved. High school alumni and exchange students from this FLEX program take a more positive attitudes towards democracy, free elections, and market economies, and demonstrate aspirations towards leadership when compared with others in their country who did not have this experience. The data from this program directly resulted in the creation of a similar program for students from the Muslim world. This was Senator Kennedy's program that now brings about 700 students from 15 countries, plus West Bank and Gaza, to the United States every year for a full year high school exchange in which they live with an American family and go to an American high school.

Another lesson we have partly learned, apart from the fact that they work, is that the exchange flow is a little more balanced. The number of foreign students studying in the United States, according to IIE's Open Door's figures, is almost 583,000. Those are almost entirely students who are here for a period of years, studying for degrees. Outbound study abroad students are 223,000, the majority of which are overseas for a semester or less. The difference in the flow is pretty significant. Furthermore, you get 28,000 to 30,000 inbound high school students annually, If there were enough families and schools, you could increase that number probably by 10,000. On the other hand, we are lucky if we can get 5,000 American students to go overseas on a high school exchange. This is part of the origin of the Lincoln idea, so we know that we need to get more young Americans overseas and help them become more expert, knowledgeable and sophisticated about the world. One of the ways that this expressed itself immediately after 9/11 was that we suddenly realized how few people we had who spoke these critical languages like Arabic and Farsi and Urdu.

Another lesson we have learned is that funding can affect program outcomes. Compared to the general scholarship programs funded by the federal government, the Gillman Scholarship Program is a very small, yet enormously successful scholarship in which the money is designated for students with financial need. The goals of the Gillman program are to encourage more diverse populations (such as African-Americans, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, students with financial need) to study abroad in more diverse destinations. Seventy-eight percent of the Gillman recipients students are going outside of Western Europe, compared to 45% for the general population.

And we have learned some things about what happens to study abroad students. It turns out that study abroad is a pretty good predictor of success. More get post-

graduate degrees, which changes their career direction. It seems to me that we are going to need people who are international and sophisticated in every field, who can connect to the world and who can operate as better citizens with an understanding of the world. So, it is very important for our whole society.

Study-abroad numbers are going up pretty steadily without any help from the Lincoln Commission. They are, however, mostly short term, and that 223,000 is, percentage-wise, a drop in the bucket. The number of undergraduates in the United States is about 15 million, but out of 15 million, we have got 223,000 studying abroad and the majority for a semester or less. It is not enough.

In the 1970s, Senator Paul Simon wrote a book called *The Tongue Tied American* about what a poor job we do with learning languages. He has been a huge champion for our field, and his last great idea was the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Program. He brought out this idea in public for the first time at an Alliance meeting. He said -- this was post 9/11 -- that the world perceives us as arrogant, but what we Americans really are is ignorant. We do not know about the world and the world sees that as arrogant. The way that we change this is to get our children overseas and to get them to learn about the world. That was his vision, and he called this an act of national renewal. He called it the Lincoln Program. He got the Senate to appropriate some money, a commission was chaired by Peter McPherson, who is now the head of National Association for State University and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), and their charge was to write a blueprint for the Lincoln Program.

The commission's big goal or recommendation was that a million students would study abroad within a decade, from 223,000 where we are now to a million. The data on students right now who study abroad proves that the majority are still female and white. Senator Simon also wanted more students from historically black and other minority serving institutions, from community colleges or from some of the schools that had not had the opportunity, from different disciplines, not just liberal arts and social sciences, but the technical fields, to participate in study abroad. He wanted people to go to different destinations, not only in Western Europe, but also in China, Brazil, Japan and Sub-Saharan Africa, because those are areas that are increasingly important in the world. He wanted more people learning those difficult languages and understanding those cultures. The commission also wants to use grants to go to institutions to leverage institutional reform. One of the problems is that, according to the studies by the American Council on Education, over 50% of incoming US students aspire to study abroad, but in the end, 1% or 2% actually do. One of the reasons is that there are barriers in institutions. The curriculum in some technical fields especially is

very dense, and most faculties think that nobody can teach thermodynamics like they can teach it, so they do not want students to go overseas. So, the idea for the grants to institutions is to give the institutions financial incentives and to leverage reform to remove some of those barriers and make it easier for some of those students to get abroad.

Now, legislation has been introduced and it has actually passed the House and it is still pending in the Senate. The legislation would create an executive branch foundation to administer the program. It would authorize up to \$80 million a year of new money for these programs. And I also want to point out that it will not be \$80 million a year. If there is a program, what is likely to happen is that Congress will start it relatively small and allow the program to prove itself over time. So, we are not going to start at \$80 million. Again, the goal in the legislation is the million students in a decade and the diversity and the institutional reform to the condition that Senator Simon had sought.

We do not know the answer to whether the legislation will pass. We hope it will. If it does not pass, can it be revived in the next Congress? And will it be in the same form or different form? Will there be adequate funding to support the program's goals? And again, over time that funding may build. Finally, and this is where I would really be interested in your input, is there capacity overseas to absorb that many American students? I think that is a question we have not, as a community in the United States, fully addressed.

## Closing plenary Q&A

Q: I would like to ask two questions. What is the agenda for Alliance other than funding? I am sure that you have to deal with trying to influence the policy making process in terms of government funding, but do you have any other agenda such as visa or issuance. Second question is how do you work with other associations like NAFSA or AIEA and also you may work with other associations overseas or could you address that?

McCarry: Sure. In terms of what other items are on our agenda, we have spent much time on visas, as you would guess, in recent years. For about five years now, we have been taking delegations of our members to visit U.S. embassies overseas to sit down with consular officers and public diplomacy officers and talk about the role exchange programs play and what they are doing in that country, but also to get into the nitty-gritty, if you will, of visa processing and visa issues. These have been really successful efforts by us. We have visited now over 40 posts. We have been in Asia. We have spent much time and visits to central Europe and former Soviet countries, mostly Moscow, but other places as well, Ukraine, Belarus, South America. And what we have found almost invariably is that it is pretty easy to make a common cause with consular officers because, and I think this is a big shift in the Foreign Service since the time I was in the Foreign Service, most of the consular officers now very clearly understand, by and large, the value of these activities. Not just the dollar value, although the dollar value is well publicized and well known about how much money foreign students bring to the United States, but the academic value and the long term policy value. And the consular officers have been dealt a terrible hand by the policymakers here in Washington. The fact that they have to interview everybody and they almost can never waive a personal appearance is terrible for people that have to travel a long distance to get the interview, but it is also terrible for the consular officer because they have got to take all that time and there are all these clearances and screenings. By and large, at the posts, they are doing a very good job and they understand. We have been able in the course of these meetings, often, to suggest ways to smooth the process, to give them reassurance about the kind of screening and selection that is being done by the American sponsors. We typically do a little summary, I have to write up a summary of the conversation and I share with all of our members, even those who are not there can see the benefit of that, and we are able to help them identify problems in a particular country that affect adjudications. So that has been very good. So we have done a lot of

work on that. It is probably too arcane a topic for this kind of discussion, but we also spend much time on program regulations. The State Department regulates many of these exchanges and their eligibility criteria and we spend much time working with them on what we call federal rule makings. They just created, for example, a new internship category, so young people can come to the United States, for up to 12 months and work in an American company as an intern in the technical fields and elsewhere too, which I think, is going to be a fantastic opportunity. It is virtually no cost to the federal government. Almost all these internships will be paid and it allows us to engage the business sector in a more dynamic way than we have in the past. What else do we do when we are not, we worked six years with the State Department on trying to get those regulations out. I personally drafted three or four different sets of regulations for that program eventually and it was not my draft that came out in the final set. So those are the kind of things. In terms of working with other organizations, you mentioned NAFSA and AIEA, both are members of the Alliance. Marlene Johnson, who is the head of NAFSA, was the chair of our board at one point. We work closely with all these people and it depends on the set of issues. I mean that some of our members care more about the appropriation. Some care more about the visa stuff, and some are more engaged than others. But, if you will, we are an association, so our members set our agenda. We are representing them.

Q: My question has to do with in terms of discussion in Washington. Where would Washington like these one million people to go? And I will frame, like if I was thinking about national security, I could decide where there is like free plutonium sitting around, I want to make friends so people do not sell that plutonium. Maybe I would think about like the two billion people in the world that are living under poverty and I want them to like us. Or maybe I would go to like the parts of the world where those two billion people are going to live under water scarcity, like by the year 2025. So there is a discussion where Washington would like these one million people to go, besides not all go to Europe.

McCarry: Not at that level of specificity, but yes. If you use broad terms, and I do not think the discussion gets much beyond that, they would really like to see them go some place other than western Europe. In a way, that is what it comes down to. You hear about the so-called big emerging markets. India, Brazil, China, Turkey, Africa and places with critical languages are high on the list and difficult languages to learn. When you hear people talk about how do you get to a million students, you have got to get

many students going to India to places in China that are not Beijing or Shanghai. Where is the capacity? Those are places where there may be capacity. I am not so sure about India. There was a university presidents' summit that Secretary Rice hosted at the State Department and Karen Hughes was very involved in that, one of the things that came out of that was that they did some delegations of university presidents to go to different countries in the world. They used these as press opportunities and they wanted to make the point that in academic terms, America is open for business. We will welcome your nation. We want your students to come to the United States, and one of the things the group that went to India heard in the Ministry of Education was concern about the Abraham Lincoln Program. And it was couched in terms of this: "We cannot meet the demand of our own citizens for higher education. We are involved in deep and complex planning to expand the number of academic institutions in India. We have not got room for 100,000 American study abroad students." Now, does that mean study abroad to India cannot be expanded? I do not think so, but it may mean that if you are looking to get 100,000 students there to make a million, that might be a long term goal.

Q: I have one comment. I am from Hiroshima University in Japan and I have been coordinating my exchange program for 11 years. And this study abroad program with exchange students is quite different. The concept of study abroad tends to be more American, self-serving type of education, which means that only American students go to the various countries without exchanging or accepting the students. Like Asian universities, we are organizing activities to try to promote exchanges inside Asia, but for example Thai universities said that only top elite universities can have exchanges, but lower level of Thai universities often said that we want to have exchanges with American universities, but the American universities often say "No you have to pay tuition if you want to send students, but we will send students to your university". Of course, tuition is very cheap in Thailand. So I hope there is some scheme of establishing more focus on exchanges, as well as study abroad. By and large, study abroad is mainly self-serving program for American side, but it does not really promote mutual understanding, I think. The other thing is that study abroad tends to be short and it takes long time to really mutually understand culture. Cross-cultural education is very important. I often receive American students. Sometimes only a few students, maybe 5%, or 10% of my exchange students from United States are, I should say, little naïve? They did not receive any proper type of cross-cultural understanding classes before they come to Japan. Probably in other countries too. So that is another focus. American

higher education should provide good quality of cross-cultural understanding courses before they start to send their students. That is my point.

McCarry: No, that is a great comment. Would any of the American higher education representatives like to take a crack at that?

Q: I think we need to do more in that area. We do it on a voluntary basis. We do not require cross-cultural courses, which are available, of all of our students. We try to build an incentive for students to do it and it is just one more hurdle for them, but I think your point is well taken and we would be well advised to consider making it obligatory rather than voluntary.

Q: Yes. There are orientations, but those orientation sessions that everybody must attend are fairly thin in what they can deliver.

McCarry: Let us face it, even if the orientation session had some depth, how could you construct an orientation session that was going to give anybody an in-depth understanding of a culture as complex as Japan? You have got to be there, you are right, I think duration is an issue. It is interesting that in the Lincoln Commission debates there was many discussions within the commission, about what duration would be, what is the minimum duration acceptable for a Lincoln scholarship and some people said one year and some people said one semester. The community colleges were actually quite effective in saying, "No, no, you cannot do it that way because our students, community college students are what we call non-traditional students. They tend to have jobs. They may have families. They cannot get away for a month, or for a semester". So what the commission came down as a recommendation was credit. The determining factor is credit. If the home institution will give credit for the activity, and that is academic activity conducted overseas, then it would qualify and allow the community college students a better opportunity to participate. Now I have studied those two Asian languages and lived in those countries for quite a while and so I really understand and appreciate and support the long term idea. I agree with you. But in a policy sense, I am comfortable with the notion of some people going for shorter periods because, first off, one size does not fit everybody and, like I said, I think anybody who has this exposure is going to be better for it. But a certain number of those students who have the short term exposure are going to come away wanting more. And some people, I am sure that you all have foreign friends who have had this experience in Japan where they go for a short

time and they think, “I am fascinated by this. I want to learn more about it”. And some of those people become relatively expert and quite conversant with Japan over time. So, we are balancing all these pieces, but not one size for everyone.

Q: I am in charge of the international student exchange and also taking care of foreign students at Kyoto University. I want to add a comment because from my viewpoint also, I have slight concern about the relationship between U.S. and Japan, in relationship to the student exchange. Our students have more exposure to European or Asian students nowadays because the number of exchange students with France is more than that of United States at least in our university. Because a consortium of U.S. universities, of 14 universities like Stanford and so on, have a remote campus on our campus and every year they send for 50 students and our students can still have a contact with these students from United States. They stay two semesters on our campus, but without such a situation, the number of U.S. students who come to Japan is rather limited in comparison with Asia, for example, we have 60,000 Chinese students maybe start studying in Japan, but we have also more European students. And I think that how to increase the number studying abroad from U.S. side is a very good opportunity, also for Japan to increase exposure of students with your students. My proposal is to create some kind of structure between two governments. Most of the universities in Japan really have difficulty in funding. But if we have proper funding, proper assistance, some proper initiative from the governmental side, maybe it is possible to set up some kind of structure to absorb certain number of students. So it is a good opportunity from the viewpoint of exchange of two students.

McCarry: Yes. I agree with you. If there were a new program like Lincoln or I guess we are now calling it Simon, it would be an opportunity to do that. You could put some emphasis on particular countries because you are going to get a whole applications and I think that would be a way to do it. You reminded me of something, this is another Foreign Service war story in the middle '80s when I was working in Washington before I went to China and there was a perceived crisis about the imbalance of student flows between the U.S. and Japan. And there was something like 40,000 Japanese students here at the time and, I think, 2,000 American students in Japan. I remember going to like a two day inter-agency meeting about this, most of which was consumed with trying to figure out how we were going to get 398,000 Americans to a level of Japanese where they could attend Waseda University, which was probably not a realistic policy goal. But if, what we need to do is get more Americans over there, like I said before, and all of

them are going to know more about Japan, and some of them are going to get really interested in Japan. And the more who go, the more who will come because students operate by word of mouth a lot of times and that is the most effective advertising for programs in new destinations. But I think it would be a very good idea if there was some government push to get more Americans going there.

Q: I am from Tokyo Institute of Technology. First of all, I would like to thank the conference organizer because the participants from engineering and science fields are not the minorities. Normally in this kind of internationalization of the university, we tend to be a minority and listen to the other fields, but throughout this sessions I had an opportunity to exchange many opinions from the same field and I realized it is not only the Japanese universities' school of engineering who has the problem, U.S. as well. So it was quite a provoking experience. Having said that, I was very happy to hear about this difficulty of making exchange students get highly motivated to go out. And one of the reasons is this condensed curriculum that the student has to go through during the course of four years or additional two years. But at the same time, I think we do have a condensed curriculum for a good reason because in addition to the basic knowledge and application we have a series of laboratory work and quite a high quality is required to complete those curriculum. Yet at the same time, we ought to understand and agree that those young engineers and scientists need to be exposed to the world in order to be confident in their abilities. So, as a lobbyist, how would you make a practical argument for loosening up those condensed curriculum while keeping the quality, but at the same time providing opportunity for them to go out and to be exposed to the world?

McCarry: That is an excellent question. You see, I am a lobbyist in Washington, the federal government, but we have people here who have to lobby university administrations so maybe they have an answer.

Q: The problem is that this question cannot be solved only by the university because those curricula have to be accredited by the government or national level institution, so I think different university with engineering or science have not been suffering, but debating between those opportunity and the difficulty.

McCarry: Now that I have tried to be clever, let me be serious. I think it is a very serious and good question and I did not mean to suggest at all that engineering students have a difficulty because the faculty is being mean to them or shortsighted. I understand that

this is a dense curriculum for a reason. There is a lot of content and it is complicated. If people are going to be qualified as engineers, they need to know this stuff, as Ambassador Gosende said the other day. I do not want the buildings to fall down either. So this is all important. I do not know how you deal with it on the campus level, but it seems to me that one of the ways things change in the exchange world is by leadership from the federal government. If there is a Lincoln Program, and if part of the clear message of that program is that we want to get students from these other disciplines participating and we have got money to support it, people tend to hear messages that have money attached to them. If it creates demand within students and there is a policy message that this is a good idea, I am not saying that this is going to change overnight, but there will be an impetus there to start creating some change. Some of this is going to be up to individual decisions on campuses. Kay, do you want say anything about what Minnesota has done in terms of connecting your curriculum with some of the schools you work with and programs you work with at other schools?

Q: Yes. I think this is a very real problem and certainly one that we have had and continue to have in other fields. But we got a grant to do a curriculum integration project which we had faculty and departments take a look at courses in different majors at overseas universities and evaluate them for transferability for credit at the University of Minnesota and transferability to fulfill degree requirements. It is just really a drop in the bucket in terms of how far we have gotten with that, but already it has made a significant difference in the motivation of students to be able to go because they know they are not going to lose ground or time towards the degree.

Q: I was just going to say that we heard this morning from our colleague Professor Mook from the University at Buffalo about the engineering collaboration in creating a semester-long program.

Q: Yes, actually I will just mention that. I had quite a few numbers in my presentation. And I think if you look at the bullet list, there is a lot of detail in there that might be interesting, but it addressed this problem of curriculum density and the fact that, in my opinion, to have a meaningful type of experience like you are describing, that is what we all would like a full year. But for most engineering curriculum in the United States, it is going to mean extending the program. So, something like Abraham Lincoln programs, I will just suggest, to be successful in engineering, the funding needs to enable an extra year of study. And one of the interesting opportunities that already exists in Japan is

the Monbusho Scholarships. The scholarships are so generous that this will enable an extra year of study currently for American students, but it is a relatively small number. I would also just like to say one more thing in just defending my colleagues. I am the chairman of an organization that has 35 American engineering universities that exchange. I think I can speak on behalf of most of them in saying that faculty, by and large, recognize that the quality of instruction overseas is certainly suitable. There is not a knee-jerk reaction that says nobody teaches thermodynamics like we do. I do not find that. I am not insulted by it, but I get that everywhere I go. People say that and it is simply not my experience and I am actually talking and meeting with these people on a very regular basis from in here.

McCarry: Well, I picked thermodynamics because of the audience, but I have heard that kind of comment not a lot, just once.

Q: I think it is more difficult at the higher level research that people do not want to share research because they do not want to give up their students. But at the level of undergraduate teaching, I do not think anybody doubts that calculus is taught as well all around the world as it is here.

Q: From my experience, it is more just a matter of how do we tell ABET that they are doing it as well. And it is not the doubting.

Q: I was going to add that I agree that additional time on task, additional time for study is one of the principal keys, but in the absence of that, the sort of initiative that the global engineering program has taken seems to provide a fitting and very useful model for some other disciplines. Other disciplines could learn from some of these very tightly scheduled curricula. Regarding the additional time to study abroad, I find that it is a rare student who will be concerned about prolonging his or her education if they have the opportunity to study abroad with some support. So that is a very viable thing. At the University of Mississippi, we have a very intensive Chinese language acquisition program that has the ambition of taking people to professional levels of Mandarin within five years. But it does take five years. We start from zero and there is no question about what those students are prepared to do that and they do receive support for it. But we have every reason to think that our students will step up to the plate with their time if we can help those who need resources find those resources to study abroad.

Q: I just want to confirm whether this Lincoln Program targets only undergraduate students or not? (Yes.) Then I would like to ask you why graduate students are not covered or targeted? I think graduate students also must need more growth experience. Especially, from my experience, my university, Hitotsubashi has only social sciences, without engineering and other science field, but I receive more proposals from European or Asian neighboring countries for short time, one semester or sometimes summer program, but I do not hear any of these proposals from American side. That is why I am also concerned. We have already received more European students or Asian students in summer program or one semester exchange at Master level or PhD level, but very few from United States.

McCarry: Yes. When we think of study abroad in the United States, we are the vast majority of that takes place at the undergraduate level. That was Senator Simon's vision. He wanted to get students when they were fairly young, not yet set on a professional track, more impressionable perhaps. When you are dealing with undergraduates, a big and very diverse pool of people and he thought having it reaching the widest audience was going to make it politically the most successful. That was now Senator Simon's vision and that is the way the legislation is under, is written out, and the program is understood. I do not think that precludes the possibility that graduate students might be included at some point. That is a policy decision that will get made down the road perhaps.

Q: It might be my naïve perception about that American higher education, but as you mentioned those community college people, they have their own job and they are non-traditional students. Sometimes I doubt that they have the financial assistance and that they cannot leave the university or their family. So I think if you provide more financial assistance to Master's students, they are happy to spend maybe one semester or one year in foreign countries.

McCarry: Maybe the program will evolve that way, if we get a program.

Q: I also would just like to say something about the 4 to 1, from going 250,000 to a million, and our really small numbers of engineering students that are going. This organization that I am chairing currently sends about 250 a year. I do not doubt that our current partners would absorb 1,000, so we could go to 4 to 1, but we are not, we are a tiny fraction of the total, so I think it is an interesting question overall. But the other

comment I would make comes back to the idea of exchange. If people are really engaging in exchanges, and that is what we are trying to do, it is a one for one swap. Whether we send one or a million, everybody ends up with the same number of students on the campus, so the absorption problem is only an issue if this is going to fund a bunch of these island programs. In these study abroad programs an American professor takes a group of American students and there is no exchange involved, they just go plop down somewhere and have a study abroad experience, then somebody is absorbing more students than normal, but if it is an exchange, everybody has the same number at the end.

McCarry: Plenty of universities have relationships that could cause exchanges to happen. Most study abroad is not that.

Q: I do not know if that is, do you know that to be true? (Yes, it is true.) (But that does not mean it has to remain that way.) There is no question that the big growth is on these non-exchange short term programs. But I do not know that it is more than half yet. Do you know? (Do you mean with exchanges?) Just in terms of the total number of students going. Is it really more than half already that are in these short term summer type of programs?

Q: I think they say it just crossed half.

McCarry: More than half a semester or less.

Q: But students that go for a semester could be going on an exchange. For that matter, even the summer I will express my guilt. I do some short terms summer programs, but those are exchanges. For us they are exchanges, but they are typically not one for one because of the short term program. But they are still exchanges because we do not do anything where we only send students.

Q: I was just going to say that some of the most successful partnerships programs that I have been involved in the past had to do with faculty members and students from two partner universities working together on courses and research in both locations together. We were not exchanging places, but being in one place at one time and then being on the other campus at the other time. It is extremely exciting. There is many intellectual activities. There are jointly written papers, depending upon the field of

course, whether writing papers is appropriate or if it is laboratory based or whatever. But we do not do enough of that sort of thing and one of the reasons is overhead costs, taking faculty as well as students. You have to partner with institutions which themselves can afford to do this, which limits the numbers, but that would not be an issue between Japan and the United States. So the imbalance in ability to pay or support would not be an issue at all. I would love to see more programs like that. In fact, one interesting program that is under way at the University of Mississippi this summer for the first time is a trilateral program with students from three universities and three continents working together. And I do not know all the details about that program, but I am going to be watching it carefully this summer.

McCarry: I want to come back to a point you made about the island program. I think it would be disappointing as an outcome if Lincoln funded many activities where an American student went overseas and hung out with a bunch of other American students. Particularly if the focus is on getting to some of these under-visited places, if you will; these places we need to know more about. We do not know if there is going to be a Lincoln Program and what the content of it will be if there is one. I hope that there is a predisposition in the program rules and the grant making to make sure that these are meaningful encounters with the other culture and not just what you described.

Q: Yes, you quoted some very nice statistics, I do not remember the number about the impact of being here on foreign students. So, Lincoln you get double duty if you fund an exchange because you are influencing foreign students to go home and have a better, hopefully...

McCarry: Yes, I could have put up 50 slides of those numbers from the State Department evaluations. All these programs work. Not everybody who comes to the United States, and again, they are mostly measuring foreign participants or overseas participants who come here, but not everybody who comes here loves us. Some people even have bad experiences, but by and large, people come to understand and appreciate the United States in a way they did not before. I had that slide where it said lesson partially learned about the imbalance in flows. I think there is a policy, this is one of the unfortunate, but it is my perception of American exchange programs that there is a predisposition policy-wise for us to want to educate the other as opposed to learn from the other. As Japanese you may have noticed this about us, but I hope not too often. When we have a foreign policy issue, I mentioned this YES program with the Muslim

high school students coming here. This has been going on now for four or five years, quite successfully. We are only now starting to think about whether we should send some American students to that part of the world. You know the message that you want more American students to know more about Egypt than they know to pick a country. Yet there is a message that has sent by the fact that sending our students there that is a very useful one in terms of the relationship between the two countries. For example, I was talking to an Egyptian woman who was the head of the AFS office in Egypt. This program has been going on for five or six years. She said that the Egyptian parents who send these children and the students are very highly screened. They are outstanding in every way. They have got good English, academics and all the rest and they come from good families. Not all students are from wealthy families, but even though there has been this wave after wave of students who have gone and come back to Egypt, these parents still think the purpose is to brainwash their children. And this Egyptian woman, who is the head of AFS there said that the only way we are going to change that perception is if we start sending American students to Egypt. They might start to believe that we are genuine in saying that we just want to expand your kids' horizons, help them understand us better. So it is really important and we do not do nearly enough of that. That is why Lincoln is such a good idea at this time.

