

NAFSA: Association of International Educators
Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age

*A Policy Forum marking the release of the report of the
NAFSA Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad*

November 18, 2003

RICHARD W. RILEY, former U.S. Secretary of Education: Good morning. My name is Dick Riley, and I'm pleased to welcome you to this event marking the release of NAFSA's Task Force on Study Abroad report, entitled "Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age." I'm particularly pleased that we are meeting during the fourth annual International Education Week. Upon my recommendation and that of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, President Clinton proclaimed the first-ever International Education Week in 2000. And I'm so pleased that the Bush administration has continued to observe International Education Week and that's what we're observing this week. When the Clinton administration was ending, I was considering what I wanted to do next – once you lose your power, then you have to decide what you're going to do. I knew I wanted one affiliation that would enable me to continue to pursue my very strong belief in the important value of international education – something I had become very much interested in, especially the last two years of my eight years in office.

So I looked around and I asked myself: Who is doing the effective work in this area? Where are the folks who are moving and shaking things? And it became evident to me that NAFSA's clear vision – their activist agenda, their strong leadership -- made it a place for me to hang one of my hats. And I've been a Distinguished Senior Fellow at NAFSA for the past three years. And during that time, my respect for the organization as a true driver of the international education policy debate in this country has truly deepened. So it's been my honor to serve as honorary co-chair of this impressive task force, consisting of university presidents

and provosts, foreign policy and national security specialists, senior corporate managers and people with long experience in managing study abroad programs.

The task force has produced a compelling set of recommendations for promoting study abroad, which I hope will be taken seriously by our national and state leaders in government, business and academia. Since 9/11 it has become more and more clear that our country simply cannot afford to remain ignorant of the rest of the world. The stakes are simply too high. The generation that will lead our country tomorrow, the so-called millennial generation, must receive an international education today. They must have opportunities to learn about other countries, other cultures, and other points of view from direct experience as an integral part of their higher education.

They must have opportunities to learn the world's languages by living in the countries where those languages are spoken – the study and practice of the language must be part of the study abroad experience. There is a fallacy in this country that we don't have to learn other languages because everyone else is learning English, and that view profoundly misunderstands the value of foreign language learning. The fact that you can find a McDonald's anywhere in the world and order a burger in English is beside the point. [laughter] In today's world we must be able to understand other people, their countries, their cultures, and their aspirations. And we do that through language. If we cannot communicate with people in their own language, our understanding of them will always be limited. We are, in many ways, blind to what is really going on in countries where we cannot communicate in their own language.

We have, certainly, an obligation, I think, to get this right. By virtue of our power, the United States is truly the world's leader, but we cannot lead a world that we don't understand for very long. If we are to have any hope of living in safety and security, any hope of

exercising our world leadership in the constructive manner in which we all aspire, then we will have to take steps to understand the rest of the world much better than we now do. This understanding must begin in college, if not before, through study abroad programs, that are available to all who want them. The task force report makes this case in a compelling way, and it sets forth an action plan for making study abroad what it must become: a routine part of U.S. higher education. We have a distinguished panel for you this morning, which will close with my co-chair, my friend, former Senator Paul Simon, who will announce by videotape a major study abroad scholarship proposal.

It's now my pleasure to introduce Marlene Johnson, Executive Director and CEO of NAFSA, who will introduce and moderate the panel. Marlene.

MARLENE JOHNSON, Executive Director and CEO, NAFSA: Association of International Educators: Thank you, Secretary Riley, for those remarks and for your commitment and contributions to the task force report, to NAFSA, and to international education. It's a pleasure to have you as a colleague.

I join Secretary Riley in welcoming all of you to this significant event, and I say significant not just because I believe so deeply in the importance of study abroad and of this report. I say it also because we bring together today at this forum three major study abroad initiatives – NAFSA's, and the initiatives being developed by former Senator Paul Simon and by Michigan State University, which you'll hear about in a few moments. Each of these initiatives was developed separately and each will maintain its separate identity, reflecting the richness of ideas in our community about promoting study abroad.

But the sponsors of each initiative have agreed to come together at this forum. Those of you who live and work in this political town, where competing for status and attention is a

cottage industry, know how unusual that is. We all pledge to you today to work together in the interest of a more globally educated America.

Four years ago, and again earlier this year, NAFSA and our colleague association, the Alliance for International Education and Cultural Exchange, released a statement entitled “Toward an International Education Policy for the United States.” As part of such a policy, we urged the nation to commit itself to the following goals: to send 20% of our college students on study abroad programs by the year 2010 and 50% by the year 2040; to promote ethnic socioeconomic and gender diversity in study abroad; to promote the diversity of the study abroad experience through increased study and non-traditional locations, increased study of less commonly taught languages and increased study abroad in underrepresented subjects. And finally, to promote the integration of study abroad into the higher education curriculum and to increase opportunities for international internships and service learning.

We charged this task force with telling us how to achieve those goals, the result of which, I am proud to say, is the report that you have before you. The report states that Americans’ lack of knowledge of the world represents a national liability in the war on terrorism. To turn that liability into an asset, the report recommends a bold national program to ensure that American college students devote a substantive portion of their education to gaining an understanding of other countries, regions, languages and cultures through direct personal experience. In other words, study abroad.

The report calls on the President and the Congress to articulate the need for study abroad as a national security priority, to provide an appropriate legislative framework, and to make resources available that are commensurate with the urgency of the problem. It calls on governors and state legislators to make international education an integral part of efforts to

enhance state economic development and competitiveness. It asks colleges and university presidents to take a variety of steps to encourage study abroad on a school-wide basis to address financial curricular and other disincentives to study abroad, and to ensure that an array of options exist that make study abroad accessible to the broadest possible spectrum of students.

And the report asks the private sector to do a far better job of communicating to students that it values international and cross-cultural competence in its workforce, and to provide more resources for study abroad.

Well, that's all you're going to hear about the report itself this morning. You have it in your packet, I hope you'll read it and re-read it and just make it part of how you're thinking about these issues. Today we have people here who can answer questions about it, including a person I'd like to recognize – Carl Herrin, right here in the front row, a long-time government relations professional in international education and a leading member of our association who was the working chair of the task force. I'd also like to recognize NAFSA's president, Mary Anne Grant, who is the Executive Director of the International Student Exchange Program, whose support was essential for the success of this task force report.

Now we'll turn to a panel of three experts who were not involved in writing the report, but who have very important things to say about study abroad, about why it's so important to our country, and who have made and continue to make important contributions to international education in this country. Our first panelist is Peter McPherson, President of Michigan State University, who has held many senior foreign and economic policy positions in the United States government. Michigan State is certainly among the most "internationalized" of our

major universities, so Mr. McPherson brings great credibility to this subject. He joins us from East Lansing via video-conference.

Carol Conway is the Deputy Director of the Southern Growth Policies Board, which is an organization of the southern states and their governors. Carol Conway has a deep understanding of how international education and study abroad can serve state and economic regional growth and development. She is a former member of the Board of Directors of NAFSA.

And finally, Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch, former Ambassador to the Kingdom of Nepal, who has also held a variety of senior government positions. She currently serves as Ambassador in Residence at the University of Maryland, College Park and as a Starr Senior Fellow for U.S.-China relations at Peking University and Fudan University in China.

All of our panelists will be available to take your questions once they have all completed their remarks, but questions pertaining to the specifics of the report should be directed to me and my NAFSA colleagues.

Before turning to our panel I want to mention very briefly a complementary effort that is also happening this morning. In fact it's one in which Secretary Riley is also involved. The Asia Society and the Goldman Sachs Foundation have joined forces to create the Goldman Sachs Foundation prizes for excellence in international education. These are \$25,000 awards, which will be given annually to schools or states, higher education institutions and media and technology groups for innovative programs that are closing the international knowledge gap by bringing the world into America's classroom.

The first annual awards ceremony will take place later this morning here in Washington. Secretary Riley is on the committee that selected this year's awardees. It is now my great

pleasure to turn to our distinguished panel. We'll begin with President McPherson, President of Michigan State University and following his remarks we'll proceed in order with no further introductions. Mr. McPherson.

PETER MCPHERSON, PRESIDENT, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY: Thank you Marlene. Secretary Riley, it's good to see you again and good to be part of this panel, including my old colleague of almost seven years at AID, Julia Chang Bloch. Let me set forth briefly some comments here. First I think we would all agree that it's important as part of our long-term national security for our general population and our leaders to have greater knowledge, sensitivity, and understanding of the international situation. And we know that study abroad can be a very important component of that.

We know that the public thinks generally that students should study abroad. There is a lot of polling data that says that and, moreover, that students themselves, for example, in Michigan State – but we're not alone in this – two-thirds of them say before they come to college they'd be interested, varied degrees of interest of studying abroad. Yet, in the end, only 3% of the students in four-year institutions are studying abroad every year. Somehow there is a major disconnect between aspirations, interest, and what actually happens. I suppose some of that is natural, but going from 60-plus percent to 3%, which might translate into 10, 12, during a college career for a student, there is a major disconnect here.

All of us interested in this, of course, have thought a lot about why aren't these numbers better? If so many people are interested in this, why doesn't it happen more? There are barriers of various kinds and you need to just get them right on the table is my belief. First of all, it hasn't proven to be easy to integrate that experience in Paris or Mexico City into a curriculum. And all of us involved in higher education know how difficult it is to move

curriculum. There is, in the best of circumstances, a certain amount of inertia that takes some real pressure to move that.

Secondly, study abroad remains, in many universities, the preserve of upper middle class students. We have found it acceptable too often to have study abroad be quite expensive and much more expensive than what the students are paying back on their campus. This is a particular problem for public universities, where tuition is markedly lower than they are in private schools. I looked at all that money in those private schools and I wonder why they can't get everybody to study abroad, given those monies. But in public schools we've got to drive down those costs. So costs, integration, clearly are major factors.

What would a congressional effort get to? How would we, as Senator Simon and others have proposed, how would we structure this so as to get there? One, I am for this – I am for some federal money going into this. We've been talking about this at Michigan State and other places for some time. But I think it cannot just be money given to universities on the hope and prayer that they're going to have more study-abroad students. I feel strongly that federal support has to be based upon incremental increases at universities. The universities need to be pushed to get their curriculum – to get people behind it. We at Michigan State have moved from some 700-800 students to 1800 a year, but it's taken a lot of pressure, a lot of push on this campus and it can be done.

By the way, the next thing that has to be done, I believe, is that the money has to be conditioned somehow or the other in real efforts to deal with the cost structure. Not just scholarships somehow – that may help – but to really contain the cost. You can educate a student in Mexico City or Dakar, Senegal or wherever, a lot cheaper than you can in Rome or Paris or London. And we should be prepared to offer those options. At Michigan State, 60%

of our programs, on a per-credit basis, are no more expensive than being on campus, plus airfare and some of them even including airfare. I'm interested in a federal program that helps universities and students but expects to have progress on integration, on costs and, by the way, safety as well. There are a number of things that are needed to make this work. I believe it can. I've seen it in a number of places. While we've been more aggressive than most, certainly many universities over the last few years particularly, have really picked this up and I would expect we should see real progress. It's good to be here this morning.

CAROL CONWAY, Deputy Director, Southern Growth Policies Board: It's a real pleasure to be here, particularly with our local hero, Secretary Governor Riley from South Carolina. As Marlene indicated, my organization represents a 13-state association interested in economic development. So what I'm here today – I'm going to present to you the economic development perspective for the business community as well as state government about why study abroad is critical to our future. And I commend the commission for their work because this will be a helpful tool for us in going back to our legislators and leadership to explain the need.

I see that there are four reasons why we need to study abroad on the scale that they are talking about in this report. The first is purely for export development. A lot of folks think export development doesn't really add all that much to the economy, but that is not correct. Plenty of research indicates that it is our growth companies that export. They go together hand in hand. And to give a certain sense about the scale of export potential that isn't being tapped – we did a back-of-the-envelope calculation on southern growth that indicated that if all of our southern states (this is not including Texas or Florida) if all of our member southern states were performing just to the national average of exports as a share of gross state product, which is still

a very low threshold, the South would have \$60 billion more in sales and nearly a million more jobs, and that certainly would go a long way toward helping us in the economic transition that we're facing in our traditional industries.

You might reasonably ask, well, if it's such a good deal, if there is such great potential, why don't the businesses just go out there and do it? It's a good question. A lot of it has to do with the lack of confidence and lack of experience overseas. The interior South, if you will, has been very isolated in terms of the rest of the world. A lot of our folks that do trade development will say that there's not only inexperience but there's a lack of an experienced peer base. Businesses kind of go together and they train each other about how to do something. And there's also just a raw fear. Exporting is a risky business. It's got a steep learning curve and it's quite a commitment to do it, so a lot of folks haven't.

This is why in our own report at Southern Growth Policies Board, called "Fast Forward: Mobilizing the South for Prosperity in a Global Economy," we call on the states to consider an immersion experience for all students, and this might extend to students who are going to become teachers. Because how can our teachers teach to the future if they themselves haven't been out and about in the world? That might be something that I'd like to work with NAFSA to target in particular.

There's another part of that export development story, which is the future of America's exports, in the services industries and high tech industries. It's what we do best. It's what we're competitive in. But the trick here is that these are not commodities that we can sell kind of anonymously. There are, in fact, we're selling half-finished products; it's a concept. It's a general indication about how you're going to address a problem. And in these types of transactions the customer has to work very closely with a provider in order to complete the sale

and complete the product. This is high-contact sport – this is not something that you can just work out through e-mail and faxes. You have to be right in there with the client and working with them and understanding with them, living and breathing. It has to be trust.

And trust-based relationships do not grow out of English translators. You have to be right there in the client's home, in their community and having a drink or something. You have to be right there in the culture and sharing your personal stories with each other. That requires cultural sensitivity as well as knowledge of the language.

There's a second reason why we need study abroad, from an economic development perspective, and that is innovation. Innovation is, at heart, what keeps us competitive – nothing else. It's innovation, innovation, innovation. And the beauty of study abroad is that it's one of those things that helps bring an innovative climate into our businesses. It's that juxtaposition of different experiences and perspectives that gives rise to something completely new.

As a little example, there was a small family-owned manufacturer in rural Georgia that was forced to go international because they were losing their U.S. customer base – dragged kicking and screaming into the foreign market. And they not only did well, they discovered in Australia a new use for eucalyptus fibers that solved an industry-wide problem. I think it had to do with clogging wood-chipping machinery. It was by being out there and understanding and experimenting in this new atmosphere that allowed them to develop a completely new product line.

There is a third reason, and the last two are more workforce-related because workforce is economic development. And that is, one, we have to understand the immigrants in our own workforce. If we face the fact that one-quarter of the workforce will be first- or second-

generation foreign born, these folks are here to stay and we need to make sure that they are successful in their endeavors.

To the extent that we have culture clashes at the local level – and again, here in the South, we have had very little experience with immigrants – that can get in the way of economic development in terms of workforce relations as well as civic peace. And there is a wonderful story that I'll just kind of encapsulate for you.

Out of Chatham County, North Carolina, a rural community, recently large numbers of Mexican workers were coming to work in the poultry processing plants. These are nasty jobs, no one else wanted them during the time when jobs were plentiful, pre-2000. So the Mexicans were there but there was the general perception that they were taking jobs away. And the chairman of the County Board of Commissioners wrote to the INS asking to take all those “illegals” away – deport them. And there were tensions, very high tensions between the Hispanic and native-born community, such that it was leading toward a confrontation led by none other than David Duke.

Well, here the University of North Carolina stepped in with a special program that took a delegation of Chatham County leaders to Mexico, right into the sending villages – the villages that were sending their best men into the United States to work. And by the experience and getting to know these people and know more about Mexico, the delegation came back with 180 degree turn in attitude and worked quickly with the Hispanic leaders in their community to call off participation in a rally that David Duke had scheduled. And since then they've been working cooperatively together. It's that kind of experience that's required to have that attitude change.

I think it's important to consider that study abroad is necessary – on the scale that they're talking about here – is necessary to keep from splitting the “haves” from the “have nots.” If you consider that technology and international are the growth career tracks, the high-paying career tracks, and you look at who is enrolled in foreign studies, foreign language programs, you will see relatively few African-Americans. Even though we have some terrific role models, going all the way back to Andy Young, of African-Americans leading foreign policy, we have very little participation.

So clearly there is a financial barrier as well as, I think, a cultural barrier where the children – African-American children – do not have the parental guidance or, again, that peer base to encourage them to consider foreign policy, international studies and foreign languages. In concluding, I think we've got to face a paradox and resolve this paradox that for our economic security we must reach out and we must engage increasingly in the global economy.

Yet, at the same time, by reaching out and engaging, we also appear to be more vulnerable. I see study abroad as actually addressing both sides of this paradox. Through study abroad we not only are able to realize the potential in economic opportunities overseas but, at the same time, be more aware and cognizant of the world around us and better able thus to protect national security. Thank you.

AMBASSADOR JULIA CHANG BLOCH: After Secretary Riley, Marlene Johnson, Peter McPherson and Carol Conway, what can a layperson like me say about international education? Well, not ever having been a wallflower, let me just plunge right in. Let me first congratulate NAFSA for giving this country a much needed wake-up call to address America's international knowledge gap. The NAFSA study makes it very clear, particularly to me, that there has never

been a moment in history in which our influence on the rest of the world has been as great or our understanding of it less sufficient.

September 11 awakened Americans to the question that President Bush made famous – why do they hate us? The easy answers are very comforting: We are rich and they envy us. We are strong and they resent this. We stand for freedom and they don't like it. All of this may be true, but these answers cannot fully explain why September 11 moved men not only to kill, but also to die.

To deal with such fanaticism, America has to strike back and strike hard as we are doing against all terrorists – al Qaeda and Iraq. But every day that we are in Iraq, we must be reminded that this kind of terror cannot be eradicated by military action alone. We need to ask ourselves not only why they hate us but also why we did not know they hated us so much.

September 11 exposed an international knowledge gap among Americans of crisis proportions. Even though I am a member of the Asia Society's of National Coalition on Asia International Studies in the Schools – they're meeting right now across town – I was not prepared for its 2001 report, which found that vast numbers of Americans, particularly young Americans, know very, very little about the outside world. The fact that 25% of college-bound high school students surveyed did not know the name of the ocean that separates the United States from Asia, and 80% did not know that India is the world's largest democracy, did not astound me as much as the finding that very few, if any, teacher-training institutions require any course work in non-Western history for our future history teachers, for the students who are preparing to be history teachers.

I was more prepared, but no less appalled, when the National Geographic Society released its 2002 global geographic literacy survey, which found Americans ages 18 to 24

scoring next to last among young adults surveyed in nine countries. The great majority – 83% – could not find Afghanistan or Israel on a world map. And even a larger number – 87% – could not locate Iraq or Iran. Less than half could find the United Kingdom, France or Japan. Less than two-thirds could correctly identify a much larger land mass: China.

Young adults from other nations knew the size of the U.S. population better than their American counterparts, 30% of whom estimated the U.S. population at a billion or more. American ignorance of the outside world, however, pales in comparison to our infamous monolingualism. The *Chicago Tribune* recently trumpeted the just-released study by the Modern Language Association. The headline was “Language Boom Sweeps Colleges.” A closer look, however, found that only 1.4 million American college students are enrolled in foreign-language study. Although this is the largest number of American students taking foreign language classes since the organization began their survey in 1958, it only means 8.7% of our total college student population. And more than half of that population is studying Spanish. There’s nothing wrong with Spanish – I studied it too because it was the only language outside of Latin offered in my high school.

Despite this so-called boom, foreign-language study in America’s colleges and universities lags far behind schools in other countries. In Europe, language study often begins as early as age five. And high school graduates are proficient in at least two languages. Chinese students begin to study English in the third grade. And when they graduate from senior middle school, they are expected to have an English vocabulary of at least 4,500 words, or equivalent to the current fourth level of college English tests.

I should not have been so surprised, if I knew then what I know now. America’s international knowledge gap is hardly surprising if you know that this country has retreated

from international education after the Cold War. We let U.S. competitiveness in the international student market decline, allowed funding for exchange programs to decrease by 40% in real dollar terms over the past decade, tolerated low participation of U.S. students in study abroad – as the NAFSA study points out. And crippled ourselves with a critical shortage of Americans with foreign-language skills.

And as the *Washington Post* editorialized yesterday, visa hassles prompted by post-September 11 security concerns, are now driving foreign students and travelers alike to more hospitable countries at a very, very serious cost to American tourism, business, academic institutions – not to mention America’s reputation abroad. It is as if emerging after the Cold War as the only global super power, America decided that the defense of U.S. interests and the effective management of global conflict would not require Americans who understand the world in terms other than our own.

September 11 brought home the horrible costs of short-changing international education, of not having enough critical language and area expertise in federal law enforcement and intelligent agencies, not to mention our diplomatic corps. Have we learned our lesson? September 11 may have awakened Americans to the degree to which we are disliked and resented around the world. But in addition to asking why we didn’t know, we need to ask ourselves what we can do about it. You know the answer. Exactly what the NAFSA report recommends – more and better study abroad programs.

As a Syrian student studying at an U.S. university told Assistant Secretary of State Patricia Harrison, after September 11: “We are your link to the world, we overseas students. The solution to end terrorism is international educational exchange.” As my personal experience has taught me, the best way by far, for anyone to learn about a foreign culture is by

living abroad for at least a year – not just six weeks. There is no substitute for first-hand experience. No amount of reading, watching television, or surfing the Internet can convey the sense and nuance of a culture or the feelings and sentiments of a people. There is no substitute for experiencing a foreign culture – only study abroad and international exchange can connect people to people across boundaries. Only face-to-face dialogue can build understanding of cultural values, trust, confidence, networks and collaboration. And only international education can produce the leaders needed by the global knowledge economy that we all live in today.

I want to quote Jack Welch, the former CEO of General Electric, who said this to his employees: “The Jack Welch of the future cannot be me. I spent my entire career in the U.S. The next head of General Electric will be somebody who spent time in Bombay, in Hong Kong, in Buenos Aires. We have to send our best and brightest overseas and make sure they have the training that will allow them to be the global leaders who make GE flourish in the future.”

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time, right now, that we close our international knowledge gap. And if we implement, beginning right now, the NAFSA study report recommendations, we will be taking only a first step. I believe that the future demands that we take even bolder steps, doubling, tripling, quadrupling the number of American students who study abroad is only the first step, although a very critical step. We should keep this in mind as I hope all of you will help to realize the NAFSA recommendations. Thank you. [applause]

Marlene Johnson: Before we take questions, we have via videotape a special announcement by former Senator Paul Simon, who is now the Director of the Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale [phonetic]. I think we’ll see it right here.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON (via videotape): I’m sorry I can’t be with you personally at this press conference – a press conference I think is extremely important. It’s important because it

relates to a huge need that we have in our country and a huge need we have in our world. We had at the last school year, academic year, 584,000 international students who attended our colleges and universities. Just slightly over 1% of our students ever study abroad for a summer or a semester. The reality is we're going to have to become much more sensitive to the rest of the world. September 11 should have taught us a lesson – I hope it did teach us a lesson, tragic as that event was.

Former Secretary of Commerce, Pete Peterson, who was Secretary of Commerce under Richard Nixon, headed a small group to look at where we ought to be in the rest of the world and the reaction of the rest of the world. And they came to the conclusion that our insensitivity to the rest of the world comes across as arrogance. I think that is correct. I say that with great reluctance. What can we do about it? Well, those statistics I cited on students studying abroad, I think are important.

In the year 2009 we celebrate the bicentennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth. Abraham Lincoln is primarily known for freeing the slaves, but he was also very sensitive to the international scene. And he signed a controversial measure – the Morrill Act, the Land Grant College Act – which James Buchanan ahead of him had vetoed. That bill was the G.I. Bill of the nineteenth century. It moved the nation ahead in higher education as nothing else had done up to that point and nothing else did up until the enactment of the G.I. Bill in 1944. If we were to have a scholarship program for 500,000 college students, up to \$7,000 a year, with preference being given to the developing world – one of the problems now is that two-thirds of that one percent go to school in Western Europe. Ninety-five percent of the world's population growth is going to be outside of Western Europe, so that if we have these scholarships available primarily for studying in the developing nations, we can move this nation ahead fairly

dramatically. In ten years we would have at least five million Americans who had studied abroad, and we would be a much more sensitive and responsive nation.

Now, that's a lot of money -- \$3.5 billion it would cost a year, but that's one-seventh of 1% of our federal budget. When the President suggested spending \$87 billion, primarily in Iraq, a little in Afghanistan -- and I support the President on that -- but that would take care of this program for 25 years. It would help our security, reduce terrorist threats. It would pay off in international trade alone. One of the things we have to recognize is we can't just drift into becoming a greater nation. Too many political leaders, in both political parties, are afraid to tell us we're going to have to sacrifice a little. The reality is if I want to improve my home, I have to sacrifice a little. And if we want to improve our nation and our world, we're going to have to sacrifice a little. And this small gesture would be extremely important in terms of our relationship and our leadership ability in the rest of the world. Again, I'm sorry I can't be there personally to join you in answering any questions you may have. But I applaud the ideas that are being put forward, and I hope we can work together to see that this nation moves ahead to really provide the leadership that is sensitive that the world needs.

Marlene Johnson: And now we'll open it for questions, to any member of the panel. Mr. McPherson is still with us, I believe. Okay, he is still with us. And there is a roving mike, so if anyone has a question, Rachel will bring you the microphone so that Mr. McPherson can hear it also.

Question: Good morning, I'm Bai Adridge, President of WorldWise Services and a visiting research scholar at the International Center for Transcultural Education at the University of Maryland. About one out of every four Americans is a person of color, yet when you go abroad and you look at the students who study abroad, it's probably one out of ten

approximately. Marlene, you mentioned that diversifying the students who study abroad was an important objective of the study, yet, when I look at it, I don't see much at all addressing that issue, which I think is a really important issue. So I would be interested to know what kinds of discussions you had on the committee and what kinds of ideas you came up with.

Marlene Johnson: I think the specifics of accomplishing that are strategies that need to be developed at the university level. The task force focused on what the issues were that need to be addressed, and where the responsibility for that is. And I think there is a great deal, as Mr. McPherson said, as other university leaders have said, there is a great deal of recognition that this is an area that needs to be addressed, and I think increasingly, a commitment to do that. Our next job now is to take this report and work with the various groups that have responsibility here to decide to come up with strategies for moving forward. Mr. McPherson would you like to make any comments?

Peter McPherson: Well I would, because I think this is part of the reason why we have to address the cost of these programs, while obviously the income status of students varies, but there is generally the case at many universities that a disproportionate amount of students of color come without a lot of resources. So, frankly, if study abroad programs are, in fact, or have the image of sort of programs for wealthy students, many students of color don't even apply, don't even look at it. And I think we've got to be very clear that study abroad is for students across the income spectrum.

I also think that the study abroad programs in Latin America and Africa end up being programs that African American/Latino/Hispanic students often take advantage of. I would specifically say that I'm not encouraging those students to take advantage of those particular programs. I think that they may well want to study in Paris or London or wherever, but merely

the fact that we have programs available in Senegal or Mexico or Ecuador or wherever, is a way to get students, students of colors, at least taking a look at all these things.

We have to work at it. And we're not satisfied with our percentages – our proportion of students of color aren't equal to our student body, but we're working at it, and I think we've got to get there.

Julia Chang Bloch: I think there has to be also an image change. Because right now, I think study abroad is seen as something fluffy, not integral to the discipline or to the curriculum. It's not serious and it's also a program for the wealthy, for those who can take a summer off to go to Europe and enjoy themselves. I think there is very much that kind of image. I have spoken to many, many Asian students who are not really necessarily, let's say, on the income side, having a problem. But they don't feel somehow that the study abroad programs are for them and there also needs to be – it's a chicken and egg thing – there needs to be a critical mass of students of color participating in study abroad before more and more students of color will apply.

Peter McPherson: I think this image question varies by campus, but I do think that the predominant image in decades past has been this was for wealthy students. You just saw the signs around campus showing “spend the three times the tuition and go to Madrid this coming semester” or whatever. And we haven't spent the time driving down the costs of these programs. We thought it was acceptable to have study abroad be substantially more expensive than on campus. So you've got that question. And I agree with Julia that we've got to change that. I think we've gone a long way to changing it on our campus and I send letters to students before they get here saying they're expected to study abroad. I mean I try to create . . . I've got

everything except the rule that you have to. And overtime that's changed and we've got to talk about the money.

The image one is an important part of it – the quality was the other thing I was going to mention. We can't just have this be a tour. Frankly, your faculty won't support it – won't sustain their support unless they believe – in places like Michigan State and I think almost all universities – unless they believe it's real. If they think it's real academics and demanding, they'll push it. If they don't, they won't. So a quality component here is just as important as the cost of integration of the curriculum and the rest of it.

Carol Conway: There is another aspect to this, which is Marlene has correctly said... I think a number of the specific strategies have to be created locally, but I would say the universities have a role in communicating with the high schools and middle schools to start the interest way back then and to engage the parents in the discussion. Because that's probably where the decisions are being made, is way back much earlier in the game.

Peter McPherson: I wouldn't disagree that that's an important part of the thing. But I think, Ms. Conway, that it is almost the universities that need the delivery here. Students come – the polling suggest – two-thirds of them think they ought to study abroad before they come. But why can't we, as institutions, respond to that apparent interest? That's really the searching question in many ways. I think more people are prepared to do this than we appear to be able to accommodate with quality programs that are integrated into the curriculum – with cost structures that fit in the budgets. I think what this recommendation that Senator Simon and others are suggesting is really to force changes in universities that we aren't delivering, in my judgment, yet. And we're not going to deliver it if they just give us money – we like money all the time and we'll be happy to spend it. It's got to be money that we get only if we make

significant changes. This is really a huge change for universities where we're willing to do it, I think a lot of presidents in this country are talking about this. But the law has got to be heavily demanding to make these very decentralized structures move.

Marlene Johnson: We have time for one more quick question. It needs to be a short question and a short answer.

Question: Hi, I'm not sure this is a very short question.

Marlene Johnson: It has to be a short question because we have to move out. There's a question here – no, this man I called on before.

Question: I'll try to make this brief. My name is Nathan Scott and I work with the Studies Abroad for Global Education program, and I appreciate your comment because this is a good segue. I work for a high school study abroad program and many, many of our students who go on the high school study abroad program later definitely take advantage of college-level study abroad. But my question is: Is NAFSA, I have not yet read the report, but is NAFSA addressing high school level study abroad and, if so, what kind of recommendations are being made at the high school level, because I agree with Ms. Conway, that's a very important factor.

CARL HERRIN, Working Chair, NAFSA Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad: It is a good question about the issues encouraging American high school students to participate in overseas experiences. The task force was charged with looking at issues in the context of higher education and largely limited its deliberations and recommendations to undergraduate education. There is, however, I believe, a reference very early on in the report that we see these issues as part of a larger set of issues involving pre-collegiate education and graduate study. So, in our view, there are a similar set of issues about access and opportunity that clearly exist

in the elementary and – actually in this case at the secondary level – so we didn't particularly comment on those particular areas.

Marlene Johnson: I'm afraid we've used up our time here with the Carnegie Endowment. We thank them very much for their hospitality and to all of you – Mr. McPherson, thank you very much for participating with us today and to Julia Chang Bloch, Carol Conway and Secretary Riley – thank you all very much. If there are other questions, you can come up here. [applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]