

ACE INTERNATIONALIZATION LAB

American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Lab

Subcommittee on Administrative Leadership, Structure & Staffing Report

Members

David Victor

Co-Chair

Professor, Center for Global Transformation Endowed Chair in Innovation and Public Policy, School of Global Policy and Strategy

Doug Ziedonis

Co-Chair

Former AVC, Health Sciences

Adele Brumfield

Former Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management

Peter Cowhey

Former Dean, School of Global Policy & Strategy


James McKerrow

Dean, Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Lisa Ordóñez

Dean, Rady School of Management

ACE INTERNATIONALIZATION LAB



Becky Petitt
Vice Chancellor, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Suzi Sterner
Associate Chancellor

ACE Subcommittee
Administrative Leadership, Structure & Staffing

David Victor, Co-Chair, Professor, School of Global Policy & Strategy

Doug Ziedonis, Co-Chair, AVC, Health Sciences

Adele Brumfield, Associate VC, Enrollment Management

Peter Cowhey, Dean, School of Global Policy & Strategy

James McKerrow, Dean, Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Lisa Ordóñez, Dean, Rady School of Management

Becky Petitt, VC, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Suzi Sterner, Associate Chancellor

SUMMARY

There is a need for centralized leadership, structure, and support to help UC San Diego coordinate and enhance its internationalization efforts. An integrated strategic plan across the campus that aligns the Divisions current work has an opportunity to increase impact, reputation, and funding. Leading peer institutions have all established an office of global affairs (by various names) to provide this function—among them, the University of Minnesota, University of Washington, University of Arizona, Ohio State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and Yale.

The committee recommends that UC San Diego establish an Office of Global Affairs (OGA). We also recommend recruitment of a distinguished leader for that office who is capable of performing big picture strategic planning while also identifying the evolving niches where the OGA could add value—a leader who will be a champion for cross-unit collaborations in research, education, service, public health/clinical, and community engagement pertaining to UCSD’s presence internationally. While this office could sit organizationally in many different places, the committee agreed strongly that the head of OGA should be part of the UC San Diego Chancellor’s Senior Management team. A model for this office is UCSD’s office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. We identify base resourcing, surely affected by COVID19 and other related matters, that would be important to provide even if the current budget climate does not allow creation of a full-blown international office. This approach would allow UC San Diego to evolve its international presence alongside the imperative of a changing internationalization strategy with the pandemic.

MAIN REPORT

UC San Diego has a long history of global outreach and engagement in all mission areas, including education, research, clinical, public health, and community through policy and other ways. About 25% of the undergraduate student body is from another nation; the faculty, graduate students and visiting scholar communities are highly international. Diverse research activities expand on every continent, with many new activities organized around rapidly emerging countries and regions—such as in Asia. UC San Diego health draws patients from around the world, and health sciences faculty engage globally on health matters. Strategic partnerships in key geographical areas, notably in Mexico and in China, have expanded. New strategic initiatives, notably in India, are taking shape. Matters such as climate change are global matters and a strength of our campus.

UC San Diego has made various efforts to study and consider new ways to organize and plan strategically the internationalization of its education, research, clinical, and community activities.¹ So far, those efforts have led to some increased dialogue across the campus but only limited formal change in the University's structure and processes. The ongoing global expansion of UC San Diego's activities, as well as the unforeseen crises such as COVID19, requires better organization for both times of expansion and global crisis.

To assist in fresh thinking about internationalization strategy, UC San Diego recently began working with the American Council on Education (ACE) International Laboratory and its network of about 150 other universities that are also using the ACE process and peer collaboration to learn best practices in many areas, including organization and structure. In that context, the ACE Internationalization Laboratory has been meeting with UC San Diego leaders to offer advice, analyze our current global activities, and help align our structures and functions with the campus internationalization goals into a strategic plan from which to implement changes in structure, function, and collaboration. There have been routine meetings with ACE advisors and meetings with peer institutions that have developed their goals and plans. The UC San Diego ACE Internationalization Laboratory has three co-chairs drawn from UC San Diego leadership and is organized into six working groups, of which this our group is one.²

Our Committee is charged with the task of “Recommending the necessary university resources needed to support comprehensive internationalization, including organizational structures and reporting lines.”³ We take this charge as including but not limited to recommendations on

¹ 2015. *International Strategy Workgroup Report*. Sandra Brown, Kim Barrett, Ann Craig, Ahren Crickard, Peter Cowhey, Steven Gamer, Michelle Hermas, Alan Houston, Margaret Leinen, Eduardo Macagno, Pamela Radcliff, Ramesh Rao, Barbara Sawrey, Kim Signoret-Paar, Kirk Simmons, Mounir Soliman, Mary Walshok, Darla Wilson. For more information see https://evc.ucsd.edu/files/International_Strategy_Workgroup_Report.pdf

² Tri-chairs: Alysso Satterlund, Robert Schooley, and Paul Yu. Six working groups: 1) Enhancing Research Collaborations 2) Student Engagement 3) Curriculum, Co-Curriculum and Learning Outcomes 4) Faculty Policy and Practices 5) Administrative Structure and Staffing 6) Institutional Collaborations and Partnerships.

³ “*ACE Internationalization Laboratory Structure*” Page 4, ACE Steering Committee (in progress), 2019 Steering Committee Meeting at UC San Diego. Ken Loh, Lei Liang, Lori Weiner, Margaret Leinen, Mary Walshok, Miroslav Krstic, Nancy Postero, Olivia Graeve, Roark Miller, Mounir Soliman Sarah Spear-Barrett, Suzi Sterner, Thomas Hermann, David Victor and Douglas Ziedonis.

leadership structure and placement, size and scope of the office, needed resources to support the plan, including centralized and decentralized structure and processes. We found that it was impractical to respond to this charge without focusing, first, on key functions that could be performed in the context of comprehensive internationalization.

A central element of our deliberations—perhaps THE central element—concerned how any program to organize UC San Diego internationalization could be implemented in ways that added value to the many elements of internationalization already under way. Unlike in some other universities where organization preceded global expansion, UC San Diego already has substantial international presence in its research, teaching and alumni networks. In some areas, such as recruiting and hosting students from overseas, the university has well-established and effective mechanisms in place. In other areas, such as international research partnerships, the University already has decentralized mechanisms—organized by schools, departments and other units—that so far have been fit for purpose; however, there are still likely benefits from a centralized Office of Global Affairs to help coordinate and elevate current activities across the campus and work closely with the VC of Research’s Office and others. The geographical presence of our existing research is truly global and spans every continent, including Antarctica. Increased knowledge of other research groups work will likely help with new groups starting new work in these areas and also increasing possibilities such as satellite campuses.

Recommendation 1: The committee recommends that a special effort must be made to identify organizational forms and functions for an international office that recognize and add to the many elements of internationalization that are already far advanced on campus. Success will require ongoing attention to the right balance of decentralization and centralization. Many smaller units on campus would benefit from being able to draw upon centralized internationalization functions while larger units (e.g, the Medical School) may choose to continue to provide many of those international functions on their own.

Through the ACE process, UC San Diego was linked to 16 other campuses that are in the same cohort of international planning. However, our committee found that many of those campuses were not comparable peers to UC San Diego—because of their size (much smaller), orientation solely for undergraduates, lack of hospital complexes and health sciences faculty, or lack of comparable scale of research activities and rates of growth. Thus, we relied in our deliberations on review materials prepared by ACE about the broader experiences across US universities,⁴ discussions with ACE,⁵ published studies on the same topic,⁶ reviews of the organizational

⁴ These campuses vary substantially in the placement of the international office. At Berkeley, for example, there are ~4 international offices. “Global Engagement” reports through the Vice Provost for Academic and Space Planning to the Provost. And three separate offices report through the Vice Chancellor of Research, alumni development, and study abroad—with each of those offices reporting to senior leadership via different channels. Several campuses have two or three distinct offices. At UCLA the office of “International Studies and Global Engagement” is one of 26 units (including all Deans) that report to the EVC and Provost.

⁵ In particular, we thank David Fleshler, *Vice Provost for International Affairs*, Case Western Reserve University who was our main point of contact via ACE.

⁶2017. Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. “*Pervasive Internationalization: A Call for Renewed Leadership*” For more information see <https://www.aplu.org/library/pervasive-internationalization-a-call-for-renewed-leadership/file>;

structures at all other UC institutions that have international offices,⁷ and experience of the committee and other UC San Diego Staff. We also interviewed key officials at peer institutions that have been actively evaluating their own programs and offer relevant experiences and lessons—in particular, Ohio State⁸, University of Arizona,⁹ University of Minnesota,¹⁰ and University of Washington¹¹. These interviews followed a roughly similar format¹² and played a particularly vital role informing our deliberations and this report because all of these campuses have already confronted—and to varying degrees addressed—the challenge faced at UC San Diego of adding strategic planning and functions to a wide array of international activities already under way. We benefitted, as well, from four ACE-organized webinars about international activities at UC Davis, Indiana University, NYU and The Ohio State University. These discussions were invaluable in adding perspective and lessons learned on leadership qualities and placement in the Universities structure, new role in centralized strategic planning, need to include all mission areas in scope, and need for considering online presence, satellite global offices, and staying connected to other University Offices of Global Affairs.

The importance of an Office of Global Affairs (OGA)

The vast majority of peer institutions that have active international programs and presence also have a dedicated International Office, led by a senior administrator or a faculty member serving in an administrative role. The titles for this leadership role vary. Often the head of this office, if there is a singular office, is known as the university’s “senior international officer (SIO)”, an acronym that is already taken for another purpose on our campus. We will refer to this role, if created at UC San Diego, as the Senior Global Affairs Officer (SGAO).

While that office performs different functions in different institutions, in essentially every case the central office adds value as a hub with unique functions, including providing system level leadership, advocacy for International matters, and offering enhanced connection across the campus. It is the place where people outside the university turn for information about international programs; it provides coordination functions that can facilitate joint action, such as when different arms of the university aim to recruit students from different places overseas. In

⁷ These campuses vary substantially in the placement of the international office. At Berkeley, for example, there are ~4 international offices. “Global Engagement” reports through the Vice Provost for Academic and Space Planning to the Provost. And three separate offices report through the Vice Chancellor of Research, alumni development, and study abroad—with each of those offices reporting to senior leadership via different channels. Several campuses have two or three distinct offices. At UCLA the office of “International Studies and Global Engagement” is one of 26 units (including all Deans) that report to the EVC and Provost.

⁸ Gil Latz, Vice Provost for Global Strategies and International Affairs, Ohio State

⁹ Brent White, Vice Provost for Global Affairs and Dean, Global Campuses, Univ of Arizona.

¹⁰ Meredith McQuaid, Dean of International Programs, University of Minnesota.

¹¹ Jeff Riedinger, Vice Provost for Global Affairs, U of Washington and former senior international affairs officer at Michigan State University.

¹² We asked these questions:

- What does your office do, and how big is it?
- What role do you play in the strategic direction of the university?
- What is the history—key events or observations that triggered creation, and problems that were identified?
- What is the balance of effort in your office between education and research?
- What has proved particularly difficult to do?

many universities the international office runs key overseas activities, such as study abroad programs and provision of visa services for visiting students and researchers. Often these functions emerge in the context of need and require rapid, strategic response. For example, at the University of Minnesota, as the pandemic spread rapidly in early 2020 the office helped counsel students, faculty and researchers concerned about repatriation issues; it also organized public forums where Chinese faculty (senior and junior) could discuss rising concerns about how Chinese nationals were being viewed in the US. Some offices have a dedicated communications or marketing person to help message about international activities on campus and outward (e.g., Univ of Arizona and Univ of Washington each have one full time person on that function; at Michigan State that function was performed alongside a staff of 6 people responsible for advancement and also for joint grant-writing).

Nearly everywhere that we have observed, this office becomes centrally involved in planning strategic initiatives and must be fully aligned and supported by the top leader of the University. Often, our interviews revealed, universities are marked by excellent leadership within schools and colleges that, by design, advances the interests of their school or college; the international office, well led, is a counterweight that encourages a different cross-unit, international perspective and activity.

In some universities this office appears somewhat peripheral to the core management of the university---it does not appear on organizational charts and its head nor does it appear to be part of the inner strategic operations of the university.¹³ However, in most universities the international office is located centrally within the organizational chart and run by a senior member of the central university administration, such as a Vice Provost; in most cases, reporting is either directly to the head of the university or one step removed. Reviews done for ACE, along with advice from ACE received through our committee, have underscored the need for the international office and its leadership to be centrally involved in the broader university planning and management.¹⁴

Recommendation 2: The committee recommends that UC San Diego establish an Office of Global Affairs (OGA). We also recommend recruitment of a distinguished leader for that office who is capable of performing big picture strategic planning while also identifying the evolving niches where the OGA could add value. The committee had mixed opinions on exactly what title would be best (AVC, VC, etc). However, we agree that this role should be part of the UC San Diego Chancellor’s Senior Management team. Some suggested an AVC role reporting to the EVC where others suggested a VC role similar to the VC of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. The level of authority and delegated authority for this leadership position would need to align with the roles of the position and office taking into consideration other VCs, Deans, and AVCs roles at the Division and system level. Conversations with other Universities all were unanimous that the leader needed to be part of the Chancellor’s Senior Management Team to assure that all parts of the campus are connected, including Health Sciences and SIO.

¹³ Examples include the University of Maryland, where the SIO and the international office perform important services for the University but are not on the core organizational chart of major reports to the President.

¹⁴ Justin Jeffery. 2018. “*An Inventory of Institutional Commitment and Administrative Resources for Internationalization at U.S. Public Flagship Universities*”.

The Functions of an Effective UC San Diego OGA

On other campuses, the international affairs office performs a wide array of functions. In our deliberations, based on advice from ACE, we looked closely at three functions.¹⁵ Other assessments of international affairs offices have looked at a larger number of functions.¹⁶ The offices vary widely in size. Among the smallest of the mature programs is the Univ of Washington, which has 25 people in the office—15 to administer Study Abroad and the rest focused on other functions such as travel and security policy (2 people), strategic initiatives (1 person), and MOUs (1 person). By contrast, the Univ of Minnesota (UMn) has a staff of 130 and runs more international programs directly from the office. (Unlike UC San Diego, UMn has multiple campuses and has adopted a hub and spoke model for internationalization—with the international office at the center, a role it built up over more than a decade of gathering information and providing a growing number of international functions.)

Every interview with peer institutions emphasized the need for such an office to add value and to respect the reality that many units' international programs are working fine and will appreciate continued autonomy. Every interview emphasized that many units were unaware of similar activities under way elsewhere at the university and that a critical function for adding value and building trust lies with information. At the University of Minnesota and the University of Washington the heads of the international office emphasized that early in their tenure they visited units in person and listened and gathered and shared information. These offices, and many others, maintain a “dashboard” of information and clearinghouses across campus.

Recommendation 3: Because so much of “internationalization” is already advanced on the UC San Diego campus, our committee recommends that an effective OGA be designed to

¹⁵ Our committee organized its deliberations looking, in particular, at three functions that emerged from extensive dialogue with ACE:

- Organize and steward study abroad programs, including those that are linked to overseas research and internships.
- Host the international student and scholar's office—a place where international students call “home” and which can assist in the myriad of functions that are unique to international student and scholar experiences (eg, visas).
- Think strategically about where the university is going—such as with major new initiatives in key regions (China, India, Mexico, etc); funding of those strategic initiatives; marketing both outward (so the world knows more about UCSD) and inward (so that UCSD faculty and students know more about overseas opportunities).

¹⁶ For example, in 2017 the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) Commission on International Initiatives Task Force (Tony Frank, chair) published *Pervasive Internationalization: A Call for Renewed Leadership*, which recommended transformative strategies aimed at addressing five dimensions of internationalization:

- Facilitating international research
- Internationalizing the curriculum
- Engaging faculty
- Supporting students
- Strengthening global operations

Those functions, while helpful categories, are already being performed at UC San Diego to varying degrees.

look carefully and repeatedly at whether it is adding value and to adjust its portfolio in response; it should employ staff, with conspicuous leadership, to canvas the UC San Diego campus for all ongoing international programs, educational opportunities, and exchanges. This will ensure an adequate assessment of ongoing international efforts since solicitation of information often falls short. Developing clarity on what are the problems that need to be addressed will help (e.g. tracking of visitors and travel, enhancing collaborations, developing strategic choices of where to prioritize system level investments, etc)

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AREAS OF INITIAL FOCUS, FURTHER INQUIRY ON SCOPE OF THE OGA, AND FUNDING SUPPORT:

The Committee identified a small number of critical areas where an OGA could immediately add substantial value. There are of course many other areas that would be identified by a formal strategic planning process that engages the whole campus and external stakeholders and partners. In addition,

1. Areas of Initial Focus: We recommend that an OGA’s substantive activities be focused, initially, in three areas of strategic planning, critical coordination and learning functions, and visibility to the outside world:

- **Strategic planning.**
 - The OGA should become the entity that organizes and solicits feedback on major initiatives. The current COVID19 crisis offers an example of where this office could play a central strategic role—evaluating, for example, contingency plans for remote learning and identification of remote platforms and functions that might be retained even as the crisis abates. There would be a benefit to documenting all the global impacts and solutions that are being developed and evaluate the impact—offering a foundation for strategic planning of response strategies when the next such crisis arises. In many campuses the response to the pandemic will be less internationalization; UC San Diego should be exploring whether alternative, greater internationalization might be warranted.
 - Realistically, by the time an OGA is established these issues will need to have strategic planning and there may also be a new initiative on India will be under way—in addition to other major country initiatives such as in China and Mexico. It was not our place as a committee to evaluate whether other countries should be added to the list, or whether strategically the university might benefit from a small number of countries as focal points for strategic overseas activities.
 - Future strategic planning might rethink the focal points for international investment—away from geographies as the unit of analysis and toward, perhaps, the four major campus-wide themes that were used to organize the last capital campaign?
 - UC San Diego, like many universities in the US, has become deeply connected to China—through research collaborations and a large number of Chinese students on campus. Openness is essential to modern universities, but strategic planning in an era of growing international uncertainties and tensions is also vital. Such

planning must be done with utmost sensitivity to strategy, reputational risk and other adverse outcomes—something that requires a degree of centralization that befits an OGA.

- **Critical coordination and learning functions.** While we have not done a thorough review of all international activities already under way at UC San Diego, we do note that there are many topics arising at the “seams” between already active international programs. In many of these areas, a larger dose of coordination could add value:
 - MOUs. At present, each school (and often many units within schools) establish MOUs with foreign partners. Respecting the diversity of that experience, it is also critical that units understand the appropriate standardization of elements, levels of commitment, and potential roles for MOUs that include multiple Divisions / Units needs. This process will help the university have a better appreciation for the geographical scope of its activities as well as the range. In most of the international offices we have examined closely the office provides clearinghouse functions for MOUs—typically on a volunteer basis. Helping to improve the quality of MOUs can be an area where an international office adds substantial value.
 - The international student experience. In most other universities, the international office plays a central and active role in most aspects of the international student experience. These educational programs and student matters are currently being managed by the schools that offer the programs and by the International Students & Programs Office (ISPO). While those core functions are performed well, to our knowledge, we have heard numerous concerns about the isolating effects of the international student experience. What is needed is not more siloed functions aimed at supporting international students but more coordination of experience and experiments aimed at helping integration of those students. The aftermath of the coronavirus pandemic may amplify those needs—not just for students from Asia but also students from regions of the world where local responses to the pandemic are seen as inadequate. This function may extend beyond coordination to training and seeding new ways to integrating international students. In particular, international students have been identified by our UC San Diego Healthy Campus Network and Student Health Services as being at high risk for food scarcity, housing issues, and mental health problems, including anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation, and substance misuse.
 - Diversification of country presence. Individual schools run their own admissions processes, but there could be a useful role for coordination of efforts to outreach into new countries—especially countries where the school historically does not have a presence and it can be costly and difficult to understand how to establish a presence. The OGA might have a modest strategic recruitment fund that can be used to help establish beachheads in different countries—especially as graduate education pays close attention to the need for diversity in student bases beyond China and India. For some parts of campus, a substantial challenge is the cost of

fellowships for overseas students; some coordination around best practices could help.¹⁷

- We have also learned, anecdotally, about a large number of functions that different units have been forced to perform as they become more embedded overseas. Examples include how to move funds across some borders; how to deal with payments not made by foreign agencies; how to raise funds from overseas institutions, such as NSF-equivalent's in other countries. This office could be a useful point of contact for quick response and connections between people who need this knowledge and those with experience handling such problems.
- **Visibility to the outside world.** This function could include at least two major elements:
 - While UC San Diego has rapidly become a global brand, we still struggle to offer a unified image for overseas students and visitors---people who have questions such as “What does UC San Diego do on global education?” Or, “what is it like to be a foreign student at UC San Diego?” With a light touch, a degree of strategic organization, packaging and coordinated visibility around global affairs would be useful.
 - In addition, there is an opportunity for different Divisions to support the overall brand of the University and the other Divisions' reputation and visibility. The OGA also has an opportunity to help further enhance the reputation and knowledge of UC San Diego's many strengths with global partners about the whole campus in a way that single units within UCSD primarily enhance the reputation and knowledge of the unit's activities.
 - Engaging the alumni network. In our interviews, most universities reported that their international alumni are substantially less engaged with the university—campus visits, advancement, etc—than US and local alumni. That outcome is hardly surprising. In coordination with Advancement, an OGA at UC San Diego could help organize alumni networks in critical countries. In coordination with key units, those networks might also help provide other critical functions, such as support and networks for local research and even satellite campus-like functions should those be necessary for ongoing operations during the current or future travel lockdowns.

2. Areas of Further Inquiry on Scope of Office: The Committee identified a few areas that need further inquiry and feedback regarding whether the proposed Office of Global Affairs (OGA) would also have responsibility for including in its primary roles or perhaps to be a supportive role.

¹⁷ Efforts along these lines include, at Global Education, the negotiation Collaboration Agreements with third-party funding agencies to support master's and PhD students. The aim, through minimal cost-sharing at the doctoral level, is to achieve the goals of 1) diversifying the international student population, 2) attracting external funding that can help offset domestic diversity initiatives and 3) raise UC San Diego global profile in regions like Latin America and Southeast Asia. For example, an agreement with the Vingroup in Vietnam (full funding for master's and a \$45k fellowships for first 2 years of doctoral program) was established earlier this year; other efforts are taking shape with ANID in Chile, EUDCAFIN in Guanajuato and LPDP in Indonesia.

- For example, the VC of Research Office has the authority to monitor research compliance issues, such as export controls, COI, etc, and federal and state agencies would continue to work with that office on these matters. It is our impression that those responsibilities are well executed. However, what other compliance matters that relate to internationalization matters that are not covered might be identified in this review process?
- International Education overall is undergoing a review by other committees in this Internationalization initiative. This might also include online education; however, there are many aspects of digital / online education that include IT technical expertise, training faculty in digital teaching, confidentiality protections when needed, as well as many other educational components. The Committee will seek feedback from the Oversight Leadership Co-Chairs on whether OGA scope includes study abroad or any other current office activities.
- Clinical and Public Health matters have a primary focus in Health Science; however with the new School of Public Health, the Pandemic, and the clinical support for our students, there is broader demonstration of the value of working cross campus on these matters. Further inquiry is needed on whether and how to engage the clinical and public health service with the OGA.

3. Funding Support for the OGA:

The Committee considered what might be the overall budget for the Office. The Committee met prior to the COVID19 impact on our campus which likely will affect all budget decisions. Prior to COVID19 the Committee estimated that the OGA would need a budget that matched the size and scope of the roles comparable with the EDI Office. Aggregating resources into the OGA from current resources would support some of the office, but additional resources would likely need to be considered to address the new tasks. The budget might also need to include some leadership and skills training in these related matters. ACE offers some mentoring programs and leadership development meetings, including the development of a network of SIO officers. However, the committee found that the question of training should be left to the head of OGA since training must follow function. Mindful of the likely difficult budget situation, the committee believes that it would be better to initiate a smaller office with the right leadership—suitably reporting into the top of the university administration and centrally involved with strategy—than to postpone the process altogether. A leaner, initial office would focus on information gathering, strategic planning, vital tasks post-pandemic such as stabilizing international enrollments (in coordination with relevant undergraduate and graduate admissions), and other critical tasks as they arise.

We note that the most effective international programs at our peer institutions all seem to have some funding for faculty- and unit-driven strategic initiatives. For example, at the Univ of Washington the international office manages a “Global Innovation Fund” that awards about \$250K/yr (plus multiplying funds) on research activities plus other funds that provide smaller awards (with higher matching) for international teaching outreach. These funds helped create connections between the international office and an otherwise decentralized campus. The head of that office reports, as well, that these kinds of

connections helped UW include internationally oriented problem-solving as a big part of its latest (\$5-6b) funding campaign and has, over time, led to more multi-PI large scale international grant proposals, which his office helps to catalyze. The University of Minnesota has a \$750K annual fund that it distributes to faculty for international programs.