

**ACE Internationalization Lab
Steering Committee Meeting**



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

**Global
Engagement**

November 26, 2018, 8:30am-10am

Handout: [Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement \(CIGE\) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization](#)

Committee Membership: (* - Co-Chair; ^ - Unable to attend)

Scott Brandt, Elisabeth Cameron, Matthew Clapham*, Becky George*, Lisbeth Haas^, Jeremy Hourigan*, Richard Hughey*, Galen Jarvinen, Steve Kang, Lori Kletzer, Tracy Larrabee, Flora Lu^, Katharyne Mitchell*, Katia Obraczka (via zoom), Massimiliano Tomba

- Richard called the meeting to order at 8:35am
 - Committee members introduced themselves
- Richard provided a brief summary of the campus context leading to this effort at strategic internationalization
 - The CP/EVC is expecting the Committee to produce a plan with specific recommendations for implementation.
 - Richard read out from the latest draft of the charge to the Committee that is forthcoming from the CP/EVC to members and campus leaders
 - Richard summarized the kick-off meeting in DC in August 2018, which Marlene Tromp, Richard Hughey, Matthew Clapham, Jeremy Hourigan attended
 - “Random acts of Internationalization” – The Committee fully acknowledges that there are already a great deal of activities happening on campus that would fall under the umbrella of “internationalization”. The ACE planning process will be, in part, a systematic effort to catalog campus accomplishments in this area as they will inform future efforts.
- Jeremy provided a summary of the [6 pillars of Comprehensive Internationalization](#) – a framework provided by ACE that will help guide the Committee’s efforts at data gathering.
 - A steering committee member asked a clarifying question about articulated institutional commitment vs. curricular articulation.
 - A steering committee member asked to clarify the current administrative structure. The Division of Global Engagement, while a start, may not be as comprehensive as it could be and a systematic rethinking of this is hopefully one of the outcomes of this strategic planning process.
- Becky discussed examples of current efforts at the Division of Global Engagement (GE) and how they align with the pillars of [Comprehensive Internationalization](#) (see handout).
 - Absent an existing overarching strategic roadmap for the institution to drive partnership building, GE has employed best practices by soliciting information about current faculty relationships and analyzing existing student mobility interests to guide partnership building.
 - Co-curricular programming:
 - GE currently offers a variety of inbound student programming such as orientations (Global Start), workshops, and a mentoring program.

- Working on building out Study Abroad programming for outbound students, e.g. Intercultural Communication workshop has been established, more can be done in the area of re-entry programming for study abroad returnees.
 - Faculty policies and practices:
 - GE has worked extensively with CEP, CAFA on set of policies to allow campus to welcome and attract visiting students.
 - For example, working with CEP to develop a UC credit policy for campus exchanges.
 - Student mobility:
 - GE provides programming but also works on visa processing and policies (ISSS);
 - Study abroad policies including student health and welfare;
 - GE is working on developing bilateral exchanges directly with partner universities abroad (outside of UCEAP which is a system office).
 - Collaboration and Partnerships:
 - GE has developed a set of templates for general partnership (MOU), student exchange.
 - More to come in time. For example, working on an agreement for exchange with UNAM in Mexico to bring undergrad and grad researchers to campus;
 - GE is developing a partnership model that grows out of existing faculty connections but then systematically expands to involve more departments over time.
- The steering committee split into four groups and examined four pillars of Comprehensive Internationalization, focussed on the data collection phase of the Internationalization Lab process. The groups rotated, considering and adding to process.
- Richard offered a preview of next meeting (formal agenda to be shared later):
 - Some preliminary data to share and discuss
 - Exploring how best to structure subgroups of the Committee; how best to bring in non-Committee members on some projects
 - Looking internally for examples of best practice in internationalization but also externally - within the UC System and also beyond.
- Meeting adjourned at 10:01am