



**National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22230**

**National Science Foundation
Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering
April 25-26, 2011**

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Saifur Rahman, Chair AC-ISE
Howard Alper
Jean-Pierre Ezin
Roddam Narasimha
Jeanne L. Narum
Maresi Nerad
Kevin Pilz
Nicholas Vonortas
Daniel Wubah
Janis Weeks
George Middendorf, CEOSE Liaison

[A list of Advisory Committee Member affiliations is attached.]

The Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering (AC-ISE) met at the National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia in Stafford II Room 555 on April 25 and 26, 2011. The meeting agenda is attached.

Monday April 25, 2011

Welcome, Review of Meeting Agenda, Objectives, and Housekeeping

Dr. **Saifur Rahman**, Chair, Advisory Council for International Science and Engineering (AC-ISE), called the meeting to order. He noted that AC-ISE member **Lueny Morell** was not able to attend. He emphasized that the AC-ISE is charged to focus on international science and engineering for the entire National Science Foundation, not just the Office of International Science and Engineering.

Dr. **Machi F. Dilworth**, Director, Office of International Science and Engineering (OISE), described her expectations for the meeting, including that committee members identify possible strategies for connecting OISE to other offices and directorates at NSF.

Meeting with Director of the National Science Foundation

Dr. Dilworth introduced Dr. **Subra Suresh**, Director, NSF. Dr. Suresh noted that he had asked to address the advisory committee at the start of the meeting so that he could give the committee a sense of the types of questions he would like the committee to consider. He also noted that the

chairs of the various advisory committees would eventually meet to provide insight into the issues identified in these questions.

Dr. Suresh described international engagements as being an essential component of NSF for many years. He asked the committee to consider how NSF might strategically address internationalism over the next decade, including identifying new possibilities for internationalizing NSF activities. He emphasized the need for a strategy guided by principles, opportunities, and circumstances, and asked the committee to address activities that NSF should always do, based on principles, as well as things that NSF should never do. He also requested that the committee take into account circumstances, such as the current economic and budget outlook in the United States. The committee's recommendations have the potential to shape the increasingly global perspectives of a \$7 billion agency rather than just a \$50 million office.

Dr. Suresh noted that international activities are increasingly housed in individual directorates and offices, and that mechanisms should foster greater synergy, efficiency, and engagement across NSF. International activities and OISE play a critical role in his vision for OneNSF and effective ways to coordinate all directorates, including OISE, are needed to move NSF in one cohesive direction.

Dr. Suresh asked the committee to consider the strategic locations for NSF to have overseas offices for the next decade, given cost constraints during a time of great fiscal pressure. He stated that NSF runs major facilities in Antarctica and in Chile, but does not have official offices there. He posed several alternatives to permanent overseas offices, including: (a) fellows at U.S. embassies, (b) visiting NSF staff or rotators, and (c) engaging with other agencies strategically. Dr. Suresh also asked the committee to think about the mechanisms and strategic opportunities for greater international operations through "virtual" centers and institutes across the globe. If OISE were to play a catalytic role, what "sunset clauses," if any, should be built into existing operations? Dr. Suresh asked committee members to consider the metrics of success in international operations, as well as the international policy roles that NSF should engage in to facilitate greater scientific collaboration with overseas partners. It is challenging to create bilateral engagements with each of the numerous large and small countries on the planet. As such, perhaps NSF should focus on engagements with continents or existing international groups. He stated that scientific excellence must be the goal, not geographical presence. He also asked whether the emphasis should be on a few larger activities with potential for greater impact, rather than on many smaller long-standing activities. He asked how NSF might develop metrics that would help better measure current activities. Given that NSF is a national agency that supports U.S. researchers, it is important to focus on things that can only be done internationally and that cannot be accomplished effectively solely within the U.S.

Dr. Suresh asked the committee to consider how NSF might seamlessly integrate education and research in international activities. Even though NSF currently has a Directorate for Education and Human Resources, he remarked that each office could develop an education component and treat education as an integral part of all NSF activities.

Dr. Suresh recognized the role of technology in facilitating greater international engagement, not only by connecting people with real-time data, networks, and educational activities, but also in

the international review process. He asked how NSF can most effectively engage the best referees from all over the world while avoiding confidentiality issues.

As NSF expands multi-lateral agreements, it is important that potential partners have an infrastructure for scientific merit review. Additionally, that institutions or entities enforce professional ethics and standards that are acceptable to institutions that have been at it for a long time. Dr. Suresh stated that NSF is working on developing opportunities for virtual panel review, so international researchers might better participate in the NSF merit review process.

Dr. Suresh observed that NSF is increasingly engaging in networks that provide data from around the world, such as environmental and earthquake data. He offered as an example the consortium of IRIS (Integrated Research and Infrastructure in Seismology) with partners from around the globe, and noted that some key countries have not been active partners for a variety of reasons such as security or geopolitical issues. He has started some conversations to find ways to overcome these issues and gain the ability to share scientific data from around the world. There is a significant opportunity for NSF as an agency and it should play a key role facilitating these initiatives.

Dr. Suresh asked the committee to discuss the best way to organize OISE and its activities, with the intent of strengthening NSF's international impact. He asked the committee to consider scientific excellence versus science diplomacy in international engagement. Increasingly, science diplomacy has become important and can be a road map to generate cooperation in new democracies, but he stressed that scientific excellence is the overall driver of science diplomacy.

Dr. Suresh welcomed the committee's thoughts, ideas, and recommendations. **Dr. Roddam Narasimha** suggested that NSF seek out a natural partnership with India, which has a science funding agency modeled after NSF, and that NSF collaborate with universities in Bangalore on computing and data management.

Dr. Howard Alper suggested that NSF create an International Priorities and Planning Committee. He stated that the international arena operates very slowly and that while a few bilateral agreements are important, the best institutions in the U.S. should be linked with the best institutions in the world, regardless of location. He described the "Global Young Academy" that launched last month. Dr. Alper discussed the importance of government-industry collaborative research and development, and its potential for helping faculty and students develop their scientific expertise. He gave examples of international activities by the Canadian Research Council. Among other places, they have offices in Dakar, Nairobi, Cairo, Montevideo, Delhi, and Singapore. Strategic funding of activities with foreign counterparts need to be strengthened and NSF/OISE needs to think about making the best linkages all over the world.

Dr. Rahman noted that with the increase in research papers being published outside the U.S., it is important for NSF to consider opportunities to develop merit review partnerships with international organizations. He stated several countries (Japan, Sweden, Germany, Norway, and even China) train and educate their students in English, and suggested that NSF should find a way to take advantage of this. The U.S. is no longer the only country in the world where students desire to pursue graduate school.

Dr. Suresh remarked that Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa are growing rapidly in numbers of graduate students and many are still coming to the U.S. China is sending about 1.3 million students to this country. The U.S. continues to play a leadership role, while China, India, Korea, and Taiwan follow suit. He suggested that NSF should be able to engage international researchers in panels and in peer-reviews of proposals (including virtual panels while protecting confidentiality).

Dr. **Maresi Nerad** commented that collaboration is a two-way street, and the U.S. has not taken advantage of international students who return to their home countries. There is an opportunity to establish pilot programs that would pursue and analyze the benefits to be gained from these “ambassadors.” She emphasized that international collaboration should be beneficial to both sides.

Dr. **George Middendorf** talked about the need to optimize international research data collection by amassing and analyzing it. There could be more synergy among U.S. agencies engaged in international activities and there are many opportunities. For instance, Peace Corps, USAID, FWS, and USGS have a deep involvement in international activities that could be leveraged by NSF.

Director Suresh clarified that the questions he initially posed are meant to be food for thought, rather than specific policy questions for the committee. He noted that the U.S. needs to protect its leadership role in attracting international students and scientists. He also stated that it is important for NSF be able to work with other federal agencies.

Role of NSF in Leading Global S&E Cooperation

Dr. David Stonner, Deputy Director, OISE, presented data on co-authorship of research papers, showing that international co-authorship has increased significantly over the past decade. Scientists are working together because each collaborator adds value to the partnership. Dr. Stonner described the EURO HORCs (European Heads of Research Councils) meeting held in October 2010 noting that this group controls the majority of European research funding. One of the goals of the meeting was to develop a model that would encourage research communities to engage in collaboration. Dr. Stonner presented a variety of international models, each of which offers unique strengths. He described the G8 HORCs, International Collaborations in Chemistry, a lead agency model, Materials World Networks, and Ideas Factory models.

AC-ISE Open Discussion of Meeting with the Director, NSF

Dr. Rahman asked the committee for feedback about how NSF might strengthen programs involving international partnerships, as well as develop new ones. Committee members offered a variety of suggestions, including:

- Ensure that research is linked with universities.
- Increase funding for industry partnerships. There appears to be no good connections between industry and universities in Africa. In that continent, industry does little or no research, only universities do.
- Link with universities in Africa. Research-based teaching for building capacity and enhancing NSF’s ability to engage with African institutions should be pursued.

- Attention should be given to developing relationships that can influence how science is done in small, less developed countries.
- Address the principles on which international engagements are based.
- Revisit the PIRE program to determine whether the current program is a wise investment of money.
- Few Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) awards involve international components. The committee should address REU and International Research Experiences for Students (IRES) programs.
- NSF should be more nimble and take more risks, employing strategies such as RAPID grants so that potential researchers can receive funding decisions faster.
- Develop a mechanism to bring countries together to make funding decisions.
- Develop metrics that will allow NSF to determine the efficacy of education and training programs.
- Be aware of science funding programs occurring beyond NSF, for example recent awards made by the Department of Energy.
- Educate proposal review panels to see international collaboration as a major positive factor.
- Expand the use of international reviewers for NSF proposals.
- If the committee will be giving advice to the entire foundation, rather than just OISE, it will need to better articulate its vision for international activities at NSF.
- The Committee needs more information on NSF's international activities.
- AC-ISE members should be present on each of the other NSF advisory committees, so that internationalism can be part of advisory committee discussions throughout the Foundation.
- NSF needs to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the AC-ISE. The committee should try to offer more proactive advice to NSF. The committee has an opportunity to provide advice about intra- and inter-agency partnerships, and should better consider minority and disadvantaged individuals, as well as young faculty members.
- Develop talking points that show the expertise the committee brings to NSF, so that the AC-ISE will be better positioned to have an impact throughout the foundation.

Dr. Dilworth noted that the role of the AC-ISE is to give advice about general principles, rather than specific management recommendations.

Dr. Stonner clarified the meaning of “internationalizing” NSF: facilitate or ease international cooperation; make it more efficient; acquire value-added by performing research with international collaborations, and integrate more seamlessly with international research councils and researchers. He suggested that many PIs might not seek true international collaboration because it adds a layer of complexity to research. However, he stated that the presence of true international collaboration should provide a compelling reason to fund a proposal, in that international collaboration will expand U.S. access to expertise, facilities, and talent. Inclusion of true international collaboration should make a proposal more likely of getting funding, not less.

Update on NSF/OISE Activities

Dr. **Mark Suskin**, Executive Officer, OISE, summarized staffing changes since the last advisory committee meeting, introducing incoming staff and thanking departing staff. He summarized the OISE FY 2012 budget request to Congress, highlighting that it represents a 21.3 percent increase in funding over the FY 2010 enacted budget.

A member asked about the Pan American Advanced Studies Institutes (PASI) program. Dr. **Harold Stolberg**, OISE Program Coordinator for the Americas, responded that OISE is considering developing Asian and African Advanced Studies Institutes. Five research directorates at NSF provide \$200,000 each, as does the Department of Energy, for a total of \$1.2 million in PASI funding annually.

A member asked about the Partnerships for International Research and Education (PIRE) program evaluation. Dr. **John Tsapogas**, OISE Program Coordinator for Global Initiatives, replied that upon the conclusion of the PIRE evaluation a presentation would be given to NSF and results would be disseminated beyond NSF. The 2012 PIRE competition will focus on the NSF-wide investment area, Science, Engineering and Education for Sustainability (SEES). Since the last advisory committee meeting, PIRE has held a PI meeting and conducted a PI Symposium on SEES-related topics. OISE is also working on a PIRE Portal and is creating a webinar program. The Portal will not be available for the 2012 PIRE competition, but will eventually serve as a place for PIs to share their experiences and strategies for successful PIRE projects and will highlight best practices for international research and education.

Dr. Suskin reported that the East Asia and Pacific Summer Institutes (EAPSI) program received 610 proposals in FY 2011, an increase of 15 percent over last year. Ms. Narum remarked that an EAPSI student at UC Berkeley presented at a conference she attended, and that his articulate explanation of his experiences with EAPSI was a highlight of the conference.

In addition to managing program competitions, OISE has participated in numerous Joint Commission/Consultative Meetings, and is involved in multi-lateral relations, including groups such as G8-HORCs and EU-ERC.

Overseas Office Reports

Dr. Stonner described the European Commission 7th Framework Program research areas, funding levels, and recent trends. He compared several models of international collaboration.

Dr. **Clive Woods** reported on the Tokyo Regional Office on behalf of Dr. Anne Emig. Emphasis was on the impacts of the March 11 earthquake and tsunami on research facilities and activities, and NSF responses to those events.

Dr. **Jong-on Hahm** reported on the Beijing Office on behalf of Dr. Emily Ashworth. She described the 12th Five-year Plan (2011-2015), the growth in R&D investments, and challenges for science, engineering, and innovation. She concluded by identifying opportunities for collaborations in China.

Working Group Reports

Dr. **Nicholas Vonortas** reported for the Strategic Planning Working Group on behalf of Dr. Lueny Morell, that Dr. Tsapogas produced an initial draft of an OISE Strategic Plan, and the Working Group provided an independent review prior to the meeting. The OISE Strategic Plan was developed to align with the current NSF Strategic Plan. The Working Group offered additional refinements to the draft plan and asked for a revised draft soon after the committee meeting.

Ms. **Jeanne Narum** offered that the Programs Working Group would yield its time, so that the conversation about the OISE strategic plan might continue.

Dr. **Daniel Wubah** summarized recent activities of the Developing Countries Working Group, and introduced Dr. **DeAndra Beck** and Dr. **Mark Doyle**, OISE staff, who presented a summary of NSF and OISE activities with developing countries. Dr. Beck described the Partnerships for Enhanced Engagement in Research (PEER) program that replaces the Partnerships in Science for Development program at USAID. She stated that PEER is a competitive grants program to enhance partnerships between NSF-funded scientists and their developing country collaborators on topics of mutual priority, such as water, climate, biodiversity, disaster mitigation, and renewable energy. While the NSF award supports the research and training of U.S. scientists and students, the USAID award supports in-country scientists, students, and institutions. She stated that USAID is engaging a third party implementer to receive and review proposals and make PEER awards. NSF will participate in a steering committee for PEER administration and oversight, and OISE will announce PEER funding availability through a Dear Colleague Letter.

Dr. Doyle described the PEER Phase I Pilot Activity. USAID contacted NSF-funded scientists who are conducting research in developing countries on projects of interest to USAID, and invited those U.S. scientists to contact their developing country collaborators about submitting a proposal for potential USAID funding. Using a small amount of seed funding, USAID made six awards to developing country partners ranging in size from \$15,000 to \$30,000. The Phase I awards supported student training, travel for developing country scientists, basic equipment, and supplies. NSF is drafting a developing countries strategy to prioritize opportunities for identifying and engaging new partners to facilitate collaboration with developing countries.

Tuesday April 26, 2011

Internationalization of U.S. Universities.

Dr. Rahman invited Dr. **Anne Marie Massa**, Director of Science, Technology and Law at the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to discuss her work and findings regarding global research universities. Dr. Massa made the following points in her presentation, entitled “*Global Research Universities: Emerging Constructs in the Knowledge Market.*”

Current Situation

- 3 million students are pursuing education outside their home country. This represents a 57 percentage increase since 1999. Expectations are that this will rise to 8 million by 2025.
- U.S., UK, Germany, France, Australia, China, and Japan host 72 percent of world’s international students.

- China, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, New Zealand, and the Middle East are stepping up efforts to attract more foreign students. China had more than 1.2 million students studying abroad in 2010.
- Before 1999, there were 35 foreign branch campuses. Between 2006 and 2009 this increased to 162 campuses. Between 2006 and 2009, U.S. established 78 campuses abroad, Australia 14, and the UK 13. Programs at these campuses include undergrad/graduate students, business, law, medicine, and liberal arts.
- Recently, the National University of Singapore (NUS) and Yale established the Yale-NUS College, a new model of liberal arts education. NUS also has a medical school with Duke, conservatory of music with Hopkins, law school with NYU, and engineering programs with MIT.
- Gulf States are allocating billions to open branches of top U.S. and European universities such as Cornell in Qatar and the Sorbonne in Abu Dhabi.
- King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) opened with \$10 billion gift from King Abdullah. They launched the Global Research Partnership in 2007 providing awards to researchers from around the world, who will spend 3 weeks to 3 months at KAUST working on a wide variety of research topics with global significance and particulate importance to Saudi Arabia, including water desalination and solar technology.
- French and German universities compete for state funds earmarked to create a small group of globally competitive institutions.
- The Bologna Accord seeks to standardized degree requirements across the European Union.
- India announced intentions to build 14 new comprehensive universities of world-class stature and is welcoming the entry of foreign universities.
- There is no single model for a successful global research university. Early efforts include branch campuses abroad (brick universities), information technology offering open and virtual learning environments (click universities), or a hybrid (brick and click).

Globalization of Higher Education

- Industrialized countries have long recognized the importance of leading-edge research to economic development. Many developing countries now recognize this as well and are placing an increasing emphasis on higher education and a desire to develop collaborations and establish their own top tier institutions. As a result of this growth, there is intense competition for talent – student, faculty, administrative.
- By some measures U.S. faculty are the least mobile worldwide, yet recent findings indicate that time spent abroad has the greatest influence on the international content of faculty teaching and research. There is a desire for new collaborative research patterns and arrangements, and for new institutional arrangements with new agreements with non-U.S. institutions and governments.

Dr. Massa listed several key areas to explore: (a) partnership models and mechanisms, (b) legal and regulatory aspects, (c) governance and quality, and (d) diplomatic and economic development. There is no committee yet to work on these ideas. They are seeking funding and welcome the opportunity to get feedback from the committee.

Dr. Rahman noted that in Germany, Siemens brings Indonesian students to study engineering and business. They later return to Indonesia to work in branches of Siemens in that country. Dr. Massa replied that industry plays an important role. For instance, UK and synthetic biology holds a symposia encouraging industry participation. Ultimately, individuals go back to industry and innovate. The students bring science diplomacy.

At the NAS, the S&T policy program brings in U.S. and foreign postdocs at U.S. institutions, and assigns them to a committee for 3 months. Many go back to their own countries or work in other nations outside the U.S., about one third stay in the DC area where there is much better appreciation of S&T policy. This program has been running for 13 years and has resulted in 600 scientists working all around the world.

Dr. Middendorf asked about the Bologna Accord, which has the participation of 43 countries, but there appears to be little U.S. response. Dr. Massa replied that Harvard and Yale are pushing hard for their students to study abroad, but they are still small programs and it is not the same as getting a degree abroad. Dr. Nerad noted that joint degrees are more common in business and engineering and there are few joint degrees in international relations. New quantitative studies are showing increasing trends in industry and university collaborations.

Dr. Alper identified several issues, including (a) attraction of foreign students to the U.S. will continue as long as the U.S. is regarded as a world leader in S&T. (b) U.S. universities set up campuses abroad to help their budgets. In Qatar, science is not inculcated in school. Boys are less interested in science or school, but girls are very interested. Money will not work in these places in the long term. Foreign faculty leave Qatar after making their own money. (c) Many people in developing countries do not understand the U.S. concept of Conflict of Interest (COI). He emphasized that as U.S. universities expand abroad, we need to think about the benefits to be gained by the U.S. from these expansions.

Dr. Massa commented that when looking at cultural issues such COI, one has to understand the host country, their norms of academic freedom, and cultural mores. For U.S. institutions with campuses abroad to make money, the only way to accomplish this is by becoming integral parts of the communities they serve. They must be focused on issues that are important to the host country.

Dr. Rahman reported that in the U.S. 18 percent of engineering students are women; in Jordan, Qatar, Libya, and other Middle East nations, that percentage is closer to 50 percent. Higher education is a way for women to gain dignity.

Continuation of AC-ISE Discussion of Meeting with NSF Director

Chairman Rahman urged the committee to make recommendations about what NSF should do, rather than how NSF should do it. He invited members to offer general comment on the meeting discussions. Member comments included:

- All international engagements shall be mutually beneficial. Seize opportunities across NSF to build global partnerships for mutual benefit.
- Look at the impact on the home institution: education and long term involvement in research.

- Promote efforts to send U.S. students abroad and a good proportion of them should be of color.
- Increase the diversity of institutional types involved in international activities.
- Define a set of high level principles appropriate for international engagements.
- NSF should support the best research and education, people and projects, and connect the best here with the best elsewhere.
- Facilitate new domestic partnerships which will enable, and benefit from, cooperation with the international communities.
- Define how OISE should relate to other U.S. agencies and, as appropriate, should serve as a liaison across U.S. government and international agencies, and NGOs.
- Globalize the STEM community of the future. The earlier a person gets an international experience, the more likely she/he will get involved internationally in their careers.
- Academic administrators need to be motivated to address international matters at their institutions. What principles would guide NSF to motivate administrators?
- Establish the mechanisms by which the AC-ISE should operate. Consider liaisons with other directorates and advisory committees.
- Understand how other directorates deal with international activities.

The meeting of the NSF Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering adjourned at 11:50.

National Science Foundation
Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering
Membership List with Affiliations

April 25-26, 2011

Saifur Rahman - Chair AC-ISE, Director, Virginia Tech Advanced Research Institute, Arlington, VA.

Howard Alper, Chair / Président, Science, Technology and Innovation Council / Conseil des sciences, de la technologie et de l'innovation, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Jean-Pierre Ezin, African Union Commissioner for Human Resources, Science and Technology, African Union Headquarters, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Lueny Morell, Director of University Relations, Hewlett Packard Company, Palo Alto, CA.

Roddam Narasimha, Chairman, Engineering Mechanics Unit, Jawaharlal Nehru Centre for Advanced Scientific Research, Jakkur, Bangalore, India.

Jeanne L. Narum, Founding Director—Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL), Senior Fellow—PKAL/Association of American Colleges & Universities, Director—The Independent Colleges Office, Washington, DC.

Maresi Nerad, Director, Center for Innovation and Research in Graduate Education (CIRGE), Associate Dean, UW Graduate School, Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Kevin Pilz, Commodity Security and Logistics Adviser, Commodities Security and Logistics Division, Office of Population and Reproductive Health, Bureau of Global Health, U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington DC.

Nicholas Vonortas, Director, Center for International Science and Technology Policy, George Washington University, Washington, DC.

Janis C. Weeks, Professor, Institute of Neuroscience, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Daniel Wubah, Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, Office of the Provost, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA.

George Middendorf - CEOSE Liaison, Professor of Biology, Howard University, Washington, DC.

AGENDA

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

April 25-26, 2011

National Science Foundation
Office of International Science and Engineering
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington VA 22230

All meeting sessions will be held in Stafford II Room 555

Monday, April 25, 2011

- 8:30-9:00** **Welcome, Review of Meeting Agenda and Objectives, and Housekeeping**
Machi Dilworth, Director, OISE
Saifur Rahman, Chair, AC-ISE
Robert Webber, Executive Secretary, AC-ISE
- 9:00-10:00** **Meeting with Director of the National Science Foundation**
Subra Suresh, Director, NSF
- 10:00-10:20** **Role of NSF in Leading Global S&E Cooperation**
David Stonner, Deputy Director, OISE
- 10:20-10:50** **Break, with light refreshments**
- 10:50-12:00** **AC-ISE Open Discussion of Meeting with the Director, NSF**
Saifur Rahman, Chair, AC-ISE
- 12:00-1:30** **Lunch, in meeting room**
- 1:30-2:30** **Update on NSF/OISE Activities**
Mark Suskin, Executive Officer, OISE
- 2:30-3:00** **Reports from Overseas Offices**
David Stonner, Head, NSF Europe Office
Anne Emig, Head, NSF Japan Office
Emily Ashworth, Head, NSF Beijing Office
- 3:00-3:30** **Break, with light refreshments**

- 3:30-4:30** **Working Group Reports:**
Strategic Planning Working Group
Nicholas Vonortas, Acting Chair, Strategic Planning Working Group
- Developing Countries Working Group**
Daniel Wubah, Chair, Developing Countries Working Group
- Programs Working Group**
Jeanne Narum, Chair, Programs Working Group
- 4:30** **Adjourn**

Tuesday, April 26, 2011

- 8:30-9:30** **Internationalization of U.S. Universities**
Saifur Rahman, Chair, AC-ISE
- 9:30-10:00** **Continuation of AC-ISE Discussion of Meeting with Director, NSF**
Saifur Rahman, Chair, AC-ISE
- 10:00-10:30** **Break, with light refreshments**
- 10:30-11:30** **AC-ISE Members' Open Comments**
- 11:30-12:00** **Wrap-up**
Machi Dilworth, Director, OISE
Saifur Rahman, Chair, AC-ISE
Robert Webber, Executive Secretary, AC-ISE
- 12:00** **Adjourn**