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Abstract
Two major barriers prevent many US universities from significantly increasing their study abroad enrollments: 1) the added financial cost and 2) the delay in graduation incurred by students when they participate in study abroad programs that do not clearly meet requirements for their major and degree. We worked with University of Minnesota faculty and advisers in such diverse programs as technology, management, nursing, and human ecology in collaboration with Purdue, Northwestern, and the University of Wisconsin Madison. UMTC Learning Abroad Center staff assessed major degree programs and study abroad opportunities; supported faculty site visits; developed new advising materials, websites, and practices; and provided special training for faculty and advisers. We also disseminated successful practices and reforms to other universities.
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Introductory Overview
There is nearly universal agreement among postsecondary educators that study abroad is a highly effective means of improving students’ second language abilities and cross-cultural skills, and enhancing students’ understanding of international affairs. Despite this conviction, however, two major barriers still prevent many US universities from significantly increasing their study abroad enrollments: 1) the added financial cost imposed on students studying overseas; and 2) the delay in graduation incurred by students when they participate in study abroad programs that do not clearly meet program requirements for their major degree. Many universities are addressing the financial question by developing aggressive scholarship drives and establishing new funds.

The second problem, however, is particularly difficult to overcome and mainly affects large research universities, where faculty members have often been more separated from the study abroad enterprise. When students must choose between study abroad and a timely graduation, many undergraduates are compelled to omit study abroad from their programs of study.

The FIPSE grant expanded upon a pilot project at the University of Minnesota designed to enhance the articulation of study abroad programming with undergraduate-level major degree programs, and to disseminate successful practices and reforms to other major research universities. Working with faculty and study abroad staff in such diverse programs as the Institute of Technology, the Carlson School of Management, the School of Nursing, and the College of Human Ecology, project staff assessed the match between current major degree programs and study abroad opportunities; supported faculty site visits to select programs; developed new advising materials, websites, and practices; and provided special training for major degree program advisers.
Evaluation was conducted during the project, and project staff worked initially with three major research universities (Purdue, Northwestern, University of Wisconsin Madison) to discuss and describe barriers and ways to address these barriers. We disseminated new findings and practices and fostered the creation of new discipline-to-discipline partnerships to enhance the integration of study abroad programming with professional degree programs at the undergraduate level.

This project: 1) supported the development of new approaches to articulating study abroad programming with undergraduate-level professional degree programs; 2) increased access to study abroad programming on the part of professional school students, students of limited financial needs, and students of color by eliminating an important barrier to study abroad; 3) created new partnerships involving four major research universities that will encourage disciplinary collaboration around study abroad; and 4) developed broadly replicable models for enhancing discipline-based advising that effectively integrates study abroad into some of our nation’s strategically most important fields.

Problem
The President of the University of Minnesota set a goal of increasing the percentage of students who participate in study abroad before they graduate to 50%. The University is also working to increase the number of students who graduate in 4 years. This project sought to eliminate a major barrier to achieving these goals by addressing the delay in graduation incurred by students when they participate in study abroad programs that do not clearly meet program requirements for their major degree. There were several key aspects of the problem that are common issues across higher education.

First, study abroad has long been the purview of study abroad professionals who have limited communication with and input from university administration, faculty, and academic advisers. We knew that to be successful, we would need to deepen the collaboration with these colleagues by educating them about study abroad, learning from them how they viewed the problem, and working with them to determine and implement possible solutions.

Second, we needed to talk with students in these four colleges to determine what the perceived and real barriers were from their perspective. We conducted focus groups and surveys that confirmed that finances and academic fit were the main barriers to increasing the number of students who studied abroad. This needs assessment also helped determine students’ academic, personal, and career goals for study abroad.

Third, we needed to educate our colleagues abroad, and in our own office, about our need to find academic matches for a wider array of majors than those humanities and social science majors previously participating in study abroad. Some understood immediately that this was the wave of the future; others required some prodding to begin to think outside the box. All came to understand that it was to their benefit to collaborate with us.
since the work we were doing would lead to other universities using these study abroad programs for a wider range of students also.

Fourth, we needed to find ways to communicate the results of this project with students, faculty, administrators, academic advisers, our partners abroad, and study abroad colleagues across the country. This required reexamining and revising our advising process (individual conversations with students, materials, meetings, and website), our on-campus communication tools, our website, and our interactions with colleagues around the country and abroad.

When we began this project, we were matching programs abroad with majors on campus. This was accomplished initially with fairly broad strokes but within a year or so we realized that we needed to determine matches based on specific courses offered abroad rather than just programs that were strong in, for instance, finance, chemical engineering, nursing, or family social science. If the students weren’t going to get specific required courses abroad, graduation still might be delayed since the courses wouldn’t “count” toward requirements. This required that we learn more about the availability of specific courses and syllabi abroad for a wider range of majors. Matches are now assessed based on faculty evaluations of specific courses rather than overall availability of courses in those majors at universities abroad. We have also been able to “tweak” the programs we run abroad to better meet the needs of our students.

**Background and Origins**

In the late 1980s the UMTC study abroad office initiated conversations with some humanities and social science departments across campus to determine programs that would best meet the needs of their students and to prepare materials that described these programs for students. Although we advised individual students from all majors across campus on study abroad, most professional students who studied abroad were interested in the traditional study abroad goals: improvement of language and cross-cultural skills. In 1997 we began collaborating with the Institute of Technology (IT) to determine good study abroad program matches for IT students. As part of this collaboration, IT partially funded the salary of a study abroad staff member. This allowed the study abroad staff member to say that she “worked for the IT Dean” when she met with departmental chairs and directors of undergraduate studies. This paved the way and we sought similar support from other colleges in the pilot phase of our work to integrate study abroad into the curriculum. The name for this methodology was curriculum integration.

Prior to this pilot project, about 6 IT students would study abroad each year out of a total IT enrollment of about 6,000 students. During the pilot projects we saw annual gains of 9, 10, and 24 students. Thanks to the FIPSE project, during 2003-2004 133 IT students studied abroad in a wide range of countries and types of programs.

The success of this pilot gave us the basis for seeking a FIPSE grant. We knew we had defined the problem and seen some preliminary success, but needed outside funding to be able to widen and sustain the scope of our work. We decided to focus on some of the most challenging majors, sensing that if the methodology was successful in those a
majors it would work everywhere. We invited IT, the School of Nursing, the College of Human Ecology, and the Carlson School of Management to participate in the grant project and partnered them with Purdue (Human Ecology), Northwestern (IT), and the University of Wisconsin Madison (Nursing and Management). Madison was already sending nursing students abroad. The other universities were, like us, not sending many professional program students abroad.

In addition to the institutional support committed through the FIPSE grant, in August 2001 we were successful in obtaining a Bush Foundation grant (Archibald Bush, founder of 3M) to integrate study abroad into all 204 majors on all four campuses of the University of Minnesota. The Bush grant also required substantial matching institutional support. In total, we had approximately $3.5 million over the course of 5 years to develop and refine a methodology that could be used at and adapted to other institutions.

During the course of the project, three main areas of organization policy had to change. First, the University had a policy that only graded courses could count toward the major. Since some students studying at universities abroad receive transfer credit, we successfully requested an exemption to University policy for students studying abroad. Second, the Learning Abroad Center’s systems and technology had to be integrated into the University’s systems. The increased numbers of students studying abroad meant that our systems needed to be brought up to date, into the University systems, and streamlined. This required massive effort and expense for our office as well as other offices across campus (financial aid, bursar, registrar, etc.) and we are not yet done with these improvements. The systems improvements also meant that some of the work normally done centrally on behalf of study abroad students was now done in our office, requiring study abroad staff to receive greater access and authority than before. The third major change has occurred in the climate on campus. From admissions through graduation clearance and now alumni relations, study abroad is being woven in to the fabric of the institution and all related policies and procedures. None of this would have been possible without the high profile of the FIPSE and Bush grants and the outstanding support of central administration.

**Project Description**

Throughout the FIPSE grant, we met with faculty, administrators, and academic advisers, in small and large groups, to find appropriate study abroad programs that would match major requirements on campus and students’ academic, career, and personal goals. These meetings were very productive and generated a great deal of interest across campus. Here are descriptions of the project work in each of the four UMTC colleges and our assessment of impact on other institutions.

1.) **Carlson School of Management**

The Carlson School of Management has been very active and successful in their efforts to integrate study abroad into the curriculum of their various majors. One important piece of this activity has been the development of an infrastructure to support the work and the increased number of students studying abroad.
Carlson is unique in that they have their own international office. This office runs Carlson exchange and graduate programs. The partnership with the international office has been key in implementing all of the activities over the past few years. Additionally, over the past couple years the college has groomed two advisers within the Undergraduate Advising Office to specialize in study abroad. This has allowed for more systematized activities in the areas of evaluating study abroad courses, promoting study abroad through already existing activities (orientation) and new activities (study abroad events), maintaining a course equivalency database of study abroad courses, as well as refining the overall study abroad student process so that it follows the logic of the overall Carlson school undergraduate student process. In the fall of 2004 they also created an email account for students with study abroad questions. It is important to have this role within the undergraduate office in Carlson because they work with students from entrance to graduation, there is no faculty advising.

Much of Carlson’s success is seen in the quantity of work that has been done. The academic year 2003-2004 saw the completion of the departmental faculty meetings to identify study abroad programs that work particularly well for each major. This process also included obtaining course equivalencies for the chosen programs as well as defining study abroad guidelines (how many credits of the major can be done abroad and which courses are best to look for abroad) for students by each department. By the start of the 2004-2005 academic year, the results from these meetings were incorporated into the Carlson FAQ’s, major fact sheets that every student receives for his/her major.

This process also enabled us to get a broad sense of locations and courses that would be ideal for Carlson students. Two program developments came from this work. First, a collaboration was developed with the Carlson International Programs, Carlson Undergraduate Services Office, the Kelly School of Business at Indiana University, and the program provider CIEE. CIEE worked with Carlson and the Kelly school to identify courses that would be good options for their students. Then, they used syllabi from the schools to create the courses at their Barcelona study center site. Secondly, the Carlson International Programs, Carlson Undergraduate Services Office, Smeal College of Business at Penn State, and the program Provider IES developed by a sponsored program in Berlin, Germany that provided business courses in English at a study center and local university. The study center courses were pre-approved by Carlson.

The heightened presence of study abroad in Carlson has led to heightened interest by students. In response, Carlson is beginning to develop short-term programs for undergraduates that will allow students to fulfill required coursework abroad. To support this work they have added a new staff person in the International Programs Office to assist with these programs and student advising. Lastly, there is continued collaboration between the Carlson International Programs, and Carlson Undergraduate Services Office to implement adviser training such as focusing on study abroad issues here on our campus or inviting Carlson staff to meetings where our on-site partners are presenting about their programs.

2.) Institute of Technology
The Institute of Technology has achieved sending more students abroad each year. The position, Assistant to the Dean, has about 30% of her role dedicated to study abroad. She is responsible for promotion, advising on Institute of Technology programs, as well as short-term program development. The college has been very active in maintaining short-term programs. They now run 4 each year and plan to keep that consistent.

Challenges in this college have mainly focused on the diffusion of responsibility for study abroad out of the Dean’s office due to structural and functional barriers. There are few professional advisers in the college for first and second year students as they employ peer advisers. After the second year, students move to faculty for their major advising. Training with these two groups tend to be a challenge in one, getting peer advisers and faculty to attend, and two, to see the importance of the information. The one training session that we were able to set up was a challenge to arrange and received minimal interest. This means integration of the study abroad message into the advising message, in addition to support from various faculty and advisers, is sporadic at best.

Attempts at updating the Study Abroad Major Advising sheets were met with sporadic and minimal interest from departmental faculty also. Astrophysics matched an entire year of curriculum for the University of Melbourne and Chemical Engineering pioneered the Academic Considerations page for their Study Abroad Major Advising sheet that made them the only supporter who followed through with the Academic Considerations page project. A plan is being developed with the Dean’s office about how to overcome this. The Dean’s office recognizes the importance of the Study Abroad Major Advising sheets because they have received high marks on their ABET certification due to these sheets. This fact led the Assistant to the Dean to work with our office to develop a sheet for the college’s new major, Biomedical Engineering. The faculty was not involved in that process but it was deemed necessary to create a sheet.

The Learning Abroad Center staff, with support from the Institute of Technology, had been working on a project with Lancaster University to identify a full year of curriculum that would work for a variety of sophomore engineering students. This project was dubbed the Sophomore Science Year project. After much research into courses and equivalencies with collaboration from faculty in the college, Lancaster fell through as a partner. The project has been set aside for now and may be unearthed again if another suitable university is identified. A positive outcome of the Sophomore Science Year project is the identification of sophomore year as an ideal time for most engineering students to study abroad. To this end many promotional activities focusing on freshman have been planned for the 2004-2005 academic year. This pattern is expected to continue.

An extremely successful development in the college is the start of a student chapter of the International Association of Student Technical Exchange (IASTE) a program of the Association for International Practical Training. This group focuses on developing paid professional internships for students from other countries as well as allows 1-3 students from this institution to apply for paid professional internships abroad.

3.) College of Human Ecology
The College of Human Ecology provides a lot of support for students planning on studying abroad. There is an identified study abroad coordinator who spends about 30% of her time on study abroad. She works in the main administrative unit within the college and so is in close contact with advisers, the assistant dean, and faculty. The small size and orientation of the college also helps foster cross collaboration. The coordinator meets with every student who plans to study abroad and assists him or her with their academic planning by using a record of how other students have been able to use study abroad credit.

There were two large achievements in this college. First, all of the Study Abroad Major Advising sheets were updated and now have an academic considerations page. The development of this page engaged faculty to determine guidelines for their students studying abroad. They also determined a “best time to go abroad” for the major. The second large achievement is that this information was then added to the Four Year Sample Plans that each student receives and generally follows for course selection.

Additionally, the College of Human Ecology has been great at planning study abroad events in their college. Faculty and advisers are common attendees at these events and there have also been planned adviser training sessions that focus on study abroad.

Through the process of identifying best times to go abroad and identifying what courses and requirements can be done abroad, it was identified that Interior Design students have a semester that is ideal but for one studio course. The Program Chair is generally flexible and allows students to replace this with almost any studio course. However, the Learning Abroad Center staff, the College of Human Ecology Study Abroad Coordinator, and the Interior Design Program Chair are working to tweak the existing Study and Internships in London program to fit all Interior Design students second semester junior year so it can be offered as a consistent option for students as they enter the program. Currently, our on-site staff is looking for a way to offer the required studio course. That, in addition to an Interior Design internship and courses that fulfill general education requirements, will complete the semester. While the program is being developed, the Program Chair is allowing students who do the summer Study and Internships in London program to fulfill their internship requirement even though the hours are less than the required amount.

Finally, the college is planning to expand their international profile by developing their first university relationship with a university in Mexico. They are in the process of identifying their interests and locating Mexican universities that could complement the interest areas as well as benefit from an international partner. The next step is a site visit to Mexico that is tentatively planned for spring 2005. This relationship will mainly focus on faculty and graduate students but there is the possibility of opportunities for undergraduates as well.

4.) School of Nursing
The academic year 2003-04 was a year of transition at the School of Nursing. Beginning in fall 2003, the School of Nursing moved from a two-year to a three-year curriculum.
As a result of this major change in their curriculum, there is more flexibility, though still quite small, in their curriculum in which to incorporate study abroad coursework.

During meetings with the School of Nursing faculty to discuss the new curriculum, the nursing faculty identified the possible semester that nursing students could study abroad. Based on these discussions, the Learning Abroad Center undertook extensive research to identify universities and study abroad programs that would meet the curricular needs of the nursing students. We identified a number of potential universities and shared this research with the School of Nursing for their review. The goal is that the nursing faculty will identify several universities where their students could study abroad for a semester. These semester opportunities will be added to the short-term opportunities, which had previously been selected by the faculty to offer nursing students a wide-range of study abroad opportunities.

In addition to the transition of the curriculum, there was also a transition in the leadership of the School of Nursing. A new Associate Dean was appointed at the end of 2003. We have worked with the new Associate Dean to introduce her to study abroad including arranging for the Associate Dean to participate in a study abroad site visit to Denmark. As a result of this site visit, the Associate Dean is working the faculty of the program in Denmark to make several adjustments to the program to make it a better academic fit for University of Minnesota nursing students. The Associate Dean hopes that several nursing students will participate on this program each summer.

We also continued to think with the nursing faculty about the cost of study abroad, which remains one of the main barriers to greater numbers of nursing students studying abroad. The Associate Dean is planning to begin some specific fund-raising by the School of Nursing to support study abroad scholarships.

Finally, the partnership with the University of Wisconsin’s nursing program continued during the academic year 2003-04. Professor Linda Baumann who has been involved with this project throughout its duration participated in the conference, Internationalizing the Curriculum, offered by the Learning Abroad Center and hosted at the University of Minnesota. Professor Baumann presented a conference session on study abroad and the health sciences.

5.) Impact on other Institutions
This project started with partner institutions attached to each of the colleges. The Institute of Technology was paired with Northwestern’s Engineering school. That collaboration never developed very well. Partly, it was due to the fact that the institutions were very different and had different needs. Also, the study abroad office at Northwestern is a two-person office that had difficulty managing intensive special projects. There was no colleague in the engineering school that took this project under their supervision as well.

However, the Institute of Technology did participate on an international level in conferences such as NAFSA: Association of International Educators and the University
of Rhode Island International Colloquium on International Engineering Education. Through presentations and networking information was shared.

The College of Human Ecology was paired with Purdue University. The study abroad office there went through many staff changes and no lasting connection was made with a faculty member. The collaboration never got off the ground.

The School of Nursing was paired with the University of Wisconsin Madison’s nursing school. Madison was ahead of the University of Minnesota in sending nursing students abroad so we would call Madison with questions or to gain their perspective about issues. A faculty member from Madison’s nursing school co-presented with Learning Abroad Center staff at the international conference on Curriculum Integration that we hosted in April 2004.

The Carlson School of Management collaboration may have been the most successful. The study abroad coordinator in the School of Business at University of Wisconsin at Madison developed a new national organization, the Network of Study Abroad Administrators in Business. The Carlson International Programs Office has been integral in the development and maintenance of the network. The Network has held a conference once a year and maintains a listserv to address issues particular to study abroad coordinators in business schools.

Finally, international partners seem to be a main focus for all of these colleges. Each one has created relationships or built on existing relationships with institutions abroad.

**Project Results and Evaluation**

In addition to the outcomes reported by college in the Project Description section above, there are many other results to report. Evaluation has been integrated into our activities from the very beginning and is designed to provide both quantifiable and qualitative data. Our evaluation efforts have focused on two areas. First, we have focused on the effectiveness of our approach, especially in our workshops and with the collaboration between our working groups. Secondly, we are measuring the impact and efficacy of our efforts on the University of Minnesota and the extent to which our efforts achieve the goals outlined in our grants.

We are using focus groups, on-line surveys, workshop evaluations, and enrollment data collection as our evaluation methods.

On a basic level, we are counting the students who are being advised about study abroad and those who actually are studying abroad. These numbers are a general measure of our initiative’s success. The number of students studying abroad within the entire University system is on the rise, especially for 2003-04. Specifically in the four colleges that were the focus of the FIPSE grant, student enrollment was 70 in 1997-1998 (the year the pilot began), increased to 205 in 2000-2001 (the year the FIPSE grant began), and reached 310 in 2003-2004.
But, while counting is important, this method lacks the qualitative information we need to ensure that curriculum integration becomes institutionalized within our University. Our President, Robert Bruininks, has told us that even if it takes 10 years to reach our numeric goals, we, as an institution, should keep striving to transform the culture of the University toward one that embraces internationalizing.

Thus, in addition to simply counting students, we are using focus groups, on-line surveys, and workshop evaluations to reveal issues and monitor for results. We would like to think of our evaluation activities as a process improvement effort, as we are still learning how to move forward with this initiative.

It was clearly stated in the grant if we were to effectively respond to the needs of students, faculty and advisers, we would need to understand their opinions and behaviors regarding study abroad. Nowhere has a more massive undertaking happened on collecting data from faculty, advisers, and students with respect to their views on study abroad.

We conducted focus groups with students to reveal major themes regarding their perspectives of study abroad. In addition, over the first year of the grant we created the evaluation timeline, methods, and established collaborative working relationships with partners such as the Office of Measurement Services to conduct on-line surveys and University Relations to conduct focus groups with students.

In the second and third years of the grant, we have surveyed students, faculty, and advisers. The surveys are intended to capture the attitudes and beliefs these groups hold about study abroad. Ideally over time, we would see a change in those attitudes and beliefs as study abroad curriculum integration took hold at the University. The student survey required consultation with the Twin Cities vice provost to ensure that our surveys were appropriate, as we would be surveying thousand of students randomly.

We have administered the survey to cohorts of sophomores and seniors over the past 3 academic years, and intend to continue administering the survey to monitor changes over time. The response rate for the sophomore survey was 16% in the first year, and has averaged 25% since then. The average response rate on the senior surveys is 20%.

Finally, another valuable evaluation method is the constant evaluation of our meetings with faculty and advisers. Overtime, we have made adjustments in our workshop pedagogy and structure based upon the evaluations completed by our faculty and adviser participants. Our participants know that we read every single comment they write, and we believe that our current model accurately reflects our teacher/learner principle.

As we see from the data reflected in our faculty surveys, over the past several years faculty and advisers are gaining a better understanding of study abroad. Over 76% of the faculty and advisers participating in the initiative now report they have a good to excellent understanding of study abroad, this is up from the 38% who reported this level of understanding at the beginning of the initiative.
When faculty and advisers began this initiative, they were asked if students could use credit earned from study abroad courses toward requirements in the major. Over 40% were uncertain as to the answer to this question. At this point in the initiative, only 6% of the faculty and adviser participants are uncertain.

As faculty and advisers become more confident, they are talking more proactively with their students about study abroad. Students report that faculty and advisers are increasingly talking with them about study abroad.

We see a change in the sophomore data indicating that sophomores are acting upon the messages they receive from the institution about study abroad. More sophomores are asking their professors and advisers about study abroad.

Over the past 3 years on the Twin Cities campus, there has been a twofold increase in the number of students advised in the study abroad office, from 902 students in 2001 to 1,855 students in 2003.
Increases in advising contacts likely reflect an increase in the visibility of study abroad due, in part, to more faculty and advisers talking with their students about study abroad.

The message of planning for study abroad, in order to integrate study abroad coursework into the degree so that students may graduate in a timely manner, has been one of the core messages that we, collectively, as a University are realizing through this initiative.

The Carlson School of Management, on the Twin Cities campus, is one example of where this message is communicated from the dean, faculty, and advisers to freshmen. Over the past two years, Carlson freshmen have been told during orientation that study abroad is expected of them. Note: the message is that students are “expected,” not “required” to study abroad. We have seen a dramatic increase in students from the Carlson School of Management seeking study abroad advice in the Twin Cities study abroad office.

Since our grant also included the goal of increasing enrollments of students of color who are under-represented in study abroad at the University of Minnesota, we have oversampled for students of color in our surveys to identify their perceived barriers to study abroad.

We are seeing a decline in students of color perceiving delay in graduation as a barrier to study abroad.

Given the national attention on this project, we identified the need to create a web page where our instruments and data would be located. All of our baseline data have now been collected, and the Evaluation web page reflects our most recent data, which keeps our University and national audience updated.
We hosted an international conference on curriculum integration at the University of Minnesota in April 2004 that was attended by 400 faculty, advisers, administrators, and study abroad professionals from 120 universities around the country and world. We described our methodology and results during a 4-hour plenary session. The following 2 days there were 42 concurrent sessions presented by UMTC and colleagues from around the country and world.

The external grant consultant, Dr. Michael Vande Berg from Georgetown University, has been instrumental in communicating the value of the curriculum integration work to our audiences during speeches that he has made during conferences and at our international conference during this past year.

Summary, Conclusions, Lessons Learned
We believe and have heard from others that we have succeeded in our efforts to increase the numbers of students studying abroad from a wider variety of majors and in the process created a methodology that can be used and adapted by other universities.

Kathleen Sideli, President, Forum on Education Abroad recently wrote, “As they say, imitation is the greatest form of flattery. I haven't been anywhere in the past couple of years where the term 'curriculum integration' was uttered without a reference to the University of Minnesota.” Dr. Sideli was also the closing keynote speaker and stated, “I think we all agree that we have witnessed a landmark project here. This conference will be long remembered as a defining moment in education abroad.”

We did not succeed in forging a close collaboration with Purdue, Northwestern, and Madison in part because of the differing levels of staff available at all 4 campuses to devote to this work and in part because of varying levels of commitment to the project.

We hope that other universities and colleges around the country can benefit from the work we’ve done at the University of Minnesota and that our conference and websites will help them better integrate study abroad into all majors. Though we were very fortunate to have grant money for curriculum integration, some of our grant work can be done on a shoestring or with little money by using our materials and website as a jumpstart.

We are very appreciative of the Department of Education and FIPSE’s support of our efforts. Thank you very much.