

F I N A L R E P O R T

FORUM ON EDUCATION ABROAD
STANDARDS OF GOOD PRACTICE
PILOT PROJECT

MARCH 2007

THE FORUM ON EDUCATION ABROAD was created in 2001 to meet the needs of the education abroad profession. Our members include educational institutions, consortia, agencies, and organizations, as well as individual leaders in the field. Together, we have worked to establish standards of good practice, improve study abroad curricula, and promote data collection and outcomes assessment, all to advocate for high quality education abroad programs. As recognition of the Forum's work, the US Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have designated the Forum a Standards Development Organization (SDO) for the field of education abroad. The Forum on Education Abroad has received permanent status as a not-for-profit, 501 (c)(3) corporation. The Forum offices are located on the campus of Dickinson College in Carlisle, PA.

Staff

Brian J. Whalen, *CEO and President*

Kalyani Glass, *Director*

Annmarie Marlin Whalen, *Project Manager*

Dear Colleagues:

An unprecedented, impressive effort has been attempted in the field of education abroad. I am referring to the pilot project of the Quality Improvement Program (QUIP).

QUIP is the linchpin of what The Forum is all about---promoting and assuring that education abroad programming of US students is continually and incrementally improved. It is the actualization of The Forum's *Standards of Good Practice*. This will be an endless but vital effort. It is critical to The Forum fulfilling its designation by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission as the Standards Development Organization (SDO) for the field of education abroad.

QUIP is an ambitious, critical process whose time has come. In a world in which organizations of all types must adhere to a higher level of accountability, commitment to quality and transparency, QUIP is timely. It assures that a sound quality control system is in place.

In accepting this challenge, The Forum on Education Abroad has committed itself to providing leadership for its members and the field at large through advocating for best practices and serving the best interests of its members and students served. This is an ambitious undertaking because, unlike existing education abroad organizations that have been conducting program reviews successfully for decades, QUIP is aimed at achieving an effective quality control system across a much broader array of educational models, institutional types and student constituents. QUIP is aimed at serving the entire field, the scope of which is complex, daunting and impressive. In fact, The Forum embraces the rich diversity within the field.

In order to assure quality control for the sake of students and to evolve as a field that adheres to best practices, the education abroad community needs to embrace both The Forum's *Standards of Good Practice* and QUIP. Using traditional, well-founded and tested academic methods, QUIP represents the testing of the rigor, validity and applicability of the *Standards of Good Practice*. Both are organic in nature. That is, both are subject to on-going change based upon lessons learned from the pilot and subsequent, more formalized program reviews.

On behalf of The Forum Board of Directors and staff, I want to express our deepest appreciation to those institutions that volunteered to participate in the pilot study. They invested much time and effort in testing QUIP. They represent the valuable variance within the field since consortia, domestic and overseas providers, domestic and overseas colleges and universities, and community colleges participated in the pilot. Also, I want to thank the peer reviewers, the review panel and our higher education consultants who invested significant time, wisdom and effort. They have been generous in providing very constructive, useful feedback for future improvements. Lastly, I would like to thank The Forum staff, led by Dr. Brian Whalen, for their enormous, successful effort accomplished within a very short period of time to lead and oversee the pilot project.

Much was learned through the successful implementation of the pilot project for QUIP and we will move forward making any needed changes and improvements.

Best Regards,

Mary M. Dwyer

Chairperson, Board of Directors of The Forum

President/CEO, IES: The Institute for the International Education of Students

The Development of the Standards of Good Practice by The Forum on Education Abroad

Standards of good practice emerged as a priority in January, 2001 at the first meeting of the education abroad professionals who became the Founding Board members of The Forum on Education Abroad. They quickly placed standards as the number one goal of The Forum. Compiling standards of good practice was the first project that the Board tackled, under the direction of Jon Booth, after soliciting input from Forum members in 2002 regarding the top issues in the field that needed standards of good practice. In fact, that survey found that the top ten issues in rank order were: development of standards for academics and program design, research in outcomes assessment/language acquisition, health and safety, finances and financial aid, ethical issues, advocacy, services/staff/faculty development/use of technology, access to/participation in education abroad, curriculum integration and pre-departure/re-entry issues.

Adherence to good standards was considered a necessary attribute of any member institution, organization or individual who joined the Forum. Although finalized standards did not exist at the time the Forum recruited its initial members, the Board added a statement to the membership form that indicated, "By completing this application, I affirm that the institution or organization named below is committed to the highest standards of education-abroad good practices." The Board had agreed that bringing as many institutions and organizations into The Forum as possible was the best way to ensure that they would share The Forum's priorities and profit from its advancements in the five goal areas.

To provide continuity in terms of content projects, the Board soon added to its governance structure an Advisory Council (today known as The Forum Council). The first elections were held in July of 2002 and the Council's first task that fall was to charge five committees with carrying on the five goals of the Forum. The Standards Committee, chaired by Bill Anthony, continued the standards project that the Board had initiated. At the CIEE conference in Atlanta in November of 2002 there were roundtables on the Forum's goals, including standards. At the time the Standards Committee an-

nounced that they planned to benefit from work done by the field in the past thirty years, to identify areas where standards had not existed, to create products to assist professionals with implementing standards (toolbox, links, etc.) and to seek input from the field along the way. With input from the roundtables in Atlanta and through expert guidance from Dr. Larry Braskamp, the former executive director of the Commission for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and the consultant who produced IES's Model Assessment Practice, the Standards project advanced quickly.

In January, 2004, the Board of Directors voted to have a formal certification process utilizing the finalized standards in three years. During this period the Board planned to seek counsel and advice from various accreditation and certification agencies regarding the pros and cons of various approaches to the application of standards of good practice. That same year the IFSA Foundation gave one of its inaugural grants to The Forum to further the goals of the Standards project, particularly to advance the planning for a systematic pilot project to test the application of the standards. The first formal draft of the standards was released as a publication at The Forum's first conference in Santa Fe in November, 2004, in conjunction with the CIEE conference, and was widely distributed in the field from that point on since it was made available on The Forum's website. Discussion boards on the website also stimulated input from the field regarding the draft document.

A unique opportunity presented itself in 2005 when the US Department of the Justice and the Federal Trade Commission took applications from entities that sought to be the Standards Development Organization in their field. The concept for these SDOs emanated as a means to curb the excesses and misbehaviors of various organizations that had garnered infamous publicity in previous years. Through SDOs, the US government hoped to encourage self-regulation and compliance with standards in such organizations. Geoffrey Bannister, the first executive director and president of The Forum, successfully achieved SDO status for The Forum. This important status carries responsibilities

that have helped shape the direction of the organization's application of the Standards since SDOs must exhibit the following elements: *Openness*, defined as the opportunity for involvement by all parties known to be affected by the particular standards development activity; *Balance*, which requires balancing interests so that standards development activities are not dominated by any single group of interested parties; *Transparency*, which calls for readily available access to essential information regarding proposed and final standards; *Consensus*, defined as the requirement that substantial agreement be reached on all material points after the consideration of all views and objections, and *Due Process*, including the right to express a position, to have it considered, and to appeal an adverse decision.

In 2005 a second edition of The Forum's *Standards of Good Practice*, produced under the guidance of Michael Steinberg, chair of the Standards Committee beginning in 2004, was distributed at the second conference in Miami in November, again in conjunction with the CIEE conference. The new edition resulted from the important input of the field. The second edition was designed to be linked to electronic resources at a future date. Other important changes included: a new section on the topic of marketing, a new standard was added to Ethics and Integrity, 43 queries were modified, 17 queries were dropped, 37 queries were added and several US-centric phrases and suggestions were modified. The most important change was publishing the eight standards separately from the queries so that they would stand out more clearly. The query approach was retained since most individuals involved with the project felt this was the best way to guide the users of the standards.

The Pilot Project was initiated in 2005 and continued through 2006, involving over 20 institutions and organizations, although not all of them completed the project due to competing activities. Program reviewers were selected from volunteers from the membership, with two assigned to each institution or organization. Guidelines for self studies and for the on-site evaluations were created to assist everyone engaged in the process. Visits took place in the summer and fall of 2006, culminating in a Summit at Dickinson College, the current home of The Forum, in late November of 2006 where representatives from the Council's Stan-

dards Committee, Forum staff and other Forum leadership benefited from lessons learned through the Pilot Project.

In January of 2006 the Board of Directors created a Task Force on Standards to make a recommendation to the Board regarding the formal utilization of the Standards, in consonance with the Board's vote in January of 2004 to have a process created within three years. After much deliberation and consideration regarding a number of options, the Task Force recommended a process that is called The Forum's Qualify Improvement Program (QUIP). This is very much in keeping with the directions in the field of higher education today which focus more on quality improvement than strict accountability models. QUIP will be useful to the wide range of institutions and organizations in the field of education abroad, which vary immensely in terms of their own self evaluation systems. QUIP offers a standardized approach to program and system reviews. Today, offices and programs often invite peers to evaluate their operations without access to an agreed-upon process or template. QUIP should quickly become the standard in the field for evaluating offices and programs. There are a variety of forms of QUIP, depending on the scope of the review. All reviewers will undergo training so there is consistency with the evaluation processes. Institutions and organizations will also receive guidance regarding the self-study component.

The Forum recognizes that many individuals, institutions and organizations may have different opinions about the best way to apply standards in the field of education abroad. The current process reflects the work of many, many individuals and experts and has been democratic in nature from the start. While the process may not be perfect, it is the most deliberate, most focused and most collaborative process of its kind that the field has known to date in the area of ensuring standards of good practice. We invite The Forum membership to support QUIP and to help make it the success it should be. Our students deserve no less.

Kathleen Sideli
Indiana University
Former Chair, Board of Directors of the Forum
Chair, Forum Board Standards Task Force

The Forum Council's Standards Committee and the *Standards of Good Practice*

Developing Standards of Good Practice for the field of Education Abroad has been at the core of the Forum's mission from its inception, and the Standards Committee of the Forum Council has led the organization in developing and refining the Standards. During the first year of the Forum's existence, the Forum membership identified the development of Standards as a central priority for the organization. A Board of Directors committee consisting of David Larsen of Arcadia University, Tom Roberts of the Institute for Study Abroad, Michael Delaney of the University of Colorado, and Jon Booth of Syracuse University began the discussion of Standards. When the Advisory Council of the Forum was formed, the Standards Committee was established as one of the five Council Committees. The Standards Committee then took over the discussion of the Standards. Bill Anthony, the first chairman of the Committee, was joined by Joan Raducha of the University of Wisconsin, and myself, with Jon Booth as Board representative, to map out the Standards project. They agreed on three essential components for the Standards project: a framework of core standard areas and standards, a set of queries that would enable organizations to examine their fulfillment of the general standards, and a tool box of examples of supporting documents and best practices developed in study abroad and related fields for all aspects of international education programming.

The Forum hired Larry Braskamp, a nationally-recognized expert on accreditation and assessment, to help the committee flesh out the Standards, and David Comp of the University of Chicago to develop the Tool Box. An enlarged committee, under Bill Anthony's leadership, with the help of these consultants, produced the first draft of the *Standards of Good Practice* in June of 2004.

The Standards Committee has involved Forum members in refining the Standards in an active dialectic process through a series of workshops and roundtables. In addition, the Standards Committee has taken soundings with other organizations with an interest in higher education standards and/or in study abroad, and issued a revised version of the *Standards of Good Practice* in November, 2005. The Standards have been divided into eight sections that cover all aspects of education abroad programs and provide tools for analysis by individual universities and colleges, study abroad providers, education abroad programs and international institutions that receive study abroad students.

In January 2005, the U.S. Department of Justice's Anti-Trust Division and Federal Trade Commission designated the Forum as the Standards Development Organization (SDO) for the field of education abroad. This status provides a firm basis for the Forum to use the Standards to study institutions' programs in study abroad.

During the last year, the Standards have been tested in a Pilot Project with a group of volunteer institutional participants – domestic and overseas providers, domestic and overseas universities and colleges, community colleges and consortia. Participants in the Pilot Project met in Carlisle in November to discuss their experience with the application of the Standards. A new draft of the Standards is in the process of development on the basis of these discussions. With the completion of the pilot stage of the project, the Forum has announced the Quality Improvement Program (QUIP), a program open to all Forum members that will utilize the Standards as a benchmark for study abroad efforts.

Michael Steinberg
Executive Vice President and Director of Academic Programs,
The Institute for the International Education of Students (IES)
Chair, Forum Council Standards Committee

Applying the Lessons Learned from the Pilot Project

The Forum's Standards Pilot has been a complex and fruitful endeavor. It has involved enacting change on campuses and within organizations as they have utilized the Standards to assess their education abroad programs. The Pilot has also provided a significant professional development opportunity for those participating as peer reviewers.

In addition to these direct benefits for both organizations and individuals, the Pilot has yielded significant results for the refinement of the Standards as well as the development of the Forum's Quality Improvement Program (QUIP) for Education Abroad. The Pilot has been a reflective process during which all participants were not only employing the Standards and a Pilot review process, but also noting recommendations on how to improve both. Indeed, while there were tangible benefits for the Pilot institutions and peer reviewers involved in the Pilot, the primary purpose was to learn lessons about the Standards and the process for their implementation.

The process of Standards development and implementation has been multifaceted. It is a process in which the Forum membership and the field of education abroad should have a high degree of confidence because it has followed best practices, which have included:

Broad and Diverse Involvement: Hundreds of colleagues from around the world representing all types of organizations and institutions have participated in the formulation of the Standards and their trial implementation.

Controlled Experimentation: The Pilot was akin to a laboratory experiment during which detailed observations and analyses were conducted both by participants and those on the "outside."

Rigorous Study and Revision: The entire process has involved examining the Standards and the review process from a critical perspective that has involved documenting each observation and suggestion and analyzing them in various committees and in open meetings and discussions.

Openness and Transparency: Throughout the process, the Forum membership and the public have been kept informed of the results through reports on the Forum web site, presentations and interactive sessions at professional meetings and conferences, and the publication of this Final Pilot Project Report.

Consultation with Outside Experts: Expert consultants have been used throughout the process to insure that the Standards and their implementation are developed in dialogue with how other associations, accreditation commissions, and agencies have developed and implemented standards.

(continued)

(Applying the Lessons Learned from the Pilot Project, continued)

Effective Decision Making: Decisions about implementing lessons learned have followed the Forum's inclusive and deliberate processes. The Board-appointed Standards Task Force has functioned as the body that has made recommendations to the Forum Board of Directors regarding the development of Standards implementation in light of the lessons learned. The Standards Committee of the Forum Council, composed of Council members, members at-large, as well as outside experts, have decided on revisions to the Standards themselves, a revised "final" draft of which will be recommended to the Board of Directors for endorsement at its July, 2007 meeting.

The process for developing and improving the Standards and their implementation will not end now that the Pilot Project has been completed. The process will be ongoing, as it should be with any effort to implement Standards for a given field. The reasons for this are many: new conditions in the field of education abroad; results from research; continued feedback from the QUIP program and from others who utilize the Standards.

However, it is also important to note that while both the Standards and the process for their implementation, the Quality Improvement Program (QUIP), will continue to be assessed, there is a high degree of confidence in their relevancy and effectiveness. They are not expected to change radically in the future; indeed, the extensive development process insures the stability of and the authority for both the Standards and QUIP.

The ultimate test for the value of this process will be in the results of the Standards implementation in QUIP. Based on the feedback from the many colleagues in the field who have studied and tested the Standards and their implementation, the Forum is confident that the goal of improving the quality of education abroad programs will be met.

Brian J. Whalen

President and CEO, The Forum on Education Abroad

Associate Dean and Executive Director of Global Education, Dickinson College

PILOT PROJECT
PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS
AND INSTITUTIONAL CORE REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

CALIFORNIA COLLEGES FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (CCIE)

Rosalind Raby, Director

DICKINSON COLLEGE

Brian Brubaker, Associate Director for Study Abroad

Laurie Mossler, Director, Office of Global Education

Marcelo Borges, Resident Director, Dickinson in Málaga

Malinda Mochizuki, Program Associate

THE FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (FIE)

Michael Woolf, President

Dominic Janes, Academic Director

John Pearson, Vice President, Operations

John Janoudi, Vice President, Finance

Emma Sweeney, Writer in Residence

INSTITUTE FOR STUDY ABROAD, BUTLER UNIVERSITY (IFSA)

Amy Bartnick Blume, Vice President for External Relations

Joanna Holvey Bowles, Senior Vice President

Opal Leeman Bartzis, Assistant Director for Academic Affairs

Rebecca Clouser, Assistant Director for Spanish-Speaking Programs

Diana Arízaga, Resident Director, IFSA-Butler Mérida

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

John Keller, Director, Education Abroad

Anthony Ogden, Associate Director

Sylvia Neely, Professor of History, Chair, Education Abroad Advisory Committee

Jane Agnelly, Financial Officer, Comptroller's Office

Sherry Miller, Business Manager, International Programs

SAINT NORBERT COLLEGE

Joseph Tullbane, Associate Dean and Director of International Education and Outreach

Rosemary Sands, Director of Study Abroad Office

Robert Rutter, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness

Joyce Tullbane, Study Abroad Coordinator

SCHOOL FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAINING

Rebecca Hovey, Dean, SIT Study Abroad

David Shallenberger, Director of European and Middle Eastern Studies

Adam Weinberg, Provost

Laurie Black, Assistant Dean for External Relations

(continued)

(Pilot Project Institutions and Organizations, continued)

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, NEW PALTZ

Bruce Sillner, Dean, International Programs
Joan Feuer, Study Abroad Advisor
Penny Schouten, Study Abroad Recruitment Coordinator
Heather Gillman, International Programs Assistant

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Jon Booth, Executive Director, SU Abroad
Sue Shane, Associate Director
Andrea Licavoli, Coordinator
Susan Wadley, Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences
Clint Tankersley, Associate Dean, School of Management
Donald Saleh, Associate VP Enrollment Management, Graduate School
Raymond Bach, Director, Strasbourg
Barbara Deimling, Director, Florence

UNIVERSIDAD REGIONMONTANA

Carlos Teissier, Director of International Affairs
Jorge Mercado, Director for Academic Affairs
Veronica Morales, Coordinator of International Non Traditional Programs
Perla Ortiz de Leon, Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Mitch Leventhal, Vice Provost International
Susan Bacon, Director, UC International Programs
Karen Ramos, Program Manager, UC International Programs
James Tenney, Assistant Director, UC International Services
David Edelman, Director, School of Planning
Susan Sadlier, Director, College of Business International Programs
Sara Woolen Danner, Manager, Opera Festival, Lucca
Connie Scarborough, Professor, UC program, Brazil
Gayle Elliott, Director, International Co-op
Terry Becraft, Assistant Director, Professional Practice
Dinshaw Mistry, Director, Asian Studies
Robert Zierolf, Head, Composition and Theory, CCM
Stefano Allegrini, Director, Koinè, UC Opera Festival, Lucca [observer]
Larry Braskamp, Professor Emeritus, Loyola University of Chicago [facilitating consultant]

UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK

Liam Ó Dochartaigh, Director, International Education Division
Eoin Devereux, Senior Lecturer in Sociology
Linda Stevens, Executive Director, Plassey Campus Centre
Adrian Thomas, Director of Quality
Ellie McHugh, Coordinator
Grainne O'Donovan, Technical Writer

(Pilot Project Institutions and Organizations, continued)

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

Rob Castle, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic and International
 Jim Langridge, Vice-Principal, International
 Trish Tindall, Manager, International Relations
 Carly Ludbrook, Study Abroad and Exchange Coordinator
 Anna Maskiell, Management Cadet, UniAdvice
 Michael Gillmore, General Manager, Accommodation Services
 Associate Professor Greg Hampton, Head, Student Services
 Associate Professor John McQuilton, Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts
 Gary Noble, Director, International Operations, Faculty of Commerce
 Associate Professor David Vance, Sub-Dean, Faculty of Creative Arts
 Associate Professor Ted Bryant, Associate Dean, Faculty of Science
 Cathy Sharpe, Manager, Occupational Health and Safety
 Heather Sainsbury, Assistant Director, Strategic Planning Unit

VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY

Lance Kenney, Director, International Studies
 Hoda Baeshen, Assistant Director
 Levi Brautigam, Senior Program Coordinator

PEER REVIEWERS FOR THE PILOT PROJECT

| | |
|---|---|
| Adrian Beaulieu, <i>Smith College</i> | Nancy Kanach, <i>Princeton University</i> |
| Elizabeth Brewer, <i>Beloit College</i> | Katharine Krebs, <i>Binghamton University</i> |
| Kendall Brostuen, <i>Brown University</i> | David Macey, <i>Middlebury College</i> |
| Erica Gray Smith Caloiero, <i>Lehigh University</i> | Donna Mancini, <i>Haverford College</i> |
| Jim Citron, <i>Colby College</i> | Richard Mitten, <i>Baruch College</i> |
| Mary Ryan Dando, <i>University of Colorado, Boulder</i> | Anthony Ogden, <i>Pennsylvania State University</i> |
| Timothy Lynn Elliott, <i>Brigham Young University</i> | Annagene Yucas, <i>University of Pittsburgh</i> |
| Stephen Ferst, <i>Rutgers University</i> | Rodney Sangster, <i>University of California</i> |
| Uliana Gabara, <i>University of Richmond</i> | Carolyn Sorkin, <i>Wesleyan University</i> |
| Michael Gallagher, <i>University of Notre Dame</i> | Lee Glover Sternberger, <i>James Madison University</i> |
| Richard Gaulton, <i>Cornell University</i> | Scott Van Der Meid, <i>Brandeis University</i> |
| Meredith Hyde, <i>Syracuse University, London</i> | Paige Weting |
| Martha Johnson, <i>University of Minnesota</i> | |

The Pilot Project

Basic Intentions

The Pilot Program has been intended as a test of both the process for program review and evaluation and a test of the various instruments to be used in the review. To the extent that a participating organization used the Pilot to conduct an actual program review, that was a clear additional benefit. However, the review itself has been seen as subsidiary to the central intent to test and refine the review and evaluation processes for future use.

The process has been based on the basic principles of a Standards Development Organization, or SDO, a role the Forum provides for education abroad in the United States. The basic principles guiding the SDO process are that it should embody:

- Openness – the opportunity to all parties known to be affected by the particular standards development activity;
- Balance – balancing interests so that standards development activities are not dominated by any single group of interested parties;
- Transparency – readily available access to essential information regarding proposed and final standards;
- Consensus – the requirement that substantial agreement be reached on all material points after the consideration of all views and objections; and
- Due Process – the right to express a position, to have it considered, and to appeal an adverse decision.

The Forum's *Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad*, and the processes used in their development, embody all of these principles. The Pilot Program, based on these standards, also embodied the following elements in its review and evaluation process:

- Engagement in the process is voluntary, and by invitation only;
- The process is marked by a clearly stated process of peer review;
- The final evaluation and determination is conducted by an independent body;
- The process provides for a range of evaluative advice and outcomes;
- The process has appropriate confidentiality and reporting systems; and
- The review body does not engage in making comments or casting aspersions on programs not voluntarily subjecting themselves to the process.

Main Elements of the Pilot

- The preparation of a comprehensive Self-Study Report by an institution/organization's Core Review Team relating its education abroad programming to the mission and goals of the institution/organization, and placing the education abroad activities within the context of the Forum's Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad;
- The review of the Self-Study Report and a site visit by a team of Peer Reviewers, and the creation of a Peer Review Report by that team;
- A response by the Core Review Team to the Peer Review Report to correct any errors of fact and address recommendations made by Peer Reviewers;
- Review of the Peer Review Report and any Response, and then communication of a final outcome by The Forum Review Panel.

Recognition of Participation in the Pilot Project and Nature of the Final Outcome

The Standards Task Force served in the role of the Forum Review Panel for the Pilot Project. Its final outcome communication was comprised of a statement indicating that the organization has participated in the piloting of a quality improvement process and also indicated whether or not the organization has been found to be in conformity with the Forum's *Standards of Good Practice*. This final outcome gives substantial recognition to those programs and organizations that meet the appropriate standards for a high quality education abroad program, as judged by performance against the *Standards of Good Practice*.

Programs and organizations that merit this designation through the Pilot Program are now eligible to apply for participation in the Forum's Quality Improvement Program (QUIP) without repeating the full review process. QUIP is a process intended to improve the quality of an organization's education abroad programs and also to recognize those programs and organizations that meet the Forum's *Standards of Good Practice*.

Chronology of the Pilot Project

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Fall 2005: | Recruitment of participant institutions and organizations |
| January 31, 2006: | Pilot Project Manual distributed |
| February– June 2006: | Core Review Teams and Leaders formed; Self Studies conducted by participating institutions |
| June, 2006: | Open call for and recruitment of volunteer Peer Reviewers |
| June 30, 2006: | Submission of first Self-Study Report, continuing on a rolling basis |
| July 15 -December 2006: | Site Review visits, Peer Review Reports, Forum Review Panel decisions |
| November 29-December 1, 2006: | Standards Summit held in Carlisle, PA |
| December – February, 2007: | Final decisions, evaluations; Project wrap up |
| March 1 - 3, 2007: | Conference presentations and dissemination |

The Standards Summit November 29 – December 1, 2006

Thirty Pilot Project participants gathered at the Forum's offices on the Dickinson College campus in Carlisle, PA, from November 29-December 1, 2006, to discuss their experiences of participating in the Standards Pilot Project. Before the Summit, participants received a set of "Thinking Points" to prepare for the discussions. The goals of the Summit were to:

- Gather useful information on: what worked and what didn't in each phase of the Pilot Project; suggestions on how to improve the self-study and peer review processes; suggestions for training/orientation of institutions/organizations and Peer Reviewers.
- Gather feedback on the Standards of Good Practice: content and structure.
- Generate conclusions for the Standards Pilot Project Final Report.
- Develop presentations for sessions about the Standards Pilot Project at the Forum Conference in Austin, March 1-3, 2007.

The summit meeting sessions included:

Wednesday, November 29, Evening Session

- Welcome Dinner and Address by Mary Dwyer, Chair, Forum Board of Directors

Thursday, November 30, Morning Sessions:

- Welcome and opening comments by Brian Whalen, President and CEO; Kathy Sideli, Chair, Forum Board of Directors Standards Task Force
- The Standards Pilot Project: Lessons Learned: Group divides into two facilitated working groups: Institutional Representatives discuss and debrief Self-Study Process: structure, phases, pre-planning; Peer Reviewers discuss topics related to the Peer Review Process: training, role, amount of time needed to examine materials
- Working groups report back to whole assembly, floor open for comments and discussion.

Thursday, November 30, Afternoon Sessions:

- Feedback on the Standards and their implementation. Break into groups according to topic-related areas of Standards: Additions to /comments on content of current edition of Standards
- Group Reports and Discussion

Friday, December 1, Morning Session:

- Planning sessions for the Forum conference. Attendees volunteer to develop conference sessions based on lessons learned from the Pilot, then break into working groups by session.

Forum Standards Summit Attendees

Institutional Representatives:

Susan Bacon, University of Cincinnati
Amy Bartnick Blume, IFSA – Butler
Laurie Black, School for International Training
Brian Brubaker, Dickinson College
Rob Castle, University of Wollongong
John Keller, Pennsylvania State University
Lance Kenney, Villanova University
Eleanor McHugh, University of Limerick
Laurie Mossler, Dickinson College
Sue Shane, Syracuse University
Bruce Sillner, SUNY New Paltz
Adrian Thomas, University of Limerick
Joseph Tullbane, Saint Norbert College
Michael Woolf, Foundation for International Education

Peer Reviewers:

Adrian Beaulieu, Smith College
Kendall Brostuen, Brown University
Erica Smith Caloiero, Lehigh University
Jim Citron, Colby College
Stephen Ferst, Rutgers University
Nancy Kanach, Princeton University
Katharine Krebs, Binghamton University
Donna Mancini, Haverford College

Other:

William Anthony, Northwestern University (Forum Standards Committee)
Larry Braskamp (Pilot Project Consultant)
Patti Brown, Franklin & Marshall College (Chair of the Forum Conference Committee)
William Cressey (Forum Standards Task Force, Consultant)
Mary Dwyer, IES (Chair, Forum Board of Directors)
Kay Glass, Forum (Director)
Kathleen Sideli, Indiana University (Chair, Forum Standards Task Force)
Michael Steinberg, IES (Chair, Forum Standards Committee)
Annmarie Whalen, Forum (Project Manager)
Brian Whalen, Forum (President and CEO)

Observations and Feedback from the Standards Pilot Project

Sources of Information

The observations and feedback from the Standards Pilot have come from a variety of sources:

1. Correspondence and telephone conversations between Forum staff and institutional representatives and core review team members;
2. Correspondence and telephone conversations with peer reviewers;
3. Discussions with those attending the Standards Summit: institutional representatives, peer reviewers, Standards Task Force Members, Standards Committee members, consultants;
4. Evaluations completed by institutional representatives and peer reviewers;
5. Analysis of institutional Self-Study Reports and Peer Review Reports;
6. Debriefing and discussions with the Standards Task Force members, Forum Council, Standards Committee, and the Forum Board of Directors.

Observations and Feedback Related to the Self-Study and Peer Review Processes

From Participating Institutions and Organizations

On Training:

- It is critically important to have broad institutional buy-in and support from all levels of the administration, faculty and staff, across the institution or organization.
- It is important to have a realistic understanding of the nature of the task of the Self-Study, and the amount of work and the amount of time it will take.
- It is important to link the Self-Study, if possible, to other internal assessments, as well as to the strategic plan of the organization/institution.
- Be cautious about authority granted to the Peer Reviewers. There is a need to restrict/control what additional materials and on-site meetings Peer Reviewers should be able to ask for.
- Concern about there not being enough objectivity on the part of some Peer Reviewers: too much individual opinion, some philosophic bias brought into site visits and the Peer Review Reports.
- This is a quality improvement program and not a compliance model. It is meant to help institutions improve the quality of their education programs and operations and not make them go through a list of items for the sake of checking them off.

(continued)

On the Review Process:

- There should be an appropriate division of labor in the Core Review Team that will complete the Self-Study.
- There is a need to be sensitive to the internal timing of the Self-Study in relation to other offices and program activities within the organization/institution.
- The institutional Core Review Team should respond to the Peer Review Report and include specific recommendations about how it should act in light of the conclusions of the review.
- If more than one program or office of an organization is under review, the individual constituents or units should submit self-study reports to the Core Review Team. The Core Review Team could combine these individual reports into a comprehensive document. For example, if the organization is a university or program provider, it could include individual reports from study abroad offices and from education abroad programs. If the organization is an education abroad program, it would include reports from its program director, academic personnel and student services personnel. The comprehensive Self-Study Report (including all reports, data and documents) would be provided to the Forum prior to the visit of the Site Review Team.
- It may be necessary to tailor a peer review team to meet the needs of the organization, such as adding an administrator from outside the field or a faculty expert in a certain area. For example, if an institution wants to assess the language aspect of its study abroad programming, then it might be advisable to include an expert on foreign language acquisition on the peer review team.
- Individual institutions and their distinctive missions and goals need to be respected. Reviews should focus on determining how well the institutions are meeting their goals rather than imposing a checklist of desired goals from the outside.
- The review process should be forward-looking, and not a backward-looking compliance model. Institutions should respond with a future action plan and not a simple “yes” or “no” regarding their practices. Since the review and judgment about the programs is meant to recognize their quality for the future, it makes sense to make that designation last into the future for some years.

On Administration:

- The cycle of reviews should not be too frequent. The Self-Study takes a great deal of time and it is not reasonable to expect institutions to do it every four or five years. Senior administration will not want to fund such a study on a short cycle. Ideally, reviews should be done somewhere between 7 – 10 years.
- Peer Review Teams need to have time during the site visit to formulate their thoughts and begin to write the Peer Review Report.

(continued)

From Peer Reviewers

On Training:

- Peer Reviewer training should be specific to the Standards and the Forum review model. There should be a thorough training regarding the expected outcome of the review in reference to quality improvement.
- The Peer Review Report should be given a suggested length and examples of excellent Peer Review Reports should be shown as part of the training.
- Peer Reviewers are more familiar with a compliance/accreditation model, and not the quality improvement model.
- Peer Reviewers generally need more structure, management, and specific guidelines.

On the Review Process

- In all reviews, whether international or domestic, meeting with students or recent returnees and faculty is essential. Returned students and faculty provide essential information about the quality of education abroad programming.
- There should be clear communication between Peer Reviewers before the site visit to discuss division of labor in the areas to be explored during the Site Visit and in writing the peer Review Report.
- What is the best way to address academic quality in the review? Can Peer Reviewers view sample transcripts, statistics of grades given, how grades are reported/credit given?
- Should each Peer Reviewer write his or her own report? This would provide two distinct points of view. The reviewers could write in their own style and say what they want to say, especially in a situation where the reviewers not agree.
- The Self-Study should include a narrative articulating the institution/organization's own goals for the review. Knowing and understanding the mission and goals of the organization/institution is a critically important part of the review process.
- The Self-Study report should include basic data not found in the response to the Standards queries: history or organization/institution; numbers of students; frequency of program offering; staffing; budget, etc.
- When reviewing an overseas program, there should also be an opportunity for Peer Reviewers to have contact with US-based office staff.
- Larger, more complex reviews may need more than two Peer Reviewers.
- The Peer Review Report should have room for insights and suggestions beyond simply responding to the Self-Study Report. Peer Reviewers may want to offer observations and recommendations that lie outside the formal structure of the Report.
- Depending on the complexity of the organization or program being reviewed, Peer Reviewers need to receive the Self-Study Report and documentation at least one month ahead of time in order to study it adequately and prepare for the site visit.

On Administration:

- There should be a Team Leader appointed to lead the Peer Review Team. The Team Leader could be responsible for coordinating the review prior to departure, during the time on site, and also handle the wrap-up meetings at the end of the review. The Team Leader should compile and submit the report if it is a collaborative effort.

(continued)

- The precise responsibilities and division of labor of each Peer Reviewer should be established before the review.
- The Peer Review Report needs to be put into a standardized, structured format. A template should be provided to help Peer Reviewers organize their information and judgments. The template might include specific areas to be assessed, and their strength/weaknesses and best practices.
- When Peer Reviewers disagree and cannot resolve their differences, there should be a mechanism to report these as divergent opinions as such, which can then be considered by the Forum Review Panel.
- Forum staff should more actively manage setting up the site visit meeting schedule, and this meeting schedule should be arranged well ahead of time.
- Pre-site visit contact between Peer Reviewers and the organization/institution: while it is important for setting up an effective meeting schedule, it is also important to recognize that for reasons of maintaining the integrity of the review, direct contact needs to be mediated and/or limited.
- Forum staff should manage Peer Reviewers' requests for further information/documentation, and changes/additions to the schedule of the site visit.
- Peer Reviewers could either be assigned to a specific role, or they could choose their area or areas of responsibility. For example, one reviewer could focus primarily on academic areas and another Peer Reviewer could focus on the student services area.
- Peer Reviewers should receive a specific timeline for all parts of the review, including making travel arrangements, submitting the report, submitting receipts, etc.
- There should be explicit guidelines about who covers what expense during the review.
- It would be convenient to have the Self-Study Report and all supporting documents accessible online and password protected.
- A clear confidentiality/non-disclosure agreement needs to be signed by the Peer Reviewers and institutions/organizations.
- Peer Reviewers' CVs should be provided to the organization/institution ahead of time so that the Core Review Team and others can become familiar with the background of the Peer Reviewers.

Observations and Feedback Related to the Standards of Good Practice

From Institutions and Peer Reviewers:

- The next and "final" edition of the Standards should be completed before the review processes begin.
- The Standards should focus more on academics and student learning, and student learning outcomes, and promote a forward-looking sense to the process. There needs to be more emphasis on the need for institutions to develop goals for learning outcomes.
- The Standards queries are framed so that they elicit "yes" or "no" responses rather than more action-oriented responses. It needs to be emphasized more strongly that responses to the queries should involve more than "yes" or "no" answers. It might be beneficial to replace most, if not all, of the yes-no queries with questions that might elicit a more substantive response.

(continued)

- In some cases, the Standards have an underlying tone of compliance and a focus on administrative and resource “inputs” rather than on “outcomes” and goals for the future. This should be modified so that institutions/organizations realize that responses to the queries will depend on the distinct mission and set of goals of the entity going through the review process.
- The Standards should push the institutions and organizations to be forward looking in how they respond to the Standards.
- Consider moving the section on *Ethics and Integrity* from #1 to another spot since it is harder to collect those documents and can be discouraging for those working on the Self-Study to tackle at the start something that is more difficult than the Mission/Policies section.
- The entire listing of the Standards might be reordered so that the Standards relating to academics and learning come first and others related to administration come later.
- There are some queries in the Standards that do not relate to some institutions and organizations. It needs to be made clearer that it is acceptable to skip over queries that do not relate to an institution/organization’s programs.
- Use color-coding to highlight the standards that are ‘essential’ components for any unit.
- Some of the standards are difficult for non-US institutions to interpret correctly and need to be restated so that they apply more equally to overseas host institutions and programs.
- The section that is labeled “academic standards” emphasizes academic processes and also needs to address more directly academic learning outcomes.
- There needs to be a distinction made as to what is being reviewed: an institution’s programs; or a program provider, or a program abroad. Somehow the Standards have to be arranged in such a way that they can be easily applied or used to measure how all these different types can be evaluated successfully and appropriately.
- The current format is too much of a checklist. It does not provoke the institution to identify goals, describe current vehicles for achieving those goals, and analyze related strengths, weaknesses and strategies to improve.
- There are redundancies that can be eliminated and the Standards can be made a bit more concise.
- Having separate versions of the standards would ultimately fragment the discussion of the standards. All programs need to hold themselves and each other accountable to the same standards when they apply.
- It may be practical to remind members that, in using the Standards to construct programs and inform and guide practice, individual organizations will need to adapt them to specific circumstances.
- The issue of whether programs adhere to host culture and/or home culture safety standards needs to be addressed.
- Use of the term “EdAPS “was a constant problem for a school that uses direct enrollment and exchanges only. A better term (a bit more general to fit various types of programs) would be more useful.

The Impact of the Standards Pilot Project

Impact on Institutions and Organizations

Institutions and organizations that participated in the Standards Pilot provided detailed feedback regarding the review process and the use of the Standards. They were also asked the following questions to assess the impact that their participation had on their organization/institution. All of the institutions responded to the survey, and the results show that participation had an overwhelming positive impact.

Responses from Pilot Project Evaluation:

Question 1. Participating in the Standards Pilot was valuable for my institution.

0% do not agree 22% agree 78% strongly agree

Question 2. The value of participation in the Standards Pilot was:

0% very negative 0% negative 0% neutral 57% positive 43% very positive

Question 3. I believe the Pilot Project will lead to positive changes at my institution.

0% do not agree 79% agree 21% strongly agree

Question 4. The changes which will result at my institution are likely to be:

0% very negative 0% negative 21% neutral 50% positive 29% very positive

Quotes from Institutional Participants

- “It is beneficial to have the core team meet regularly and to involve as many staff and faculty as possible. This spreads the staff development benefit.”
- “It was an accountability process that gave reassurance that we have the resources to work at generating the outcomes we want.”
- “We undergo an accreditation process every five years and the added work was a bit redundant; however, consideration of the Standards is useful. A positive outcome is that we have consistent measures by which our programs are assessed.”
- “Our administration was fully supportive of the process and felt that it was important in taking our program to the next level.”
- “The Self-Study and review took more time and effort than we expected, but we all felt that it was well worth it. You need to assess the benefits versus the amount of staff time that it takes to go through the process.”
- “The project helped us to clarify the goals for our programs. It was useful to have an outside perspective on what we do, and to recognize what our successes are.”
- “We were able to identify some areas that we needed to focus on to improve, and also some new opportunities that we had not considered before.

Impact on Peer Reviewers

Peer Reviewers who participated in the Pilot Project provided detailed feedback about the review process and the Standards. They were also asked the following questions to assess the impact that participation in the Pilot Project had on them. 21 of the 30 Peer Reviewers responded to the survey and the results indicate that it was an overwhelmingly positive experience for the Peer Reviewers.

Responses from Pilot Project Evaluation

1. This was a valuable professional experience for me.

0% do not agree 29% agree 71% strongly agree

2. I would be interested in serving as a Forum Peer Reviewer in the future.

0% do not agree 24% agree 76% strongly agree

Quotes from Peer Reviewers

- “The administration at the organization were welcoming, eager to hear our thoughts and to present who they were.”
- “The institution’s written response suggests that they are taking into account all of our recommendations and are making changes based on them.”
- “I think (the Peer Review Report) confirms that they are doing things the right way and they can be confident in their program.”
- “I think we did a good job of identifying some of the challenges and hopefully assisting with them. The (institution) was very receptive to suggestions, and discussed with the peer review team the major changes it is now undertaking.
- “We didn’t identify problems without suggesting possible solutions, but we left the details up to them.”
- “The problems we identified were, for the most part, already evident to the host organization and they were making an effort to address them. Since they had already a grasp on these problems I am not sure that any “solution” we could propose would be better than those they had worked out. However, I believe that they were encouraged by our positive reviews of how they are approaching these problems.”
- “In a few instances we identified areas where the institution could improve but the institution was very innovative in solutions based on their resource base...We tried to present suggestions as options or choices.”

Dissemination of the Outcomes of the Standards Pilot Project

Conference Presentations (confirmed or completed)

- ... British Universities Transatlantic Exchange Association (BUTEX), 2006 Conference, Durham, England, July, 11, 2006, “Embracing Innovation, Building on Tradition”
 - Panel Presentation: “Quality Assurance in Study Abroad: A Report on the Piloting of the Forum on Education Abroad's Standards of Good Practice”
 - Presenters: Adrian Thomas, University of Limerick; Michael Woolf, Foundation for International Education; Brian Whalen, Forum on Education Abroad

- ... Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), 2007 Conference, Washington, DC, February 21, 2007, “The Global University: Challenges and Opportunities”
 - Panel Presentation: “Standards in Action: The Forum on Education Abroad’s Pilot Project”
 - Presenters: Nancy Kanach, Princeton University; Joseph Tullbane, Saint Norbert College; Brian Whalen, Forum on Education Abroad.

- ... The 2007 North Carolina State University Undergraduate Assessment Symposium, Cary, North Carolina, April 14, 2007, "Systematic, Systemic & Sustainable Assessment: A Process of Inquiry"
 - Panel Presentation: Evaluation and Assessment in Study Abroad Programs
 - Presenters: Michael Steinberg, IES, Chair of Standards Committee; Joseph Tullbane, Saint Norbert College; Brian Whalen, Forum on Education Abroad

- ... NAFSA: Association of International Education Administrators, 2007 Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June, 2007, “Preparing Global Citizens”
 - Panel Presentation: “Results of the Forum on Education Abroad's Standards Pilot Project”
 - Presenters: Liam O’Dochartaigh, University of Limerick; Michael Steinberg, IES, Chair of Standards Committee; Michael Woolf, Foundation of International Education; Brian Whalen, Forum on Education Abroad

Publications

Final Report: Forum on Education Abroad Standards of Good Practice Pilot Project, The Forum on Education Abroad, Carlisle, PA (March, 2007)

The Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad, 3rd edition, The Forum on Education Abroad, Carlisle, PA (Summer, 2007)

The Way Forward: A Quality Improvement Program (QUIP) for Education Abroad

The results of the Pilot Project have helped to inform the Forum's Quality Improvement Program (QUIP) for education abroad. As announced in earlier publications, the QUIP is based on the *Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad* produced by the Forum in consultation with many colleges and universities and third-party providers.

The Forum QUIP is designed to help institutions improve the quality of their education abroad programming and services and thereby contribute to quality assurance. This is not a compliance review or an accreditation process. The purpose is to help an institution improve the quality of its offerings and to think strategically about its future development. The QUIP addresses general aspects of programming such as ethics and integrity, and organizational and program resources as well as specific dimensions of international programming related to education abroad for US students. In the broadest terms, the focus of the review should be on student learning and development, and how an institution fosters this via its academic programs and administrative procedures. QUIP is intended primarily for:

- (1) Any organization that runs one or more education abroad programs. This includes US colleges and universities that run programs for their own students or for American undergraduates generally, so-called 'third party providers,' which typically run programs that colleges and universities include in their own offerings, and overseas institutions—whether institutions of higher education or other organizations—that provide education abroad experiences for US students.
- (2) Any US College or University which, while not operating its own programs, offers education abroad services to students, evaluates programs, maintains partnership relationships with program operators, offers credit, and provides other support services to students who choose to study abroad.

Depending on which category best describes a particular institution, and on the scope of its operations, its self-study will address one or both of the specific international programming dimensions mentioned above—education abroad programs and sending school operations. The focus of QUIP is forward-looking. It's aim is to help institutions and organizations by offering suggestions for improvement.

The main elements of the review process are the following:

1. The preparation of a Self-Study Report by a Self-Study Team appointed by the participating institution or organization.
2. A site visit by a Peer Review Team of independent education abroad professionals.
3. Preparation of a Peer Review Report by that team.
4. A response by the Self-Study Team, which will include an indication of the institution's plans for future improvement.
5. In some cases, additional communication between the Peer Reviewers and the Self-Study Team.
6. A thorough review of the documents by the Forum Review Panel—a group of senior education abroad professionals nominated by a committee composed of Forum Council and Board members and appointed by the Forum Board of Directors.
7. A letter summarizing the findings of the review written by the Forum Review Panel to the institution or organization.

The Forum Review Panel's final letter will include a statement indicating whether or not the organization has been judged to have addressed sufficiently the standards in light of its own mission and purpose, and it will include suggestions for future development.

It is anticipated that QUIP Reviews will begin in September 2007, with the Comprehensive Program Reviews to be the first type to be offered. Other types of reviews, including Review of Evaluation Processes and Guided Strategic Planning, are expected to begin to be offered in 2008. Institutions interested in the fall 2007 round of reviews are encouraged to apply in the spring of 2007. At the Forum Conference in Austin, Texas, in early March 2007, a workshop is being offered that will help institutions prepare for the reviews.

Pricing for the reviews is based on the scope of the institution or organization under review. The starting fee for the Comprehensive Program Review begins at \$2,000. In addition, travel expenses for reviewers (in the US or abroad) would be paid by the institution under review.

In all cases, the persons reviewing programs and services and, in the case of assistance for strategic planning, are established experts in the field of international education. They will have received training by the Forum, and will sign conflict of interest statements and confidentiality agreements.

Additional information concerning the QUIP processes and procedures is contained in the **QUIP Guidebook**, which is available as an institutional member benefit by contacting the Forum office.

The Forum's QUIP is offered to the field at an auspicious moment in the history of our profession, when leaders, both within and outside academic circles, are emphasizing the importance of education abroad.

From the IFSA Foundation

In the summer of 2004, the Directors of the newly-established IFSA Foundation announced an inaugural grant to the Forum on Education Abroad. The three-year grant was intended primarily for the purpose of assisting overall development of the Forum and, particularly, implementation of the Standards of Good Practice.

The broadly stated mission of the IFSA Foundation is to support undergraduate study abroad. The Directors could think of no better recipient for the first grant than the Forum, an organization dedicated to the improvement of study abroad with one of its primary stated goals the establishment of standards for the field.

The Directors of the Foundation have a long, well-documented dedication to high standards for study abroad and considerable personal experience in the difficulty of setting these standards for the field. To us, the agreement, at the very least, of all concerned to aspire to high standards in academic and other areas of the conduct of study abroad programs has been and remains the major issue confronting practitioners in our work in international education.

The first grant disbursement to the Forum was made in November of 2004 and the final payment was sent to the Forum this past December. Multi-year grants from the IFSA Foundation are not automatic but must be justified by documented appropriate and effective use of the previous year's fund. Each year we have received, with great pleasure, excellent reports from the Forum indicating the fine progress that has been made in the establishment and implementation of the Standards of Good Practice.

On the occasion of this "coming of age" conference, the first stand-alone conference of the Forum on Education Abroad, the Foundation's Directors would like to applaud the Forum on its achievements and, knowing that there is much work yet to be done, wish it well in its continuing efforts.

We feel privileged to have contributed in some part to the Forum's success but are well aware of the volunteer nature of the endeavor and the large number of individuals and institutions who have contributed time, energy, expertise and generosity in bringing the Forum to this stage.

Tom Roberts, President
David Gray, Secretary
M. Jean White, Treasurer

About the IFSA Foundation

The IFSA Foundation (www.theifsafoundation.org) assists the continuing advancement of international education through direct and indirect support of study abroad by undergraduates from US colleges and universities. This is the first foundation whose mission focuses exclusively on study abroad as a major component of higher education in the United States. Since its founding in 2004, the Foundation has distributed over \$2,400,000 in grants to over 40 colleges, universities and other not-for-profit institutions, in support of undergraduate study abroad.

The Directors of the IFSA Foundation believe that effective study abroad for US students involves minimally a semester-length experience and, wherever possible, close academic integration with recognized universities abroad and, in all cases, the provision by the program sponsors of comprehensive student services to maximize the academic and cultural benefits of the experience and provide for the welfare and security of its students.

The IFSA Foundation intends to concentrate on projects that will provide much-needed strength to study abroad for US undergraduates: scholarships to extend opportunities (particularly among underrepresented groups); start-up funding for underdeveloped areas of semester and full-year study abroad programs; and support for development of innovative projects designed to broaden the scope of the undergraduate study abroad experience.

THE FORUM COUNCIL, 2006-2007

The fifteen elected members of the Forum Council set the agenda for and carry out the initiatives and activities of the organization. Each member serves a three-year term; the Council elects its own leadership from within its members.

Sheila Bayne, Chair
Tufts University

Lance Kenney
Villanova University

Mell Bolen, Vice-Chair
Brethren Colleges Abroad

Kim Kreutzer
University of Colorado at Boulder

Lynn Anderson
University of California at San Diego

Patricia C. Martin
The University of Pennsylvania

Bill Anthony
Northwestern University

Natalie A. Mello
Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI)

Kate Darian-Smith
University of Melbourne, Australia

Vija G. Mendelson
Academic Programs International (API)

Carol Dickerman
University of Michigan

Michael Steinberg
Institute for the International Education of Students (IES)

Dennis R. Gordon
Santa Clara University

Anders Uhrskov
DIS: Denmark's International Study Program

Stephen Hall
Bowdoin College

THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE OF THE FORUM COUNCIL

Michael Steinberg, Chair
Institute for the International Education of Students (IES)

Monica Perez Bedmar
Association of American Programs in Spain (APUNE)

Joy Carew
University of Louisville

Rosalind Raby
California Colleges for International Education (CCIE)

James Citron
Colby College

Prema Samuel
Sarah Lawrence College

Dennis R. Gordon
Santa Clara University

Trish Tindall
University of Wollongong

Gonzalo Mendieta
Universidad de San Francisco, Quito

Anders Uhrskov
DIS: Denmark's International Study Program

Teresa O'Donnell
Commission on English Language Program Accreditation

Michael Woolf
Foundation for International Education (FIE)

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FORUM ON EDUCATION ABROAD

The Board of Directors is the policy-setting body for the Forum and maintains the ultimate legal and financial authority and responsibility for the well-being of the organization. Directors are drawn from a variety of fields, a structured mix of education abroad professionals and persons outside the field required by the Forum's By-Laws.

Mary Dwyer, Chair*

Institute for the International Education of Students (IES)

Jerry Wilcox, Vice Chair

International Office, University of Texas

Al Balkcum* †

The Learning Abroad Center, University of Minnesota

Mark Chichester

The Socrates Society, Aspen Institute

Madeleine Green

American Council on Education (ACE)

Roberto Gutierrez †

Edison Schools

William Hoffa*

Amherst College

William Hoyer†

Institute for the International Education of Students (IES)

Mary Lou Merkt

Furman University

Barbara Rowe

Yale University

Mark Scheid*

Baker Center for Public Policy, Rice University

Kathleen Sidel†*

Indiana University

Michael Vande Berg *

Council on International Education Exchange (CIEE)

Michael Woolf

Foundation for International Education

*Founding Member

†Member, Board of Directors Task Force on Implementation of Standards of Good Practice

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| AACUPI | CONAHEC | International Studies Abroad |
| Abroadco | Connecticut College | InterStudy |
| Academic Programs International | Cornell University | James Madison University |
| Academy for Educational Development | Council on International Educational | John Carroll University |
| Agnes Scott College | Exchange | Kalamazoo College |
| AIEA | Cultural Experiences Abroad | Lehigh University |
| Alfred University | Cultural Services International | Lewis and Clark College |
| American Councils for International | Dartmouth College | Lexia International |
| Education | DBS Schools of Business and Arts | Linfield College |
| American Institute for Foreign Study | De Pauw University | Miami University |
| American Intercontinental University, | Denmark's International Study Program | Loyola University Chicago |
| London | Dickinson College | Macalester College |
| American University Center of Provence | Earlham College | Macquarie University |
| Amherst College | Eastern Illinois University | Marist College |
| APUNE | EDU - Educational Directories Unltd. | Meredith College |
| Arcadia University, Center for Education | Emory University | Messiah College |
| Abroad | Endicott College | Miami University of Ohio |
| Arizona State University | European Study Abroad (EUSA) | Michigan State University |
| Auburn University | Fairfield University | Middlebury College |
| Austin College | Flinders University of South Australia | Missouri State University |
| Australearn | Florida Atlantic University | Monash University |
| Australian Education International | Fordham University | Mount Holyoke College |
| Azusa Pacific University | Foundation for International Education | North Carolina State University |
| Baruch College, CUNY | Franklin & Marshall College | Northern Kentucky University |
| Baylor University | Friends World Program at Long Island | Northwestern University |
| Beloit College | University | Oberlin College |
| Bentley College | Georgetown University | Ohio State University |
| Bethel University | Georgia Institute of Technology | Pacific Lutheran University |
| Boston College | Georgia Southern University | Pennsylvania State University |
| Boston University | Georgia State University | Pepperdine University |
| Bowdoin College | Global Learning Semesters, Inc. | Pitzer College |
| Bradley University | Global Student Experience | Purdue University |
| Brandeis University | Goucher College | Queensland University of Technology |
| Brethren Colleges Abroad | Gustavus Adolphus College | Rhodes College |
| Brigham Young University | Hampshire College | Rice University |
| Brown University | Harvard University | Rollins College |
| Bryn Mawr College | Haverford College | Rutgers University |
| Center for Cross-Cultural Study | Hope College | Saint Mary's College |
| Center for International Studies | HTH Worldwide | Santa Clara University |
| Center for University Programs Abroad | Illinois State University | Sarah Lawrence College |
| Center of Academic Programs Abroad | Indiana University | School for Field Studies School for |
| Central College Abroad | Institute for American Universities | International Training |
| Chatham College | Institute for International Education of | Scripps College |
| Claremont McKenna College | Students (IES) | Scuola Lorenzo de Medici |
| Colby College | Institute for Shipboard Education | SEA Education Association |
| College Year in Athens | Institute for Study Abroad, Butler | Seattle University |
| Colorado College | University | Siena School for Liberal Arts |
| Columbia University | International Honors Program | SITE - Services for International Travel |
| Compostela Group | International Student Exchange Program | Skidmore College |

THE FORUM ON EDUCATION ABROAD: MEMBERS 2006 - 2007

| | |
|--|---|
| Smith College | University of Miami |
| South India Term Abroad | University of Michigan |
| Southern Methodist University | University of Minnesota, Twin Cities |
| Southern New Hampshire University | University of Missouri-Columbia |
| Southwestern University | University of Nevada, Las Vegas |
| Spelman College | University of New Orleans |
| St. Mary's College of Maryland | University of New South Wales |
| St. Norbert College | University of North Carolina, Charlotte |
| Stonehill College | University of North Texas |
| Study Abroad Italy | University of Notre Dame |
| Study Australia | University of Pennsylvania |
| Suffolk University | University of Pittsburgh |
| SUNY Brockport | University of Queensland |
| SUNY New Paltz | University of Richmond |
| Swinburne University of Technology | University of South Alabama |
| Syracuse University | University of South Carolina |
| Texas Christian University | University of Southern California |
| The Scholar Ship | University of St. Thomas |
| Towson University | University of Tennessee |
| Trinity University | University of Texas, Austin |
| Tufts University | University of Tulsa |
| Union College | University of Virginia |
| University of Adelaide | University of Western Australia |
| University of Arkansas | University of Wisconsin, Madison |
| University of California, Education Abroad Program | University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee |
| University of California, Berkeley | University of Wisconsin, Platteville |
| University of California, Davis | University of Wollongong |
| University of California, Irvine | University Studies Abroad Consortium |
| University of California, Los Angeles | University System of Georgia |
| University of California, Riverside | Ursinus College |
| University of California, San Diego | Valdosta State University |
| University of California, Santa Barbara | Vanderbilt University |
| University of California, Santa Cruz | Villanova University |
| University of Central Florida | Warren Wilson College |
| University of Chicago | Washington University in St. Louis |
| University of Cincinnati | Webster University |
| University of Colorado at Boulder | Wellesley College |
| University of Connecticut | Wells College |
| University of Denver | Wesleyan University |
| University of Illinois, Chicago | Wheaton College |
| University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign | Whitman College |
| University of the Incarnate Word | Whitworth College |
| University of the Pacific | Willamette University |
| University of Iowa | Williams College |
| University of Kentucky | Wofford College |
| University of Limerick | Worcester Polytechnic Institute |
| University of Maryland | Yale University |
| University of Massachusetts-Amherst | |
| University of Melbourne | |

THE
FORUM
ON EDUCATION
ABROAD

DICKINSON COLLEGE

PO Box 1773

CARLISLE, PA

17013

WWW.FORUMEA.ORG