Standards: 2014 Revision Project
A Brief History, 2001-2011

- Standards as “the #1 goal of the Forum” in 2001
- Early iterations and the Forum as the field’s SDO
- 2004-2011: First four editions released; Queries, toolbox, and QUIP created
- 2011: Fourth edition; broadened Queries, more clarity of Standard 8, and new language regarding non-discrimination, assessment, and environmental/social responsibility
Moving into a Second Decade

- Change of Committee leadership in 2012
- Forum marking its 10-year anniversary
- Broad brush-stroke discussions about the growth and evolution of the Standards, and how to bring them into their second decade
- First, the guidelines!
- Now, we dig in.
Standards: Now and Forever

Queries

Statements

Toolbox

QUIP
• Emphasis on implementation—the “doing” of education abroad
• Basic principles ←→ complex challenges
• Designed to with the diversity of the field in mind—not “one-size fits all”
• Queries: dialogic, self-reflective
• Creative tension between aspirational & prescriptive
• Why? Students.
Guiding Principles: Slash & Style

- 5 pairs of reviewers
  - Bill Anthony + Chris Deegan: Standards 1 and 9
  - Scott Daby + Peter Kerrigan: Standards 2-3
  - Dennis Gordon + Michelle Gere: Standards 4-5
  - Trevor Goddard + Barbara Gorka: Standards 6-7
  - Mark Hayes + Angi Yucas: Standard 8

- Worked sequentially, not concurrently
- Applied “deep, fresh thinking”
- Solicited input beyond the committee
Guiding Principles: Slash & Style

- Encouraged to work towards a final product that’s:
  - Accessible and user-friendly
  - Web-savvy
  - Concise/elegant
  - Broadly applicable
  - Maintaining a balance between prescriptive and aspirational
- On time (March 1)
Challenges & Next Steps

- Revising the revisions: reading them as a group
- Applying improvements to all nine: implementing “assessment-friendly phrasing” for example
- Determining the place for the Queries
- Soliciting and implementing broader input before our Barcelona roll-out
Discussion Questions

- How do you use the Queries and where would you want to position them in the Standards document?

- Prescriptive vs. aspirational: Are we striking the right balance?

- How can we improve our process in our next phase?
General Goals:

- Avoid duplication

- Speak to multiple constituencies: Study abroad professionals, faculty, administrators, students

- Link specific standards and queries to Toolbox resources
Standards 4 & 5

• Move from general statements “how does your organization . . ?” to “in what specific ways does your organization . . ? “

• Include the goal of assessment as in “in what measurable ways do confirm the effectiveness of pre-departure orientation?”
Standards 4 & 5

Consolidate Standard and Query to focus on assessment:

• **Pre- and Post-Departure Advising and Orientation:** The organization provides appropriate advising and orientation support, and continually improves that support by using relevant qualitative and quantitative instruments to assess student needs, such as:
• the past experiences of students, faculty, and staff

• course and co-curricular activity narrative and numerical evaluations
Standards 4 & 5

• current research on international education

• ongoing communication with participants, staff, and faculty
Standards 4 & 5

Followed by Query:

• What type of data is collected to inform faculty and staff understanding of student needs?

• How are students advised on appropriate program selection?

• What specific procedures and assessment activities are used to ensure appropriate advising and pre-departure support?
Consolidated Standard, Query, Resource:

5. Student Recruitment, Selection and Code of Conduct: The organization maintains fair and transparent policies regarding student recruitment, selection and code of conduct.
Standards 4 & 5

Student Recruitment and Selection: The recruitment and selection processes are fair and transparent.

In what specific ways do recruitment goals and admission standards reflect fair and transparent practices?
Standards 4 & 5

Toolbox Web Resources – via link

- Applying to Study Abroad (Northwestern University -- see p. 4)
- Democratizing Study Abroad (Barclay-Hamir)
Standards 4 & 5

Practical Examples:

• list admission standards on program website

• balance top down recruitment goals with staff capacity
Colleague Comments

• Right amount of text, information

• More interesting depiction of the standards in action:
  - Timeline
  - Flow chart
Example:

- Student selects non-approved program
- Credit and application process explained
- Consult Queries to assess effectiveness of application materials
Standards 4 & 5

- Explore Toolbox resources and examples

- Revise procedures, recruitment materials

- Include questions in post-application survey to assess value of materials to students
Standards 6 & 7
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Approach to Revision

Consider standard as **prescriptive**, and convert queries to **bulleted guidelines** that describe elements of that standard

- Standards that are prescriptive are in bold print
- Bulleted guidelines are **not** bolded and intended to be used as:
  - aspirational goals
  - guide for implementation of new programs (your own or others’)
  - guide for assessment of programs (your own or others’)

Example of revised format (Standard 6a)

**Policies:** The organization has adequate and published policies that govern its education abroad programs. This may include:

- Criteria for establishing and terminating programs
- Standards for accepting and reporting student credits from a program
- Waivers and agreements for students participating in programs
- Policies and procedures for negotiating, signing, and implementing agreements and contracts (whether with institutions abroad, program providers, or among consortial member schools)
- Academic and financial policies for students studying abroad
Approach to Revision

- Remove queries that could not be measured
- Reduce redundancy (within individual standards and across standards)
- Don’t get hung up on any one bulleted guideline—when in doubt, we included our concerns, confusion, or questions in the version we sent back to the Forum for future discussion
- See handout for two examples of our “before” and “after” process
Discussion Questions

- How do you use the Queries and where would you want to position them in the Standards document?

- Prescriptive vs. aspirational: Are we striking the right balance?

- How can we improve our process in our next phase?