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The Data Committee: What We Do

- Expand the scope of data collection and analysis in education abroad
- Develop new methodologies for collecting quantitative and qualitative data
  - Student participation
  - Program characteristics
  - Issues and topics in the field
- State of the Field Survey
  - Biennial take on the pulse of the field
  - Seventh iteration
  - Longitudinal information about education abroad issues, policies, practices
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State of the Field Methodology

Differences and Trends from 2015

Closer Look:

  Workload

  Increasing Participation

  Impact on Host Communities

Q & A
Methodology: Demographics

- 264 total responses
- 34% of the overall membership
- Response generally representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forum membership</th>
<th>Survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. institution that sends its own students abroad</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-based entity that provides education abroad programs for students not earning a degree through the organization (e.g., program provider, consortium, system office)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A host institution, international university, organization, or independent program provider based outside of the U.S.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or none of the above</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology: Revisions

- **Why Revise**
  - Reflect changes in the field of and its vocabulary
  - Clarify questions
  - Eliminate questions that repeated information gathered elsewhere
  - Craft an easier to complete survey

- **Revisions**
  - Unchanged: 35%
  - Modified: 37%
  - New: 28%
Methodology: Disclaimers

- Where possible: data presented in the context of previous surveys
- New & modified questions: no direct comparisons
- Large sample sizes: U.S. Institutions
- Smaller sample sizes:
  - Overseas Institutions and Organizations
  - U.S. Program Providers
Comparison to 2015: All Respondents

A higher percentage of respondents indicated that The Forum’s Standards of Good Practice were used to shape institutional/organizational policies (70% in 2015, 79% in 2017). Similar results were found for the Code of Ethics (47% in 2015, 64% in 2017). (Note: This is not a long-term trend.)

The rising cost of program operation, marketing, and administration continues to be reported as a primary challenge for both sending and receiving organizations.
Comparison to 2015: All Respondents

Have rising costs and/or declining resources led your institution/organization to change its education abroad programming for the coming academic year?
Comparison to 2015: U.S. Institutions

The distribution of program offerings at U.S. Institutions remained consistent between 2015 and 2017 (figure below is for 2017).
Seventy percent (70%) of respondents at U.S. Institutions indicated that at least some funds paid by education abroad students go to institutional accounts not controlled by the education abroad office. This represents an increase from 56% in 2015 (and 64% in 2007).
Theme #1: Workload

- Common question from Forum member institutions throughout the year

- Past findings
  - 2008: only 18% of respondents “staffed appropriately for the caseloads you presently handle”
  - 2015: “not enough staff” among top barriers to increasing participation; overseas hosts and program providers more likely than U.S. institutions to have increased staff to accommodate growth

- New in 2017: How many staff in your office are dedicated to Health & Safety?
Workload: Overall Staffing Levels

How many full-time equivalent staff are currently employed/work in your office?
Workload: Health & Safety Staffing

How many staff (FTE-equivalent) are dedicated to Health & Safety at your institution?
How many staff (FTE-equivalent) are dedicated to Health & Safety at your institution?
Workload: Health & Safety Staffing

How many staff (FTE-equivalent) are dedicated to Health & Safety at your institution?

- Private Institutions: MEAN: 0.6
- Public Institutions: MEAN: 0.7
- U.S. Program Providers: MEAN: 1.6
- Overseas Program Providers: MEAN: 2.9
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## Education Abroad Staff vs Students Abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average student/staff ratio* (U.S.)</th>
<th>Average student/staff ratio* (Non-U.S.)</th>
<th>Average student/Health &amp; Safety staff ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges and Universities (excl. CCs)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Program Providers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Institutions and Organizations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*number of students sent abroad in 2016-2017 AY / sum of Full-Time and Part-Time paid staff only (not including volunteers or student workers)
Discussion – 5 minutes

1. Do these data reflect what’s happening on your campus? What surprises you?

2. What do you expect to see in the 2019 State of the Field?

3. What other data, tools, or resources would you like to see?
Theme #2: Increasing Participation / Barriers

- Why we’re all here
- Generation Study Abroad
- Surprising diversity of responses
Increasing Participation in Education Abroad

Is your institution/organization trying to send/receive a greater number of students abroad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Institutions and Organizations</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Program Providers</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Institutions</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increasing Participation in Education Abroad

For respondents trying to increase #s, did participation increase in the last year?

- **U.S. Institutions**
  - Yes, significantly: 44%
  - Yes, slightly: 28%
  - Remained about the same: 13%
  - Decreased: 2%
  - Just began actively trying: 13%

- **U.S. Program Providers**
  - Yes, significantly: 31%
  - Yes, slightly: 27%
  - Remained about the same: 19%
  - Decreased: 13%
  - Just began actively trying: 0%

- **Overseas Institutions & Organizations**
  - Yes, significantly: 31%
  - Yes, slightly: 23%
  - Remained about the same: 25%
  - Decreased: 15%
  - Just began actively trying: 0%
Barriers to Increasing Participation

Are there barriers for your institution/organization to increase the number of students abroad?

- **Overseas Institutions and Organizations**
  - Yes: 59%
  - No: 41%

- **U.S. Program Providers**
  - Yes: 82%
  - No: 18%

- **U.S. Institutions**
  - Yes: 87%
  - No: 13%
## Barriers to Increasing Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>U.S. PROGRAM PROVIDERS</th>
<th>OVERSEAS INST/ORGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Competition with home campus activities, sports, internships</td>
<td>Geo-political environment (including travel advisories)</td>
<td>Lack of portability of financial aid, tuition waivers, scholarships, work study jobs, other benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rising cost for program operation, marketing, and administration</td>
<td>Resistance from students’ families; fear; lack of encouragement</td>
<td>Not enough support from or access to institutional leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of portability of financial aid, tuition waivers, scholarships, work study jobs, other benefits</td>
<td>Competition with home campus activities, sports, internships</td>
<td>Not enough interest on the part of faculty to integrate education abroad into degree requirements for transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion – 5 minutes

1. What changes are you seeing in terms of type of programs students choose?
2. Who are these “no barriers” institutions, and what can we learn from them?
3. What impact is Generation Study Abroad having at your institution?
Theme #3: Considering our Impact on Host Communities

The State of the Field Survey has asked Forum members about their consideration of the **environmental, economic, and social consequences** of their programs’ presence in the host country when approving, designing and managing programs. For the first time, the 2017 survey offered **specific response options** for this question rather than a simple yes/no.
Ways respondents actively consider or prepare for environmental consequences of education abroad in host communities.
Ways respondents actively consider or prepare for the social impact of education abroad on host communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for location, transportation, duration, and safety components' impact on the local community</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating host partnerships that are ethical, collaborative, and sustainable</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing community service and/or service learning projects</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - We do not actively address social impacts</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways respondents actively consider or prepare for the economic consequences of education abroad in host communities

- Investing in local entities and understanding the consequences of payments made to those entities: 31%
- Observing local legal and financial standards to align with local practices: 51%
- Teaching students about their economic impact on the local community: 33%
- N/A - We do not actively address economic consequences: 35%
Discussion – 5 minutes

1. What steps has your institution/organization taken to address the environmental, social, and economic impact of education abroad in host communities?
2. What tools would help your institution/organization to better address these concerns?
3. Why do you think considerably fewer respondents indicated that they do not take into account environmental consequences of education abroad compared to its social and economic impacts?
Q & A
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